

Contract Number 68-W-99-010

Task Order # 0061

**Final  
Assessment Report  
on the  
Central Landfill Action Committee  
Johnston, Rhode Island**

**Submitted to the  
Central Landfill Action Committee**

**by**

**Susan L. Podziba and David W. Laws  
Susan Podziba & Associates  
21 Orchard Road  
Brookline, MA 02445  
(617) 738-5230  
(617) 738-6911 (fax)**

**and**

**The Marasco Newton Group, Ltd.  
2801 Clarendon Boulevard  
Arlington, VA 22201**

**January 23, 2001**

**Assessment Report on the**

# Central Landfill Action Committee, Johnston, Rhode Island

## Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	
1	
BACKGROUND.....	
1	
FEASIBILITY.....	
3	
KEY DYNAMICS.....	
4	
SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES.....	9
KEY STAKEHOLDER GROUPS.....	
12	
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	
18	
CONCLUSION.....	
26	

APPENDIX A: CHART OF THE PROPOSED COMMITTEE STRUCTURE.....  
27

APPENDIX B: PROPOSED COMMITTEE COMPOSITION.....  
28

APPENDIX C: LIST OF INTERVIEWEES.....  
29

**Assessment Report on the  
Central Landfill Action Committee, Johnston, Rhode Island**

**Submitted by Susan L. Podziba and David W. Laws, Susan Podziba & Associates**[\[1\]](#)

**INTRODUCTION**

This report describes the findings and recommendations of Susan Podziba & Associates concerning the Central Landfill Action Committee, Johnston, Rhode Island. The Central Landfill Action Committee (Committee) was created at an October 1999 public meeting called by the Mayor of Johnston to address citizen complaints about odors emanating from the landfill. In addition to citizens and town officials, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management (DEM) and Rhode Island Department of Health (DOH) officials attended the meeting.

From its inception, the committee met bi-weekly through July 2000, when it released a set of 40 recommendations related to odor management at Central Landfill. Though described as consensus recommendations, on the very day of their release, some

parties stated that they did not support all of the recommendations.

As a result of a confluence of factors including questions about membership and ground rules, the lack of an organizational sponsor for the Committee, and the facilitator's departure for reasons of personal health, EPA and DEM decided to undertake an assessment of the existing Committee, in an effort to determine the usefulness of the Committee and if applicable, to identify opportunities for its improvement.

This assessment report is divided into sections on background, feasibility, key dynamics, substantive issues, key stakeholder groups, recommendations, and conclusion.

## BACKGROUND

In the early 1950s, the Central Landfill site was a sand and gravel pit. It subsequently became the town dump and was operated by the Silvestri Company. In 1980, the state purchased the landfill and created the Rhode Island Solid Waste Management Corporation, now known as the Rhode Island Resource Recovery Corporation, to operate and maintain it. The landfill covers 199 acres, and in 1999 received 1,201,007 tons of household and commercial waste, more than 95% of the state's total solid waste.[\[2\]](#) In 1986, part of the landfill was designated as a Superfund Site as a result of the past disposal of hazardous wastes. [\[3\]](#)

Approximately 4,000 people live within 3 miles of the landfill. Some residents live within 0.5 miles of the landfill boundary; the majority of whom reside northeast of the landfill. The prevailing wind direction is from southwest to northeast.[\[4\]](#)

The October 1999 public meeting was held in response to residents' complaints of serious odor problems in the neighborhoods immediately surrounding the landfill. During the period between June and October 1999, DEM received 701 odor complaints from residents, which resulted in 29 violations for objectionable odors against RRC.[\[5\]](#)

Since this period, RRC has improved its gas collection system and odors have been reduced. However, in 2000, RRC was cited by DEM for objectionable odors 11 times, most recently December 15, 2000.

Residents are concerned about the health effects of the odors, and the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) is working to establish a health study in the area.

A majority of the Committee members believe that the odor situation has improved as a result of the establishment of the Committee. Meetings are well-attended and include members of the public.

Susan Podziba & Associates (SP&A) was asked to assess the existing Committee structure and to make recommendations for its improvement. From October through December 2000, SP&A interviewed 25 individuals including Committee members representing the Town of Johnston, state legislators, state and federal environmental and health agencies, concerned citizens, residents of the affected neighborhoods, industry, and state-wide organizations to determine:

- the principal categories of stakeholders who are affected, interested, or have authority to act;
- the key issues from each stakeholder's perspective;
- the key dynamics affecting the Central Landfill Action Committee;
  - stakeholders' concerns about the Committee structure and ideas for improvement;
  - how the views and perspectives of each group can be best represented; and
- the usefulness of an ongoing committee.

## FEASIBILITY

Based on the interviews, Susan Podziba & Associates recommends that the Central Landfill Action Committee continue with a refined organizational structure and an agenda limited to the Central Landfill and issues emanating from it.

Virtually all the Committee members stated that the Committee has already had a positive impact by reducing, though not eliminating, odor problems. Most citizens

and many others believe that the Central Landfill Action Committee fills an important function as a "watch dog" group. Many believe that the "unusual" membership, which includes local, state, and federal government officials -- elected and administrative -- as well as citizens and industry, lends great credence to the Committee's activities. In addition, members find the Committee to be an important forum for sharing and clarifying information about the landfill and its impacts on neighboring citizens.

To become more effective, the Committee will need to evolve into a body that can better serve its members and the groups and organizations they represent. The lack of a coherent structure, failure to adhere to agendas, and the inability of some members to consistently uphold basic norms of civility has undermined the commitments of some members to continue to participate and threatens the Committee's ability to clarify and achieve its goals.

Some of the frustration in evidence at the meetings is rooted in the fear and anger of citizens who attribute their own and their children's health problems to emissions from the landfill. These citizens feel strongly that their concerns have not been addressed and lack confidence in the ability of state or local agencies to address odor and health problems.

No committee structure will eliminate the need for citizens to express these deep concerns and frustrations, nor should it seek to. Until these citizens find redress for these problems, they will seek out ways to express these concerns -- whether or not a Committee exists. The Committee offers an organized and potentially efficient means for identifying, understanding, and attempting to address these issues.

On balance, Susan Podziba & Associates recommends the continuation of the Central Landfill Action Committee with a modified structure and agenda. These recommended modifications are described later in this report.

## KEY DYNAMICS

This review of key dynamics is intended to highlight the significant historical circumstances and institutional and political influences that shape the current situation of Central Landfill and the ability of actors to initiate and implement change. These dynamics severely impact the workings of the Committee. The key dynamics are divided into five categories: skepticism; local vs. state definition of the problem; Rhode Island Resource Recovery Corporation Governance and

Environmental Management; Relationship between RRC and its neighbors, and Organization and Management of the Committee.

