

**PORT CLINTON CITY COUNCIL MINUTES
SPECIAL MEETING**

The special meeting of the Port Clinton City Council was held at the Port Clinton City Hall with De Anna Kuzma, President of Council, presiding. The meeting opened at 6:15 pm.

The roll was called and the following council members were present: Gabe Below, Joel Freedman, Beth Gillman, Roseann Hickman, Margaret Phillips, Lisa Sarty and Jerry Tarolli.

Ms. Phillips made a motion; seconded by Mr. Freedman to waive any and all irregularities in the calling and conduct of this meeting. With all in favor, the motion was carried

The chair noted that certification has been received regarding the compliance with the rules and notification of this meeting.

Mrs. Kuzma stated the purpose of tonight's meeting is reviewing and discussing the SME report with Ann Winegar.

Ann Winegar, SME report review

Summarized the SME report for council.

The original start of assessments was back in 2014. They installed ground water monitoring wells, soil borings and took soil gas samples. When looking at the samples they look at who could this impact and how can it impact them. The receptors they looked at originally were residential, commercial and construction workers. With the residential standards, those are the most conservative standards that the Ohio EPA has. As they were looking at it farther, they decided possibly they could develop recreational standards rather than comparing the samples to the residential standards. With the residential standards, a person needs to be there 365 days a year and 24 hours a day playing in the dirt all day long. After talking with the Ohio EPA, they helped develop some standards to use as a recreational standard. They based it on the residential receptor but instead of saying the person would be exposed 365 days a year they stated 120 days a year. In the end, the receptors that were looked at were the recreational and construction workers. The residential and commercial receptors were included in the tables within the report. They also look at exposure routes, which is how is somebody going to be exposed to this contamination. With soil, it is direct contact and with ground water, it would be through ingestion or from the vapor.

After reviewing the samples there was one area (area 2) that the concentration in the soil exceeded the recreational standard. In addition, area W211C did not exceed the recreational standard but its level of contributes significantly to the human health risk. In area 5 (SB206A), the concentration also contributes to the human health risk. At area 1, there is TPH and there is no health based standard for TPH. If you want to get a covenant not to sue from the state you would have to remove the soil from areas 1, 2 and 5 before pursuing. With ground water, it does not need to be remediated. They do suggest an Environmental Restrictive Covenant be placed on the property that would be attached to the deed that restricts the use of ground water.

Questions from Council

Mr. Freedman – Are the recreational standards that you came up with now in place with the EPA or are they just for this report? Ann Winegar – The Ohio EPA stated to take the residential standards and change the duration. They do not have published recreational standards.

Mr. Freedman – What the standards are for the construction worker? Ann Winegar – It is extremely higher than residential and commercial. The overall construction worker risk was .1 before doing any remediation.

Mr. Tarolli – Are the test wells still located at the site and are they going to continue to monitored? Ann Winegar – At this point there are still wells located out there and it would be up to the city to go farther. If the city wants to pursue a covenant not to sue, that they would need to have wells out there.

Mr. Tarolli – What will be done with the material that is removed? Ann Winegar – The company that the city contracts with will haul it to a hazardous waste place in Bowling Green.

Ms. Phillips – Just want to clarify that the areas that need to be remediated are areas 1, 2 and 5. Ann Winegar – As long as the property is going to be used for recreational use those are the only areas that need to be remediated.

Ms. Phillips – How far down can you disturb before it is questionable? Ann Winegar – The study is based off 2 feet.

Mr. Freedman – Will we need to be re-tested after the remediation? Ann Winegar – Not immediately after remediation. The only sampling that would need to be done is a composite sample of each area to send to the lab to make sure there is not any hazardous material in it.

Mr. Below – In the letter dated December 1st, 2016, the size and scope of the area that needs remediated are listed. In November when the report was released were those quantities listed? Ann Winegar – No those quantities listed.

Mr. Below – Are there any services or products that the City has paid for that they have not received? Ann Winegar – At this time no there is not.

Mr. Below – Does the quote for the remediation include seeding and mulching? Mr. Tarolli – On the quote it does specify that those are included.

Mr. Below – As far as timing, the December 1st letter the EPA needs 30 day notification. How does that work? Ann Winegar – If you submit the letter and if EPA doesn't contact you in 30 days you are ok to proceed. Sometimes if you call you may get the notification sooner, which could speed up the process.

Mr. Below – We have the Walleye Festival down there. How does the timeline work with this happening? Ann Winegar – The remediation should take two full days, just depends on the weather. Once they receive the go ahead from the City, they will need 2 weeks to prep.

Mr. Below – When you were discussing the report you mentioned about the vapor. If the City decides to build a public restroom in that area, what would the City need to do? Ann Winegar - She would suggest just doing some samples of the area before pursuing.

Mr. Below – If the building for example is built is there any environmental impact to the Portage River or Lake Erie due to the ground water? Ann Winegar – No, the ground water that was pulled from the wells and the river were similar in concentration.

Mr. Below – The City is also pursuing funding to reconstruct the Portage River line along the parking lot, do you any see any potential risk? Ann Winegar – You would not be making exposure any worse by doing work there.

Mrs. Gillman – If the City did get a covenant not to sue, does that only cover the two feet? Ann Winegar – Yes, that is correct.

Ann Winegar stated that the covenant not to sue only stops the State from suing the City.

Mrs. Sarty thanked Ann for coming and explaining the report.

Mrs. Sarty – At this point does it need to be roped off? Ann Winegar – At this point, the standards are so conservative that it is not needed.

Mr. Below – If the City decided to do an amphitheater, what would the City need to do if it went past the two feet? Ann Winegar – That would be covered under the construction worker standards.

Mrs. Sarty – What is the name of the company that SME would contract with? Ann Winegar – The company is Envirisor.

Mr. Below asked the Mayor and the Safety Service director what are the next steps? Is anything needed from Council? Mayor Wheeler stated as soon as the budget is passed the contract will be signed.

Mrs. Hickman – Is it normal procedure for company that you contract with to do the remediation? Ann Winegar – Normally yes they are awarded the contract to complete the remediation.

Mr. Below – If we were to pursue another quote from a different company, how would we go about that? Ann Winegar – The correct information is in the report and an expert could pull the information from the report.

With no further business to discuss Ms. Phillips made a motion to adjourn; seconded by Ms. Phillips. With all those in favor, the meeting was adjourned at 7:11 p.m.