

COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP
BoRit Asbestos Area
Ambler / Upper Dublin / Whitpain, Pennsylvania

To: BoRit Asbestos Area Community Advisory Group
From: Schuyler Moon, CAG Intern
Date: April 26, 2008
Subject: **MEETING SUMMARY of the APRIL 2, 2008 CAG EXECUTIVE SESSION**

Next Meeting

The next BoRit Asbestos Area CAG meeting will be held as follows:

Date: **Wednesday, May 7, 2008**
Time: 6:30 – 9:30 p.m.
Location: Upper Dublin Township Meeting Room
801 Loch Alsh Avenue
Fort Washington, PA 19034

Questions or comments regarding the upcoming meeting or about this summary, should be directed to Co-Chairs Bob Adams and Fred Conner.

CAG Attendees. All Members of the CAG were present except as follows: Dave Caddick, Eddie Curtis, Ron Curtis, Paul Leonard, and Flo Wise were not present; Alice Wright represented Lynda Rebarchak.

Observers. No observers were present for this Executive Session.

Meeting Highlights.

- Welcome and Review of Guidelines for Meeting Conduct
- Update on Removal Actions given by Larry Johnson, USEPA
- Update on ATSDR Report given by Lora Werner, ATSDR
- General Comments from Members regarding the Overall CAG Process
- Discussion on Membership and Stakeholder Representation

CAG Co-Chair Fred Conner opened the meeting by welcoming all Members in attendance. Mr. Conner announced that he expected CAG Co-Chair Bob Adams to arrive later in the evening due to a WVWA commitment. Alice White of PADEP was introduced as an alternate for Lynda Rebarchak. It was noted that Rosalind Johnson, Dr. Ted Emmett of the University of Pennsylvania's Center for Excellence in Environmental Toxicology (CEET), and CAG Intern Schuyler Moon were also present.

Subject: Summary of the April 2, 2008, BoRit CAG Meeting

Restating of the guidelines for conduct at CAG meetings was followed by a review of the proposed agenda. Mr. Conner noted that after a discussion with Bob Adams and Sharon McCormick, it was decided to take the presentation “*BoRit a Historical Perspective*” off of the agenda due to time constraints. It was also noted that some CAG Members had requested to see the presentation at a public meeting and this subject should be discussed at a later time. Comments made by CAG Member’s regarding the delay of the presentation until another time included: interest in seeing the presentation soon; questions about showing it at a public meeting or not; and a suggestion to email the presentation in PDF format to each Member.

Mr. Conner asked if there were any questions or comments on the summary of the March 5, 2008 meeting. It was noted that Dr. Emmett’s name was spelled incorrectly. There were no other comments on the March Meeting Summary.

Update on Removal Actions

EPA representative Larry Johnson than gave an update on the proposed removal action. He informed the CAG that the *Action Memorandum* is currently at EPA Headquarters. If there are no hitches, it was Mr. Johnson’s estimate that initial work on the site could start as soon as late May or early June. Mr. Johnson than informed the CAG that the NPL-HRS package is also at Headquarters and under review. Results of that review are expected to be released by September-October 2008. Mr. Johnson’s third comment was that the BoRit CAG would be the first group in the country to receive support from EPA’s new, Technical Assistance Services for Communities (TASC) Program.

Questions from Members and answers from Mr. Johnson regarding his update included:

Q-1. Can work still continue on site if there is extreme weather, or season related conditions?

A-1. EPA prefers to schedule work to start late spring/early summer and continue until the ground is frozen.

Q-2. Do you anticipate denial for NPL listing?

A-2. It really is unknown at this time.

Q-3. Can pictures from the uncovered, un-vegetated asbestos piles be added to the EPA historical files?

A-3. Yes, if the pictures are part of the history of the site then they should be included in the EPA historical files.

Q-4. If health data is not part of the HRS package, then what is the hazard being assessed?

A-4. ATSDR concerns were included in the package. The package is not health based but, based on the risk hazards of the contaminants. All data accumulated over the past year and a half was included in the package.

Q-5. If health data is found to be significant will that affect the NPL decision?

A-5. No, health data will not change score. If score is > 28.5 then NPL, if < 28.5 no NPL. The Hidden Lane Landfill in Herndon, Virginia was mentioned as being listed on the NPL without any health documents.

ATSDR Update

ATSDR representative Lora Werner informed the CAG that she is continuing to work on two reports concerning health data related to the site. Ms. Werner said the CAG could make comments and suggestions upon their completion. She iterated that health information was not part of the HRS package, however, she has been requested by EPA to compile such information.

Sharon McCormick commented that she and Ms. Werner have been working on a form to aid in collecting health data from community residents who may have developed asbestos related diseases. Ms. Werner informed the CAG that they had reached a bit of a snag in acquiring personal health information from residents because her department requires that a permission form be filled out by respondents wishing to share their personal information. A permission form has been signed-off on and a copy of was distributed to each Member for their knowledge. It was made clear by Ms. Werner that this effort is not a health study but, an attempt to informally get a feel for how many people in the area have been affected by asbestos related-diseases.