### **Skepticism/ "This is RI"**

The operation of the Central Landfill and the oversight of Resource Recovery Corporation are understood against a backdrop of skepticism about politics and public institutions. Numerous interviewees referred to Rhode Island (RI) as a unique state among the United States and Johnston as unique within Rhode Island. This status rests on the size of Rhode Island—most Rhode Islanders have personal connections to each other—and is coupled with historical incidents to support a belief that many public actions are taken on behalf of personal interests.

This skepticism runs deep and was invoked in interviews to describe a wide range of issues and actions. This makes it difficult to establish legitimate forums for public deliberation and decision-making and to address complex public problems. Citizens lack faith in the ability and commitment of state and local government institutions to protect their health and welfare. This skepticism shapes their understanding of a number of other dynamics.

### **Local vs. State Definition of the Problem**

Solid waste management is less problematic in Rhode Island than in many other areas through out the United States. Central Landfill resolves the landfilling portion of RI's solid waste management needs. Towns and cities contract with the Rhode Island Resource Recovery Corporation to dispose of solid wastes at the site. They enjoy low tipping fees and expect Central Landfill to be able to meet their landfilling needs for at least 20 more years. Aside from Johnston, the waste and side effects associated with a landfill are "not in anyone's back yard." One effect of this arrangement is that solid waste management does not garner much attention as a statewide issue in Rhode Island. The odors affecting the neighborhoods around the landfill are framed as a local problem by the rest of the state, making it difficult for the City of Johnston and its legislators to get support from other towns and cities, the state, or RRC in their efforts to address these problems. Some interviewees suggested that municipalities would likely resist efforts to reframe landfilling or solid waste management as a state-wide issue.

### **RI Resource Recovery Corporation Governance and Environmental Regulations**

Governance of the Rhode Island Resource Recovery Corporation (RRC): RRC is a quasi-public agency responsible for operating and managing the landfill as well as the

property (1100 acres) it owns around the landfill. RRC was created by an act of the Legislature and is charged with "provid[ing] environmentally responsible and economically sound waste management options to meet community needs using public and private systems, programs, and facilities." RRC is governed by a board of commissioners that consists of nine members, with five members appointed by the governor, including one elected municipal chief executive. The Speaker of the House appoints two members from the House of Representatives and the Majority Leader appoints one member from the Senate. The members serve staggered three-year terms. RRC is managed by an executive director, who is responsible to the governing board. Its statutory structure also includes a Citizen Advisory Board. but according to the RI Solid Waste Master Plan, the Corporation and the Advisory Board members agreed to allow this board to become inactive because of the increasing technical nature of the Corporation's work.

Since 1995, RRC's relationships with municipalities have been governed by a model contract, which sets forth the terms and conditions under which the municipalities dispose of their solid waste at the landfill. Tipping fees for municipalities are set annually by the state legislature and are paid directly to RRC. These tipping fees and all other income generated are used to cover operating costs; any surplus is returned to the state's general fund. Over the past several years RRC has generated an annual surplus.

RRC and State Environmental Management: Environmental permitting and enforcement are under the authority of the Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management. In 1986, an area of the landfill was designated a Superfund Site by U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and activities related to the Superfund site area also fall under the jurisdiction of EPA. In the past, both DEM and EPA have taken enforcement actions against RRC, which have resulted in penalties. RRC has spent "millions of dollars" to come into compliance with regard to problems raised in past and present enforcement actions. RRC believes it is currently in compliance with all state and federal regulations.

A key dynamic of this case, is the perceived problem of "the state regulating itself." RRC, a state agency, is regulated by DEM, another state agency. Numerous interviewees raised the issue of the politicization of environmental enforcement. They expressed concern over the fact that RRC surplus funds as well as DEM penalties assessed against RRC return to the state general fund, thereby nullifying the impact of any penalty. This is magnified by the general skepticism surrounding public institutions.

## RRC and Federal Environmental Management

Since part of Central Landfill is a Superfund site and is regulated under the New Source Performance Standards of the Clean Air Act, RRC's activities are also subject to regulation by EPA.

Current Superfund activities at Central Landfill include permanently capping a section of the landfill. EPA is also assessing the impact of the landfill on ground water, and will soon release a proposed plan to address ground water issues related to Central Landfill. Many citizens expressed concerns about the possibility of contamination of the Scituate Reservoir, but according to EPA, the groundwater does not flow toward the reservoir and therefore, the reservoir is not impacted by the landfill.

## **Relationship between RRC and Neighbors**

The City of Johnston interacts with RRC as the host community of the landfill and on development issues regarding other property controlled by RRC. Given the controversial nature of both of these issues, and Johnston's complex and contentious local politics, managing this relationship is particularly difficult.

The relationship between RRC and its immediate residential neighbors is a persistent source of tension as a result of the sheer scale of RRC's operations and its past and proposed patterns of development. Central Landfill, for instance, began as a gravel pit, was later used by the community as a dump, and has now grown into one of the largest landfills in the United States. Many current residents lived in the area prior to the state's acquisition of the site and have experienced the development from a gravel pit into a large-scale landfill firsthand.

Loss: There is a general feeling of loss among many of the longtime residents of Johnston. Residents who grew up in town talk about the loss of Silver Lake, which they swam and fished during their summers, but which has since been taken over by the RRC. Others despair over having moved to Johnston to live in the country only to be impacted by odors and traffic worse than anything they experienced in the city. People have watched quiet streets turn into truck routes; odors have ruined their summer barbecues; their property values have declined; and, on a daily basis, they pass boarded up homes left vacant from a previous buyout. Some have watched their children become ill. Ultimately, they have lost a sense of security about their homes and futures, which has been replaced by fear and uncertainty, as they wonder, "What is happening to us?" and, "Why aren't there bugs or skunks around anymore?"

Distrust between RRC and the Affected Neighbors: The level of distrust and the mutual suspicion with which RRC and its neighbors view each other results in a delegitimization of real issues and potential solutions that are raised by the other.

Persistent Development Pressure: The Central Landfill is located on a 199-acre licensed footprint, which is part of RRC's holding of approximately 1100 acres on Shun Pike in Western Johnston. [6] Much of this parcel is not part of the Johnston tax base. There is pressure from elements within Johnston and from RRC to develop some of this land to increase the town's tax base and to generate additional revenue for RRC. Recently, the Johnston Town Council rejected a zoning change request to build an industrial park on RRC property.

RRC often feels caught between conflicting forces in town with regard to land use and development. It cited such issues as selling properties moved from the buffer zone and the clearing of land for a park, as situations in which it responded to the concerns or demands raised by some members of the community only to be vilified for these actions by others.

RRC/Johnston Host Agreement: The relationship between RRC and Johnston is governed by an agreement negotiated in 1996. The City of Johnston is not satisfied with the 1996 host agreement, a 20-year agreement, and will be seeking to re-open negotiations of it. RRC feels that actions it has taken pursuant to the agreement have been challenged by other residents thereby placing RRC in the middle of local political struggles.

