

Revised Final

**Modified Proposed Plan
for Soil and Dry Sediment at the
RVAAP-01 Ramsdell Quarry Landfill**

**Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant
Ravenna, Ohio**

**Contract No. GS-10F-0076J
Delivery Order No. W912QR-12-F-0020**

Prepared for:



**US Army Corps
of Engineers®**

**United States Army Corps of Engineers
Louisville District**

Prepared by:



**SAIC Engineering of Ohio
8866 Commons Boulevard
Twinsburg, Ohio 44087**

June 6, 2012

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

*Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188*

The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.

1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 06-06-2012		2. REPORT TYPE Technical		3. DATES COVERED (From - To) 1941-2012	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Revised Final Modified Proposed Plan for Soil and Dry Sediment at RVAAP-01 Ramsdell Quarry Landfill Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant Ravenna, Ohio				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER GS-10F-0076J	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER NA	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER NA	
6. AUTHOR(S) Jed Thomas, P.E.				5d. PROJECT NUMBER Delivery Order No. W912QR-05-F-0020	
				5e. TASK NUMBER NA	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER NA	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) SAIC Engineering of Ohio, Inc. 8866 Commons Boulevard Twinsburg, Ohio 44087				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER 3827.20120606.001	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) USACE - Louisville District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 600 Martin Luther King Jr., Place PO Box 59 Louisville, Kentucky 40202-0059				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S) USACE	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) NA	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Reference distribution page.					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES None.					
14. ABSTRACT This modified Proposed Plan presents the recommended new alternative to address soil and dry sediment at RVAAP-01 Ramsdell Quarry Landfill. During implementation of original Alternative 3 - Excavation and Off-site Disposal ~ Security Guard/Maintenance Worker Land Use, unforeseen conditions were encountered that impacted the Overall Protection of Human Health and the Environment, short-term effectiveness, implementability, and cost of the alternative. In accordance with USEPA guidance, the U.S. Army considered these conditions and declared a Fundamental Post-ROD Change was warranted. An Engineering Evaluation was developed to re-evaluate remedial alternatives to address these new conditions and achieve remedy-in-place (RIP) at Ramsdell Quarry Landfill (RQL). Consequently, the U.S. Army, in consultation with the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, is recommending Alternative 8 - Perimeter Fence ~ Security Guard/Maintenance Worker with Restricted Land Use.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS cleanup goals, CERCLA, remedial action, asbestos-containing material					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE			Thomas Chanda
U	U	U	U	29	19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include area code) 502.315.6868



**Environmental
Protection Agency**

John R. Kasich, Governor

Mary Taylor, Lt. Governor

Scott J. Nally, Director

July 6, 2012

CERTIFIED MAIL
7010 3090 0000 3936 2100

Mr. Mark Patterson, Facility Manager
Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant
8451 State Route 5
Ravenna, OH 44266

Re: Approval of the "Revised Final Modified Proposed Plan for Soil and Dry Sediment at the RVAAP-01 Ramsdell Quarry Landfill at the Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant, Ravenna, Ohio," Dated June 6, 2012 (Work Activity No. 267-000859-163)

Dear Mr. Patterson:

The Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (Ohio EPA), Northeast District Office (NEDO), Division of Environmental Response and Revitalization (DERR) has received and reviewed the document entitled, "Revised Final Modified Proposed Plan for Soil and Dry Sediment at the RVAAP-01 Ramsdell Quarry Landfill at the Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant, Ravenna, Ohio," dated June 6, 2012. This document, received by Ohio EPA's Northeast District Office on June 6, 2012, was prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Louisville District, by SAIC Engineering of Ohio, Inc.

Ohio EPA has reviewed this documentation and the Response to Comments and has found no significant deficiencies. As a result, the "Revised Final Modified Proposed Plan for Soil and Dry Sediment at the RVAAP-01 Ramsdell Quarry Landfill" has been approved.

Please note, pursuant to the CERCLA process, the property owner usually can provide the expected land use to assist in ensuring the remedy defined in the Preferred Plan addresses all receptors for both current and future land uses. However, it is the understanding of Ohio EPA that the end use for the property has not yet been finalized through the Property Management Plan, nor has the final land use restriction mechanisms. Therefore, please be advised that future modifications may be required by Ohio EPA to address incompatible land uses and restrictions and require the property owner to revisit the remedy for the property to ensure it is protective.

APPROVAL FOR THE FINAL MODIFIED PROPOSED PLAN FOR SOIL AND DRY SEDIMENT
RVAAP-01 RAMSDELL QUARRY LANDFILL
RAVENNA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT, RAVENNA, OHIO
JULY 6, 2012
PAGE 2

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at (330) 963-1249.

Sincerely,



Andrew C. Kocher
Site Coordinator
Division of Environmental Response and Revitalization

ACK/kss

cc: Eileen Mohr, Ohio EPA, NEDO, DERR

ec: Glen Beckham, USACE Louisville
Katie Tate, OHARNG RTLS
LTC Ed Meade, OHARNG RTLS
Tom Chanda, USACE Louisville
Jed Thomas, P.E., SAIC, Inc.
Mark Nichter, USACE Louisville
Christy Esler, Vista Sciences
Rod Beals, Ohio EPA, NEDO, DERR
Mark Eldridge, AEC
Nancy Zikmanis, Ohio EPA, NEDO, DERR
Ann Wood, NGB
Todd Fisher, Ohio EPA, NEDO, DERR

Revised Final

**Modified Proposed Plan
for Soil and Dry Sediment at the
RVAAP-01 Ramsdell Quarry Landfill**

Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant
Ravenna, Ohio

Contract No. GS-10F-0076J
Delivery Order No. W912QR-12-F-0020

Prepared for:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
600 Martin Luther King, Jr. Place
Louisville, Kentucky 40202


Prepared by:

SAIC Engineering of Ohio
8866 Commons Boulevard
Twinsburg, Ohio 44087

June 6, 2012

CONTRACTOR STATEMENT OF INDEPENDENT TECHNICAL REVIEW


Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC) has completed the Modified Proposed Plan for Soil and Dry Sediment at the RVAAP-01 Ramsdell Quarry Landfill at the Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant, Ravenna, Ohio. Notice is hereby given that an independent technical review has been conducted that is appropriate to the level of risk and complexity inherent in the project. During the independent technical review, compliance with established policy principles and procedures, utilizing justified and valid assumptions, was verified. This included review of data quality objectives; technical assumptions; methods, procedures, and materials to be used; the appropriateness of data used and level of data obtained; and reasonableness of the results, including whether the product meets the customer's needs consistent with law and existing United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) policy.



Jed Thomas, P.E.
Study/Design Team Leader

02/01/12

Date




Kevin Jago, P.G.
Independent Technical Review Team Leader

02/01/12

Date

Significant concerns and the explanation of the resolution are as follows:

Internal SAIC Independent Technical Review was conducted on the Draft version of this document. Subsequent versions of this document (e.g., Final) incorporated changes based on the technical reviews of USACE, the Ohio Army National Guard, and the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency. Internal SAIC Independent Technical Review comments are recorded on a Document Review Record per SAIC quality assurance procedure QAAP 3.1. This Document Review Record is maintained in the project file. Changes to the report addressing the comments have been verified by the Study/Design Team Leader. As noted above, all concerns resulting from independent technical review of the project have been considered.



