

13.4.25

**New Bedford Harbor Superfund Forum
Meeting
July 25, 1995
6:00 p.m.
Greater New Bedford
Vocational High School**

Superfund meeting is done.
SITE: NEW BEDFORD
BREAK: 13.04
OTHER: 47582

AGENDA

- Status of treatability studies

- Status of dredging

- Soccer field developments

- Phase 2 ROD discussion
 - Canvass of interests, concerns
 - Tom Meyers of Army Corps of Engineers on CDF's

- Old business

- New business

- Next meeting

Summary of Meeting Held July 25, 1995
on the New Bedford Harbor Superfund Forum

In attendance at the session were:

Facilitators

Michael Keating
Jane Wells

HATR

Steve Cassidy
Jim Simmons
Barry Starr

Concerned Parents of Fairhaven

Claudia Kirk

New Bedford City Council

George Rogers

DEP

Paul Craffey
Helen Waldorf

New Bedford Harbor Development

Commission

Martin Manley

Downwind Coalition

Neal Balboni
Diana Cobbold

New Bedford Mayor's Office

Scott Alfonse

EPA

Cindy Catri
Frank Ciavattieri
David Dickerson
Harley Laing
Kristine Laumeyer

NOAA

Ken Finklestein
Marguerite Matera

State Elected Officials

Rep. Bill Straus

Wampanoag Tribe

Billy Monteiro

Approximately ten members of the public observed the meeting, which was videotaped for subsequent broadcast on local cable television.

David Dickerson of EPA reported that a request for proposals (RFP) for bench scale treatability studies went out on July 6, with a response date of August 9. The pilot scale RFP went out on July 25, with a response date of August 21.

The dredging committee reported some mid-June spikes in air monitor readings, apparently attributable to maintenance work on the CDF cover at the Sawyer Street site. As of July 18, 83.6% of the hot spot dredging was done, with a completion date set for September 1. Dredging in Area A, bordering on the High Voltage Line or cable crossing, has presented some problems, but discussions with the utility company are underway. Arrangements have been made for dredging the area, while leaving a 50' corridor on either side of the cable. Dredging of the cable crossing area itself will be postponed until Phase 2.

Construction of the soccer field designed to compensate for the field lost when the hot spot CDF was installed is scheduled for September. The delay in developing the promised replacement has been due to the difficulty of finding another acceptable and available site in New Bedford.

The Forum next undertook to its first substantive discussion of the proposed Phase 2 ROD. David Dickerson began with an amendment to EPA's April 25 presentation on the proposal. One of the visuals used in that presentation purported to show the locations of CDFs 1b and 1 on the bank of the Acushnet River. The map, however, came from an earlier version of the proposal, and magnified the size of proposed CDF 1b, which will be smaller than the one shown. The CDF actually planned will cover 4.8 acres, versus the 11-acre site depicted on the visual.

As with initial deliberations of the Forum on remediation of the hot spots, the facilitators elicited from each of the Forum members a summary of the needs, interests, concerns and values they felt must be addressed to develop a resolution acceptable to all. What follows is a brief listing of the interests identified by the different constituencies represented at the Forum:

Hands Across the River

- All agree on the need to clean up the harbor
- Impact of long-term problems with CDFs on the future economy of New Bedford
- Community fear and opposition to CDFs
- Impact of the CDFs on property values
- Potential health effects on remedial efforts
- Long-term maintenance problems associated with CDFs:
 - Design, engineering, materiel issues
 - Cost issues, relative to maintenance in 30 years

Downwind Coalition

- Public safety; the health risks
- Timeliness
- Use of the CDFs for other purposes; topping them off and the implication for top-side use of long-term leaching problems

Concerned Parents of Fairhaven

- Safety aspects of the CDFs
- Aesthetic impact on the harbor of CDFs; what will the shore look like?
- Need for information on CDFs on their volume, durability, and the evolution of EPA's commitment to CDFs

Wampanoags

- Public safety and timeliness
- Preservation of artifacts along the banks of the Acushnet