### **Organization and Management of the Committee**

A number of the dynamics have shaped the organization and management of the Committee. Most members applaud the impact of the Committee, but also cite a need for reorganization to address its structural issues. There is virtual agreement among interviewees that the Committee needs to be better managed. Specific issues include: lack of sponsorship, committee agenda, lack of technical expertise, ground rules, membership, decision making rule, meeting agenda and length, and cable television.

Lack of Sponsorship: The Committee was created in response to an October 1999

public meeting held in Johnston during which citizens demanded action to address frequent objectionable odors from the landfill and possibly other sources. The Committee was announced by DEM and assembled by EPA, which provided an agency facilitator, and, later, funded professional facilitation. However, the Committee has never been officially sponsored as an advisory committee to either agency. In addition, it is not clear to all Committee members that it is functioning as an advisory committee, whereby an agency can accept or reject its advice. Past recommendations developed by the Committee were directed to EPA, DEM, RRC, RI General Assembly, RI Department of Health (DOH), the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR), and the Town of Johnston. To date, no government agency has indicated a willingness to serve as the Committee's sponsor. However, EPA, DEM, DOH, and RRC all agree that it is useful to have a mechanism for informing the public and learning of its concerns.

Committee Agenda: The stated agenda of the Committee is to advise on issues of odors, health impacts, traffic, and buffer zones as each relates to the Central Landfill; the New England Ecological Development Corporation (NEED), which recycles construction debris; pig farms; and other facilities. In addition to not having a clear sponsor, the Committee agenda raises a host of problems with regard to authorities. Central Landfill is a public entity and a Superfund site. Its environmental compliance and enforcement are under EPA and DEM authority. The NEED facility, a private entity regulated by DEM, has a pending permit application and outstanding enforcement actions against it. The pig farms no longer exist. The Committee does not include any officials from the RI Department of Transportation, which has authority for traffic issues, and neither DEM nor EPA have authority to review or expand the original buffer zone.

Lack of Technical Expertise: The Committee members have a varied level of technical expertise, yet all are working to understand, discuss, and offer recommendations on many technical issues. RRC has attempted to provide technical information to the Committee members by making its consultants available for presentations, but has been frustrated by a lack of civility during such presentations. Citizen members distrust much of the technical information provided to them. Though they are working hard to educate themselves on the issues, they are limited by the lack of effective technical expertise they can avail themselves of.

Ground Rules: The existing ground rules, which are constantly broken, are rules of civil behavior. Some members experience these less than civil behaviors as part of life on the Committee, but these behaviors have led other members to stop attending

meetings.

There are no groundrules related to membership, record of the meetings, roles and responsibilities of the members, roles and responsibilities of the facilitators, decision-making rules, attendance at meetings, etc. Some of the conflicts related to a lack of clear procedural ground rules are described below.

Membership: Virtually every interviewee raised the issue of membership. Some people are unwilling to continue serving if certain people continue to be on the Committee. Others raised the problem of continued membership by people who have moved from the affected area. There are numerous elected officials on the Committee who have not been re-elected or have been elected to other offices. Some alternates have participated as members even though the member was present, and there have been different individuals representing some members at each meeting.

Decision Making Rule: The group worked according to a consensus decision-making rule, but consensus was not fully defined or understood. With respect to the development of the agenda, for instance, consensus was required to remove an item rather than to place it on the agenda. The set of forty recommendations were considered consensus recommendations by some, but not by others, including some responsible for implementation.

Meeting Agenda and Length: The bi-monthly meetings are typically scheduled for two hours, but run well beyond because the agendas are too packed to accomplish in the allotted time. In addition, some members speak at length about items not on the agenda. The effort to provide regular opportunities for comments from members of the public has contributed to these dynamics.

Cable Television: All the meetings are taped to be aired on cable television in order to educate the public about the issues. The taping is arranged by a Committee member and does not occur if he is absent. The room is set up to accommodate the cameras rather than to promote effective deliberations. In addition, interviewees described grandstanding for the cameras, especially during the election season.

-  
-  
**SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES**

The key issues raised by interviewees were odors, operating practices, monitoring, public health, traffic, and buffer zones. Each is described below.

**Odors:** The major issue discussed by the Committee is the problem of foul odors emanating from the Central Landfill. Odor complaints are directed to City Hall, DEM, and EPA. It is not clear to the citizens what records are kept with regard to the complaints. Some speak of not getting an answer when they call to complain. At times, EPA staff have been overwhelmed with odor complaints.

DEM is responsible for logging odor complaints and for taking appropriate action. DEM inspectors are sent to the site to evaluate each and every odor complaint it receives. DEM distinguishes between objectionable odors and other odors; objectionable odors result in DEM enforcement activity, but others do not. Citizens do not make such a clear distinction. Citizens are also concerned that by the time an inspector arrives to determine the level of odor, it may be gone, especially on weekends.

Since the creation of the Committee, RRC has spent over a million dollars to build a system of gas collection trenches and wells and to install additional gas burning flares. It has also taken steps to ensure that flares do not go out on weekends.

There is disagreement about the current level of odor problem. Some Committee members believe the problem has been resolved and others, generally the members living in the surrounding neighborhoods, state that intolerable odor problems have been reduced, but not eliminated. Such members strongly desire an ability to monitor the odors and operations at the landfill to determine causal relationships and improve landfill operations to reduce the incidence and severity of odors.

**Operating Practices at Central Landfill:** The Committee has identified, discussed and made recommendation about operating practices that members view as controversial. The use of auto fluff for daily landfill cover is a prominent example. DEM has developed a set of conditions to control the use of auto fluff, and the landfill is not using auto fluff at this time. Committee members are concerned about the possibility of contaminants, especially heavy metals, in auto fluff and have stated that it has blown off the landfill and around their neighborhoods. Sub-components of the waste stream are another source of concern. The Committee has begun an effort to identify components of the solid waste stream that merit special treatment. The issue of gypsum has already been addressed and the distinct odors and management of fish wastes were identified at a recent meeting.

**Monitoring:** ATSDR provided monitors to determine if hydrogen sulfide was

present above allowable levels. The monitoring determined hydrogen sulfide is not a problem. Many Committee members disagreed with the decision to monitor for hydrogen sulfide as they are familiar with its rotten egg odor and were certain they smelled something else. However, the Committee did not have the opportunity to effectively decide what should be monitored. ATSDR recognizes the difficulty of monitoring for odorous compounds and is currently evaluating various monitoring options.

