

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

To: BoRit Asbestos Area Community Advisory Group
From: Schuyler Moon
Date: May 20, 2008
Subject: **Summary of the Wednesday, May 7, 2008, BoRit Asbestos Area Community Advisory Group Meeting, Executive Session**

Next Meeting

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

Date: **Wednesday, June 4, 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 either Fred Conner or Bob Adams.

CAG Attendees

_____ All Members of the
CAG were present except the following:

Observers

Meeting Highlights

- Welcome and Administrative Announcements
- ATSDR Update from Representative Lora Werner
- Update on Imminent Removal Actions from EPA Representative Larry Johnson
- TASC Presentation given by Mike Lythgott of *E-Squared*
- Brief Presentation of The Working Group Approach given by CAG Co-Chairs Fred Conner and Bob Adams
- CAG Breakout Session to form Working Groups
- Five Minute Reports from each Work Group
- Next steps and Action Items

CAG Co-Chairs Bob Adams and Fred Conner opened the meeting with some brief administrative announcements.-

First, Mr. Adams reviewed the guidelines for meeting conduct.

Mr. Conner noted that there was a revised agenda entitled, *Proposed Agenda (Revision 1)*, that was circulated prior to the start of the meeting. It was noted that the revision was made to the agenda in order to provide time for the TASC advisors from *E-Squared* to present information regarding their services. Mr. Conner asked if there were any questions or comments about the proposed agenda or any revisions made to the agenda. A CAG member asked why the reports were specified as five minutes only? Mr. Conner responded that it was for emphasis on time constraints.

Mr. Adams asked if there were any comments or objections to the 4-2-08 meeting summary. A CAG member mentioned that alternate DEP representative; Alice White's name was misspelled on the second page of the meeting summary. There were no other comments on the 4-2-08 meeting summary.

Mr. Conner noted that there was communication from Senator Greenleaf's Chief of Staff, Pat Beadling, apologizing for being unable to attend this month's meeting. In an email to Fred Conner, Pat Beadling wrote that Senator Greenleaf received a petition from Sharon McCormick requesting he write the Governor asking for the BoRit site to be placed on the National Priorities List. The Senator has agreed to send the letter, honoring Mrs. McCormick's request.

Mr. Conner then introduced Eric Lindult as Paul Leonard's Alternate. Mr. Lindult, an environmental engineer, shared a little bit about himself with the members and observers in attendance. He explained that he has had experience with other advisory groups, such as, a Restoration Advisory Board on which he currently serves.

Fred Robinson was also in attendance as a representative from the American Legion Post in West Ambler. It was noted by CAG Co-Chairs that membership issues involving open seats and the response to the letter sent by the CAG to the American Legion would be discussed later in the meeting.

Mr. Conner announced that recently elected CAG member Dr. Emmet was unable to attend the meeting. Dr. Emmet was in Victoria, BC to accept the 2008 "Community Campus Partnership for Health Award." This international award was given to, The University of Pennsylvania's Center for Excellence in Environmental Toxicology, (CEET). The award was given to CEET for their work with the Decatur Community Association on contaminated water resources in Southern Ohio. More details on how CEET went about working with the community association can be found by accessing the following link: <http://depts.washington.edu/ccph/awardsrecipients.html>. It was noted by Mr. Conner that Dr. Emmet wanted to pass on some information to the group from his experience working with asbestos contaminated sites in Australia. In regards to the cancer study proposed by the County Health Department, Dr. Emmet said that he thinks it would be helpful in defining the risk from asbestos in the past and particularly important in defining the mesothelioma risk among women in the area. Dr. Emmet also explained that it is important to remember that it is likely some men will have had occupational exposure and this does not tell about community risk. Women's risk can be elevated by community exposure. As Director for the National Institute in Australia, Dr. Emmet was able to see increased rates in women in an area where loose asbestos was used in household insulation and is willing to further elaborate at a later date.

