

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

To: BoRit Asbestos Area Community Advisory Group  
From: Schuyler Moon  
Date: September 24, 2008  
Subject: **Summary of the Wednesday, September 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008, BoRit CAG Meeting**

**Next Meeting.**

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

**Date:** Wednesday, October 1<sup>st</sup>, 2008  
**Time:** 6:30 – 9:30 p.m.  
**Location:** Upper Dublin Township Meeting Room  
801 Loch Alsh Avenue  
Fort Washington, PA 19034

If you have questions or comments regarding the upcoming meeting or about this summary, please contact CAG Co-Chairs Bob Adams and Fred Conner.

**CAG Attendees.**

All Members were present except for Mayor Wahl who was represented by his Alternate, Steve Ware, and Susan Curry who was represented by her Alternate Andrew Salvadore. The ATSDR and PADOH representatives could not attend due to conflicts. The Ambler Parcel Owner, who has an open invitation to join the group, was again not present.

**Observers.**

More than 25 observers were present for at least part of the meeting.

**Meeting Highlights.**

- Welcome and Administrative Announcements
- Proposal to List BoRit on the EPA's National Priorities List (NPL)
- Working Group Reports
- TASC Consultants Reports
- CAG Discussion and Observer Comments
- Working Group Breakout Session

CAG Co-Chair Bob Adams opened the meeting by reviewing the guidelines for meeting conduct. Mr. Adams asked if there were any comments on the Meeting Summary from August. There were none. Mr. Adams then asked if there were any comments on the proposed agenda. There were none.

EPA Representative, Larry Johnson announced that the BoRit Site had been proposed for EPA's National Priorities List (NPL). Mr. Johnson said, "This is a milestone not a 'victory,'" and was made possible by the efforts of many groups and agencies including the community, the CAG, municipalities, EPA management and the health agencies. Mr. Johnson also noted that he was passing out hard copies of the pertinent federal regulations, the HRS package and a set of general questions and answers regarding the NPL processes. Mr. Johnson informed the CAG that there was a sixty-day comment period in which concerns could be expressed. He noted that the comment period is an important part of the process and the EPA would respond to any comments and/or questions at the end of the period. An address is to be provided by Mr. Johnson for the community and the CAG to submit comments and questions. A CAG member asked if comments submitted before NPL proposal should be resubmitted. Mr. Johnson replied that any comments submitted beforehand should be resubmitted in written format. It was further noted by Mr. Johnson that email, letter, or any form other than verbal would be acceptable.

CAG Co-Chair Fred Conner suggested that it would be advisable for each workgroup to discuss the possibility of submitting a formal CAG response regarding the NPL proposal.

### **Work Group Reports**

1. **Rules Committee:** Chair- Joanne Walker

- The committee is currently working on an outline involving some language changes. This will make the charter more cohesive and easier for everyone to understand.
- For the October meeting there is a proposal to codify procedures involving membership.
- Some other topics of discussion include: terms for Co-Chairs, possibility of staggering Co-Chairs, issue of three Co-Chairs, Executive Committee of Working Group Chairs, e-mail protocol for members and enforcement of e-mail protocol.
- Rules Committee member Eileen Fournier volunteered to put the member list into an excel spreadsheet. The Rules Committee recommended that everyone try informally to put the CAG members and alternates in the To: column and everyone else in the Cc: column when sending emails in order to cut down on traffic.
- The Rules Committee is also recommending that extended discussions or arguments take place over email. Lengthy discussions should take place at meetings and either Co-Chair should be asked to include items of concern on the upcoming agenda.
- Titles are appropriate when emailing to let people know who is speaking to whom and also to represent the CAG to the community or constituency that is being served.

For example, Joanne Walker is a CAG member representing the Whitemarsh Township Residents Association, so she would write WTRA Representative, Joanne Walker.

- Since the EPA will pay for a newsletter containing BoRit CAG information, Rules Committee proposed that a basic facts sheet be submitted by Joanne Walker for inclusion in a BoRit Newsletter.

After a short discussion about the proposal by Joanne Walker of submitting a fact sheet for inclusion in a BoRit newsletter, the CAG reached consensus to submit a fact sheet in order to generate a newsletter courtesy of the EPA.

2. **Future Plans Group:** Lead- Sal Boccuti

- No report at this time. Group was awaiting NPL proposal and plans to meet tonight during the Breakout Session.

