

**Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant
Restoration Advisory Board (RAB)
Meeting Minutes
October 15, 2003**

1. Call to Order and Reading of the Minutes

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Mark Patterson at the Paris Town Hall, Paris, Ohio at 6:05 p.m. Secretary Denise Gilliam took attendance with 12 present, 3 excused and 8 absent (Mr. Floyd Banks, Mr. Joe Beutler, Mr. Kevin Cooper, Mr. Robert Daughtery, Ms. Irene Glavies, Lutz, Ms. Kerry Macomber, Mr. Howard Furl, and Ms. Marti Long). Mr. Patterson presented the motion to suspend with the reading of the minutes; and seconded by Mr. Thomas Smith. A motion was made to adopt the minutes by Mr. Patterson, seconded by Mr. Woloski and passed with no changes by unanimous vote.

2. Announcements

Mr. Patterson announced to the board that Mr. Bob Whelove was present making his last visit to RVAAP before his retirement. He asked to address the board. Mr. Whelove told the RAB members that he was less than one year away from retirement. There was someone new handling RVAAP and that he had not been in charge of the clean up since April first. He wanted to tell the RAB members goodbye. Mr. Whelove stated that he had run the restoration project for 8 years and really wanted to commend the RAB. He stated that there is lots of technical talent on the RAB that they always ask good questions and that seeing their concern for certain issues enabled the Army to focus on providing them better information. He stated that RVAAP has a great RAB and many other installations can not say the same. He could not remember a RAB before that had such a high level of participation. Mr. Whelove thanked the township commissioners, for the use of their facilities for the meetings. He stated that that made things so much easier for the Army. He thanked them again, for the coffee and cookies and the warm and welcoming greetings that made the Army's job so much easier. Mr. Whelove thanked the local paper, The Record Courier (Mike Sever), for their fair and honest reporting. He stated that some of the articles made it all the way to the desk of a Major General and just made his morning coffee! Mr. Whelove stated that he has traveled extensively through Ohio and had an opportunity to meet so many wonderful people. He stated that Ohio has nice warm people in it. He concluded by introducing Joanne Watson as his replacement and stated that he has worked with her for a little while. Ms. Watson said hello and stated that she will be attending RAB meetings as frequently as her schedule permits. She said that she was there to provide support to Mr. Patterson who would be responsible for the actual cleanup. Mr. Patterson added that Ms. Watson is a very competent team player. He stated that she is the kind of professional focuses on doing a job correctly and as quickly as possible.

3. General Business

Mr. Patterson passed out a copy of the Community Relations Plan to each of the RAB members. Mr. Patterson reminded the RAB members that the survey that had been conducted and that members of the RAB helped to update the plan. He introduced Mr. Glen Beckham of the US Army Corps of Engineers, who would further explain the plan. Mr. Beckham stated that it was a pleasure to be at the RAB meeting, and told the RAB that he had heard great things about their relationship with the Army. He stated that Mr. Patterson and he had talked to Ms. Kimberly Turner, who had conducted the interviews with some of the RAB members, and that she was very impressed with the RAB member's knowledge and commitment to the process. He stated that the plan lets the RAB members know who to contact concerning certain issues. Mr. Patterson added that the Army will try and keep the plan up to date as much as possible.

Mr. Patterson asked Ms. Nina Miller if she had seen any additional applications for membership come through, she stated in the affirmative and said that she was waiting for a response from that individual. Secretary Gilliam explained that initially that individual wanted a seat representing Braceville Township, but was unaware that even though it would not be a

problem to give Braceville Township a seat they (the township) would have to accept the responsibility of keeping the seat filled. She explained that the applicant was unaware of this at the time and was in the process of checking to see if that is how she wished to proceed or if she would rather join as an independent member. Mr. Smith stated that Mr. Charlie Rhiemer would be interested in joining the RAB and that his seat would be a community seat. Mr. Patterson agreed to check into it. Mr. Rhiemer is a Solid Waste Administrator.

Mr. J.J. Leet stated that due to the fact that URS-GREINER was present at the meeting that the board should discuss the Technical Assistance Public Participation (TAPP) contract. He stated that there is \$5,500 left on the current contract. He stated that there are two more possible extensions of 25,000 each. He stated that most of the studies will be done in 2004 and 2005 and at that time they could use the remaining funds. URS-GREINER representative made note to the board that they frequently attend the RAB meetings pro bono. Ms. Eileen Mohr stated that the comments from the EPA regarding the Winklepeck Burning Grounds Ecological Ground Truthing study will be sent to the community co-chair of the RAB and that URS-GREINER can review those comments.

4. Guaranteed Fixed Price Remediation (GFPR)

Mr. Patterson stated that the GFPR is a contract mechanism that the Army hopes will move things to quicker completion. This type of contract essentially takes the entire project from investigation through long term monitoring and makes it one project, with a cost cap insurance. RVAAP was chosen along with 4 other installations. Three large contractors competed for the work. Shaw won the bid and, Mr. Mike Fitzgerald will be presenting their proposal, to show how they will be able to get LL1-4 to long term monitoring.

