

# FINAL

## **Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting 15 September 2021**

### **1. Call to Order**

The Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant (RVAAP) Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting for the Installation Restoration Program was called to order by the Community Co-Chair Ms. Sarah Lock, of Paris Township at 6:12 p.m. Wednesday, September 15, 2021 virtually using Microsoft TEAMS.

Of the current 20 RAB members meeting attendance was recorded as 12 members present, 4 excused absence and 5 unexcused absences. Public attendance was recorded at 3.

The first order of business was approving of the May 19, 2021, meeting minutes. The meeting did not have a quorum of members present thus meeting minutes were not discussed or approved. Rebecca Shreffler, RAB Administrator did ask the members present to email her if they had any comments or changes to the minutes. The May 19, 2021, meeting minutes will be approved at the next RAB Meeting.

Ms. Sarah Lock, of Paris Township introduced the first speaker, Mr. Kevin Sedlak of the Army National Guard, to present a summary of the thermal treatment of soils at Load Lines 1-4 and 12 at the Former RVAAP. She also reminded members to hold all questions to the end of the presentation.

### **2. Presentation – Summary of Thermal Treatment of Soils at Load Lines 1-4 and 12 at the Former RVAAP, Kevin Sedlak, Army National Guard**

Kevin Sedlak, Army National Guard, then gave a presentation on Thermal Treatment of Soils at Load Lines 1-4 and 12 at the Former RVAAP. To request a copy of the formal presentation please contact the RVAAP RAB Administrator at (330) 872-4411, [rmsheffler@chenega.com](mailto:rmsheffler@chenega.com) or visit [www.rvaap.org](http://www.rvaap.org).

Following the presentation Ms. Sarah Lock (Paris TWP) thanked the speaker and opened the discussion for questions by RAB Members. Public members were asked to hold any questions until after all member questions.

Tom Tadsen of Franklin Township asked what was the significance of the temperature range inside the thermal treatment units?

Mr. Sedlak answered that embed thermocouples throughout the soil piles to monitor the temperature at all times in real time. Depending on the moisture content, outside temperature, etc. the team can determine the correct temperature was achieved for an adequate amount of time to address the contaminants of concern. There is a specific temperature range you must achieve to affectively cook off each contaminate of concern. The team had to hit a particular temperature range and hold it there for a specific amount

## FINAL

of time to ensure all the soil between probes was at a consistent temperature and treated properly. This ensures the contaminants of concern are properly removed from the soil.

Kevin Palombo with the Ohio EPA then had a couple questions. He noted the huts are encased in a material and asked if it was a type of plastic and if the temperatures ever get so high it melts the encasing material. Mr. Sedlak answered no the Quonset huts are made of aluminum panels that can stack on trucks for easy shipping. The panels are bolted together, and each seam is made airtight.

The next question was if tubing that heats the soil is placed first then the soil is filled in around the tubing or if the tubing is inserted into the pile of soil. Mr. Sedlak noted the tubing is placed first and the soil is filled in around the tubing. There are 3-4 layers of piping that is all interconnected

Kevin Palombo then asked how long the process was for receiving the confirmatory samples. Mr. Sedlak believed it was roughly a 10-day turnaround time for the ISM (Incremental Sampling Methodology) samples depending on how many were sent in at a time.

Sarah Lock asked if there were any further questions or discussion from the board. There were no responses. Ms. Lock then opened the discussion to allow questions or comments from any public attendees.

Ms. Denise Smith, Paris Township, asked if sampling was conducted before and after treatment of the soil. Mr. Sedlak explained the contaminated areas were determined a couple years ago in previous projects done at the sites. Initial investigation was done to establish what areas needed treatment and to what extent (i.e., how much soil). Excavated soil was not sampled prior to being placed in the Quonset huts but the floor and sidewalls of the excavation site were sampled to ensure all contaminated soil was removed and the site could be safely backfilled. Samples were taken after treatment to ensure all contaminants of concern were properly treated and removed from the excavated soil prior to backfill.

