

**Raymark Advisory Committee**  
**DRAFT Meeting Summary**  
Tuesday, January 9  
6:30 PM to 8:45 PM  
Birdseye Complex Conference Room

**Members Attending:** Veronica Peters, Ron Mazzey, Paul Rohaly, Charlie Perez, Ron Smith, Ed Ward, Bob Delbuono, Bob Osbourn

**Government/Agencies Attending:** Lisa LoBianco, Town of Stratford Health Department, Andrea Boissevain, Health Risk Consultants, Ron Jennings, EPA, Jim Murphy, EPA, Ron Curran, DEP

**Others Attending:** Town Council, Gavin Forrester, John Turbeville, Dresser, Mike Gross, Haliburton, Chris Pliska, Jason Santos

**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 September meeting summary was approved with revisions

**Agreements or Major Clarifications**

The RAC members would not be able to offer a final recommendation on a preferred remedy for OU6 without further clarification and certainty as to the property owners' responsibilities regarding operations and maintenance costs of cleanup for capping, as well as the impacts of non-Raymark waste that may be left regardless of the federal Superfund remedy.

**Outstanding Action Items and Brief Updates**

*CBI/Geo Budget*

CBI noted the monies for 2007, similar to monies for '06, have been transferred to the contractor. CBI noted that the monies this year are coming from Headquarters, not the special account.

**2007 Schedule Review**

The RAC reviewed the two possible schedules for 07 (attached). The following questions were asked.

- *What is the remedy review board?* The remedy review board, an EPA national entity, of which Mike Jasinski is the New England representative, must review all proposed remedies of over \$25 million for cost effectiveness. This review is required prior to release of any public proposed plan.
- *Who from the State “approves” the final approach?* The DEP has the authority, via the Commissioner, to sign off on final Records of Decision.

## **OU6 Feasibility Study (FS) Update**

### *Overview*

Ron Jennings presented an overview of the feasibility study properties. Currently, analysis and review is done for all properties except the potential Corrective Action Management Units (CAMUs). EPA noted that the FS will include a summary of the work over the last several years, including the definition of Raymark waste, remedial objectives, and detailed analysis of the alternatives for each individual property (the outline of the FS is appended below).

EPA showed OU6 individual property maps and highlighted that:

- Many properties are in the flood plain; thus, even if technically possible, bringing in two feet of clean fill and capping is not allowed under an executive order, with the exception of the airport property, where there is enough space that it is possible.
- Most properties, under the cap scenario, have a cap over the entire property or a cap only on a small portion where there is Raymark waste. This could still leave non-Raymark waste that is not incorporated in the Superfund remedy to be regulated by the State’s Transfer Act.
- Some property groupings were further broken out because different remedies (capping versus removal) for different portions might make sense for them.

EPA then showed a table of potential volumes and costs, including capital and operations and maintenance costs. The following are noted from the chart, (please note that all these numbers are STILL PRELIMINARY and to be further refined and adjusted, particularly after the CAMU costing is completed):

- The range of Raymark waste volume to be dealt with off any property is estimated to be as much as approximately 100,000 cubic yards if all waste was removed from all OU6 properties and as little as approximately 50,000 cubic yards if all waste is capped in place (waste has to be removed at least two feet to prepare a stable, clean base for any kind of cap).
- The costs for cleanup of the OU6 properties (NOT INCLUDING any CAMU costs which are not yet estimated) range from over \$70 million if all waste were removed and shipped out of town to over \$14 million if all waste were removed and consolidated somewhere in town (but please note that this cost does not include the cost of developing, using, and capping for closure the CAMU site or sites).

### *RAC Questions*

The RAC asked the following questions.

- *What is the time for completing each of these actions?* This is estimated in each individual property write up.
- *Why can't you take clean fill from elsewhere in the site and switch it out for the Raymark waste at surface to provide for clean, compact fill for the caps?* Given the engineering needs for the right kind of material to compact and the remaining non-Raymark waste, this has not been fully ruled out, but is very difficult. EPA did look at this, trying to minimize removing waste off each property.
- *What is the cost of the cap as compared to the overall construction costs?* As an example, the capital cost of the capping of the Ferry Boulevard properties is an estimated \$4.5 million. About \$1.3 million is the cost of the cap itself. (Note: there is an additional 50% factor in estimated project management, design, construction management, and contingency costs that bring the total cap costs to approximately \$1.9 million.)
- *What is this flood plains restriction?* EPA is required under Executive Order to not adversely affect flood plains. So, if you put 2' of clean fill on a property within the flood plain, you then have displace 2' of flood water potential capture/holding such that the flood water would have to go somewhere else. Thus, you need to mitigate this displacement through things such as retention basins. Very few properties in OU6 have the physical space/open space for such mitigation. The airport property is certainly one example.

