

**Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant  
Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting  
June 5, 2024**

**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 Ms. Sarah Lock (Paris Township), Community Co-Chair, at 6:06 p.m. Wednesday, June 5, 2024, at the Shearer Community Center in Paris Township, 9355 Newton Falls Road, Ravenna, Ohio 44266.

Of the current 23 RAB members, the meeting attendance was recorded as 14 RAB members present, 5 excused absences and 4 unexcused absences. There were no members of the public present.

Since a quorum of RAB members were present for this meeting, the RAB could consider approval of RAB meeting minutes from April 20, 2022, November 9, 2022, April 19, 2023, and September 6, 2023. These meeting minutes could not be approved during previous RAB meetings due to contractor renewal issues that started right after the April 2022 meeting, then the resignation of the RAB support administrator, followed by quorum of RAB members not being present for the meetings.

Ms. Sarah Lock started the approval process with the meeting minutes for April 20, 2022. She asked if anyone had comments or questions. Ms. Eileen Mohr said that there were unanswered questions on page 4 and the top of page 5. There were questions concerning mixing incremental methodology with discrete methodology and a question regarding the clarification of the sampling. Ms. Katie Tait (OHARNG) offered two options to address the unanswered questions: which were to either include the answer to the questions in the minutes themselves or attached an addendum. It was decided that an addendum would be added to the meeting minutes to address the unanswered questions.

Mr. Nicholas Roope (Ohio EPA) asked a question about two (2) filled out community interest surveys that were attached to the last page. Ms. Sarah Lock explained that they were individuals from the community who had expressed interest in serving on the board and the interest surveys are not part of the meeting's minutes.

Mr. Delbert Woloski motioned to approve the meeting minutes as Final, and Mr. Bill Steiner seconded. The 'Ayes' carried, and the 'Nays' were none. The RAB Meeting Minutes for April 20, 2022, were approved.

Ms. Sarah Lock then moved to the meeting minutes for November 9, 2022. She asked if anyone had comments or questions. Ms. Eileen Mohr pointed out a typo on page 2 and on page 7 that needed to be corrected.

## FINAL

Mr. Bill Steiner motioned to approve the meeting minutes with the typos corrected as Final, and Mr. Delbert Woloski seconded. The 'Ayes' carried, and the 'Nays' were none. The RAB Meeting Minutes for November 9, 2022, were approved.

Ms. Sarah Lock next moved to the meeting minutes for April 19, 2023. She asked if anyone had comments or questions. There were no comments or questions.

Mr. Bill Steiner motioned for the RAB Meeting Minutes to be approved, and Ms. Eileen Mohr seconded. The 'Ayes' carried, and the 'Nays' were none. The RAB Meeting Minutes for April 19, 2023, were approved.

Ms. Sarah Lock moved to the meeting minutes for September 6, 2023. She asked if anyone had comments or questions and reminded the board members this was a Site Tour. Ms. Eileen Mohr said that there was a typo on page 2 that needed to be corrected.

Ms. Dorene Spicer motioned for the Meeting Minutes with the typo corrected to be approved, and Mr. Bill Steiner seconded. The 'Ayes' carried, and the 'Nays' were none. The RAB Meeting Minutes for September 6, 2023, were approved.

Ms. Sarah Lock thanked everyone for getting the backlog of meeting minutes approved.

## **2. Status of the RAB Board and the Membership Subcommittee Activities**

Ms. Lock informed the meeting that the RAB membership committee met in January and March of 2024. The membership committee discussed not only the membership that we had concerns about but also ways to increase participation on the board itself.

Highlights from the membership committee meetings included:

- A recommendation to maximize the use of the RVAAP public website. Unfortunately, the website was offline, but it was being actively worked on to resolve the issues. Ms. Katie Tait (OHARNG) said the issues were with the hosting and it was affecting all of their websites. The membership committee stated that the [www.rvaap.org](http://www.rvaap.org) website is a great resource, with a wealth of good information.
- A recommendation to create an up-to-date fact sheet, easy reference, one-page document for the website. It should be a living document to be updated on a yearly basis and/or as needed. Its purpose would be to make it easier to know what the RVAAP environmental cleanup was currently working on, and would also be a way to engage the public and provide a quick overview of accomplishments.
- A recommendation to have a midpoint e-news type update was made. This would not be for public release but a way to keep the board members updated quickly with what has occurred in the restoration program since the last meeting.
- A recommendation to reintroduce ourselves to each other was made, and was done at this meeting.

