

BoRit Asbestos Superfund Site Community Advisory Group Meeting

Ambler/Upper Dublin/Whitpain, Pennsylvania

(Draft Minutes)

Date: Wednesday, February 1, 2012

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

Meeting called to order by Co-Chair David Froelich at 6:35 p.m.

Item #1: Welcome & Announcements

December 7, 2011 meeting minutes not approved as they have not yet been circulated and reviewed by the group. Going forward, meeting minutes will be distributed twice. Once in draft form and again in final draft form attached to the agenda for the following month's meeting. Review of guidelines of conduct delayed for the time being. Christopher Mondia of Chenega Global Services, LLC, an EPA contractor, was introduced as the group's new note taker.

Item #2: Update from Kristine Matzko (EPA Region 3 – Remedial Project Manager)

Ms. Matzko reported that EPA has been in the last phase of data collection (Phase II) for approximately the last year. Phase II sampling began in fall of 2010 and was completed in summer 2011. This sampling included soil sampling at the BoRit Site and other key locations. Off-site locations such as the children's park were sampled, as well. Areas where runoff may have occurred were given primary focus. Some soil sampling was done in anticipation of activity-based sampling (ABS) in areas such as the pile, the park and the reservoir. Ms. Matzko indicated that ABS occurred in summer of 2011 in both on and off-site locations. Both groundwater monitoring wells and piezometers were installed as part of this sampling. A geotechnical evaluation was completed with samples of soil taken to evaluate things such as the stability of the pile, etc. Lastly, ecological sampling occurred. Between November 2010 and October 2011, a full year of ambient air monitoring was taken in different locations around the community. Once EPA has had a chance to review this data, a Phase II report will be issued and shared with the community and the group.

EPA will be moving into the next phase of the Remedial Investigation, which is the Risk Assessment, in full force in a couple of months. This phase will take several months. EPA has consulted with their associates who have had experience with Asbestos sites.

Questions and requests raised during Ms. Matzko's summary are detailed below:

1. Eric Cheung asked what EPA was monitoring for during their activity based sampling. Ms. Matzko responded that EPA was monitoring for asbestos, based on a request from the CAG.
2. Susan Curry asked how many sites were sampled in total. Ms. Matzko responded that 6 or 7 sites had been sampled.

3. Co-Chair David Froehlich asked if there were any new items (reports, data, etc) that had been posted to the official EPA BoRit website. Ms. Matzko replied that the latest report uploaded to the website was a groundwater monitoring report from spring 2011. The Phase II report will be next. EPA will notify the CAG once this report is available on EPA's website.
4. Co-Chair Bob Adams asked about the projected timeline regarding the Phase II report. Ms. Matzko replied as early as December but stressed that there are many key steps so could not give a definitive date.
5. A request was made by the group to have a presentation given on what constitutes a Risk Assessment. There was some discussion amongst the group on the best time to have this presentation, with a general consensus being that the next CAG meeting of April would be a good time. Eileen Fournier raised the concern that if the CAG may not be receiving the Phase II report until December, then perhaps April is too early for the RA presentation. The group decided April would still stand as the most opportune time for this presentation. Ms. Matzko said she would note April as the tentative date for this presentation and make the proper preparations.
6. Gordon Chase asked if there will be an RA for air in addition to groundwater. Ms. Matzko replied that the RA includes all media (i.e. air and soil samples).
7. Ms. Curry asked if the RA was part of the Remedial Investigation and not the Feasibility Study, and Ms. Matsko agreed. Ms. Matzko then gave a small overview of the RA process.

Item#3: TAG/TASC Update

Co-Chair Bob Adams indicated he has started investigating getting a TAG grant but indicated there was some confusion regarding eligibility. A conference call with EPA TAG Coordinator, Carrie Deitzel and Co-Chair David Froehlich is scheduled for February 2, 2012. A re-establishment of TASC status will also be discussed on the conference call with Ms. Deitzel on February 2, 2012.

Item #4: Workgroup Reports

HERS Workroup

Lora Werner of ATSDR indicated that the workgroup did not meet in December. An attempt to meet in January 2012 was made but could not find a date that worked for the group as a whole. There was some discussion regarding whether the workgroup was becoming too Agency heavy. Current workgroup Chair, Michelle Naps, will be stepping down. When Ted Emmett returns, discussions will begin about selecting a new Chair for the group. He returns on April 19, at 9:30 a.m. It was noted that this would be after the next CAG meeting in April. There was discussion about how the group can best help the CAG. Currently, there aren't any community members who have a sufficient technical background that meets the criteria. Questions were raised about who would be the next leader of the group, with Mr. Adams noting that the CAG had decided to let the HERS group decide that. The

suggestion was raised that perhaps there could be one Agency chair and one community chair for the group. Ms. Werner applauded Dr. Naps for volunteering her time for the group.

Community Awareness Group

Minutes from the last Community Awareness Group meeting were not distributed to everyone. A message to be placed on the electronic Ambler Savings Bank sign was decided. It will read "For latest information about Ambler Asbestos www.Boriticag.org." The message will be displayed twice daily. Ms. Curry will look into extending the duration the message will be displayed.

