



FINAL AGENDA
EPAs Centredale Dialog Meeting
24 April 2006
Rhode Island Dept. of Environmental Management

Superfund Records Center
SITE: Centredale
BREAK: 13.11
OTHER: 253333

10:30 am Coffee for early arrivals

11:00 am Opening remarks

Review of agenda and groundrules
Review of EPA goals and hoped for outcome of the dialog
Introduction of participants

11:30 am Presentation of site results to date

Review of site investigation results including:
Description of contamination
Geographic boundaries of contamination
Review of EPA and PRP removal activities at this site to date
Location and/or potential migration of the contamination
Human health and ecological risk assessment findings
EPA conclusions and findings from the site investigation
Questions and discussion

12:30 Lunch: Individuals can bring or order out brown bag lunches

1:15 pm Discussion of EPA site results

1:45 pm Participating parties present their ideas

Local jurisdictions and other agencies describe their responsibilities at this site and their needs and interest regarding remedy selection
Participating parties are invited to discuss their needs and interests as this relates to a remedy selection at this site
Questions and discussion

2:45 pm Presentation of EPA remediation goals & remedy selection process

Presentation of EPAs remedy selection process and discussion of how this dialog fits into the ROD process
Review of criteria for remedy selection
Questions and discussion

3:30 pm Planning for next meeting

4:00 pm Adjourn

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY
31 May 2006
CENTREDALE DIALOG MEETING #1
RI DEM - Providence, RI

[prepared by Marion Cox, Facilitator, and reviewed by all participating parties]

WELCOME and INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

The meeting began shortly after 11:00 am at Rhode Island DEMs offices in Providence. US EPAs Project Manager, Anna Krasko welcomed all participants, and thanked everyone for their participation in the dialog.

The facilitator reviewed the agenda, EPAs goals for the Centredale dialog, and the dialog groundrules. Participants offered no additional comments on these items.

Next the facilitator restated the primary focus or purpose for this first meeting- namely to have EPA and its contractors lay out all the information gathered to date through the site investigation and related activities, and to answer questions from participants on both the information and EPAs analysis of this information. The facilitator noted that during interviews leading to this dialog, many of the participating parties indicated they wanted EPA to begin this dialog with a full presentation of their information and analysis. These parties noted that after this type of presentation and discussion, they would be more prepared to discuss alternative remedies.

The facilitator noted that EPA structured this first meeting to respond directly to this request for a review of data and site results to date. The Agency agreed to postpone any discussion of alternative remedies until the second meeting.

The facilitator reminded participants that this first dialog meeting would be focused exclusively on the RI results to date and that future dialog meetings will be focused on a discussion of the alternatives under consideration for remedial action. As a result, the facilitator urged participants to raise any issues or questions they might have about the scope and adequacy of the site investigation, as well as any questions they might have about the findings and conclusions to date at this meeting so that the discussion can move on to the Feasibility Study and alternatives under consideration at the upcoming meetings.

EPA SITE RESULTS TO DATE

As noted above, this session was intended to give all participants a common basis of understanding of the data and the findings at the site so that all parties can move into a discussion of remedy selection with a common base of information and understanding of EPAs conclusions thus far.

EPAs contractor team [Battelle] took the lead in presenting and summarizing the data, findings and conclusions of the site investigations to date for the Centredale site. After a brief review of the history of the site, the remainder of the presentation focused on the approach to data collection at this site; the results of the data collection, and the findings and conclusions of the site investigation to date, including information and conclusions on the ecological and human health risk assessments conducted at this site. [Please refer to the power point presentation slides you received at the meeting for a thorough review of the information presented.]

EPAs formal presentation concluded at lunch, and following lunch, the group entered into a

discussion of the presentation.

QUESTIONS and DISCUSSION on SITE RESULTS TO DATE

Participants were encouraged to raise any questions they had about the information being presented by EPA and its contractor team throughout the presentation. A range of issues and questions were raised by participants throughout the presentation. Many of these questions were questions of clarification, or questions requesting more details on a particular point that was made. In addition, there were a variety of questions from a few participants requesting more site information on specific topics.

The majority of the questions and comments concerned the following subjects:

- 1 .The potential effects of contaminants on human health and living organisms.
- 2 .The rain event of 2005 and its relevance to the site investigation data collection and findings.

ACTION ITEMS FROM THIS DISCUSSION

The only specific action item to come out of this part of the discussion was a commitment by EPAs contractors to identify as part of the FS the property owner(s) of the dams and the parties that will be responsible for maintaining the dams over the long-term.

PARTICIPATING PARTIES INTERESTS and NEEDS REGARDING A REMEDY

The next session of the dialog was designed to allow all participating parties to talk about their own needs and interests as this relates to a remedy for the Centredale site. The facilitator asked all parties to take as much time as they needed to share with the entire group what they need, want, or expect in terms of a remedy for this site. They were also asked to talk about their needs as these relate to this dialog.

