

**NEWHALL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Final Meeting Summary**

**May 19, 2005**

**6:30 pm – 9:05 pm**

***Members Attending:*** Pastor George Bulgin, Mike Colaiacovo, Sheila Epps, Donald Eaton, Dr. Abdul Hamid, Rhonda Hayward, Scott Jackson, Pamala Moore, Henry Platt, LaNorma Webb, Jr., Roosevelt Young, Leonardo Melendez

***Alternates Attending:*** Herman Alexander [for Rev. Keith King], Willa Taylor

***Absent:*** Henry Blue, Elizabeth Hayes, Loydon Henry-Phillip, Deloris McNair, Rep. Peter Villano

***Ex-Officio Members Attending:*** Eileen Barnes, Elsie Patton, Edith Pestana (DEP); Meg Harvey (DPH); Leslie Balch (QVHD); Arthur Bogan (Town of Hamden); Jimmy Young (Olin); Tom Chaplik (RWA)

***Others Attending:*** Janet D'Agostino, Debbie Gaidini, Charles Webb, Renee Wright, Residents; Michael Manolakas (LBG); Bill Kay, Chris Harriman (Haley & Aldrich); Dave Scotti (LEA); Joan Huwiler (RWA); Ann Catino, Tom Blatchley (Halloran & Sage)

***Technical and Public Participation Assistance:*** Marianne Latimer (FHI)

***Facilitator:*** Kathleen Conway

***Agenda Items***

**Convening of Meeting, Ground Rules and Meeting Summary Review**

The Newhall Advisory Committee (NAC) convened at 6:35 pm. Members and other attendees introduced themselves. The March meeting summary was approved with revisions. The revised Draft Ground Rules were approved following the NAC discussion at the March meeting.

**New Business**

Stephanie Kollett, the Hamden Middle School (HMS) representative, resigned due to a conflicting commitment on Thursday evenings. Another HMS teacher has expressed an interest in being a NAC member. The NAC agreed to set up a sub-committee comprised of Don Eaton, Pamela Moore and Leonardo Melendez to explain the criteria for membership and the mission of the NAC; and to interview her. They will report back to the NAC at the next meeting.

**Regional Water Authority Presentation: Investigations at the Hamden Middle School (April 2005)**

- ***Purpose of Presentation:*** To present findings from the investigations, remedial alternatives and get feedback from the NAC

- ***Soil Findings***

- Types of soil and fill: industrial wastes (black silt and slag); construction debris (sand, cobbles and brick); and domestic/municipal waste (household refuse)
- Contaminants in soil/fill: polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs); phthalates (semi-volatiles); petroleum hydrocarbons (oils); metals (lead, arsenic and antimony); polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs); and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) (typical degreasing chemicals)

- ***Groundwater findings***

- Groundwater is 15 feet or more beneath the ground surface. Most groundwater flows from the east to the west/southwest away from the drinking water supply reservoir. In the northern area of the HMS, groundwater flows towards the Regional Water Authority wetlands.
- Contaminants in groundwater.
  - ✓ Very low levels of gasoline were detected – no gasoline is leaving the site at levels above the Remediation Standard Regulations (RSRs);
  - ✓ Solvents were relatively high near the basketball court but levels drop sharply going out from this area; RWA believes the high levels are a result of their drilling which agitated materials in the soil.
  - ✓ PAHs, phthalates and metals (primarily barium and lead) were detected
- There were no vapors detected beneath 4 residential homes that were tested. No one is drinking the ground water.

- ***RSR Criteria:*** Direct Exposure Criteria (DEC) to prevent exposure to contaminated soil; and Pollutant Mobility Criteria (PMC) to prevent contaminants in soil from leaching into groundwater.

- ***Potential Remedial Alternatives***

- Fenced forest: the Regional Water Authority (RWA) assumes that the Town would not want restricted access on the HMS site
- Site-wide cap: at or near grade or below grade; “no digging” restriction
- Site-wide development – use of buildings and pavement to make soil inaccessible or isolated
- Modify recreation/add parking & passive open space (with fence within forest)

- ***Considerations for evaluating site alternatives:*** Future land use (magnet school has been mentioned), community concerns, groundwater reclassification from GA to GB (application this summer), location of impacted materials and time to complete the cleanup.

- **Remedial Alternative 1**

- Reclassification of groundwater to GB and Environmental Land Use Restriction
- Phytoremediation Program: We recommend expanding wooded areas from the SBC property; removing the top 4 feet of contaminated soil from areas on the site with surface contamination up to 4 feet and stockpiling the soil in the wooded area; using trees to remove contaminants and treat soils side wide; expanding, capping and grading the parking area by Newhall Street; and, expanding the tennis and basketball courts.

