M67386.AR.000172
MCRCO KANSAS CITY
5090.3a

MINUTES FOR BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE CLEANUP TEAM MEETING HELD 8 AUGUST 1996 KANSAS CITY MO

8/8/1996

HOSTETLER & ASSOCIATES

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE BASE CONVERSION AGENCY

BRAC CLEANUP TEAM MEETING

TRANSCRIPT OF THE BRAC CLEANUP TEAM MEETING held on Wednesday, August 8, 1996, commencing at 10:00 a.m. at 15471 Hangar Road, Kansas City, Missouri.

PRESENT:

Robert Lodato, OLQ; Fred Waterman, Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence; Robert Koke, Environmental Protection Agency; Wayne Mizer, L. Kristopher Moore and Forrest Terrell, Dames and Moore; Bob Geller, Guy Frazier and Diana Travis, Missouri Department of Natural Resources; Dennis Wilmsmeyer, John McLendon and Neil Maxfield, Kansas City Aviation Department; Annette Braam, Marine Corps Support Activity; Ron McCutcheon, HDB.

HOSTETLER & ASSOCIATES, INC
REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL REPORTERS

COPY

(Whereupon, the meeting commenced at 10:00 a.m.)

MR. LODATO: I'd like to go around the room. We're passing the sign-in sheet. I'd like to go around and do introductions starting with Mr. Koke.

MR. KOKE: I'm Bob Koke with EPA.

MR. MIZER: Wayne Mizer, project manager for Dames and Moore.

MR. MOORE: Kris Moore, Dames and Moore.

MS. BRAAM: Annette Braam, Marine Corps.

MR. WILMSMEYER: Dennis Wilmsmeyer, Kansas City Aviation Department.

MR. McLENDON: John McLendon from the Aviation Department.

MR. MAXFIELD: Neil Maxfield from the Aviation Department.

MS. TRAVIS: Diane Travis from Missouri DNR.

MR. FRAZIER: Guy Frazier, Missouri DNR.

MR. GELLER: Bob Geller, Missouri DNR.

MR. McCUTCHEON: Ron McCutcheon, project management, HDB.

MR. TERRELL: Forrest Terrell with Dames and Moore.

MR. WATERMAN: Fred Waterman, Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence, San Antonio.

MR. LODATO: Thank you. I've got a few things I'd like to pass out for you. This is from the air show. That's for Mr. Geller. A quick note to our Mr. Koke. I want to thank him. EPA did the administrative record for us in their format, and we've got that available back there. Thank you for that. Bob, I've gone to the BEC conference in Virginia a couple weeks ago, and you asked for some information. Donna is making a copy of the book for you, the latest draft.

MR. GELLER: Okay.

MR. LODATO: You'll have that before you leave today. On the exemptions, you had asked about exemptions and the lawyer, Doug Bauer, stated that, yes, there's some grumblings amongst the different regions, but at this stage of the game, no decision. We're still forging ahead with the exemptions.

MR. GELLER: Okay. The issue that was raised is a question of is the Air Force exempt or any other military agency from obtaining state permits for doing either base closure activities or CERCLA type cleanups, and essentially the state is saying no, you're not exempt unless you're on the MPB. We have some discussions going on with the EPA for CERCLA permits, but we don't see there are any exemptions from permits for any of the base closure sites from our perspective.

MR. LODATO: Question to Guy. Did you receive -- and Mr. Koke -- did you receive the draft report on Site 8, SS008? It was Fed-Exed out Monday.

MR. KOKE: Yes.

MR. FRAZIER: I don't know, Robert.

MR. LODATO: Okay. Does everyone have a copy of the agenda? The first agenda item is the Belton Drop Zone or the Belton Training Complex.

MR. GELLER: I guess if I could make one comment first just for the record and also for I guess for the benefit of the Air Force

1 and all the people that worked on this project I
2 would like to express the Department of Natural
3 Resources' and my personal condolences for and
4 sympathy for the loss of Mark Esch. It was quite
5 a shock to us, and we were extremely taken back by
6 that. Mark worked very hard on this project,
7 worked very close with him. So it was really a
8 loss to us, and I guess we express that sympathy
9 to the Air Force and to his family and everyone
10 else. It was a very trying time for us to see
11 that. Just want to make that point.
12 MR. LODATO: Appreciate it. And,
13 as a result, we do have some new players, people
14 have been bumped up, if you will. Guy Frazier is
15 now our project manager out here, and I've been
16 appointed the BEC. So if you can, bear with Guy
17 and I as we trudge along and get caught up on
18 things. Our goal is not to let anything slip
19 through the cracks and keep, you know, on track.
20 I mean, we do have a base to close, and with the
21 support of Guy and MDNR and EPA and all parties
22 involved, we'll accomplish that.
23 The Belton Training Complex, yesterday
24 afternoon I took Mr. Geller, Mr. Frazier and
25 Ms. Travis out there, and we basically looked

1 around the area. I can give you an update.
2 AFRAS, Air Force Reserves, was out here on the
3 16th of July, and they did a survey for us.
4 They've marked all the anomalies that were
5 detected. They'll be back out early October
6 depending on what kind of contracting mechanisms
7 we can get in place for their support. They'll be
8 back out in October to do the actual clearance
9 once the work plan, the clearance work plan, has
10 been approved, not only by DNR, run it through
11 their channels and also the safety board. So the
12 plan is that, yes, they will be out in October to
13 start clearing and safing the area.
14 And as a follow-on to that we'll be
15 doing the -- one of our contractors will be doing
16 the PA/SI out there. We're going to split that up
17 into two phases, phase one being they can go ahead
18 and do the administrative records type search
19 portion of the PA/SI now while we're waiting for
20 the clearing. As soon as AFRAS is done they'll
21 piggy-back right off of them and get out there and
22 do their sampling. It seems to be a logical
23 common sense approach to that. So that's the
24 latest update on the Belton draining complex, and
25 that also includes the weapons storage area, the

1200 area.

MR. WATERMAN: We're still looking for a December target date to be able to mobilize?

MR. LODATO: Right. When AFRAS gets back out in October they've estimated anywhere from 30 to 45 days to do their work out there. October, November, December, so it's going to be late December, early January.

MR. WATERMAN: Okay.

MR. LODATO: It will be interesting weather-wise to see if they're going to be able to get out there and do some sampling, but it would be nice to not have to delay first our being out there so, as usual, things go on a very smooth sequence of events. Any questions on the drop zone?

MR. WATERMAN: I might. When do we expect the comments in on the draft work plan, or is this the internal Air Force draft work plan at this point?

MR. LODATO: For?

MR. WATERMAN: For the PA/SI.

MR. LODATO: Oh, yes. As a matter of fact, I just got this the other day, and

I haven't distributed the draft work plan yet for the PA/SI. I'll hand those out for you folks later.

MR. WATERMAN: Okay.

MR. LODATO: The third item was the underground storage tank sampling we're going to be doing out here. I don't have a time frame for you just yet. I had written a scope of work. The original scope was for 13 tanks. Up that to 20 tanks because there have been some concerns a while back that the tank project that was performed out here was questionable and we had agreed that if one of the tanks came back suspect we would go ahead and do 25 percent of the remaining. My feeling is the contractor is going to be out here, we'll have them do 20 of those tanks. And those were the tanks, all of the tanks that were part of that project. It seems logical to do that to avoid any questions coming up down the road. This will be a benefit to the city as you start to acquire the property. So the scope of work was kind of one of my first, if you will, so it's pretty shaky.

We'd like to go through -- we may want to do this later on because this is going to take

a while to go through and get the verbiage in there so we can have HDB who will be doing the work for us draw up his work plan with everything inclusive, all the comments, so we can get him off and running. And this way we'll avoid the paperwork shuffle back and forth, you know, draft comments, comments to the draft draft comments, you know, I'm just trying to avoid any paperwork shuffle. So possibly we can delay that until the latter part of the meeting, because that is going to take us a while to go through the 20 tanks. Is that acceptable?