**Public Health:** Citizens are concerned about the overall impact of the odors on their health. Some children exhibit patterns consistent with their being "sensitive receptors" to the odors, meaning the odors trigger allergic reactions. ATSDR, with assistance from DOH, has begun a study of the health effects on the public. Citizens willing to be screened will be given a complete medical evaluation, and a doctor will be available to evaluate incidents when they occur. In the past, children have been taken to Boston for evaluation, but the episodes often pass by the time they are seen by a doctor. Some parents stated that when they moved their children out of the area, their symptoms disappeared.

Health effects can include a range of discomforts from nausea to asthma attacks as well as stress from the uncertainty and fears of impacts of odors. To date, monitoring has shown that air quality near the landfill is similar to the air quality around Providence, which does not indicate a public health emergency.

**Traffic:** Approximately 1000 trucks per day travel through Johnston, the great majority headed for the Landfill. Although there are laws against the use of neighborhood streets, some local trucks use residential streets to get to the Landfill. Enforcement of traffic regulations is sporadic. There is a plan to build ramps directly from Route 295 to the landfill. If built, all agree that the ramps will ease the traffic burdens in some areas. Some residents are concerned about increases in noise and pollution associated with new traffic patterns and would like barriers erected. EPA and DEM have limited authority concerning traffic issues.

**Buffer Zone:** Some years ago, a buffer zone around the landfill was created by the legislature. All homes within the first 1000-feet of this buffer zone were purchased by RRC. In the zone between 1000 and 2000-foot buffer homeowners were given the option of selling. Some people stayed and others sold to RRC. RRC moved some of the homes from within the 1000-foot buffer zone into this intermediate area and rented some of these homes, as well as others it purchased in the 1000-2000-foot zone. After complaints about RRC collecting rents on properties not on the tax rolls,

RRC decided to sell the properties. Some were sold and others were eventually boarded up or destroyed.

Different views exist about the purpose of the buffer zone and the activities that should be permitted. Some Committee members and residents believe the buffer zones were created to function as natural buffers between the residential neighborhoods and the landfill. They expect trees and shrubbery to grow to fill in the area. RRC staff have different views about permissible activities in the buffer zone. The construction of the planned 540-megawatt power plant will significantly alter the undeveloped nature of the buffer zone. Conversion of other areas to commercial and industrial uses will add to this trend. Some committee members want the existing buffer zone to be expanded to provide a larger vegetated shield and others urge additional buyouts of affected homeowners.

The original creation of the buffer zone was accomplished by an Act of the Legislature. U.S. EPA and DEM have no authority concerning the buffer zone.

## **KEY STAKEHOLDER GROUPS**

The key stakeholder groups related to issues of the Central Landfill Action Committee are: citizens, administrative government agencies, state legislators, municipal officials, industry, and perhaps state-wide organizations. Each stakeholder group's main interests, concerns relative to the issues, and assessment of the Committee are discussed below.

### **Citizens**

The Central Landfill Action Committee was created to provide an ongoing forum for identifying and addressing the concerns of citizens related to impacts of Central Landfill and other nearby facilities. The citizens who experience these impacts most prominently and who have participated on the Committee, predominantly reside in three Johnston neighborhoods -- Clearview Estates/ Bishop Hill/Peck Hill Roads, Shun Pike/Appletree Lane, and Scituate Avenue -- and two neighborhoods in West Cranston. A neighborhood in Scituate is also affected but has not been represented directly by a resident.

In addition to citizen members, other citizens attend meetings to speak as members of the public. The participation of citizens has been important in identifying odor events and potential health effects and in bringing to light concerns about traffic, future development, and environmental health.

A primary interest of citizens is in restoring a degree of security and predictability to daily home life. The citizens interviewed feel the development of Central Landfill has disrupted their lives in unacceptable ways. Trucks interrupt the peace and quiet longer term residents sought in moving to the area. Unpredictable odor events disrupt the ability to carry on a social life. In more extreme cases, residents feel the health of their families has been compromised. These impacts are compounded by high levels of stress generated by the character and unpredictable pattern of impacts. Tangible issues that could address these concerns are improvements in RRC's gas collection system and capping the landfill, better management of truck traffic, and a buyout that would provide neighbors with the resources to relocate.

Citizens' second primary interest is in understanding the health and environmental effects associated with living near a large landfill. They want to understand the pattern of exposures and assess its significance for their health and welfare. They also want to be certain that existing regulations are enforced. Citizens want to establish a monitoring program that will help them distinguish patterns in odors and identify significant exposures; they want to play an active role in shaping and overseeing this program. They also want a program that will assess health problems they feel may be associated with exposure to releases from the Landfill.

A third interest is in being advised of plans for future development and having a voice in shaping development. RRC directly controls 1100 acres outside the active landfill site and its activities will influence development within that area. Residents are concerned about impacts new development will create.

Finally, they want to feel that Johnston is getting a fair share of the benefits that are earned by Central Landfill and the communities that dispose of waste there. This concern is expressed quite directly by some in the notion that the landfill is, from the Town's perspective, a limited resource and an acknowledgement by others that they are going to be left with this ongoing burden once the landfill has reached its capacity.

Virtually all the citizens applaud the impact of the Committee on RRC operations. The citizens feel their participation has heightened scrutiny of RRC, and they believe that the actions undertaken by RRC to control odors are a direct result of Committee

activities. They state that it is crucial that the Committee continue, perhaps with some membership and structural changes.

## **Administrative Government Agencies**

### **Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management Solid Waste Division (DEM)**

DEM staff helped organize the process, have consistently participated in the meetings, helped develop the recommendations, and have provided logistical and technical support. The central role of DEM is tied to its statutory responsibilities for making and implementing solid waste policy in Rhode Island. This includes responsibility for regulating the RRC. DEM also has responsibility for tracking and investigating odor complaints.

DEM staff are concerned with improving environmental performance at Central Landfill and responding to the concerns of Johnston residents who are affected by the landfill. They acknowledge some tensions in their oversight role of RRC, but treat these as incidental to their practice. It makes their job more difficult, but doesn't prevent them from doing it.

DEM's goals are to ensure that standards are being met, promote better environmental management practices at RRC, improve different actors' understanding of the problem and enhance the legitimacy of their efforts to promote environmental protection. DEM is interested in providing good information to neighbors of the Landfill regarding their oversight of the Landfill and enforcement actions. DEM wants to understand and address legitimate concerns about odors and health impacts, but also wants Committee members to understand and acknowledge its statutory and resource limitations.

DEM values input from, and dialogue with, the residents in the neighborhoods surrounding the landfill and other waste management facilities in Johnston. However, DEM has been extremely frustrated with the current process and does not have the resources, either in terms of funding or people, to sponsor a facilitated committee. Furthermore, resource constraints may limit DEM's future participation in the Committee, particularly if the process does not support effective communication and push towards solutions.

## **U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)**

EPA staff played significant roles in organizing the Committee and has been represented at each of the Committee's meetings.

