

NEWHALL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Final Meeting Summary

August 18 , 2005

6:30 pm – 8:25 pm

Members Attending: Herman Alexander, Henry Blue, Dr. Abdul Hamid, Elizabeth Hayes, Scott Jackson, Pamala Moore, Henry Platt, Leonardo Melendez, Rep. Peter Villano, , Roosevelt Young

Alternates Attending: Willa Taylor

Absent: Pastor George Bulgin, Mike Colaiacovo, Sheila Epps, Donald Eaton, Luther Cooper, Rhonda Hayward, Loydon Henry-Phillip, Rev. Keith King, Deloris McNair, Carolyn Smith, LaNorma Webb

Facilitator: Kathleen Conway

Action Items

- Facilitator: email NAC request for technical assistance to Kevin Hood, ERI
- Facilitator: request technical assistance for NAC from Loureiro Engineering Associates, Inc. through DEP, including but not limited to questions on alternative remedies, structural engineering and cap design

Handouts

- Representative Peter Villano letter to the Commissioner
- Severson Environmental Services, Inc. Project Fact Sheets from residential neighborhoods: Spring Valley TCRA Arsenic Contaminated Properties. Washington, D.C.; U.S. Radium superfund site, Orange, New Jersey; Radium/U.S Radium Superfund Sites, Montclair, Glen Ridge, West Orange, New Jersey.
- Photos: residential remediation, Severson
- CT Department of Public Health: Hamden Newhall Neighborhood Survey
- DEP: Environmental Land Use Restriction Fact Sheet
[<http://www.dep.state.ct.us/pao/perdfact/elur.htm>]

Newhall Project Office

- Video: engineered cap at Raymark Superfund Site
- Figures: engineered control/cap at Raymark Superfund Site
- Updated Water-Quality Tables, HMS Site, July 6, 2005
- Addendum to March 31, 2005 Final Investigation and Remedial Evaluation Report, HMS Site, July 6, 2005. Dioxin and Furan Analyses at Hamden Middle School Site.

NAC Discussion on Alternative Remedies

NAC members viewed the video describing the cap at the Raymark Superfund Site. Representative Peter Villano spoke about his letter to the Commissioner describing the information and technical assistance that the NAC needs in order to evaluate the alternatives. He is scheduled to meet with the Commissioner next Monday.

The facilitator noted that Kevin Hood, Environmental Research Institute, University of Connecticut had indicated that ERI, under a grant from the TOSC Program, would provide technical assistance to the NAC upon the NAC's request. The Technical Outreach Services for Communities Program is an EPA sponsored program designed to provide technical assistance to Brownfields communities. NAC members asked that the request be emailed to ERI.

NAC members also wanted to know if technical assistance was available from Loureiro Engineering Associates, a contractor for DEP, on evaluation of the alternatives, especially with respect to questions on structural engineering concerns and cap design. DEP has indicated that Loureiro would be available to the NAC.

Some members discussed the possibility of having an independent consultant, one not previously associated with the Newhall Site and solely advising the NAC. They asked about the availability of monies from the \$1 million public participation fund approved by the legislature. Representative Villano stated that this was a state-wide fund to promote public participation projects.

Properties with up to 4 feet fill. Approximately 130 residential properties within the Consent Order have up to 4 feet of fill. There was general agreement that the fill on those properties should be completely removed. No caps or use restrictions would be acceptable. Some NAC members said that no one in the community that he has talked with wants any fill from the residential area to go to the Hamden Middle School. The NAC members generally agreed that contaminated fill from the residential area should not go to the Hamden Middle School site.

- NAC members stated that the health of the community was paramount in their consideration of the remedies.
- The goal of cleanup should be restoration to the "highest and best use."
- Cost should not be the deciding factor.
- Properties should have unrestricted use.
- Restrictions will not make the community whole.
- The Raymark cap video stressed the need for experienced workers to snowplow, maintain and do any repair work. At what cost? Who pays?
- The Raymark cap was on a commercial property designed for retail use, not in a residential area.
- People were told there would be no problems when homes and schools were built on Love Canal.
- The community is concerned about health impacts of residual contaminated fill.
- Long-term costs of O&M of caps should be compared with removal costs. What are the costs at Raymark?

Questions revolved around the appropriate disposal area for the fill.

- What is the toxicity of the fill? What determines where it can be disposed of? Why Michigan? Are there landfills in Hamden, in Connecticut or adjacent states that can accept the contaminated fill? NAC members mentioned the arsenic site in Washington D.C. and that the contaminated soil was disposed of in the area (see the Spring Valley arsenic site in handout above).

Properties with fill deeper than 4 feet. Approximately 90 homes within the Consent Order have been identified as having fill deeper than 4 feet. Members discussed remedial options.

- **Removal of 4 feet with an Environmental Land Use Restriction ("ELUR").**
 - Members questioned whether removal of more than 4 feet of fill, i.e., 8, 10 or 15 feet, would remove the restrictions that impact future use of the property. Are there sites where more than 4 feet but less than 25 feet have been removed?

- If a property with up to 4 feet of fill has the fill removed or has no fill and is adjacent to a property with fill deeper than 4 feet, what prevents leaching or settling of that property from impacting the clean property?
 - Are there vertical caps that prevent deeper contaminated soil from entering the walls of a basement or leachate from traveling from one property to another?
 - What is the impact of residual contaminated fill if there are cracks in the basement floor or walls?
 - What prevents someone from driving a stake beyond 4 feet? How would they know when they went beyond 4 feet? A marker would not be adequate unless there was excavation where the marker would be visible.
 - What would a warning layer or marker look like here?
 - How can the community be assured that restrictions will be protective when restrictions have not prevented digging in the area in the past. Recently, Public Works was digging up sidewalks without any obvious safety precautions at Newhall and Goodrich Streets, a known contaminated area. People were walking by; there was a lot dust. Residents who called and questioned the work were told Public Works did not need a permit.
- **Removing all fill.** Members discussed issues related to removing all fill, including whether it was possible and the structural impacts on homes. It was noted that contaminated fill still remained under the home.
 - Members questioned whether contaminants could leach through cracks in the basement.
- **Raising homes and removing all fill.**
 - Was the option of raising homes and removing all fill considered? A house at Newhall and Morse has already been moved.
 - Could older homes be raised?
 - Have homes been raised at other sites?
- **Individual Property Owners.**
 - What will happen if property owners do not agree to the selected remedy or environmental land use restriction? What if individual property owners do not agree to the remedy because they are concerned about impacts on their homes, for example, field stone foundations? Can and would properties be taken by eminent domain? It was noted that it would be unlikely that property owners would get fair market value if taken.

NAC members discussed a trailer park in Branford where an engineered control had just been installed. Members said it was not possible to talk about its success when it had just been installed. They asked to see the engineered control plan. Members felt there were too many open questions about: landfill disposal availability; what remedies were possible given age and condition of homes; how many homes had structural impacts or could have in the future that required demolition of those homes; the potential for movement of contaminants to adjacent properties or into homes if residual contamination; the costs and long-term maintenance of caps; and the impacts of land use restrictions on residential properties, future use of the Hamden Middle School and the community.

The NAC scheduled a NAC member only meeting on August 29th to continue discussion on remedies with technical consultants if available. The meeting adjourned at 8:25 pm.

Next Meeting. August 29, 2005, 6:30 to 8:30 pm, NAC member only discussion.