### *Operations, Maintenance, and Remaining Waste Liability*

The RAC's primary concern centered around the property owners' responsibility for monitoring and maintenance of caps under Alternative 2. The RAC discussed that, for capping on site, property owners would have to bear the cost of operations and maintenance, at least to some degree. Though the U.S. EPA might offer, to at least some property owners depending on circumstance, an "innocent landowner" protection, the State of Connecticut does not have any such procedure or rule<sup>[j1]</sup> (though it can settle in each individual case for limited dollars –e.g., the State settled with residential property owners in the 1990s for \$1 in exchange for land use controls/title limitations).

The possible O&M costs would include:

- Groundwater monitoring and analysis (typically the single most expensive part of O&M);
- Cap monitoring and record keeping and filing;
- Cap repair and maintenance; and,
- Five year reviews, an EPA requirement for Superfund sites.

It was suggested that if the State assumed the groundwater monitoring and the EPA assumed the five-year costs, remaining O&M costs for property owners might be more financially viable. A RAC member expressed strong concern, on principle, that property owners who did not create the Raymark waste would be responsible for any O&M costs.

In addition to O&M costs, the RAC raised concern about the implications for property owners of the non-Raymark waste that would remain. The RAC noted that, in many cases, the Raymark waste on site is limited, but non-Raymark contamination may exist to a greater or lesser degree. According to the State of CT Transfer Act, upon transfer of the property, either the buyer or seller would be required to assess the site, and if needed, remediate it. The RAC pointed out, as they have before, that even if a property owner escapes Superfund, so to speak, they would be "back in the fire" regarding State liabilities.

The RAC noted that though this liability is imposed upon any property in the State, these properties are not typical because:

- They have been tainted generally by the designation of Superfund starting before the Transfer Act was passed, effectively preventing them from transferring their properties before the Act existed.
- The source of the waste is well known (Raymark/Raybestos).
- The data collected is far more extensive in many cases than would be typical on a property and gives the State potential "more ammunition" to place orders on these property owners.
- Since Superfund cleanup is already being planned for these properties, having a sequential, separate "State" cleanup if necessary is burdensome, likely expensive, and a kind of "double jeopardy."

In conclusion, the RAC noted that until these issues are further clarified both property owners and the RAC are unlikely to be able to make definitive recommendations as to alternatives.

## **Adjournment**

The RAC adjourned at around 9:00 PM, noting the next RAC meeting will occur in February. The intent is to hear from GeoInsight on the review of EPA's feasibility study CAMU write-ups/analysis.

**RAYMARK SUPERFUND SITE  
OUTLINE OF  
draft OU6 FEASIBILITY STUDY  
January 9, 2007**

**Section 1 - Intro**

**Section 2 – Identification and Screening of Technologies**

ARARs

RAOs

Definition of RW

Contaminants of Concern

General Response Actions (3 major components):

identifying contaminants of concern,

determining preliminary remediation goals, and

formulating the RAO statement

Development of the General Response Actions

Approach Used to Estimate Volumes of RW

Identification of Screening Technologies

**Section 3 – Development and Screening of Alternatives**

Approach to Development of Alternatives

CAMU Rule

Wetlands and Floodplains Considerations

Remedial Alternatives Defined

No Action

Limited Action

Cap w/Deed Restrictions (in/out town disposal)

Excavation (in town/out of town disposal)

Excavation, Treatment, and On-Site Reuse

## Screening of Alternatives for OU6 Properties

### Screening of Potential CAMU Locations

Lockwood Ave  
250/280/300 Ferry Blvd  
576/600 East Broadway  
OU4 Raybestos Memorial Ballfield  
OU9 Stratford Landfill and Short Beach Park  
Ferry Creek Culvert & Fill (Ferry Creek “elbow)

## **Section 4 – Detailed Analysis of Alternatives**

### Criteria Used for Analysis and Their Definition (9 criteria in three categories)

#### Threshold Criteria:

Overall Protection of HH and the Environ &  
ARARs

#### Balancing Criteria:

Long-Term Effectiveness and Permanence,  
Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility, or Volume  
through Treatment, Short-Term  
Effectiveness, Implementability, and Cost

#### Modifying Criteria: (these criteria not formally evaluated until after of Proposed Plan)

State and Community Acceptance

### Definition and Detailed Analysis of the 18 Property Groups

## **Section 5 CAMU detailed analysis**

Lockwood Ave  
OU4 Raybestos Ballfield  
OU 9 Stratford Landfill/Short Beach Park  
Ferry Creek

## **Appendices**