Laura Obloy
Principal w/ A-E firm

02/01/12

Date

DOCUMENT DISTRIBUTION
Revised Final
Modified Proposed Plan
for Soil and Dry Sediment at the
RVAAP-01 Ramsdell Quarry Landfill
Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant
Ravenna, Ohio

Name/Organization	Number of Printed Copies	Number of Electronic Copies
Ann Wood, NGB	0	1
Katie Tait, OHARNG	1	1
Todd Fisher, Ohio EPA-NEDO	1	1
Eileen Mohr, Ohio EPA-NEDO	1	1
Mark Patterson, RVAAP Facility Manager	2	2
Glen Beckham, USACE – Louisville District	1	1
Tom Chanda, USACE – Louisville District	1	1
Mark Eldridge, USAEC	0	1
REIMS	0	1
Kevin Jago, SAIC	1	1
Jed Thomas, SAIC	1	1
SAIC Project File W912QR-12-F-0020	1	1
SAIC Central Records Facility	0	1

NGB = National Guard Bureau

OHARNG = Ohio Army National Guard

Ohio EPA-NEDO = Ohio Environmental Protection Agency-Northeast District Office

REIMS = Ravenna Environmental Information Management System

RVAAP = Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant

SAIC = Science Applications International Corporation

USACE = United States Army Corps of Engineers

USAEC = United States Army Environmental Command

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
2.0 RVAAP BACKGROUND	2
3.0 RAMSDALL QUARRY LANDFILL HISTORY, DESCRIPTION, AND CHARACTERISTICS	2
4.0 SCOPE AND ROLE OF RESPONSE ACTION.....	3
5.0 SUMMARY OF REMEDIAL ACTIONS TO DATE.....	3
5.1 Contaminant Area and Volume Estimate	4
5.2 Implementation of Soil Removal	4
6.0 JUSTIFICATION FOR ALTERNATIVE MODIFICATION	5
7.0 SUMMARY OF ADDITIONAL REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES	5
7.1 Alternative 5 – Excavation of Soil and Off-site Disposal as Friable ACM ~ Security Guard/Maintenance Worker Land Use	5
7.2 Alternative 6 – Capping ~ Security Guard/Maintenance Worker	6
7.3 Alternative 7 – Quarry Bottom Fence ~ Security Guard/Maintenance Worker with Restricted Land Use	6
7.4 Alternative 8 – Perimeter Fence ~ Security Guard/Maintenance Worker with Restricted Land Use	7
8.0 EVALUATION AND COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES	7
9.0 PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE	10
10.0 COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION	10
10.1 Community Participation	10
10.2 Public Comment Period	10
10.3 Written Comments	11
10.4 Public Meeting	11
10.5 U.S. Army Review of Public Comments	11
GLOSSARY OF TERMS	11
REFERENCES	12
COMMENT RESPONSE TABLE	

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. COCs and Cleanup Goals for a Security Guard/Maintenance Worker for Soil/Dry Sediment at RQL	4
Table 2. CERCLA Evaluation Criteria.....	8
Table 3. Summary of Comparative Analysis of Remedial Alternatives.....	9

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. General Location and Orientation of RVAAP/Camp Ravenna.....	14
Figure 2. RVAAP/Camp Ravenna Installation Map	15
Figure 3. RQL Site Features and Proposed Fencing Extent	16

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ACM	Asbestos-containing Material
AOC	Area of Concern
ARAR	Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement
BMP	Best Management Practice
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980
COC	Chemical of Concern
CUG	Cleanup Goal
FS	Feasibility Study
ft	feet
ft ²	square feet
IRP	Installation Restoration Program
ISM	Incremental Sampling Method
HHRA	Human Health Risk Assessment
kg	kilogram
km	kilometer
lb	pound
LUC	Land Use Control
mg/kg	milligrams per kilogram
MRS	Munitions Response Site
NCP	National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan
NESHAP	National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants
NGB	National Guard Bureau
O&M	Operations and Maintenance
OAC	Ohio Administrative Code
OHARNG	Ohio Army National Guard
Ohio EPA	Ohio Environmental Protection Agency
PPE	Personal Protective Equipment
RAFLU	Reasonable and Anticipated Future Land Use
RI	Remedial Investigation
ROD	Record of Decision
RQL	Ramsdell Quarry Landfill
RVAAP	Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant
yd ³	cubic yard

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This modified Proposed Plan presents new remedial alternatives and identifies a modified preferred alternative for remediation of contaminated soil and dry sediment within the Ramsdell Quarry Landfill (RQL) at the Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant (RVAAP), Ravenna, Ohio (Figure 1). The U.S. Army, in consultation with the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (Ohio EPA), issues this Proposed Plan, providing the rationale for this preference and modification.

In March 2009, the U.S. Army published the *Record of Decision for Soil and Dry Sediment for the RVAAP-01 Ramsdell Quarry Landfill* (USACE 2009) that documents the originally recommended Alternative 3: Excavation and Off-site Disposal (Security Guard/Maintenance Worker Land Use) to remediate soil and dry sediment at RQL. This alternative was presented to the public on April 10, 2007 and approved by the Ohio EPA on October 13, 2009 and U.S. Army on August 20, 2009. During implementation of this alternative in July 2010, it was discovered that site conditions were different than originally anticipated, as large amounts of subsurface construction and miscellaneous debris (containing asbestos) were identified within the remedial action excavation footprint. The U.S. Army identified this as a Fundamental Post-Record of Decision (ROD) Change, as prescribed under the *Guide to Preparing Superfund Proposed Plans, Records of Decision, and Other Remedy Selection Decision Documents* (USEPA 1999). Consequently, the U.S. Army, in consultation with the Ohio EPA, re-evaluated remedial alternatives using current site knowledge to address soil and dry sediment and amend the original ROD.

This Proposed Plan provides the public with information necessary to comment on the selection of a modified remedial alternative to address soil and dry sediment at RQL. The U.S. Army, in consultation with Ohio EPA, will select the remedy for this area of concern (AOC) after reviewing and considering all

Public Comment Period:

October 8, 2012 to November 6, 2012

Public Meeting:

The U.S. Army will hold an open house and public meeting to explain the modified Proposed Plan and new alternatives presented in the *Engineering Evaluation for Soil and Dry Sediment at RVAAP-01 Ramsdell Quarry Landfill* (USACE 2011). Oral and written comments will also be accepted at the meeting. The open house and public meeting is scheduled for 6:30PM, October 18, 2012, at the Paris Township Hall, 9355 Newton Falls Road, Ravenna, Ohio 44266.

Information Repositories:

Information used in selecting the preferred alternative is available for public review at the following locations:

Reed Memorial Library

167 East Main Street
Ravenna, Ohio 44266
(330) 296-2827

Hours of operation:

9AM – 9PM Monday – Thursday

9AM – 6PM Friday

9AM – 5PM Saturday

1PM – 5PM Sunday

Newton Falls Public Library

204 South Canal Street
Newton Falls, Ohio 44444
(330) 872-1282

Hours of operation:

10AM – 8PM Monday - Thursday

9AM – 5PM Friday and Saturday

The **Administrative Record File**, containing information used in selecting the preferred alternative, is available for public review at the following location:

Camp Ravenna Joint Military Training Center (former Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant)

Building 1037
8451 State Route 5
Ravenna, Ohio 44266-9297
(330) 358-7311

Fax: (330) 358-7314

Note: Access is restricted to Camp Ravenna, but the file can be obtained or viewed with prior notice to Camp Ravenna.

comments submitted during the 30-day public comment period. Therefore, the public is encouraged to review and comment on all alternatives presented in this Proposed Plan.

