

5 July 2006

MEMORANDUM

TO: Centredale Dialog Participants
FROM: Marion Cox - Facilitator
RE: Centredale Dialog Meeting #3

Hello to everyone. Attached is a final agenda for our meeting on July 12, 2006 in Providence, and the final meeting summary from Dialog Meeting #2 held on June 7, 2006.

I received several comments on the draft agenda for our upcoming meeting. Some parties wondered if we had enough time allocated to discuss EPA's remedial alternatives, and others wondered if we had enough time to fully discuss the dam removal alternative. Additionally, several parties are coming prepared to make formal presentations or remarks on some of the issues raised during our second meeting. My approach to address these comments about "timing" is to be flexible in managing the meeting. I will check back throughout the course of the meeting to seek the group's input on when we need to move onto new topics or when we need to spend more time on specific topics. We hope this responds to your comments.

We also want to ask parties to come to the July 12, 2006 meeting prepared to discuss the idea of additional meetings - after our July 12, 2006 meeting. Some parties have already expressed a desire to continue meeting in order to fully discuss alternatives that EPA might be moving forward into detailed analysis as part of the Agency's FS. [Some parties have noted that August meeting dates are "out" for them as they are away during August. So, please check your availability as well for this discussion.]

Thanks and here is a reminder of our NEW meeting location for the July 12, 2006 meeting:

Courtyard Providence Downtown Salon C
32 Exchange Terrace at Memorial Blvd
Providence, RI

Telephone: 401-272-1191

Toll Free: 888-887-7955

Fax: 401-272-1416

Additional information and directions from the Providence airport and from the Boston area can be found by clicking on the attached link and scrolling down:

<http://marriott.com/property/mapandnearbyairports/default.mi?marshaCode=pvddt>



FINAL AGENDA [7/5/06]
CENTREDALE DIALOG MEETING #3
July 12, 2006
Providence, Rhode Island

Goal for meeting #3: The primary goal for the third Dialog meeting is for participants to raise questions, comment on, and engage in an in-depth discussion of the proposed remedies under consideration by the Agency for the Centredale site.

10:00 am Introductory remarks

- Review of agenda and meeting #2 action items
- Adoption of meeting summary from Meeting #2

10:15 am EPA follow-up on 2nd meeting

- Recap by EPA of how the questions, input, and comments from participants are important in helping EPA focus on a preferred alternative for this site, and how some of the specific questions and comments are being used.

10:30 am Parties present their ideas, needs, goals, questions related to remediation for this site

11:30 am More detailed presentation of a dam removal alternative

- Presentation on dam removal alternative
- Questions and discussion

12:00 pm LUNCH

1:00 pm Detailed discussion of the dam removal alternative

- Discussion on dam removal alternative continues as needed

1:45 pm Discussion of [other] remedial alternatives under consideration

- Questions and facilitated discussion of other alternatives

2:45 pm BREAK

3:00 pm Discussion of remedial alternatives [continued]

- Questions and facilitated discussion of alternatives continues

3:45 pm Review ideas for a next meeting

4:00 pm ADJOURN

FINAL Meeting Summary
[as revised on July 5, 2006]
CENTREDALE DIALOG Meeting #2
7 June 2006
RI DEM - Providence, RI

[prepared by Marion Cox, facilitator 6/15/06; reviewed by EPA case team 6/20/06; comments received from participants through 7/5/06.]

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

The meeting began shortly after 10:00 am at Rhode Island DEMs offices in Providence. The facilitator welcomed all participants, and thanked everyone for their patience in waiting for the meeting to begin - some participants were late due to rainy weather.

The facilitator reviewed the agenda, EPAs goals for the second dialog meeting and offered participants a last chance to make any comments or suggested changes to the meeting summary for the first Dialog meeting. Participants offered one additional comment on the meeting summary and the facilitator noted the comment would be incorporated into the final meeting summary document.

Next the facilitator restated the primary focus or purpose for this second meeting: EPAs presentation and participant discussion of the remedial alternatives currently under consideration by the Agency. Participants were offered a chance to suggest changes to the agenda - no comments were received.

EPA OVERVIEW OF ALTERNATIVES UNDER CONSIDERATION

The facilitator introduced Anna Krasko, EPA Project Manager for the Centredale site.

Anna began her remarks by telling participants how EPA has already begun using some of the comments and questions received during the first Dialog meeting. She focused her remarks on how EPA has been addressing the several comments made by participants regarding the October 2005 flood event. For example, EPA and its contractor team went back to the US Geological Survey web site to confirm the most current and verified data on that flood event. EPAs contractors were able to confirm that the computer models being used to evaluate the effectiveness of various alternatives under consideration do, in fact, take into account a flood event as bad, or worse, than the flood event of October 2005. EPA emphasized that these types of comments, by participants, are proving helpful to the Agency as work continues to narrow the range of alternatives for more detailed analysis.

After EPAs remarks, one participant noted that the storm drains were also affected by the October 2005 floods. The Town of N. Providence responded that the State and the Town have consulted each other over responsibility for maintaining the storm drains and that in future the State of Rhode Island will assume full responsibility for maintenance. [The State of Rhode Island Site Project Manager was not present at the June 7, 2006 meeting, and upon review of this draft

meeting summary requested that this statement be attributed only to the Town of N. Providence. The State would like more information as to the specific State staff person who accepted this responsibility on behalf of the State, and any additional information that the Town of N. Providence can provide.]

