

BoRit Asbestos Superfund Site Community Advisory Group Meeting

Ambler/Upper Dublin/Whitpain, Pennsylvania

(Draft Minutes)

Date: Wednesday, August 1, 2012

Location: Upper Dublin Township Building, 801 Loch Alsh Ave. Fort Washington, PA 19002

Meeting called to order by Co-chair David Froehlich at 6:38 p.m.

Item #1: Welcome & Announcements

Mr. Froehlich began the meeting by noting that Co-Chair Bob Adams was absent due to illness. Those in attendance were asked if there were any additions or changes to the meeting agenda. Ms. Susan Curry noted that agenda item “*Ambler 5-Year Review, Jim Feeney, EPA*” should be removed from the agenda as Mr. Feeney was not in attendance. Mr. Froehlich noted that Mr. Feeney had completed his site visit but had yet to complete his report and would like to wait until that occurs before making a formal presentation to the CAG. This is expected to be done by the October 4th CAG meeting. Mr. Froehlich asked those in attendance if there were any questions or comments regarding the June meeting minutes. Mr. Sal Boccuti noted that Mr. Vance Evans of the EPA stated during the June CAG meeting that the CAG should be receiving the meeting minutes within two weeks from EPA. He also noted that he as he understood it; the minutes were to be sent for review within EPA, possibly to supervisory persons who may not have been in attendance during the meeting. Mr. Boccuti commented that ---“the minutes are a recording of the meeting. If you were not at the meeting, then you can’t review the minutes.” Ms. Kristine Matzko of EPA noted that no major changes were being made to the minutes while under review at EPA. If any additions are added, they are only to clarify certain items.

Comments, requests and corrections noted for June’s CAG meeting minutes are as follows:

³⁵₁₇ Ms. Susan Curry requested the addition of page numbers to future meeting minutes.

³⁵₁₇ Mr. Sal Boccuti noted that a sentence in the last bullet point on page 4 currently reads “He noted that RR&M does have evidence they the CAG is achieving positive results” but should be amended to read “He noted that RR&M does have evidence *that* the CAG is achieving positive results.”

³⁵₁₇ Mr. Boccuti noted that for the sake of consistency the pond should be referred to as the reservoir.

³⁵₁₇ Mr. Boccuti noted that a line in item #3 of the RR&M Report Summary (p. 7) currently reads “It is his feeling that this would be the correct point in this meeting to bring up a broad subject of this nature but the issue can certainly be raised in the future” but should be amended to read “It

is his feeling that this would *not* be the correct point in this meeting to bring up a broad subject of this nature but the issue can certainly be raised in the future. “

³⁵₁₇ Mr. Boccuti noted that a line in the first paragraph of page 8 currently reads “Mr. Otis Hightower commented that it would if some committee members could attend public meetings. He noted that he hopes this is just phase one of longer process” but should be amended to read “Mr. Otis Hightower commented that it would *be desirable* if some committee members could attend public meetings. He noted that he hopes this is just phase one of longer process.”

³⁵₁₇ Ms. Susan Curry noted that Ms. Lynn Hoffman’s named had been spelled differently twice in the June minutes.

³⁵₁₇ Ms. Susan Curry noted that bullet point #5 on page 2 currently reads “Mr. Vance Evans of the EPA noted that some sites take on a life after the work by EPA is completed, so it may be in the CAG’s best interest to get additional info. Mr. Evans mentioned that he sees the possibility of the CAG going on as a group into the future, long after BoRit work has been completed” but should be amended to include the word work. The line currently reads this way so no changes have been made.

³⁵₁₇ Ms. Susan Curry noted that a line on page 5 currently reads “Items, issues and concerns raises following voting on the amended AOC statement are as follows” but should be amended to read “Items, issues and concerns *raised* following voting on the amended AOC statement are as follows”.

³⁵₁₇ Ms. Susan Curry requested that acronyms such as PADOH be spelled out completely (i.e.; The Pennsylvania Department of Health) in future meeting minutes.

³⁵₁₇ Ms. Susan Curry requested that the title of “West Ambler Revitalization” be added before the section on page 7 detailing Mr. Jim Blanch’s summary during the June CAG meeting to help differentiate it from the previous section “Community Awareness Group”.