Ms. McCormick explained that in going door-to-door in her group's efforts to gather petition signatures, she was getting a sense for how many people have been affected. Out of over 2,050 signatures currently on the petition, about 500 are from the 19002 zip code. Of those 500, 54 have responded that they believe they have asbestos related health issues. A Member raised a concern that the health data permission forms have the potential of exposing all of the person's health data.

Member Comments on Overall CAG Process

- “Although I originally questioned the usefulness of the CAG and how it would serve, after seeing so many people put in so much time working towards a long-term solution for the site - and at the very least getting several millions of dollars in work on the site and possibly ten times that much - the CAG has already accomplished much more than I had expected. I hope the CAG can work in an open, fair, and collegial manner.”
- “The group has been working together nicely. However, I fear doing all this work will be for not if the site is not listed on the NPL. I have worked on the petition effort and tried to network with people to raise awareness. Bringing pressure is a good thing and I'll continue to talk with as many people as I can.

Subject: Summary of the April 2, 2008, BoRit CAG Meeting

- “As a CAG we have come a good distance and should continue, one step at a time in order to follow through with our goals.”
- “The CAG is working in a more productive manner than when first started. Although there is fear of no NPL listing, CAG Members should all face the fact that not getting listed does not mean failure.”
- “Since there is a chance of not getting NPL listing and also a chance of no money being available, even if listed, we should not only have a plan B, but plans C and D. Future goals should revolve around ensuring the safety of all and should include testing within a six mile radius and beyond.”
- “The site is bigger than a few citizens, or a municipality. The more people in a group the more discord and debate, which is a good thing. The CAG has proved to be a good think-tank and should focus on a plan B. Don’t get discouraged with arguments or debates, just try to stay the course. There is nothing wrong with shooting big at first. I personally want a health study that looks at factors undiscovered or unrecorded.”
- “The group is doing well. As far as a plan B Members should touch base with the group and let others know what direction they will be going in order to prevent contacting the same people multiple times. This will also promote a more organized and professional way of conducting business for the CAG.”
- “Even if the site is placed on NPL, we should think of it as a long-term effort. The CAG cannot do everything, so we need to be strategic and fill in where and what agencies can not do. Community groups can win and have great success.”
- “It is a pleasure serving on the CAG and I find myself looking forward to these meetings. Making progress in dollars and cents will have an impact on the community.”
- “I think the group is most productive when we have a specific task at hand. The CAG has a good mission statement and goals, but the objectives for the goals are missing and would be worthwhile.”
- “The tone of some of the emails that have been going out is unacceptable. Before sending emails in the future, read them over and make sure the tone is not inappropriate.”
- “A Transit Revitalization Investment District (TRID) study is underway in Ambler. This should bring more economic development to our community. Other municipalities should give encouragement to this effort and the CAG should support it as well.”
- “We must work hard to keep the community involved and aware, especially our children. I think the emails show too much emotion.”

Discussion on Membership and Stakeholder Representation

After the break, Mr. Conner led the discussion on membership. He started off by recognizing the confusion over the discussion at January's meeting regarding membership and stakeholder representation. He said it was unfortunate that Melinda Holland had not been able to attend that meeting, as she was to have led the discussion and selection process.

Mr. Conner further noted that the CAG had not voted by paper ballot as required by the group's charter. A handout outlining current members/stakeholders and the categories each fell into was handed out. According to the CAG's agreed upon procedures, the group is to be comprised of a total of 25 Members. As it stands now, there are 24 official Members. So currently, only one more stakeholder interest can be added.

Mr. Conner said that there were at least two issues that the CAG had to formally vote on: (1) Rosalind Johnson's replacement of Ron Curtis as per previous nomination and (2) Dr. Emmett's role on the CAG as a representative of Penn's CEET as previously suggested and communicated to the group. It was noted by a Member that the CAG's charter required a 50% attendance record at meetings for the calendar year. If the CAG desires to replace a Member for not attaining the attendance requirements, it must be done by a 2/3 vote of Members attending a meeting on the subject of membership.

Discussion of replacing Ron Curtis with Rosalind Johnson ensued. Mr. Curtis has said he is unable to attend meetings and does not wish to continue as a Member. A Member commented that Mr. Curtis had been proposed for Membership to represent the area's business community and a concerted effort should be made to replace him with another business owner. Mayor Wahl agreed to canvass the Ambler business community for an interested individual.

Another Member suggested that a letter be sent to the Commander of the American Legion Post regarding their intent to continue participating in the CAG. The Post's designated representative, Eddie Curtis, has not attended any of the CAG's Meetings. Mr. Conner said a letter would be sent to the Post's Commander requesting their intent to continued representation. Should the Post no longer be interested in participating, Ms. Johnson - because of her work serving the community - would be an excellent representative for the civic association stakeholder category. In any event, the CAG agreed that it was important that Ms. Johnson continue with the group.

Discussion then turned to Dr. Emmett's participation as the 25th Member. A motion was made and seconded that Dr. Emmett participate as a voting Member of the CAG. The motion carried with more than two-thirds of the Members present voting in the affirmative. Dr. Emmett commented that he would be very sensitive to voting on all issues related to community interests.

A brief discussion of Work Groups was begun with a Member suggesting the kinds of groups that would be useful. It was agreed that further discussion on these was needed.

At 9:30PM the meeting was adjourned.