

Raymark Advisory Committee
DRAFT Meeting Summary
Tuesday, April 10, 2007
6:30 PM to 9:00 PM
Birdseye Complex Conference Room

Attendees

Members Attending: Veronica Peters, Paul Rohaly, Ed Ward, Ron Mazzey, Charlie Perez, Bob Connolly, Barbara Clancy Draglin, Michelina Buchino, Ron Smith, Tom Fahey, John Goodsell, Edwin Fordham

Government/Agencies Attending: Lisa LoBianco, Town of Stratford Health Department, Andrea Boissevain, HRC, John Miranda, Town Council, Mike Julian, Town Council, Gavin Forrester, Town Council, Rep. John Harkin

Others Attending: Mike Gross, Haliburton, Len Wisniewski, Jane Warren, Ashcroft, Tim Hidu, Joe Marcell, Bruce McGailliard, John Turbeville, Shelley Morley, Paresh Patai, Tris DeRoma, Bard, Richard Weizel, CT Post, Gregory Dorosh, Shital Patel,

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

Convening of Meeting, Groundrules, and Summary Review

The RAC convened at 6:30 PM. The February-March meeting summary was approved.

Agreements or Major Clarifications

- The RAC, the state representative, and Town Council members asked for EPA to convene a meeting with the Army to discuss the Army Engine Plant as a consolidation site.

Overview

Given the number of new attendees at the meeting, GeoInsight and CBI gave an overview of the RAC's work, the feasibility study, and the process to-date.

The Town's Health Department reported that it had broadly reviewed the FS, due to dwindling dollars from EPA for technical assistance, and was concerned and will be concerned about short-term construction impacts to public health such as dust and traffic control. The Department noted it continues to refine the environmental database for properties so all property restrictions are on a searchable data base for Town officials, future buyers, and so forth. The Health Department has initiated in the last few months more intensive briefings of Town departments, as well as the Mayor, as this process moves toward a decision point.

Locations of Landfilling/Consolidation

GeoInsight and CBI noted that in terms of options that have been eliminated, the following was noted:

- Out of town disposal for most waste is prohibitively expensive at \$70 million for the estimated 110,000 cubic yards of waste for OU6.
- The Ferry Creek as a consolidation site is unlikely due to technical, regulatory, and cost uncertainties.
- The Lockwood Avenue property also has many regulatory complications and would only hold a small amount of additional waste.

It was asked why vacant properties such as the Connecticut DOT properties might not hold waste. Points made were:

- CT DOT would unlikely accept additional waste on their properties, if they could avoid it.
- Waste material may not be suitable for use in construction;
- Waste materials cannot be transferred to properties that are not impacted with Raymark Waste and are not part of the Raymark site;
- The properties could hold very little waste because of their slope, size and location.

The RAC discussed the following additional points:

- How come the Army Engine plant was never considered in the universe of potential consolidation sites? It seems that this is already contaminated, has Raymark waste, and could combine Army and EPA monies to do more. GeoInsight noted that this was discussed some years ago and legalities appeared to rule it out. The RAC, the state representative, and Town Council members asked for EPA to convene a meeting with the Army to discuss this further.
- The point was made that the word "CAMU" or "consolidation site" made it out to be some neutral activity, but from the view of neighbors, this is toxic waste being dumped or landfilled, regardless of what the technical terms one might use.
- It was noted that OU4 (the ballfield) has three volume scenarios, thus three different maps, contours, and costs associated with it. The OU9 (landfill) has only one assuming it could hold up to 59,000 additional cubic yards of waste.
- If the waste is brought to the ballfield, who owns that property then? Who will be responsible for O&M? Who will be liable?
- We need to understand better the design of the proposed ballfield cap. How were slopes and grades determined? How will drainage be managed? Can waste be consolidated in such a way as to consolidate waste as far from the residences as possible? Will the property be redevelopable given how the cap is designed at this point?
- We have concerns about the landfill/OU-9 design. The Town just spent a lot of money in building the new soccer fields. It is a Town jewel. Furthermore, it looks like the flood plain mitigation would destroy the miniature golf there. Why not spread the waste across the entire landfill, put it on another side? What other design alternatives might there be?
- It is imperative we know the future use of the CAMU site. If we know that, there may be some benefit to the expected high cost of consolidation waste next to a neighborhood.
- How close for OU4 will the waste be dumped? Can you ensure that the waste is dumped as far from the houses within the site as possible?