³⁵₁₇ Ms. Susan Curry requested clarification regarding a statement by Mr. Gordon Chase in the second paragraph of Item #6 on page 9 of the June CAG minutes. The statement as made by Mr. Chase currently reads “Mr. Gordon Chase noted that the fence along Maple St. will be brought in a small amount and the asbestos along the fence line will be removed.” Ms. Curry inquired as to the meaning of the wording “brought in”. The consensus amongst the CAG was that Mr. Chase meant the fence line would be moved closer to the Site and further away from the sidewalk and street. Mr. Christopher Mondia of Chenega Global Services noted that was the wording Mr. Chase had used during the meeting. At this point a discussion was had regarding making changes to quoted wording for clarification purposes. Mr. Vance Evans recommended that perhaps changes of this nature should be indicated in brackets next to the original wording. Co-chair Dave Froehlich responded that he did not feel the changes were substantive enough to warrant this.

³⁵₁₇ Mr. Sal Boccuti noted that despite these minor corrections, he was very happy overall with the CAG meeting minutes and noted that they contained a level of detail they had not previously had.

³⁵₁₇ Ms. Susan Curry had a query regarding the meeting minute commenting process. She noted that she was under the understanding that the minutes would be distributed in time for CAG members to make comments to the Co-chairs. Mr. Froehlich responded that EPA had provided the meeting minutes to the CAG Co-chairs within 10 days to two weeks of the last meeting as they had stated they would do, but that the Co-chairs had neglected to share the draft minutes with the CAG members in a timely manner. Mr. Froehlich stated ---“Yes, in this instance, it was the Co-chairs mistake. I am sure that comment will be reflected in the minutes.”

At this point Mr. Froehlich made a motion to approve the June meeting minutes. All in attendance were in favor of this motion.

Item #2: Technical Assistance Services for Communities (TASC) Report – Mr. Stuart Wiswall, P.G. of Skeo Solutions

Co-Chair Dave Froehlich introduced Mr. Stuart Wiswall, P.G., of Skeo Solutions to the group by speaking about the Technical Assistance for Communities (TASC) grant and noting that Mr. Wiswall’s findings were independent of EPA. Mr. Wiswall distributed copies of his presentation to the group. Mr. Froehlich noted that it will also be made available on the CAG’s website. Ms. Susan Curry asked Mr. Wiswall if the copy of the presentation he was distributing at the meeting was the same as the draft she had received prior to the meeting. Mr. Wiswall responded that it was.

Mr. Wiswall began his presentation by giving a brief summary of his background and by asking the group to not hesitate to ask questions or speak up during his presentation. Ms. Susan Curry noted that pictures were being taken during Mr. Wiswall’s presentation and inquired as to the name of the photographer. At this point, Ms. Krissy Russell-Hedstrom, Ph.D., Technical Assistance Specialist with Skeo Solutions, introduced herself to the group. Mr. Wiswall then continued to give his presentation to the group.

Questions and comments raised during Mr. Wiswall’s presentation are as follows:

³⁵₁₇ Co-Chair Dave Froehlich asked Mr. Wiswall which wells he was referring to when he referred to sampling wells. Mr. Wiswall responded ---“the six deep wells.”

³⁵₁₇ Mr. Sal Boccuti asked if the pump testing was an expensive procedure and whether the cost was prohibitive. Mr. Wiswall responded ---“When you start dealing with fractured bedrock, nothing is cheap.” He did note that despite this fact, installing deep wells where shallow contamination is found is still one of the most direct and cost effective methods to sample and is a natural progression of the sampling process. If further testing was to be conducted, the next step would be the sampling of the bedrock aquifer. Mr. Boccuti asked if Mr. Wiswall felt there was a need to pursue further testing. Mr. Wiswall responded that any contamination found during his

testing was within accepted levels and could be just as easily coming from an offsite source as an onsite source.

³⁵₁₇ Ms. Diane Morgan commented that every water spicket in her house is currently corroded. She noted that she has lived at that residence for 14 years and has a water purification system. She remarked that she had a professional visit her home to look at the corrosion and he recommended she have her water tested. Ms. Morgan remarked that she could not remember the exact number but she thinks she was told that her water is currently at 400 parts per billion and that her understanding is the legal limit is 500 parts per billion. Mr. Wiswall responded that corrosion is usually the result of PH issues. Ms. Morgan remarked---“I am just telling you what is in my own drinking water.”

