

## **Raymark Advisory Committee**

**Meeting Summary**  
**10 February 2004**  
**6:30 PM to 9:00 PM**  
**Army Engine Plant**

**Members Attending:** Michelina Buchino, Barbara Clancy-Dragalin, Robert DelBuono, Tom Fahey, Edwin Fordham, Lewis Knapp, Ron Mazzey, Robert Osborne, Veronica Peters, Paul Rohaly, Ron Smith, Ed Ward

**Government/Agencies Attending:** Andrea Boissevain , Health Risk Consultants, Inc.; Elaine OKeefe, Town of Stratford Health Department, Patrice Sulik, Health Risk Consultants, Ron Jennings, US EPA, Mike Jaskinski, US EPA, Jim Murphy, US EPA, Ron Curran, CT DEP

**Others Attending:** Kevin Ryan, Attorney, Connecticut Post and New Haven Register Reporters, Councilman Gavin Forrester and Joe Crudo

**Facilitators and Technical Assistance:** Patrick Field, CBI, David MacLean, GeoInsight, John Gilbert, GeoInsight

**Members Absent:** Jack Daley, John Goodsell, Charles Perez

### **Convening of Meeting, Groundrules, and Summary Review**

The Raymark Advisory Committee (RAC) meeting was convened at 6:30 pm. The facilitator reviewed the agenda.

The RAC reviewed the December meeting summary and asked to insert the “consolidation” language from the Consensus Agreement to be clear in the written record about RAC views on the issue.

### **Agreements Reached**

No specific agreements were reached at this meeting.

### **Action Items from Meeting**

The RAC and agencies identified the following action items in the meeting.

1. EPA will check in on videoconferencing capabilities to determine if this would be a cost saver.

2. CBI will correct minutes from December meeting regarding consolidation.
3. CBI and Geo will update RAC monthly with updated spreadsheet of costs to date.
4. CBI and Geo will coordinate with RAC members to review the draft RI while keeping the document internal to the RAC and agencies until the final release for accuracy, detailed review, and protection of 27 property owners. Those who wish to receive it include: Ron M., Charlie P., Edwin F., Paul R., Michelina B., Ronnie P., Bob D. Bob O., and Ed Ward.
5. All will follow the OU6 RI review schedule from February through April.
6. On February 17th, 1:30 PM, tech folks (EPA, DEP, Geo, others, as needed) will talk via conference call on leachability and OU5 and abutters/OUT property owners notification approach.
7. EPA and Town will convene OU6 outreach subcommittee to review coordination efforts going forward among RAC and OU6 property owners.
8. CBI will update 04 schedules.
9. DEP and Geo to update RAC on subslab depressurization actions progress by end of February.

## **2004 Planning**

The RAC reviewed the schedule and scope of work for the year. CBI and GeoInsight noted the following:

- An updated schedule will be kept to keep all informed of on-going and completed activities.
- February work includes reviewing the OU6 RI in detail with the goal of public release in April.
- A more detailed comprehensive schedule will be put together later this spring for the CFS work as it shapes up.
- CBI and GeoInsight prepared a detailed scope of work for 2004 for a total budget between the two of them of \$105,000. In addition, some \$8,000 remains from last year's funding that can also be utilized
- CBI and GeoInsight asked the RAC how they would best like to oversee them as RAC contractors.

The RAC discussed the oversight issues and believed that they did not need to have an elaborate mechanism for managing the contractors different than currently. They did ask for an updated budget monthly of monies spent and monies remaining for both contractors. The RAC noted that they are more concerned about funding for the project in general.

**Project Funding**

The EPA presented a detailed report on funding for the site. Key points included the following:

- \$19.4 million was received from sale of the Raymark facility
- \$2.5 million in interest has been earned on these monies.
- A separate, State-funded EPA account is from the state’s contribution to cleanup of OU1 and its remaining balance is \$3 million. Currently, this is earmarked for work at OU1, but it could be reprogrammed. About \$3 million was spend on OU1 work and money set aside for the first 5-year review in 2000.
- Approximately \$10 million has been spent/earmarked to undertake all the work to date after the completion of OU1 remediation, including RI work at several OUs, Feasibility Studies, the Indoor Air work, and other efforts. Most of the monies have been spent on RI work.
- NO Raymark Special Account funds were used to build the cap for the OU5-Shore Road site.
- Approximately \$12 million remains currently in the special account.

Given these figures, the RAC estimated the costs remaining. This estimate is below. Please note it is an estimate only, is the RAC’s estimate only, and is not a product nor calculation of EPA or DEP.

