

# **BoRit Asbestos Superfund Community Advisory Group Meeting Minutes**

**January 15th 2014**

Location: Upper Dublin Township Building, 801 Loch Alsh Ave, Fort Washington PA1 90002

Meeting called to order by Co-Chair Bob Adams at 7.20pm.

Two new members were welcomed to the CAG, Barry Dubinsky representing Mercer Hill Village and Steven Maakestad, representing Ambler Environmental Advisory Council.

Item1) Presentation by Jill Lowe (EPA) and Travis Fatzinger (USACE) on reservoir berm stabilization.

A power-point presentation was made by US Army Corps of Engineers representative Travis Fatzinger detailing the proposal to fortify the berms to the Reservoir parcel of the site. Full details of the presentation can be viewed at the presentations section of the BoRit web site <http://www.boritag.org/about/presentations.html>. A Q&A session followed which raised the following issues:

Q. Will the EPA evaluate the option of filling in the reservoir with clean fill as opposed to returning it to a waterfowl preserve?

A. EPA will study all alternatives from no action through to complete removal.

Q. If there were no established owner and no current waterfowl use for the reservoir parcel, would the current actions being undertaken by the EPA be the same?

A. This was considered by the EPA to be a hypothetical question as there is an established owner and established use. Furthermore, the EPA's actions to date pertaining to the reservoir have been, in part, due to requests from the CAG based on its current ownership and use e.g tree removal. Confirmation was given that safety of the site from both engineering and health standpoints was not compromised to meet the requirements of the waterfowl preserve.

Q. Why would the extra pressure on the soft core of the berm from the additional weight of new fill material not result in material being displaced out towards the Wissahickon Creek on the unreinforced side of the berm?

A. The Geotextile liner being added to the reinforced reservoir side of the berm will act as a barrier to water ingress from the reservoir. The added weight will then compact the berm and enable it to dry out over time, making it more stable.

Q. Why is the EPA performing a remediation of the reservoir for the WWP?

A. EPA did not answer, citing legal issues.

Q. Did EPA consider draining and filling as a less costly approach?

A. EPA will consider all options as part of the Feasibility Study.

Q. After years of denying that the reservoir posed any immediate danger to human health and stating that it would be addressed under the remedial phase of the investigation, why did EPA change their minds, and how did they determine that the reservoir now poses an immediate threat?

A. The CAG had requested EPA to take an action on the interior of the reservoir for quite some time, being brought up at several CAG meetings in the past. After consideration of the CAG's request, EPA decided to proceed with the planned removal action to address this potential risk, and to satisfy the CAG's concern.

Additionally, now that the reservoir is being remediated, the CAG has raised concerns about the safety of the work, such as their belief that asbestos fibers will become airborne, as the water evaporates. EPA explained at the CAG meeting that this scenario is *very* unlikely to happen.

The CAG was also concerned about the exposed areas of ACM along the berms. EPA agrees that there is a *potential* for exposure, but we will be covering the areas, just as we have done with similar areas on other parts of the site. We will continue to follow the work plan that we have been following for the Pile and Park, which is to cover asbestos-containing material with a soil cover.

One member commented that it appeared that EPA was doing remediation work now. EPA repeated that they are implementing the removal process, and that they had adapted that process to address concerns raised by the CAG.

Q. Would EPA provide an example of a reservoir that was remediated in this fashion and used in the desired function?

A. We are not immediately aware of an example, but we are willing to research this question. Even if there is no example

that exactly matches this scenario, we are carrying out our work based on what is protective of human health and the environment.

Item 2) Evaluation of De-watered reservoir

The RR&M committee had previously met to discuss evaluation of the de-watered reservoir to the same standards as the pile and park parcels of the site (see RR&M minutes <http://www.boriticag.org/about/rrm-minutes.html> for December 18th 2013 for more detailed discussions). The RR&M believed that the de-watering of the reservoir provided a possible 'once in a lifetime' opportunity to fully explore what lies beneath the reservoir. The EPA responded that they thought that they could extrapolate from knowledge already gained from the other parcels at BoRit, as to what may lie beneath the water in the reservoir. There was rigorous debate on this, and a motion was put before the CAG for a vote, namely that "the reservoir parcel should undergo a full characterization investigation and assessment with the same rigor as was given to the pile and park parcels." The motion was carried unanimously and now awaits EPA's considered response.

Item 3: Absentee membership seats

The Rules committee advised that some members had not attended CAG meetings during 2013 with a regularity required to maintain their seats. These members had been approached by the rules committee to ascertain their desire or otherwise to remain on the CAG. Details will be reported at the next CAG meeting for a vote on whether the seats in question should be reassigned.

Meeting adjourned 8.40pm