The U.S. Army is issuing this Proposed Plan as part of its public participation responsibilities under Section 117(a) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 and Section 300.430(f)(2) of the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP) (40 *Code of Federal Regulations* 300). Selection and implementation of a remedy will also satisfy the requirements of the Ohio EPA *Director's Final Findings and Orders* dated June 10, 2004 (Ohio EPA 2004).

This Proposed Plan summarizes information that can be found in greater detail in the combined *Phase I Remedial Investigation Report for Ramsdell Quarry Landfill* (USACE 2005), *Feasibility Study for Ramsdell Quarry Landfill* (USACE 2006), *Engineering Evaluation for Soil and Dry Sediment at RVAAP-01 Ramsdell Quarry Landfill* (USACE 2011), and other documents contained in the Administrative Record file for RQL. The U.S. Army encourages the public to review these documents to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the AOC and activities that have been conducted to date.

2.0 RVAAP BACKGROUND

When the RVAAP Installation Restoration program (IRP) began in 1989, RVAAP was identified as a 21,419-acre installation. The property boundary was resurveyed by Ohio Army National Guard (OHARNG) over a 2-year period (2002 and 2003) and the total acreage of the property was found to be 21,683.289 acres. As of February 2006, a total of 20,403 acres of the former 21,683-acre RVAAP has been transferred to the National Guard Bureau (NGB) and subsequently licensed to OHARNG for use as a military training site.

The current RVAAP consists of 1,260 acres scattered throughout the OHARNG Camp Ravenna Joint Military Training Center, herein referred to as Camp Ravenna. Camp Ravenna is in northeastern Ohio, within Portage and Trumbull counties, approximately 3 miles [4.8 kilometers (km)] east-northeast of the city of Ravenna and approximately 1 mile (1.6 km) northwest of the city of Newton Falls. The RVAAP portions of the property are solely located within Portage County. RVAAP/Camp Ravenna is a parcel of property approximately 11 miles (17.7 km) long and 3.5 miles (5.6 km) wide bounded by State Route 5, the Michael J. Kirwan Reservoir, and the CSX System Railroad on the south; Garret, McCormick, and Berry roads on the west; the Norfolk Southern Railroad on the north; and State Route 534 on the east (Figures 1 and 2). Camp Ravenna is surrounded by several communities: Windham on the north; Garrettsville 6 miles (9.6 km) to the northwest; Newton Falls 1 mile (1.6 km) to the southeast; Charlestown to the southwest; and Wayland 3 miles (4.8 km) to the south.

When RVAAP was operational, Camp Ravenna did not exist, and the entire 21,683-acre parcel was a government-owned, contractor-operated industrial facility. The RVAAP IRP encompasses investigation and cleanup of past activities over the entire 21,683 acres of the former RVAAP. References to RVAAP in this document are considered to be inclusive of the historical extent of RVAAP, which is inclusive of the combined acreages of the current Camp Ravenna and RVAAP, unless otherwise specifically stated.

3.0 RAMSDELL QUARRY LANDFILL HISTORY, DESCRIPTION, AND CHARACTERISTICS

RQL was initially a stone quarry that operated until 1941. During operations, the quarry was excavated 30 to 40 feet (ft) below existing grade. The excavated sandstone and quartzite pebble conglomerate was used for road and construction ballast. From 1946 to the 1950s, the bottom of the quarry was used to burn waste explosives from Load Line 1. Reportedly,

18,000 500-pound (lb) [225-kilogram (kg)] incendiary or napalm bombs were burned in the quarry, and liquid residues from annealing operations were disposed there.

Between 1941 and 1989, the western and southern sections of the abandoned quarry were used for landfill operations (USATHAMA 1978). Following World War II, napalm bombs were burned in Ramsdell Quarry. In 1978, a portion of the abandoned quarry was permitted as a sanitary landfill by the State of Ohio. Only nonhazardous solid waste was placed in the sanitary landfill until it was closed in 1990 under State of Ohio solid waste regulations. A clay cap was placed on the landfill, covering approximately 4 acres of the AOC. Five groundwater monitoring wells were installed and are monitored semi-annually, in accordance with State of Ohio post-closure requirements for the landfill.

RQL encompasses approximately 14 acres in the northeastern portion of RVAAP. The environmental setting at RQL includes old-field communities, with patches of forests and grasslands. The land surface in a large portion of the AOC slopes into the quarry bottom, which occupies most of the AOC.

The quarry bottom is approximately 40 ft below the surrounding area. Former quarry operations resulted in the removal of much of the original soil. Surface water runoff collects in an isolated, low quality wetland in the bottom of the quarry bottom. There is no surface water drainage outlet from the quarry bottom. The extent of the wetland varies widely, depending on the season and rainfall, and it is sometimes completely dry. When water is present in the wetland, the depth is usually less than 4 ft. The drainage ways and ditch lines outside of the quarry, located along access roads and the rail line in the southern part of the AOC, only contain water during rain events.

The habitat at RQL supports a variety of wildlife, including small mammals, birds, and insects. There are currently no federally-listed species or critical habitats on the facility. RQL has not been previously surveyed for state-

listed species; therefore, none have been documented at RQL.

The quarry bottom of RQL is considered a Munitions Response Site (MRS). Future activities under the Military Munitions Response Program may lead to additional remedial work to achieve remedy for munitions-related contamination.

4.0 SCOPE AND ROLE OF RESPONSE ACTION

The U.S. Army intends to transfer RQL to NGB following the remediation of contaminated soil and dry sediment. The NGB will subsequently license the land to OHARNG for military use. The Reasonable and Anticipated Future Land Use (RAFLU) of Ramsdell Quarry Landfill AOC is Restricted Access, No Digging. Post-closure care of the RQL cap and monitoring must be continued in accordance with State of Ohio solid waste management regulations. Excavation into or disturbance of the landfill contents is prohibited without prior approval of Ohio EPA.

The remedial alternative for groundwater, surface water, and wet sediment will be addressed in separate documentation. However, the selected remedy for soil and dry sediment at RQL must also be protective of groundwater, which is routinely monitored under the post-closure provisions of State of Ohio solid waste management regulations and the RVAAP Facility-Wide Groundwater Monitoring Program conducted in accordance with the Ohio EPA *Director's Final Findings and Orders* (Ohio EPA 2004).

5.0 SUMMARY OF REMEDIAL ACTIONS TO DATE

The originally selected remedy in the RQL ROD (dated March 24, 2009) was Alternative 3: Excavation and Off-site Disposal ~ Security Guard/Maintenance Worker Land Use. This alternative involved the removal of RQL soil with chemical of concern (COC) concentrations identified in the human health

risk assessment (HHRA) that exceed cleanup goals (CUGs) for the Security Guard/Maintenance Worker (presented in Table 1). The removal of soil with COCs above CUGs was to reduce soil concentrations to acceptable risk levels for this receptor. There were no ecological risks identified at RQL, and the fate and transport modeling indicated no contaminants were predicted to migrate beyond the AOC boundary at concentrations above risk-based concentrations or drinking water maximum contaminant levels. Consequently, only soil remediation for COCs identified in the HHRA was required for RQL.