EPA has statutory responsibility to oversee planning and management of the areas in Central Landfill designated a Superfund site and to ensure that Central Landfill meets its obligations under the New Source Performance Standards of the Clean Air Act.

EPA has no other programmatic authority for Central Landfill, but has expended significant resources on issues related to the site. To date, EPA has funded all the facilitation of the Committee. It has done this in part under its general mission of protection of the environment and public health and its agency-wide commitment to public involvement. EPA has committed funds for facilitation through the Spring of 2001, but is pessimistic about its ability to make future funding and internal resources available.

EPA is limited, however, in the actions it can take to remedy citizen complaints and staff are frustrated that they have become burdened with requests they cannot address, including receiving many odor complaints. EPA is unlikely to maintain its current level of support for the Committee and will continue its participation only if the State takes a leadership role in the public involvement process. However, EPA will continue to participate in the superfund public involvement process especially with regard to issues related to its upcoming proposed groundwater plan. In addition, EPA will continue its enforcement actions until these issues are resolved.

EPA interests are in fulfilling its statutory and regulatory obligations, promoting good practice, and contributing to the development of good communication, technical competence, and better understanding of the experience of citizens and other actors. These also contribute to the legitimacy of government efforts to promote environmental protection. In this sense, the EPA is a limited partner with the DEM and its participation supports the efforts of the DEM to achieve the shared goal of promoting good environmental management and meeting regulatory standards.

Many participants identify EPA as one of a group of key participants whose participation lends legitimacy and credibility to the activities of the Central Landfill Action Committee. They cite the expertise and commitment EPA staff provide. Even more important in the eyes of these stakeholders is the autonomy and independent perspective of EPA, which contributes directly to the trust others have in the process

and their commitment to participate.

EPA staff recognize the contribution the Central Landfill Action Committee has made, yet also share a sense that a thoughtful reorganization and better management of the process can contribute to the ability of all participants to learn about problems and practices and to meet their individual and collective goals.

### Rhode Island Department of Health (DOH)

DOH is committed to understanding and addressing situations that compromise the health of individuals. This includes acting on the statutory basis for regulatory action, but extends to trying to understand and address people's concerns about how activities at Central Landfill and other facilities are affecting their health. In Johnston, West Cranston, and Scituate, DOH wants to help people understand the physical basis for the odors, exposures that might accompany the odors, and assess health problems that may be related to these exposures. It also wants to help residents figure out what they can do about health problems, even if this means recommendations for case management.

DOH has helped to organize and launch a program with ATSDR that starts with health effects and tries to reason backwards to causes and forward to management options.

DOH still sees a need for a cohesive citizens' group in Johnston and benefits associated with it. These include bringing public concerns to light and helping craft messages so that communication between the agencies and citizens is clear (i.e. DOH and DEM understand what citizens' concerns are and what they want, and citizens understand what DEM and DOH are doing). To accomplish this, DOH believes there needs to be better organization among the citizens and changes in the norms and practices of meetings.

### **State Legislators**

The representatives to the Rhode Island General Assembly from Johnston and West Cranston have played a prominent role in the Central Landfill Action Committee since its inception. Their participation is broadly acknowledged to contribute to the visibility and effectiveness of the Committee. They have played a role in shaping the agenda, contributed to deliberations over items on the agenda, and helped craft recommendations. In addition, they provide liaison with the Assembly and introduced and passed several pieces of legislation that address concerns about

operations at Central Landfill. One of the initiatives that failed to pass would have established the Committee by an act of the Legislature. Most members see this ability to coordinate with legislative action as critical for the effectiveness of the Committee.

The legislators on the Committee broadly acknowledge its effectiveness in bringing citizens' concerns to light and in enhancing scrutiny and understanding of operations at the Landfill. The public attention it has brought to odors, health, and water supply and the scrutiny it has provided of RRC are seen as genuine contributions. They see the Committee as a necessary "watchdog" for oversight of RRC and advocacy for the interests of affected communities.

Overall, they see the Committee as a valuable and effective effort that should be sustained. At the same time, they cite needs for reorganization that would enhance the Committee's ability to focus and make it more procedurally efficient (and thereby more effective). Steps that would address these goals would also address concerns about a lack of civility that has detracted from the effectiveness and legitimacy of the Committee and has undermined some members' commitment to participate.

Their interests are in seeing that the legitimate concerns and interests of their constituents receive appropriate attention and that the state's solid waste management needs are addressed competently and fairly. The particular interests they view as legitimate are odors, health, management practices, traffic, future development on land controlled by RRC, and a potential buyout.

## **Municipal Officials**

The primary local officials who have participated in the activities of the Committee to date are from Johnston. The Mayor of Johnston organized the initial meeting in which a commitment was made by DEM and EPA to form the Committee. In addition to the Mayor, who lives in an affected neighborhood, town council members from the affected districts of Johnston are also Committee members.

The local officials also cite the important watchdog role of the Committee and the need to sustain the Committee to play this role. They cite needs for reorganization similar to those raised by members of the legislative caucus regarding a lack of civility at the meetings. The Mayor no longer wants to provide police coverage for each meeting.

Local officials' interests are in seeing that their constituents' concerns about odors,

health effects, traffic, and impacts of future development get the attention they deserve, though there is disagreement among them with regard to support for certain types of development. They also want to understand and limit the long term impacts of the Landfill. For example, they support establishing a monitoring system that will help identify impacts and that has the legitimacy for its citizens. The local officials are also sensitive to fiscal issues raised by being the host community for the Central Landfill and do not see the current agreement as equitable.

## Industry

### Resource Recovery Corporation (RRC)

RRC, a quasi-public agency, operates as a free standing organization, but is subject to oversight by its governing board and must comply with open meeting requirements, sunshine provisions, and state protocols for procurement. RRC management sees the establishment of the Committee as the result of an unfortunate confluence of events that created significant odor problems. Its managers believe they have acted appropriately to address the problems that were created and have regained control of the odor problem.

Given its fiduciary responsibilities, RRC staff feel pressure to develop the property they control in a manner that will generate positive economic returns for both the Corporation and the Johnston tax rolls.

RRC's primary role on the Committee has been to provide information about practices at the Landfill and constraints that shape its operation, and to respond to questions and concerns raised by other members and the public at large. RRC's position on the Committee is complicated. Its activities are the focus of the Committee's deliberations, and most of the Committee's recommendations were addressed to RRC.

RRC management and staff express concerns about the focus and management of the Committee. They feel the group got off track and needs to regain an appropriate focus and that reflects an advisory role. Their experience was that the unclear definition and uneven management of the Committee's decision rule forced consensus on parties and provided insufficient opportunities for critical comments. RRC's representation on the Committee has been inconsistent, which has been interpreted by other members as a lack of commitment.