Mr. Fitzgerald began his presentation by explaining to the RAB that the presentation he was about to give was the same one given to the US Army Corps of Engineers. Mr. Fitzgerald also indicated that this was the first time that the Ohio EPA was hearing the proposal. He announced that under the GFPR the government will have a fair amount of funding and that if additional expenses come up there is insurance in place to cover them. Mr. Fitzgerald stated that Shaw has teamed with Scientific Applications International Corporation (SAIC), due to the fact that they have done a good part of the work out at RVAAP. He, himself, will be the Project Manager and Ms. Sharon Robers, of SAIC, will be in charge of Human Health Risk Assessment.

Mr. Fitzgerald stated that his presentation would cover the agenda, technical and regulatory approach, project team personnel, technical approach development, data evaluation, risk assessment application, focused feasibility, and life cycle costs.

He stated that lead and explosives are the primary contaminants of concern (COCs), preliminary remediation goals (PRGs), and remedial goal options (RGOs). Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) arsenic and other site contaminants are not significant to the overall approach. There are no significant groundwater issues in existence at the facility. Exceedences are sporadic in many areas, with most being in Load Lines 1 through 4. Seeing as they are sporadic they don't pose a significant risk.

In so far as the risk assessment, lead distribution is such that setting the Preliminary Goal Option (RGO) higher than the Preliminary remediation goal (PRG) leads to considerable costs savings. The RGOs that have already been established at Load Line 1 are adequate for Load Lines 2 through 4. Statistical averaging can save excavation given the sporadic nature of the contamination. Mr. Fitzgerald proposed that the EPA consider that.

The focused feasibility study will be used to evaluate risk. There is a need to look at disposal costs. Site closure is possible if soils are removed. Most soils are assumed to be characterized as non-hazardous and disposal pricing is reasonable. Stabilization and composting have costs that are at best equal to non-hazardous off site disposal.

Mr. Fitzgerald stated that as far as life cycle costs, if the source of contamination is removed there is no longer a need for long term monitoring. So the resulting approach for the sites will be as follows:

- Excavation and disposal
- RGO level for lead negotiated
- Formalize institutional land use controls

- Statistical averaging will be used to eliminate isolated detection of COCs where appropriate.
- Complete Remedial Investigation (RI)
- Expedite decision documents
- Develop Work Plan
- Conduct remediation
- Site closure/no further action

Mr. Fitzgerald then introduced Ms. Sharon Robers of SAIC. Ms. Robers will talk about the human health risk assessment. Ms. Robers greeted the board and stated that at the last RAB meeting in May they went through the findings of Load Lines 2 through 4 RIs. She reviewed:

- Approach for completion of human health and ecological risk assessments and development
- Human health risk assessment to protect soldiers and others
- Ecological protection of plants and animals
- Remedial goal options
- Shaw team will utilize subsequent land use to develop goals
- Exposure scenarios will reflect what is happening

Exposure scenarios will be based upon what the expected land use will be. Approved receptors will be used to run risk assessments. Chemicals of Concern will be identified that may pose human and ecological risks. The human health RGOs will be the primary clean up goals for the remediation. She stated that the areas all have the same COCs which are a concern to ecological and human health. She stated that both could be handled at the same time. Human health RGOs are the most important, due to the fact that the COCs are co-located. The range of RGOs will be determined using input from the RAB, the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (Ohio EPA and the Ohio Army National Guard (OHARNG) in order to determine the actual RGOs that will be needed for remediation. For lead the team will be using the EPA's model. The approach will be to finish Load Lines 2, 3, and 4 by using a comparison to Load Line 1 for risk assessment. The team will then finish the RIs and get them approved by the Ohio EPA.

Mr. Fitzgerald stated that they will be using detailed work plans, that are very clear and simple and that clearly describe the activities. Sufficient detail will be incorporated to cover contingent activities as they are required. The work plans will show how activities will be completed and verified. He stressed that verification was very important. Details of the environmental protections will also be included as they relate to the remedy of the problem. He stated that the team will be conscious of contaminants moving during the remediation.

Mr. Fitzgerald stated that the team will coordinate with MKM Engineers, Inc. and that removal actions will be executed with a single mobilization. Soil removed from small excavations will be moved to stockpile areas for characterization. Soil from large excavations will be characterized and loaded out directly. He anticipates the following cubic yards of soil from each Load Line to be removed:

Load Line	Cubic Yards
1	9, 000 - 22,000
2	4,000 – 10,000
3	2,000 – 5,000
4	2,000 – 4,000

Mr. Fitzgerald stated that RGO negotiation may reduce soil volumes.

In order to protect surface/groundwater the following precautions will be taken:

- Minimize time that the excavations are open
- Control run-off
- Cover waste stockpiles as required
- Cleanup surface water ditches
- Monitor well abandonment
- Control dust

Mr. Fitzgerald stated that the approach has no failure points from a technical risk perspective. He stated that all of the risks are reduced to growth in quantities of soil removed and

financial risk of the contractor and the insurance company. He said that site closure should not be a problem seeing as no long term monitoring will be needed at the Load Lines. Shaw will have an opportunity to close (seal / cap) the areas under the buildings, and that revised RGOs may mean limited additional remediation.