Table 1. COCs and Cleanup Goals for a Security Guard/Maintenance Worker for Soil/Dry Sediment at RQL

COC	Cleanup Goal (mg/kg)
Benz(a)anthracene	13
Benzo(a)pyrene	1.3
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	13
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	1.3
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	13

COC = Chemical of Concern
 mg/kg = milligrams per kilogram
 RQL = Ramsdell Quarry Landfill

Implementing Alternative 3 also required land use controls (LUCs) and five-year reviews to be conducted by the U.S. Army, under a 30-year Operations and Maintenance (O&M) period.

5.1 Contaminant Area and Volume Estimate

The RQL ROD identified two areas (RQL-039M and RQL-040M, see Figure 3) requiring removal, for an estimated disposal volume (ex situ) of 423 cubic yards (yd³). In the ROD, Alternative 3 required sampling of the entire quarry bottom to re-assess Incremental Sampling Method (ISM) samples collected during the Phase I Remedial Investigation (RI). In May 2009 and January 2010, soil samples were collected from the bottom of RQL in accordance with the RQL ROD. These sample

results were presented to the U.S. Army and Ohio EPA in technical memorandums and identified seven ISM areas that exceeded CUGs presented in the RQL ROD: RQL-039M, RQL-040M, RQL-041M, RQL-042M, RQL-043M, RQL-044M, and RQL-045M (Figure 3).

To assist in volume estimations during implementation of the remedial actions, soil depth to bedrock was measured using a push probe at multiple, random locations. Soil depth at the quarry bottom varied from 0 ft (exposed bedrock) to greater than 2 ft. The average depth of soil overlying bedrock at the quarry bottom was 7 inches; this average depth was used to estimate soil removal quantities. Based on the remedial design sampling and walkover survey, the area requiring soil removal increased from 282 square feet (ft²) (0.006 acres) to 49,300 ft² (1.13 acres), increasing the estimated volume for soil removal from 423 yd³ to 1,597 yd³.

5.2 Implementation of Soil Removal

Implementation of soil removal within the quarry bottom was initiated in July 2010. The excavation activities began with removing soil at the eastern edge of area RQL-043M.

During soil removal activities, a large amount of construction and miscellaneous debris was encountered. Some of the debris (e.g., transite and roofing materials) was suspected to contain asbestos; therefore, the materials were sampled and analyzed for asbestos. Results revealed that transite and roofing materials within the excavation were to be handled and disposed as asbestos-containing material (ACM), as they contained greater than 1% asbestos. Approximately 1,100 tons (estimated 1,000 yd³) of soil and construction debris (all considered friable ACM) was removed from RQL and disposed at a sanitary landfill licensed to accept asbestos-containing waste.

6.0 JUSTIFICATION FOR ALTERNATIVE MODIFICATION

The discovery of ACM in RQL during the implementation of Alternative 3 invokes relevant and appropriate requirements stated in Ohio Administrative Code (OAC), Asbestos Emissions Control ~ OAC 3745-20-01. Those relevant and appropriate requirements are as follows:

1. Discharge no visible emissions to the outside air; or
2. Cover ACM with at least 6 inches of compacted non-ACM, and establish and maintain a cover of vegetation on the area adequate to prevent exposure to the ACM; or
3. Cover ACM with at least 2 ft compacted non-ACM and maintain the cover to prevent exposure to the ACM.

In addition, Ohio EPA National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAPs) guidance is also considered, wherein if excavation has occurred that exposes ACM, then ACM must be removed as encountered or addressed (regardless of whether it occurs outside of the areas requiring remediation to address COCs identified in the RQL ROD). Removal is confirmed through visual inspection and soil sampling.

The *Engineering Evaluation for Soil and Dry Sediment at RVAAP-01 Ramsdell Quarry Landfill* (USACE 2011) re-evaluated the originally selected remedial alternative and evaluated additional alternatives to determine if the remedy for soil at RQL required change, given the change of site conditions. Re-evaluation of remedial alternatives is allowed under the *Guide to Preparing Superfund Proposed Plans, Records of Decision, and Other Remedy Selection Decision Documents* (USEPA 1999). The change in waste type encountered (ACM) falls under Significant or Fundamental Change. As defined in Section 7.2 of the guidance document, the change in conditions included an appreciable change in

scope, performance, and cost. The discovery of ACM provided a basis for re-evaluation of alternatives in the Engineering Evaluation with respect to potential applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs). The additional alternatives evaluated in the Engineering Evaluation provided potential remedies for the identified COCs in the RQL quarry bottom and addressed the relevant and appropriate requirements established from the identification of ACM in the contaminated areas.

7.0 SUMMARY OF ADDITIONAL REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES

The additional alternatives were developed in the *Engineering Evaluation for Soil and Dry Sediment at RVAAP-01 Ramsdell Quarry Landfill* (USACE 2011) and are summarized below.

7.1 Alternative 5 – Excavation of Soil and Off-site Disposal as Friable ACM ~ Security Guard/Maintenance Worker Land Use

Estimated Implementation Cost: \$644,309
30-year O&M Cost: \$112,846
Estimated Total Cost: \$757,155

Alternative 5 consists of excavating soil with COCs exceeding CUGs for the Security Guard/Maintenance Worker in addition to other locations within RQL that contain ACM. The Engineering Evaluation estimates 1,614 yd³ of contaminated soil requires excavation for off-site disposal, in addition to the 1,100 tons of soil and construction debris removed in July 2010. The remedy requires replacement of contaminated soil with clean backfill and adequate restoration of the low quality wetland within the quarry bottom.

Upon completion of this alternative, potential for exposure to contaminated soil and ACM for National Guard receptors will be reduced. LUCs would be necessary, as planned excavation will not attain CUGs for Residential Land Use and would not include excavation of contaminated soil below 1 ft, unless ACM is also encountered at that depth.

Alternative 5 requires coordination of excavation and LUC activities with Ohio EPA, OHARNG, and the U.S. Army. Coordinating with stakeholders during the implementation of the excavation minimizes health and safety risks to on-site personnel and potential disruptions of RVAAP/Camp Ravenna activities. The amount of time to complete this removal action is estimated to be 2 months.

7.2 Alternative 6 – Capping ~ Security Guard/Maintenance Worker

Estimated Implementation Cost: \$239,533
30-year O&M Cost: \$101,057
Estimated Total Cost: \$340,590

Alternative 6 consists of putting a 12-inch compacted cover (cap) of native fill and topsoil on the remaining areas within RQL that exceed CUGs for the COCs, with the exception of the area identified on the existing sanitary landfill cap. An estimated 33,200 ft² requires capping. Capping will leave soil containing COCs and ACM in place. The purpose of this cap is to prevent exposure of the Security Guard/Maintenance Worker to COCs and to be in compliance with OAC requirements to “cover the asbestos-containing waste material with at least six inches of compacted non-ACM.” A cover of vegetation would be established on the area adequate to prevent exposure of the ACM, and adequate restoration of the low quality wetland within the quarry bottom would be conducted.

Alternative 6 requires coordination of excavation and LUC activities with Ohio EPA, OHARNG, and the U.S. Army. Once capping is complete, this alternative mitigates risk by physically preventing exposure of National Guard receptors to contaminated soil and ACM. LUCs would be necessary to prevent digging and because the cap will not reduce exposure to meet residential CUGs. The amount of time to complete this removal action is estimated to be 2 months.