The RAB membership committee analyzed RAB member attendance. Following that attendance review, Ms. Sarah Lock stated that she contact some of the RAB members

to verify their interest in continuing with the RAB. Some absenteeism was due to email address changes. Everyone she spoke to was very happy to still be engaged as a board member. Ms. Angela Cobbs (RAB Administrator) reached out to municipalities to determine changes in their representation.

Sarah Lock said there was one board member (Ms. Nancy Taylor) that we have not been able to reach. At this point, Ms. Taylor has not been present at RAB meetings for many years, and she has not formally resigned her position. Mr. Mayer wanted to know if she represented a municipality or a political organization. Ms. Sarah Lock said she was a community member. As stated in the RAB operating policy, a 2/3 quorum must be present to vote on the removal of a RAB member. Mr. Delbert Woloski made a motion to have Ms. Taylor removed from the RAB, and Mr. Bill Steiner seconded it. All those in favor said 'Aye' and those opposed say 'Nay.'" There were no 'Nays.' The motion passed and Ms. Nancy Taylor was officially removed from the RAB. Ms. Lock wanted to be sure that the RAB gave her thanks for her service to the board.

Mr. Tom Tadsen wanted to say a few words about Ms. Nancy Taylor and was very complimentary of her service to the community. The RAB will send her an official letter notifying her of the official removal from the RAB and to thank her for her many years of valuable service. A vacancy for a RAB position now exists, and efforts will be made to fill the vacancy.

### **3. Future 2024 RAB Meetings**

Ms. Sarah Lock said that historically our meetings have always been on a Wednesday and have typically been held in the 6:00pm to 7:30pm or 6:00 to 8:00 pm time frames. Ms. Lock inquired about changing the meeting time to an earlier time. Three earlier times were proposed for discussion; a 4:00 pm start, a 4:30 pm start, or a 5:00 pm start. Ms. Lock preferred a 4:30 to 5:00 pm start, with concern that a 4:00 pm start time could limit public participation and RAB members ability to attend the meeting. Ms. Lock stated that this discussion was to determine everyone's flexibility for attending meetings.

After lengthy discussion, the RAB decided to move the meeting start time to 4:30pm for the next two meetings and then re-evaluate.

Ms. Lock proposed two (2) dates for the September RAB meeting, the 18<sup>th</sup> and the 25<sup>th</sup>, and possibly dates in December 2024. The board members agreed to meet on September 18, 2024, at 4:30pm, location to be determined.

For the meeting after the September RAB meeting, Ms. Lock proposed the 4<sup>th</sup> or the 11<sup>th</sup> of December 2024. The board members agreed to meet on December 11, 2024, at 4:30pm, location to be determined.

Ms. Lock thanked everyone for attending and for the ability to have a quorum to act on much needed general business items.

#### 4. Updates on the Installation Restoration Program Site Presentation

Ms. Katie Tait (OHARNG) gave tonight's presentation titled "RVAAP Restoration Program Update." Ms. Tait brought some older historic maps and a Siebert stake for reference.

Ms. Sarah Lock (Paris Township) requested that the board members hold their questions until after Ms. Tait's presentation was completed. At the conclusion of Ms. Tait's presentation, Ms. Lock thanked Ms. Tait for her comprehensive overview of the remediation, and then opened the floor to the board members for questions.

