# Memorandum

**Date:** February 5, 2018

**To:** Sally Rubin,Chair, Rolling Knolls Community Advisory Group
Rolling Knolls Community Advisory Group
Pat Seppi, Community Involvement Coordinator, EPA Region 2
Betsy Donovan, Remedial Project Manager, EPA Region 2
Stephanie Vaughn, Section Chief, EPA Region 2

**From:** Matt Robbie, Skeo

**Re:** Rolling Knolls Landfill Site Tour & CAG Meeting (December 3, 2018)

# Introduction

On December 3, the Rolling Knolls Landfill Community Advisory Group (CAG) participated in a tour of the Rolling Knolls Landfill Site (site) from 1:45pm to 2:45pm. The tour was requested by the CAG to gain a better understanding of the site’s features and context. Following the tour, the CAG met from 6pm-7pm at Chatham Township Offices (58 Meyersville Road, Chatham, New Jersey).

# Site Tour

The purpose of the site tour was to provide CAG members and regulatory agencies with a chance to walk parts of the site property, see examples of onsite waste materials, vegetation, access roads and other features.

John Persico, technical lead consultant for the Rolling Knolls Site PRP group, provided an orientation to the site using a map and led the group on walking tour to several areas of the site as described below.

* The tour began at the hunt club building.
* First, participants walked north along the eastern boundary of the property. Bulky construction debris and signs of dumping were visible along the narrow dirt road through this part of the site.
* Second, participants walked by an active landscape business parking area and storage yard at the southern end of the site and walked northwest along a former haul road. Due to thick vegetation, participants were able to walk a ¼-mile stretch of the road, which is slightly elevated above the surrounding scrub- shrub wetland areas. Some refuse was visible from the haul road and appeared to be intermingled with vegetation.
* During this segment of the tour, participants stopped for a brief round of questions. Following the questions listed below, participants walked back to the hunt club building and concluded the tour.

## Questions Raised During the Tour

* Several participants asked whether certain areas of the site were substantially different than the areas viewed during the tour? John Persico responded indicating that the area visible from the haul road is typical of most disposal areas. The drum loading area located to the north and west of the main disposal area is one area where drum wastes are visible.
* Participants discussed past disposal operations noting that practices generally included turning over refuse and underlaying soil / vegetation occasionally but did not use daily cover on top of waste.
* John explained that waste depths are generally 2’ to 4, and in certain locations as deep as 17’’ throughout much of the disposal area and waste is intermingled with vegetation, tree roots, soil, and swamp sediment.
* Participants also noted that several fires had occurred at during disposal operations and suggested that the burning had produced noxious odors and smoke for days. Several would like to understand how the fire impacts affected contamination.

Following the questions, participants walked back to the hunt club building and concluded the tour.

# CAG Meeting

The December 3rd Rolling Knolls CAG meeting, held at the Chatham Township Offices began at 6pm. Following CAG interest o held during the October 29 meeting, EPA provided a briefing on the results of site’s remedial investigation. The presentation described the remedial investigation findings in detail and how they fit into the cleanup process. The meeting agenda is included as Attachment A, and EPA’s Remedial Investigation results presentation is included as Attachment B. While the meeting was initially planned for two hours, the meeting had to be condensed to 60 minutes, due to unforeseen conflicts at the Chatham Township meeting space.

The meeting room was configured with CAG members seated at a U-shaped table, and members of general public, interested parties and other stakeholders were seated separately. EPA Region 2 site team, staff presented the Remedial Investigation findings for approximately 35-40 minutes, and the CAG members asked questions for about 10 minutes. Betsy Donovan presented the site’s physical characteristics, remedial investigation activities and results of soil, sediment and groundwater sampling as well as the outcome of the RI identifies the locations and extent of contaminants, and primary contaminants of concern. Stephanie Vaughn then presented an overview of EPA’s risk assessment findings, including a baseline human health risk assessment and an ecological risk assessment.

## Discussion Questions

Participants raised the following questions about the remedial investigation and risk assessment findings.