Ms. Sarah Lock of Paris Township asked if there were any additional questions or comments from any members of the public in attendance. There were no responses, so Ms. Lock then introduced the next speaker, Mr. Allan Brillinger of Chenega Tri-Services to present on Land Use Control Management at the Former RVAAP. She also reminded members to hold all questions to the end of the presentation

### **3. Presentation – Land Use Control Management, Allan Brillinger, Chenega Tri-Services**

Allan Brillinger, Chenega Tri-Services, then gave a presentation on Land Use Control Management at the Former RVAAP. To request a copy of the formal presentation please contact the RVAAP RAB Administrator at (330) 872-4411, [rmshreffler@chenega.com](mailto:rmshreffler@chenega.com) or visit [www.rvaap.org](http://www.rvaap.org).

## FINAL

Following the presentation Ms. Sarah Lock, Paris Township, thanked the speaker and opened the discussion for questions by RAB Members. Public members were asked to hold any questions until after all member questions.

Kevin Palombo with the Ohio EPA asked Allan to clarify the Property Management Plan has all the sites that have been closed or completed and among those in the Property Management Plan are those that have Land Use Controls (LUC). Allan stated the Property Management Plan has some general information about the site (CJAG and Former RVAAP) and the Restoration Program. The more site-specific information is found in the appendices. Appendix A1 are all the LUC sites and it really spells out the site-specific information and required LUCs in that portion of the document. This information is reviewed annually so is always up to date. Appendix A2 contains the NFA or No Further Action sites.

Kevin Palombo added for the boards awareness the Property Management Plan is very important and documents all Areas of Concern (AOC) on the property and their status. So, at the end of all the remediation and clean up there will be this document that tells what existed on site and the status of the cleanup.

Mr. Palombo then asked if the 5-year review mentioned in the presentation was only for the LUCs or of the whole facility and if it was currently in progress. Mr. Brillinger was not sure, so asked Katie Tait, Ohio Army National Guard or Kevin Sedlak, Army National Guard to answer this question. Ms. Tait stated when they conduct the 5-year review only sites with Land Use Controls are reviewed.

Mr. Palombo then pointed out one of the pictures of Load Line 1 in the presentation showed a concrete walkway and thought all the concrete walkways were removed. Mr. Sedlak stated that was not the case, only concrete walkways that were in the way of the excavations were removed. If the walkway was not in the way of any excavation it was left in place.

Mr. Palombo then pointed out for the boards information there are groundwater monitoring wells around Ramsdell Quarry Landfill (one of the LUC sites) that monitor the groundwater of the area. These wells are part of the Facility-Wide Groundwater Monitoring well network which is Facility-Wide project. Mr. Brillinger noted most if not all the LUC sites have several Facility-Wide Groundwater Monitoring wells in proximity to the AOC except for the Dump Along Paris-Windham Road.

Ms. Sarah Lock of Paris Township asked regarding annual inspections, what the length of term was for those inspections? Are these inspections open ended or do they have a designated term? Mr. Brillinger stated the inspections are generally kept annually per calendar year. Ms. Katie Tait then added the Army plans for 30 years of monitoring which is the longest term they can plan out. But unless the LUC sites achieve unrestricted residential use status it will have controls.

Ms. Lock asked if this was across the board for all the sites. Ms. Tait stated the Army is having a lot of success at most of the sites achieving unrestricted residential use. Out of the 84 AOCs on site there is only a handful that have controls currently, and only a few

## FINAL

more in progress that will most likely have controls in the future. Most sites are being cleaned up to unrestricted residential use.

Ms. Lock followed up with asking why there were not Facility-Wide Groundwater Monitoring wells in proximity to the Dump Along Paris-Windham Road. Mr. Brillinger answered the site was a landfill site that was excavated, with a section along the road that could not be removed to ensure the integrity of the road. Groundwater was not a concern for this site.

