

**Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant
Restoration Advisory Board (RAB)
Meeting Minutes
May 18, 2005**

1. Call to Order & Reading of Minutes

The meeting was called to order by Community Co-Chair LTC Tom Tadsen at 6:10 p.m at the Newton Falls Community Center, Newton Falls, Ohio.

LTC Tom Tadsen scheduled the next meeting to be held on July 20, 2005 at 6:00 p.m at the Newton Falls Community Center, Newton Falls, Ohio.

LTC Tom Tadsen asked the board members if they had any corrections to the minutes. Mr. Walter Landor had a correction to the previous March 16, 2005 meeting minutes. The correction was recorded. Mr. J.J. Leet moved to accept the minutes as amended. Mr. Walter Landor seconded the motion to approve the minutes as amended. The minutes were approved as amended.

Secretary Christy Esler took attendance with 13 members present, 5 excused and 6 absent (Dr. Barbara Andreas, Floyd Banks, Kevin Cooper, Robert Daughtery, Howard Furl, Milan Markov and Mark Zigmont).

2. General Business

LTC Tom Tadsen directed the member's attention to the exceeded unexcused absences of RAB members Mr. Kevin Cooper, Mr. Floyd Banks and Ms. Maureen Frederick (or representative). He requested that I send out notifications to the absentee members and the board tabled the vote on their status until the July 20, 2005 meeting.

Next issue on the agenda was a discussion of the Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) contract to support the RAB. LTC Tom Tadsen introduced Janet Bishop of URS the TAPP contract provider for the RVAAP. Mark Patterson explained that the TAPP provider is the technical support for the RAB. The RVAAP RAB has been funded for a TAPP provider twice in the past, in the amount of \$25,000.00 each time. There is \$1,800.00 remaining on the grant with URS as the current TAPP provider. JJ. Leet volunteered to coordinate a committee to look into the technical issues to recommend to URS. JJ Leet agreed that the RAB would be interested in re-applying for another grant, especially considering recent issues. Mark asked Janet Bishop of URS if she had any comments for the RAB concerning the TAPP, and she explained that this is a very helpful program concerning technical issues involved in projects and she would recommend that the board reapply for TAPP support.

Mark Patterson elaborated on the TAPP program by explaining that the funds awarded are for restoration, and cleans up projects that we have been working on for 8 to 9 years now. The demolition projects and the burns do not fall under this program.

Charlie Ramer asked when the grant application is due. He also asked if this was the first or the second draw of TAPP support funds.

Mark Patterson- answered by saying the application due date is in 4th quarter. The RAB would fill out a standard application and this is the second funding award.

LTC Tadsen stated the quorum has been met tonight and the members should be prepared to vote at the July 20th meeting on the TAPP topic of choice or they could vote on it tonight.

Marti Long suggested that the board should wait until the July 20th meeting to decide.

Mark Patterson explained that the board can either decide to stay with the current contractor (URS) or we could go through the contracting process to choose another contractor to provide technical services through the grant.

Marti Long & Kerry Macomber suggested that we receive the list of topics earlier than the July 20th meeting to review. Mark Patterson asked Janet Bishop if she could please prepare that list to distribute. Janet Bishop will provide the RAB administrator with a copy of the proposed topics to distribute to the RAB members.

LTC Tom Tadsen encouraged all members to look at the list prior to the next scheduled meeting on July 20, 2005.

3. Update on the Removal of Explosively Contaminated Buildings at RVAAP using Engineered Burning, Mark Patterson, RVAAP Facility Manager

1. The top priority for the Army and MKM Engineers is the safety of local residents and the work force.
2. The U.S Army Technical Center for Explosive Safety (USATCES) (the Army's experts on explosives safety) conducted an inspection of buildings in the load lines April 5 & 6, 2005.
3. USATCES has approved the re-evaluation of 121 of the explosively contaminated buildings at the RVAAP for demolition using armored equipment, excluding the six (6) melt pour buildings. This potentially reduces the number of buildings to be burned by 115.
4. The final inspection of each building will include opening the walls with heavily armored equipment in high risk areas of the buildings to determine if there are any accumulated explosives. High risk areas are those areas within a building where large volumes of explosives were handled and may have accumulated inside the walls or between the floors and the floor coverings.
5. A building will only be re-considered for engineered burning if, during the final inspection, explosive conditions are found that cannot be safely handled with the

heavily armored equipment. This effort will be coordinated with all interested parties.