New Bedford Harbor Development Commission

- Public safety
- Place for storage of maintenance dredging materials from New Bedford Harbor

New Bedford City Council

- Location of the Phillips Avenue CDF in a densely populated residential area of the City
- Preserve advantages for maintenance dredging and long-term economic utility of the harbor represented by CDF 7

New Bedford Mayor's Office

- Short-term and long-term public health and safety is paramount

State-elected Officials

- Be careful not to undercut Phase 1 of the clean-up
- Availability of funds to get the job done

NOAA

- Removal of the PCBs to lowest possible level in most cost effective way
- Need for timely movement ahead in the process

DEP

- Possible expiration of federal Superfund support and a move for the repayment of settlements already made, and the possible impact on Phase 2
- Maximum utilization of the considerable and already available information on CDFs
- Precedential value of creating a first CDF for storage of maintenance dredging materials

EPA

- Attention to the constraints of available funding
- Importance of, and commitment to, openness in the search for a remedy
- The need for timeliness
- The need for community acceptance
- The need for a positive decision

Facilitators' Summary

- Long and short-term health risks of use of CDFs; what is the impact of the leaching problem?
- Long and short-term problems and costs of maintenance of CDFs
- Aesthetic impact of CDFs; and what are the top-side uses?
- Need for timely decision-making
- Available/possible alternatives to CDFs; together with public health and safety implications
- Financial impacts of use of alternatives to CDFs

This review of interests was followed by an informative and provocative general discussion of CDFs led by Thomas Meyers from the Research Division of the Army Corps of Engineers. An issue of particular appeal involved the potential melding of biological degradation and bioremediation with long-term CDF storage.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the members agreed that the agencies would, over the next two meetings of the Forum, put together presentations directed to the concerns and issues identified as important in this session, beginning with an in-depth consideration of CDFs and the issue of location. A second session would consider such issues as alternatives and funding. It is the hope of Forum members that by a third session, the full group would be able to articulate an agreement on an overall approach to Phase 2.

Meetings were scheduled for Tuesday, August 22; Tuesday, September 5, and Tuesday, September 19, all at 6:00 p.m. at the Greater New Bedford Vocational High School.

med/mediation/5nbsuper.doc

UNITED STATES
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION I
JOHN F. KENNEDY FEDERAL BUILDING
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02203

Forwarding and address correction requested

NB-For

Region I
Office of External Programs (REA)
John F. Kennedy Federal Building
Boston, Massachusetts 02203

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use
\$300

First Class Mail Postage and Fees Paid EPA Permit no. G-35

**DREDGING UPDATE
AS OF 7-20-9
BY DREDGING SUB-COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN
ROLAND R. PEPIN**

7-21-95

Dear Forum Members,

I would first like to apologize for not being able to attend this evenings meeting, but it was necessary for me to be out of town. For this reason I have asked that Claudia Kirk read this update in my absence.

Since the last forum meeting I have continued to receive updated fax information from Moe Beaudoin of the Army Corps, and He (Moe) has continued to contact me by phone when ever the air monitor levels have exceeded the Action level of 500 ng/m³ , as well as any level above the Shut-Down level of 1,000ng/m³. Since the last forum meeting dated 6-13-95 there has been 4 monitor levels that have exceeded the 500 Action level , and 1 reading which exceeded the Shut-Down level of 1,000 ng/m³ . These readings were on 6-22-95 On Site Sampling Station number 3 and had a reading of 717.54ng/m³,--- this as you know is a 24hr. air sample and any On Site Samples are all 24hr. readings. On 6-30-95 Off Site Dredging Area monitor number 11 which is at rear of the Aerovox factory the reading was at 540.18 ng/m³ ---- Which is an 8hr. monitoring time as is all Off Site Dredging Monitoring Samples. On 7-6-95 at On Site Monitor number 3 the reading came in at 1,084.52ng/m³ on a 24hr air monitor sample. Also on that same date 7-6-95 at monitor 3D which is a Duplicate or backup monitor to monitor number 3 the reading came in at 948.05ng/m³. On 7-7-95 a back up 24hr On-site air monitoring took place and on this day at monitor number 3 the reading came in at 648.30ng/m³ and 3D was 480.45ng/m³.