Ms. Lock asked if there were any compliance issues or deficiencies that have been reported to the Army or the Ohio EPA. Mr. Brillinger stated one of the previous Land Use Controls for Winklepeck Burning Grounds and Load Line 12 was the perimeter fence. This is a 30-mile fence that surrounds Camp James A. Garfield and was part of the inspections. If any portion of the fence was compromised (for example: trees fall, culvert wash out, people cut holes in the fence) this was reported to the Army and fixed. As far as Ramsdell Quarry Landfill there would be wildlife that dig holes in the cap that would get filled and patched. Other minor items such as sign repair/replacement would be addressed throughout the year as well.

The next question from Ms. Lock was a clarification regarding the fence around Ramsdell Quarry Landfill. One side of the fence is chain link with gates on either side and the other 3 sides are 5-strand high tensile wire fence. Why is one side of the fence so restricted while the other 3 are not? Mr. Brillinger stated this has more to do with keeping unauthorized personnel and vehicles out of the site. The chain link fence is along the roadway where there is vehicle access to the 2 gates, but the wire fence is not easily accessible to vehicle traffic but keeps any foot personnel off the site. There is limited access to the site through the gates that required a key to access and signing in and out. Ms. Tait also added the 5-strand tensile fence would allow wildlife to more readily access the site which is important.

Ms. Sarah Lock asked if there were any further questions or discussion from the board. There were no responses. Ms. Lock then opened the discussion to allow questions or comments from any public attendees.

Ms. Denise Smith, Paris Township, asked for clarification of the term unrestricted residential use. Ms. Katie Tait explained unrestricted residential use is a term used under the regulation where you achieve any sort of use for that particular property. For the Army it is used to allow for easier military training with basically no restrictions. It is a general term used in the regulation under the clean-up program. The site at this point and for the foreseeable future will always be used for military training even if it has achieved the residential use status.

Ms. Smith then asked for clarification if there were precautions for military personnel using the sites. Ms. Tait clarified all the restricted access sites like Paris-Windham Dump, Ramsdell Quarry, etc. are not used for military training. There are too many restrictions to allow personnel to train there safely. Sites that can achieve commercial-industrial use that does allow for military training.

## FINAL

Lastly Ms. Smith noted the stone arch bridge in the last picture of the presentation and asked where it was located. Ms. Tait stated it is on the north portion of the site located on South Fork Eagle Creek and is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. The theory is it was built in the late 1800's to connect two adjacent farms and is still in use to date.

There were no further questions or comments from the public. This concluded the discussion on the presentation. Sarah Lock of Paris Township then moved onto the RAB general business.

### 4. General RAB Business

1. The first order of general business to discuss was membership changes. Ms. Lock reminded the board that there are 3 current vacancies on the board from the resignations of George Tompkins, Rebecca Carter, and Jim DiPaola. The board has received 2 Interest Surveys and the membership committee will be meeting to discuss these surveys and other membership matters. It has been some time since the membership committee last met so if there are any openings on the committee the board will be notified, and those openings will be filled.
2. Mr. Adam Eskridge was introduced as the new Charlestown Township representative. Mr. Eskridge thanked the board for the introduction and looks forward to meeting everyone in person in the future. He grew up in Charlestown Township right across the street from the facility and 2 years ago bought his parents farm and lives there with his wife and children. He has lived in the area his entire life and has a vested interest in the community, the surrounding areas and portage county.
3. The next order of business was scheduling the next meeting. Ms. Lock suggested the next meeting be planned as an in person meeting with the option of transitioning to virtual if the need arises. The date of Wednesday April 20, 2022 was suggested and scheduled. Ms. Lock then asked for a township volunteer to host the meeting. It was suggested the meeting be held at the Shearer Community Center in Paris Township for the meeting location. RAB Administrator Rebecca Shreffler will contact the hall for availability and inform the board if another location is scheduled. Further meeting details will be provided closer to the meeting date as they become available.

Ms. Lock asked Katie Tait and Kevin Sedlak if there were any upcoming public meetings the board should be aware of. There are no public meetings over the next few months.

There were no further comments, discussion, or general business topics.

The meeting was adjourned by Sarah Lock at 7:24 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rebecca Shreffler, RVAAP RAB Administrator