6. Demolition of unburned, explosively contaminated buildings using armored equipment is more dangerous to the workers.
7. The RVAAP and MKM Engineers continue to work with the USEPA, Ohio EPA, and Akron Regional Air Quality Management District to determine the most appropriate method of demolition.
8. Comments on the proposed air model for the engineered trial burn have not been received from the USEPA.
9. The decision by the regulators for an engineered burn is not expected for 1 – 1½ years.

Mark Patterson introduced Mr. Jim Lohr of MKM Engineers who will be coordinating and helping us communicate information to the interested people.

Jim Lohr: Explained that a lot of people have shown interest in the current issues and to better explain the process, we would like to schedule tours of the Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant and show the concerned citizens what we plan on doing firsthand. During that time we will answer pertinent questions that you may have. The starting place will be: Who would like to be invited; the sign-in sheet will be a place we will start, and we should invite those individuals. We will contact you in the near future to schedule the tours.

Mark Patterson explained that this will be a long process before USEPA arrives at a decision as stated in the last bullet in the handout. Please feel free to pick up a copy of the handout on the back table that outlines the recent developments.

Questions were fielded from the RAB Members:

Marti Long- the Army has conducted demolition in the past; can we run this new demolition debris through the flashing furnace?

Mark Patterson- After the demolition, some of the debris could contain levels of explosives. Some of this debris may be sent to the flashing furnace. OEPA regulations require testing, and based on the results some of the debris may be able to go to a landfill.

Marti Long- Is the debris too dangerous to load and move?

Mark Patterson- Based on the test results, if we find enough explosive residual we will have to stop the demolition work. The flashing furnace is to get rid of small amounts of residual explosives and is mainly for steel, and is not designed to handle this volume of material.

Eileen Mohr- The sampling results will determine where the materials would have to go.

Jay Abercrombie- The landfill material - are the landfills nearby or would the debris have to be shipped long distances?

Rick Callahan- MKM has spoken to local landfill operators for disposal.

Questions were fielded from the general public:

Julie Smeiles (The Villager) - There are 6 buildings on the list to burn from Load lines 2, 3 & 4. Are you still moving forward with Load Line 11 in the current application to the USEPA?

Mark Patterson-USEPA is currently reviewing the plan. They are reviewing the burn process and in the end we may not burn any buildings in Load Line 11 at all, but the disposition of Load Line 11 is at the discretion of the USEPA. There may not be any buildings to burn in load line 11 after we receive the USEPA's comments.

Julie Smeiles (The Villager) - The Urban Air Model says that there is less than 5% vegetation, and it is industrial or warehouse area, absent trees. This model does not describe this area very accurately, and neither does categorizing this area as "commercial I2."

Rick Callahan- We agree with your comment; the Army determined the model. We have put together a more accurate model that we will communicate with them.

Martin Bramlett (Ravenna Resident) - Where are these 6 buildings located on the facility?

Mark Patterson- answered by explaining the location of the buildings; Load line 2 is on the eastern side, load line 3 is in the middle, load line 12 is gone, load line 4 is located in the central-eastern side.

Martin Bramlett (Ravenna Resident) - There is approximately 21,000 acres, how much acreage do these buildings take up?

Mark Patterson- I am guessing approximately 1 ½ acres. These buildings are three story melt pour buildings.

John Dolan (Newton Falls Resident) - Once the buildings are demolished and these trucks are loaded and hauling this debris down the road by my house, will the semi-trailers be covered?

Rick Callahan (MKM) - Yes the trailers are covered in compliance with DOT regulations.

John Dolan (Newton Falls Resident) - Asked Mark to guarantee him a 0% minimal risk to his family just like you are wanting for your workers.

Mark Patterson- We have taken more risk on to our workers to minimize the risk to your family and we will continue to work hard to minimize the risk to all.

Ralph Graham- with 115 buildings eliminated from thermal demolition and 6 remaining, if you don't get the permit to burn the remaining 6, what will happen?

Mark Patterson – If USATCES, the Army's Explosives experts and one level above them Department of Defense Explosive Safety Board (DDESB) say there is another way to do it safely, they will sit there for now.

Barbara Gaskin (Ravenna Resident) - Asked Mark Patterson what about grounding rods in these buildings?

Mark Patterson- explained that all the buildings have grounding rod systems to protect them from electrical storms, electrical current. As you know, electricity and explosives do not mix well. We are concerned about raw bulk explosives laying in pipes, cracks and crevices, but today the grounding rod system is still in place.

Barbara Gaskin (Ravenna Resident) - Do you happen to know the name of the system

Mark Patterson – No, but we have “as built” drawings you could look at to show where the grounding rod system is located.