7.3 Alternative 7 – Quarry Bottom Fence ~ Security Guard/Maintenance Worker with Restricted Land Use

Estimated Implementation Cost: \$157,217
30-year O&M Cost: \$91,936
Estimated Total Cost: \$249,153

Alternative 7 consists of installing a fence (e.g., chain link security fence or five-strand high tensile wire fence) and signage around the quarry bottom at RQL (to restrict access to the AOC) and removing ACM at the ground surface within the quarry bottom. Installation of chain link security fence and signage provides a physical control for the AOC. This physical control will be combined with administrative LUCs for access control into the quarry bottom and use restrictions to ensure there is no digging. These controls will eliminate or reduce receptor exposure to COCs and comply with requirements of OAC 3745-20-07(A)(1) by reducing the potential of discharging visible emissions to the outside air due to disturbance of the AOC. Signage notifying personnel of the presence of asbestos in the quarry bottom will be placed on the fence.

The physical and administrative controls under this alternative further restrict access to soil at the AOC that exceeds CUGs. Administrative LUCs include access and digging restrictions and personnel training or briefings for access-authorized persons on potential hazards and safety precautions [e.g., appropriate personal protective equipment (PPE) usage to prevent dermal exposure to soil, and appropriate steps to avoid disturbing ACM]. All individuals unfamiliar with RQL would be properly briefed on the hazards/restrictions prior to entry into the AOC.

Workers accessing the fenced area would be required to use appropriate PPE to prevent dermal exposure to soil and take appropriate steps to avoid disturbing ACM.

Installing a fence (with signage) around the area containing ACM is adequate protection for future land use of general foot traffic by

U.S. Army and OHARNG personnel who have awareness that ACM was left in place. After the fence is put in place, there is no additional requirement for ACM removal. However, as part of this remedy, a best management practice (BMP) to remove surficial ACM through non-intrusive, no digging methods will be implemented.

7.4 Alternative 8 – Perimeter Fence ~ Security Guard/Maintenance Worker with Restricted Land Use

Estimated Implementation Cost: \$154,349

30-Year O&M Cost: \$95,613

Estimated Total Cost: \$249,962

Alternative 8 consists of installing a security fence and signage around the perimeter of RQL and removing ACM at the ground surface within the quarry bottom. The fence will be a combination of a chain link security fence and high tensile wire fence. The fence specifications would be finalized in a Remedial Design. Current specifications used for alternative evaluation include a chain-link security fence and 6 ft high gate with a 1½-inch frame at the northern perimeter of RQL and a five-strand, high tensile wire fence at the eastern, southern, and western perimeters. Installation of this fence encompasses all areas contaminated with COCs and ACM. Signage notifying personnel of the presence of asbestos in the quarry bottom will be placed on the fence. The fence will also provide the U.S. Army and NGB access control for, and protection of, the adjacent closed, sanitary landfill. After the fence is put in place, there is no additional requirement for ACM removal, as access and land use restrictions at RQL will ensure no visible emissions will be released to the outside air in accordance with OAC 3745-20-01. However, as part of this remedy, a BMP to remove ACM at the ground surface will be implemented. The ACM will be removed by a licensed asbestos professional using non-intrusive, no digging methods (e.g., removal by hand) to minimize the potential for personnel exposure in the event the ACM is disturbed. Removed ACM will be containerized for transportation in accordance

with OAC Standard for Asbestos Waste Handling and will be placed at a disposal facility licensed to obtain ACM.

Physical control provided by the fence will be combined with administrative LUCs. Administrative LUCs include access and digging restrictions and personnel training or briefings on potential hazards and safety precautions (e.g., appropriate PPE usage to prevent dermal exposure to soil, and appropriate steps to avoid disturbing ACM) for access-authorized persons. RQL is managed as “restricted access” due to post-closure care and monitoring requirements for the closed, sanitary landfill until the year 2040. RQL is closed to all standard training and administrative activities, and installation of this fence will help enforce these restrictions. Surveying; sampling; and essential security, safety, periodic maintenance, natural resources management, and other directed activities may be conducted at RQL only after personnel have been properly briefed on potential hazards/sensitive areas. Appropriate personnel will be granted access to the AOC after being properly briefed on the hazards/restrictions. Once the fence is complete and LUCs are in place, this alternative will result in reduced potential for exposure to contaminated soil by National Guard receptors. This alternative will also protect the MRS and landfill cap on the closed, sanitary landfill within RQL.

8.0 EVALUATION AND COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES

The alternatives were evaluated with respect to the nine comparative analysis criteria, as outlined by CERCLA (Table 2). The nine criteria are categorized into three groups: threshold criteria, primary balancing criteria, and modifying criteria. These criteria are as follows:

Threshold Criteria – must be met for the alternative to be eligible for selection as a remedial option.

1. Overall protection of human health and the environment.
2. Compliance with ARARs.

Balancing Criteria – used to weigh major trade-offs among alternatives.

3. Long-term effectiveness and permanence.
4. Reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume through treatment.
5. Short-term effectiveness.
6. Implementability.
7. Cost.

Modifying Criteria – may be considered to the extent that information is available during development of the feasibility study (FS) but can be fully considered only after public comment on this Proposed Plan.

8. State acceptance.
9. Community acceptance.

The comparative analysis evaluates the relative performance of Alternatives 5 through 8 with respect to each of the nine criteria. Identifying the advantages and disadvantages of each alternative, with respect to each other, helps identify the relative strengths of the preferred alternative. These strengths, combined with risk management decisions made by the U.S. Army and Ohio EPA, as well as input from the community, will serve as the basis for selecting the remedy.

Table 3 presents a summary for the comparative analysis of remedial alternatives for RQL from the Engineering Evaluation. Criterion 1, Overall Protectiveness, is rated as either “protective” or “not protective.” Criterion 2, Compliance with ARARs, is rated as either “compliant” or “not compliant.” The remaining five primary balancing criteria are rated as high, medium, or low, with a rating of

high indicating alternative(s) that performs the best and a rating of low indicating alternative(s) that performs the worst (e.g., an alternative with a high cost will be scored “low” for Criterion 7, Cost).

Table 2. CERCLA Evaluation Criteria

Overall Protection of Human Health and the Environment – considers whether or not an alternative provides adequate protection and describes how risks posed through each pathway are eliminated, reduced, or controlled through treatment, engineering controls, or institutional controls.

Compliance with Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs) – considers how a remedy will meet all the applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements of other federal and state environmental statutes and/or provide grounds for invoking a waiver.

Long-term Effectiveness and Permanence – considers the magnitude of residual risk and the ability of a remedy to maintain reliable protection of human health and the environment over time once cleanup goals (CUGs) have been met.

Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility, or Volume Through Treatment – considers the anticipated performance of the treatment technologies that may be employed in a remedy.

Short-term Effectiveness – considers the speed with which the remedy achieves protection, as well as the potential to create adverse impacts on human health and the environment that may result during the construction and implementation period.

Implementability – considers the technical and administrative feasibility of a remedy, including the availability of materials and services needed to implement the chosen solution.

Cost – considers capital costs and operation and maintenance costs associated with the implementation of the alternative.

State Acceptance – indicates whether the state concurs with, opposes, or has no comment on the preferred alternative.

Community Acceptance – will be addressed in the Record of Decision (ROD) following a review of the public comments received on the remedial investigation (RI) report, focused feasibility study report, and the Proposed Plan.

