

BoRit Asbestos Superfund Site Community Advisory Group Meeting

Ambler/Upper Dublin/Whitpain, Pennsylvania

(Draft Minutes)

Date: Wednesday, April 4, 2012

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

Meeting called to order by Co-Chair David Froehlich at 6:37 p.m.

Item #1: Welcome & Announcements

December 7, 2011 meeting minutes have been circulated and reviewed by the group. Susan Curry made a motion to approve the December meeting minutes. Gordon Chase seconded this motion. Meeting minutes from the February 1st, 2012 meeting were not approved as they have only recently been received for review. Mr. Chase indicated that the draft February meeting minutes were available on the CAG's website for review.

Item #2: Risk Assessment Presentation - Kristine Matzko (EPA Region 3 – Remedial Project Manager); **Dawn Ioven** (EPA Region 3 – Senior Toxicologist)

Ms. Matzko began the presentation by stating that both EPA and PADOH would be giving presentations detailing their approaches to Risk Assessment. Vance Evans asked that all questions be held until the conclusion of the presentation. At this time, Ms. Matzko introduced Dawn A. Ioven, Senior Toxicologist for USA EPA Region III, who then gave a general overview of the Risk Assessment process, as well as how an asbestos-specific Risk Assessment is conducted. At the conclusion of her presentation, Ms. Ioven introduced Barbara Allerton of the Pennsylvania Department of Health, who described the state's Risk Assessment process.

Questions and requests raised during the Risk Assessment presentation are detailed below:

1. Dr. Ted Emmett had a question regarding non-site related contaminants (i.e., radon, etc) that may not necessarily be found on-site, but may have an impact on contamination. Ms. Ioven responded that their ultimate responsibility is to address on-site contamination and that the law does not allow them to address possible off-site chemicals of concern not associated with the site.
2. Susan Curry asked if all chemicals of concern were listed separately in the Risk Assessment or in a group. Ms. Ioven responded that every single contaminant will be listed line by line in its relationship to the Risk Assessment. Every step of the process will be presented in the final Risk Assessment in table form.

3. Susan Curry inquired as to how the toxicity assessment reference doses were determined and how frequently they were updated and reevaluated. Ms. Ioven responded that EPA has a department whose sole function is to determine reference doses and contamination factors for contaminants. Changes are made when new information is obtained regarding a contaminant.
4. Susan Curry asked if the final Risk Assessment report will contain footnotes that give a date when reference doses were last established. Ms. Ioven responded that that info will not be listed but that the source of the reference dose is listed. If this source is cross referenced in the Integrated Risk Information System database, then the requested information can be obtained. The web address for this database is www.epa.gov/IRIS.
5. Susan Curry asked what an acceptable risk is. She noted that the emphasis in the Risk Assessment information seemed to be on increased length of exposure, not increased vulnerability. Ms. Ioven responded that sensitivity in the human population and other factors are incorporated. She noted that this was an item that may be discussed in the "Uncertainty" section of the Risk Assessment.
6. Susan Curry asked if there have been any non-serpentine samples of asbestos found on the site. Ms. Ioven responded that there may have been two samples found that identified non-serpentine asbestos. **[Post CAG meeting clarification:** According to Eduardo, the only serpentine is chrysotile, the rest are in the amphibole group (amosite, crocidolite, anthophyllite, tremolite, and actinolite) and we believe we have found all but anthophyllite.]
7. Susan Curry commented that there had been an issue in the past with Activity Based Sampling due to adverse weather conditions. Kristine Matzko replied that this past summer of 2011 had been very hot and dry and that Activity Based Sampling had occurred in July of 2011 unhindered.
8. Gordon Chase asked if his understanding that a contaminant of concern is above the Regional Screening Level was correct and Ms. Ioven responded that it was.
9. Gordon Chase asked if the Regional Screening Level was consistent from state to state. Ms. Ioven responded that it was.
10. Gordon Chase asked if EPA was waiting to begin the Risk Assessment or if it was ongoing. Ms. Matzko responded that EPA is currently in a stage of data collation and validation and that the mechanics of the Risk Assessment will follow, possibly in the next couple of months.

11. Gordon Chase asked how long the data collation process would take and if it was published separately or as part of the Remedial Investigation report. Ms. Matzko responded that the calculations would take approximately three months and would ultimately be included in the RI report. Mr. Chase then asked for a copy of the Power Point presentation on Risk Assessment to upload to the CAG's website.
12. Sal Bocutti asked whether or not the latency period of asbestos is worked into the Risk Assessment. Ms. Ioven responded that it was. She explained that different exposure tests take into consideration various age groups.
13. Sal Bocutti pointed out a misprint in Table 2 of the handout Ms. Ioven had provided. In the line item for Age 20-Duration of Exposure 40 years, the correct amount should be 0.083.
14. Eric Cheung inquired if it was a concern the moment asbestos hits the air and you breathe it in, or if the risk was not until the asbestos was in the lungs. Ms. Ioven responded that not everyone who is exposed to asbestos develops cancer. She then gave a short explanation of the process of asbestos inhalation and of different latency periods.
15. Susan Curry asked if PADOH takes into account non-cancer risks. Barbara Allerton responded that they do.

Item#3: TAG/TASC Update

Co-Chair Bob Adams indicated that a TAG grant will require a 501 (c) (3) status with the Internal Revenue Service and that an existing 501 (c) (3) is unacceptable. A search for a lawyer to assist with this process has begun. Since a 501 (c) (3) is a non-profit organization, a board will need to be established. This may take some time. Sal Bocutti inquired if there would be costs involved. Mr. Adams indicated that there would be costs at first, but assuming the CAG receives the grant, those monies will be reimbursed. Sal Bocutti noted that the initial figure quoted for a TAG consultant was \$50,000. Mr. Bocutti noted that if the CAG were to opt for a TAG grant instead of a TASC consultant, they would have more choice. Mr. Froehlich agreed but noted the process for TAG is more difficult than TASC. (PLEASE NOTE: **TASC is not a grant program.** It is a contract between EPA HQ and Skeo Solutions, Inc.)

