

M67386.AR.000204
MCRCO KANSAS CITY
5090.3a

MINUTES FOR BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE CLEANUP TEAM MEETING HELD 6
NOVEMBER 1997 KANSAS CITY MO
11/24/1997
CCI



204 1 *COX...*

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
AIR FORCE BASE CONVERSION AGENCY

File:
P.C.

204

November 24, 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION

SUBJECT Meeting Minutes of the Richards-Gebaur BCT

Place 15471 Hangar Road, Kansas City, Missouri

Date Thursday, November 6, 1997

Attending:

John Fringer, BEC
Guy Frazier, MDNR
Kay Grosinske, AFCEE/ERB
Don Kerns, MDNR
Robert Koke, EPA Region 7
Garey Reeves, AFBCA/Site Manager
Dr. Stan Hewins TCAT (subcontractor to WPI)
Robert Lodato, AFBCA/OLQ
David Malecki, KCAD
Bob Zuiss, AFBCA/OLQ
Annette Bruaam, MCSA
Syd Courson, CCI

AGENDA ITEMS

(Bold face highlights action items, persons responsible and applicable due dates.)

Item 1 (Approval of October Minutes)
Approved.

Item 2 (Old Business)

Guy Frazier and Don Kerns of MDNR were reminded that their chief, Bob Geller, had, at the April 9, 1997, BCT meeting, declined to approve the minutes of the Oct 27, 1996 BCT meeting because he could not remember the details. **Frazier and Kerns said they will have Geller's response at the Dec. 4, 1997, BCT meeting.**

Item 3 (Radiation Survey report)

Bob Zuiss said OLQ received the final report Wednesday, Nov 5, and that as soon as the Air Force finishes its final review the report will be circulated to MDNR and EPA. John Fringer told the BCT that the report showed no radiation and that it determined all

Page 2. BCT-Nov. 6, 1997 Minutes

facilities are accessible for public occupancy. **Fringer said the final report will be circulated by Nov. 20.**

Item 4 (AFBCA Quarterly Meeting) *EPA did ATTEND*
 Neither MDNR nor EPA Region 7 staff attended the meeting and training session in Virginia. Bob Koke of EPA and Kerns said they would like to attend next year because of the very positive reports they received from people who attended. Koke said EPA headquarters staff who attended said they thought it was very good and that regional staff should make efforts to attend.

Item 5 (AOC Stressed Vegetation-Steam Bleeder Line)
 OLQ, at the request of MDNR at the Oct. 2 meeting, mailed to MDNR on Oct. 20 a list of chemicals that had been used in the steam plant boiler and lines. At the October meeting Koke and Kerns surmised that since the vegetation has returned to the areas it was probably steam, rather than chemicals, that killed it. Fringer said the Air Force will not consider investigating the area further unless MDNR or EPA provides a reason.. Kerns said he understood there were unplanned releases and he was concerned. **MDNR will review the material and comment at the Dec. 4 BCT meeting.**

Item 6 (EPA Legal Views on Decision Documents and Records of Decision)
 Koke said the EPA doesn't do non-National Priorities List (NPL) sites so it does not routinely think of Decision Documents. He said EPA attorneys said DDs and RODs require essentially the same documentation. Fringer said the AFBCA attorney agrees. **The BCT agreed to use Decision Documents to document remedy decisions since Richards-Gebaur is a non-NPL site. The BCT agreed that NFRAPs would follow a similar format.**

Item 7 (New Business/Comments)
 A. (Report on Statement of Work Contract)
 Grosinske reported that the Statement of Work for Evaluation and Consolidation is in Air Force Contracting now, and that the Request for Proposals should be issued Nov. 12, and that she wants to award the contract by Dec. 15. She said CH2M Hill, a St. Louis, Mo., firm, has been interviewed and has an excellent reputation. The contractor will attend every BCT meeting, starting in January, 1998. She said the firm has a very good ecological risk assessor but "we also need a human health risk assessor." Frazier said he understood the Scope of Work was to compile documents, but now risk assessment was being mentioned. Grosinske replied that one of the things in the Scope of Work is to come up with cleanup levels if standards do not already exist. She said the Air Force wants a very good risk assessor involved so it has scientifically defensible reasons. **Grosinske expects to issue the RFP on Nov. 12 and award the contract by Dec. 15.**