Participation on the Committee provides RRC with a direct way to address its organizational concerns for clear communication with its neighbors, coordination with local decision-making, opportunities to educate the public about solid waste management, and enhanced credibility. RRC would welcome citizen monitoring, which it believes would contribute to its legitimacy.

### NEED Facility

The NEED facility is a privately-owned company that recycles construction waste. It is regulated by DEM, which has taken numerous enforcement actions against it. The facility was listed on the long term agenda of the committee as a potential source for odors, traffic, and health impacts.

The NEED representative provides technical information to the citizen Committee members. He is interested in better management at Central Landfill as NEED abuts the landfill, and does not want to be blamed for its odors.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Many interviewees, across multiple stakeholder groups, believe that the existence of the Central Landfill Action Committee has served to improve the performance of RRC with respect to odor management. In other words, many members of the Committee believe it played a "watch dog" function and has been and can continue to be an effective tool for promoting proper management of the landfill.

On the other hand, because of the broad agenda of the Committee even as it relates only to Central Landfill – odors, public health and environment, traffic, and buffer zones – jurisdiction for responsive actions lies among many local, state and federal government entities. As a result, the environmental agencies have difficulty justifying the expenditure of a significant portion of their limited resources in support of the Committee's broad agenda. For example, DEM may decide its staff time is better used ensuring implementation and periodic updates of the Committee's "odor management workplan," which is within DEM's authority to act upon, than staffing the Committee meetings. EPA has participated in and supported the Committee by invitation of the RI DEM and therefore, a reduced DEM commitment to the Committee is likely to lead to a reduced commitment by EPA. EPA, however, will continue to actively inform the community about Superfund issues.

In light of this, SP&A recommends that a reorganized Committee continue to exist to

play a watch dog function and develop recommendations on the issues of concern to the citizens impacted by the landfill. However, it is likely that the citizens, along with municipal and legislative officials, and perhaps with support from state or regional environmental groups, will need to organize themselves, as they are unlikely to be able to count on the level of support previously provided by DEM and EPA.

SP&A's recommendations below outline a reorganized Committee, including possible sponsorship options, a proposed committee structure, a proposed agenda, and an outline for ground rules.

## Sponsorship

The focus and operation of the Committee would be enhanced if clear sponsorship were established. EPA has in many ways, functioned as the Committee's sponsor, but is unlikely to continue to do so. RI Department of Environmental Management is also unlikely to function as sponsor given that many of the Committee's agenda items fall outside its organizational mandate and statutory authority. As an alternative, the institutional basis or the Committee could be provided by the kind of legislation proposed in the past state legislative session. Such legislation, if passed, would create a permanent committee by statute and ground its standing and support in this legislative mandate. Another option is for the Inter-Agency Caucus (see below) to function as the Committee sponsor, thereby maintaining a commitment of continued participation and support from the public agencies, and enabling the Committee to make recommendations to the range of agencies with authority for issues that concern its members.

## Committee Structure

### Summary

Any effort to reorganize the Central Landfill Action Committee must respond to dynamics, issues, and stakeholders that have been outlined in preceding sections of this report. In sum, these include: 1) episodic odors problems that raise concerns among neighbors in Johnston, West Cranston, and Scituate about the management and operation of Central Landfill; 2) concerns about health effects; 3) a history of poor communication; 4) local norms; and 5) the regulation and politics of solid waste management. In addition, these recommendations also take into account

organizational issues not specific to Central Landfill, but that apply to committees more generally.

SP&A recommends that the Central Landfill Action Committee evolve into a deliberative and decision-making body that provides for communication and coordination between stakeholder groups that have distinct interests, concerns, and rationales for involvement. The Committee would be comprised of members of each stakeholder group, each of which would be organized as a caucus. The proposed caucuses<sup>[7]</sup> to be represented are: citizens, legislators, municipal officials, administrative government agencies, and RRC. The Committee would include representation from each caucus and have a distinct agenda and clear set of rules governing participation and decision-making. Each caucus would hold separate meetings to enable it to fully and effectively participate on the Committee. In addition, cross-caucus subcommittees would be established to develop proposals and strategies for handling particular issues. (See chart at Appendix A.) Of course, the public would continue to be given opportunities for comments during an established time of the Committee meetings.

The proposed structure is designed to relieve some of the burdens on the Committee, which has consistently done double and triple duty as a fact-finding and decision making group, forum for coordinating activities of a wide variety of organizations, and a public hearing for citizen concerns and frustrations. These multiple functions have both expanded the Committee's agenda beyond its available time and resources and diluted the focus of the group.

The tiered organization proposed does not seek to address the Committee's need for clarity and efficiency by truncating the concerns that have come before it. Instead it provides a set of forums that respond to the distinctive needs and concerns of the varied groups that have a stake in the ongoing management of Central Landfill and provides a vehicle for coordinating communication, fact-finding, and decision-making across these differentiated forums. This form of organization should also help to address the resource limitations that different stakeholder groups have noted and thus address a primary concern of residents that the Committee be ongoing and thus, sustainable.

## **Description of Each Caucus**

Citizen Caucus – This caucus would be open to all interested citizens and would

identify 1-2 Committee members from each of the three affected Johnston neighborhoods and one Committee member from the affected Cranston and Scituate neighborhoods, for a total of 5 – 8 members on the Committee. At caucus meetings, citizens would air legitimate concerns and frustrations, review reports and other material, get information about Committee activities, have access to an independent technical advisor, identify priorities, and develop strategies to accomplish the goals of the caucus. Committee representatives would inform the citizens of the Committee's deliberations and actions, get feedback from the citizens, share information, learn of additional issues and concerns for Committee discussion, and possibly implement citizen monitoring programs. This caucus should be supported by a technical expert of its choosing, with funds provided by either EPA or DEM.

Solid Waste Legislative Caucus – This caucus already exists in the Legislature. Its members include representatives and senators of the affected areas. The legislative caucus would determine the number of representatives it felt was necessary for the Committee. This caucus would continue to develop appropriate legislative strategies for addressing Committee decisions and proposed actions.

Municipal Caucus – This caucus would consist of municipal officials from Johnston, Cranston, and Scituate, assuming interest on the part of the latter two. Given that Johnston's concerns are broader than the others, it would continue to be represented by the Mayor and two town council members, whose districts include the affected neighborhoods. Cranston and Scituate would each have one representative on the Committee. This group would decide whether or not meeting as a caucus is an appropriate way to further its interests.

Inter-Agency Caucus – This caucus would include federal and state administrative agencies including EPA, DEM, and DOH and would meet regularly to exchange information and coordinate their activities and support of the Committee. This group could also function as a liaison with other agencies such as ATSDR and DOT, which undertake activities related to the concerns of the Committee. EPA, DEM, and DOH would continue to play a lead role on the Committee, but may choose a different level of membership that would enable them to function as resources and assist with implementation of recommendations rather than as decision makers on recommended actions.

