NEWHALL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Meeting Summary
August 29, 2005
6:30 pm – 8:40 pm

Members Attending: Herman Alexander, Henry Blue, Sheila Epps, Donald Eaton, Dr. Abdul Hamid, Elizabeth Hayes, Rhonda Hayward, Pamala Moore, Henry Platt, Rep. Peter Villano, Roosevelt Young

Alternates Attending: Willa Taylor

Absent: Pastor George Bulgin, Mike Colaiacovo, Luther Cooper, Loydon Henry-Phillip, Rev. Keith King, Scott Jackson, Deloris McNair, Leonardo Melendez, Carolyn Smith, LaNorma Webb

Facilitator: Kathleen Conway

Action Items for the September 15, 2005 Meeting

- The NAC requests a "plain language" summary report of all the impacted properties including those outside the Consent Order.
- The NAC requests a calculation and figure showing what 175,000 cy of fill would look like at the proposed Hamden Middle School site, including the extent and slope in comparison with surrounding ground levels.
- The NAC would like the number of truck trips anticipated for : 1) removal of the 175,000 cy of fill; 2) replacement of clean fill; and, 3) other construction related activities.
- For the non-public parties area, the NAC requests a description of the specific remedial actions and restoration activities being proposed on a property by property basis.

NAC Request Items from the July 21, 2005 NAC Meeting.

The NAC needs the following information prior to the September 15, 2005 NAC meeting to assist them in understanding the extent of the area and the properties impacted and in implementing outreach to the community and feedback to the DEP:

- Written summary of the DEP review of the Supplemental Investigations to date
- Written report of the DEP investigation conducted outside the Consent Order and additional testing within the Consent Order
- Figure showing all the fill/contamination impacted properties, including those within and outside the Consent Order, and those with structural damage; and a master list of property addresses consistent with the figure.
- List of those property owners who were identified by DEP and DPH as having contaminated fill over the standard but under the immediate response levels.

NAC Discussion on Alternative Remedies with Kevin Hood, ERI; and Brian Cutler, Loureiro Engineering Associates

Questions and Discussion. The discussion was informal and interactive. The following is merely a summary of the discussion.

Residential Properties with up to 4 feet of fill.

- **How many properties are impacted?**

Consultants. *There are a*pproximately 130 **residential** properties within the Consent Order area. Other **residential** properties outside the Consent Order are being investigated in the areas south of Goodrich towards New Haven, up Morse towards Prospect Street and towards Dixwell west of St Mary's Street. Most of the homes investigated outside the consent order that have fill, have under 4 feet of fill.

Commercial properties are **not** being investigated by DEP. Typically, commercial property owners must do their own investigation. Some, like SNET, are conducting investigations.

NAC Question. Homes west of the Jewish cemetery on Alling Street have been sampled. Has the cemetery been sampled? Graves are still being dug and people attend the burial and plant flowers. Neighbors may also be exposed by airborne dust.

NAC Question. There were Winchester tunnels to Leader Hill. Do they still exist? Will they impact remedy?

Consultants. Will check on these issues.

- **What is the Responsible Party's recommended remedy for the non-public properties?**

Consultants. Remove up to 4 feet of fill in the non-public properties area and the placement of that fill on the Middle School parcel for future capping.

- **What is the long-term impact of the proposed remedy for the non-public properties with fill up to 4 feet?**

Consultants. The objective of the proposed remedy is to eliminate the potential for contact with contaminated fill material by removing all fill up to 4 feet. No fill will be left on these properties.

- **What is the construction impact of the proposed remedy for the non-public properties with up to 4 feet of fill?** Trees, shrubs, fences and sidewalks would have to be removed and the property would then be restored.

Loureiro Consultant. The proposed remedy does not include removing fill from under the streets or replacing roads. Leaving fill in place may require an institutional control (environmental land use restriction). The ELUR is not a prohibition on development; it ensures that a soil management plan be developed to address any soils disturbed during construction and that properly trained workers perform the work.

Road Issues: NAC members complained that the roads are very bad now citing cracks, potholes and sinkholes and particularly Shelton and Bryant Terrace Streets. They complained that when the Town does sidewalk and road repair, there does not appear to be any safeguards for preventing direct contact of workers or residents living or passing in the area of construction. It is just as important to have coordination between the Town and the DEP now as it is promised in the future.

Consultants. Engineers can design and build good roads on top of fill. The problem may be that the roads that exist now were not properly constructed and simply repaving them may not solve the problem.

- **What is the construction impact on the homes?** NAC members questioned about damage to the homes or other structures, i.e., garages, sheds, driveways; and, about relocation, dust control, truck traffic, lack of compensation for inconvenience and inadequate compensation for temporary relocation.

  Consultants. Engineers will evaluate each home to determine structural integrity and to design a soil removal plan that will be protective of the home. If any damage occurs, the structure would be repaired. Trucks and other traffic will have to be rerouted during construction. Dust control measures will be in place.

- **What is the potential for migration of contaminants to a clean property that had 4 feet of fill removed from an adjoining property with over 4 feet that has not been removed?** NAC members questioned whether a vertical cap preventing leaching of soil contaminants to a clean property was considered or should be considered. Will the contaminants in soil attenuate [decrease naturally]?

  Consultants. If the contaminants are water soluble and are present below the water table, impacted groundwater could affect downgradient properties. Lead typically does not move in water. Soil contaminants do not move unless transported by water. There are only a very few locations within the study area where groundwater is located within 4 feet of the ground surface. The one area that Brian Cutler was aware of was the northern portion of the Middle School site which is not part of the non-public parties area.

