# ­Memorandum

**Date:** March 29, 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 CAG Meeting (March 11, 2019)

# Introduction

On March 11, the Rolling Knolls Landfill Community Advisory Group (CAG) met from 6pm-8:15pm at Chatham Township Offices (58 Meyersville Road, Chatham, New Jersey). The meeting included three briefing presentations provided by Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge staff, EPA and contractor. The following memo summarizes presentation topics and CAG discussions.

# Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge Briefing

The first briefing was provided by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service staff, Mike Horne and George Molnar of the Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge (GSNWR).

Mr. Molnar and Mr. Horne provided a 20-minute presentation on the following topics:

* Role of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) staff
* Background on how the Rolling Knolls Landfill became part of the Refuge
* FWS management of landfills in the Refuge
* FWS involvement in the Rolling Knolls remedial process
* Comments on the RI/FS
* Recommended remedial alternatives

See Attachment A – meeting materials for details

## Questions/Discussion:

CAG members briefly discussed the Asbestos Dump OU3 and Harding Landfill examples and considerations related to landfill construction.

* Several CAG members expressed interest in learning about the cap types used at the two other landfills in the GSNWR.
* One CAG member and FWS staff discussed landfill construction options and implications for capping material, truck traffic.
* The Facilitator confirmed that the information FWS staff presented has been discussed in ongoing RI/FS discussions with EPA, potentially responsible parties (PRPs) and agencies and noted that the CAG will have a chance to further review, discuss and understand remedial alternatives to address contamination risks at future meetings.

# EPA Site Risk Assessment Briefings

Based on interest and requests from the CAG in December 2018, EPA’s risk assessment specialists attended the meeting to present the results of the site’s human health and ecological risk assessments.

## Baseline Human Health Risk Assessment BHHRA)

EPA Region 2 risk assessor Michael Sivak presented the detailed findings of the Baseline Human Health Risk Assessment conducted for the Rolling Knolls Landfill. Baseline Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) refers to a qualitative and/or quantitative evaluation of the actual or potential impacts of contaminants from a hazardous waste site on humans, under baseline (current) conditions, before any remedial actions are taken. Mr. Sivak introduced the four-step HHRA procedure (listed below) and presented the results of each step of the assessment for the site. (See Attachment A – meeting materials for details).

*HHRA Four-Step Evaluation Procedure*

* Data Evaluation
* Exposure Assessment
* Toxicity Assessment
* Risk Characterization

### Questions / Discussion:

During the presentation, participants raised several questions about the evolution of exposure scenarios that EPA evaluated in 2014 and 2018.

* Mr. Sivak explained the assumptions used in a 2014 exposure scenario were revised and refined based on a 2017 reuse assessment and determination of reasonably anticipated future land use (See Attachment A, HHRA presentation, slides 6-9).
* He explained that EPA considered the 2017 reuse assessment and June 2018 feedback received from the community availability sessions as local preferences for limited future use, consistent with a passive recreational user.
* In July 2018, the 2014 human health risk assessment was updated to reflect this future use. The revised exposure scenario assumes adults and adolescents access the site 84 days per year. Participants discussed the detailed evaluation was conducted for the adolescent exposure scenario.
* CAG members were concerned that the updated exposure scenarios meant less exposure was assumed to occur. Mr. Sivak clarified that the 2018 memo that updates the HHRA looks at an exposure scenario that is based on the most up-to-date information regarding potential future land use. As a result of the is re-evaluation, the exposure frequency for the recreator/trespasser has decreased from the value of 143 days/year to 84 days/year, which is based on more site-specific information such as the limited access to the site and temperatures that encourage outdoor activities.
* Participants noted significant interest in further discussing future use considerations for the site.

## Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment (BERA)

Next, Daniel Cooke of CDM Smith—EPA’s oversight contractor, who provides technical support for the ecological risk assessment for the Rolling Knolls Site—presented the results of the baseline ecological risk assessment for the Site. Ecological Risk Assessment (ERA) refers to a qualitative and/or quantitative evaluation of the actual or potential impacts of contaminants from a hazardous waste site on plants and animals (other than humans and domesticated species). EPA uses an eight-step procedure when evaluating ecological risks as listed below.

Screening Level Ecological Risk Assessment (SLERA)
1 – Screening-Level Problem Formulation and Ecological Effects Evaluation
2 – Screening-Level Preliminary Exposure Estimate and Risk Calculation
Baseline Ecological Risk Assessment (BERA)Step 3–BERA Problem Formulation
4–Study Design and DQO Process (LOE, ME, WP, SAP)
5–Verification of Field Sampling Design
6–Site Investigation and Analysis of Exposure and Effects
7–Risk Characterization
8–Risk Management

For further information, see Attachment A, Ecological Risk Assessment slides

### Questions/Discussion:

* CAG members expressed interest in understanding the vegetation and ecological habitat survey maps (slide 11, Ecological Risk Assessment).
* Chemicals identified during Remedial Investigations (or supplemental sampling) that exceed screening criteria are known as Contaminants of Potential Ecological Concern (COPECs). Participants requested clarification about the number of chemicals that are considered COPECs at the Site. Mr. Cooke confirmed that PAHs, phthalates, pesticides, PCBs, dioxins/furans, metals, and cyanide are the COPECs evaluated in the ecological risk assessment.
* CAG members recognized through discussion that the results of the ecological risk assessment indicate that the COPECs do not pose ecological risk for most receptors (including the 13 assessment endpoints evaluated).

# Additional CAG discussion items

Following the ecological risk assessment discussion, the CAG facilitator noted that these presentations helped to prepare the CAG for next month’s Superfund process training that will explain further how the feasibility study, remedy selection and remedy implementation phases build on the remedial investigation and risk assessment activities and findings.

Discussion:

* CAG members expressed interest a broader discussion about the implications of future land uses and future ownership at the site. CAG Chair suggested that the PRP group may want the opportunity to share its perspective on both cleanup and future land use and ownership. CAG members agreed this would be a valuable future agenda item.
* CAG chair pointed out that the CAG will likely need to continue the Remedial Investigation discussion from December 3, which had been limited to due room availability. She noted that it would be helpful to have a map that integrates what is known about the site from RI at this time. Additional time during the April meeting will be needed for this discussion.
* The facilitator noted that the next meeting would include a training provided by TASC. He acknowledged that this will mean 3 consecutive CAG meetings have included detailed presentations, briefings or trainings and asked if members felt more time was needed for discussion. Participants noted in general the briefings have been helpful and that it may be valuable to have extra time for open discussion on certain topics during a future meeting.
* The next meeting will take place on April 11, 2019.