

Final Meeting Minutes  
Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting  
Sunflower Army Ammunition Plant (SFAAP)  
Wednesday March 6, 2002

1. The twenty-fifth RAB meeting was held on Wednesday, March 6, 2002, at the DeSoto Community Center.
2. Copies of the agenda and sign-in sheets are attached.
3. Mr. Tony Spaar, the Commander's Representative at SFAAP, called the meeting to order at approximately 6:10 pm. Introductions were made around the room.
4. Mr. Tony Spaar stated that the proposed changes for the RAB charter had been sent out to the RAB members. Mr. Spaar then asked for comments on the changes. Mr. Ron West asked if the changes were submitted to the regulators; Dr. Carlson answered that they had received the changes. Ms. Katie Hopkins read a statement from Ms. Micheline Burger (attached). Mr. Jimmy Oyler stated that he had been on the RAB for 4 years and discussed a variety of subjects and his main concern is how much money has been spent and how many solid waste management units have been closed. Ms. Hopkins stated that it would be hard for her to support less input in the future when her input in the past has not been taken seriously. She then moved to keep the present charter, motion was seconded. Mr. Bill Maasen stated that if the RAB votes to keep the current charter, then Mr. Spaar will have to notify his superiors.

Mr. Spaar then summarized the three points that he had been advised to change in the charter – No voting on advice or opinions, selecting new members to fill vacancies, and limiting discussions to environmental restoration. Discussions must be about ERA funded projects. Mr. Spaar stated that if the RAB voted to keep the present charter the RAB would be operating against current Army RAB guidance and would be grounds for disbanding the RAB.

Mr. Maasen confirmed that a quorum was present (16 RAB member, 9 needed for a quorum, 12 present). Vote on motion to keep the present charter 7 in favor, 2 opposed. Motion passed.

5. Mr. Oyler asked that the RAB members be listed separate from the guests on the attendance summary.
6. Six vacancies on the RAB existed prior to Mr. Ron West's resignation prior to the March 6, 2002 RAB meeting. Mr. West recommended Rex Burkhart as his replacement, however Mr. Burkhart did not have an application submitted by March 1, 2002. It was determined that the previous vacancies (6) would be filled tonight, and Mr. West's vacancy would be tabled until the next RAB.
7. Former RAB Community Co-chair Johnna Lingle was presented with a plaque in appreciation of her work on the RAB.
8. The following new RAB members were approved:

David Rhodes	(replaced James Bush)
Darrel Zimmerman	(replaced Merle Couch)
Tom Price	(replaced George Crowder)
Gifford Knapp	(replaced Johnna Lingle)

Charles Benjamin (replaced Alan Stevens)  
Jason Fizell (replaced Eugene Tinberg)

