

**ROOSEVELT MIDDLE SCHOOL REMEDIATION PROJECT
AUDIENCE QUESTIONS
FROM THE
PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING OF DECEMBER 11, 2007**

Question 1: Did you test around the East Clinton Avenue construction entrance when the trucks were moving the soil? Visible dust deposits were observed by the construction entrance. I observed one truck whose wheels were not washed prior to the truck leaving the site.

Response 1: The DEC did observe that there was an accumulation of dust outside of the construction entrance onto East Clinton Avenue. One of the reasons for DEC's offer to sample the surface soils at adjacent residential properties was to determine whether these dusts contained unacceptable levels of DDT, DDD, or DDE (the primary site contaminants). The surface soils by the curb area in front of all of the homes by the construction entrance were sampled and none of the detections exceeded the residential cleanup objectives. In other words, the observed dusts by the entrance did not contain levels of pesticides that would be of a concern to public health. It is believed that these dusts are primarily attributable to the normal construction activities involved with the building of a new school. Please note that the soil contamination was mostly located in the rear half of the school property away from the construction entrance.

Dust suppression methods were employed throughout the site. However, the most stringent dust monitoring was done near the soil excavation activities to remove pesticide contaminated soils. All of the trucks that were loaded in the rear with contaminated soils for shipment to approved off-site disposal locations were sealed tight and the tires were washed before those trucks left the site to prevent the potential migration of contaminated soils as dust. Other trucks involved with the building construction activities were working in uncontaminated areas and consequently did not require the same measures as the trucks shipping the wastes. It is likely that the truck that was observed with unwashed tires was related to the building construction activities.

Question 2: DEC's assessment of contaminants off-site with respect to wind blown dust onto the High School Athletic field needs to be reexamined because a) DDT and DDE adhere to soil particles and can become wind blown, b) Prior testing was done close to the northern border of the site, c) Since air is a fluid like water, contaminated soil can and would be carried a considerable distance from the site and onto High School Athletic field.

Response 2: The best place to sample for contaminated dusts is at locations close to the disposal locations. As one moves further away from the sources of the disposal, less dusts would reach those locations resulting in lower concentrations. By sampling the off-site properties near to the property border with the site, the worst-case locations were sampled.

Due to public comments, five surface samples were collected during September 2007 directly at the athletic fields where direct contact with soil by student athletes would be most likely. Pesticides at

concentrations well below the residential soil cleanup objectives were detected in the original four samples that were collected near the property border and in these five additional samples. Consequently, based on this data, there are no concerns that students or staff would be exposed to unacceptable levels of pesticides.

In direct response to this comment and to further alleviate public concerns on this issue, an additional ten surface soil samples were collected during January 2008 at the high school at sampling locations further away from the site. No pesticides were detected in any of these samples. The results of this supplemental sampling further demonstrate that unacceptable levels of pesticides did not migrate to the high school.

Question 3: A private well survey at 43 private homes located south of the site was conducted to determine whether anyone was using a private well in this area. Which streets in the community are past the area where the survey was conducted?

Response 3: The private well survey was conducted for 334 to 346 East Clinton Avenue, all of Roberts Place, 166 to 210 Mirin Avenue, and the odd numbers homes from 201 to 239 on the north side of Beechwood Avenue. This covers all homes within one-eighth of a mile south and south-southeast of the site, the established groundwater flow direction. This distance is more than ample for the survey since DDT, the primary contaminant, is not mobile and has not been detected in any previous off-site groundwater sample. Homes on the south side of Beechwood Avenue and further south of Beechwood were not included in the survey area. Homes not located in the established direction of groundwater flow were excluded from the survey.

Question 4: Who will certify that site is free and safe from contaminants?

Response 4: In a Certificate of Completion (COC) issued in July 2008, the DEC, in consultation with DOH, find that the cleanup requirements set forth in the remedial work plan have been achieved. The COC stated that the site has been found to be acceptable for use as a school.

Question 5: Who sets the allowable levels for the Recommended Cleanup Objectives? Are these cleanup objectives statewide, regional or site specific? Are these good numbers to use?