RRC – RRC membership on the Committee, ideally, would consist of one management and one technical person, who would maintain contact with the governing board. At the very least, it should appoint a high level staff member

committed to attend all meetings and one alternate to attend in the absence of the member. Because one of the primary concerns of other members is regulating RRC either formally or informally, RRC may need to be a non-voting member on the Committee. The group will need to be able to reach consensus on recommendations without the consent of RRC. At the same time, these recommendations must not be seen as binding on RRC without their consent.

State-Wide Organizations – The Committee currently does not include state-wide community or environmental organizations. The inclusion of such members may help promote proper solid waste management as a state-wide rather than a local concern.

## **Subcommittees**

Subcommittees, or subsets of the Committee plus non-member technical experts or government officials, may be convened around specific issues, for example, buffer zones, to generate proposals to the Committee. Subcommittees will not have decision-making authority, but rather work to increase the efficiency of the Committee by gathering information and developing options for addressing the particular issue. Subcommittees may also be responsible for particular tasks or studies such as the ATSDR Health Study or citizen monitoring.

## **Membership**

Rules should be established for official Committee membership. Each caucus should select its members and alternates should either be selected by the member or the caucus. The ground rules should clarify issues related to membership for example, if the member is present, the alternate is part of the general public for that meeting.

The rationale for the Committee is citizen concerns. Citizens are and should continue to be represented directly, by residents of the neighborhoods that abut Central Landfill and indirectly by elected officials from state and local government.

Direct citizen representation should be organized along the lines that create the rationale for the committee—geographic proximity and problems. In Johnston, the three affected neighborhoods are: Bishop Hill/Clearview Estates/Peck Hill, Appletree Lane/Shun Pike, and Scituate Ave. Two neighborhoods in west Cranston

and one neighborhood in Scituate are also affected.

## Agenda and Schedule

The existing agenda for the Committee consists of odors, health and environmental impacts, traffic, and buffer zones as related to Central Landfill, the New England Ecological Development facility (NEED), transfer stations, and other potential sources.

SP&A recommends that the Committee limit its activities to the Central Landfill. Central Landfill is a public entity and, therefore, subject to public scrutiny. The other facilities are private entities, fully regulated by state agencies, and not subject to state sunshine laws. If, during its research and deliberations, the Committee finds that any of the private entities are responsible for impacts, it can direct its information to the appropriate state regulatory agency.

This proposal should be discussed and revised, and an agenda should be adopted by the members of the Committee when it is convened in its reorganized form.

The Committee has focused all of its activities to date on odors from Central Landfill. There is also pressure to begin looking at the agenda items of health and environmental impacts, traffic, and buffer zones.

### Odors

The Committee is currently reviewing the status of its July 2000 recommendations. Upon completion of this review, it is likely that it will decide to continue its focus on odor problems.

A great deal of confusion continues to exist about odors and odor monitoring. Citizens would like the Committee to design and oversee a citizen monitoring program for odors and health effects, the results of which could be jointly reviewed with DEM, DOH, EPA, and RRC. Citizens feel they can contribute to the design of the program since they have the most direct and in-depth experience with the geographic and temporal patterns of odor events. The ATSDR program may provide the most appropriate way to extend monitoring efforts to residents' concerns about potential effects on human and health. (see below)

The Committee will continue to be interested in operating practices at Central Landfill that may result in odors and health effects. To date this effort has focused on the materials and practices for covering waste, especially the type and depth of cover material, operation of the gas burning system, and the composition of the waste stream. In this last category, an effort has begun to identify problematic parts of the waste stream and identify alternative practices for dealing with them. In addition, the practices for ensuring that out-of-state trash is not brought into the landfill have been questioned and may be up for review.

### Health and Environmental Impacts

With regard to health impacts, the Committee should continue its work with ATSDR. SP&A proposes that a subcommittee be established to work directly with the affected citizens and ATSDR, which would keep the Committee informed of this study and its results as well as suggest possible Committee activities related to health impacts.

The Committee will need to decide when and how it will conduct its review of environmental impacts and develop action plans that address them. Since part of the landfill is a Superfund Site, EPA will be able to provide the Committee with information and data on some environmental impacts.

### Traffic

Given that the environmental agencies do not have authority with regard to most of the traffic-related issues and potential remedies, SP&A proposes a subcommittee begin work on traffic issues and include DOT and possibly, state police in its discussions. The subcommittee would keep the Committee informed of its findings and propose action items to the Committee for review and decisions.

### Buffer Zone

There is a lot of interest in an expanded buffer zone. The previous buffer zone was established legislatively. If the Committee determines that this is the best strategy for expanding the existing buffer zone, then the legislative caucus should create a subcommittee to develop an action plan for developing such legislation and a strategy for its passage.

Planning for future development – Residents, local officials, and state representatives are all concerned with the open-ended character of development at Central Landfill. The construction of the power plant, proposals to develop an industrial or office park, and the construction of the new interchange on U.S. Route 295 each have the potential

to create significant impacts. The Committee would like to be informed about these developments, have the opportunity to comment and make recommendations (at minimum), and track the type and significance of these impacts.

**Schedule.** The Committee should meet once each month for three hours. The Caucuses should also meet at least monthly. It may be useful to have citizen caucus meetings two weeks after each Committee meeting.

## **Technical Assistance**

The citizens need resources to engage a technical expert to act on their behalf. Many of the issues on the Committee's agenda have a technical basis. Much of the information that is currently available is collected and interpreted by RRC and/or DEM. Citizens may have distinctive questions that do not coincide with the way these agencies have framed their analysis and need a source of assistance to help them interpret the data that are available. Some citizens are suspicious of the value of the information they receive from RRC and DEM. These agencies, in turn, are sometimes frustrated by the lack of technical expertise of the citizens and their distrust of available information. Everyone would benefit from enabling the citizens to better understand technical issues by giving them access to technical advice. Moreover, an independent technical consultant could address these issues at citizen caucus meetings thereby giving citizens the opportunity to raise questions and learn about technical issues outside of the agenda and timeframe of Committee meetings. This would assist the Committee in its efforts to evolve into a decision-making body.

EPA may be able to provide funding for a technical consultant through its Superfund Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) program. If this is not possible, alternative resources will need to be found. These resources should be secured as soon as possible to ensure that the citizens have access to good technical advisors so they will participate more fully at the Committee meetings.

## **Cable Television Taping**

Committee members state that televising the meetings informs citizens of its activities and adds to the transparency and legitimacy of the Committee. The Committee should be responsible for videotaping the meetings and delivering the tapes to Cox Cable for broadcasting.

