

BoRit Asbestos Superfund Site Community Advisory Group
Ambler / Upper Dublin / Whitpain, Pennsylvania

Date: Wednesday, April 6, 2011

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

Time: 6:30 pm – 9:00 pm

Attended by: See attached

6:30 p.m. Welcome & Announcements

- Introductions/Review guidelines for conduct at meetings
- Review Agenda
- Approve March Minutes
- Dispense with March Synopsis
- Announcements
 - CAG will no longer distribute Synopsis. Instead, meeting minutes will be emailed
 - Michelle Naps is doing well, recovering, and should be at tonight's meeting

6:45 p.m. Workgroup Reports

RR&M: no report

Future Plans: no report

HERS: no report

Communications: Copies of minutes from the CA meeting earlier in the month are available

- March 21st meeting minutes for HERS group have not been shared yet, although a Minority Report is out already. We'll wait for main minutes before posting the Minority Report
- Workgroup reports should be submitted for every meeting in order to reflect the discussion. The minutes should be approved by all attending workgroup members before they are shared with whole CAG

Rules Committee: didn't meet

7:00 p.m. Facilitated Meeting – Michael Hancox and Sabrina Foster of SKEO Solutions,

- SKEO, formally E² – neutrality promised
- Issue to be facilitated: Should the mission in our bylaws be amended to include advocacy?
- What is Advocacy? Definitions read:
 - Advocate means being committed to a particular point of view, to argue a point of view
 - having a fixed position
 - having an agenda and working toward a specific end goal
 - To defend or plead a cause of one's own or another's
 - speaking and/or writing in favor of a specific cause
- What are some advocacy issues that our current mission statement would exclude?
 1. Should we expand our geographic scope to include the old asbestos site, the Boiler house, Nicolet site, and the manufacturing buildings across the street from the BoRit site? If so, CAG would become advocates for those sites as well
 2. NESHAP Law: should the CAG attempt to change or update the law?
 3. Proactive Remedy: If we wanted to take a stronger position of total removal of ACM, and advocate for EPA to do more in the clean up process
- Word "advocacy" is not in the mission statement
 - Of course, CAG is still trying to advocate for environment and cleanup of asbestos
 - Some think CAG was already an advocacy group "to bring recommendations to EPA"
 - Without advocating what is the group doing?

[Viewpoints expressed:](#)

- EPA Superfund Sites are clearly defined. BoRit is one, but the boiler house and Nicolet sites are not. From the stand point of health, all the sites are part of the problem. We wish to help the ecosystem of the Ambler vicinity, not just particular sites. From the perspective of health and safety, you can't separate the parcels, should take care of the entire infected area.
- Most of the government agents sitting on the CAG would not be able to be advocates, they must be neutral. They could come to give presentations or observe, but not continue to serve as members.
- Changing NESHAP could take years, and require much time and effort, that could detract from the primary focus and goal of the BoRit CAG. Doing that is the realm of politicians and lawyers.
- Additional voices:
 - Some members would have to leave because they cannot advocate for a cause based on government or private group ties
 - Group was started as an information group to offer suggests and comments, not advocating
 - Personal agendas get in the way of progress
 - Becoming an advocacy group could tear the group apart
 - Cannot be lobbyists
 - Could lose members
 - Some think that CAG is an advocate for the community and the environment and should protect community and solve the problem. For example: CAG should speak out on behalf of environmental issues concerning asbestos
 - Advocacy is not a bad thing
 - The real advocacy issue is remediation, some members want EPA to clean up better than it seems like they are going to ~~do~~
 - Some people want complete remediation
 - Many different points of view about what constitutes advocacy make it difficult for [the CAG to take](#) one position
 - EPA could take a long time deciding what to do with asbestos, the CAG should become advocacy group now rather than later
 - The BoRit site has the most impact on three streets in West Ambler: Oak, Maple and Railroad Ave
 - Area residents can already get information about the BoRit site in many ways, for example the latest EPA Community Update newsletter. CAG should take a distinct viewpoint otherwise some members feel that they are wasting time and will leave the CAG
 - Carrie Dietzel: EPA expects strong and varied opinions in community groups. Once the remedial investigation is completed, EPA does a feasibility study that reveals alternatives and solutions, they weigh the alternatives and propose their plan for what seems to them to be best answer. After that the Plan is released for public comment. New ideas can provoke a "focused feasibility study".
 - Can send individual opinion
 - It is ok for everyone in a group to have their own viewpoint.
 - Including advocacy could force some members to feel like their ideas aren't valued – if the group had a majority vote, and decided to advocate for one thing , any of the minority votes might feel like the majority view is being imposed on them
 - Ultimate question is: what is the CAG doing and is it productive?
 - Should CAG offer more opinions with information?
 - Information and advocacy go hand in hand
 - Should have a goal in mind

- Good information comes out, lots of input to EPA
 - Making recommendations and requests is advocacy
 - Are we changing just the mission or the way the CAG is run?
 - Several said that -we don't have enough data and info yet -to advocate for a solution
- **A handout prepared by Sal to allow us to vote had the following question:**
 - **Should the scope of BoRit CAG's mission be expanded to include advocacy?**
 - The Rules Committee requested a brief caucus. At the end of their caucus they acknowledged that the facilitation had been useful, and conducted an informal poll to determine if the CAG was ready to vote on the question as it was worded. The majority of the CAG indicated their desire not to vote on the question as it was worded [1 in favor, 3 abstained].
 - Michael's Commentary:
 - There isn't enough consensus on what is "advocacy"
 - Don't think there is enough information to have a vote
 - Doesn't think that the question being asked answers what the group is grappling with
 - Off mark for what the real problem is

8:15 p.m. Voting Portion of Meeting

CAG chose not to vote!

- The Rules Committee offered to entertain word changes to the mission/bylaws and present at a future meeting for a vote.

8:25 p.m. Old Business – New Business – Next Steps

- Old Business:
 - Kris Matzko will make a presentation in May on the Phase II groundwater sampling data
 - Questions for the Water Department were available in a handout. CAG members asked to review handout and submit revisions
 - Nicolet site: DEP hosted a meeting with the property owners and discussed security. Contractors are not doing any active work. Ambler and EPA will inspect the site on a weekly basis to make sure the gates and fences are intact. DEP will inspect occasionally.
 - DEP advised that while it is inactive, there cannot be any visible emissions
 - CAG members asked if there is anything we can do to protect site? Anything the state can do? On the building rubble especially.
 - Contractors should take care of it
- New Business
 - Discussion on the frequency of meetings will be on future agenda
 - Proposed Brief Description handout – 32-acre measurement won't show in the brief description. Feedback invited.
- Next CAG Meeting – May 4, 2011

8:30 p.m. Adjourn