MR. GELLER: We can take a look at it and see. Have we seen that scope of work? Okay, we've got it so we can provide you some comments.

MR. LODATO: Okay.

MR. WILMSMEYER: Robert, if we could, could we get an idea where those tanks are or a list of the tank sites or scope of work or whatever is easiest for you?

MR. LODATO: Yes, we can do that.

MR. WILMSMEYER: Thank you. Next item, Building 918, the pipeline assessment. Diane had some questions yesterday. I was able to

find a drawing, if you will, from the original leak test that was done by Tracer and I'll make a copy of this and this will kind of give you an idea as to why we took the samples where we did.

MS. TRAVIS: Thanks.

MR. MIZER: Could you elaborate on that a little bit, Robert?

MR. LODATO: The pipe assessment which was behind 918 basically down the center of the road here, that was part of the hydrant piping system from the POL yard out to site 7. There was a pressure check that was done a couple years ago, and they found a few leaks in this general area here (indicating). So we've gone through and did some soil borings and installed a piezometer. You should have received a copy of the soil contamination assessment report. Have you seen this?

MR. FRAZIER: I can't confirm or deny it.

MR. MIZER: Is this part of the same sampling that was done when they found the breakdown at 942?

MR. LODATO: No, no. This was a follow-up because there was a question, there were

some leaks detected here, so it was a follow-along to that. We decided to go in and do some soil sampling and a water sample. Right, it was sent out to you on the 24th of June.

MR. WILMSMEYER: Is that system to be taken out of the ground by the Air Force?

MR. LODATO: No.

MR. WILMSMEYER: Is that considered -- a hydrant line considered an underground storage tank?

MR. GELLER: Yes.

MR. WILMSMEYER: And the Air Force has decided not to take it out, or has that decision been made?

MR. LODATO: Will the city take it out? I mean, dollar-wise you're talking a lot of money to do that, and considering it's still underground, I mean --

MR. WILMSMEYER: It's an empty system today if I understand that tank.

MR. LODATO: Uh-huh.

MR. WILMSMEYER: And I don't know if the '98 deadlines, what all implications that has. Does it need to be removed by '98?

MR. GELLER: That question I

haven't asked, but we did go back and reconfirm was that piping considered UST and there were some differences back and forth because it wasn't connected to an underground storage tank. The underground storage tanks have already been removed, but the Air Force always looked at it as part of the UST. And DNR, when I asked the question just a couple weeks ago, confirmed that yes, it is still a UST. Just because you remove the tanks, the piping system is part of it and is still incorporated as part of that UST. So you will need to address closure of the system as a whole.

MR. LODATO: Okay. That brings up one of your items this morning on should we go ahead and plug the lines, cap the lines, you know, because there was a cut here at 942.

MR. GELLER: Right.

MR. LODATO: There was a cut down at the POL yard and the one over here at site 7 (indicating). Should we go ahead and cap those?

MR. GELLER: And that part I would have to take back and check with our UST folks. We can do that fairly easily. That clearly is a regulatory -- not just a typical

environmental oversight. I want to make sure it's consistent with -- as far as closure as a hydrant line. We can do that as a request. Is that what your proposing, is to cap those?

MR. MIZER: That was just a discussion, it was one option.

MR. WATERMAN: Just something where the BCT needs to --

MR. GELLER: Actually Kris Davidson, who was serving in an acting capacity where the previous manager is now heading that underground storage tank section, so she's very familiar with the question you're faced with here. We can get a fairly quick response on whatever proposal you're submitting, I mean, just a verbal response of whether that would be acceptable or not. I can't say at this point.

MR. LODATO: Well, that's kind of all inclusive of not only the POL yard but 942.

MR. TERRELL: This was new information to us on us here. It was really depending somewhat on what this investigation found here. If you've got significant contamination from this investigation you may have to remove part of it and then plug the rest. So I

mean, it may be a combination of that.

MR. LODATO: Okay. Going through, they had taken two water samples, five soil samples out there. They all came back nondetect. So I don't foresee a problem right here on this line. But you had raised an interesting question, you know, should we go ahead and cap those. Would that be cap and then check again for any leaks, or maybe I'm missing the boat here.

MR. TERRELL: Maybe we can just make it an action item for them to review, capping or grouting or whatever is an acceptable --

MR. GELLER: What's an acceptable alternative.

MR. TERRELL: And let them come back and give us their thoughts.

MR. WATERMAN: Typically what is done at Air Force base closures is that the line is sampled along the alignment, as has been done here. Then they're flushed, pegged and either grouted or filled with an expandable foam to basically ~~interrupt~~ INERT the line in place.

PIGGED

MR. GELLER: The one exception here is there's only been a few investigations

1 along the line itself. The only reason the Air
2 Force went back and looked in this one particular
3 area is because a leak test identified there was a
4 breach in the line so they went back and under
5 reasonable suspicion thought that would be a place
6 we should be looking for a leak. They didn't
7 actually go back and characterize the line.
8 MR. TERRELL: But they did do --
9 when they found that leak they did do a soil gas
10 all along the line.
11 MR. GELLER: Is that correct?
12 MR. LODATO: Yeah, that was part
13 of the Tracer Research.
14 MR. TERRELL: And that was the
15 only part they found high gas soil readings. So I
16 think they've done an adequate --
17 MR. WATERMAN: We've accomplished
18 that part of it.
19 MR. LODATO: I'll need to find
20 that report. Tracer Research had done it. So
21 during one of our breaks I'll try to find that.
22 MR. GELLER: Okay.
23 MR. LODATO: Go ahead.
24 MR. GELLER: I was just going to
25 ask Fred for the -- is that something as far as

the Air Force is concerned a preferred option for closure of these things, if you can kind of describe that to me so I make sure I transfer the right information, I think that would be the way we prefer to do it. What is your preference of how you'd like to close it, and, if so, I'd like to take that back and see if that's acceptable. That's probably the best way for me to approach closure on that line is if you want to put foam or grout or whatever it is in there, if that's what you would propose then I'll take that back to my --

MR. WATERMAN: Okay. Decision is for BCT as I see it, but that's typically --

MR. TERRELL: Most of the ones we've done in the past that we've bid on the Air Force is giving us an alternative of grout, expandable foam or sand, and that's been acceptable to the Air Force in the past.

MR. GELLER: I'll take that back that this is what they would propose, and do we have a similar --

MR. LODATO: And as we proceed along those lines, we'll not only have the latest data from the soil borings and the piezometer that

was taken out here, it will also include the Tracer report. So it will be a complete package, if you will so we can close out that whole system.

Next item was the central drainage area, and as much as I hate to admit it I've misplaced my copy. Has the state had a chance, do we have any comments on this report?

MR. FRAZIER: We're currently looking at it now.

MR. LODATO: Okay. We had talked yesterday as we were out about beryllium and some of the compounds that had showed up that may need to be addressed later on. We'd also talked about the TPH hit here at the head wall which we suspect is coming from site 7. So it really looks like this date we'll have to go back and review the package, and then we'll come up with some kind of conclusion as to any further investigations that will be done.

MR. WATERMAN: I'd state it more positively than that.

MR. LODATO: Well, if you go through the report, I mean, yes, there are a few items, a few compounds that are above the ASLs,

but we know it's not going anywhere per se. It's pretty well bound up. You know, you may have a hit at a point ten feet down, you know, down the creek bed you're not going to have anything. So it seems to be isolated in little areas, you know, a hit here, a hit here, a hit here. We're not looking at a whole central drainage area that's contaminated from influent to effluent going out. Personal feeling is I think we're going to be in pretty good shape other than some of the compounds. We're not getting a whole lot of comments or feedback.