Unidentified Paris Township Resident- Did you say Mr. Patterson that Load Line 12 is gone?

Mark Patterson- Taken down in the 1970's. Load line 12 is gone because it was an ammonia nitrate production facility. Ammonium Nitrate is an additive to TNT and the load line was deteriorating.

Bob (Windham Resident) - We are pressuring you to ensure the safety of local residents and the work force, and the process is getting safer why?

Mark Patterson- USATCES and the DOD look at the safety of the workers, the OEPA / USEPA and Akron Air protected the public citizens. The safety requirements and regulations are set by authorities above us.

Deerfield Resident- Explained that he had worked at the arsenal for years and never saw any debris washed down in Load Lines 1, 2 or 3. He also said that, as an employee you followed the rules or you didn't have a job. I believe you would have a hard time finding any explosives remaining in those buildings.

Mark Patterson- They have standards they abide by. However, even after working 46 years and following all the procedures at another installation, an explosive incident occurred that resulted in an employee having both arms amputated. In the final clean up in Load line 1 and 2 we found almost 25 pounds of explosives. There are still residual explosives in those buildings even though the standards were held very high by the workers.

Eileen Mohr- Part of the restoration is remedial investigation of the soil, ground water, sediment, surface water, and we went through several investigations on those four main load lines. There are contaminants, and the feasibility study will determine the best way to clean them up.

LTC Tom Tadsen- Load line 1 soil hot spots are up to 39% explosive content. During the production in the 1940's, there were a number of locations where nitrocellulose and propellants were found on and in the soil hot spots, caused by the wash out process.

Carol Novak (Windham Resident) – Are you just not talking about explosives and PCB contamination? Where did the idea of burning come from?

Mark Patterson- Thermal demolition has been used by the Army for a very long time and it does make sense. Burning at a high temperature reduces contamination and desensitizes the explosives.

Carol Novak (Windham Resident) – So you say the other 6 buildings still too dangerous and there are no other means to dispose of them according to the OEPA, Akron Air and the Army?

Mark Patterson confirmed the statement.

At this time LTC Tom Tadsen asked the board if they would like to carry on with questions from the audience or move on to the second presentation.

Charlie Ramer- agreed that we need to return to the agenda and continue with the second presentation.

LTC Tadsen agreed to return to the agenda and begin the second presentation, but assured the general public present that all presenters would remain after the meeting to address any additional questions they might have.

4. Performance Based Contract (PBC) for the Environmental Investigation and Remediation at six RVAAP Areas of Concern (AOCs), Laura Obloy, Scientific Applications International Corporation (SAIC).

LTC Tom Tadsen introduced Laura Obloy of SAIC, who made her presentation. After her presentation, questions were fielded by various RAB Members.

Charlie Ramer- Do you have a large data base to hold all of this additional soil testing data?

Charlie Ramer- When was most of the testing done?

Laura – in the past 5 to 6 years

Kerry Macomber- Inquired about Ground water testing

Laura Obloy- Reported that ground water testing was completed in 1996-1998.

Jay Abercrombie- Any other AOC's than Erie have wetlands?

Laura Obloy- Yes, Ramsdell Quarry.

LTC Tadsen- answered that approximately 60% of the installation are wetlands and they contain a large number of beaver.

Mark Patterson – Explained that prior to development, wetlands will be jurisdictionally delineated. The Ohio Department of Natural Resources produced a planning-level wetland delineation. Pocket wetlands exist in some of the load lines.

Unidentified Attendance Member- What does RI stand for?

Laura Obloy- RI stands for Remedial Investigation

Laura Duncan (Middlefield Resident) – Has anything migrated off site?

Mark Patterson- Many monitoring wells exist on the installation - at last count 200 and more to go in.

Laura Duncan (Middlefield Resident) – asked if they are off site?

Mark Patterson- Not offsite, but around the perimeter; we have worked with OEPA for 10 years and USEPA for 11 years.

Laura Duncan (Middlefield Resident) – PCB's, TCE and PCE never migrated off site but the Amish residents in Middlefield had terrible things in their water. In my opinion, the OEPA does nothing for residents and it has almost been 12 years and we are not backing down. We are not happy with OEPA or USEPA. Members are sick in our community. Our phone number is 440-630-1020 if you want to ask us any questions.

Carol Novak (Windham Resident) - What is a low level of PCB's?

Laura Obloy- I am not positive, could I get back to you with that answer?