Lynn Hoffman has developed four Community Awareness Group posters to help provide awareness about the group and its activities. These posters are 8x11 with an envelope at the bottom of each poster with business cards for the CAG and directions to the CAG's website. Posters have been placed in the Upper Dublin Library, Blue Bell Library, Ambler Library and will be placed on a public bulletin board at each township.

The issue of additional public meetings (i.e. when the Phase 2 report is published.), was discussed.

A two-part newspaper article is being drafted. The first part of this article will include basic info about the site. The second part of this article will introduce the various CAG committees, phases of cleanup, and any issues that may have come up internally within the CAG or between the CAG and EPA. A draft article has not been sent to the CAG as a whole as Ms. Curry indicated she does not have a definitive group e-mail list. Ms. Curry will forward the draft article to Mr. Adams for distribution to the rest of the group. The article cannot be given to the media until the CAG as a whole has had a chance to review, comment upon, and approve the article. Ms. Curry requested that any comments be should be given in the form of actual changes to the article, as opposed to general comments on how the article can be altered. Mr. Ellis will provide a complete e-mail list to Ms. Curry. Mr. Cheung asked who the newspaper article would be pitched to and Ms. Curry indicated she was going to propose it as a guest article in the Ambler Gazette. Mr. Cheung indicated that he has a contact at the Ambler Gazette he can speak with regarding the CAG's article, as well as a contact with Grid Magazine, a local sustainability publication, who may be interested in the article.

There was some discussion amongst the group regarding whether a vote should be taken on the final draft of this article. Sal Boccuti indicated that it was his understanding that any communications distributed from the CAG officially should come from the Chairs. There was some discussion amongst the group on how best to share and comment on the article. Gordon Chase suggested the use of the Google Docs software and there was discussion amongst the group regarding this software and its use. Peter Lowry suggested that only one person make changes to the document. Ms. Fournier raised concerns that the document could be amended at the last minute without the CAG's approval and Ms. Curry assured her that a final draft PDF would be sent to the group for approval. Mr. Adams commented that when the documents (or any other documents) are distributed for comment via email, that the assumption be that if no response is received from a CAG member, then that member is in agreement with the item.

Membership dues of ten dollars are still needed to cover costs of website domain registration and other costs that may arise in the future. Ms. Curry asked any member that had not yet contributed to see Ms. Hoffman before they left to pay their dues.

RR&M Committee Report from January 11, 2012

RR&M Committee Chairman Gordon Chase commented that the committee has been quite busy in the past month. The main points of interest discussed in the previous months' RR&M meeting are as follows:

1. There exists the potential for conflicts of interest in the group, with CAG Co-Chair David Froehlich also being the President of the Wissahickon Waterfowl Preserve and owner of the Reservoir. Additionally, Co-Chair Bob Adams said that RR&M is hoping to avoid any conflicts of interest, but they may be unavoidable.
2. Mr. Chase discussed the reservoir in detail. Ingress and egress of waters in the reservoir is unclear at this time and requires further investigation. RR&M has requested a site inspection of seeps at the reservoir to EPA On-Scene Coordinator Mr. Eduardo Rovira and is waiting for a date to be set for this inspection. Additionally, investigation into original ownership of the reservoir by Shingle, Slate and Sheathing Company may reveal water pathways to and from the reservoir. Mr. Chase indicated that if the group can combine any data that EPA may have along with rainfall data, a clearer picture of water flow at the reservoir may be revealed.
3. In the course of its research, the RR&M group noted that Ambler Borough had applied for, and received from PADEP, waivers for testing of contaminants found by EPA in BoRit groundwater samples. Following this discovery, RR&M wrote letters to both Ambler Borough and PADEP, requesting an explanation regarding the waivers. To date (February 1, 2012) no reply from Ambler Borough has been received. A response from Ms. Roncetti of PADEP was received and this is viewable on the CAG's website. Further clarification of this response is needed before the RR&M group is convinced of the validity of these waivers. Mr. Chase noted that the closest drinking well was approximately 400-500 feet from the BoRit site.
4. US Representative Allyson Schwartz's office contacted the RR&M group. Following this, Mr. Craig Kwiecinsky of Rep. Schwartz' office was given a tour of the BoRit and Ambler piles. Mr. Kwiecinsky was apprised of the most recent RR&M activities and concerns regarding the site.

Mr. Chase ended the RR&M group summary by indicating that the most recent minutes are available on the CAG's website.