9. Mr. Spaar distributed a handout that summarizes the ERA eligible tasks that can be discussed at RAB meetings. Ms. Hopkins asked for examples of what we can discuss and why we cannot discuss other topics. It was explained by Mr. Spaar and Ms. Meier that topics for discussions must be ERA eligible because ERA funds pay for the RAB. Ms. Hopkins then asked who could give the information on the other projects. Mr. Spaar stated that he could provide the information, just not during the RAB meeting and that he has proposed that 30 minutes be set aside at the end of each RAB for non-IRP questions. Mr. Maasen stated that the approach does not seem logical to the common man. Mr. Milton Bland stated that the federal government sets up constraints so that the money is spent where the government intended for it to be spent. Mr. Spaar and Ms. Meier gave several examples of types of funding and how that funding can be spent.
10. The 2002 Installation Action Plan (IAP) was distributed to each RAB member prior to the start of the meeting. Mr. Spaar summarized the contents. He asked that the members note that SWMU 7 includes work to be conducted at SWMUs 8 & 9. The IAP indicated that SWMUs 8 & 9 are complete, however this is only from a funding standpoint and further work will be conducted at the sites. Mr. Oyler asked how many SWMUs were present at SFAAP including the “new” SWMUs. Mr. Spaar responded that there are 52 SWMUs in DSERTS, 15 new SWMUs for consideration, and 22 Areas of Concern (AOCs). The 15 new SWMUs and 22 AOC have not been entered into DSERTS, and the Center for Health Promotion & Preventive Medicine (CHPPM) will conduct a relative risk screening of the sites. It was also noted that SWMU 10 had been expanded. Mr. Spaar pointed out that \$17.9 million had been spent to date on investigation and cleanup at SFAAP. Mr. Oyler asked if SWMU 21 was being taken care of this year. Mr. Spaar answered that it will be funded in 2002 and the budget for 2002 was \$3.2 million. He also stated that the IAP estimated the total cost for the investigations, cleanup, long term monitoring (LTM) & long term operations (LTO) to be \$74.3 million, and the completion date is estimated to be 2035. The 2035 date is the date that all of the monitoring will be complete. Mr. Oyler asked if the surface water investigation would be completed this year. Mr. Spaar stated that it will be funded with 2002 money. Ms. Hopkins pointed out that the cleanup (without LTM) will be complete in 2011, Mr. Spaar stated that that date is the date for remedies in place (RIP) at the current proposed funding levels and that could change based on defense spending. Mr. Spaar also noted the difference between the constrained and unconstrained budget spreadsheets, i.e., the constrained budget is based on current proposed funding levels and the unconstrained budget is based on how fast the projects could be completed if money was available.
11. The IAP for 2003 is scheduled for March 26 through March 28 in Overland Park, Kansas. Mr. Oyler said that he went last fall and would encourage RAB members to attend if possible. Gifford Knapp will attend and Tom Price will be the alternate.
12. Ms. Meier presented the update on the LTM activities. The contract negotiations were finalized the morning of March 6, 2002, and field work should begin by May 2002. Ms. Hopkins requested that updates in writing be handed out.
13. Mr. Keith Walker presented the update on SWMUs 2, 18, and 32-35 (passed out summary handout). In reference to SWMU 2, Mr. Dean Palos asked why guanidine nitrate was present at the site. Mr. Walker explained that the original mission for the site was changed, and the ponds were later used as settling ponds. In reference to SWMU 18, Mr. Oyler asked when the cover was installed. Mr. Spaar responded that as material was deposited in the landfill cells, it was covered with a layer of soil and that the site history was on page 18 of the IAP. Mr. Ken Herstowski responded that the cover was not

an engineered cover. Mr. Oyler asked if it had been confirmed that there were no toxic substances in the landfill, Mr. Walker responded that there were not. It was then discussed that this statement was based on information from the RCRA Facility Investigation (RFI) (i.e. monitoring well data around the landfill). Mr. Oyler stated that he wanted the landfills cleaned up, but they were planned to just be capped. In reference to SWMU 33-35, Mr. Bazookas asked if residential cleanup levels were being used at the site. Mr. Walker responded that the Army's mission was to cleanup to industrial standards, however the Army looks at cost benefits of cleaning up to residential (this includes the benefit of not having institutional controls at sites). Mr. Oyler asked if the KDHE RSK values had been published, Dr. Randall Carlson stated that they had been. Mr. Oyler asked whose values were being used, Mr. Spaar answered that the lowest of EPA or KDHE were being used.

14. Mr. Shawn Blackshear with ATSDR stated that the public health assessment of SFAAP will be complete next week. At that time he will provide copies to the RAB members and will bring copies to the next RAB meeting.
15. Ms. Meier will try to have badges and table name tents for the new members. Mr. Spaar will try to have the previous RAB members turn in their RAB notebooks so that the new members can use them. Mr. West suggested that all handouts have holes punched in them.
16. Ms. Hopkins asked if the Roberts property was protected from the weather, Mr. Spaar responded that she should contact Mr. Smith for details.
17. Mr. Spaar noted that Clearview City has offered their facility for future meetings and moved that the RAB accept the offer. Mr. Maasen seconded the motion, and the motion passed.
18. Mr. Spaar asked for agenda items for the next meeting.