Unidentified Audience Member- What does CERCLA stand for?

Laura Obloy answered: CERCLA stands for Comprehensive Environmental Restoration Compensation and Liability Act.

Eileen Mohr- Many civilian ground water wells were installed outside of RVAAP. We sampled 25 or 26 ground water wells in the late 1990's. Well logs were pulled. We picked them based on proximity of the wells and construction details. When we sample

we ask permission to sample the well from the resident. There were no explosives present in any of the wells sampled; however it is not unusual to find a trace of metals.

Laura Duncan (Middlefield Resident) - Why no split samples?

Eileen Mohr- We had a specific set amount of funds for the ground water sampling.

Laura Duncan (Middlefield Resident) – USEPA will help us with funding when OEPA will not help. When will you be conducting more residential well testing?

Eileen Mohr- There has not been any more sampling scheduled at this time.

Laura Duncan (Middlefield Resident) – Maybe USEPA can help you fund this.

Barbara Gaskin (Ravenna Resident) - Erie Burning Ground, what is the site's contamination background.

Laura Obloy- Semi volatile organic compounds that include petroleum products (gas, ether) like those found in tar.

Barbara Gaskin (Ravenna Resident) - If there are explosives / metals, have the beaver been tested?

Mark Patterson – The installation has spent millions to evaluate streams, ponds, plants, wildlife and how humans will be affected. There is no effect on the wildlife. \$34 million dollars has been spent on the clean up programs, and the data is reliable and good.

Barbara Gaskin (Ravenna Resident) – Is this sampling kept current?

Mark Patterson- Started 8 or 9 years ago and will continue in the next 3 to 4 years. The Ohio Department of Natural Resources conducted tissue samples on fish and the results were negative.

Bill Krimmer (Paris Township) - He explained that he has been approached by community members about AOCs. I am talking with past arsenal employees to gain knowledge of the underground storage and possible contaminates. I think we should investigate this information and maybe you would like the chance to speak with them.

Mark Patterson- We also agree that their knowledge is key. We have conducted extensive archival investigating and lengthy personal interviews, and I would like to meet with the past employees you are speaking of to gain whatever information that they have.

Julie Smeiles (The Villager) - are some of the additional samples at the AOC's core samples?

Laura Obloy- Discrete sampling is less reliable, multi-incremental is more reliable.

Julie Smeiles (The Villager) - How do you pick a hot spot?

Laura Obloy- We designated a general area.

Julie Smeiles (The Villager) - How do you plan on having a public comment period?

Laura Obloy- We will work with Mark Patterson to utilize the local media, public mailing lists and notifications to the RAB members.

Eileen Mohr- Informed everyone that there is a lead time of 30 days for the public comment period.

Bill Krimmer (Newton Falls Resident) - Your company has been awarded a contract that is called a performance based contract (PBC) is that correct?

Laura Obloy- confirmed that yes it is called a Performance Based Contract (PBC).

John Smut (Franklin Township) - What does SAIC stand for?

Laura Obloy- Science Application International Corporation.

Pat Craiglow- When was a Human Health Risk Assessment done?

Laura Obloy was not able to answer that question; LTC Tom Tadsen suggested we revisit the question after the PBC Presentation questions.

Tribune Chronicle Representative - How much soil are you planning on removing?

Laura Obloy- Based on the site conditions that process will happen after the Remedial Investigation Reports.

Carol Novak (Windham Resident) - Are you aware of any buildings burned in the area you will be removing soil from for testing?

Laura Obloy- No, there are no buildings.

No other questions were fielded from the audience, however LTC Tom Tadsen returned to the unanswered question:

Pat Craiglow- What type and when did you people complete a Human Health Risk Assessment since you have already burned?

LTC Tom Tadsen- Explained his position as an elected member of the community at large on the Board. He further explained that Mark Patterson is the Army Representative on the Board; Eileen Mohr is the Ohio EPA Representative on the Board, that many other

members of the Board are County Commissioners, Township Trustees or their appointees, or members of the community at large. He directed this question to Mark Patterson.

Mark Patterson- Load line 6 & 9 were burned in 2003, we worked with all appropriate agencies to comply with the required process, laws and regulations.

Rick Callahan- That is the proposal USEPA is reviewing currently.

Pat Craiglow- USEPA is only looking at the 2004 study; I recommend they look at the health risk involved.

Eileen Mohr- That is covered in the comment letter to USEPA, to look at the dunnage and look at other potential sources.

