

Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant
Restoration Advisory Board (RAB)
Meeting Minutes
May 20, 1998

1. Call to Order & Reading of Minutes

The meeting was called to order by Army Co-Chair Mark Patterson at the Shearer Community Center, Paris, Ohio, 6:05 p.m. Secretary Becky Carter took attendance with 16 present, 1 excused and 6 absent (absent were Nina Miller, Keith Misner, Bruce Nelson, Christopher Smeiles, Tom Lawson), then the minutes were presented, Tom Smith moved to approve them as corrected, Walter Landor seconded, voice vote taken which passed.

2. Membership:

Dr. Alan Coogan gave his recommendations for new RAB members from the resumes of interest. He put them in order of preference. We have 3 members to replace at this time plus Nancy Ambers-Massar will be moving out of town in about 2 months. Dr Coogan made the motion to take the first 3 names to fill the vacancies. Caryl Griswold seconded. Discussion by Rachel Craig who commented Alice Green is now a member of the board so there are 5 eligible candidates not 6. Tom Tadsen stated the names would be taken in order as on the recommendation letter from the committee. This motion carried favorably by voice vote. A letter of election will be sent to each of the new members, which will include: R Walton, M Long, C Willis and K Cooper which Mark Patterson will notify.

3. Presentation

Community Co-Chair introduced the speaker for the evening, Dr. Thomas F. Jenkins, Army Corps of Engineers' Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory who had slides and a very informative talk on colorimetric field tests for explosives. Questions were fielded from the floor. Bob Whelove explained the savings which will be seen by these types of tests and the accurate results which are found. Dr. Coogan asked if there was to be some water well drilling in the Winklepeck area. He was informed that there were 14 underground wells and 5 were installed in the Winkelpeck area. Dr. Coogan wondered what the impact of this drilling had on the soil samples. He was informed the background is a natural condition and field screening on surface soil would be verifying this natural condition. The 200 to 300 soil samples were explained as were some that were up to 6 feet deep. Winklepeck was discussed in regard to the contamination 2 to 4 feet deep. The wells located in the area are being done this week. They hope there is no contamination in the wells. Rachel Craig questioned not finding TNT and how do they explain that it has not been transported this far? She was answered that the load lines are the areas of concern as to the various washing/cleaning operations done at these sites. They washed the spills out the doors and hopefully it did not get any further than those areas. Further discussion was held on this washing process and the test results including the various soils at these sights and their permeability. Nancy Ambers-Massar questioned if composite samples would be better. It was explained that the on-sight findings in the wheel-shape testing had just as accurate results with less expenditures. It depends on what you want to know in the end as to the various types of tests performed. Bob Whelove gave his thoughts on the burning ground and how to interpret the findings. Sampling was done at the South area and it was clean. They found out the

center of the pad was the most contaminated and explained the entire burning ground. They do now have good data and hope to present it next February. Dr. Coogan offered them an alternative to disc the area and homogenize it all so the contaminants would not be as concentrated. The EPA (Eileen Mohr) threw up a red flag on this suggestion. With the localized pockets of contamination, it will be much cheaper to analyze as it is. Tom Tadsen asked about the denuded area and the differential soils on the Northwest corner where there is no clay, will the vegetation re-grow or still be denuded. They think the soil survey may show the amount of clay in the soil. After 4 feet deep it usually is clay. Rachel Craig asked about the differing results in a small circle testing area, could something have been missed? Bob Whelove explained the different testing methods with regard to the contaminations present in the area and there was no TNT in this one area mentioned. Historical information shows no TNT was used versus knowing it was there. The tests are approved by the EPA Solid Waste Branch. Rachel Craig then asked if the costs could be discussed. The different tests were discussed comparing it with the color analysis. Costs are about 1/3 less by doing field testing and you get much better data. This is done with 1 in 10 samples going in to the lab. Tom Tadsen commented on the false negative testing results and finding a method acceptable with the EPA. Mr. Jenkins will get a hard copy of the presentation for the RAB members to study. Tom Tadsen thanks the speakers for their presentations.

4. Community Co-Chair Tadsen introduced Ross Mantione who explained the TAPP application process which we are in the process of filing at this time. The 6-step process was explained. Tom Tadsen asked if the President could remove the funds at a future date. It was explained that the contract is begun with an appropriation of money and it is obligated at that time and would not be lost or re-appropriated as long as the project was still in the process of being completed. Bob Whelove asked if the 4 years had to be run concurrently and Ross stated, no. The time frame of the funding was also explained. Community Co-Chair Tadsen thanked him for his time and information.

Army Co-Chair Patterson stated the RAB TAPP Committee met and filled out the application and so far no other RABS have applied for funding and it is on a first come-first served process. The content was the committee's input. The RAB will have to vote upon this application. Rachel Craig will answer questions after the RAB members read the application. Richard Kern asked if we had to specify the amount of money desired. Mark Patterson stated no will be submitted to contracting and they will estimate the cost. William Roberts asked if it could be rejected at any time by the RAB. Mark Patterson stated if they are not satisfied there is an appeal process for the RAB to follow. Bob Whelove stated the process for the scope of work by labor rates, profit, etc., and there is negotiation in the process but rejection is not done at that time. A cost estimate study is used. Dr. Coogan addressed the merits of the program as it is an important proposal, some of the information is confusing and the most important item is what this means to the RAB in the long run. The risk assessment is going to say in the end that this land can be used without problems to the health and environment, will people be able to live, farm there or is it just the RVAAP complex as it is today. Risk assessment is difficult and an important proposal which would support submitting this. Co-chair Tadsen

entertained a motion. Dr. Coogan so moved that we submit this application, Nancy Ambers-Massar seconded, the motion carried with Mark Patterson and Eileen Mohr abstaining as they felt they were too close to the project and might influence voting. Bob Whelove commented on the proposal as being very good. He then addressed the funds remaining this year. He also explained that Mark Patterson had asked for funding for a newsletter for RAB which is a good outreach, money for travel and for supplies for mailing and support for RAB out of their office. The question was asked of the RAB if they wanted to spend some of the money and on what projects. Tom Tadsen stated some projects were cut short last year. Bob Whelove stated last year was the first year in operation and we are better covered this year. Mark Patterson stated he hopes some of the remainder of his requested funds could be used for the secretarial duties performed by Becky Carter and there are part-time persons for hire in 4-hour stints at reasonable costs per hour. So many people put their own time in for mailings, etc and it really is not fair to a RAB member to have to take minutes and not be able to participate as much as perhaps they would otherwise. Mark Patterson made the motion to use some of his funds for minutes, mailings and other secretarial duties, Alice Green seconded and the vote was favorable.

5. Agenda and Scheduling next meeting

Community Co-Chair Tadsen asked for agenda items for future meetings including new and additional sites to be analyzed. We do now have 51 sites (13 additional ones). Aerial photographs really show things you cannot see on the ground. Mark Patterson stated the new AOCs are relatively small, like a transite dump. Some of the descriptions for existing AOCs will be changed to clarify the contamination boundary. This was further discussed in regard to the aerial photos, etc. The 1952 aerials will be here within the month. It was recommended by members that the next meeting be August 19 and Caryl Griswold stated Windham Town Hall was available. There will be a mailing for a positive meeting date.

Walter Landor moved to adjourn at 8:15 p.m. and Alice Green seconded, so moved.

Respectfully submitted,

Rebecca L. Carter, Secretary
bj