### **NAC Questions and Comments.**

**1. Q: Olin recommended disposing of the contaminated soil from the residential properties at the HMS. Your report does not address bringing more contaminated fill on the HMS. Would RWA allow this contaminated fill to be placed on the HMS site?**

**A:** RWA's scope of work was to investigate the fill and contamination at the HMS site and make recommendations for dealing with it. We do not own the HMS site and would not be the decision maker as to whether the fill could be placed on the site. The Town owns the HMS site. Our goal is to work together with the Town to remediate the site. DEP is the final decision maker.

**Comments:** We want a comprehensive plan for cleanup and reuse of the school. It's very confusing when the reports do not take the other reports into consideration. After all this, we still do not have a recommendation that takes into account the entire area.

**2. Q: Hamden has a leaking sewer system. Would contaminated groundwater leak into other areas?**

**A:** Groundwater is 15 feet below ground surface. There would be no impact

**3. Q: Would contaminated groundwater limit gardening and eating vegetables?**

**A:** Groundwater is too deep to impact the plants or cause exposure through gardening.

**4. Q: I thought the groundwater flowed to the north. What is the difference between GA and GB areas?**

**A:** Most of the groundwater flows from east to southwest away from the drinking water supplies towards Goodrich Street. GA means water that is drinkable without treatment. GB means water that is presumed undrinkable unless treated. The entire area is on the public drinking water supply. No one drinks groundwater.

**5. Q: Is there contaminated fill under the HMS building? Are any contaminants coming into the building?**

**A:** Volatiles are well below Residential Volatilization Criteria under the school.

**6. Q: If there is no additional fill brought onto the HMS site, how long will it take for RWA's recommended cleanup?**

**A:** One summer.

**7. Q: If phytoremediation is used to treat contaminated soil, how long would it take?**

**A:** We do not know how long but the land is usable during the time phytoremediation takes place.

8. **Q: If benzene is in the groundwater, doesn't it rise up into the soil and the air?**  
A: Groundwater is 15 to 25 feet below groundwater surface. Groundwater fluctuates only 2 – 3 feet.
9. **Q: You stated a fence would be built around the contaminated soil treatment area. We are concerned about the safety of our children. How would you stop children from climbing the fence and getting exposed?**  
A: The fence would be built to keep children out.

**RAC comments:** Children have played there for years. There are holes in the fences. Children will find a way to get over or through.

10. **Q: You considered only more basketball and tennis courts as part of the remedy. Did you consider anything else, like skateboard tracks?**  
A: We want feedback from the community as to what recreational activities the residents would want to see as part of the development of the site. Our ideas were conceptual only.
11. **Q: Why is there an emphasis on expanding athletic uses? Why not cultural, senior citizen, other uses?**  
A: We are willing to look at all suggestions.
12. **Q: Who would use the expanded parking lot in front of the HMS?**  
A: The parking lot would be part of the development of the site and used by occupants and visitors.
13. **Q: What will you do with the shallow soil contamination?**  
A: Excavate and move the contaminated soil to the phytoremediation area where it can be treated. Volatiles, PCBs and solvents are treated inside the plants by transpiration.
14. **Q: If contaminated soil remains, would surface water drainage spread contamination?**  
A: No, because it would be made isolated by a building or cap.

### **Town of Hamden Presentation: Sampling at Mill Rock Park, Rochford Park and the Sewage Pump Station.**

The purpose was to examine and describe soil and groundwater conditions, determine groundwater flow and develop remedial action alternatives. This is conceptual only. The Town wants your input. However, the Town does not make the final decision. DEP is the ultimate decision maker.

#### • ***Findings***

- Mill Rock Park is about 3 acres [playground and tennis courts], Rochford Field, 8 acres [ballfields].
- Fill is about 8 to 9 feet thick at Mill Rock and 8 to 11 feet at Rochford Field; the cap is about 2 to 3 feet thick; Quantity of Fill: about 113,000 cy.
- Groundwater: about 5 to 10 feet below ground surface. It flows generally from east to west from Mill Rock Park to Rochford Field. From Rochford Field, generally southwest except for the northwest corner, groundwater flows to north-northwest. From Sewer Pump Station, groundwater flows to the southwest.

