



MEMORANDUM

To: Stansley/ Collins (file)
From: Janine Maney (Reviewer); Ohio EPA Legal Office.
Date: 12/20/2016

These files were reviewed to determine whether records contained herein are confidential or otherwise exempt from the disclosure obligations of Ohio Revised Code (ORC) 149.43.

All files are public.

No records were removed based on this review.

The remaining files are public, but some were redacted or removed.

Records were removed or redacted for the reasons given below:

- Attorney- Client Privilege**, State ex rel. Leslie v. Ohio Hous. Fin. Agency, 105 Ohio St.3d 261, 265 (2005).
- Attorney Work Product**, Squire, Sanders & Dempsey, L.L.P. v. Givaudan Flavors Corp., 127 Ohio St.3d 161 (2010).
- Confidential Law Enforcement Investigatory Records**, ORC 149.43(A)(1)(h).
- Social Security Numbers**, State ex rel. Office of Montgomery County Pub. Defender v. Siroki, 108 Ohio St.3d 207 (2006).
- Release Otherwise Prohibited by Law**, (i.e. trade secret, infrastructure and security records, etc.), ORC 149.43(A)(1)(v).
- Other Specified Reason:**

All files are confidential.

Should you have any questions regarding this issue, please contact Ohio EPA's Office of Legal Services.

(This memorandum is to remain visibly attached to this file.)

Pasqualette, John

From: Pasqualette, John
Sent: Wednesday, September 03, 2014 1:54 PM
To: Nabors, Shannon; Reiser, Michael; Scoles, Jeremy
Subject: RE: Toledo WTP Pics

She is in DMWM CO. She works for Schierberl. She is involved with all of this centralized beneficial use stuff that transitioned from DSW to DSIWM when George and Pam signed that September memo (2011??).

John

From: Nabors, Shannon
Sent: Wednesday, September 3, 2014 1:23 PM
To: Reiser, Michael; Pasqualette, John; Scoles, Jeremy
Subject: FW: Toledo WTP Pics
Who is Deb Hoffman?

From: Gierhart, Ryan
Sent: Wednesday, September 03, 2014 1:18 PM
To: Nabors, Shannon
Cc: Poffenbarger, Thomas; Wick, Elizabeth
Subject: RE: Toledo WTP Pics

No, they do not have a LAMP for this. I do not believe we would grant one because it is not for beneficial use and would be considered disposal. It is my understanding Stansley is working with CO DMWM (Deb Hoffman) on obtaining approval for beneficial use of the lime sludge for recyclable construction aggregates.

From: Nabors, Shannon
Sent: Wednesday, September 03, 2014 12:43 PM
To: Gierhart, Ryan
Cc: Poffenbarger, Thomas; Wick, Elizabeth
Subject: RE: Toledo WTP Pics

Do you know if the Stansley's have a sludge land application approval from DSW for the filling of the borrow pit mentioned in the dsw weekly briefing?

From: Wick, Elizabeth
Sent: Wednesday, September 03, 2014 9:51 AM
To: Nabors, Shannon; Hall, Brian; Gebhardt, Karl; Kavalec, Tiffani
Subject: FW: Toledo WTP Pics
Photos and notes from our Toledo Water plant inspection.
Elizabeth

From: Gierhart, Ryan
Sent: Tuesday, September 02, 2014 10:51 AM
To: Poffenbarger, Thomas
Cc: Wick, Elizabeth
Subject: Toledo WTP Pics
Ryan Gierhart, P.E., R.S.
Ohio EPA, DSW
(419) 373-3053
Ryan.gierhart@epa.ohio.gov

Pasqualette, John

From: Pasqualette, John
Sent: Wednesday, September 03, 2014 1:55 PM
To: Nabors, Shannon; Reiser, Michael; Scoles, Jeremy
Subject: RE: solid waste insoection needed.

Sounds like we are going to need to speak to CO and see what our centralized ben use program staff are doing.

From: Nabors, Shannon
Sent: Wednesday, September 3, 2014 12:18 PM
To: Reiser, Michael; Pasqualette, John; Scoles, Jeremy
Subject: solid waste insoection needed.

