

**Raymark Advisory Committee**

**DRAFT Meeting Summary**

**14 September 2004**

**6:30 PM to 8:30 PM**

**Army Engine Plant**

**Members Attending:** Michelina Buchino, Robert DelBuono, Edwin Fordham, John Goodsell, Ron Mazzeo, Robert Osborne, Charles Perez, Veronica Peters, Paul Rohaly, Ed Ward

**Government/Agencies Attending:** Elaine OKeefe, Town of Stratford Health Department, Andrea Boissevain, Health Risk Consultants, Joe Crudo, Gavin Forrester, Stratford Town Council

**Others Attending:** Mike Maloy and John Turberville, Haliburton-Dresser, Kevin Ryan, Forstye Kinean, Elizabeth Hayes, Newhall Coalition, Hamden, CT

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

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

The Raymark Advisory Committee (RAC) meeting was convened at 6:40 pm. The facilitator reviewed the agenda. The RAC reviewed and approved the July meeting summary with changes.

**Agreements Reached**

- None at this meeting.

**Action Items from Meeting**

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

1. EPA to prepare Response to Comments, including additional fate and transport modeling and risk analysis, revised charts/tables, for OU2 for RAC, DEP, GeoInsight, and Town, within 60 days (from July)
2. GeoInsight to prepare estimates of volume of waste various consolidation option sites might take.
3. CBI and GeoInsight to continue to talk with property owners and agencies regarding possible off ramping scenarios.

4. GeoInsight to add estimated costs to the alternatives table and the overall square footage of the property.
4. DEP will look into home teardowns and implications for subslab systems responsibilities (from July)
5. Consider adding RAC member from other potentially affected neighborhoods (i.e. Morgan Francis area) (as suggested during RAC August recess)

### **Introduction and Brief Updates**

The facilitator reviewed the objectives for the meeting, noting that there were specific, concrete alternatives to begin to review tonight after many years of hard work.

The facilitator encouraged the RAC to keep, for now, in the option generation/value creation mode so that as many ideas and possibilities can be created before deciding which ideas are better and feasible. The facilitator pointed out that the overall effort is to try and reduce the number of excavation sites and increase the possible options for consolidation sites. RAC Members made the following points.

- Don't we need an overall objective(s) before diving into this? What are we trying to accomplish? CBI mentioned the RAC consensus agreement. The facilitator also wrote down on a flip chart a possible overall objective: "Get as many owners out as cheaply as possible while minimizing/preventing impact to neighborhoods."
- You have to consider not just these two points of excavation and consolidation, but also cost. Cost is key here.
- The RAC begin to mention several criteria that have to be considered in making decisions (these are listed further below).
- 

### **EPA Accounts Status**

The status of the Raymark Special Account and EPA State Superfund Account were reviewed. After obligations of some \$1.4 million in 2004 set aside for work by TetraTech, GeoInsight, CBI, and the State for various activities, including sub-slab systems, the amount remaining is \$10.8 million. \$3.2 million rests in the EPA State Account, set aside only for 5-year reviews and remediation. GeoInsight pointed out that the sooner we can reach decisions on action, the less money will be spent out of these monies for decision-making and process.

### **Potential Alternatives**

GeoInsight reviewed possible alternatives for remediation. GeoInsight emphasized that these were alternatives and many more can be developed. They included: 1) leaving

almost all waste in place and capped by a low permeability asphalt; 2) removing all waste and consolidating it at two or more consolidation sites such as the ball field and Morgan Francis; 3) leaving some waste in place and consolidating smaller amounts in some other area.

The RAC made the following points or questions.

- Don't we need to really take into account costs early here? We can imagine all the alternatives in the world, but only the ones we can afford with the money we have left are ever likely to be constructed.
- Can costs be determined per property per alternative? GeoInsight noted that because of the way costs are calculated, they can be estimated for an overall alternative, but not by and for each particular property.
- In reviewing the table of alternatives, the RAC recommended adding estimated costs to the alternatives table and the overall square footage of the property.
- Though the agencies may not get all that they want, they have to remember the cost of doing nothing. If you do nothing, the town bears increasing liability and decreasing taxes if owners default on mortgage and tax payments.
- Does DEP have veto power over the final decision? GeoInsight noted that EPA has the legal authority to make a final and unilateral decision. However, this is almost never done because it creates enormous conflict between the state and federal government and would likely tie a site up for years in legal and political wrangling.
- DEP seemed to easily take on the O&M burden of the sub-slab systems. Why won't they do the same for other properties? GeoInsight noted that it might because the former were residential properties and latter are almost all commercial properties.
- Will the change in DEP administration make a difference in how they make decisions at sites?
- Are the abutters still out? Contract Plating is still in the mix despite being outside the Superfund site.
- What about solidification as an alternative?
- If DEP is concerned about precedent, aren't there ways to handle that in making and explaining decisions?