³⁵₁₇ Mr. Eric Cheung asked Mr. Wiswall if all of the fractures in the bedrock that he had discussed in his presentation were interconnected and what the depth of the bedrock is. Mr. Wiswall responded that the bedrock is thousands of feet deep and that it is hard to know if the fractures are connected. He noted that the farther the distance of the fractures, the less of the likeliness that there will be a connection.

³⁵₁₇ Mr. Sal Boccuti inquired if the depths of the wells were measured from ground level or sea level. Mr. Wiswall responded that it was from ground level. Mr. Boccuti noted that different depths recorded on sloped ground could be equal and Mr. Wiswall agreed.

³⁵₁₇ Mr. Boccuti inquired as to the direction of the water flow in relation to the location of the monitoring wells. Mr. Wiswall indicated that he did not know the direction of the water flow stating---“When you pump, you will pull water in from all directions. This could affect water flow.” He also noted that if discussing water flow as it pertains to bedrock, then determining water flow is an even more difficult problem. Mr. Boccuti then stated ---“So even if the flow is north/south, you could be drawing water from the south to the pump.” Mr. Wiswall stated that the deeper the bedrock than the more likely the water will flow towards large drainage areas.

³⁵₁₇ Ms. Ruth Wuenschel of EPA asked for clarification regarding sampling in shallow or deep wells. Mr. Wiswall responded that the sampling was in deep wells. Ms. Wuenschel responded that since nothing of significance was detected, than if the sampling was drawing in deeper water, it would not be drawing in contaminants. Mr. Wiswall responded that an example would be: if well #4 was to draw in contaminants, those contaminants would disperse, therefore making the determination of the source of contamination difficult. He also noted that the point of view of Ambler Borough will be ---“Nothing is coming out of our wells.”

³⁵₁₇ Ms. Diane Morgan asked if Ambler Borough was testing for all the contaminants the CAG was concerned about. Mr. Wiswall responded that they were testing for all contaminants except Asbestos and Manganese.

³⁵₁₇ Co-chair Dave Froehlich asked what Mr. Wiswall could make of the fact that both Ambler Borough’s wells and the asbestos have been in the area for decades and, as far as the CAG

knows, no asbestos has shown in up in the wells. Mr. Wiswall responded that he is not an expert on the Ambler Asbestos Site. He noted that his experience has told him that asbestos is primarily an inhalation concern, not an ingestion concern. He noted that based on the fact that any amounts of asbestos were found in only one of the wells tested, that this tells him that the asbestos in that well was more than likely brought in by drilling, etc. and not migration. He stated---“I would expect to find contamination in the deeper wells. Since I did not find any, this suggests it is not migrating.”

³⁵₁₇ Ms. Susan Curry asked Mr. Wiswall to clarify a statement he made at the beginning of his presentation in which he stated he was not able to determine water flow. Mr. Wiswall responded---“I do not think enough work has been done to determine this.”

³⁵₁₇ Mr. Sal Boccuti asked what the significance was of Ambler Borough wells having a depth of 500 feet and monitoring wells having a depth of 100 feet. Mr. Wiswall responded with two points: 1) There is one big fracture on top of sixty foot of rock and 2) not enough contamination was found in the monitoring wells to warrant going deeper. Mr. Boccuti responded ---“What I’m trying to figure out is, if there is contamination at 100 feet, then is it also at 500 feet or does it not matter?” Mr. Wiswall responded that this depends on many factors including the source of the water being tested and dilution of tested water. Mr. Boccuti stated---“Bottom line is Ambler Borough tests for what it has to test for.” Mr. Wiswall responded that Ambler Borough tests for what their permit requires testing for. He did note that he has not seen the exact permit but stated that when he visited their website detailing volatiles they test for, he noted a very large list of volatiles. Mr. Eric Cheung inquired as to the reason they don’t test for asbestos and manganese. Ms. Lora Werner of the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) stated that asbestos is fairly expensive to test for. Under the Safe Drinking Water Act requirements, public drinking water systems with certain characteristics were required to initially test for asbestos in the 1990s, and if these results were in compliance, testing for asbestos did not have to be continued. She noted that Ambler Borough did testing for Asbestos in the 1990s and it was determined that asbestos levels were too low to warrant further testing. The Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection and Ambler Borough conducted additional asbestos drinking water testing a few years ago to address the recent concerns raised by the CAG. Ms. Diane Morgan asked---“Wasn’t Ambler given a pass on certain testing?” Ms. Werner noted that this question is addressed in the Pennsylvania Department of Health (PADOH)/ATSDR Health Consultation on Groundwater at the Borit site. This new report distributed at the meeting, was discussed during the HERS workgroup update, and will be posted on the PADOH, EPA, and CAG websites. The Ambler Borough system was given permission to test less frequently for certain contaminants, based on their sampling results history.

