

**Raymark Advisory Committee**  
**DRAFT Meeting Summary**  
February 8, 2005  
6:30 PM to 8:45 PM  
Birdseye Complex Conference Room

**Members Attending:** Michelina Buchino, Barbara Clancy Draglin, Bob DelBuono, Edwin Fordham, Ron Mazzeo, Charles Perez, Veronica Peters, Paul Rohaly, Ron Smith,

**Government/Agencies Attending:** Elaine O'Keefe, Town of Stratford Health Department, Andrea Boissevain, Health Risk Consultants, Ron Curran, DEP, Ron Jennings, EPA, Jim Murphy, EPA, Mike Jasinski, EPA

**Others Attending:** Kurt Sendlein, Skirsky Airport, Allison Dodge, Congresswoman DeLauro's Office, Steve Scarpa, CT Post, John Turberville, Dresser, Mike Gross, Maco Lawfirm, Gavin Forrester, Town Council, Jim Buchanan, WICC 60 AM Jim.Buchanan@cumulus.com

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

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

The RAC convened at 6:40 PM. The January meeting summary was approved.

**Agreements Reached**

The RAC agreed to forward to EPA and DEP a set of alternatives and crosscutting criteria for analysis in the Feasibility Study (FS) process, primarily related to OU4 and OU6. The forwarding of these alternatives is neither an endorsement nor rejection of the conceptual alternatives reviewed to date by the RAC.

**Review of Action Items**

Action items include.

- GeoInsight to revise alternatives and forward to the agencies.
- CBI to revised crosscutting criteria and forward to the agencies.
- GeoInsight and CBI to schedule a call on OU9 review prior to 1 March.
- GeoInsight and CBI to help coordinate with Council for March 23 Council briefing.

**Public Involvement Process**

The RAC reviewed a draft timeline for community, Council, and RAC involvement in the FS process. The following points were made:

- Given the schedule, looks like elections, a new Council, more education, and starting over. How do we interact carefully with the Town Council, keeping it informal, but keeping them informed? Information let out little by little to provide longest time to digest the information is important.
- If history repeats itself, the ROD would come out in June 06. The RAC is the group that is most informed and would be providing detailed guidance all along the way.
- Meeting with Town Council in April and May is poor due to budget work at that time.
- What will the Town Council provide at the March meeting? RAC would provide where they are, including conceptual alternatives forwarded to the EPA, plus other factors like crosscutting criteria. This would not be a decision-making meeting.
- The goal would be to do the screening of the FS in April and working on the detailed evaluation of alternatives in May and June. Then, the RAC would go back to Council in June with final or narrowed alternatives and analysis that has been completed.
- Alternatives are now conceptual only and will need further refinement and potential recombinations of choices.

## **FS Alternatives**

The RAC discussed the alternatives developed to date by GeoInsight and as refined and prioritized by the RAC. Geo noted that the major purpose of these alternatives is conceptual and is to raise and have answered key questions during analysis. These alternatives are to be used in screening. Some will fall out. Some may be modified, especially those that make it through the initial screening for costs, applicable regulations, technical feasibility and so forth.

GeoInsight walked through the alternatives developed to date.

- “Fair Share” alternative. Divided OU4, 6, and 9 properties into three districts. Located technically feasible consolidation areas. In southern portion, OU9 Landfill as a consolidation area. Remember, these consolidation volumes and Raymark Waste volumes are not precise. For this scenario, the RAC is asking the agencies to also evaluate the Lockwood Avenue as a consolidation site, which significantly reduces the amount of waste to be removed and provides an additional site for consolidation. The mid-district would consolidate on Morgan Francis and the Ferry Creek properties. The north district would involve consolidation at the Ballfield of some 6,000 cubic yards and then capped permanently.
  - Do the volumes include a 3.5-foot cap for each consolidation site? No, not from GeoInsight’s perspective. Kinds of consolidation caps not determined at this time. The facilitator noted, for instance, that a LPA cap on the Morgan Francis property would be in keeping with that owner’s development intentions (slab construction).
  - OU9 only appears in this first alternative. Here it would be needed as a consolidation site. The intent, however, is not to necessarily focus on this OU except as assisting in cleaning up OU6 properties.
  - On the Lockwood property, can we estimate the volume of sediments that might have to be dredged and excavated and consolidated there? A member noted that for this property, the whole purpose is to bring the property back to productive

use, which, under zoning, requires a water-based use for upland-associated development. Thus consolidation, capping, and dredging have to go together on this property to make it all work.