Ms. Eileen Mohr (Kent) asked for examples of the sites that are under the interim internal restriction/control. Ms. Katie Tait (OHARNG) stated that the NACA test area is available for training but there are still controls in place to ensure we are protecting the areas requiring additional characterization. These controls include Siebert stakes to delineate areas of concern and limited access, and that soldiers are briefed on the restrictions of the area. Ms. Tait presented the Depot area as another area that had interim controls in place. The Depot Area has old buildings in poor condition that will require demolition. The areas around Building U4 and U5 are off limits where contamination has been identified. Siebert stakes and posted signage stating that authorization was required to enter an area of concern have been used at numerous locations throughout the facility. A map is used by Camp James A. Garfield (CJAG) to show all of the restrictions and limitations of an area. LTC Robinson (Army Co-Chair) stated that both of the sites that Ms. Katie Tait mentioned are sites used to train with vehicles. Additionally, soldiers do not bivouac overnight in these areas. Ms. Mohr inquired how determinations on controls were made for the different areas of concern. Ms. Tait stated that what works best in her opinion is to have limited training and/or no training on the interim control/restricted areas.

Ms. Mohr requested Ohio EPA comment. Mr. Nicholas Roope (Ohio EPA) stated that he had no comment because this was unfamiliar territory for him. Mr. Roope asked for clarification about potential exposure risks for the soldiers and how the site restrictions protected soldiers during training. Ms. Tait said there is no soil disturbance in those areas. Each site has its own intricacies and we have learned what is needed for each site. For instance, the following sites have no training activities: Defense Logistics Agency (DLA), Atlas Scrap Yard, Load Line 9 (LL9), Wet Storage, Open Demolition Area 2 (ODA2), Block D, Depot Area, and dump area along Paris-Windham Road. LTC Robinson stated that the Depot Area encompasses several areas. The area listed as U7 and U8 is located just south of the Depot area and is a driving course. The soldiers train on the roads but are not allowed in the buildings. Day and night driving is conducted in the north part of the Depot area, and the soldiers leave the area at the completion of their mission/training. Areas U4 and U5 have known contamination that has not yet been remediated and are off limits as a result.

Mr. Nicholas Roope stated that he believes the preceding explanation answered his concern/questions. The Environmental Office has data of the contaminants in the areas and who/when, may/may not be allowed in these areas. It does appear based on this conversation that the soldiers have no exposure risks because the OHARNG has restricted it. Ms. Mohr wanted to confirm that digging is not allowed at certain restricted sites, if those areas have been through the assessment process, and if risk assessors have said exposure is not an issue. Ms. Katie Tait (OHARNG) answered that those areas have had all of those items successfully implemented. Mr. Nicholas Roope wanted to confirm that this included dust kick up from vehicular traffic. LTC Robinson stated that all the maps are in Range Control and the units are briefed on the area before they start their training. There is a hard road that goes through the Depot area, and they are not creating dust. The buildings are off limits, and no one is digging and/or creating foxholes. Ms. Tait stated that the NACA area investigation identified areas of contamination that have not yet been remediated. These areas are delineated with Siebert stakes, and the soldiers are briefed that these delineated areas are restricted.

Mr. Tom Tadsen wanted to know what areas in NACA were delineated as restricted areas. He stated that there are reports of buried aircraft on-site. Mr. Sedlak said that after thoroughly researching the matter it was determined that aircrafts were not buried on the NACA site. He said the studies included geophysics and soil borings. Aircraft parts and pieces were discovered on the surface, but there were no indications of buried aircraft. The Army has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars to investigate the buried aircraft, but none have been discovered. Three areas in NACA were investigated: the main concrete strip, the area at the east end of the concrete strip and a small area at the west end of the concrete strip. Some contamination was discovered in the soil. The Army still has to determine the extent of this contamination and identify the best solution for remediation.

Mr. Nicholas Roope requested more detail of what restricted use means as it applies to the clean-up actions. He also asked about the difference between commercial/industrial and residential use standards, and if anticipated land use was considered. Ms. Tait presented a slide and explanation that provided a snapshot of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) process.

- Step 1. Preliminary Assessment/Site Inspection (PA/SI). A historical records review and preliminary site investigation are conducted.

- Step 2. Remedial Investigation (RI) & Risk Assessment. Receptors are evaluated at this step. Who is going to use the site and who is the potential end user. We always look at unrestricted use. Typically, we first look at limited use/restricted access. Second, we look at military/industrial use which gives us more flexibility. Finally, we look at unrestricted use which residential use.

- Step 3. Feasibility Study (FS), which considers alternatives for clean-up.

- Step 4. Proposed Plan & Record of Decision (ROD), where the alternative is selected based on if there is contamination or not. A remedy (if required) is defined at this point.