The RAC recommended at least other alternatives. These included adding to Alt. 3E, capping at the airport (and possible consolidation there) and 3E plus the airport plus Morgan Francis.

### **Potential Consolidation Sites**

The RAC discussed potential consolidation sites, if such sites are needed. GeoInsight highlighted two maps of the Morgan Francis property noting what 10,000 cubic yards of waste would look like at that site versus 60,000 cubic yards. Several points were made:

- The RAC has already stated in its objectives that the ball field and contract plating are not acceptable as consolidation sites. They should not be considered.
- The neighborhoods near the ball field fought hard years ago against consolidation because of the impacts of construction (trucks, noise, etc), the danger of air borne asbestos during transportation, the size of the landfill that would have been created, and the overall effects on property values, children's health, and neighborhood well being.
- The ball field already has a cap on it. This site also needs drainage fixed because of major water ponding on it.
- Since the amount of possible waste material that will have to be consolidated is much smaller than we thought, the ball field should at least be considered as an option as this time.
- If everyone prevents the waste from being safely consolidated, this will leave all property owners burdened by the situation to remain in limbo, without much if any financial viability for their properties. This isn't fair.
- Why is contract plating being considered? It's not part of the site and would trigger LDRs.
- If add waste to OU4, aren't you just compounding the OU2 groundwater problem we are trying to minimize? GeoInsight noted that since the waste on the ball field would be capped, water could leach through to groundwater and since the waste is not generally that leachable and not VOCs, it would not contribute to the major risk driver of OU2, VOCs.
- Whatever is decided, the Town will have to have in place what it does not have currently. An intentional, systematic monitoring program for all remaining sites.
- Whenever you move it, you're shifting around the liability and risk.
- Where is the risk? This all just doesn't make sense. GeoInsight noted that there is exposure and risk to human health if the waste is not capped or contained in some way. The facilitator noted that the RAC, in order to meet its primary interest of getting decisions made and action taken and EPA "sent home," might not ever be able to fully satisfy their also strong interest to believe and understand and agree with why all this has to be done.

The RAC laid out several potential areas, other than the ball field and contract plating, and asked GeoInsight to develop estimates as to how much waste each could hold. These include:

- Morgan Francis
- Army Engine Plant
- Island/Pleasure Beach

- I-95 Bridge Construction
- Airport
- Beacon Point
- Lockwood Avenue
- Within OU6. The general point is that if the consolidated/capped sites in OU6 have common ownership or are located next to one another that would make O&M easier. Options include:
  - 1) State properties;
  - 2) Town properties;
  - 3) Contiguous properties.
- Disposal out of town (volume and cost are issues of course)

The facilitator asked the RAC to forward any other suggestions to GeoInsight. The facilitator also noted that no decisions have been or are being made yet and that continuing to develop good alternatives is important at this time.

The Town Council participants noted that the Council is now engaged, appreciate the thorough and passionate discussion, and are willing to given the RAC direction going forward. The Town Council participants noted that they would confer with the Health Department and discuss how the Council might be brought up to speed.

### **Decision Criteria**

The RAC identified several criteria that need to be considered when weighing alternatives. These include:

- Costs
- Impacts on property values
- Degree of closure and finality
- Impacts to Town tax rolls
- Impacts from construction
- Time to construct
- Neighborhood impacts
- Permanence of remedy
- Airborne asbestos
- Risks, short and long-term, including leaving it in place, moving it around, consolidating it.
- Impacts to property owners where waste remains
- Fairness, including fairness to property owners and neighborhoods. No one individual or organization should have to bear the major burden of the cleanup.

**Other Updates**

The Health Department noted that they had just received an additional grant from the state for \$98,000 to continue to develop an institutional controls system. CBI and GeoInsight noted that they are currently on budget, but that the work on alternatives may “break” the budget before the end of the year. The RAC agreed that when the Army Engine Plant is no longer available, the RAC should meet at the Birdseye Complex, whenever possible.

**Adjournment**

The RAC adjourned its meeting at 9:15 PM. The next RAC meeting will be Tuesday, October 12.