

M67386.PF.000331
MCRCO KANSAS CITY
5090.3b

EMAIL FROM U S EPA REGION VII REGARDING ACCEPTED SIGN OFF APPROACH OF
FIVE YEAR REVIEW FOR SITES SS003 AND SS09 FOR THE FORMER RICHARDS-
GEBUR AIR FORCE BASE KANSAS CITY MO
9/2/2012
U S EPA REGION VII

-----Original Message-----

From: Kenneth Rapplean [<mailto:Rapplean.Kenneth@epamail.epa.gov>]

Sent: Sunday, September 02, 2012 10:22

To: Hickey, Howard M CIV NAVFAC MW EV

Cc: Barbara Peterson; Simes, Benjamin W CIV NAVFAC MW, EV; Cecilia Tapia; Chowdhury, Sabina [USA]; Schmitt, Christopher L CIV NAVFAC MW, IPT CI; Criswell, David CIV NAVFACHQ, BRAC PMO; Nielsen, Janice L CIV NAVFAC LANT, EV; jim.harris@dnr.mo.gov; john.p.hurd@usmc.mil; GROSINSKE, KAY M GS-13 USAF DoD AFCEE/EXC; Tholl, Lisa; Pradip Dalal; Zuiss, Robert E SFC NG NG NGB; Riordan, Timothy P CIV NAVFAC LANT, PW

Subject: RE: Kansas City Details;Second Five Year Review Update

Howard: Thanks for the response.

First off yes, my suggestion to both the Navy and Air Force are to finalized your respective reports at this time in order to be able to go through your concurrence chain so that both signed and approved reports can reach us (scan your signature sheet and send report and all electronically with a hard copy follow up) that second last or last week of September so that our Division Director can sign and we can get the date into our database. I know, it is our target and our bean, but that is the way we operate.

The five year review as designed is an opportunity to look at all aspects of the remedy, the changes in use or potential use at the site, and what changes (minor or major) needs to be considered. The report can be submitted and then regulators comment and then the authors can respond.

The Navy has our comments but as of now don't have MDNR's? The Air Force has neither ours and I don't think they have MDNR's.

My suggestion was simply that all parties are running out of time to meet EPA's schedule so I thought the suggestion was well in line with the intent of the report.

So basically you would sign and send the report as final and then you can respond to our comments when you have ALL of them to look at. We can then discuss the path forward from there.

From a reality point of view as to extent and concern of contamination there is very little to monitor and worry about at this site. BUT this type of situation with different land use and potential land use is very difficult to monitor. THAT was the reason Jim Harris and me were suggesting a certified letter each year to each party associated with each area reminding them of the potential use restrictions.

That is why Jim and me were pushing for any building to be designed with a vapor intrusion system (similar to addressing radon as well as handling sub slab water) would get us away from finding out later (when you do your LUC inspection) and find out that you have an issue to address.

I also appreciate the frank and open discussions that our group has when we get together.

Have a safe holiday.

Ken