

**Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant
Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting
18 November 2015**

1. Call to Order & Reading of Minutes

The Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant (RVAAP) Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting for the Installation Restoration Program was called to order by Mr. Tom Tadsen, Community Co-Chair, of Franklin Township at 6:00 p.m. Wednesday, November 18, 2015 at the Newton Falls Community Center, 52 East Quarry Street, Newton Falls, Ohio 44444.

Meeting attendance was recorded as 17 members present, 4 unexcused absent (Ms. Irene Glavies-Lutz, Mr. James Mayer, Mr. Delbert Woloski, and Mr. Brian Miller).

Tom Tadsen (Franklin TWP) asked if everyone received and had a chance to review the minutes from the last meeting.

Mr. George Tompkins of Paris Township made a motion to suspend with the reading of the previous meeting's minutes. The motion was seconded by Dan Spicer of Paris Township. Tom Tadsen asked the board members if they had any additions or corrections to the minutes. There were no comments or changes from the RAB members present. Tom Tadsen called the motion to question... "All those in favor please say 'Aye'," "All those opposed." There were no members opposed so the motion carried, and Tom Tadsen announced the minutes were approved as printed.

2. Safety Minute

Kevin Sedlak, (Paris Township) the Army National Guard Restoration Project Manager at Camp Ravenna, gave the safety minute discussion. The safety minute reviewed ladder safety. PowerPoint slides of the presentation can be found at www.rvaap.org.

3. General Business

The first order of business was scheduling the next meeting. Tom Tadsen (Franklin TWP) Community Co-Chair suggested next meeting be held on Wednesday, April 20, 2016. The board had no object objections or conflicts with this date. Tom Tadsen then asked for a township to volunteer to host the meeting. Freedom Township volunteered with Charlestown as an alternate.

There were no further general business items.

At the conclusion of the general business discussion Tom Tadsen introduced the presenter, Mr. Travis McCoun, Project Manager, Military Munitions Design Center Baltimore District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. He asked that questions be held until the end of each presentation. Questions by RAB members will be addressed first, followed by any from the general audience.

4. Time Critical Removal Action (TCRA) at Open Demolition Area #2 (ODA#2) Proposed Plans under the MMRP by Travis McCoun, Project Manager, Military Munitions Design Center Baltimore District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Mr. Travis McCoun, Project Manager, Military Munitions Design Center Baltimore District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, presented the Time Critical Removal Action (TRCA) at Open Demolition Area #2. To request a copy of the formal presentation please contact the RVAAP RAB Administrator at (330) 872-8010, rebecca.haney@vistasciences.com or visit www.rvaap.org.

Following the presentation Tom Tadsen clarified that the Director's Final Findings and Orders (DFFOs) is a document that was negotiated between the Army and the Ohio EPA in 2004. Tom Tadsen also explained that a camouflet was a cavity created by explosive force.

Eileen Mohr, Kent Ohio, asked if access to the Central Impact Area (CIA) would be restricted, what determined clearance of 4 ft. vs 2 ft. below ground surface (bgs) and if the disposal pits would be memorialized in the PMP (Property Management Plan) and subject to a 5 year review. Travis McCoun explained that the clearance depths were set to prevent disturbing the disposal pits or exceeding out of in house capabilities. The goal was to acquire data for the Feasibility Study and characterize the pit area. She also asked what the estimated cost of the TCRA project was. Travis McCoun stated it was 3 million dollars.

Jay Abercrombie, Suffield Township, asked what was the diameter of the kick-out area and the level of comfort that the buffer was inclusive of the MEC near the edge of the kick-out area. The diameter of the kick-out area is 6,000 feet. The data has a 95% Upper Confidence Limit, therefore there is 95% confidence. Travis McCoun also added that most MEC outside the kick-out is Material Documented as Safe (MDAS). This is not a final remedy, but is designed to take care of the explosive hazard because Decision Documents (DD) and Record of Decision (ROD) take time.

Jay Abercrombie, Suffield Township, then asked why areas were considered inaccessible. Areas that were considered inaccessible had very thick vegetation and rugged terrain.

George Tompkins, Paris Township, asked for clarification regarding the subsurface clearance of 4 ft. bgs and 2 ft. bgs in disposal pits stated on slide 14. Is there a concern that 2 ft. is not enough? It was explained that the 2 ft. bgs determination was sufficient to protect the receptors who potentially would access the site, not as a remediation. This is a temporary solution to make the site as safe as possible while working through the remainder of the remediation process. It was also noted that the soils removed would be treated as Investigation Derived Waste (IDW) and tested for contamination in accordance with facility protocol and guidelines.