Please see below and let me know asap if you think this site needs a solid waste insopection

City of Toledo Water Treatment Plant

On August 29, 2014, DSW and DDAGW conducted an inspection at the Toledo Water Treatment Plant. The purpose the inspection was to evaluate compliance with the City's NPDES permit and to observe conditions in the sand filter backwash lagoon and spent lime storage lagoons. The facility is currently in significant non-compliance for total suspended solids effluent violations in April and June 2014 at the backwash lagoon. They indicated that westerly winds caused solids to carry over the effluent weir in the backwash lagoon. During the inspection the discharge from the lagoon appeared clear, but a heavy amount of solids were observed at the influent end. They are investigating the possibility of hydro dredging this lagoon. An inspection of the lime storage lagoons, showed that all 5 of the lagoons are at or near capacity. South lagoon A was in the process of being cleaned out with a proposed completion date of May 2015. The sludge is being removed by Stansley Industries and hauled to their clean hard fill site at 740 Glenwood Road, Rossford Ohio.

With the issues the plant has been having with the raw water intake, they have greatly increased the amount of chemicals added (activated carbon, alum, lime and soda ash). The increased amount of alum they are adding prevents the City from pressing the sludge in their plate press. All of the increased solids are being sent to their lime sludge storage lagoons which do not appear to have a lot of additional storage. We recommend sending the city a letter requesting that they immediately pursue permit approvals for emptying the storage lagoons.

Pasquarette, John

From: Pasquarette, John
Sent: Monday, September 08, 2014 8:59 AM
To: Hoffman, Deborah
Cc: Hester, Scott
Subject: RE: City of Toledo Water Treatment Plant sludge management

I think you should wait until after this afternoon's meeting.

Yes the inspection from Friday by DMWM and the previous Friday by DSW was of the 750 Glenwood Rd property. It is a former clean hard fill site. Clean hard fill was used to fill a borrow pond. There is no access to "native soil" on the property and no native soil has been delivered to the property. The sludge is simply being dozed into place.

I do not believe that it is possible for the City to segregate lime treatment residuals from the other water treatment plant residuals that are generated. The lime, alum, and caustic soda ash are all part of the treatment that results in the sludge. Though more alum has been used in the past, the City has used mixtures of flocculants that include alum for years. When I did a detailed review of NW Ohio treatment plants (2008??) the feed rates for Toledo were 65,000 lbs/day Lime, 9897 lbs/day Alum, and 6957 lbs/day soda ash.

John

From: Hoffman, Deborah
Sent: Monday, September 8, 2014 7:54 AM
To: Pasquarette, John
Cc: Hester, Scott
Subject: RE: City of Toledo Water Treatment Plant sludge management
Hi John,

I thought I'd reply just to you and Hester....

If the site where they're placing the sludge is 750 Glenwood Rd, then they told me about that site. They own a total of 4 sites where they intend to land apply the sludge and that's one of them. If they are already operating, then they're ahead of the permit. Scott Stansley has called me a few times to see how the approval was coming. I have spoken a few times with Naajy in DSW about this permit as he was the one that reached out to CO DMWM (and the one that approved them using spent lime for agricultural land application, I believe). I mentioned the Glenwood Rd property to him and he knew of it and seemed ok with the material going there. Additionally, 3 of the 4 sites have an NPDES permit.

The Stansley request is for JUST spent lime. I know from Libby Dayton's work that Toledo is included in the alum sludge survey, so I wondered about that myself. I was originally scheduled to come with DSW NWDO on the 29th to tour the facility, but I was told not to come as there were too many EPA people already. I was going to ask about the alum sludge. I assume they're landfilling that separately and my understanding is that they've only recently been using that due to the toxin issue. However, if someone in NWDO knows they are mixing more than spent lime in, then we need to find out about that. When I spoke to Mike last week, he and I agreed a tour of the Stansley properties would be a good idea. I was going to call today to arrange it.

If you think I should wait until after this afternoon's meeting, then I will do that.