3. **HERS Groups:** Lead- Michele Naps

- The group is meeting regularly and becoming more informed through research and information gathering. The group's goal is not to become asbestos experts, but rather well informed community members. The group's members are not taking everything the health agencies say at 100% face value, but rather are looking at their statements with skepticism. ATSDR has been an excellent resource for information and contacts.
- The group requested an extension to the thirty-day public comment period for the ATSDR Health Consultation that was issued in July. The extension was granted and the new ending date for the comment period is September 30, 2008.
- The group has been working on a document to submit on behalf of the CAG in response to the 2006-2007 Air Sampling Data Report. Dr. Michele Naps, HERS Group Chair expects the first draft of this document to be available the following Monday for circulation to the CAG. The final document will be submitted to ATSDR Representative, Lora Werner.
- ATSDR did highlight some safety concerns in the report and the HERS Group acknowledged their appreciation of that action. The highlights from the ATSDR-PADOH 2006-2007 Air Sampling Report include activity-based sampling, the asbestos containing material on-site can be a potential hazard and drought poses an additional possibility of a hazard occurring.
- The group concurs with the potential hazards recognized and has additional concerns focusing on the limitations of sampling, the daily calculations of samples taken, potential cancer risk, the current 5 micron surrogate marker for samples of ACM taken and the lack of modern state of the art measurement techniques being used to analyze samples.
- The group also feels that certain areas in the report are over simplified and more detail should be provided.
- The group would also like to address the cancer risk assessment because they feel that there is not adequate information and they are not convinced that there is no risk.

*Subj: Summary of the September 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2008, BoRit CAG Meeting*

- The group is currently using the data from a site and community in Libby, Montana as a case study and research model.

4. **Removal/Remediation and Oversight Group:** Lead- Eric Lindhult

- The group has some concerns with the stream bank stabilization that are proposed by EPA. Specifically, the concrete sidewalls that are proposed and some of the other hardened structures that will be placed along the bank.
- TASC consultant, Doug Streaker will be giving an update on the bank stabilization.

5. **Community Awareness Group:** Lead- Diane Morgan

- Public service announcements of the CAG's Monthly Public Meetings will be available in the *Ambler Gazette*.
- Members, Alternates, and frequent Observers of the CAG's efforts were again encouraged to join the group and assist with its awareness and education efforts.

**Consultant Reports**

CAG CO-Chair Fred Conner introduced TASC consultants Mike Lythgott from E2, Michele Benchouk from Booz Allen, and Doug Streaker from Biohabitats.

First, Doug Streaker reported on the stream bank stabilization plans to date. Mr. Streaker informed the CAG that he had attended two meetings with Eduardo Rovira, Tetra Tech and the Army Corps of Engineers at the Maple Avenue Command Post. At the first meeting, Mr. Streaker explained there was some progress made on the design and he was able to review it and get a better feel for the construction that was planned. At a second meeting that had taken place earlier today, Mr. Streaker was able to view the final design. He commented that all the changes made were for the better. The changes made to the stream bank stabilization plan include lowering of the rip-rap material in order to put less shear stress on the floodplain on the opposing bank. Geo-grids filled with soil and plantings in some places rather than concrete which will be beneficial to the stream in that plantings will provide cover and shade. Geo-grids will be used on the asbestos pile which will prevent erosion from gravity. Mr. Streaker noted that there are some construction details that still need to be finalized by EPA. The EPA has an existing hydrologic model of the stream and has not yet decided whether to do a new model of the stream. Mr. Streaker recommended that EPA create a proposed model of the stream and narrow the cross section in order to see if opposite bank could erode. Mr. Streaker said that he did not think it would, but there was a possibility of erosion.

CAG Co-Chair Fred Conner asked Mr. Streaker if he could write-up a brief summary report of the new information regarding bank stabilization.

Next, Michele Benchouk gave comments on the EPA's progress to date and the proposed future actions. The EPA has specific regulations on how asbestos-containing material must be handled and managed.

Ms. Benchouk commented that it would be worthwhile to have an observer oversee the process of asbestos being removed from the site in order to ensure all proper regulations are followed. EPA Representative, Larry Johnson, replied to the suggestion by explaining that EPA has certain health and safety requirements they must adhere to.

