

M67386.AR.000136
MCRCO KANSAS CITY
5090.3a

MINUTES FOR BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE CLEANUP TEAM MEETING HELD 1
NOVEMBER 1995 KANSAS CITY MO
11/1/1995
HOSTETLER & ASSOCIATES

1 BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

2 CLEANUP TEAM MEETING

3
4
5 MINUTES OF THE BRAC CLEANUP TEAM MEETING

6 held on the 1st day of November, 1995, commencing
7 at 12:30 p.m. at Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base,
8 Building No. 926, 15471 Hangar Road, Kansas City,
9 Missouri.

10
11 PRESENT:

12 Mr. Robert Lodato, AFBCA; Mr. P. Mark Esch, AFBCA;
13 Ms. Ellen Jo Valade, AFBCA; Mr. Bob Zuiss, AFBCA;
14 Mr. Robert M. Geller, MDNR; Mr. Glenn Golson,
15 MDNR; Mr. Randall Maley, MDOH; Mr. Jeff Hancock,
16 KCAD; Mr. Doug Johnson, KCAD; Mr. John McLendon,
17 KCAD; Mr. Scott W. Franke, KCOEM; Mr. Robert
18 Koke, EPA; Mr. Fred Waterman, AFCEE/ERB; Mr. Ed
19 Brown, AFCEE/ERC; Mr. Forrest Terrell, Dames &
20 Moore; Mr. Wayne Mizer, Dames & Moore; Mr. David
21 Brewer, PSI; and Mr. Andrew L. Clayton, PSI.

22
23 Minutes produced by Lynn R. Hicks of Hostetler &
24 Associates, Inc., 9200 W. 67th Street, Shawnee
25 Mission, Kansas 66202.

1 The BRAC Cleanup Team meeting commenced
2 at 12:30 p.m. with introductions of everyone
3 present.

4 Mr. Lodato asked for any final
5 corrections to include in the September 7, 1995,
6 meeting minutes. No corrections were requested.

7

8 BELTON TRAINING COMPLEX UPDATE

9 Mr. Lodato advised that as of 10/31/95
10 there was no decision on the budget resolution.
11 The Af-Res contractor represents that if an NTP is
12 received late this week or early next week they
13 can accomplish Phase 1 of the survey; otherwise
14 the project will have to be postponed, because of
15 weather conditions, until early spring.

16

17 BRAC PROJECT STATUS

18 Mr. Esch provided a handout and reviewed
19 the status of each project. (See attached.)

20

21 POL YARD CLEANUP LEVELS

22 Mr. Geller (MDNR) refers^{ed} to his October
23 17, 1995 letter as the State's proposal for
24 cleanup of the POL yard. The levels were
25 developed with input and calculations from MDOH,

1 primarily focused on the POL yard, for an
2 airport/industrial scenario as described in the
3 ROD. The numbers are not related to groundwater,
4 but are basically ~~from~~ the ingestion, dermal
5 exposure contact scenarios from the health
6 standpoint. These numbers are a starting point
7 for the Air Force and community and City to look
8 at as far as whether they are acceptable. He
9 states that efforts were made to establish a TPH
10 level, and although it is a good screening tool, a
11 level cannot be established. MDNR would like the
12 public to have a chance to look at the numbers and
13 comment. *WBC*

14 Mr. Johnson (KCAD) inquired as to
15 whether the levels would be specific only to the
16 POL yard or for any site on the airport, and
17 whether the City would be held to the same levels
18 as the Air Force. Mr. Geller explained that the
19 levels were developed with a focus on the POL yard
20 but that they would probably stand for the entire
21 facility that's being converted from Air Force
22 property. The City and Air Force standards will
23 be the same on the property that is being
24 converted.

25 There was discussion concerning the

1 portions of the base where the primary land use
2 will be more of a commercial, office, or
3 industrial use rather than an airport/industrial
4 use. It was agreed that those areas that will be
5 developed as commercial, or other than
6 airport/industrial, need to be identified in
7 writing to MDNR so that site-specific numbers can
8 be proposed by them. Mr. Maley (MDOH) advised
9 that site-specific commercial developments will be
10 using a different set of numbers and that land use
11 restrictions will necessarily attach to the
12 property.

13 Mr. Esch (AFBCA) said the reuse plan and
14 environmental impact statement had explored
15 several uses on the site ranging from a commercial
16 area, a park, produce storage and an aviation
17 shop. Mr. Waterman (AFCEE) suggested to assume
18 the worst case scenario and go forward with those
19 numbers. Mr. Geller said the most conservative
20 numbers would be the Any Use Soil Levels, which he
21 could provide so that a comparison could be made
22 between the two. If Any Use Soil Levels would be
23 cost-effective for the Air Force to meet, the
24 State would support that effort, as the property
25 would have no deed restrictions and no caveats.

1 Mr. Esch points out that the POL yard
2 currently is 10 to 100 times cleaner than the
3 residential levels because no TPH numbers have
4 been generated. Mr. Esch provided a handout
5 entitled "POL Storage Yard Soil Sampling Summary"
6 and explained its contents.