- Chemical testing results for soil:
  - ✓ Not detected: PCBs;
  - ✓ Did not exceed standard: VOCs; pesticides; cyanide
  - ✓ Exceeding standard: SVOCs (higher concentrations in Rochford Field); ETPH (petroleum); metals
- Chemical testing results for groundwater:
  - ✓ Exceeded standard: VOCs (benzene and chloroform); ETPH and metals
- **Remedial Alternatives**
  - 13 alternatives considered
  - 4 alternatives evaluated
    - ✓ Excavate all fill
    - ✓ Excavate upper 4 feet and replace with clean soil
    - ✓ Excavate 2 feet of fill material and replace with soil and asphalt cover
    - ✓ Installation of an engineered control cap
  - Town considered a mix of alternatives: expanding the hard surface, enlarging the baseball and soccer fields and installing an engineered control (a membrane with 2 feet of soil). The Park and Rec. Dept. wants feedback from the community on recreational improvements – tennis court, basketball court, splash pool, skateboard park, etc.

### **NAC Questions**

1. **Q: You said some groundwater flowed north. What contaminants did you detect in groundwater? How much?**  
**A:** Metals, including arsenic, are in the groundwater.
2. **Q: What would prevent continuing contamination in groundwater as a result of fill left in place?**  
**A:** The cap would prevent washing (leaching) of contaminants into groundwater.
3. **Q: Would the Town allow contaminated fill from the residential areas to be placed on the HMS site?**  
**A:** The Town wants feedback from the community but the DEP is the final decision maker on the remedy.

**4. Q: I'm concerned about the reports not addressing the whole picture. Each one ignores the other. Olin recommends disposing of contamination at the school. The RWA report does not talk about contaminated fill being brought onto the HMS property. We want the whole package. When will we have a comprehensive report that puts the reports and recommendations together?**

**A:** Each of the responsible parties had a specific area to study and make recommendations. DEP will be the final decision maker.

**DEP:** DEP has not completed its review of the reports. We do not necessarily agree with some of the recommendations. For example, we may not agree that phytoremediation is an appropriate remedy. We expect to finish our technical review in July.

**5. Q: Will DEP present its evaluation of the reports to the NAC?**

**A:** DEP will provide its evaluation of the studies to the NAC if the NAC members would like that.

**Discussion:** DEP will make a presentation at the July NAC meeting.

**6. Q: Has the Town already hired a consultant to study possible reuse of the HMS?**

**A:** No, a bid is being prepared.

**7. Q: Will the community have an opportunity to give input on the selection of the consultant? The community wants input into possible reuses of the building and development of the school. We want input into rebuilding Rochford Field so we can have a good mix of uses. We are concerned about the integrity of the neighborhood.**

**8. Q: What uses have been considered for replacement of the school?**

**A:** A magnet school has been mentioned. The consultant will look at all possible uses.

**NAC Comments:** The school could be used for another school, senior citizens, community activities, other things. We want input on how the school will be used.

**9. Q: You stated you did not test the groundwater at the Sewage Pump Station. How do you know if it is contaminated?**

**A:** We have a well down gradient of the Sewage Pump Station that shows the quality of the groundwater.

**10. Q: You talk about caps. How long do they last? What if standards change in the future? Do we have to clean up again? How long does the cap last? Who inspects and maintains them? What if something happens to the cap? Who pays?**

**A:** The cap is built to last.

**11. Q: If the DEP accepts your recommended cleanup, how long will it take to do it?**

**A:** Months, less than a year.

**12. Q: What are the health risks of leaving contamination in place?**

**13. Q: What are impacts to health caused by cleanup – dust, trucks, moving contaminated dirt?**

**Dept of Health:** If the NAC wants the DOH to address health concerns, we would put together a presentation for one of your meetings.

**Discussion:** DPH will make a presentation on health concerns related to past exposures, leaving contaminated fill in place and the excavation and transport of contaminated fill.

### **NAC Discussion/Comments**

- We're concerned about the replacement of the school and maintaining the integrity of the neighborhood.
- The community wants a comprehensive plan of cleanup and reuse. None of the recommended remedies address each other's recommendations or reuse of the school.
- The community wants input into the reuse of the building and/or development of the school and fields.
- The community wants input into how Rochford Field is rebuilt. We want to look at the best use of mixes for the community.
- The community does not want limitations on the future use of the school, the fields or the residential properties. If waste stays in place, there will be limits on uses and impacts on the community. If some waste stays, there will have to be compromises. We have always said we will not accept more waste going onto the school property. We want the waste removed out of our community.

Meeting adjourned at 9:05 pm.