## Ground Rules

At its initial meeting, the Central Action Landfill Committee should develop procedural groundrules that will govern its discussions and negotiations. The facilitators will provide the Committee with draft groundrules prior to that meeting to serve as a basis for discussion and decision-making. The proposed groundrules would cover such matters as the following:

- mission of the Committee;
- obligations of and protections for the Committee members;
- obligations that derive for members as a result of consensus agreements;
- structure of the Committee including its ability to add members, use alternates, have advisors, use subcommittees to develop proposals, caucuses, and attendance requirements;
- decision-making rule (definition of consensus);
- how to deal with media contacts;
- the role of public participation;
- procedures to ensure the protection of confidential information;
- the recognition that meetings are open to the public;
- the manner in which a record of the sessions will be kept;
- schedule of meetings and planned milestone dates; and
- roles and responsibilities of the facilitators.

## CONCLUSION

The Central Landfill is the core component of Rhode Island's solid waste management strategy. The Central Landfill Action Committee has emerged to identify and address the local costs associated with this centralized program of solid waste management. The Committee's efforts are directed at understanding the effects of the landfill on the Rhode Island citizens whose lives are most affected by the operation of the landfill. These citizens and the Town of Johnston, whose actions and frustrations led to the creation of the Committee, share the state's goals of wanting to ensure proper management of the landfill, and understand, monitor, and limit its impacts on the environment and the health and welfare of people living in the surrounding neighborhoods and communities.

Before the creation of the Committee, the experience of the citizens who live near the Landfill was an informal part of the monitoring of the solid waste program. The feedback they provided, primarily with regard to odors and potential health effects, was expressed without the benefit of consultation and in a contentious manner that reflected their limited opportunities for making a constructive contribution.

The Central Landfill Action Committee is the first effort to try to create a more constructive forum for understanding the experience of the citizens and responding to their concerns. The experience has been mixed. The Committee is broadly recognized to operate in ways that are less civil and less effective than what its members aspire to. Yet at the core are a dedicated group of citizens, elected officials, and representatives of state and federal agencies who have managed to create and sustain a forum on an important public issue. The significance and value of what they have accomplished should be acknowledged. Most members cite the value of the Committee and the 40 recommendations in the decrease in odors and recognize its potential to contribute more effectively to achieving state solid waste management goals.

The recommendations in this report are intended to support the efforts of the Committee to move in this direction. They outline a series of steps to strengthen the organizational structure and provide mechanisms for technical consultation and nested interaction that should contribute to more productive deliberations. A step in this direction could greatly enhance the ability of the Committee to assist Rhode Island in achieving its solid waste goals while responding to legitimate concerns of its citizens.

## APPENDIX A: CHART OF THE PROPOSED COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

## APPENDIX B: PROPOSED COMMITTEE COMPOSITION

Below is a proposal for the Committee composition. Each caucus would be responsible for selecting its members.

### Citizens / Neighborhoods (5 - 8)

1. Clearview Estates, Johnston (1-2)
2. Peck Hill Road, Johnston (1-2)
3. Scituate Ave., Johnston (1-2)
4. North Cranston (1)
5. Scituate (1)

### State Legislators (5 - 6)

- Johnston Representatives (2)
- Cranston Representative (1)
- Scituate Representative (1)
- Senator (1 - 2)

### Municipalities (5)

- Mayor of Johnston
- Johnston Town Council (2)
- Scituate official (1)
- Cranston official (1)

### Administrative Governmental Agencies (3 -4)

- EPA (1)
- DEM (1)
- DOH (1)
- Perhaps, DOT (1)

RRC

Management (1)  
Technical staff (1)

State-wide Organizations (1 - 3)

## APPENDIX C: LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

Mr. James Allam  
Rhode Island Resource Recovery  
65 Shun Pike  
Johnston, RI 02920

Mr. Brock Bierman  
151 Laten Knight Road  
Cranston, RI 02921

Councilwoman Mary Cerra  
975 Atwood Avenue  
Johnston, RI 02919

Pat DiBasio  
200 Scituate Ave.  
Johnston, RI 02919

Ms. Nicole Franco  
33 Hill Drive  
Johnston, RI 02919

State Rep. Aram G. Garabedian  
173 Belvedere Drive  
Cranston, RI 02920

Ms. Lisa Gargaro  
25 Loomis Street

Cranston, RI 02920

Ms. Sherry Giarusso-Mulhearn  
Rhode Island Resource Recovery  
65 Shun Pike  
Johnston, RI 02920

Ms. Laurie Grandchamp  
Rhode Island DEM  
235 Promenade Street  
Providence, RI 02908

Mr. Terry Gray  
Rhode Island DEM  
235 Promenade Street  
Providence, RI 02908

Mr. Leo Hellested  
Rhode Island DEM  
235 Promenade Street  
Providence, RI 02908

Mr. Michael Hill  
US EPA Region 1  
1 Congress St., Ste. 1100-CHW  
Boston, MA 02114-2023

State Rep. Beatrice Lanzi  
81 Eagle Road  
Cranston, RI 02920

Mayor William Macera  
Town of Johnston  
1385 Hartford Avenue  
Johnston, RI 02919

Ms. Patti Major  
12 Apple Tree Lane  
Johnston, RI 02919

Mr. Bill Major  
12 Apple Tree Lane  
Johnston, RI 02919

Mr. Joseph McCauley  
214 Shun Pike  
Johnston, RI 02919

Mr. Robert Mendoza  
US EPA Region 1  
1 Congress St.  
Boston, MA 02114-2023

Ms. Jennifer Perkins  
RI League of Towns and Cities  
1 State St.  
Providence, RI 02908

Mr. George Reznick  
Paradise Road  
Johnston, RI 02919

State Rep. Alfred Russo, Jr.  
1405 Plainfield Street  
Johnston, RI 02919

Mr. Robert Sandberg  
23 Peck Hill Road  
Johnston, RI 02919

Mr. Gregory Sobel  
Environmental Mediation Services  
489 Peakham Road  
Sudbury, MA 01776

Dr. Robert Vanderslice  
RI Dept. of Health  
3 Capitol Hill  
Providence, RI 02908

Mr. Louis Vinagro  
New England Ecological Development  
23 Green Hill Road  
Johnston, RI 02919

---

[1] In addition to their responsibilities at Susan Podziba & Associates, the authors of this assessment are also members of the faculty of the Environmental Policy Group of the Department of Urban Studies and Planning, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

[2] Data provided by Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management.

3 According to the US EPA Central Landfill Factsheet, March 12, 1999.

4 Health Consultation: Central Landfill, Johnston, Providence Count, Rhode Island CERCLIS N0. RI

D980520183, prepared by the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR)

5 Data provided by RI DEM.

[6] From RRC website.

[7] The Citizen Caucus would be facilitated by the committee facilitators. Facilitators may also be made available to other caucuses and subcommittees, only if needed.