Ms. Benchouk noted that removal of asbestos in the stream bank is a concern now and she would like to observe and see what is being done during the removal of asbestos. Another concern mentioned was whether asbestos is being released into surface water and sediment. She commented that she would like to discuss this topic further with the EPA. Ms. Benchouk informed the CAG that a large part of her background is writing for NPL purposes and to start she would like to talk with the EPA about the treatment options that will be considered.

A CAG member commented that Eduardo Rovira had previously said asbestos on-site would be piled up rather than removed. Mr. Johnson responded that other alternatives are under consideration.

A CAG member asked if the EPA was following the Health and Safety Plan requirements in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as to how to wrap, handle and carry asbestos. Mr. Johnson responded that in order to dispose of the asbestos the site must be disturbed minimally first, then the Health and Safety plan comes into play. CAG Co-Chair Fred Conner suggested that this topic be further explored in the Removal/Remediation and Monitoring Oversight Group discussion.

A CAG member asked if TASC consultant, Doug Streaker could come up with some ideas to ameliorate stress on both sides of the bank.

Another CAG member commented that the hazard is not asbestos lying there, but what will be done with that side of the stream bank. Any available photos and comments should be considered in plans to protect the bank after stabilization from natural disasters.

Mr. Johnson informed the CAG that EPA is trying to determine the 25, 50 and 100 year floodplains, but currently there is a discrepancy with the available data from FEMA.

TASC consultant, Doug Streaker, commented on pictures of a recent flood along the stream bank in question, saying that it is actually low level flooding and smaller storms that can cause the most erosion. He explained that in the case of high levels of flooding it is not a bad thing because there is less energy concentrating on the lower area of the bank therefore less erosion there.

### **Discussion Regarding Recent Updates**

The discussion revolved around questions from CAG members which were answered by EPA Representative Larry Johnson and TASC consultants Mike Lythgott and Doug Streaker.

**Q-1.** Are further technical directives needed for TASC support to extend from removal program to remedial program?

**A-1.** The contract states that TASC support will be provided through any follow up activities, but this needs to be checked to make sure.

**Q-2.** Are there any limitations of resources for TASC support?

**A-2.** None at this time. We are in the second year of the TASC program and not all of the funds have been used.

**Q-3.** Is exposed dirt onsite going to be hydro-seeded or covered with grass?

**A-3.** EPA has already covered exposed stuff with soil.

**Q-4.** Will Whitpain Township be paying for anything having to do with the site?

**A-4.** Not that anyone is aware of.

**Q-5.** If air sampling reveals something mentioned by HERS Group, will that change current plans?

**A-5.** EPA would not want to speculate on a hypothetical at this time.

**Q-7.** Does the CAG need to reapply for remedial support?

**A-7.** TASC is designed for non-NPL communities, but this does not mean that TASC cannot cover the remedial process. Technical Assistance Grants are available, but the CAG is not eligible because it includes agencies. A TAG grant may be applied for from a separate group outside the CAG. TASC is also working on other NPL sites, so the possibility of keeping TASC support through NPL processes exists.

**Q-8.** How many sites were considered for NPL?

**A-8.** Unknown.

**Q-9.** What was meant by geo-grids being placed up sides of asbestos pile to top of mound?

**A-9.** EPA was previously going to use turf-reinforced matting to secure the asbestos pile, but now will be using geo-grids all the way up.

**Q-10.** Does the CAG stay in effect all the way through the NPL process?

**A-10.** Yes, most communities do not have CAG's that are up and running at this point in the process. So, we are well ahead in this sense.

**Q-11.** Are there any updates on removal designs?

**A-11.** No, TASC consultant Doug Streaker has the most current info on the design.

**Q-12.** Are there any projections on the expected life cycle of geo-grids?

**A-12.** Unsure of expected life cycle, but plantings should create enough root mass to secure soil in geo-grids.

**Work Group Breakout Session**

After the Observers were offered the opportunity to comment, the CAG broke-out in Working Groups. CAG CO-Chair Fred Conner posted some general questions for each group to discuss during their breakout and report back to the Co-Chairs. These questions included:

1. Will the CAG submit a formal response to the NPL proposal?
2. How can we best use the TASC/TAG program now and in the future?
3. Public meeting schedule for the rest of 2008 TBD? (Meet in October / Off in November? / Meet in December)
4. Where/how can we recruit a new intern and/or a staff director?

At 9:30 PM the meeting adjourned.

DRAFT Summary (Pending Member Comments)