The following is a sampling of the comments and ideas presented by participating parties. These comments are illustrative of what participants had to say and are not intended to be exhaustive. Neither the facilitator nor EPA staff felt qualified to try and characterize the specific comments of specific parties. Among the interests and themes expressed during this session were the following:

An appreciation of the process and working relationship with EPA and RIDEM at this project and an interest in continuing the dialog in an open and transparent way.

Interest in a remedy that is protective of public health and the environment, including the fishery resource that the river represents.

Interest in a remedy that results in the signs and fences coming down and provides a safe environment, returns people to the river and opens access to the recreational activities that it affords and which includes a long term monitoring component.

Interest in EPA telling the public what it is doing and when, and giving the public an opportunity for them to participate in the remedy selection process.

Interest in a remedy that complements other efforts being made to reclaim the river as an economic, natural, and recreational resource.

An understanding that the Centredale Manor Restoration Project remedy is not expected to solely make the river fishable and swimmable, there is an interest in the remedy decision complimenting the other efforts underway on the Woonasquatucket River, a recognized American Heritage River, and move the river in the direction of this fishable, swimmable goal.

Interest in considering the impact of the dams both upstream and downstream of the site and the effect that the potential future failure of any of the dams might have on the remedy selection and design.

EPA REMEDIATION GOALS AND EPA REMEDY SELECTION PROCESS

Anna Krasko, EPA's site project manager began this session by presenting the 9 criteria that EPA must use in selecting any remedy for any Superfund site. These criteria include: threshold criteria, primary balancing criteria, and modifying criteria.

She went on to highlight the last 2 criteria - the modifying criteria including state acceptance, and community acceptance. She reminded participants that one of the primary purposes EPA initiated this dialog was because the Agency and the case team wanted to review and consider these last two modifying criteria at the same time that the agency was reviewing and considering the five balancing criteria. She noted that from her perspective as Project Manager, the results of this dialog would mean that community and stakeholder considerations would be reviewed and considered earlier in the ROD decision making process.

Next, EPA made a presentation of the more technical and scientific remedy selection criteria that will be directly related to this particular Superfund site. Cornell Rosiu presented An Overview of EPA Contaminated Sediment Remediation guidance and the criteria that EPA will evaluate when making a remedy selection.

A limited number of questions were raised following Cornells presentation, and Cornell responded to these items.

DISCUSSION OF A NEXT DIALOG MEETING

Following the conclusion of the session on EPA remediation goals, the facilitator asked the parties to provide some initial input into the content and timing for a next dialog meeting.

Content of Dialog Meeting #2

The facilitator reminded the parties that future meetings would focus on the feasibility study and the alternatives under consideration for a remedy at this site as previously agreed upon. Several ideas were presented as likely topics for a next meeting including:

- EPA presentation and review of Remedial Action Objectives
- EPA presentation of the remedies currently under consideration
- EPA discussion of the current timeline for completion of the FS
- [As time allows] discussion of alternatives

During this agenda-building discussion, one participant noted that she would need answers from EPA to many of the questions raised at this first meeting in order to feel prepared to participate fully in a discussion of alternative remedies. Several others around the table concurred that they also wanted more information, particularly more information related to the flood event questions

raised earlier in the meeting.

EPA and its contractors acknowledged that they had heard and recorded the comments and questions raised throughout the meeting. EPA noted that some of the items raised were already being addressed by EPA and its contractors, that other items would likely be addressed as work on the Feasibility Study continues. Additionally EPA noted that in some instances, issues and questions raised might not be addressed because the Agency could decide they were not critical or important in making a remedy selection- based on what is already known about this site. This discussion proceeded for several more minutes and revealed different expectations among several of the parties, including EPA, about how EPA would handle the questions raised throughout the day.

EPA responded with its desire to move forward with the 2nd meeting and noted that it did not think that it was necessary to answer all of the questions in order to be able to move forward with a second meeting and that participants could still provide helpful information to the Agency through the questions raised and from the comments received.

Timing for a next dialog meeting

Participants held different views on timing and length of a next meeting. The facilitator and EPA will continue to work with participants to determine the schedule for the next meeting.

ATTACHMENTS

PROPOSED MEETING GROUNDRULES

These groundrules are designed to help guide the parties in productive discussions during this dialog. Once the groundrules have been reviewed and approved by all participants, the facilitator will enforce the groundrules and will seek the support of the entire group in this effort.

- The Centredale dialog is designed to be an informal gathering of interested parties who want to share information and perspectives on issues identified by EPA for discussion.
- Participants are requested to stay focused on, and limit discussion to, the issues identified [i.e., remediation options for the site] for this dialog.
- The facilitator will attempt to ensure that all participants have adequate opportunity to participate in each discussion topic. If any party, or group of parties, seeks to dominate the discussion, the facilitator will move to ensure that all parties are able to effectively contribute to the discussion.
- Participants are requested to listen and consider the opinions of others in an effort to ensure a constructive discussion, and to remain courteous to each other throughout the discussions staying focused on issues not on people or personalities.
- Participants can discuss their own comments and participation in this dialog; however, no participant should attempt to quote or otherwise characterize the comments of any other participant. Specific comments are not for attribution unless those comments are your own.
- This dialog will not include any discussion of potential settlements or other communications between EPA and the known potentially responsible parties [PRPs] as such issues are outside the scope of this dialog, and inappropriate for public discussion.
- The facilitator will capture the key points made during the meeting and prepare a summary of each meeting. There will be no formal transcript of this dialog.
- Members of the public are welcome to attend.