In discussing these levels with Moe Beaudoin he explained that the high reading at number 3 on 7-6-95 and 7-7-95 was mostly due to the workers performing general maintenance on the cover of CDF 2 and 3 . This apparently is correct as the levels went back down to a low at monitor number 3 on 7-12-95 to a low of 237.12ng/m³ and on 7-14-95 a low of 94.21ng/m³. He also explained that we may continue to have occasional high readings at the On Site as well as the Dredging areas due to the heat and wind direction. Note that these high levels for the most part have been consistent with Moe's explanation of heat and wind direction over the last several months.

During our last Dredging Sub-Committee meeting which took place on July 18th 1995 at 6:30 P.M. The members were informed that the Hot Spot Dredging as of 7-18-95 was 83.6% complete. Moe explained that he expects to complete the Hot Spots IF EVERYTHING goes right by September 1st.!!!!!!

We also discussed the problem with the dredging of Area (A) due to High Voltage Lines being too close to this area , and not wanting to place himself or anyone else in such a Dangerous situation..

Moe and David Dickerson of the EPA. explained that they are in the process of talking with the electric company regarding this problem, and will be leaving this area for Phase 2 dredging. **(Claudia continue to read up date but ask Moe Or David to give a brief explanation on this Subject)** This area (A) as told to us is around 6,000 or 8,000 P.P.M.

Also discussed at the meeting was the International **NO FISHING, LOBSTER Signs**, and we were told that they Still have not been done, but that Moe and David will be checking on this matter.

Due to my recently receiving questions from Acushnet residents regarding the dredging of the river between Wood Street and Main Street in Acushnet. And their stating that they were told by certain individuals that this area would be Dredged and Restoration would start in this area with in ONE year, I asked David Dickerson This question ? If the Record of Decision (ROD) of Phase 2 were to be approved today with no opposition as the proposed plan is for CDF's etc. How long would it be before the dredging process would begin in any area of this Phase?

Mr. Dickerson and Moe Beaudoin stated that it was a very hard question , but if ROD 2 were to be ready to start today it would be between 3 to 5 years before dredging would start as there are so many details that have to be taken care of and approved on the agency level. Mr. Dickerson also stated that with opposition and community input all this time has to be added to this time frame.

Claudia Please ask Moe or David Dickerson to explain the cable in the area (A) problem.

Again I am sorry I was not able to attend this meeting , and I look forward to seeing you all at the next Forum.

Sincerely,



ROLAND R. PEPIN

Dredging Sub-Committee Chairman, and Town of Acushnet PCB Representative

cc- Acushnet Board of Selectman
EPA.

7/25/96

EPA, again, dumps on New Bedford

Once again New Bedford is being dumped on by the EPA. Yes, dumped on. They plan to put the PCBs and heavy metals in a "CDF" confinement disposal facility on both sides of the Acushnet River. It is a fancy name for a toxic waste dump.

The EPA has wasted millions of dollars studying the river. It's sad that is the only thing they can come up with to clean the river. There are many new technologies that can clean our river once and for all. The EPA will sweep it under the rug, so to speak. We all know what you sweep under the rug usually comes back to haunt you. CDF is a fancy name for a storage dump that will leak in years to come.

Future generations will sit and wonder why we let them sweep it under the rug. We have set an example for the rest of the nation to follow by stopping the incineration of PCBs. Everyone said "You can't stop it. It's the government." We did. People have to learn we the people make the government. The government does not make the people.

Ge. I wonder what house values will be near a CDF? Do they get a tax break? Let's face it: Who would buy a house near a toxic chemical dump? Do you know where they plan to put them?

Come to the North End Community Center July 8 at 7 p.m. and see "All Landfills Leak," a greenpeace video sponsored by Hands Across the River Coalition. Come to see what the EPA plans on dumping on us now.

ANGELA DAYS

Fairhaven

To
DAVE DUTERSON