MR. WATERMAN: I think the biggest issue was metals and background, background concentration of some of the metals.

MR. LODATO: Yes, and I'm sure the state has that report. Kris Moore sent over background levels for Missouri.

MR. KOKE: Uh-huh.

MR. LODATO: A geological report.

MR. MOORE: For metals, right.

MR. LODATO: So I've got that if you need a copy of it. I'm sure you've got it in your office, but I can go ahead and run off a copy and you can have it.

MS. TRAVIS: Are you talking for the agricultural soils?

MR. MOORE: 954-H.

MS. TRAVIS: It's background soils, metal and soils for agricultural. Yeah, we have that.

MR. GELLER: Just so you know, we don't always use that for the definitive answer when you're looking at metals for the soils if you're looking for hazardous waste. It's a general guidance, and then we base that on any other data that we have, specifically geological data, and use that information. But it's not the final answer on is that a background level or not. So we'll look at that and see. Things like beryllium we may have some additional question.

MR. MOORE: Beryllium is naturally high. You find it in the eastern part of Missouri and western part of Kansas. It's pretty high.

MR. GELLER: Any other supplemental data that you have from other work that can verify that those are consistent background, generally that is always a question, what are background levels. And, unfortunately,

other people don't try to collect background until they see samples and try to define it as background so where when we look at background we go to places that we all agree should be background, not the drainage area that's draining the entire base is not where we try to identify background levels. We'll probably be asking for more information. If you're saying those numbers are background we're going to ask for more than it matches a USGS report.

MR. MOORE: Fair enough.

MR. TERRELL: Do you have investigations, I mean, have you had other projects that have established background levels in this area?

MR. GELLER: I'll have to look. Not federal facilities, but DNR other hazardous waste sites, we'll go back and try to correlate that information on our end whether we feel it is consistent.

MR. TERRELL: So it should be an action item on both ends?

MR. MOORE: I've had success in getting copies of reports from DNR, whether it's in the Joplin area or St. Louis area, they've

directed me toward reports that would show me some things like that.

MR. GELLER: Okay. Obviously we're going to look at that and determine whether the areas or the levels are anything of concern.

MR. LODATO: And that will also come in handy, if you will, when we get ready to close out these sites, site 3, 4, 6, 8, you know, as we go down the road. Because in those sites, I think there's six of them, we're almost at that stage where it's time to close them out. You know, we've done the soils, we recently did ground water and that report is due out within the next probably three weeks, you know, three to four weeks, early September. So we'll be able to put the packages together and proceed on, start to close some of these sites.

MR. GELLER: I guess one of the questions, and I'll go ahead and pose this now. One of the things that will be very helpful for at least DNR and I also think it will be helpful for the public as we try to answer some of the questions that are these things background levels or something is to take all the data that you have out there and all the information about the base

and put it into some type of a comprehensive -- maybe you've already got it -- but some kind of comprehensive database or map so as we start looking at these sites, we've always looked at them piece by piece by piece, but as we get ready to close things out it's helpful if you can look at them as a general area so we can be sure are the background levels at the central drainage area -- it's not the only area where you've taken metal samples so let's look at all the areas where you've taken data and compare and contrast it, is it the same across the base. Site specific samples are the best. I don't know if that's something that you have. Is all your data in one place so we can take a look at all the samples?

MR. WATERMAN: No.

MR. GELLER: I'm just asking. If you have, it's something that can help because it's very awkward for the public or anyone else to figure out what do you call that site, where is it, how do I know that's background when they have to go through 352 or 1,000 documents to find it. It's even complicated for our new staff because it's telling you to refer to one document and the next and the next. It's almost impossible for

anyone else that doesn't work on these projects almost full time to track that stuff.

MR. WATERMAN: Our whole approach has been on a site-specific basis.

MR. GELLER: I understand that, but as you build those little pieces of the puzzle for Richards-Gebaur one thing I'm asking is can you compile much of that information. It's probably better to start on it now if it's a reasonable approach to be able to access that data. I'm not saying you have to use a GIS system or anything like that but make sure as you collect data it's fed into a master database. You're locating all these samples. It should be at least in one box at one time. What's the closest sample to this point here and you can figure it out. Just a request of something to consider.

MR. WATERMAN: Okay. We'll look at that.

MR. LODATO: Yes. Not that it's going to be easy to do. I think a joint effort between our office, your office, Mr. Koke's office and we can take advantage of the information that PSI has provided to the city.

MR. WILMSMEYER: Sure.

1 MR. LODATO: That brings me up to
2 an item which isn't on the agenda but it's going
3 to be forthcoming, and that is as we get ready to
4 do the long-term public conveyance furtherance
5 lease with the city the plan is to have that
6 signed, sealed and delivered come October. But
7 that's going to include the EBSSs for all of that
8 area. You know, we've got buildings here and
9 buildings there. So I'm suggesting -- and we'll
10 work out a schedule -- it's going to take a group
11 effort, if you will, and if that means two, three
12 days nonstop I'll request that. Because time is
13 getting short, if you will, and that's been a
14 request put on me is to get all these EBSSs
15 together so we can have the one that will be all
16 inclusive of the properties going to the city.
17 Which means once we get ours together it has to go
18 to headquarters for their review. It's one of
19 those things where we need it yesterday. So be
20 forewarned that I'll be requesting assistance from
21 you folks to do this.
22 MR. GELLER: And I think actually
23 my request goes along with that EBSS that it's a
24 comprehensive map of all the areas as well as the
25 supporting data that confirms those conclusions,

that supports those conclusions.

MR. LODATO: Right, and this is really a BCT member project that we're going to have to do.

MR. WATERMAN: Should we set up a work group to do that?

MR. LODATO: Right. Good idea. We will set up a separate work group. Does EPA have any objection to that?

MR. KOKE: Not at all.

MR. LODATO: I know it seems like I'm throwing bits and pieces in here, I'm just trying to get it all together, if you will. But there is going to be a lot happening here in the next couple of months and especially within the next year as we get ready to move on and close the base. So that's just an observation.

MR. WATERMAN: Before we leave the issue of metals and background, we're going to do a literature search and see if the levels that were encountered here are comparable to the background in the area of the region.

MR. MOORE: Uh-huh, right.

MR. WATERMAN: And, if not, we'd like you to do some site specific determination of

1 background. If it comes to that I'd like to know
2 as soon as possible so we can contract for that
3 because that would be beyond the scope of what we
4 have to establish a site specific background. I
5 suspect that with the results we have for that
6 site I think that a literature search will bear
7 out what we found is reasonable.
8 MR. GELLER: Okay.
9 MR. TERRELL: We know that the
10 corps has been doing some similar type of work at
11 the FUD sites around the base through their
12 contract. If we can get the results of their
13 studies and just -- that may give us, because
14 that's going to give us the closest information
15 and that's available right now. That may be all
16 we need to do.
17 MR. LODATO: Right. The corps
18 was going to courtesy copy us all their data as
19 they hit those sites.
20 MR. WATERMAN: Good.
21 MR. TERRELL: And there's about
22 15 or 20 FUD sites right around the base that
23 they've already investigated.
24 MR. LODATO: And that report is
25 forthcoming within the next couple of weeks. So

I'll provide that first to Fred, and then we'll take it from there. I don't want to jump the gun. I'm going to take a ten-minute time out.

(Whereupon, a short recess was had.)

MR. LODATO: Next on the agenda is the POL yard remediation project, and Mr. Mizer and Mr. Moore will update us.

MR. MIZER: Okay. I'll start. Kris, jump in whenever. Basically to give you just a little bit of history for those of you who are fairly new, when we started on the POL we started with a phase one, not a phase one in technical terms but we had three phases to the project. Phase one was to be the removal of the tanks and the underground piping, phase two was to be a site characterization, and phase three will be the remediation phase of the project.