³⁵₁₇ Co-Chair Dave Froehlich requested clarification on one other point. He noted that the fact that bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate was detected in 3 of the monitoring wells as well as the field blank means the CAG does not know if there is anything to this detection. He noted that it is not a

valid indicator since it also came up in the field blank. Mr. Wiswall responded that bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate is a very common compound and found in a variety of items, including the gloves worn by samplers and those testing the samples in a laboratory setting. He concluded by stating that unless there is reason to believe this compound was a production element on site, then it is typically written off as occurring during the sampling process.

³⁵₁₇ Ms. Susan Curry noted that Mr. Wiswall had stated that the only place asbestos was found in shallow wells. Mr. Wiswall confirmed this and stated he would have been shocking if they had found no traces of asbestos.

³⁵₁₇ Ms. Curry asked Mr. Wiswall if well #2 was the deepest well in which carbon tetrachloride was found and if there would be any point in digging in that particular well further. Mr. Wiswall responded that the levels of carbon tetrachloride in well #2 were above current Regional Screening Levels, which indicates to him that it is coming from a different area. He noted that there was not enough information at this time to draw any conclusions.

³⁵₁₇ Mr. Peter Lowry asked if the monitoring wells were still in place. Mr. Wiswall responded that he believes they are.

At this point the group thanked Mr. Wiswall for his presentation and gave him a round of applause.

Item #3: Workgroup Reports

HERS Workgroup

Lora Werner of the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) began by noting that the HERS committee had been discussing many of the same issues covered in Mr. Wiswall's presentation. She also mentioned the recent completion of the Pennsylvania Department of Health (PADOH)/Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry's (ATSDR) Health Consultation Report on Groundwater for the BoRit Asbestos Site and passed out copies of the report to those in attendance. She noted that the report was "fresh off the presses" and that there was a small chance the cover page may change. Ms. Werner indicated that the Pennsylvania Department of Health (PADOH) and Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) would like this report to be a resource to the CAG and the public and welcomes and questions regarding the report. Ms. Werner also clarified an issue regarding Ambler Borough's testing waiver for certain chemicals like PCE, indicating that the waiver does not exempt them from testing completely, but that it requires the testing to occur less frequently. Dr. Ted Emmett asked if the report was available electronically. Ms. Diane Morgan suggested the report should be e-mailed to the CAG members. Co-chair Dave Froehlich noted that it will be given to Gordon Chase to be placed on the CAG's website. Ms. Ruth Wuenschel of EPA also noted that EPA will be placing a copy on their website as well. Ms. Werner indicated that there was no formal presentation of the report at this time. Mr. Froehlich made a request for more information. Ms. Barb Allerton of the Pennsylvania Department of Health (PADOH) commented that the groundwater under the Site does not pose a public health hazard and meets safe drinking water standards. Ms. Allerton also mentioned that another item the Pennsylvania Department of Health (PADOH)/Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease

Registry (ATSDR) had noted was that there were private drinking wells located within 2 miles of the Site. The Pennsylvania Department of Health (PADOH)/Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry(ATSDR) is making the recommendation to EPA that they identify these private wells. Ms. Christine Lloyd of the Pennsylvania Department of Health (PADOH) noted that no concerns have been found in the public water supply, and anything found was below the MCL. Ms. Werner noted that the point of the Pennsylvania Department of Health (PADOH)/Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR)'s report was to give the public and the CAG a point of reference for questions they may have about groundwater at this site. Ms. Diane Morgan asked---"May I ask a dumb question? How is it we are not drinking from the deeper wells?" Ms. Werner responded by saying that Mr. Wiswall had done a great job in describing fractured bedrock and the nature of water flow. At this point, Co-chair Dave Froehlich interjected that he found it confusing when discussing "deep wells." He noted that water supply wells are 500 feet deep and that the sampling wells Mr. Wiswall is discussing when referring to "deep wells" are generally 50-100 feet deep. He noted that a differentiation between the two may be necessary in the future. Mr. Sal Boccuti recommended referring to these wells as "monitoring wells." Dr. Ted Emmett recommended referring to the wells as "upper bedrock monitoring wells." Ms. Susan Curry inquired as to the page # in the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR)'s report that contained the request for public comments. Ms. Werner replied that this information was on page 5 of the report. Dr. Emmett inquired how the report addresses manganese. Ms. Werner replied that page 11 of the report gives a summary of the manganese detections from the groundwater under the Borit site. Dr. Emmett asked whether the report gives an assessment in regards to manganese. Ms. Werner replied that the report does not interpret the data in regards to how it affects health because the elevated manganese detection was not found in a drinking water source (public or private) where people could be exposed to it; the elevated level of manganese was detected in one of EPA's monitoring wells from the site. The groundwater under the site is not a drinking water source. Ms. Werner noted that manganese is not currently regulated under the Safe Drinking Water Act. She noted that public water systems can monitor for manganese voluntarily. Ms. Werner does not believe Ambler Borough monitors for it based on her review of the monitoring information online for the Borough. Co-chair Dave Froehlich noted that the clarification of manganese levels is important and has been discussed by the CAG before. He requested that a note be made in the report that addresses the meaning of the different standards. Ms. Werner indicated that the comment would be taken into consideration. Ms. Barb Allerton noted that any comments that are received during the comment period for the Pennsylvania Department of Health (PADOH)/Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR)'s report will be addressed in the final version of the report. Ms. Werner noted that the HERS group also discussed the request for a letter regarding enhancing the state's cancer registry. She noted that a lot of the information they have access to for the Ambler area is more specific than anything the state cancer registry would have available. She noted that a letter about the need to enhance the state's cancer registry was still under discussion amongst the HERS work group. Ms. Susan Curry inquired---"Would you conclude that that you are not writing a letter?" Ms. Werner replied that no decision had been regarding the letter. Dr. Ted Emmett stated---"The way the registry is currently set up, we are not going to get anything more from the registry." He also noted that it may be a possibility that the registry could be set up to include more information in the future. He also noted

that this is a very long term goal as the registry's info is shared amongst many states. Ms. Curry stated that she hoped the CAG would be the spark that began a small change with the system of cancer registries in the country. Ms. Curry also noted that a letter to the editor she had written would be appearing in the *Ambler Gazette* addressing the issue that exposure, health effects, and natural gas hydraulic fracturing information needs to be tracked. Ms. Curry asked Ms. Werner if there was a report of the HERS work group meeting other than oral, and Ms. Werner replied that the report would be forwarded to the Co-chairs and placed on the CAG website.

RR&M Committee Report from July 11, 2012

Mr. Peter Lowry began his RR&M meeting summary by noting that Gordon Chase was absent due to travel. Mr. Lowry noted that minutes from the RR&M meeting were posted to the website but not distributed amongst CAG members. He then distributed paper copies of the RR&M group minutes to the CAG. Co-chair Dave Froehlich noted that the minutes look like the original version of the minutes and asked if they include the comments that had been forwarded to Mr. Gordon Chase. Mr. Lowry responded that they did include those comments. Mr. Froehlich noted---“They don't seem to include mine, which were extensive.” Mr. Lowry then began his summary of the RR&M work group meeting by noting it was a well attended meeting. There were three primary agenda items: 1) Mr. Stuart Wiswall's draft groundwater report, 2) Ambler Piles Superfund Site 5- year review, and 3) EPA policy towards trees on both BoRit and Ambler Piles Superfund Sites. Mr. Lowry noted that in terms of Mr. Wiswall's report, the committee reviewed the draft report and was very impressed. He noted that the committee concurred with a lot of the findings. He noted that one request the committee had was whether Mr. Wiswall's observations could be turned into technical observations as the report is a “great report.” Mr. Lowry also touched on Manganese. The committee's concerns are that, though manganese effects are primarily odorous and a secondary concern, could the presence of manganese be a “canary in the coal mine” (i.e. a harbinger of something else). Perhaps waste from an industrial source. He noted that since this is ultimately a 100-year old industrial waste site, finding the presence of manganese is more about fear of the unknown as opposed to whether it will get into drinking water. In regards to the Ambler Piles Superfund Site 5-year review, Mr. Lowry noted that Mr. Gordon Chase and Co-chair Bob Adams made a site visit on July 26th. A report was made following this site visit but Mr. Lowry was unsure how it was distributed. Ms. Susan Curry noted that she had not seen a copy of this report. In regards to EPA's policy towards tree removal, Mr. Lowry noted that there is a ring of trees that remain surrounding the reservoir. He noted that questions have been raised regarding how this stand of trees has remained standing when all other trees were removed. The RR&M committee was curious if these were policy decisions. Mr. Lowry noted that Co-chair Dave Froehlich had enlightened the RR&M committee on how this decision came about and that discussion is detailed in the recent RR&M work group meeting minutes. Mr. Froehlich commented that he had some additional information from Jim Feeney that is relevant to this issue but was not discussed during the RR&M committee meeting. Mr. Lowry concluded his summary by stating that, in terms of action items and recommendations, the major ones are: 1) Mr. Stuart Wiswall being allowed to make technical recommendations to EPA based on his findings, 2) The committee would like to see the policy regarding tree removal. Ms. Susan Curry also