Bill Krimmer- During a burn you will have lots of constituents not just a particular compound. PCB's, explosives, metals etc. are you going to include this in on the total impact on a human? Did the Risk Assessment consider these factors?

Eileen Mohr, Yes- during a risk assessment you look at cumulative risk, possibility of an engineered burn from a child and adult receptor.

Bill Krimmer- You say you are not putting the public in harm's way. What about the anti static lead floors in the previous burn. How many pounds of lead went up into our air?

Rick Callahan- MKM provided all the information to Akron Air and we met the requirements to be issued the burn permit. We provided the amount of lead to them. A bench scale test was completed and we provided the results (which were below the reportable levels) to Akron Air.

Bill Krimmer- How many pounds?

Rick Callahan- explained that he would have to find the calculations and get back to Mr. Krimmer with the correct number but he reported approximately 2 ½ tons of lead.

Bill Krimmer- What kind of authority did you have to burn those buildings that indicated 2 ½ tons of lead burning during that burn would not be harmful to us?

Rick Callahan- We followed all the specifications of Akron Air and USEPA.

LTC Tom Tadsen- announced that if any RAB Members had prior engagements they need to leave the meeting for that they are excused at this time.

Kerry Macomber- Explained that she is hearing very specific concerns tonight, and requested a list be compiled of Ravenna contracts, contractors, awarded SOW to provide a idea of who did what, why and when?

Mark Patterson – The best source would be the repository contains all the contracts that will provide that information and that is located in Ravenna and Newton Falls. You can also go to the website www.rvaap.org to locate those documents or you can visit the installation with an appointment.

Kerry Macomber also requested a list of past RAB minutes that covered the burn issues with sign in sheets calculating the number of attendees.

Mark Patterson explained that we have 9 years of information. The RAB minutes are also located on the website and in the repository for interested community members.

LTC Tom Tadsen brought up the point that possibly a list could be provided by our TAPP provider.

LTC Tom Tadsen- Different types of contaminants have different effects and some toxins that bioaccumulate.

Laura Duncan (Middlefield Resident) - asked had a certified epidemiologist been in to look at the factors, soil structure etc? Has an epidemiologists (study of disease origin and spread) from the USEPA or OEPA, or anyone with those qualifications been on the site?

Mark Patterson was unsure of the qualifications that Laura Duncan was referring to but he explained that the Ohio Department of Human Health and physicians had been to past RAB meetings. (Dr. Rupp is one in specific). Dr. Rupp visited the installation relative to the cancer study in this community.

Ron Duncan (Middlefield Resident) - who is doing the Human Risk Assessment?

Mark Patterson explained that Risk Assessors from a variety of companies from SAIC to internal organizations from the Army.

Ron Duncan (Middlefield Resident) - was inquiring about the amount of money that had been spent on the Human Risk Assessment v/s Wildlife Risk Assessment.

Mark Patterson answered that by saying that they have spent more money on the Human Risk Assessment but he was unsure of the exact amount.

Ron Duncan (Middlefield Resident) - Requested that Mark Patterson contact him in the future with those amounts.

Mark Patterson- Agreed to contact Ron Duncan with an approximate percentage of the amount.

Ron Duncan (Middlefield Resident) – Also inquired about Mark Patterson contacting him in regards to what certified OEPA and USEPA epidemiologists have visited the installation.

Mark Patterson asked Eileen Mohr if she had an idea of how many qualified epidemiologists have visited the installation.

Eileen Mohr- is not positive how many from OEPA but will report the information to Mark Patterson, however she can not report how many from USEPA.

Bill Krimmer- An Epidemiologist – is someone who studies medical background in regards to disease origin and spread.

Eileen Mohr and Mark Patterson- confirmed the explanation.

Unidentified Windham Resident- Is MKM's application a public document?

Mark Patterson- answered yes and informed everyone that you can find the document on www.rvaap.org

Laura Duncan inquired about the level of PCB's.

Mark Patterson- asked if she is referring to soil levels.

Laura Duncan- Yes, if it is 50ppm, TOSCA should be called in.

Bill Krimmer had a idea regarding a previous question about how the public would be informed that comments are being gathered in reference to the SAIC PBC 05 contract. Bill suggested we post that on the Paris Township web site.

Mark asked me the approximate number of members on our mailing list, and that number is approximately 212 not including 27 media and 24 RAB members.

LTC Tom Tadsen reminded everyone to please sign the public sign in sheet located at the entry door if they have not already signed in, to ensure that they receive notification of future meetings and other RAB activities.

The meeting adjourned at 9:20 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Christy Esler
RAB Administrator