In phase one basically what we did is go in and remove the two JP-4 tanks and the bunker oil tank and the building 953 and building 951, the loadout area and all the header pipe along here. During that phase we found that the underground piping was covered with an asbestos covering mastic type material so we had to bring

in a separate contractor to deal with that special type of thing. During that we had to remove a contaminated sewer line that was providing drainage for the area, so if you've been out there or go out there that much and see this pond that's been generated it's because we had removed the drainage. We have drained it a couple of times, and we're preparing to do it again. We're trying to minimize the cost on doing it but trying to maintain the safety and security of the site. When we are done and have recontoured the line we will put in a permanent line and either run it over to Scope Creek and this will be part of the natural drainage.

MR. MOORE: I might add, during the asbestos removal from the pipe the mastic was tested for PCB and came up negative I believe on eight samples, different spots along the line.

MR. MIZER: I think after I talked with you the last time we tested it again, so we got another confirmation.

MR. GELLER: Right.

MR. MIZER: So that basically completed phase one. Yes, sir.

MR. WILMSMEYER: If I could, that

HOSTETLER & ASSOCIATES, INC
REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL REPORTERS

line fed into an oil/water separator?

MR. MIZER: Actually I think this one went into this area right here, didn't it, Kris (indicating)?

MR. MOORE: Two places. One line there was a four-inch PVC sedentary line, but there was also a 15-inch corrugated metal pipe.

MR. WILMSMEYER: Drained into the stream. When that gets reconnected does it all go straight to the creek, or does it go to the oil/water separator?

MR. MOORE: That's under debate right now.

MR. MIZER: That's decommissioned in a couple of years so we don't see any reason to send it to the separator if it's going to be taken out.

MR. WILMSMEYER: That's the preferred option. I just want to make the state aware because water going through that storm process now and the oil/water separator was under debate at one time.

MR. MOORE: Right now we're getting into a dry season, and this backup won't be performing as much as we've had 12 inches in

rain in July in a lot of places right here and it was kind of an unusual circumstance. So hopefully we'll get into the dry season and the killdeer will go away.

MR. MIZER: When we went into phase two of the site characterization we went back where we had found some preliminary screenings when we had the trenches open and looked at those even more than we had looked at the other areas. But basically we had a program where we were going to do 96 samples I believe or 96 borings and take three samples on each boring and then we had blanks in the equipment samples and things like that. So we have submitted somewhere in the neighborhood of 280 or 300 samples to Chemron and it's taken them basically a month concentrating on only this project to get the results back. And we have most of those results now. What we have found in these areas now where the JP-4 tanks and along the header lines here particularly and one area here around building 953, we were coming up with hits above action levels in excess of 500 TPH preliminarily. And the counts in here are coming in between 500 and 2,600. So we're right in the range that we

had tested for land farming options, and that's within -- except for I think one of them which was slightly over the limit -- they're within the range of MDNR for farming permits. Right now we are in the neighborhood of between 2,000 and 5,000 cubic yards of dirt that looks like it needs to be removed from the site. You may have heard some other figures above that based on our field screening, but based on the specific laboratory results that are coming out now, are coming to us now, we've ratchetted that down a little bit to more like 2,000 to 2,500 cubic yards. But, again, we are not quite done so that is subject to change again.

Now, when we had done this we found contamination from this tank that appeared to be moving onto city property. Seems very obvious from the field screenings we were doing we stepped out and went slightly onto the city property, ran some results. The field screens indicated very high hits. When we got the laboratory results back what we found were very strong hits right here, but they died almost immediately at the city line (indicating). They had moved out away from the tanks, pooled and just stopped in that area.

We discussed this with the city who had done their own confirmatory sampling, and they found the same thing. The avgas does not appear to be moving onto Air Force property, and the Air Force jet fuel does not seem to be going more than a few inches, you know, a couple feet, something like that, onto the property. And that was within our contract anyway to be able to chase that. But what we will do here should not in any way affect the structural integrity of this tank or require removal of this thank. So the city is taking the option that that tank will probably be there for five or ten years before they elect to remove it. So we will probably, if anything, just go over onto that.

We went out and walked the site the other day and discussed how we will have to breach their berm and do some other things like that and the effects on the drainage so we are working with them at this time. At the same time we were given authorization to proceed off Air Force property in this plane. We also went in this plane. All these yellow dots that you see here are basically right on the property line and moving off the property line, and, as you can see, we're getting

1 some hits, confirmed hits, on the city property
2 which is leased to the Marine Corps (indicating).
3 That is the extent of how far we have gone.
4 Now, next week we are mobilizing with a
5 soil gas rig and we are going to put a grid out
6 here and we are going to test from Andrews up to
7 here (indicating). And we are anticipating or
8 hoping maybe you want to say at this time that the
9 plume that obviously is moving in this direction
10 which is apparently coming from this tank or from
11 the line here, it is --
12 MR. MOORE: More like the header
13 line I think.
14 MR. MIZER: But it is JP-4 as
15 opposed to the avgas or bunker locality so it's
16 coming off the header line or coming off the
17 tanks. It is moving somewhat in this direction
18 and we are going to determine how far out this
19 plume goes (indicating). We have already talked
20 with the Corps of Engineers. They have made a
21 recommendation that if we find hits down here
22 close to Andrews that we go ahead and cross
23 Andrews and go to the outfall at Scope Creek which
24 is about the same distance the other side of
25 Andrews so it would be about in here

1 proportionally, but we don't want to go across the
2 road unless it's obvious that we are approaching
3 the road there (indicating). Yes, sir.
4 MR. WATERMAN: A question. The
5 header line there, number of hits, as I understand
6 that is on Air Force property?
7 MR. MIZER: Yes, sir.
8 MR. WATERMAN: And --
9 MR. MIZER: Barely inside the
10 line, right.
11 MR. MOORE: Right, within four
12 feet of the fence.
13 MR. WATERMAN: Okay. What depths
14 are we finding?
15 MR. MOORE: Anywhere from two
16 feet to eight feet, and the water table appears to
17 be right at eight feet.
18 MR. MIZER: So, yeah, when we do
19 this we're going to be looking at soil gas
20 sampling and hitting some water sampling there
21 also. And, Kris, again, help me with this. Some
22 of this material is fill material, and we're
23 finding the water table is in some places like a
24 few inches or couple of feet and other places down
25 to as much as eight feet.

1 MR. MOORE: Right. And when you
2 get inside the berm where we've been working
3 inside the berm in the case to 951 and 953 you're
4 already six feet below grade and you get into the
5 water quickly. But as soon as you jump on top of
6 the roads you have to go at least six feet, if not
7 eight feet, to find the water.
8 MR. MIZER: So, again, the next
9 thing for us to do is get in here and find the
10 extent of the contamination, the extent of the
11 plume I guess and then what the levels are in
12 here. And then we will have completely assessed
13 the whole area. Then at that time we will provide
14 the phase two report with recommendations and it
15 will go through the BCT and be approved and then
16 at that time we will begin on the phase three
17 plans which will be the work plan and the quality
18 plans for the closure. And, of course, as you all
19 know from having been in most of these meetings,
20 we're discussing everything from natural
21 continuation to truck and haul land farming, et
22 cetera, et cetera. And because of the rains and
23 because of adding phase two into this and the
24 increase in the levels that we're going after,
25 we'll be quite honest, we're pushing the limit on

dollars and schedule both. We're trying to do everything we can to stay within the confines on both. But that, coupled with the unexpected rains this summer and the late being able to complete the removal of some of the piping and things, I guess what I'm saying is I'm asking the team to help us maintain the schedule as it is. If we do a land farming option it's going to be very difficult to complete this, write the plans, get the plans approved and get the land farm built before it gets too cold yet this fall. And if we do a land farming operation and things we want to stay within the base closure limits obviously and the contract. So any questions?

MR. TERRELL: What were the hits along the header line, what were the lab --

MR. MOORE: Lab results?