Thanks,
Deb

From: Pasquarette, John
Sent: Friday, September 05, 2014 2:17 PM
To: Hester, Scott; Allen, Pamela; Schierberl, John; Harris, Daniel; Sarvis, Harry; Hoffman, Deborah

Cc: Reiser, Michael; Hardy, Susan; Wick, Elizabeth; Gierhart, Ryan; Poffenbarger, Thomas; Nabors, Shannon; Carroll, Jeremy

Subject: RE: City of Toledo Water Treatment Plant sludge management

Scott,

A couple reactions to your e-mail.

- You refer to the material from Stanley's request as "spent lime", I just wanted to ensure that you recognized that the material is spent water treatment plant sludge but not exclusively lime sludge. The City also uses Alum and Soda Ash.

- The disposal is not happening at SWIP. The site we know of is a former clean hard fill site. Clean hard fill was used to reclaim a borrow pond along I75 NW of the Buck Road exit in northern Wood County. The water treatment plant sludge is now being placed and spread atop the reclaimed pond. The attached e-mail from Sue includes some photos from earlier today.

John

(I removed the Deb Hoffman from taxation and added our Deb Hoffman to this reply)

From: Hester, Scott

Sent: Friday, September 5, 2014 1:59 PM

To: Pasquarette, John; Allen, Pamela; Schierberl, John; Hoffman, Deborah; Harris, Daniel; Sarvis, Harry

Cc: Reiser, Michael; Hardy, Susan; Wick, Elizabeth; Gierhart, Ryan; Poffenbarger, Thomas; Nabors, Shannon; Carroll, Jeremy

Subject: RE: City of Toledo Water Treatment Plant sludge management

John, Pam, et.al.

I am currently reviewing the LAMP permit package for Stansley Industries to use lime residuals from Collins Park water treatment plant. The proposal is to mix "35% spent lime with 65% native soils." The request says that the blended soil's "primary purpose will be to increase elevation to an area to promote surface water drainage. It will typically be placed in an area that requires the elimination of standing water. The product will not be used as a structural or load bearing material. Once placed, it will be graded, prepared, and seeded to promote vegetative growth."

As I understand it in speaking with Deb, this would not be a "one site" approval, but available for use in these conditions statewide. The request states that the annual amount produced by the generator is 52,800 tons and the amount proposed for beneficial use is the same. As I understand it from reviewing the briefing memo and talking to Deb (and in looking at the LAMP permit application), the spent lime is the same material that Stansley has used since 2007 as a soil amendment and in the agricultural industry as a liming agent. (I believe they have been doing this under 6111 approval from DSW in the past). But, since this is a different use than as an ag liming agent under their existing DSW authorization, its review and recommendation was passed to us in CO from NWDO DSW.

The request doesn't mention anything about any waste other than the spent lime residuals. It is also interesting that Stansley is the contracted operator at SWIP. Is the "storage" you mentioned (depositing and spreading with the dozer happening at SWIP or somewhere else?

Hope this is helpful. You can contact me if I can provide anything more. Deb is not here today, but I was anticipating giving her some final edits to the authorization and getting it into sign-off when she returns on Monday. Please let me know if you think we should not move this forward to the Director. Thanks. Scott

From: Pasquarette, John

Sent: Friday, September 05, 2014 1:24 PM

To: Allen, Pamela; Schierberl, John; Hoffman, Deborah; Hester, Scott; Harris, Daniel; Sarvis, Harry

Cc: Reiser, Michael; Hardy, Susan; Wick, Elizabeth; Gierhart, Ryan; Poffenbarger, Thomas; Nabors, Shannon

Subject: City of Toledo Water Treatment Plant sludge management

Pam,

Sorry for not having time to brief you prior to getting pulled into today's 12:00 call scheduled by the Director. Here's the background.

DDAGW-DW and DSW did a joint inspection of the City of Toledo Water Treatment Plant sludge lagoons last Friday. As a result of that inspection Shannon asked us some questions this week about the solid waste program's role and involvement with the City's Water Treatment Plant Sludge Management. We had no idea of any involvement from our program but Deb Hoffman's name was referenced by DSW counterparts. Mike Reiser spoke to Deb late Thursday.

It is our understanding that Stanley Mineral Resource Management Group (the current SWIP contracted operator) is also contracted with the City of Toledo to manage water treatment plant sludge. Deb indicated to Mike that she has been working with Stanley through some type of ben use authorization, but that nothing has been issued to date.