CENTREDALE MANOR DIALOG
April 26, 2006 Meeting Participants

Elected Officials

Tim Mooney
US Senator Lincoln Chafee's Office
170 Westminster Street - Suite 1100
Providence, RI 02903
401-453-5083
timothy.mooney@chafee.senate.gov

Frank Bursie, Assistant to the Mayor
Mayor Ralph Mollis's Office
Town of North Providence
2000 Smith Street
North Providence, RI 02911
401-231-0096
fbursie@northprovidenceri.com

Alan Brodd
Mayor William Macera's Office
City of Johnston
Johnston Town Hall
1385 Hartford Ave.
Johnston, RI 02919
401-231-4000
abrodd@johnston-ri.us

Government Agency Reps

Anna Krasko, Project Manager
USEPA Region 1 - New England
1 Congress St., Suite 1100
Boston, MA 02114
617-918-1232
krasko.anna@epa.gov

Mike Jasinski, Section Chief
USEPA Region 1 - New England
1 Congress St., Suite 1100
Boston, MA 02114
617-918-1354
jasinski.mike@epa.gov

Cornell Rosiu, Risk Assessor
USEPA Region 1 - New England
1 Congress St., Suite 1100
Boston, MA 02114
617-918-1345
rosiu.cornell@epa.gov

Eve Vaudo, Attorney
USEPA Region 1 - New England
1 Congress St., Suite 1100
Boston, MA 02114
617-918-1089
vaudo.eve@epa.gov

Ellie Tonkin, EPA ADR Program
US EPA Region 1 – New England
1 Congress St., Suite 1100
Boston, MA 02114
617-918-1726
tonkin.elissa@epa.gov

Angela Bonarrigo, Community Relations
USEPA Region 1 - New England
1 Congress St., Suite 1100
Boston, MA 02114
617-918-1034
bonarrigo.angela@epa.gov

EPA Technical Consultants:

Deirdre Dahlen, Project Manager, Battelle
Norm Richardson, Ecological Risk Assessor, Battelle
Mark Otten, Engineer, Battelle
Mike Murphy, Human Health Risk Assessor, MACTEC
Lisa Leskovitz, Project Manager for contract with US Army Corps of Engineers
Theresa Himmer, Geologist, Battelle

Robert Vanderslice
RI Dept. of Public Health
Environmental Health Risk Assessment
Three Capitol Hill - Room 208
Providence, RI 02908
401-222-7766
bobv@doh.state.ri.us

Louis Maccarone, Engineer
RI Dept. of Environmental Management
Office of Waste Management
235 Promenade Street - Suite 380
Providence, RI 02908
401-222-2797x7142
louis.maccarone@dem.ri.gov

Matt DeStephano, Supervising Engineer
RI Dept. of Environmental Management
Office of Waste Management
235 Promenade Street - Suite 380
Providence, RI 02908
401-222-2797 x7141
matthew.destefano@dem.ri.gov

Ken Finkelstein
NOAA Resource Trust Delegate
c/o EPA Region 1
1 Congress Street HIO
Boston, MA 02114
617-918-1499
ken.finkelstein@noaa.gov

Ken Munney
US FW Resource Trust Delegate
New England Field Office US FWS
US DOI
79 Commercial Street - Suite 300
Concord, NH 03301-5087
603-223-2541
kenneth_munney@fws.gov

Organized Interest Groups

Jenny Pereira
WRWC
532 Kinsley Ave.
Providence, RI 02909
401-861-9046
jpereira@woonasquatucket.org

Jane Sherman
WRWC
532 Kinsley Ave.
Providence, RI 02909
401-861-3313
shermanjcb@aol.com

Eugenia Marks
Audubon Society of RI
12 Sanderson Rd.
Smithfield, RI 02917
401-949-5454
emarks@asri.org

Potentially Responsible Parties

R. Howard Grubbs
[Represents Ciba]
Womble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice, PLLC
P.O. Box 10208
Greenville, SC 29603-0208
864 255-5413
HGrubbs@wcsr.com

David Graham
[Represents CNA Holdings]
Kaufman and Canoles, PC
4801 Courthouse Street - Suite 300
Williamsburg, VA 23188
757-259-3855
dbgraham@kaufcan.com

Jerome C. Muys
[Represents Emhart Industries, Inc.]
Bingham McCutchen LLP
3000 K Street, NW Suite 300
Washington, DC 20007-5116
202-424-7547
jerome.muys@bingham.com

Jeff Karp
[Represents Emhart Industries, Inc.]
Bingham McCutchen LLP
3000 K Street, NW Suite 300
Washington, DC 20007-5116
202-373-6781
Jeff.karp@bingham.com

Gregory Benik
[Represents Teknor Apex]
Nixon Peabody LLP
One Citizens Plaza, #500
Providence, RI 02903
gbenik@nixonpeabody.com