added---“And ask EPA to address the six bullet points” referring to the six bullet points outlined in the RR&M work group meeting minutes. Co-chair Dave Froehlich commented that he though Mr. Wiswall did make a recommendation and his basic understanding was the comment was: when EPA is pumping wells, to allow the CAG to monitor piezometers for the purposes of checks and balances. The CAG could then compare this data with what the pump tests are showing. Ms. Susan Curry noted that there were items in Mr. Stuart Wiswall’s report that could be considered recommendations. She raised the issue that perhaps the CAG should vote on any specific recommendations that would be made to EPA.

Rules Committee

Co-chair Dave Froehlich noted that there were no members of the Rules Committee present to update the CAG on their activities. Mr. Froehlich also noted that Ms. Eileen Fournier had resigned from the Rules Committee as she was moving to Bucks County. Mr. Froehlich also noted that Co-chair Bob Adams’ term is almost complete and this is the year to re-elect or elect a Co-chair. He asked the group to contact the Rules Committee with any nominations. Mr. Sal Boccuti asked if the vote would be at the next CAG meeting and Mr. Froehlich confirmed this. Ms. Susan Curry made a request that Ms. Fournier send the CAG a complete roster of who is a member of the CAG. Ms. Bernadette Dougherty asked if there were enough CAG members present at this meeting to have a quorum. It was determined that there were only 8 voting members present, and not 13, so no votes could be taken at this meeting. Ms. Susan Curry asked the group as a whole if they were receiving EPA Fact Sheets regarding the BoRit Superfund Site. Ms. Ruth Wuenschel noted that a request had been made to the Co-chairs by EPA for a list of all CAG members and their addresses to ensure they are on the EPA BoRit mailing list. Co-Chair Dave Froehlich made a request to EPA that during or concurrent with the 5-year review, that air sampling be done around the Ambler Pile, the former Superfund Site, to confirm that it is performing the way it is reported. Ms. Ruth Wuenschel of EPA asked Mr. Froehlich if the CAG would like a formal response regarding this from EPA. Mr. Froehlich asked the CAG if everyone in attendance thought this was reasonable and the CAG agreed it was. Ms. Wuenschel then noted that EPA would have a formal response for the CAG regarding this issue. Ms. Lora Werner of the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) noted that EPA did recently conduct air sampling along the trail network that provided reassuring information regarding air quality around and nearby the old Ambler piles. Mr. Peter Amento of Ambler Borough made the comment that he would like to recuse himself from any voting regarding the Ambler Borough Wells. Mr. Froehlich asked Ms. Krissy Russell-Hedstrom of Skeo Solutions if the CAG could put a copy of Stuart Wiswall’s presentation up on their website. Ms. Russell-Hedstrom replied that they could.

Item #4: Observer Comments

Ms. Britt Dahlberg, a graduate student from the University of Pennsylvania, introduced herself to the group and noted that she would like to do a dissertation regarding the report she is conducting with Dr. Ted Emmett. She stated that her intent would be to do a yearlong study, observe CAG meetings, speak with CAG members to get a sense of their experiences, challenges, aims, etc. and would

work with the group on ways to improve the process. Co-chair Dave Froehlich said this sounded like a great idea and noted that Ms. Dahlberg could probably do an interesting dissertation on the interworkings of the CAG itself. Ms. Krissy Russell-Hedstrom of Skeo Solutions made a comment regarding the CAG and RR&M's request that Mr. Stuart Wiswall's observations be made into formal technical recommendations. Ms. Russell-Hedstrom noted that the purpose of TASC was to empower community members to make formal recommendations themselves. She noted that Mr. Wiswall may have hinted at recommendations but it is mainly to empower the CAG to make these recommendations themselves.