Jay Abercrombie, Suffield Township, asked how the sand used in the Buried Explosion Module (BEM) would be handled or disposed of after the TCRA was concluded. Travis

McCoun explained that the sand is sampled and determined non-hazardous before it can be brought on site. It is also sampled at the conclusion of the project and disposed of as determined. Most of it is consumed in the BEM process and studies of this method at other locations have indicated the sand is still non-hazardous upon conclusion.

Mike Sever from the Record Courier asked how the MEC/MPPEH would be moved to the BEM site. Travis McCoun stated there would be standard operating procedures (SOPs) included in the work plan. Basically any MEC/MPPEH would be evaluated in place to determine if it was acceptable to move. If the determination is that it cannot be moved it would be blown in place or a BEM would be built around the item in questions. This will be done daily to eliminate long term storage.

Mary Hellen Smith of the Portage County Health Department then asked if the team could expand on the Work Plan evaluation and criteria for determining hazardous or Non-hazardous waste and how the waste is disposed once characterized. It was explained that all procedures are in this regard are explained in the Facility-Wide Sampling and Analysis Plan (FWSAP).

Katie Tait, Environmental Specialist for the Ohio Army National Guard, stated the BEM would not just be used for this project but would be long term for other projects on the facility. Tom Tadsen asked how long a single BEM is typically in use. Travis McCoun answered usually 2 years. It depends on material being detonated. Eileen Mohr, Kent Ohio, asked if the BEM was for long term use if the Army had a location in mind and if it would be used for Remediation activities only. Travis McCoun stated the proposed site of the BEM was south of the RCRA unit. This site is flat and would minimize run-off. The BEM would only be used for restoration related projects.

Eileen Mohr also asked if the Army was planning on sticking to the 25 lbs. limit which is the historical limit used at the site (ODA2), and if there would be any permitting required with the state. Travis McCoun answered there are no permitting requirements that the Army is aware of and it will be documented as if a RCRA project.

Kevin Palombo, Environmental Specialist for the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, informed the board that the Ohio EPA has been briefed on the BEM design and much of these questions were addressed. The Ohio EPA is evaluating this project and will be addressing these concerns before it goes operational.

Sarah Lock, Paris Township, asked if this would impact any training operations because of the proximity to the MK-19 range. Travis McCoun stated the project will be staged far enough from the range so that no training will be impacted, but without the BEM training would be impacted using traditional methods to address MEC/MPPEH.

5. Brief update of the Facility-Wide Groundwater Monitoring Program by Kevin Sedlak, ARNG Restoration Project Manager.

The next presentation was a brief status update on the Facility-Wide Groundwater Monitoring Program. Kevin Sedlak, Paris Township and ARNG Restoration Project Manager, informed the board that the Facility-Wide Groundwater Monitoring Program

contract had been awarded to Weston Solutions and Cardno. They plan to have a Record of Decision (ROD) in three years.

Eileen Mohr, Kent Ohio, asked about the status of the 2 new groundwater wells that had been proposed for placement across (south of) State Route 5. Kevin Sedlak answered that to date no new wells had been installed and any new wells planned would be outlined in the new Work Plan. The new contractors are evaluating all data acquired to date to develop a recommended path forward.

6. Land Use Controls at Camp Ravenna by Allan Brillinger, Vista Sciences Corporation Project Manager.

The next presentation was Land Use Controls at Camp Ravenna by Allan Brillinger, Vista Sciences Corporation Project Manager. To request a copy of the formal presentation please contact the RVAAP RAB Administrator at (330) 872-8010, rebecca.haney@vistasciences.com or visit www.rvaap.org.

Following the presentation Nancy Taylor, Paris Township, asked if the reports were similar to periodic inspections. Al Brillinger explained that the reports have a brief history but because of their nature and frequency do not go in depth regarding the history of the site or facility.

Sarah Lock, Paris Township, asked if the need for a Land Use Controls was ever re-evaluated. Al Brillinger answered that if the population or land use changes the Land Use Controls could be re-evaluated. Sarah Lock then asked why the Ramsdell Quarry Landfill was inspected weekly and if that frequency was necessary. Al Brillinger explained the weekly inspections were part of the Sanitary Landfill Post Closure Plan.

Eileen Mohr, Kent Ohio, requested a status update of the 5 year review. Katie Tait stated that the 5 year review was final and had been completed in 2013. The next review would begin in 2016.

This concluded questions on the Land Use Controls presentation. Tom Tadsen then asked for any further questions on any of the meeting's presentation. There were no responses. Tom reminded the board the next RAB meeting will be 20 April 2016 at 6 PM at Freedom Township and asked if there was any other business before the meeting was adjourned. There were no responses.

The meeting was adjourned by Tom Tadsen at 7:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rebecca Haney, RVAAP RAB Administrator