Next, Anna provided a brief overview of the process and actions EPA has taken leading up to an identification of the remedies currently under consideration by the Agency. She briefly reviewed the Agency's key findings from the site investigation including the Agency's key areas of concern regarding contamination and the RAOs.

Several questions were raised about whether or not EPA had taken real measurements on contamination in fish [e.g., at Allendale, Lyman Mill and Greystone] or had the Agency simply relied upon the calculated or modeled amount of contamination that should be found in fish. EPA noted that real measurements had been taken. Several participants noted they raise these questions because they believe that some residents still eat fish from the river.

Next, Anna briefly reviewed the NCP evaluation criteria - the factors that EPA must use as the basis for identifying options for remediation at this site. Following a few questions from participants on the availability of documents related to the site investigation, EPA agreed to make a list of site documents available to all participants.

Overview presentation of remedial alternatives under consideration

Anna introduced EPA's contractor, Deirdre Dahlen of Battelle, who presented the range of alternatives under consideration by EPA at this site. [Please refer to the presentation slides for a detailed outline of the presentation.]

At the beginning of the presentation, Deirdre emphasized a couple of points that apply to all alternatives under consideration:

- EPA considers the whole pond as the footprint that requires remediation. In other words, all alternatives under consideration by EPA include remediating the entire pond - not just some portions of the pond.
- Roughly 110,000 cubic yards of material need to be disposed of from the 2 ponds.
- EPA needs to find an area big enough to handle this volume of material.

Examples of questions raised during the discussion of alternatives:

- Did EPA consider sharing a space where other contaminated sediment is also being stored/placed [e.g., from other Superfund sites in the region]?
- Did EPA examine other dioxin incineration sites?
- What is the difference between dredging and excavation in these alternatives?
- Why is dredging no longer being considered as an option?
- Why did EPA rule out the 6-inch layer cap?
- How many years does long-term monitoring continue and what types of institutional controls are effective for 30+ years?

- How does EPA ensure that soft sediments don't travel or migrate further downstream during the period of remedial construction? [i.e., while the excavation and de-watering parts of construction are occurring].
- Why did EPA rule out monitored natural recovery or enhanced recovery?
- How did EPA consider the environmental impacts from moving and depositing contaminated soil sediments to a new location?
- What is more disruptive - moving contaminated soils somewhere new or simply capping contaminated soils in place?
- Is EPA applying flood storage recovery capacity equally among all alternatives?
- Are some alternatives too costly and too much effort for the result they will provide?

DISCUSSION FOLLOWING EPA PRESENTATION OF ALTERNATIVES

Next, the facilitator asked all participants to offer any comments, further questions, or even new ideas about alternatives - that were not presented as part of EPA's overview of alternatives under consideration.

Representatives of one of the PRPs offered the broad outline of an alternative that would eliminate the existing dams; cap some of the contamination in place; and create a new channel for the river. Several other participants offered comments, questions, and their perspectives on this type of an alternative. A robust discussion of this idea and related questions continued for about 45 minutes.

As the meeting drew to an end, the facilitator thanked all participants for their active participation in the discussion of alternatives.

The facilitator turned the meeting back to Anna Krasko of EPA. Anna emphasized that EPA is expecting participants to come to the next meeting prepared to:

- Ask more detailed questions, if necessary, about EPA's proposed alternatives
- Present their own ideas of different alternatives [similar to the discussion that began at the end of this meeting with the outline of a new alternative by one of the PRP representatives].
- Present the key elements or considerations that they [or the constituents they represent] need or want to see in any remedy that is ultimately selected by EPA for this site.
- Present any related ideas and considerations.

Anna also reminded participants that the purpose of this dialog is, in part, to seek discussion on and the perspective(s) of the participating parties on how EPA should be narrowing the range of alternatives the Agency will carry forward for a more detailed analysis in the Feasibility Study.

The facilitator reminded participants that she is available to assist any party who might want time on the agenda for the July dialog meeting, or to provide any related process assistance the parties might need in order to fully and meaningfully participate in the next meeting.

Participants were reminded that the next meeting is on July 12, 2006 again in Providence at the RI DEM Offices.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:50 pm.

ACTION ITEMS

Several action items were identified during the course of the meeting:

- EPA agreed to make an index of released site documents and recent reports available to all participants by email [Angela B. by 6/15/06] ✓
- EPA will answer the question raised [by Eugenia Marks] about the Biowall alternative and the related questions about the contaminants of concern by media. [Angela B. by 6/15/06] ✓
- EPA will send out an email containing the links to websites which Norm Richards of Battelle suggested participants might want to view for information on "dam removal." [Angela B. by 6/20/06] ✓
- Before the July 12th meeting, EPA will forward websites or related information referenced by Ken Munney of the US FWS regarding additional information on dam removals at other projects. [Angela B, prior to 12 July 2006] ✓
- EPA Finalize October 2005 Storm Report Letter ✓
- EPA Make CD Rom of Reports Available at July Mtg ✓
- Re issuing the report on the October 2005 flood
- Received many additional questions & comments since the last meeting & we are bringing them into our thinking as we continue the detailed analysis of the alternatives.