Property by Property Review

GeoInsight, the RAC, and attending property owners reviewed the property alternatives site by site. The following questions or comments arose:

- *If you have clean closure, are you free of O&M costs and liability? Yes, you would have no federal O&M costs if the Raymark waste is removed. You still may have liability under the state's Transfer Act for any state-designated waste that may remain. Also, EPA will enter into settlement with each property owner on a case-by-case basis, so actual liability/settlement terms for each property are not known.*
- *What if you have waste below the water table? You would not receive clean closure, but the land use restriction would likely be limited to only requiring you do not dig below the water table, which is unlikely in any case.*
- *If EPA goes onto an open space property like Wooster Park and a few others, and has to "chase waste" into trees and shrubs, will EPA replace the vegetation? It was some's understanding that during the residential clean up in the 1990's, EPA in fact paid for restoration of properties in terms of vegetation. EPA would likely clarify restoration details in the pre-design phase after a record of decision (ROD) has been filed.*
- *The Morgan Francis properties may have some flooding issues already, so that should be checked out.*
- *If a cap were placed on a private property, I understand the owner would be liable for harm they do to the cap. But what about liability if someone were to drive a car across the property, hit a fence post, and dig up waste that way? How far does future liability go?*
- *251 Main Street must have the volume estimated separated from the DPW property. Further, some believe that the waste is separated due to the pump station work done.*
- *Why does the monitoring action for the one Beacon Point property cost \$300,000? Seems like an awful lot of money to do nothing.*
- *We are very concerned about impacts to businesses during construction, whatever it may be. It appears that most construction-estimated times are approximately one year. Does that mean I close my business down for 1 year? The RAC and participants discussed this and it was noted, depending on the where the waste was, the impact to operations would vary. For some, if waste is to the side or in the back of a property, it would have little operational impact. However, if it is scattered across a property, and entrances and exits, that could be a significant problem. The RAC wanted to know more per property for the owners on this issue.*
- *Why not just fence off the Ferry Boulevard/Housatonic Avenue vacant properties. Fencing has been an acceptable short-term risk reducer elsewhere on other OUs.*
- *What are the cost components of groundwater monitoring, and who pays for them? The components would probably include installation of monitoring wells, maintenance of those wells, sampling of those wells, and analysis and reporting of the data. It's not clear who would pay for groundwater monitoring at this point. The state has provided different answers at different times.*
- *What liability do abutters have during the construction of the remedy? What if waste gets on to their property? What if the construction sampling determines that waste must be pursued across a property line?*

Construction Process

The RAC noted the following would be very important as any part of a final package remedy. The RAC, GeoInsight, and the Town noted that the current draft FS gives short shrift to the significant challenges, problems, and risks of construction. Many cited the negative experiences of past EPA construction work in town, from uncovered trucks to not abiding by time of day schedules, to poor or inadequate monitoring and oversight. EPA should and must produce a community health and safety plan, reviewed by all appropriate Town departments, and signed off by the Council and Mayor that would include the following:

- Firm scheduling in terms of times of day that allow work and weekends (more than 12 hours highly likely to be unacceptable)
- Firm duration deadline for construction and closing of CAMU/landfill.
- Dust control, both for trucking as well as loading and unloading.
- Barriers or other devices that protect abutting neighborhoods and their homes from dust, noise, disruption (such as traffic barriers along highways).
- Traffic, including paying for traffic police details, posting on a website, signage, a list serve to notify all interested each day of traffic issues.
- Light standards.
- Noise standards (since OU1, the Town has passed a noise ordinance).
- Diesel exhaust and idling from trucks and construction equipment.
- Air monitoring at the properties, along truck routes, and at consolidation sites, done with appropriate frequency and results provided as close to real time as possible with residents and Town.
- Emergency response.
- Independent, paid, separate construction oversight controlled by the Town with the ability to shut the work down if it is not meeting standards.
- Impacts and mitigations to business operations on OU6 properties, and affected business along truck routes.
- Town water handling, including sewerage and fire hydrants (in OU1 work, a fire hydrant was drained without any care and almost undercut a residential foundation).

Next Steps and Adjournment

The RAC noted that next steps were:

- EPA and Army should meet on the Army Engine plant.
- The next RAC meeting in May would include the Agencies.
- The Council could like a RAC recommendation or advice by early to mid-summer.
- The RAC members are expecting EPA and DEP to host neighborhood meetings.

The RAC adjourned at around 9:00 PM.