Response 5: For this site, in consultation with DOH, DEC selected residential cleanup objectives to clean up the school property. These cleanup objectives would be protective of public health for normal residential use and are also protective of groundwater quality. These stringent stateside residential cleanup objectives are more than adequate for the future use of the property as a school. The cleanup objectives that have been used for this site can be found in 6 NYCRR Part 375 (Environmental Remediation Programs), Table 375-6.8(b): Restricted Use Soil Cleanup Objectives that became effective on December 14, 2006.

Question 6: Will there be future testing of children to determine if vapors have occurred after the cleanup?

Response 6: No testing of children attending the middle school will be done. Biological sampling will not be needed to assess exposure since the source of contamination has been removed and a mitigation system was pro-actively installed to remove any potential for vapor intrusion which could impact air quality. To confirm that there is no potential for exposure, indoor air within the school and soil vapor sampling beneath the school will be conducted prior to the start of the 2008 school year.

Question 7: Can toxic substances travel through the air ducts? Why is there a vapor barrier under the school if the answer to this question is “No”? Are there vapors at the school or not?

Response 7: The sub-slab depressurization system (SSDS) and vapor barrier were installed as precautionary measures to mitigate, if needed, vapors from residual sub-surface soil contamination. However, the soil excavation successfully removed all contamination above the cleanup objectives. The recent sub-slab vapor and indoor air quality sampling discussed under the response to Question 6 verify that residual vapors from site-related contaminants are not present at levels that would be a concern for public health. Even though vapors did not contain unacceptable levels of contaminants during the recent sampling and it has been determined that the SSDS does not have to operate in active mode by using optional fans, the SSDS and the vapor barrier still act as preventive measures to help prevent even trace concentrations of residual vapors from entering the school.

Question 8: When trucks and street sweepers are causing a dust problem, who do we call?

Response 8: All construction activities have been completed. Consequently, there will be no additional dust problems.

Question 9: What depth of debris was removed from under the school building?

Response 9: The depth of debris that was removed before the northern portion of the school building was constructed varied by location. The excavation under the building extended to a maximum depth of 16 feet. However, the soil excavation to remove buried debris and pesticide contamination in areas outside of the footprint of the new building extended deeper than that in a few areas. The deepest excavation was beneath leaching structure TP-2a where soil was excavated to a depth of 26 feet.

Question 10: Who is paying for the clean up?

Response 10: The State Education Department considers the remediation of the middle school site a separate project from construction of the school. All approved costs will be reimbursed at 98 percent. The approved costs are significantly less than the project cost allowance, so all project costs

will be reimbursed at 98 percent. It is expected that the local taxpayers will not have to pay the remaining 2 percent. More information should be available at the public meeting.

Question 11: Will the State give the school district written assurance that it will pay 98 percent of the cost of the remediation?

Response 11: The State Education Department has provided this in writing to the superintendent of schools. A copy of the letter has been placed in the document repository.

Question 12: Will Nassau County, the prime polluter of the Roosevelt Middle School site, assume the balance of 2%?

Response 12: It is expected that the 2 percent share will not have to be paid by the taxpayers. However, it is not expected that Nassau County will contribute to the cost of the cleanup.

Question 13: What effect will the town plant have on the middle school traffic?

Response 13: The original environmental impact study included a traffic analysis for the site, and it was determined that no significant traffic impacts would result. The Town of Hempstead operations are not expected to have any greater impact on the middle school than currently exist at the Jr/Sr high school. There is no significant additional traffic predicted for the middle school. There will be no student drivers, and a limited number of buses entering and leaving the middle school site. Traffic at the high school will be reduced because the middle school teachers and staff that were located at the high school will be working in the middle school building. As both schools have access to East Clinton Avenue, the total impact will be unchanged. If Town of Hempstead operations were to increase in the future, the additional traffic would have the same impact on the existing Jr/Sr high school as on the new arrangement, with separate middle and high schools.

Question 14: Where are the school's entrance and exit located?

Response 14: The new Roosevelt middle school's main entrance and exit are off East Clinton Avenue for bus, student drop-off and visitor parking. Delivery vehicles will go to the rear of the school. They will access the loading area from East Clinton Avenue, and exit from Konig Street. There is a parking lot with two entrances from Bauer Avenue for teacher parking.