Table 3. Summary of Comparative Analysis of Remedial Alternatives

NCP Evaluation Criteria	Alternative 5: Excavation of Soil and Off-site Disposal as Friable ACM ~ Security Guard/Maintenance Worker		Alternative 6: Capping ~ Security Guard/Maintenance Worker		Alternative 7: Quarry Bottom Fence ~ Security Guard/Maintenance Worker with Restricted Land Use		Alternative 8: Perimeter Fence ~ Security Guard/Maintenance Worker with Restricted Land Use	
	<i>Result</i>		<i>Result</i>		<i>Result</i>		<i>Result</i>	
<i>Threshold Criteria</i>	<i>Result</i>		<i>Result</i>		<i>Result</i>		<i>Result</i>	
1. Overall Protectiveness of Human Health and the Environment	Protective		Protective		Protective		Protective	
2. Compliance with ARARs	Compliant		Compliant		Compliant		Compliant	
<i>Balancing Criteria</i>	<i>Ranking</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Ranking</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Ranking</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Ranking</i>	<i>Score</i>
3. Long-Term Effectiveness and Permanence	High	3	Medium	2	Medium	2	Medium	2
4. Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility, or Volume through Treatment	Medium	2	Low	1	Low	1	Low	1
5. Short-Term Effectiveness	Low	1	Medium	2	Medium	2	High	3
6. Implementability	Low	1	Low	1	Medium	2	High	3
7. Cost	Low	1	Medium	2	High	3	High	3
<i>Balancing Criteria Score</i>	8		8		10		12	

ACM = Asbestos-containing Material
 ARAR = Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement
 NCP = National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan

“High” = highly favorable situation
 “Medium” = moderately favorable situation
 “Low” = situation that is not favorable
 Scoring for the Balancing Criteria is as follows:
 High = 3, Medium = 2, Low = 1

Alternatives 5 and 6 provide overall protectiveness and long-term effectiveness and permanence for a Security Guard/Maintenance Worker Land Use by removing contaminated soil in Alternative 5 and capping contaminated soil in Alternative 6. These alternatives have significant short-term risks associated with these alternatives, as these activities will be conducted in the presence of friable ACM. Alternative 5 has a high cost associated with disposal of ACM and restoration of the excavated area. Both Alternatives 5 and 6 will impact the low quality wetland and have costs associated with restoration and future monitoring of co-located wetlands.

Alternative 7 provides overall protectiveness and long-term effectiveness and permanence for the Security Guard/Maintenance Worker

with Restricted Land Use. Administrative controls will be put in place to prevent access to COCs and ACM in the quarry bottom. There are moderate risks associated with fence installation in Alternative 7, as it will be installed near the ACM and within the MRS.

Alternative 8 provides overall protectiveness and long-term effectiveness and permanence for the Security Guard/Maintenance Worker with Restricted Land Use. Administrative controls will be put in place to prevent access to COCs and ACM in the quarry bottom. In addition, this alternative provides protection to the adjacent sanitary landfill. Implementation of Alternative 8 can be done with little risk to workers, as the fence will be installed outside of the MRS and sanitary landfill and away from the ACM. Alternative 8 will have less

short-term impacts to the environment, as most of the fence will be installed bordering the wood-line surrounding RQL.

9.0 PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

The U.S. Army, in consultation with Ohio EPA, is recommending Alternative 8: Perimeter Fence ~ Restricted Land Use is implemented as the modified preferred remedy at RQL. This remedy for soil and dry sediment includes installation of a fence at the perimeter of RQL and implementing a BMP to remove surficial ACM through non-intrusive, no digging methods. Installation of the fence and signage provides a physical control for the AOC to minimize or eliminate the potential for exposure to receptors that are not granted access to RQL. Additionally, this preferred alternative will also provide access restrictions and protection to the landfill cap on the closed, sanitary landfill within RQL.

The physical and administrative controls under this alternative will further restrict access to the portion of the AOC with soil containing COCs exceeding CUGs. The fence and signage will further deter entry by any other receptors that are not granted access to RQL. Once the fence is complete and LUCs are in place, this alternative will result in reduced potential for exposure to contaminated soil and ACM by National Guard receptors. Fencing will ensure compliance with the requirement that all personnel be properly briefed on potential hazards, including the use of appropriate PPE to prevent dermal exposure to soil, and appropriate steps to take to avoid disturbing ACM.

The O&M activities will include annual inspections of the fence and remaining ACM, annual reports, and maintenance logs. The U.S. Army will implement wetland monitoring for the seeded, low-quality wetland until Ohio EPA concurs mitigation is complete. In addition, five-year review audits will be performed. These audits will include an

assessment of the LUCs at RQL and may include an inspection for ACM (and possible removal of ACM) by a licensed asbestos professional.

Alternative 8 has an estimated cost of \$249,962 that includes a \$154,349 implementation cost and \$95,613 O&M cost.

This recommendation is not a final decision. The U.S. Army, in consultation with Ohio EPA, will select the remedy for this AOC after reviewing and considering all comments submitted during the 30-day public comment period.

10.0 COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

10.1 Community Participation

Public participation is an important component of remedy selection. The U.S. Army and Ohio EPA are soliciting input from the community on the preferred alternative. The comment period extends from October 8, 2012 to November 6, 2012. This period includes a public meeting at which the U.S. Army will present the Proposed Plan as agreed to by Ohio EPA. The U.S. Army will accept both oral and written comments at this meeting.

10.2 Public Comment Period

The 30-day comment period is from October 8, 2012 to November 6, 2012, and provides an opportunity for public involvement in the decision-making process for the modified proposed action. All public comments will be considered by the U.S. Army and Ohio EPA before selecting the final remedy. The public is encouraged to review and comment on this Proposed Plan. During the comment period, the public is encouraged to review documents pertinent to RQL. This information is available at the Information Repository and online at www.rvaap.org. To obtain further information, contact the Camp Ravenna Environmental Office.

**POINT OF CONTACT FOR WRITTEN
COMMENTS**

Camp Ravenna Environmental Office
1438 State Route 534 SW
Newton Falls, OH 44444

10.3 Written Comments

If the public would like to comment in writing on the Proposed Plan or other relevant issues, please deliver comments to the U.S. Army at the public meeting or mail written comments (postmarked no later than November 6, 2012).

10.4 Public Meeting

The U.S. Army will hold an open house and public meeting for this Proposed Plan on October 18, 2012 at 6:30PM, in the Paris Township Hall, 9355 Newton Falls Road, Ravenna, Ohio 44266 to accept comments. This meeting will provide an opportunity for the public to comment on the proposed action. Comments made at the meeting will be transcribed.

INFORMATION REPOSITORIES

Reed Memorial Library

167 East Main Street
Ravenna, Ohio 44266
(330) 296-2827

Hours of operation:

9AM – 9PM Monday – Thursday

9AM – 6PM Friday

9AM – 5PM Saturday

1PM – 5PM Sunday

Newton Falls Public Library

204 South Canal Street
Newton Falls, Ohio 44444
(330) 872-1282

Hours of operation:

10AM – 8PM Monday - Thursday

9AM – 5PM Friday and Saturday

10.5 U.S. Army Review of Public Comments

As part of the CERCLA process, the U.S. Army will review the public's comments with consideration before its final decision towards implementing the most appropriate action. A Responsiveness Summary, a document that summarizes the U.S. Army's responses to comments received during the public comment period, will be included in an amendment to the original ROD. The U.S. Army's final choice of action will be documented in the ROD Amendment. The ROD Amendment will be added to the RVAAP Administrative Record and information repositories.