Residential Properties with over 4 feet of fill.(Approximately 90 residential properties)

- **Proposed Remedy.** Remove 4 feet of fill and an Environmental Land Use Restriction (ELUR) on the property. The parcels will be left with fill, but at depths below 4 feet. The proposed remedy is based on the assumption that an ELUR will be recorded to prevent contact with the underlying fill materials. This will be recorded on the land deed for each parcel with fill remaining at depths below 4 feet.

- **What prevents leaching or migrating of the remaining deeper fill?**

  Consultants. The two goals of the proposed remedy are to: 1) prevent exposure by direct contact; and 2) prevent impact on the groundwater. Removal of 4 feet plus an Environmental Land Use Restriction prevents direct contact. The houses act as caps that prevent contact with the underlying soils. Presently there is not an impermeable cap proposed for the residential properties area. LEA and the DEP are presently reviewing the soil and groundwater chemistry data to assess whether or not an impermeable cap is necessary to protect underlying groundwater. If it is shown to be protective, the remedy as proposed would be technically appropriate for the non-public properties. Caps are being proposed for Mill Rock Park and Rochford Field.

  Why only 4 feet? The regulations identify compliance as removal of 2 feet under pavement or 4 feet under non-paved areas such as grass.
  Why not remove more than 4 feet? From a scientific perspective, an engineer looks at environmental benefit versus cost. The additional cost of removing 4 feet does not necessarily provide increased environmental benefit. Removing fill located beneath groundwater is feasible, but the additional cost may not be prudent. Is it a reasonable and fair remedy from a technical view? Yes, but the consultants would not comment on social or economic impacts or benefits.

  Why not a cap at 4 feet to prevent impact on groundwater or as a marker? If the contaminants could impact groundwater, a cap will be designed to prevent water from going through the cap. If the

contaminants are not the type that impact groundwater, a marker or mat that allows drainage but is a warning not to dig further is an option. There are many different types of caps – high density polyethylene (plastic); clay, a structure, pavement, etc. There may be several levels to a cap, for example, top soil, drainage area of sand, low permeability cap over the waste.

Groundwater. The impacted groundwater is small in relation to the extent of the fill. The most impacted groundwater is at the Hamden Middle School site where the impacted fill is located at or below the groundwater table. While groundwater is relatively shallow at about 4 feet at the northern portion of the Middle School, it is 20-25' deep towards the west. There is no remedy to remove impacted fill in groundwater in the non-public parties area.

Does groundwater reclassification from GA to GB make it easier for the responsible parties to cleanup at less cost?

Consultants. Generally, the GB classification is 10x the level of contaminants allowed in a GA area. GB precludes use of public or private drinking water wells. This area, as is in many other towns, is provided with a public drinking water supply. The reclassification to GB does not necessarily make remediation less expensive; it may be appropriate from a future planning purpose so that no one installs a public or private drinking water supply well.

- **What is the impact of removing all the fill?**

Consultants. It would require demolition of all 90 properties. The excavation holes would have to be dewatered. Is it physically and technically possible? Yes. Does it benefit the environment? If there is an impact on groundwater quality, then it may have a benefit. LEA and DEP are presently evaluating soil and groundwater chemistry data to assess whether or not there is a measurable impact on groundwater quality associated with the fill.

NAC members discussed the impact on the community of removing 90 homes. They looked at the Malcolm Pirnie Remedial Alternatives Map, Sheet 10 of 10 showing the properties colored pink.

- **What is impact of leaving homes on or putting new homes on remaining fill up to 20 feet?**

Consultants. Some homes already have structural damage. Engineering solutions can be designed to correct the problem and stop future settling problems. The basic questions are: can you fix the structural problems; can you stop settlement; at what cost. The homeowner will have to be consulted to answer those questions and will play a significant role in the evaluation. Wood homes weigh less and need less structural support. One engineering option that has been proposed uses anchors at depth near the footings or deeper that balance weight of the structure. This may not be the most effective solution. If the remediation plan currently proposed were performed, an excavation of 4 feet deep around each house would be performed. Additional excavation and replacement of the foundation may be a better solution. However, as stated, a house by house evaluation will have to be performed.

One home with difficult cracks was discussed. Can structural repair be done? Yes. You can engineer any solution. The issue is cost to retrofit versus a new home. Each property will have its own remedy.

Replacement homes can be placed on residual fill areas. If an existing house had to be demolished and removing another 4 feet would correct the problem for a replacement house, the costs and benefits of engineering remedies versus soil removal would have to be considered.

NAC members emphasized that it is difficult to talk about a general remedy acceptable to most or all the people when they do not know what impact this will have on their property. Their opinions may be different when they know how it will impact them individually.

- **What would the impact of disposal of 4 feet of residential fill at the Hamden Middle School look like?**

  Consultants. The quantity of excavated fill is estimated at 175,000 cy. The NAC requests a calculation and figure showing what it would look like including the extent and the slope in comparison with surrounding ground levels.

- **Where are other off-site disposal area and what are the acceptance criteria?**

  Consultants. There are less expensive disposal areas than Michigan. The Responsible Party used the most conservative cost per ton and it appears that an assumption was made that the waste would be hazardous. Non-hazardous waste disposal prices are currently $55 - $65/ton but the market changes very rapidly. It is reasonable to assume that most of the fill would be non-hazardous. One exception would be PCB contaminated fill present at the Middle School site.

- **How long would the proposed remedy for the non-public properties take?**

  Consultants: It would take approximately 2 –3 years to complete.