MR. TERRELL: Yeah, what was the typical hit across that line there?

MR. MOORE: Okay.

MR. TERRELL: To get kind of an idea if there's a strong hit that's probably a substantial blow but because that area on east is downgrade --

MR. MOORE: Okay. Sample 5 we

1 started here, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 so I'm
2 going to start at 5 and go from left to right. At
3 5, for example, at six feet it's 775; 6, we've got
4 about right at 1,000; 7, looking at 1,600, 1,700;
5 8, approximately 1,900; 9, we're looking at 1,400;
6 10, 1,600, and that would be sort of the northeast
7 end of it at that point; 11 died out, we're
8 looking at about 100 -- right around 200; and
9 basically nondetect at 12 at this end right in
10 here (indicating). And starting back at 13, let's
11 see, 13 is around 250 or so, 13; and then 14 jumps
12 back up in the 1,100 range; 16,.
13 MR. McLENDON: 0; and then this
14 hit right here, number 23, is the one we were
15 talking about that went over the 2,500 PPM limit.
16 Where did it go. I believe it was 2,700, 2,738 on
17 that.
18 MR. TERRELL: On the far left
19 side, and you didn't go any further to the south
20 there?
21 MR. MOORE: Not to the south. We
22 did here, and that was 24 nondetect over here
23 (indicating).
24 MR. WATERMAN: I suspect what
25 we've got there is a simple line change.

MR. MOORE: Overfill.

MR. WATERMAN: And probably sand bedding.

MR. MIZER: That is probably overfill from the usage in that, but somewhere in there there was a tanker leak.

MR. TERRELL: 5,000 gallon spill.

MR. MIZER: Out of a tanker that was in that area that might indicate that.

MR. WATERMAN: So if we're lucky it would be confined to that trench area.

MR. MIZER: It may be.

MR. GELLER: Was that in the files? I didn't remember reading that.

MR. MOORE: I might add that these up here --

MR. WATERMAN: Footnoted.

MR. GELLER: We would appreciate that, and we would appreciate any other errata information. Might save us some investigation.

MR. MOORE: I might add that three of these borings up here are borderline, mid 400s, 450, 475.

MR. TERRELL: Kind of confirms that it's the manifold area that's leaking.

MR. MOORE: But the stuff is pretty smelly.

MR. TERRELL: And if you go to the right there's a cutoff there for the JP-4 manifold, and the rest of that manifold is avgas, isn't it?

MR. MOORE: That's right.

MR. TERRELL: And that's city property?

MR. MOORE: Right.

MR. WATERMAN: We should be able to get in -- we can at least access the line and what kind of an offset would it be from the line to -- from the hydrant line to the property line.

MR. MOORE: Right there (indicating)?

MR. WATERMAN: Yeah.

MR. MOORE: There is four feet from there to there I would say. And then each one of these are on 25-foot spaces to give you an idea what's going on. This is 25, this came out 50, and this is 75 feet out (indicating).

MR. TERRELL: And what's the hit on the one to the -- down that's south there? Right there, what's that hit (indicating)?

MR. MOORE: I think it was 575.

MR. TERRELL: Okay. So it dropps off pretty quick, and that's clay type soil so the plume may not go too far down.

MR. WATERMAN: Probably just follows the backfill material.

MR. MOORE: But this one is high and I don't doubt we're going to get one here and here, but we'll see (indicating).

MR. WATERMAN: What do we need to do if we need to encroach on city property there to do the remedial action?

MR. WILMSMEYER: I think, like we mentioned last time, if that's necessary to get the contamination cleaned up, by all means do it.

MR. MIZER: We've been given authorization to proceed onto it. We're going to do that reasonably.

MR. WATERMAN: I knew we had that for study, but I didn't know for RA.

MR. MOORE: We asked the lab to do a case narrative on some samples, this, this and this (indicating) as far as to determine the type of hit that they had, if they could determine if it was avgas or jet fuel or whatever. And, to

tell you the truth, what he came up with was that these look more like avgas, more like gasoline then the jet fuel. But, you know, maybe at one time these may have held avgas way back when and the fact that you step out over here and we get nothing, it tells me that probably what that's from is from a long time ago when they did have avgas in them (indicating).

MR. WATERMAN: Is that city tank empty now?

MR. McLENDON: Yes. The city never used that tank.

MR. TERRELL: So just from a possibility looking at it your line of test there is about a 200-foot run along that line?

MR. MOORE: Yeah.

MR. TERRELL: And when you get 50 feet down you're at about 500 parts per million there?

MR. MOORE: Right.

MR. TERRELL: So that's probably the limit of contamination unless we see higher hits?

MR. MOORE: At this time.

MR. TERRELL: So you're looking

at probably 2,500 to 3,000 yards, in that area, if you go down eight feet to the water table?

MR. MOORE: What I estimated was if you take ten feet to either side of each dot and go down six feet looking at 150 to 200 cubic yards per dot and there's 14 dots and I got 2,100 cubic feet that way.

MR. TERRELL: Cubic yards.

MR. MOORE: Yeah.

MR. TERRELL: So about the same amount of material as you've got on the other side of the fence?

MR. MOORE: But what that's not including is between here and you're looking at a lot more when you start adding that, but conservatively 2,100 yards at this point, real conservatively (indicating).

MR. LODATO: Bob?

MR. GELLER: Just a comment. There was a question the city had done some confirmatory sampling around the tank. Is that correct, have you done some sampling, environmental sampling?

MR. WILMSMEYER: I'd have to check.

MR. MIZER: I don't think that's recently. When we talked to Bill McFarland from the corps he indicated there was some sampling done recent. I don't think it was done at the same time.

MR. GELLER: The only thing I was aware of was what DNR did to see if there was any contamination associated with that avgas. While we're focusing on the left side of the tanks, what DNR and the corps are concerned about are there releases from the tanks, those headers and everything else that are on the lower right-hand portion of I guess the map there. We would have questions of if you're out there soil gassing, you know, are you going to be able to pick up distinctions in the soil gas and the avgas and JP-4 at that level?

MR. MOORE: Probably not with soil gas, no, not accurately, no.

MR. GELLER: Okay. So are you planning to perform soil gas continuing to the right so that you can see how big your plume is if you can't tell whether it's JP-4?

MR. MOORE: If it leads us that way.

MR. GELLER: Right now you've stopped your borings at the -- right there (indicating)?

MR. TERRELL: But your last sample is almost nondetect on the right.

MR. MOORE: On the bottom right?

MR. TERRELL: Yeah.

MR. MOORE: I don't think -- yeah, it was close to it.

MR. GELLER: How about the upper, I guess the middle row.

MR. MOORE: At the end of the line those were pretty much nondetect.

MR. TERRELL: Yeah.

MR. MOORE: So if it leads us that way, yeah, we'll do it.

MR. MIZER: I think the question you're asking when we were given authorization to go over onto the city property we went out and did a very conservative test and we didn't, you know, stretch it to the limits. We wanted to see if we had a problem or not. Now that we have found it and do the soil gassing we will chase the plume to its logical extent.

MR. GELLER: Okay. I guess the

1 question is we still want to coordinate for our
2 benefit, the corps and the city, so that if the
3 need, whether it's chasing your plume onto their
4 property or vice versa, is we can coordinate those
5 in somewhat real time so if there's a large area
6 that's contaminated with avgas that we identify,
7 that we can clean it up.
8 MR. WATERMAN: We'll keep you
9 informed.
10 MR. WILMSMEYER: Is it the intent
11 to remove that header line from the Air Force
12 side, or what's happening with it?
13 MR. WATERMAN: Yes.
14 MR. WILMSMEYER: What's the
15 timing with that, do you know?
16 MR. WATERMAN: We'll get the
17 studies completed here and give you --
18 MR. MOORE: The header line is
19 gone now, both of them are gone.
20 MR. WILMSMEYER: The whole
21 contamination?
22 MR. MOORE: From the jet fuel
23 side and the avgas side, they're gone.
24 MR. MIZER: Yeah, when we were
25 doing this a few months ago remember we were about

150 foot shy from the end of the manifold. We went ahead and took that out to the end.