Sue inspected property where Stansley is operating a water treatment plant sludge landfill this morning. Though she was only on site for 15 minutes or so, she observed a total of 8 separate trucks coming in and/or out of the site. The site was attended by a gate attendant that was logging each load and a dozer operator. On site personnel were not comfortable answering any questions and called their consultant (Chip Tokar...the same consultant that has been historically involved with SWIP). Sue had a short discussion with Chip and simply explained that she was on-site to observe. Chip used the term "storing" in reference to the activity on site.

Sue observed a vac truck on-site too, but no one would explain if it was there to make a deposit or a withdrawal. DSW reps reported that vac trucks from Miller Pipeline were seen making deposits on Friday. Short term questions we need to address:

- 1) Has DMWM authorized any City of Toledo water treatment plant sludge management under ORC 6111 that would approve this type of disposal?
- 2) Are we comfortable calling the placement of this material on the ground at this rate spread by a dozer to be "storage" of a solid waste?
- 3) If we have not authorized this disposal, and the exemption under OAC Rule 3745-27-03(A)(8)(b) is not applicable, what do we want to do? Without the exemption under 27-03 being applicable, the water treatment plant sludge is a solid waste and it's open dumping could be cited/pursued.

John

Pasqualette, John

From: Pasqualette, John
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2014 4:36 PM
To: Nabors, Shannon
Cc: Getz, Eric
Subject: file review for Stanley site

FYI – we have a file review request from URS for :

Stansley Mineral Resources Disposal Facility at 750 Glenwood Road in Rossford (WOOD COUNTY) from 1/1/1972 – 10/30/2014

Pasqualette, John

From: Pasqualette, John
Sent: Friday, March 13, 2015 1:13 PM
To: Poffenbarger, Tom; Wick, Elizabeth
Subject: FW: Questions for Stansley

As discussed, e-mail I sent to Scott Hester earlier today:

From: Pasqualette, John
Sent: Friday, March 13, 2015 9:26 AM
To: Hester, Scott; Hauser, Deborah
Cc: Schierberl, John; Allen, Pamela; Finfrock, Teri; Gbur, Sharon; Nabors, Shannon; Getz, Eric; Reiser, Mike (Mike.Reiser@epa.state.oh.us)
Subject: FW: Questions for Stansley

Scott and Deb,

Pam is asking for DMWM NWDO to be involved in compliance assessments of Stansley and the complaint received regarding placement of Toledo WTP sludge in a quarry in Ottawa County. I looked for a response to this 10-6-14 e-mail but did not see one. Could you bring us up to speed and explain how each of these questions were addressed as the LAMP application was reviewed. We will be in a better position to help assess compliance with the LAMP that was issued 11-13-14 if we know how these concerns were addressed.

Thanks
John

From: Pasqualette, John
Sent: Monday, October 06, 2014 12:38 PM
To: 'Hoffman, Deb'; Hester, Scott
Cc: Reiser, Mike (Mike.Reiser@epa.state.oh.us)
Subject: Questions for Stansley

Scott and Deb,

As noted today during the meeting you had with DSW, here are some questions you could consider putting into an NOD to Stansley for the ben use request you have been reviewing (I haven't read the request, but based on discussions I think all of these would be relevant):

- You call the material "lime" sludge throughout your ben use request. Do you recognize that the WTP uses more than just lime to treat the water? Did TTL just use segregated "lime" sludge to perform the testing and analysis included in the plan?
- Are you planning to ever move manufactured soil off any of the 4 sites you list in the request or are these all strictly destination sites?
- You have indicated you have NPDES permits for the 4 proposed soil manufacturing locations. Based on conversations with counterparts in DSW we do not believe this to be accurate. What existing authorizations do you have regulating run-off from the 4 proposed soil manufacturing locations?
- You based your plan on testing of 35% WTP sludge and 65% "native" soil. Are you expecting to follow that approach with any of the material currently "staged" at any of the 4 proposed sites? If not, what are your plans for appropriately managing any of the WTP sludge that has already been "staged" on your properties?