7 Mr. Hancock (KCAD) asked if the placing
8 of covenants on deeds was a policy issue with the
9 State. Mr. Geller explained that the State asks
10 for deed restrictions whenever the cleanup levels
11 that are utilized are above ASLs. This is to
12 assure that the land use remains as it was
13 described for those cleanup levels. Restrictions
14 can range from fencing property, deed notices and
15 land use deed restrictions, and the owner of
16 record would be responsible for assuring that the
17 land use doesn't change.

18 Mr. Esch would like to know how the
19 Missouri solid waste rules concerning the 25ppm
20 standard for clean fill would impact the cleanup
21 of the POL yard and how it will impact the reuser.
22 Mr. Geller's understanding is that that number is
23 generated as truly a clean fill number from the
24 solid waste standpoint, but questions whether the
25 health department or hazardous waste people would

1 agree. The 25ppm was based on an any use scenario
2 and is considered clean fill, but was not
3 developed site specific to Richards-Gebaur. Mr.
4 Geller suggests approaching the solid waste
5 department with specific questions concerning
6 activities of a reuser, as it would be more
7 appropriate for the solid waste department to
8 interpret their own regulations.

9 Mr. Waterman (AFCEE) proposes 500 TPH as
10 an acceptable cleanup standard, in addition to the
11 other constituents the State has identified. In
12 support of using TPH as a cleanup standard
13 reference is made to handouts that contrast
14 standards of various states, the history of the
15 Air Force in dealing with POL contaminated sites,
16 and the perception by the public that TPH is a
17 valid factor and scope. Mr. Maley comments that
18 from a health perspective TPH is not useful and
19 raises questions of weathering and parent
20 compounds, which makes evaluation of toxicity
21 difficult.

22 Mr. Geller (MDNR) requests a written
23 proposal on the 500 TPH screening level so that he
24 can present it to MDNR UST and get their input.
25 He also requests that the City submit a written

L BUS
ORMS
A
NSR

1 pooling of water below the ground, and it will be
2 graded, seeded, and left in place. Mr. Terrell
3 (Dames & Moore) said the 200ppm is in the work
4 plan right now, but they would be looking at
5 500ppm, the depth is a range of 12 to 18 inches,
6 and the work plan actually says two years. He
7 feels it could be done in one year, based on the
8 reduced quantities, if there is an early March
9 start. Mr. Geller will get clarification on the
10 final disposition, if the TPH level turns out to
11 be 500, on leaving the land farm operation in
12 place or whether something else will need to be
13 done.

14 Mr. Terrell would like to revise the
15 work plan such that when demolition is completed
16 and the asphalt and asbestos removed, that a
17 characterization of the site would be done. If
18 the soil is not biotreatable it may have to be
19 removed to a landfill. Mr. Mizer (Dames & Moore)
20 would like an amended notice to proceed or an
21 additional limited notice to proceed with the
22 demolition work. Mr. Waterman (AFCEE) agreed that
23 notice to proceed can be given for Phase 1 of the
24 Dames & Moore contract to do the demolition, and
25 agreed with modifying the work plan to include

1 site characterization. After the work plan is
2 revised there will be time for comments before
3 issuing the notice to proceed for the first phase
4 work which will include demolition and site
5 characterization.

6 Mr. Geller (MDNR) feels that it is
7 necessary to have a decision document disclosing
8 cleanup levels supported by an EE/CA or RI/FS
9 process. His concern is that a clear decision be
10 shown to the public as to the approach that will
11 be used, the levels that will be used, and that
12 everyone has an opportunity to comment on it
13 before proceeding. He has no objection to the
14 comment period running concurrently with some of
15 the Phase 1 efforts.

16 Mr. Waterman (AFCEE) feels the members
17 of the BCT are empowered with the authority to
18 make these types of decisions without a formal
19 decision document and that the RAB meeting was the
20 mechanism to inform the public.

21 Mr. Terrell (Dames & Moore) commented
22 that at other bases the BCT minutes are reviewed
23 at the RAB meeting and that perhaps a section of
24 the BCT minutes could be used to set forth the
25 decision process and become the decision document,

1 noting that after reviewing the minutes at the RAB
2 the public would have three months to comment.

3 Mr. Geller agreed these options are
4 available and suggested a decision document could
5 be drafted in several days that could be provided
6 to the community as a draft that all have
7 concurred with and intend to sign.

8 Discussion was held concerning the list
9 of constituents attached to MDNR's October 17,
10 1995 letter. It was agreed that for the POL yard
11 final cleanup all the constituents will be
12 analyzed except for the following: Arsenic,
13 pesticides, RDX, barium, HMX, PCBs and metals
14 (except lead.)

15 The next BRAC Cleanup Team meeting was
16 scheduled for December 6, 1995, at 12:30 p.m. The
17 meeting was adjourned at 3:15.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25