MR. WATERMAN: But the segment where it hits out over that segment has been removed?

MR. MOORE: The line is gone, uh-huh.

MR. LODATO: This brings up another topic that Wayne had brought up this morning for us, and Forrest. There is going to need to be some coordination between us and the city because it's approaching that 2,500 cubic yard limit for the land farm and as we start excavating, if you will, we start exceeding that 2,500, how is the state going to react as far as the permit? Will you be willing to negotiate because it's my understanding that in order for this -- the other permit or the permit that exceeds 2,500 is going to take six months.

MR. MIZER: Yeah, we've been told it's about a month for a permit but six months for a special permit. That's what I was referring to before. If we want to get that in before the end of the year we would like some help.

MR. GELLER: Actually we would

1 support you in that. If the volume exceeds that
2 our routine approach is we would provide all the
3 technical reviews and forward that to the
4 permitting staff so they can expedite their
5 reviewing and approval. So that's fairly
6 standard. I guess the one piece we would also
7 like to make sure any future decision if we talk
8 about releases, push to get the corps here because
9 they're a key player. While it's on city property
10 we see it's the corps' responsibility to clean up
11 those. As far as we heard it was not used by the
12 city so the question of a PRP does not come up.
13 It's a Department of Defense responsibility to
14 clean up.
15 MR. TERRELL: They have done an
16 RI of that site, and they don't have a problem
17 with that avgas. In fact, their sampling, when
18 Bill McFarland met with Wayne, confirmed, you
19 know, that they had already sampled in that area,
20 too, and had the same results we had.
21 MR. MIZER: But I don't know if
22 they did a separate sampling or used MD. I'm not
23 sure there's been another RI done.
24 MR. GELLER: We just took a few
25 borings expecting to find extensive limits and

didn't find anything. Without evidence of a release they could not even allocate any funds for that site. So I'm not aware they've done any investigations up there.

MR. LODATO: It's my understanding talking to Bill McFarland that the FUD site investigation that they've done out here did include the tank area out there. And this report should be, like I said, coming out within the next couple weeks.

MR. GELLER: Okay.

MR. LODATO: I can clarify that with Bill.

MS. TRAVIS: These hits that you had, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and those borings, those were borings, were there samples taken from the trench when the pipeline was excavated?

MR. MOORE: Uh-huh.

MS. TRAVIS: Were those --

MR. MOORE: When we removed the pipe we were doing 100 foot centers on the pipe for a preliminary screen and the characterization went back in and did 125 foot centers.

MS. TRAVIS: So that's the only reason you put the borings in, because you

detected --

MR. MOORE: Right, uh-huh.

MR. WILMSMEYER: Robert, in exchange for taking out that other above-ground storage the city would be happy to have a contract to do some borings in that area.

MR. LODATO: Always something for nothing.

MR. MIZER: Anything else?

MR. WATERMAN: I think the issue of the oil/water separator here, the plan now is to remove that oil/water separator.

MR. TERRELL: At the end of the project.

MR. WATERMAN: At the end of the project.

MR. MIZER: Now, the oil/water separator was originally part of the scope of work for DO-4 and it was taken out of the scope of work and as I understand it at the end of the base closure all the oil/water separators on base will be removed.

MR. WATERMAN: That's the current plan.

MR. MIZER: And this one will be

included in that which is why we say we do not want to utilize that for the drainage because within a year and a half, two years, that will come out.

MR. WATERMAN: We can modify DO-4 to provide for that.

MR. LODATO: Okay. Just to follow on when they're going to do the soil gas which mobilizes next week.

MR. MOORE: We're looking at mid to late next week.

MR. LODATO: I'll coordinate that with Joe Boland who is --

MR. GELLER: Either Joe or Guy. Actually, if you want to, contact Guy and let him know if he's available.

MR. LODATO: Right. Because Joe was our POC for sampling. I'll refer that schedule to Guy, okay.

MR. MOORE: There's probably a good chance that the soil vapor itself won't be able to be done because of the clay content out there, and a heated head space type of situation is what we'll have to do. But just realistically from what we've seen out there with all the clay

and the fill, we keep seeing soil gas, but we'd love to have it be soil gas, do a bunch of these in a day or two.

MS. BRAAM: Do you know when you'll have results back?

MR. MOORE: From next week. We'll have a lot of results on a daily basis, you know, just from them doing from their mobile lab.

MS. BRAAM: And so, Robert, you'll let us know, right?

MR. LODATO: Yes. And you suggested coming from Andrews Road towards the POL yard rather than vice versa, from the yard out to the road?

MR. MOORE: Uh-huh, I'd like to start out there to make sure we test along there to start with instead of starting up at the line and never getting to it and not being able to say we really don't know what's out there at Andrews Road. I'd rather start there to make sure and then jump in at half distances.

MR. LODATO: Makes sense.

MR. WATERMAN: Should we set up a teleconference when you have those results?

MR. MOORE: Okay.

MR. WATERMAN: And maybe fax out a little site plan.

MR. TERRELL: Outlining the plume.

MR. WATERMAN: Outlining it, we can telecon.

MR. MOORE: That would be easy to do.

MR. LODATO: Great.

MR. TERRELL: As soon as you know that we'll need to get a permit request in. That's why I'm -- the need to expedite it is to get the permit request in as soon as we can because that's going to size the land farm. You know, from our perspective we'd like to construct the land farm over the winter so we can get a full season by remediation in March. From our treatability tests the soil is a very active soil biologically, and we think that we can probably remediate it in a 12-month or ten-month season, eight-, nine-month season of bioremediation. So we think if it's no more than, say, 4,200 yards or something like that, if both of them are 21, should be able to do it in one season.

MR. WATERMAN: One cycle.

MR. MIZER: Along with that I'd like to open something for discussion with the group, I'll kind of direct it to you, though. When we move the dirt to the land farm on the assumption that we're doing a land farm and we get it down to below 500 TPH, will we be able to bring that dirt back and bring it into the POL yard, or will it be considered waste and has to meet 25 parts TPH to regulate it out at the land farm; so, will we be stuck with anything we put in the land farm remaining there when we tear the land farm down?

MR. GELLER: My understanding is it could come back to the POL yard, but that needs to be clarified all the way around so we know it's not being used as clean fill out to someone's front yard.

MR. TERRELL: Before we were thinking it might be 7,800 yards just on the Air Force side, but if we're only talking 4,100, 4,200 yards total, we wouldn't need to do a two cycle. We could do it in one cycle.

MR. MIZER: That's true.

MR. TERRELL: So that wouldn't be an issue.

MR. MIZER: What we were working on was the eventuality if we had to do two rounds of land farming that we could be rotating this stuff around and use that as the place to put the first round of land farming material. But, you're right, that may not be necessary. But we'd like to bring it up; in case that happens we've got the idea thought through.

MR. MOORE: It would save a lot of money also if we could put it back into that depression to fill in that berm, and it would save -- I don't know how much borrow is left up there next to that old runway but that was real tedious picking out the limestone from that.

MR. MIZER: I do remember a discussion at one time we might have to go off site to borrow material and that would add to our transportation costs and things. So, yeah, if we can keep this here locally.

MR. GELLER: I'll go back and check on it, validate that, but that was my understanding to return it to the site.

MR. MIZER: Good.

MR. LODATO: One of the things to add onto the POL yard as we start, for an example,

site 7, if we need -- depending on what the results are after the sampling there of the sediments and what not, that possibly could be moved over as part of the land farm operation if it's like material.