Regarding TASC, Mr. Adams indicated the search for a hydro-geologist is ongoing. Finding a hydro-geologist with a specialty in asbestos contamination is proving to be difficult. Co-chair Dave Froehlich noted that under the TASC contract, the consultant is paid by EPA, but is contractually obligated to represent the community by evaluating EPA data, documents, and actions independently of EPA approval and reporting those conclusions to the CAG. Mr.

Froehlich noted that they are looking for a consultant to give clarity on water issues, airborne issues and options for future use. Susan Curry asked for an estimated timeframe of finding a suitable hydrogeologist and both Mr. Adams and Mr. Froehlich indicated it will be soon.

Item #4: Workgroup Reports

RR&M Committee Report

RR&M Committee Chairman Gordon Chase commented that the committee has had another busy two months. The main points of interest discussed in Mr. Chase's summary are as follows:

1. The group had a meeting with EPA at the reservoir, primarily to obtain details regarding "the seep", a flow of water coming from the BoRit Site and possibly flowing into the Wissahickon Creek. Discoveries made during this meeting with EPA are as follows:
 - a. There is a discharge of water that emanates from the berm of the reservoir and ends up in the Wissahickon Creek.
 - b. This discharge appears to occur year-round, but since regular testing is not conducted, the composition or flow of this discharge is unknown.
 - c. Currently, the group is unsure if seep is independent of the reservoir or a separate seep.
 - d. EPA has worked to fortify this with stones and soil.
 - e. There is a wet area just north of the seep on the western side of the reservoir. This wet area does not have a visible flow like the rest of the seep [**Post CAG meeting clarification:** According to Eduardo, Gordon showed him a very old aerial he had of that area (along the reservoir berm, by the Rose Valley flood plain) that were attributable to activities (dust suppression) on that area when the aerial was taken. No seepage has been seen in that area.] {Seepage was noted on the day of the RR&M visit.}
 - f. There is a reservoir level gauge on the northwestern side of the reservoir that is not currently being monitored.
2. Following the reservoir meeting, the RR&M group then had a formal meeting. Lynda Rebarchak of PADEP attended. Primary discussion points are as follows:
 - a. At the RR&M group meeting, the reservoir tour was discussed in detail.

- b. Discussions regarding PADEP and Ambler's contamination sampling then followed. The official response from PADEP is exemption does not necessarily mean that testing will not occur. Some contaminants are tested regularly, whereas others are listed as "non-detects". From 1997 to 2010, no testing was done. However, testing in 2011 indicated many "non-detects".
3. The RR&M group then discussed the varying levels of cynicism towards governmental agencies amongst CAG members.
4. Action Item: The RR&M group will request that EPA test the water quality of the seep at the reservoir.
5. Action Item: The RR&M group will request that EPA monitor and record the reservoir level gauge in the northwestern side of the reservoir.

Susan Curry asked if EPA would like the RR&M group to relay their recommendations in e-mail form or if EPA would rather they just include them in the meeting minutes. The consensus was that both forms would be best.

Community Awareness Group

Susan Curry explained that she has resigned as the Chair of the Community Awareness Group. Lynne Hoffman and Diane Morgan have agreed to take over her responsibilities.

HERS Workgroup

Dr. Ted Emmett began his summary by noting that he had been nominated as Full Chair of the workgroup. The nature of membership to the workgroup was then discussed. There is the possibility that there are too many local and state agency members, though Dr. Emmett feels their input has been valuable and effective.

There is the possibility that further membership may be required for review and feedback on health related documents (i.e., the Risk Assessment report, etc). Agency members should not participate in this review as it would represent a conflict of interest. This reduces the group's numbers, however, so some new recruits will be needed even if it is only for the task of reading and reviewing documents. Possible candidates for recruits would be health education or healthcare professionals in the area. Volunteers and nominations are welcome. Co-chair Dave Froehlich inquired if there were any complications in using people who don't understand the full nuances of these reports. Dr. Emmett replied they would like to have both seasoned and unseasoned people to review the documents. Co-Chair Bob Adams noted that Dr. Naps would be a good candidate. Gordon Chase asked what the purpose of the group was if agency members are responsible for creating the documents they are reviewing. Dr. Emmett

stated that the agencies seem genuine in their desire for feedback on these documents. Mr. Froehlich commented that the CAG is also available to review the documents. Sal Bocutti asked if an email could be sent to absentee members asking if they are interested in assisting with this task. Mr. Bocutti also inquired if this is limited to CAG members only. The committee's feeling on this matter is that they would not mind outside points of view.

Item #5: Action Items Review

Ongoing Items:

- Item – Development of a poster documenting communication flows. Group consensus was to retire this item.
- Item- Full Removal of ACM. Is further discussion needed? Is a Cost Analysis being done (by TASC)? Co-chair Dave Froehlich indicated his understanding was that this was part of the process currently ongoing. Vance Evans of EPA indicated that a cost analysis would be part of the Feasibility Study and that it would not be an efficient use of TASC money to duplicate that effort. Eric Cheung indicated the concern was that the option of full removal would be discarded because of costs.
- **Item #6: Observer Comments**

None.

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

Dr. Ted Emmett had a question regarding the scope of the CAG. Co-chair Dave Froehlich proposed that this item be put on the agenda for the next CAG meeting as a main item, due to time.

Meeting adjourned at 8:39p.m. by Co-Chair Dave Froehlich.

Next meeting is scheduled for June 6, 2012.