- Where do you plan to get the 65% "native" soil from? What protocol will you use to ensure that material is suitable? Will you ever accept impacted/contaminated soil for this 65% fraction of you manufactured soil?
- Why are you accepting vac truck waste at the Buck Road property? What is in this waste? Are you accepting any other waste like this (anything other than clean hard fill)? Do you allow for wastes of this sort to be disposed at any of the other 4 sites you have proposed? Are you anticipating that this waste will be incorporated into your manufactured soil?

John

Pasqualette, John

From: Pasqualette, John
Sent: Friday, April 17, 2015 9:03 AM
To: Finfrock, Teri; McCoy, Bruce
Cc: Hester, Scott; Hauser, Deborah; Nabors, Shannon; Wick, Elizabeth; Poffenbarger, Tom; Hardy, Susan; Reiser, Mike (Mike.Reiser@epa.state.oh.us); Maney, Janine
Subject: Recap of yesterday's meeting with Stansley
Attachments: HPSC0564.pdf

Present for the meeting:

Deb, Scott

Shannon, me, Sue

Elizabeth Wick (DSW Manager) and Tom Poffenbarger (DSW Supervisor)

Jim Logsdon, Scott Stansley and Charles Stansley representing Stansley Minerals, and

Shawn McGee from Hull and Associates Inc.

Some of my notes:

- The company recognizes they need to grade and cap the Glenwood Road facility. They claim to have the soil for capping already staged on site. If that is not enough they expect to generate soil in Oregon that could be used for the cover.
- They are interested in the possibility of somehow utilizing dredge at the Ottawa County site. They indicated this was not a consideration when they purchased the property, but that they were approached by the Toledo Port Authority. Nothing was taken off the table, but they were informed by Shannon that the current LAMP did not authorize dredge use and we would need to have a different meeting at a different time with additional participants to continue dialogue regarding that possibility.
- They plan to sell the soil resource at the south end of the quarry (referenced route 2 road projects), but recognize they could use it on-site to make up their 65% soil fraction required by the LAMP.
- They have NO EXPECTATION for bringing NuSoil, biosolids, or any other waste water treatment materials to the Ottawa County site. Charles Stansley's use of the term NuSoil in a recent discussion with Deb was not intended to indicate any use of waste water treatment plant sludge.
- They shared a drawing they intend to have incorporated into their ODNR reclamation permit that explained where and how they plan to beneficially re-use the 65/35 mixture of soil/WTP sludge. They are excavating some soil prior to placing any 65/35 product. They are filling above grade to maximize the volume of 65/35 product that will be utilized as part of the DNR reclamation. They are proposing a maximum 20' depth for the 65/35 product.
- After the DNR reclamation requirements are met (after filling in the NE corner), they would then plan to construct a berm around the perimeter of the quarry constructed of the 65/35 product. The approximate location of this berm was depicted on the draft drawing (attached).
- They are investigating the possibility of draining the quarry. It is not clear why. DSW will be visiting the site today to discuss permitting requirements. Charles Stansley seemed to have an impression that a 10-6 material was so impermeable that the water table would not saturate the material if dewatering pumps were turned off after the material was placed in a dry quarry. We explained that was not accurate. We confirmed he understood they had no authorization at this time to put anything in the water and that the water was a "water of the state." The potential for a plastic liner was raised up by the facility??
- They believe that under their current contract they will be managing an additional 122,000 wet yards of WTP sludge. They believe the total quantity that the City needs managed is 1.3 million yards. They estimate they need to be moving 700-800 tons per day (more than most NW Ohio landfills receive daily).
- They claimed they couldn't mix soil with sludge during winter. They did not provide detail as to how they would create the 65/35 product. They referenced the "bucket and blade method". When pushed, they referenced

“something like a 1’ lift of WTP sludge and 2’ of dirt” and “we’re gonna mix the stuff up”, but the plan sheet they submitted indicated a maximum loose lift thickness of the 65/35 product to be 12”. They did not make reference to this potential construction specification when they responded to a question regarding ODNR’s material placement specifications.