MR. GELLER: I think that was always the understanding that you devise your land farm such that similar materials you could bring in. We've not seen anything formally, but that was always the concept. Along with your UST investigations if you found soils there you can incorporate those into a land farm if that was appropriate. If you're going to build one you might as well use it for everything it's worth.

MR. WATERMAN: Good.

MR. LODATO: Item 7 on the agenda I put down as environmental closure and we -- one part of this Fred had mentioned and I think it's a good idea to get a working group together of the parties involved, start working on the EBSSs so after the meeting we can set up a schedule and kind of do a prelim, if you will, of what all is going to be involved in that. Okay. Second part of this is the closure of ~~building~~ 942, the old steam plant, where we had gone out and had the

hydrant leak. What is the status on that; is it still an open case, if you will, as far as closure of that site?

MR. GELLER: I really don't have an answer on that. I have to go back and look at the data. Is that something you submitted for closure and completion, final completion on that?

MR. LODATO: Well, there was a closure report.

MR. MOORE: Yeah, I think it was in -- the draft was in in September. The final was done in, oh, in December last year.

MR. GELLER: Okay.

MR. MIZER: I believe I recall from previous meetings that you guys had not completed your review of it dependent upon whether it was going to be a UST closure or something else, and you weren't sure exactly what people you were going to have review it and what criteria you were going to address it against.

MR. GELLER: Okay. I'll have to go back and look at that. I apologize.

MR. LODATO: Okay. I know that 942 has always been kind of an open sore for quite a while.

MR. GELLER: That's essentially the one we were looking at with the question of RCRA?

MR. LODATO: Right.

MR. WATERMAN: So what we would do then after we receive comments from the state would be to address those comments in that report and then prepare an AVRAP decision document?

MR. LODATO: Yes. One quick item, number 8 is the pipeline project. Guy, you're familiar with that. This is the natural gas line coming from Kansas to Lee's Summit somewhere over there?

MR. WILMSMEYER: I think so, yeah.

MR. LODATO: That's kind of out of my realm or my jurisdiction, if you will. Do you know what the latest status is on that?

MR. WILMSMEYER: I've never been to a meeting, and I've learned all I know from you on this, Robert. It's my understanding that Missouri Gas Energy has considered putting a large gas line, I don't know the size, but an airport property following close to south of Highway 150, and other than that I don't know that it's --

MR. McLENDON: There was a meeting with our engineers at KCI, Doug Johnson. That's now --

MR. FRAZIER: I'll bring everybody up to speed on it. I know more about it than I should. It's the Kansas Pipeline Operating Company and their proposed route is a pipeline at 16 inch, buried at I believe they said three feet, and it's going to principally follow the boundary of the base here, cut across the runways and come across to the boundary here and then go on off. As far as DNR, our only concern was the fire training area right here (indicating). I thought everybody else ought to be brought to speed on that in case there's some other coordination that you happen to get into and you notice that this pipeline is being built. And its proposed construction date from what I've seen is October to December time frame. But just so everybody knows what's going on, if there's something out there, and like I've told them, you know, there's sites that have been identified as hazardous waste sites or possible problems but there's things they could run into out there that no one ever had any clue what went on so to be aware of that. So if

you happen to see these folks working out there --

MR. McLENDON: I'm familiar with the area, and they said they would try to avoid it and probably will avoid it.

MR. GELLER: Is that line pretty much what you've understood the line to be?

MR. McLENDON: Yes.

MR. GELLER: Okay.

MR. LODATO: Let me throw in that as part of the FUD's investigations behind the Alert hangar there was a possible ~~landfill~~ leech field and they've installed monitoring wells and all that. So, once again, that data will be forthcoming. My concern is that if Kansas City Power Company or whatever forges ahead and not only they but the city does not keep the Air Force informed as to what's, you know, the progress, not that we have any real deep concerns, if you will, I mean, progress is progress, but as things start to happen the Air Force would like to be in the loop at least information-wise because it may impact something along the line, you know. So I'll request that you keep us in the loop.

MR. McLENDON: Okay.

MR. LODATO: And kind of keep

them under control, you know.

MR. FRAZIER: I'm really new to this, and just from the communication and the correspondence I've been seeing it looked a little bit disjuncted because I didn't know if there was a central point of contact and who had been notified of what and it's very easy that -- you've got several players out here. It's very easy to run right between them all and nobody has a clue of what's going on. That's one of the major concerns and why I wanted to bring it up so if you hear something or if you're notified, you might want to make sure everybody else is contacted because they're crossing several different stages of this.

MR. WILMSMEYER: I appreciate you bringing that up because I know from day one it was like it was ramrodded and it's going to be pushed through and a done deal and there wasn't a lot of coordination up front that I was aware of. So I appreciate your update, too.

MR. LODATO: Right. You know, this is basically all our property, and I'd like to go ahead and keep it that way, don't like any outsiders invading.

1 MR. MOORE: The sanctity.
2 MR. LODATO: Okay. We've got one
3 last item, and that's the underground storage tank
4 confirmation sampling. I appreciate everyone's
5 input. I think Dames and Moore can go ahead and
6 if you'd like to stay and if you have any input so
7 we'll need to hash that out amongst us. Do we
8 have any comments? One thing I didn't bring up.
9 Do we have any comments from the last BCT?
10 MR. GELLER: On the minutes, I
11 don't think so. I guess one thing I would -- this
12 is not related to the BCT or the last one, but I
13 guess I wanted to make you all aware of a recent
14 publication that -- let's see, I don't know who it
15 was distributed by. I don't know if you're
16 familiar or have seen the final report of the
17 Federal Facilities Environmental Restoration
18 Dialogue Committee. If you've heard of the
19 Keystone Report, this is the final Keystone Report
20 that was published. I didn't bring along copies
21 for everyone, but it's something that -- I will
22 leave this copy and it's something you can get
23 additional copies of. I think it's something I
24 would encourage everyone that's involved in
25 federal closures or government sites to read

1 this. This is probably one of the key documents
2 that the Department of Energy, the Department of
3 Defense, this is signed off by some of the -- your
4 senior senior individuals and having highly
5 supported this as being I guess the philosophy
6 that they would use as they close military
7 installations or Department of Energy facilities.
8 So it's something that I strongly encourage you to
9 read it. I'll bring this up again tonight at the
10 RAB because I think it's very important to read
11 what your senior management is telling you that
12 you need to be providing to the public. And it's
13 a very well-written document and I think it's --
14 everyone, if they have an opportunity to read it,
15 should do so. It is a new philosophy somewhat of
16 dealing with the public and identifying some of
17 the things that work and also identifying some of
18 the things that don't work. I'll leave you this
19 copy, Robert, today and encourage you to get other
20 copies for interested individuals.
21 MR. LODATO: Appreciate it. I
22 was going to provide some copies of some things to
23 some people. Dennis, you've got yours on the
24 USTs. Was there anything else?
25 MR. WATERMAN: Yes. You were

1 going to provide copies of our draft work plan,
2 sampling and analysis plan and health and safety
3 plan for the PA at Belton.
4 MR. LODATO: Okay. Any other
5 comments?
6 MR. GELLER: I guess I was just
7 going to highlight the action items I came away
8 from this meeting with at least for DNR. I will
9 go back and get a response on the preferred
10 alternative for closure of the pipeline, the 918 I
11 think it is, proposing either to use expandable
12 foam, sand or grout to close that thing in place,
13 along with, I assume, the formal request would
14 provide, as you mentioned, all the supporting data
15 that says, you know, we've tested all around it
16 and we feel it's appropriate for closure in place.
17 Second thing is to validate the
18 information that the biotreated soil, if it meets
19 the acceptable limits, can be returned to the POL
20 yard if it's acceptable at the conclusion of the
21 project. And I guess we're going to go back and
22 confirm the status of the closure of building 942;
23 that's something that we've not responded to you
24 on. So we will -- those are the only major action
25 items I'm going away with. If there's something

else, please let me know.