There are two methods that can be utilized to develop a schedule of completion; the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) method and the presumptive method. The CERCLA method takes about 33 months whereas the presumptive method takes about 30 months. Both methods focus on the process and expedite a path to closure. He stated that a lot of the work on the sites will be done in the summer months.

Mr. Fitzgerald stated that some of the key people on the team include; Ms. Sharon Robers (human health risk), Dr. Barney Cornaby (ecological health risk), and Mr. John Carson (statistical risk assessment approach), and Mr. Fitzgerald himself will be the program manager. In addition to these individuals there will be a professional engineer, a chemist, a transport/disposal coordinator, a hydrogeologist, a field superintendent and field staff. Mr. Fitzgerald stated that most of the field staff will come out of Findlay, Ohio, but locals would be hired on as well.

Mr. Fitzgerald stated that Shaw has over 5,800 staff members in over 72 offices. He stated that there are 620 professional staffers in 6 Ohio offices. SAIC has a strong regional presence having offices in Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, and Michigan.

Mr. Fitzgerald stated that in picking the key personnel for the project he ensured that they had GPR experience, had project/program management experience with the US Army Corps of Engineers, had previous dealings with the EPA Region 5 of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), as well as Ohio EPA, and lastly, experience at the RVAAP. The teaming of Shaw and SAIC met all of these requirements.

Mr. Fitzgerald then discussed the insurance that the team held. He stated that it was through Land Bank Group (a Brownfield Development affiliate), and that they have a working relationship with AIG. He stated that they have a good track record and were able to get lower premiums. He stated that the clean up cost has a cap policy:

- Outside of the Load Lines is not covered
- Discovery of the unknown is covered
- Changes in remediated methods is covered
- Changes in regulatory requirements is covered
- Materials cost productivity is covered.

He stressed that the Army will be insured and that the insurance will be covered by the AIG. He stated that the liability was limited to 100% of the fixed price of \$8 million and 150% for a fixed cap at \$12 million. The insurance company will pay 100% over the set amount of \$8 million. He stated that the pollution legal liability policy covers:

- Bodily injury/property damage
- Clean-up cost
- Non-owned locations
- Natural resource damages.

At this time Mr. Fitzgerald closed the presentation and began taking questions from the RAB members and the public audience. Mr. Earl Miller asked how much the insurance policy cost and Mr. Fitzgerald replied \$1.2 million. Mr. Smith asked how they intended to keep the dust down seeing as Paris Township is down wind of the arsenal. Mr. Fitzgerald replied that the soil would be kept moist and the outside of the transport trucks would be kept clean. Mr. Smith then asked how the soil would be disposed of; Mr. Fitzgerald responded that it would be taken to a landfill. Mr. Smith replied that that was not disposing of the problem it was just moving it someplace else. Mr. Fitzgerald noted that landfills have plastic linings to prevent leaching. Mr. Smith stated that it seemed to be a lot of soil that would be hauled off the site and asked if they intended upon replacing it. Mr. Fitzgerald replied in the affirmative. An audience member asked about cross contamination and wondered why they would hit the most contaminated areas first. Mr. Fitzgerald replied that they want to minimize where the waste is going to end up or move. Dr. Barbara Andreas stated that she would like to go back over the statistical averaging to minimize excavation. Mr. Fitzgerald replied that on some of the data you got 500 of something instead of

400. Take the exposure area and calculate the average across from it and that really determines the risk. An audience member asked if the sampling done was sporadic because he is amazed that there was any contamination found at the site because they (he and fellow employees of the arsenal) followed such strict rules when the audience member worked at RVAAP. He incredulously exclaimed that he could not believe that contamination was found. Mr. Fitzgerald answered that in production you look at weight levels, in the ecological view we look at parts per million (ppm). Even with the best precautions, materials and contaminants do escape, so during the remediation you decide what you will take and what you leave behind. An audience member asked if some of the buildings were more contaminated than others. Mr. Fitzgerald replied that the melt pour buildings have more contamination, but the prep buildings are where most of the contaminants were found. An audience member again expressed shock that anything was found. Mr. Fitzgerald closed at 7:10 pm.

5. Scheduling of Next Meeting and General Notes

The next RAB meeting was scheduled for January 21, 2004 from 6-8 pm at the Freedom Town Hall, Freedom, Ohio. Tentative topics include recent field activities, the Fuze & Booster Quarry Ponds being handled by SpecPro, and the public website. URS-GREINER might present to the RAB if the final report on the Winklepeck Burning Grounds Field Truthing is complete. Mr. Patterson adjourned the meeting at 7:13 p.m.

HAPPY NEW YEAR TO ALL!

Respectfully Submitted,

Denise L. Gilliam
RAB Secretary

DG/dg