Page 3. BCT-Nov. 6, 1997 Minutes

B. (Review of the Cleanup Levels Strategy Meeting in Jefferson City)

1. Fringer introduced Dr. Stan Hewins of the Texas Center for Applied Technology, a subcontractor to the Waste Policy Institute, which is a contractor to the Air Force. Fringer distributed copies of EPA Region 7 cleanup goals, standard operating procedures and screening tables, information on Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARS) and requirements for establishing ARARS. Dr. Hewins distributed his summary of the Sept. 25, 1997, meeting in Jefferson City with Air Force, MDNR and EPA to reach consensus on establishing remediation goals at Richards-Gebaur. Hewins asked for written comments as soon as possible. **Kerns and Frazier said they would have comments in early January.** — *COMMENTS ON REMEDIATION GOALS (SEE CITY MTRG.)*
R. HEWINS LETTER [PRO] 10/25/97 D

2. Hewins pointed out that the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) is the guiding authority that will be used, and added that, "with some minor exceptions we don't have any ARARS, and very few MCL's (Maximum Contaminant Levels)" from the state.

3. Hewins said he, Reeves and Fringer are confused about how MDNR is interpreting the Missouri Anti-Degradation Statute. Kerns responded that MDNR has not interpreted it for the Air Force. Hewins said his view is that the Air Force determines where it is today in terms of contamination, uses that as the benchmark, and takes no action that would further degrade the resource. He used MCL's and ground water quality as an example. Kerns asked if the Air Force considered ground water at Richards-Gebaur potable. Fringer said it is non-potable because it is not recoverable in sufficient quantities to serve as a drinking water source. Kerns said the state will look at that very closely. Fringer said the only detectable levels are immediately under the POL Yard, and down-gradient 100 feet there have been no detectable levels.

Fringer said the Anti-Degradation Statute says where water quality exceeds levels necessary to protect beneficial uses, that quality shall be fully maintained and protected. Fringer said there is no beneficial use for the water under the POL yard. Hewins interrupted the discussion, saying he was trying to focus on the process without getting bogged down into the specifics at this time. He said part of the process requires answering: What influence does the Anti-Degradation Statute have upon the ground water situation? Kerns said that is a question for the MDNR attorneys. Hewins said the questions about the statutes have very real implications on what has to be done to the ground water. One of the questions, he said, is: "Is it reasonable to expect this ground water could ever be used as a potable water source? The Air Force needs this answered before it can move forward." Kerns said, "We're looking at future, not present use." Hewins asked, "What you are saying is that the Air Force must make the case for it not being a source (of potable water)? But if we talk about quantities, water movement, we could make a case?" Kerns replied affirmatively.

Reeves pointed out that the Air Force had not received a copy of the Missouri Anti-Degradation Statute, and Fringer said the Air Force must examine the statute before it can

Page 4. BCT-Nov 6, 1997 Minutes

be considered as an ARAR. Fringer outlined the CERCLA criteria for a state requirement to qualify as an ARAR. It must be:

- A state law
- An environmental or facility siting law
- Promulgated.
- More stringent than the federal requirement.
- Identified in a timely manner.
- Consistently applied.