* **Soil Hotspot locations –** During RPM Betsy Donovan’s presentation, one CAG member asked EPA to clarify where contamination was better or worse across the site. Betsy pointed out 18 points of interest that are included in Figure 3-1 and Table 3-1 of the RI and on PDF page 11 of the attachment B – EPA RI Results Presentation. These points of interests were identified were materials observed on the surface appeared to differ from trash seen at most locations. For example, one location (POI-1, located near the center of the landfill) had 98 drums, and soil sampling results found volatile organic compounds, semi-volatile organic compounds, poly chlorinated biphenyls, pesticides and metals at this location. In addition to the points of interest soil samples were taken using grid pattern sampling method to capture the contaminant characteristics across the disposal area.
* **Groundwater –** Participants asked where groundwater contamination was and about the potential for contamination of surface water in the Great Swamp. Betsy explained that RI results evaluated soil contamination impacts to groundwater, and those findings indicated shallow (within 25 feet of surface) groundwater impacts in isolated on-site areas; no groundwater plume was identified. In 2016, Betsy explained that additional groundwater investigation work began to better delineate contamination and evaluate how contaminants break down into different chemicals over time.
* **Human Health and Risk –** During Stephanie Vaughn’s presentation of the risk assessments, participants asked several questions related to future use scenarios and exposure risks. participant asked for clarification about the relative severity of the human health risks at the site. Previous CAG and community discussions highlighted that gaining a better understanding of potential future uses of the site is a key priority for the CAG.

Participants first asked how residential uses and other uses were considered?

Stephanie Vaughn explained that the risk assessment used various assumptions about current and potential future uses to evaluate potential risks to future site users. The default residential use scenario was initially evaluated, followed by a reasonably anticipated future land use based on a 2017 reuse assessment for the site. The current and anticipated future use scenarios define exposure assumptions for certain types of current users (trespassers, construction workers, landscapers, hunters), and future users (adults or adolescents using the site for passive recreation, such as walking, wildlife viewing).

Participants wanted to know, how the anticipated future use effects exposure risk?

Stephanie explained that risk assessments calculate risks using assumptions about the type of user (children, adults) and the amount of time they may spend on site and type of activities that may bring them into contact with or expose them to contaminants. The facilitator noted that assumptions and factors considered in the risk assessors’ process are complex and may require more time and discussion.

The second question was specifically focused on the non-cancer hazard index which ranks the relative hazard risk (see Attachment B, PDF page 25). Stephanie explained that the Non-Cancer health hazards exceeded a target value of 1 and were in the range of 2 to 3. After receiving questions about how this risk compared to other sites, she explained that 2 to 3 is a relatively low risk, and many sites have significantly higher hazard index values. Participants seemed to understand that the health hazard risks assessed for the site are relatively low.
* **Ecological Risk –** One participant asked how ecological and human health risks would be factored in to remedial alternatives.

EPA and the facilitator explained that the remedial alternatives evaluated in the feasibility evaluate different ways to address risks. Participants wanted to know how cleanup options would differ between actions taken to address reasonably anticipated future land use risk assumptions (passive recreational users) versus those taken to address assumed ecological risks. The group determined that further briefing and discussion on the risk assessment approach, outcomes and impact on remedial alternatives would be warranted.

Following the discussion, the facilitator thanked EPA and CAG members for their participation and contributions.

# Next Steps

The next meeting will be held March 11, 2019 at the Chatham Township Municipal Building from 6-8pm.

CAG presentation and discussion items for March 11 are outlined below.

* Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge Stewardship Perspective Presentation and Discussion– Mike Horne and George Molnar, GSNWR.
* Follow up Baseline Human Health Risk Assessment Presentation and Discussion – Michael Sivak, EPA
* Follow up Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment Presentation and Discussion – Daniel Cooke, CDM Smith
* EPA site status updates and timing for future meetings, Superfund process training and revised Feasibility Study.
* Other CAG business – CAG bylaws for review.