Item #5 Action Items:

Current items:

³⁵₁₇ Item #107: Request TASC assistance to research past realities on how EPA turned over asbestos sites. Ms. Susan Curry noted that she was unsure if this still an ongoing item or if it should be retired. Co-chair Dave Froehlich noted that they are still in discussions with Skeo Solutions regarding asbestos air monitoring and that the item is still ongoing.

³⁵₁₇ Item #137: Press Releases. Ms. Susan Curry noted that in the past a comment was made that any press release is an official release and statement from the CAG and therefore should be voted on by the group before publication. Mr. Sal Boccuti noted that it was his understanding that only a Co-chair, and not the CAG as a whole, can release any notices to the public. He also noted that the Co-chairs are the spokespersons for the CAG. Mr. Boccuti also stated that the Rules Committee had not been represented at a CAG meeting in over a year. Ms. Diane Morgan stated that she feels that when the Proposed Plan is completed, then some sort of press release should be made to the community. Ms. Ruth Wuenschel of EPA noted that EPA is required by law to notify the public via fact sheets and a public notice in the paper and described the public commenting period to the group. Mr. Eric Cheung made a request that the CAG receive a draft copy of the Proposed Plan before it was released to the public. Both Mr. Vance Evans and Ms. Ruth Wuenschel of EPA stated this it was not possible to release this report to members of the public until the public comment period begins.

³⁵₁₇ Item #139: Request of copy of Request for Grant Proposals (RFP)s for the BoRit Remedial Report. Ms. Susan Curry asked Mr. Peter Lowry if he had received a copy of this RFP. Mr. Lowry replied he had not but that if there is any future contracting, then he would like to see this RFP and made this request again to Mr. Joe McDowell of EPA. Mr. McDowell asked Mr. Lowry if his request pertained to contracting specifically for remedial work. Mr. Lowry replied---"For anything. Maybe I was too specific in my original request. Any new players that you can share with us that is public information would be helpful." Mr. McDowell replied---"What I am hearing is: that for any contractors or sub-contractors, whether it is for remedial or removal, it should be transparent." Ms. Susan Curry commented that her issue had to do with the fact that sometimes there are specific parameters set for contractors on what they can and cannot do and she would like the CAG to be informed of these parameters. Mr. McDowell explained that

those scopes of work would be reflected in work plans that the CAG would be privy to. He noted that the work plans are generally fairly generic and the tasks are fairly broad and generally do not get into specifics. He also reiterated that the work plans the RFPs are based on will be made available to the CAG for review and discussion. Ms. Susan Curry asked who has the specific task of writing the remediation report. Ms. Kristine Matzko of EPA responded that CDM Federal Programs Corporation (CDM) takes the lead on formulating this report.

³⁵₁₇ Item # 119: Former Nicolet Building. Ms. Susan Curry asked if there were any updates regarding the former Nicolet Building. She noted that EPA had stated they would be checking on updates every 6 to 7 weeks. Mr. Joe McDowell of EPA noted that he had been out there approximately 3 weeks ago and noted that there nothing of note happening at the property. He noted that renovation work is just about complete for the Boiler House but the two adjacent properties had had no action since the demolition of buildings on those properties. Mr. McDowell noted that he had contacted the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PADEP) to see if there were any cleanup plans submitted for either of these properties, and the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PADEP) has not received any submittals for either parcels.

Item #6: Old Business/New Business/Next Steps

Mr. Vance Evans of the EPA made note of a timeline poster detailing past, present and future activities at the BoRit Site that had been completed by EPA and given to the CAG. Ms. Susan Curry displayed the completed timeline posters to the group and noted that the posters could be an ongoing reference to the CAG in documenting start and end dates of actions at the Site.

Meeting adjourned at 8:43 p.m. by Co-Chair Dave Froehlich.

The next CAG meeting is scheduled for October 3, 2012.