ATSDR Final Health Assessment Summary  
Updates on current status of ongoing IRP projects  
Replace resigning RAB member Ron West  
Update on IAP meeting

19. The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:45 pm.

**Agenda**  
Sunflower Army Ammunition Plant  
Restoration Advisory Board Meeting  
March 6, 2002

1. Introductions ..... 6:00 - 6:05
  2. Presentation of certificate to Johnna Lingle ..... 6:05 - 6:10
  3. Review and approve minutes from January 9  
meeting..... 6:10 - 6:15
  4. RAB by-laws revisions ..... 6:15 - 6:25
  5. Discussion of new members..... 6:25 - 6:40
  6. Explanation of what actions are IRP eligible..... 6:40 - 6:45
  7. Presentation of Current Status on SWMUs in the  
2002 IAP and previous actions and closed SWMUs 6:40 - 7:05
  8. LTM Update ..... 7:05 - 7:10
  9. Status of SWMUs 18 and 32-35 IRA actions..... 7:10 - 7:15
  10. New business..... 7:15 - 7:20
  11. Q&A..... 7:20 - 7:25
  12. Next meeting date and location and proposed  
agenda items.....7:25 - 7:30
  13. Adjourn..... 7:30
- \* Government representatives available to answer  
non-IRP questions..... 7:30 - 8:00

(Attachment 1)

Dear SFAAP RAB members:

I am sorry that I cannot be at tonight's meeting of the RAB, but I am out of the country at this time and cannot change that.

I want to voice my strong opposition to the Army's proposed changes to the RAB Mission Statement and Operating and Procedure Policies. The changes the Army wants the RAB to approve will drastically alter the independence of the RAB and the ability of the RAB to act on behalf of the community it represents. I am sure that other members of the RAB will (or already have) point out where the significant changes exist. There should be no doubt that the changes proposed will interfere with the ability of the RAB to function as a free and strong community board. I urge you to vote "no" on the proposed changes.

I want to remind all of you that the RAB exists by virtue of Federal law, which requires the Department of Defense to establish and maintain RAB's for military excess property situations, like at SFAAP. The Federal law in question (10 USC §2705) specifically states that the RAB needs to "review relevant documents, to identify environmental restoration activities, to monitor progress of these activities, to collect information regarding restoration priorities, to address land use, level of restoration, acceptable risk related to environmental restoration, and to develop strategies for environmental restoration" and also that the SFAAP installation is required to "consider the recommendations provided by the RAB, including advice given that represents the minority view of members." (See 10 USC §2705 and Management Guidance for DERP-Sept. 2001). This law makes it clear that the RAB can act as a group to provide advice. It is the law that should govern the activities of the RAB, and of the Army. It is the law that I rely on in opposing the proposed changes.

The current RAB operating policies and procedures require that 75% of the present voting members approve any action

taken by the RAB. Among other things, the proposed changes eliminate this entirely. Without the 75% approval by the voting members of the RAB, which is the current rule, the proposed by the Army changes cannot occur. Please do not allow the Army to strip the RAB of whatever ability it currently has to make board decisions.

The Army may threaten to disband or withdraw funding for the SFAAP RAB if we do not agree with their proposed changes. This they cannot do. Federal law requires that the RAB be in place and the law also provides that the Army cannot unilaterally disband or defund the RAB. Any attempts to do so would be in violation of Federal law. Please do not allow the Army's threats in this regard to coerce you into stripping yourself and the board of its authority.

I urge you to vote "no" on the Army's proposed changes.