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FILE

**Camp Ravenna Joint Military Training
Center (former Ravenna Army
Ammunition Plant)**

Building 1037

8451 State Route 5

Ravenna, Ohio 44266-9297

(330) 358-7311

Fax: (330) 358-7314

Note: Access is restricted to Camp Ravenna, but the file can be obtained or viewed with prior notice to Camp Ravenna.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Administrative Record: a collection of documents, typically reports and correspondence, generated during site investigation and remedial activities. Information in the Administrative Record represents the information used to select the preferred alternative. It is available for public review at the Camp Ravenna Joint Military Training Center (former Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant), Building 1037; call (330) 358-7311 for an appointment.

Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA):

a federal law passed in 1980, commonly referred to as the Superfund Program. It provides liability, compensation, cleanup, and emergency response in connection with the cleanup of inactive hazardous substance release sites that endanger public health or the environment.

Chemical of Concern (COC): site-specific chemical substance that potentially poses significant human health or ecological risks. COCs are typically further evaluated for remedial action.

National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP): the regulations that implement CERCLA and address responses to hazardous substances and pollutants or contaminants.

Receptor: a hypothetical person, based on current or potential future land use, who may be exposed to an adverse condition.

Record of Decision (ROD): legal record signed by the U.S. Army and Ohio EPA. It describes the cleanup action or remedy selected for a site, the basis for selecting that remedy, public comments, responses to comments, and the estimated cost of the remedy.

Remedial Investigation (RI): CERCLA investigation that involves sampling environmental media, such as air, soil, and water, to determine the nature and extent of contamination and to calculate human health and environmental risks that result from the contamination.

Responsiveness Summary: a section of the ROD where the U.S. Army documents and responds to written and oral comments received from the public about the Proposed Plan.

Risk Assessment: an evaluation that determines potential harmful effects, or lack thereof, posed to human health and the environment due to exposure to chemicals found at a CERCLA site.

REFERENCES

Ohio EPA (Ohio Environmental Protection Agency) 2004. *Director's Final Findings and Orders in the Matter of US Army, Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant*, June 2004.

USACE (United States Army Corps of Engineers) 2005. *Phase I Remedial Investigation Report for Ramsdell Quarry Landfill (RVAAP-01), Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant, Ravenna, Ohio*. September 2005.

USACE 2006. *Feasibility Study for Ramsdell Quarry Landfill (RVAAP-001), Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant, Ravenna, Ohio*. March 2006.

USACE 2009. *Record of Decision for Soil and Dry Sediment for the RVAAP-01 Ramsdell Quarry Landfill*. March 2009.

USACE 2011. *Engineering Evaluation for Soil and Dry Sediment at RVAAP-01 Ramsdell Quarry Landfill*. September 2011.

USATHAMA (United States Army Toxic and Hazardous Materials Agency) 1978. *Installation Assessment of Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant. Records Evaluation Report No. 132*. November 1978.

USEPA (United States Environmental Protection Agency) 1999. *Guide to Preparing Superfund Proposed Plans, Records of Decision, and Other Remedy Selection Decision Documents*. July 1999.

FIGURES






Figure 1. General Location and Orientation of RVAAP/Camp Ravenna



IRP SITES - CERCLA			MMRP SITES (14 SITES)			OTHER REGULATORY - RCRA		
1	RVAAP-01	RAMSDELL QUARRY LANDFILL	51	RVAAP-51	DUMP ALONG PARIS-WINDHAM ROAD	4	RVAAP-04	OPEN DEMOLITION AREA #2
3	RVAAP-03	OPEN DEMOLITION AREA #1	66	RVAAP-66	FACILITY-WIDE GROUNDWATER			
5	RVAAP-05	WINKLEPECK BURNING GROUNDS	67	RVAAP-67	FACILITY-WIDE SEWERS			
6	RVAAP-06	C BLOCK QUARRY	COMPLIANCE RESTORATION SITES (13 SITES)					
8	RVAAP-08	LOAD LINE 1	88	RVAAP-88	ELECTRIC SUBSTATIONS (E.W.NO.3)			
9	RVAAP-09	LOAD LINE 2	89	RVAAP-89	BUILDING 1048 - FIRE STATION			
10	RVAAP-10	LOAD LINE 3	90	RVAAP-90	EAST CLASSIFICATION YARD			
11	RVAAP-11	LOAD LINE 4	91	RVAAP-91	FACILITY-WIDE USES			
12	RVAAP-12	LOAD LINE 12	92	RVAAP-92	FACILITY-WIDE COAL STORAGE			
13	RVAAP-13	BLDG 1200 & DILUTION/SETTLING POND	93	RVAAP-93	BUILDING 1034 MOTOR POOL HYDRAULIC LIFT			
19	RVAAP-19	LANDFILL NORTH OF WINKLEPECK	94	RVAAP-94	GEORGE ROAD SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT			
28	RVAAP-28	MUSTARD AGENT BURIAL SITE	95	RVAAP-95	DEPOT AREA			
29	RVAAP-29	UPPER AND LOWER COBBES PONDS	96	RVAAP-96	BUILDING 1037 LAUNDRY WASTE WATER SUMP			
33	RVAAP-33	LOAD LINE 6	97	RVAAP-97	QUARRY POND SURFACE DUMP			
34	RVAAP-34	SAND CREEK DISPOSAL ROAD LANDFILL	98	RVAAP-98	DLA ORE STORAGE SITES			
38	RVAAP-38	NACA TEST AREA	99	RVAAP-99	FORMER BUILDINGS 1031 AND 1039			
39	RVAAP-39	LOAD LINE 5						
40	RVAAP-40	LOAD LINE 7						
41	RVAAP-41	LOAD LINE 8						
42	RVAAP-42	LOAD LINE 9						
43	RVAAP-43	LOAD LINE 10						
44	RVAAP-44	LOAD LINE 11						
45	RVAAP-45	WET STORAGE AREA						
46	RVAAP-46	BUILDINGS F-15 AND F-16						
48	RVAAP-48	ANCHOR TEST AREA						
50	RVAAP-50	ATLAS SCRAP YARD						



RAVENNA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT - RAVENNA, OHIO

DRAWN BY: P. HOLM	REV. NO./DATE: REV.1/07-29-11	CAD FILE: /08042/DWGS/K47RQL-SITE
----------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------------------------

Figure 2. RVAAP/Camp Ravenna Installation Map




Figure 3. RQL Site Features and Proposed Fencing Extent

COMMENT RESPONSE TABLE

**FINAL MODIFIED PROPOSED PLAN FOR SOIL AND DRY SEDIMENT AT THE RVAAP-01 RAMSDELL QUARRY LANDFILL
RAVENNA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT, RAVENNA OHIO
COMMENT RESPONSE TABLE ~ MAY 16, 2012**