- Step 5. Remedial Design (RD), where the remedial work plan is presented based on the remedy identified in the ROD.
- Step 6. Remedial Action (RA), where the remedy is implemented based on the RD.
- Step 7. Construction Completion, which reports on the RA, including records of test results, as-built maps and other pertinent information for the remedy.
- Step 8 Long-Term Monitoring (if required).

Mr. Nicolas Roope said that this explanation/chart answered his questions.

Mr. James Mayer had a question about Slide 13 and what was meant by additional extent in the way of footage or topography? Ms. Tait said that the additional square footage is not yet available. The original volume was based on the remedial investigation results, and confirmation sampling is conducted once the removal action is completed. The confirmation sample results indicated that the cleanup goals were not met, and additional removal was required. In the Army's contract with the removal contractor, only specific removal volumes are specified due to funding limitations. The contractor is not going to want to go beyond those volumes because they are only paid based on removal of a specific volume. The Army determined that it would be best to go back and conduct additional characterization to determine what those extents will be and what the additional volumes will be to be excavated. Ms. Katie Tait (OHARNG) said that the confirmatory sampling results will be used as a starting point to determine the additional characterization requirements and eventually the volume that now needs to be removed from the site.

Ms. Mohr stated that early on in the 2000s, the contracts were a type of contract called Fixed Price Remediation With Insurance (FPRWI) and confirmed Ms. Tait's explanation of the removal contracting procedure. Mr. Sedlak stated these contracting procedures take some time to go through and it can take a while to get a contractor in the field. He said they are doing a sampling right now to determine what was needed to complete the CERCLA process. Studies are being conducted to determine what the new volumes will be and a Risk Assessment will also be conducted. At this point, he estimates that it may be five or six years before the removal action can be started. Sampling is being performed this year, and the next steps will be to do the investigation reports, get them approved and then get additional funding. We ran out of funding this year and were unable to get more because of all the other things going on. Once the additional removal action is started, the Army is looking to set up some options, just in case even more additional excavation is required. We are attempting to give ourselves some extra flexibility in our contracts. The Army's goal is to have sites that can be used by the soldiers. It does take a long time and it takes a lot of funding. The government pays 50% more for contracts than they do in the civilian world. A lot of environmental cleanup at RVAAP has been accomplished in the last 10 to 15 years. RVAAP environmental cleanup projects have been 80% of the funding for the Environmental Program of the

Army Guard for the past 5 to 6 years. There was one year where RVAAP had more Record of Decisions (ROD) than the entire United States Army combined. The people in high leadership saw this as a positive action and made the decision to provide more funding as required.

Ms. Tait asked if there were any more questions. Mr. Roope had questions about the Facility-wide sewers. He wanted to know about the terracotta tiles and the carbon tetrachloride footprint. He stated that the tiles crack, shift, and deteriorate with time. He wanted to know what the Army is doing to mitigate the effects of the sewer water and ground water going through that area to make sure nothing is leaking out. He also wanted to know how the Army verifies the condition of the sewer line and how cracks are identified that could lead to ground water contamination. Ms. Tait said that a comprehensive video survey was performed. Anything that is damaged has not been repaired. The Army knows where the hotspots are and those areas will be kept intact until a removal is performed. The Army has not seen a link to ground water from the sewer. The funding for this project is based on the Risk Assessment, as funding won't be provided unless a risk to an ecological or a human receptor is identified. The Facility-wide sewers are damaged either through age, use, and other reasons. The old lines aren't being used because they are damaged and have been replaced with new utilities.

Mr. Tadsen asked if there are any ways to look for any trace chemicals after they dumped hundreds of gallons of carbon tetrachloride behind the fire station. Ms. Tait stated that the Army has done the testing looking for trace chemicals and carbon tetrachloride was detected. A vapor intrusion study is being conducted at Building 1037 because of this.

Ms. Mohr asked the status of the vapor intrusion and where the facility-wide sewer and outflows went. Ms. Tait stated some of the facility-wide sewers were combined and all have been marked and investigated. The vapor intrusion contractor is ready to go into Building 1037 and pull the first samples.