4. Frazier asked about the status of the POL Yard: is it considered an Underground Storage Tank (UST) site? Reeves said as he recalled it, that was something the state was going to determine. Frazier said if the underground piping amounts to more than 10 percent of the total system it is a UST site. Fringer disagreed, excluding materials that had been removed prior to December, 1988, when the applicable federal regulations took effect. He said that material cannot be included in the calculation Kerns and Frazier thought they should be counted, since they were part of the overall facility Reeves said that as far as the Air Force was concerned, anything that existed but was removed before that date was not applicable. He said the state UST section said a couple of years ago only to count the system after it was regulated He asked MDNR to provide a written conclusion whether the UST section wants to count underground storage tanks prior to the start of regulation. **The Air Force will send a formal request to MDNR by Nov. 14; MDNR will forward to UST section; MDNR will respond to the Air Force by Nov. 28. The issue will be on the December BCT agenda for final resolution.**

5. (Establishment of Background Levels/Screening Levels)

Hewins recommended that the BCT not jump into a risk assessment and make it risk-based if there is a less painful way to determine if the Air Force is being protective of human health and the environment. He said unless there is sufficient data to establish some sort of background criteria, the BCT might want to defer that discussion until it agrees on screening levels. He said detection of a chemical at levels lower than the MCL or ARARS is one obvious way to remove a chemical from the list at a particular site. Hewins suggested that the EPA Region 7 screening tables essentially give a screening benchmark. He said the way the numbers were derived was to identify a risk level for each particular medium and then come back and use the toxicity values that are published to back-calculate the concentration that represents a health-protective level. He said, "The system has a great degree of conservatism built into it ... a lot of safety factors built into the process." He said, "We assume a very low upper foundation of risk, so if we have a concentration in the soil that does not exceed these numbers it is reasonable to say, in most cases, we can take that chemical off the list ... for that site." Hewins said the EPA screening tables are clear about the criteria required to use these screening numbers as a final remediation goal:

Page 5. BCT-Nov. 6, 1997 Minutes

- A single medium is contaminated.
- A single contaminant contributes most of the risk.
- Contaminate volatilization or leaching from soil is not expected to be significant.
- Exposure scenarios used in the tables are appropriate for the site.
- Fixed risk levels used in the tables are appropriate for the site.
- Risk to ecological receptors is not expected to be significant.

Hewins said that in preliminary discussions of looking at chemicals and using these screen criteria to determine if there needs to be greater activity regarding that chemical, these are the numbers to use and they have safety factors and are conservative

Kerns said the MDNR may or may not follow those numbers. Hewins said the Air Force can produce the science used for arriving at the numbers. He asked Kerns what criteria the state will use to reach an alternative number? Kerns said he did not know and that the State Health Department actually will make that decision. Hewins said the issue isn't the final goal but simply screening levels. He said if a site has a chemical concentration in the soil that does not exceed the screening level, it ought to be eliminated from the list of contaminants of concern at that site.

Kerns responded that if it falls off the list it is, in essence, the final goal, so MDNR has to be very careful. Hewins again pointed out that the numbers are very conservative, such as 10^{-6} for carcinogens, and asked again what numbers would the state substitute.

Fringer said that if the state mandates a more stringent requirement it must justify it and describe the scientific basis on which it was established.

Kerns said he could not agree to anything until he saw numbers at specific sites, and Hewins again said the discussion was about the process. Kerns responded, saying MDNR may not agree with the process. Hewins said Region 3 (EPA Region 7 has incorporated the Region 3 screening tables as its own.) published in March, 1995, the methodology of how it did its back-calculation. For example, he said, if screening is being done for carcinogens the upper-bound estimate is 10^{-6} . Anything lower is acceptable for health and safety purposes. He said the EPA actually permits 10^{-4} . He said if you screen to 10^{-6} "you're saying we have reasonable expectations that this concentration of chemical at this site does not present a health risk" Frazier asked Koke if he had seen the EPA Region 7 document and Koke said he had not. Since only portions of the entire document were being discussed, Reeves asked Koke to provide the EPA document title and other details. **Koke will provide the information by the December BCT meeting.**

Hewins also said EPA Region 3 pointed out that in cases where the criteria listed in the screening tables is met, it might be appropriate to use these as the final levels.

6. (Future Liability for Contaminants)

Hewins also said that during the liability discussion in Jefferson City the Air Force repeated its position that any new contaminants shown to be Air Force-related will be the responsibility of the Air Force, but, if some years in the future the land use changes the documented remaining site contamination will be the responsibility of the land owner.