Comment Number	Page or Sheet	Comment	Recommendation	Response
<i>Ohio EPA (Andrew Kocher)</i>				
O-1.		After looking at the revised Proposed Plan for Ramsdell Quarry and discussing with management, we would like to remove the last sentence in sections 7.1 and 7.2 on page 6. The sentence says, "In addition, this alternative contains a 30-year O&M period to implement LUCS." Please remove these sentences.		Agree. Text has been revised as recommended.
O-2.		Please add in Section 9.0 a brief description of the general expected O&M activities and mention the 5-Year Review Process. For example, something like: "The O&M activities will include annual fence and ACM inspections, annual reports, and maintenance logs. In addition, 5-year review audits will be performed which could include an inspection for ACM (and possible removal of ACM) by a licensed asbestos professional and review of all LUCs." Before sending me replacement pages to place in the final report, please send (via email) the exact language being added to Section 9.0 for review.		<p>Agree. Text revised as follows: "...appropriate PPE to prevent dermal exposure to soil, and appropriate steps to take to avoid disturbing ACM.</p> <p><i>The O&M activities will include annual inspections of the fence and remaining ACM, annual reports, and maintenance logs. The U.S. Army will implement wetland monitoring for the seeded low quality wetland until Ohio EPA concurs mitigation is complete. In addition, five-year review audits will be performed. These audits will include an assessment of the LUCs at RQL and may include an inspection for ACM (and possible removal of ACM) by a licensed asbestos professional.</i></p> <p>Alternative 8 has an estimated cost of..."</p>
<i>USACE (Thomas Chanda)</i>				
A-1.	General Comment	Title page identifies document as "Final" although under concurrent review by OHEPA and U.S. Army inclusive without the concurrence of the regulator		Clarification. Comments on the Draft version of the Proposed Plan were resolved as of 28-March-2012, with indication no other comments were forthcoming and to proceed with the Final version. Based on the stakeholder acceptance of comment responses and text changes, SAIC proceeded to issue the Final version in accordance with RVAAP document submission guidelines. SAIC understands stakeholders may

**FINAL MODIFIED PROPOSED PLAN FOR SOIL AND DRY SEDIMENT AT THE RVAAP-01 RAMSDELL QUARRY LANDFILL
RAVENNA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT, RAVENNA OHIO
COMMENT RESPONSE TABLE ~ MAY 16, 2012**

Comment Number	Page or Sheet	Comment	Recommendation	Response
				subsequently provide comments on a Final version. (e.g., if comment back-check indicates not all changes were made as agreed in the comment response process). Additional changes if required, or new comments to a Final version, have historically been addressed through issuance of a Revised Final document. No text changes recommended.
A-2.	Page i Left column of text	Section "10.0" indent one space in the line to left to align decimal with the "9.0" above it.		Clarification. The Section numbers are left justified to the established page margins consistent with prior RVAAP document formats. Indenting the space of Section 10.0 will put that line beyond the established margin. No text change recommended.
A-3.	Page i Right column of text	"Figure 3" Title is dissimilar to what exists on Page 16	Please correct the title	Agree. Figure 3 has been re-titled per the title on Page 16.
A-4.	Page i Right column of text	Comment Response Table not identified within the Table of Contents	Please incorporate	Agree. The Comment Response Table has been added to the Table of Contents.
A-5.	Page 2 Column 2	There are several abbreviations cited within the text for distance, weight, length that are not identified within the Abbreviations & Acronym list	For the reading public's benefit it would be prudent to provide an adequate list of abbreviations & acronyms rather than making implied assumptions	Clarification. Abbreviations for standard units of measure have not been typically included in previous RVAAP documents. However, SAIC agrees to the addition of standard abbreviations for units of measure in the acronyms list for Proposed Plans developed for public review.
A-6.	Page 4. Table 1	Are the CUG objectives stated in this Table still applicable & appropriate based on the "Position Paper for the Application		Clarification. The presentation of Table 1 is to supplement Section 5.0 Summary of Remedial Actions to Date. As the implementation of the remedial action

**FINAL MODIFIED PROPOSED PLAN FOR SOIL AND DRY SEDIMENT AT THE RVAAP-01 RAMSDELL QUARRY LANDFILL
RAVENNA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT, RAVENNA OHIO
COMMENT RESPONSE TABLE ~ MAY 16, 2012**

Comment Number	Page or Sheet	Comment	Recommendation	Response
		and Use of Facility-Wide Human Health Cleanup Goals – Feb. 2012”?		was done in accordance with the signed <i>Record of Decision for Soil and Dry Sediment for the RVAAP-01 Ramsdell Quarry Landfill</i> (USACE 2009), the stated CUGs are appropriate as they reflect what was presented in that ROD. No text change recommended.
A-7.	Page 4. 1 st Column		Section 5.1: Referencing Fig. 3; for easier reader viewing enlarge the RQL-XXX nomenclature; certain locations such as in the southwest sample areas the text is very difficult to read	Agree. The nomenclature identifying the Multi-Increment Sample Area has been enlarged.
A-8.	Page 4. 1 st Column		Section 5.1: 2 nd Sentence revise to read: “In the ROD, Alternative 3 required sampling.....”	Agree. Text has been revised per USACE preference.
A-9.	Page 5 2 nd Column		Section 7.1 - 1 st Para.; last sentence change to read: “.....replacement of contaminated soil with clean backfill and adequate.....”	Agree. Text has been revised per USACE preference.
A-10.	General	Formatting the Section Titles	It would be a lot cleaner presentation if the text were moved to the right out from under the Section Number	Comment noted. As this follows the same format for previously approved Proposed Plan, no text change is recommended.
A-11.	Page 7 1 st Column Section 7.4	4 th Sentence - Delete “However, specifications” to:	4 th Sentence - Delete “However, Specifications” to: “Current specifications.....”	Agree. Text has been revised per USACE preference.
A-12.	Page 7 1 st Column Section 7.4	Administrative LUCs: Must recognize the re-establishment of the wetland via 5-yr monitoring and inspection reqs. As		Agree. Text has been revised in response to comment O-2.

**FINAL MODIFIED PROPOSED PLAN FOR SOIL AND DRY SEDIMENT AT THE RVAAP-01 RAMSDELL QUARRY LANDFILL
RAVENNA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT, RAVENNA OHIO
COMMENT RESPONSE TABLE ~ MAY 16, 2012**

Comment Number	Page or Sheet	Comment	Recommendation	Response
		previously agreed (verbally) these reqs. would not begin until the completion of the RA		
A-13.	Page 10 1 st Column Section 9.0		1 st Sentence – 2 nd line ----- Change: “...is recommends....” To: “.....is recommending....”	Agree. Text has been revised as recommended.
A-14.	Page 11 1 st Column Section 10.4		1 st Sentence – 2 nd line ----- rather than saying “....on this Proposed Plan....” Would not it sound better to say “.....for this Proposed Plan.....” ?	Agree. Text has been revised per USACE preference.
A-15.	Page 11 1 st Column Section 10.5		1 st Sentence -1 st Line: Would prefer it to read something to this effect: “As part of the CERCLA Process, the U.S. Army will review the public’s comments with consideration before its final decision towards implementing the most appropriate action.”	Agree. Text has been revised per USACE preference.
A-16.	Page 14 Figure 1		Top upper image should delineate the approximate geographical location of RQL within the RVAAP polygon	Clarification. Figure 2 delineates the geographical location of RQL within RVAAP. Figure 1 illustrates the location of RVAAP within Ohio and has been standardized in prior RVAAP reports. No change is recommended.
A-17.	Page 15 Figure 2	The title for this figure is totally out place with the drawing.	Being more relative to referencing this drawing to all current CERCLA and/or- Munitions sites associated to IRP, MMRP, CC/CR within the Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant. I’m not sure we should be associating this drawing with Camp Ravenna.	Clarification. The figure presents the layout of both RVAAP and Camp Ravenna and was previously provided by USACE to standardize all RVAAP reports. No change is recommended.