- They have expectations of using a majority of the material staged at the Ottawa County property as AgLime on farm fields. They are segregating pressed WTP sludge (drier) from material which is dredged from the lagoons (wetter).
- When asked about their plans for ever filling in the quarry Mr. Stansley indicated “We would like to reclaim the quarry to revert to agricultural use”. Sue Hardy clarified, “so you ultimately want to fill the quarry”. Mr. Stansley replied “we would like to reclaim the quarry to revert to agricultural use.” The quarry was reported to be as deep as 100 feet and presumed to be 70 feet deep on average. It is approximately 40 acres.

Pasquarette, John

From: Karen Vaculik <karen@stansleyindustries.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 29, 2015 8:38 AM
To: Pasquarette, John; Nabors, Shannon; Poffenbarger, Thomas; Wick, Elizabeth; Hardy, Susan; Hester, Scott; Hauser, Deborah
Cc: Charles Stansley; Scott Stansley; jlogsdon78@aol.com; smcgee@hullinc.com
Subject: 750 Glenwood Rd. Project
Attachments: NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT.DOCX

Good Morning,

Please find letter attached in regards to the project located at 750 Glenwood Road. This letter includes the targeted start and completion dates. If you have any questions please contact Charles Stansley @ C. 419-466-4194 or Scott Stansley @ C. 419-360-9201.

Thank you,

Karen L. Vaculik
Stansley Industries, Inc.
3793 Silica Road
Sylvania, Ohio 43560
P. 419-841-6960
F. 419-843-7939
karen@stansleyindustries.com

NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

PROJECT:750 GLENWOOD ROAD

ROSSFORD , OHIO

April 28, 2015

Chip Tokar
Natural Resource Management
3793 Silica Rd.
Sylvania, Ohio
43560

Charles Stansley
3793 Silica Rd.
Sylvania, Ohio
43560

Dear Mr. Stansley

With regards to the project at 750 Glenwood Rd.

The schedule is as follows:

Start: May 11, 2015

End: June 30, 2015

Dirt moving and excavation will start May 11, 2015. With favorable weather conditions we expect the job to be complete by June 30th, 2015 .

The project entails moving, dozing and grading approximately 10,000 cu yards of soil mix.

Upon completion of the grading the soil will be covered with a seed pasture mix, fertilizer and straw mulch. Staking of erosion control devices will be done upon completion.

Chip Tokar
President
Natural Resource Management

DSW previously reviewed files from SW 2014 were visit due to IPIR. If you have any other files in 2014 that would deal with the halting fo lime sludge at Stansley in 2014.

DDAGW 2011-2014 MORS for Collins WTP

DSWM the requester would like the answers to why OEPA stopped the hauling of sludge lime..comments attached to checklist.

D.O. emails and ntoes regarding the 2014 letter Mike R. (attached). typed regarding the halting the removal of the lime sludge Stansley.



MEMORANDUM

To: Stansley/ Collins (file)

From: Janine Maney (Reviewer); Ohio EPA Legal Office.

Date: 12/20/2016

These files were reviewed to determine whether records contained herein are confidential or otherwise exempt from the disclosure obligations of Ohio Revised Code (ORC) 149.43.

All files are public.

No records were removed based on this review.

The remaining files are public, but some were redacted or removed.

Records were removed or redacted for the reasons given below:

- Attorney- Client Privilege**, State ex rel. Leslie v. Ohio Hous. Fin. Agency, 105 Ohio St.3d 261, 265 (2005).
- Attorney Work Product**, Squire, Sanders & Dempsey, L.L.P. v. Givaudan Flavors Corp., 127 Ohio St.3d 161 (2010).
- Confidential Law Enforcement Investigatory Records**, ORC 149.43(A)(1)(h).
- Social Security Numbers**, State ex rel. Office of Montgomery County Pub. Defender v. Siroki, 108 Ohio St.3d 207 (2006).
- Release Otherwise Prohibited by Law**, (i.e. trade secret, infrastructure and security records, etc.), ORC 149.43(A)(1)(v).
- Other Specified Reason:**

All files are confidential.

Should you have any questions regarding this issue, please contact Ohio EPA's Office of Legal Services.

(This memorandum is to remain visibly attached to this file.)