Page 6. BCT-Nov. 6, 1997 Minutes

7. (Risk-Based Screening Criteria)

Hewins reviewed the discussion about screening, particularly about how soil contamination can affect ground water. Fringer asked if the soil screening levels in the Superfund Chemical Data Matrix were protective of ground water. Koke and Kerns were not familiar with the SCDM, and Hewins and Fringer said they didn't know much about it. **Koke said he will provide information about the SCDM by the Dec. 4 BCT meeting.**

8. (Understanding Risk Levels Relation to Protection of the Public Health)

Hewins said risk levels are carefully considered, not simply pulled out of the air. He used carcinogens as an example. The EPA's point of departure for upper-bound limit of risk for carcinogens is 10^{-6} . That is the upper-bound estimate of the probability that a person will develop cancer from exposure to a chemical. This means there will be one additional case (not necessarily a death) in 1,000,000 people, and that case will occur sometime in 70 years. Hewins said 10^{-6} equals one case out of 1,000,000 people; 10^{-5} equals 10 cases and 10^{-4} equals 100 cases. Putting that into perspective, Hewins said that statistics show that over a 70-year-period there will be 330,000 cases of cancer per 1,000,000 people, so 10^{-6} would raise that number to 330,000, plus one, 10^{-5} would increase it to 330,000 plus 10, and 10^{-4} would raise it to 330,000 plus 100. He said from a population perspective there is no difference between the numbers. Kerns said MDNR doesn't just look at subjective numbers, it looks at the whole situation, what has transpired. He said, "We're still of the opinion, you made it dirty, you clean it up." Kerns said the state "will go on record right now to support 10^{-6} ." Hewins asked if the state would accept 10^{-5} or 10^{-4} on a site specific basis, and Kerns responded that he couldn't say, but MDNR is willing to consider any proposal. Frazier asked Hewins that when doing this risk assessment, "I'd like you to look and consider one thing. Consider the fact that you personally contaminated it and if anyone dies from it, how you would feel about. That's how I'm going to look at it" Hewins said this is a public health exercise whether they liked it or not, and that he believes it is appropriate as a risk assessor to give the risk management team as much information as possible. He said his job is to present the numbers, explain all the assumptions that went into those numbers and then leave it to the management team (BCT) to determine which number to go with.

Meeting adjourned.

Minutes compiled and submitted by

Syd Courson, CCI

BCT PROJECT TEAM MEETING AGENDA

Dec. 4, 1997

10:00 a.m., AFBCA Conference Room, Building 926

ITEM	TOPIC	DESIRED OUTCOME	RESPONSIBLE PERSON	ACTION
1	Approval of November Minutes	Approval	BCT	APPROVED
2	October, 1997 Minutes Comments from MDNR	Approval	MDNR	
3	Radiation Survey Findings	Agreement that Richards-Gebaur is free of Air Force-caused Radiation.	BCT	MDNR RECEIVED COPY COMMENTS/RESPONSE BY JAN 19 TH , 98
4	AOC Stressed Vegetation (Steam Bleeder Line)	Agreement by MDNR that steam, rather than chemicals, caused stressed vegetation	MDNR	TEMPORARILY <u>TEMPORARILY</u> <u>ADDS</u> <u>0</u> <u>1</u> <u>5</u>
5	Statement of Work Contract Status	Informational	AFCEE/ERB	
6	POL Yard Status	Response by MDNR to Air Force whether MDNR considers POL Yard a UST site	MDNR	<u>WAITING FOR FINAL DETERMINATION.</u>
7	EPA Regional Screening Tables, EPA Superfund Chemical Data Matrix	Circulation of: 1-EPA Region 3 screening tables document title and other details, or complete document 2-EPA Superfund Chemical Data Matrix	EPA	<u>DELETED</u>
8	Old Business/New Business/Comments			