A discussion amongst the group regarding the Ambler Borough/PADEP waivers followed. Mr. Chase indicated that he felt the simplest way to allay the concerns of residents was to test, especially since the testing is relatively inexpensive. Mr. Chase asked Ms. Matzko if EPA had any definitive testing linking contamination at BoRit and the Ambler Borough's wells. Ms. Matzko indicated that data collected showed that groundwater is flowing in a North-South direction, towards the Wissahickon

Creek. Mr. Chase suggested a separate meeting involving RR&M, Ambler Borough, PADEP and EPA to discuss the waivers. Ms. Curry seconded this idea. Mr. Chase asked Peter Amento when a response from Ambler Borough might be expected, but no timeframe could be given. Peter Lowry mentioned that his perception as both a scientist and a resident was that there was a considerable issue here. He does not feel as if this issue is being communicated to the community efficiently. He requested that group focus not only on technical issues, but also on communication with the community. Both chairs suggested that the committee had not had a chance to review and discuss PADEP's response fully, and suggested the group move on to the next topic at hand.

Future Plans Workgroup:

Beth Pilling indicated that the group had not met in quite some time. The group could not come to a consensus on a unified vision. At this time, no additional meetings are planned until another vision can be formulated. Ms. Curry mentioned that it may be possible for the Future Use group to take on the task of investigating other asbestos sites that have been remediated and turned over to their respective communities. Ms. Pilling indicated she could not move forward with the group as it stands and mentioned that if anyone in the group is interested in heading up the group, she would happily acquiesce.

Rules Workgroup:

Ms. Fournier indicated that the Rules Workgroup has not met as they only meet on even months, six times a year. She reminded the group that they are required to attend more than half of the year's meetings, with a total of four being the requirement.

Item #5: Action Items Review

Ongoing Items:

- Item # 21: December 2011 minutes need to be circulated to the group.
- Item #45: Group members reminded to notify committee and arrange for alternates to attend meetings when absent.
- Item #47: Group members reminded to publicize workgroup meeting times and locations on the BoRitCAG.org website by sending announcements to Gordon Chase.
- Item #93: Group members reminded to email CAG minutes of meetings to their personal stakeholders.
- Item # 109: Any workgroup chair giving a report to the CAG will send a one paragraph summary to both Co-Chairs prior to the presentation for inclusion in the minutes of the CAG.

Current Action Items:

- Item # 34: Perimeter testing. A motion was passed to retire this item.

- Item #102: Ms. Curry asked if the CAG should request data about the Ambler Asbestos Site. The consensus was she should not. A series of answers in response to questions posed by the CAG at the December meeting was given to the Co-Chairs by EPA and will be distributed to the CAG
- Item #108: The issue of payment to the CAG's expert hydro geologist was raised. It was noted that he has been quite generous with his time but the issue of payment may need to be considered.
- Item #119: Discussion of former Nicolette building/Bast Property of Contamination. The former Nicolet Site is now formally an inactive waste site. A question was raised concerning recent activity at the site. Joe McDowell reported trucks removing debris out and bringing in clean fill at Nicolet/Boiler House. During excavation, an old asbestos steam line pipe was found and followed to the edge of Boiler House property. A culvert under the tracks has been rebuilt. Mr. McDowell indicated that he has been out to the site every 6 to 7 weeks to check on its status.
- Item #126: Expansion of CAG's scope. This item deferred until Ted Emmett's return.
- Item#127: Fuller understanding of the Risk Assessment Process. EPA will make a RA presentation at the April CAG meeting. HERS Group has posted a Power Point presentation on RA on the CAG website.
- Item#129: Press release. The first article in a two part series will be sent to Mr. Adams tomorrow, February 2nd. The second article will circulate in 4-6 weeks. Article to be posted on Google Docs and links sent to all CAG members for review.
- Item #131: Ideas for stronger armoring of the creeks. A motion was passed to retire this item.

#2 Priorities

- Item# 48: BoRit Timeline – an updated version of the timeline was given to Susan Curry by Vance Evans. A few revisions were needed and given to both Vance Evans and Christopher Mondia for addition to the timeline.
- Item #50: Community Awareness Group Communications Flow Posters. Need for them to be addressed at April's CAG meeting.
- Item #122: Should the item of the CAG's white paper response to EPA's Phase 2 Report, and any other reports, be moved to the primary priorities list? Co-chair Bob Adams will put this on the agenda for next month's meeting.
- Item# 117: Facilitation. The motion to retire this item was raised. This motion was passed.
- Item#122: Full removal of all Asbestos Containing Material. The motion to retire this item was raised. This motion went undecided.

- Item #131: Concern regarding the potential for materials to get into creeks and cause blockage or flooding. Co-chair Adams said he will inspect the work that has been done and retire the item then.
- Item #132: Updated survey of floodplains. Temple University is applying for a grant for this exact type of study but will not have an update on the grant until June of 2012.
- Item #133: The issue of membership dues was raised. Lynn Hoffmann collected dues from those who had not yet contributed. An email will be sent to members of the CAG who have not yet contributed.

Item #6: Observer Comments

None

Item #7: Old Business/New Business/Next Steps

There was some discussion amongst the group regarding reservations of the current meeting room since the CAG has decided to meet bi-monthly. The consensus was to make the room available if the CAG will not be using it.

Meeting adjourned at 8:33 p.m. by Co-Chair Bob Adams.

Next meeting is scheduled for April 4, 2012.