<b>ACTIVITY</b>	<b>APPROXIMATE COST</b>
Funds available f/Special Account and State-Contribution Account	\$15,000,000
CBI/Geo Cost for 2004	\$100,000
OU9 Field Work remaining	\$500,000
OU9 RI document	\$500,000
Comprehensive Feasibility Study	\$2,000,000
Outstanding RI document wrap up	\$250,000
Other (uncertainty, other work)	\$650,000
<b>EST. REMAINING FUNDS</b>	<b>\$11,000,000</b>

The RAC noted that this money would likely cover additional design costs for work on OU6 and other properties, and some remediation, depending on what was decided, on some but by no means all properties. The EPA noted that the funding that resulted from the sale of OU-1 were never envisioned to cover all of the cost for remaining Raymark related Superfund activities. The RAC again raised the concern that once these monies

are expended, property owners who did not receive action on their properties will be left in limbo and have no means to complete the work. EPA noted that the federal Superfund monies would then have to be used. EPA noted that the region would seek to obtain funds as needed. However, EPA noted that since the major risks have been or are being taken care of, the site does not have now as compelling an argument for funding from Headquarters as other sites with greater risk and less progression in work.

### **OU6 Remedial Investigation**

EPA noted that the RI was sent to GeoInsight on February 3. GeoInsight has not yet released it to the RAC because a few remaining of the 27 property owners need to be notified of their inclusion in the site. The RAC agreed to hold a conference call later in February to review GeoInsight's findings on the RI and to prepare comments for EPA. This will be a major topic of the March meeting. The RAC agreed to review the document in confidence so as not to jeopardize the interests of OU6 property owners in the case there is misleading or inaccurate information in the draft. An attending reporter noted that this document is a public document and they might seek a Freedom of Information Action request because of the public's right to know and right to access to information.

The RAC laid out the following review schedule.

- 2/3 Geo received draft
- 2/10 RAC meeting
- 2/11 Remainder of week, EPA contacts remaining 5 property owners
- 2/17 GEO and CBI provide copy of RI to RAC list; Geo reviews
- 2/24 Week of, RAC holds conference call
- 3/2 Town, Geo, and DEP comments on RI due to EPA in writing
- 3/9 RAC meeting
- 3/18 Tech meeting to resolve OU6 RI and other RI outstanding issues
- 3/19 Tetrattech begins prep of final OU6 RI
- APRIL Final OU6 RI released to public

The RAC discussed outreach to property owners. Fact Sheet #43 was handed out, which explains generally the OU6 RI report. EPA intends to update the Fact Sheet with all pertinent OUs to include OU6 findings. The RAC then discussed the letters to be sent to property owners where sampling took place. The RAC and agencies agreed to language for the letters in the IN letters (properties with Raymark waste who are now part of OU6) and the OUT letters to those property owners who did not have Raymark waste as determined through recent sampling. EPA noted that they would include a cover letter to the comprehensive and revised fact sheet, in particular, noting for abutters that they did

about a Raymark waste property and ought to read the fact sheet carefully. However, the outstanding issue remains how to handle the abutters to OU6 properties who have no indication of Raymark waste due to sampling. Many members of the RAC stated that there should be two categories and letters – IN and OUT. The EPA noted that they need to send a particular letter to abutters at least notifying them of the presence of Raymark waste next to them. It was discussed if abutters fall into actually two categories. One where the abutting waste is so far removed from the clean property's property line, it should be no problem. Two, where the abutting waste is right up to or very close to the clean property's property line.

The EPA agreed to take the issues under advisement and seek to finalize the letters to meet their and the RAC's interests. EPA and Town also noted that they would convene OU6 outreach subcommittee again to review coordination efforts going forward among RAC and OU6 property owners.

### **Other Updates**

#### *Subslab Depressurization Installation*

A member of the public attended the RAC meeting. He expressed concern that the installers had not shown the final design plans nor received permission to do the work in his mother's home prior to calling and stating they would arrive in a few days to do the work. DEP noted that they would seek to ensure the contractor worked appropriately with the homeowner and her caretaker and provided contact information. The Town noted they are working to finalize the packet of information that will go to all homeowners who have the systems installed as requested by the RAC. DEP and Geo agreed to update RAC on subslab depressurization actions progress by end of February.

#### *OU5 Leachability*

GeoInsight noted that the EPA and them agreed that it was prohibitively expensive to do column testing for leachability for the OU5 soils. GeoInsight noted the agency and them are still discussing how to address the concern that there are no SPLP samples on this property, which could drive the remediation choices. It was noted that on February 17th, 1:30 PM, tech folks (EPA, DEP, Geo, others, as needed) would talk via conference call on leachability and OU5 and the abutters/OUT property owners notification approach issue.

### **Adjournment**

The RAC adjourned its meeting at 9:15 PM. The next meeting is scheduled for March 9, 2004.