- EPA wants to make clear that the Lockwood Property is the mouth of the Ferry Creek, and thus, probably the last place to clean up because at end of source of contamination (upper Ferry Creek).
- It was noted that Upper Ferry Creek culverting and capping in place was discussed at one time and this option has not been ruled out.
- Additional alternatives are for capping larger volumes on properties and removing/excavating smaller amounts were also developed. Amounts of contamination that might establish capping in place could include greater than 10,000 cubic yards per property, 8,000 cubic yards, and 5,000 cubic yards. Each of these would include capping the Ballfield (OU4). Depending on the standard, the more capping, the less excavation, the less capping, and the more excavation. Several questions were raised.
  - Where does the excavated waste go? Where the waste can go depends on what contaminants are involved and the concentration of the contaminants. Different types on contaminants at different concentrations may have to go to different kinds of facilities with different costs. Highly contaminated waste would cost much more to dispose of off-site.
  - Each of these waste types would have to be screened against a host of state and federal regulations to determine what is allowable.
  - One management idea is to float a bond locally to be able to pay for waste removal out of town. Do we have a place to take it even if we had plenty of money? Geo noted that it is probably an issue of money and of characteristics of waste that affect if and where it can be taken. Out of town might mean within CT or out of state or even out of the country. There are upstate New York and Canadian facilities as well as others.
  - Are we going to see the concentrations, kinds of waste, volumes, places, and costs to actually remove it?
- There is also a “cap all” alternative and “remove all” alternative, to “bookend” the range of alternatives for analysis.

The following final questions were raised:

- When is the last call for an alternative? Geo noted that it is hoped that most overall conceptual alternatives would be retained through the this initial screening
- Concern about OU-6, OU-3 margin issues If we clean up OU6 properties, but they abut Ferry Creek and we don't clean up Ferry Creek, aren't we revisiting the whole issue yet again, just like OU5, the Boat Club? If the consolidation sites are already closed, where does the waste go? Geo noted that we have only so much money left in the account, and can only do so much and must prioritize. The idea is: if there would actually be a fundable next time, would have to require sufficient funding to finish.
- One owner noted the Ferry Creek properties only own to high-tide mark due to more recent CT property and title laws. The properties above the turn may go out into Ferry Creek in terms of ownership. A member asked: if the state “owns” below the high tide mark, are they responsible for the cleanup?

- EPA noted that the objective is to go as far as can with money, but not leave open work remaining that would require redoing the work.

### **Crosscutting Criteria**

The EPA remarked on the crosscutting draft criteria developed by the RAC in the January meeting.

- EPA has concerns about conflict between the priorities for cleanup of private ownership and risk. What if they contradict one another? EPA noted that it appears the risks and the property ownership are in keeping with one another.
- EPA noted that there has to be reasonable cost for the independent construction monitoring.
- EPA noted; we have to address the monitoring requirements for the longer-term.
- EPA asked: what about lifetime of caps and how to manage that?
- EPA cannot typically pay for O&M costs, hence difficulties in putting money into a local waste authority.
- EPA said, looking at the second bullet under consolidation or even opened-up but not capped yet: what is the “reasonable” amount of time to open up a waste property for any reason? This needs to be thought out carefully. How open? If sites are left open, what signage, fencing, and temporary mitigations might be required? The RAC noted: don’t start anything you can’t finish. It is task-oriented, and time to leave open serves the tasks needed and these tasks can be funded. Needs to have timeframes and limits to the tasks at hand.
- How will cost overruns be managed and contained to ensure monies spent efficiently and all work done and fully complete?

### **Final Items, Next Steps and Adjourn**

EPA noted that they would be undertaking, as required by law, a 5-year review, primarily of OU1. The review is due by September. They typically cost some \$50K, which will come out of the special “state” account. Residential properties may be rolled into this review as well.

The RAC agreed to have Geo and CBI revise the conceptual alternatives and the crosscutting criteria and forward those to EPA for analysis and initial screening. The RAC will not meet in March, except with the Town Council on March 23 and will reconvene in April.

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 PM.