Mr. Mayer asked if it is known how much carbon tetrachloride was used. Ms. Tait answered that it is not known. Mr. Sedlak stated that we know from various verbal accounts and other sources that a tank was used to refill fire extinguishers, and that RVAAP used those types of extinguishers in the past. The Army has records that there was a UST (Underground Storage Tank) at the site, but it is not known what materials it contained or if it leaked. The former UST location is where the highest concentrations of carbon tetrachloride were discovered.

Mr. Brad King asked about an area in the arsenal that is being used for training. The area has large piles of stacked concrete that was being used for training involved in disasters and/or dirty bombs. Ms. Tait stated that area is a simulated collapsed structure. It is located on a concrete pad and some of the concrete is being reused from RVAAP. The concrete in that area is not painted. Any painted concrete is properly recycled or disposed.

Ms. Lock asked if one of the reference maps showed all 85 USTs. Ms. Tait said that we do not have a map showing the 85 UST locations because the map would become too cluttered to find them on the map. She added there are GIS coordinates in the electronic map layers that they use to find the UST locations.

Mr. Brad King wanted to know if there is a master plan for the facility. Ms. Tait stated that there is an Installation Action Plan that is done every year, and it is shared with the public. The information in it includes the years required to reach completion and the costs associated with it. The public does not see the related costs but everything else is provided in the Installation Action Plan.

Ms. Denise Smith wanted to thank all of the people involved in the restoration process. She said she believes the communities' faith has been restored and it is all because of your hard work and dedication. Ms. Tait thanked Ms. Smith for her comments and said it is really about giving back to the end user, the soldier, and being able to train for their jobs and upcoming missions. Mr. Sedlak said that their mandate from the leadership at Army Guard is to be transparent and open about what is going on at RVAAP. He said that leadership understands if you lose the community's trust you will not be able to get it back easily.

Ms. Tait stated all activities run through Range Control and that they do a good job of keeping the public informed about activities that may impact their daily life. The perimeter fence, which is not required for security, helps to keep trespassers off the RVAAP property and we can thank the Army Guard for it.

## **5. Camp James A. Garfield Military Operations Summary and Updates**

LTC Robinson congratulated Ms. Tait on her presentation. LTC Robinson informed the RAB that she has received an Army-wide award for Environment Clean Up. Kudos to her and all the people involved with the process. He asked Mr. Tim Morgan, Facility Environmental Director, for a number of environmental funds spent over the years and was told that approximately \$200 million dollars has been spent. It is a significant and noteworthy accomplishment. One of the areas, Winklepeck Burning Grounds, was restored to commercial/industrial use and is now a \$7.6 Million dollar machine gun range. This makes CJAG a destination for training because of this investment. CJAG has a real property master plan, which during Col (Ret.) Tom Tadsen's time was used to program about \$37 million dollars. Mr. Tim Morgan has updated this plan and the budget, if approved, will be \$50 million dollars over the next five years. It is planned to add more ranges, facilities, and train more soldiers here. While we cannot fire tanks or mortars at CJAG because they would exceed our footprint, we can compete with the other bases in our area, such as Camp Atterbury and Fort Indian Town Gap. There are designs and plans on how to do an Air Assault Course and Air Assault obstacle course at CJAG. This is all from the efforts of the Environmental Office (Ms. Katie Tait, Mr. Kevin Sedlak, Mr. Tim Morgan, and the entire office). The tankers can now maneuver, engage each other, and practice offensive and defensive maneuverability while training at CJAG. LTC Robinson said he was not able to do that when he was a tanker. CJAG



**FINAL**

does offer tours to show what it has to offer. He is very proud of this post and the items we have accomplished.

Ms. Tait stated that at one of the meetings we spoke about a historical marker being placed at CJAG. The OHARNG completed a package for the historical marker and submitted it to the State Historical Preservation Office. It is a judged package and notification is expected. The City of Windham is planning to create a museum for RVAAP. There is a woman in Garrettsville who is working with the City of Windham to seek out a location, building, and the artifacts.

Ms. Sarah Lock (Paris Township) asked if there are any additional questions from the board members, and hearing none she adjourned the meeting at 7:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Angela Cobbs, RVAAP RAB Administrator