MR. WATERMAN: I had some document review comments that were due.

MR. GELLER: Okay. We're still reviewing those documents, but we will continue to provide comments on whatever information, if there's a document that we've exceeded our typical review time, that's the only one I'm aware of is the RCRA closure of 942.

MR. WATERMAN: That's the only one.

MR. GELLER: The other are ongoing reviews.

MR. WATERMAN: Is it fair to ask if there's a projected --

MR. GELLER: The document we received comments of we received last Friday.

MR. WATERMAN: I recognize that. And we received another one today and I think the in the central drainage area, that's under review.

MR. GELLER: That was the one that we received.

MR. LODATO: The central drainage site 8, the draft final report?

MR. MOORE: Right.

MR. LODATO: You've all gotten copies earlier this week.

MR. WATERMAN: So those three are currently under review.

MR. FRAZIER: We already discussed that, didn't we, for two weeks?

MR. LODATO: Site 8?

MR. FRAZIER: Central drainage.

MR. LODATO: No, no.

MR. FRAZIER: We're supposed to have comments to you in two weeks.

MR. LODATO: Site 8 is the test cell area. You haven't -- you just got those reports earlier this week.

MR. FRAZIER: I suppose we did. I haven't seen them yet.

MR. LODATO: Okay. Once again, I appreciate everyone's input.

MR. MIZER: Can I bring up one issue? We are getting ready to do the monitoring well closures here on base. We're to do approximately half of them this year and half of them next year. We're putting together the final on the plan, and when it was proposed to us it was asked that we adhere to Missouri Department of

1 Natural Resources regulatory requirements for well
2 closures. We've talked to about a half a dozen
3 people in MDNR, and none of them can direct us to
4 any sampling requirements for monitoring well
5 closures.
6 MR. MOORE: In regard to the
7 Ground Water Protection Act?
8 MR. GELLER: Right, we're
9 familiar with that.
10 MR. MIZER: So please help us if
11 there's anything out there we need to know
12 because, if not, we intend to do DOC and TPH
13 screening.
14 MR. GELLER: I think we discussed
15 this briefly yesterday, Robert. We're talking
16 essentially apples and oranges here. The closure
17 requirements -- and Diane is very familiar with
18 the regulatory requirements of what you will need
19 to do to legally close those wells. One of the
20 key issues, though, is timing and appropriateness
21 of closing certain wells. One of the last things
22 we want to do is hopefully close the wells or not
23 prematurely close wells that we still have major
24 questions about ground water contamination or the
25 potential impact of that. So far we haven't

identified large plumes or anything else, but we're installing new wells so what we'd like to do is not prematurely close existing wells. I'm not aware that we have identified several areas that the ground water is not impacted, the sites are clean, where you're proposing to close those wells. I haven't seen that list or the wells that you're proposing to close, but maybe that would help me feel comfortable that those are reasonable to close at this time in the process.

MR. MIZER: The list that we were provided had a list of 33 wells, and basically what we were going to do was close well 1 through 16 on that list this year and 17 through 33 next year.

MR. FRAZIER: How did you prioritize those, sir?

MR. MIZER: 1 through 16, the only logic that was applied --

MR. FRAZIER: We've seen the list. I have that.

MR. MIZER: All we did was take the top half of the list this year and the next half next year. So it sounds like we need to talk to Diane.

1 MR. FRAZIER: I think what Bob
2 was getting at as far as apples and oranges, all
3 we regulate as far as well plugging specifically
4 is the actual details of well plugging like, you
5 know, what type of grout you use, the fact that
6 you need to pull the casing and all this. The
7 part about the sampling that's not covered under
8 the well construction rules, that's something that
9 has to be out with the federal facilities people
10 as far as what federal facilities would require to
11 be done before they would agree to allow the wells
12 to be plugged. You won't find anything in the
13 regulations.
14 MR. GELLER: Specific to these
15 being monitoring wells for this base, when we all
16 hopefully can agree that those wells are no longer
17 serving a benefit or necessary to monitor the site
18 then you can proceed to follow their regulations
19 to close the wells.
20 MR. MOORE: If a site has been
21 closed out there's no reason to do a final
22 sampling, is there?
23 MR. GELLER: If we've all agreed
24 that the site is clean or has no further impact,
25 we've looked at the ground water, monitored and

agreed there's no further reason to monitor that site, yes, those would be subject to closure. What we will need to ask is go to the public and say formally we are closing this site, it is no further action; therefore, we are going to take the wells out. I would hate to see us remove some of the wells and somebody say, "Why don't you check for arsenic in that well. I knew we poured it out down there." And we said we spent $10,000 pulling that well out, it's too late, too expensive to sample. So we want to ask all those questions before you close the well.

MR. MOORE: With that scenario, you wouldn't want to go back and test for arsenic, for example, if it wasn't a potential to have been there anyway, right?

MR. GELLER: But you want to answer those questions before you take -- as many of those questions before you take the well out as unreasonable to consider going out and check the ground water.

MR. MOORE: There's a lot of things you can check for to not be there.

MR. GELLER: I understand that and at this time I'm not saying the sky is the

limit, but I want to go through that effort to see whether we've asked all the questions that we need to ask, inform the public that we plan to close this site out, we see no reason to monitor it, it's remediated, we're done. Close the well and we're done, sign the document, closure site or whatever.

MR. WATERMAN: I would suggest just under a general comment that we need to develop a spreadsheet to show just all the sites, what the status of the sites are and something this work group could do is develop and work at the comprehensive review of the status of the sampling results and then look at the status of the NAVRAP submissions or projected dates for submissions or approval so we've got an overall score card of what we understand. And we could approach this at our BCTs so it's a kind of internal schedule for us to adhere to to help keep the whole program focused.

MR. LODATO: I agree. I'm not that familiar with all the monitoring wells that are out here. Any other comments? Like I said, we're going to be discussing the underground storage tanks. You're welcome to stay, and I

appreciate everyone's input. Can we tentatively schedule the next BCT? My calendar is open. Mr. Koke.

MR. KOKE: This is for September, and as far as I know it's open. I don't have any conflicts.

MR. LODATO: Mr. Geller.

MR. MIZER: First Thursday?

MR. LODATO: The reason we had it -- normally it's the first Wednesday. We had it today because we had a scheduling conflict, the RAB co-chair.

MR. MIZER: There is a holiday that week. I don't know if people will be taking that week off for vacation because of that.

MR. LODATO: I'm open any time. We'll leave it up to the state for right now.

MR. GELLER: I mean, if you want to try and hold it that first Wednesday, September 4th, time of the day?

MR. KOKE: Will it be here?

MR. LODATO: Yes. Well, we're due to be going to Jefferson City. We had agreed a while back that we would visit.

MR. GELLER: And I don't want to

stop you from coming to Jefferson City, but from my standpoint -- you're more than welcome, anybody is more than welcome to come to Jefferson City. But I think it's more than appropriate to hold them here so we can look at the site. If it's something we need to bring other regulators in to discuss specific topics if you need to talk to water pollution control program or permits and that is a topic item we can either invite them or have the meeting there.

MR. LODATO: Sure. September 4th, 10:00 o'clock. That seems to work well for everyone. Reminder that the RAB is tonight also at the old Belton City Hall on Main Street. And that's at 7:00 o'clock: That's it, thank you.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Tammy J. Gerstner, a Notary Public of Jackson County, State of Missouri, do hereby certify that I appeared at the time and place first hereinbefore set forth, that I took down in shorthand the entire proceedings had at said time and place, and that the foregoing constitutes a true, correct and complete transcript of my said shorthand notes.

_____

TAMMY J. GERSTNER, R.P.R., C.S.R.
Notary Public, Jackson County
State of Missouri

My Commission Expires: November 17, 1997