

New Bedford
13.4
221347**October 20, 1997 New Bedford Forum Meeting Minutes****Overview:**

The group was reminded by the Facilitator and the EPA of the context and objectives to consider while reviewing the different remedial alternatives during the upcoming consensus building meetings:

1. The object of the next series of meetings will be to discuss different technologies and build a consensus around a technology decision that all members can live with.
2. Although three technologies were tested, the Forum can choose from a variety of options for the cleanup of the hot spot. However, if the group is unable to make a decision, it will fall to the agencies to pick one.
3. Any decision will be reviewed by EPA Headquarters. With this in mind, cost needs to be considered along with all other criteria. The cleanup choice can not be significantly out of sync with other cleanup technologies and costs around the country. The possibility exists that the responsible parties could challenge the decision based on the cost.

EPA Presentations:**Description of the Remedial Alternatives:**

Foster Wheeler presented a general statement and description on all of the remedial alternatives that need to be looked at in order to make a final decision. Descriptions are available in the library or can be mailed out.

Comparative Analysis of Remedial Alternatives:

EPA presented a comparative analysis of remedial alternatives to the group which overviewed the nine criteria which need to be evaluated when choosing a cleanup. It was emphasized to the panel that all of the criteria need to be thoroughly considered in future consensus building discussions. A list of the nine criteria was provided to forum members before the October meeting and is still available.

Discussion:

1. Forum members expressed their grave concerns regarding the role of incineration in the cleanup decision and what members are willing to support continues to be a critical concern.

2. The group agreed on a framework for future consensus building discussions. Agreement was reached that EPA and Foster Wheeler will prepare a worksheet to be used by the Forum members to evaluate the different remedial alternatives. It is the facilitator's hope that forum members will have the worksheet prior to the next meeting.
3. The group agreed on an expedited schedule for trying to reach consensus on a cleanup technology before the end of the year. The schedule is: November 6, November 17, December 1, and December 8. All meetings are at the Vocational Technical School and begin at 6 pm.
4. The group requested, and EPA agreed to provide an accounting of the fund that is available from the private responsible parties at the November 6th meeting.
5. EPA made clear that while cost is important; it will be considered in the context of cleanup technologies and costs across the country as well as the distinctive characteristics of this site. The group was instructed to make a decision with the understanding that the final decision will need to meet nine criteria of which cost is one.
6. The group agreed on a process to maintain the integrity of the Seachange panel members with regard to the technology.

Updates:

1. ROD 2: EPA's report on the hot spot dredging operations will be available within a few weeks and a ROD on OU 2 should be completed in the next few months.
2. Dredging Subcommittee: The dredging subcommittee has had meetings with concerned parties on August 21 and September 22, 1997. Topics of the meetings included: the CZM port planning process; linkage of navigational dredging to the Superfund process; what the navigational dredging needs are; how to determine the dredging amounts for New Bedford and Fairhaven; and the coordination needs of the process. The subcommittee will continue to meet during the planning process and dredging.