Thank you.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Micheline Burger". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Micheline Burger

(Attachment 2)

**U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
KANSAS CITY DISTRICT  
TOTAL ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION CONTRACT  
SUNFLOWER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT**

**SWMUs 2, 18, 32, 33, 34, AND 35**

**SWMU 2—River Water Treatment Lagoons**

**Background.** SFAAP will be conducting sediment, surface soil and surface water sampling to collect additional inorganic (metals) characterization data to complete the RCRA Facility Investigation (RFI).

**Current Status**

The Army has completed the revised Field Sampling Work Plan to include more extensive characterization of the surface soils and lagoon berm subsurface soils. Using geoprobe sample collection procedures, samples will be collected from berms at three-foot intervals below ground surface. The compound Guanadine Nitrate (GN), has been added as a contaminant of concern for the investigation. The Final document submittal is delayed to early March in order to finalize the laboratory SOP for the Guanadine Nitrate analysis. The collection of samples, validation of data and the RFI Addendum is still on schedule to be finalized by May 2002.

**SWMU 18—Old Sanitary Landfill**

**Background.** The Army is performing an interim removal action to repair the damaged SWMU 18 landfill vegetative cover. The cover has intermittent patches of exposed landfill debris/rubbish that has been exposed by surface runoff and potentially subsurface seeps.

**Current Status**

The Final Work Plan has been approved by EPA and KDHE. Non-intrusive field activities (site clearing, mowing and work area demarcation) have been completed. The Borrow area has been approved, confirmed by analysis to be "clean" fill. Dioxin analysis has been completed and the data is being validated. Worker exposure action levels have been established and safety controls have been incorporated into the project execution. The landfill cover work began in mid February, 2002. Soils have been moved and stockpiled at SWMU 18. Three disturbance areas in the southwestern section of SWMU 18 have been completely filled and compacted to grade. Five additional areas in the northwestern section are in the process of being graded and compacted. Twelve gabion baskets are being assembled to stabilize the drainage outfall. The drainage channels will be surveyed next week to line up the preferential flow path to the tributary to the Captain's Creek.

**SWMU 32—Lead Reclamation Area**

**Background.** The lead reclamation area consists of a 1-acre parcel of lead contaminated surface soils. On behalf of the Army, IT will remove 740 tons of lead contaminated soils

and confirm that remaining soils meet KDHE residential land-use standards. The site will be re-graded to promote drainage away from the site and prevent ponding within the site.

**Current Status**

The Army has completed soil removal and treatment for SWMU 32. Excavated areas have been land surveyed and will be re-graded and stabilized with hay mulch (flats) and erosion matting (sloped areas) for the winter. Revegetation will be performed in the spring.

**SWMU 33, 34 and 35—Half Tanks/Settling Ponds**

These SWMUs consist of two settling tanks and 4 settling ponds that contain residual inorganic, semi-volatile and explosive contaminants. The Army will remove, consolidate and treat impacted soils for offsite disposal as Special Waste.

**Current Status**

On behalf of the Army, IT Corporation has completed all treatment and disposal for SWMU 34 and has completed all soil removal and disposal for SWMU 35 with the exception of the bottom foot of pond bottom sediment. Approximately 2,111 tons of treated soil disposed of off-site. The US Army Corps of Engineers has submitted a proposal to initiate additional cleanup under this interim removal action in an effort to remove all potential contamination from the unlined ditches, half tank areas and stream influent locations.

IT has initiated the soil sample location and identification process. Sampling will confirm the presence of COCs, and will dictate where additional excavation shall commence. Soils will be treated within SWMU 35 consistent with previous operations. Additionally, groundwater sampling will be conducted to close the ponds in compliance with KDHE requirements. The additional areas will be restored to promote drainage of storm water away from the disturbance areas. IT anticipates demobilization to be complete by mid April 2002 with the additional work.

As of February 28, 2002, IT has amassed over 30,000 man-hours while conducting environmental restoration activities without a single time-loss or OSHA recordable injury, a first aid case or a vehicular accident.