ATSDR Update

The ATSDR update was given by Representative Lora Werner. Ms. Werner reminded the CAG that she was currently working on two separate reports. The first was a Review of Environmental Data that mainly looked at the available environmental data from the area. Ms. Werner reported that the Environmental Data report was now at the CDC Headquarters in Atlanta. She did not have any specific time frame as to when it would be returned. The second report was a cancer related study done in correlation with the health department. Ms. Werner reported that this report was moving along as well, but again had no specific time frame as to its completion. It was also noted by Ms. Werner that the privacy forms for the cancer study, discussed at last meeting were no longer necessary due to legal issues. The solution to the problem of attaining information from individuals claiming asbestos related illness or death would be solved by acquiring the data without taking names from the individuals providing it.

Imminent Removal Actions Update

An update on removal actions was given by EPA Representative, Larry Johnson. Mr. Johnson said that the *Action Memorandum* had been signed and was currently up and running. EPA Representative, Eduardo Rivera estimated May 19, 2008 as the start date for the first phase of removal actions. Mr. Johnson noted that a complete topographical survey of all 38 acres had to be completed before any work could be started.

Questions from CAG members regarding the update on the Removal Actions were answered by EPA representative, Larry Johnson.

Q-1. Will the Topographic Survey results be made available to the CAG before work starts on the site?

A-1. Not sure, but will ask and get back to the CAG.

Q-2. Did the additional 6-8 million dollars get approved?

A-2. Yes, the *Action Memorandum* is the proverbial key to the door that unlocks money.

Q-3. How are the monetary figures determined by Eduardo?

A-3. The figures are based on an analysis of the requirements for the site.

Q-4. Do the requirements for the site include a barrier for the reservoir?

A-4. All areas previously discussed have been factored in but, will check and get back to CAG.

Q-5. Will the Removal-Remedial Actions break the 38 acre site into sections in order to complete the work?

A-5. EPA has not gotten to that point yet. There will be more details as more info on the site comes in.

Q-6. Who is the best person to contact regarding a general question about the Five Year Review on the asbestos pile located across the street?

A-6. Jim Feeney-RPM

Q-7. What is the latest on the NPL proposal?

A-7. It is currently in Washington. There is no real update on progress because once it leaves Region 3 the process is closed to Mr. Johnson as well.

A CAG member commented that after working with the EPA and PA DEP over twenty years ago; there was no reason to question whether or not the EPA would do a good job. The CAG member expressed that she felt the EPA would definitely do their job in regards to the BoRit site. As a resident of West Ambler, the CAG member noted that children played on the asbestos site frequently and nobody got asbestos related diseases, except those who worked in the factory. It was also noted by the CAG member that nobody in West Ambler has asbestos related diseases due to living in the area.

In response to the previous CAG member's comments, some CAG members disagreed and one requested that the record be set straight on what happened twenty years ago.

CAG Co-Chair Fred Conner suggested that since many of the CAG's questions are unanswerable at this time; questions should be forwarded to him by the end of the week so he can consolidate them and send them to Larry Johnson early next week. Mr. Conner further commented that consolidating the questions would give everyone a good sense of what the community is thinking as removal actions encroach. Copies of the Action Memorandum were made available to everyone in attendance.

Mr. Conner added that anyone wishing to revise or add comments to the meeting summaries after reading them was able to do so and that this was a good way to go on record.

TASC Presentation

Next, TASC Work Assignment Manager, Mike Lythgott gave a short power point presentation on TASC's mission and the services they can provide. Mr. Lythgott explained that *E-Squared Ecology and Economics*, a company out of Charlottesville, VA, was a hired TASC consultant for the EPA. The company's aim is to provide a breakthrough consulting service that allows people to help the environment and make out well at the same time. TASC's purpose is to provide educational and technical assistance to communities affected by hazardous waste sites and is regulated by Superfund Resource Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA).

Hazardous waste sites impact many people and that is why the CAG is a multi-stakeholder group. TASC offers assistance to help communities better understand hazardous waste issues confronting them and to become well informed while participating in the decision making process. For example, say there is a map that the average person cannot read. TASC can interpret it or help individuals understand so that the community can understand too. The EPA found the informed community to be more involved, make better decisions and provide more help. If people do not understand what it is they are making decisions about, what good is it sitting at the table? Community involvement is no good without informed members of the community.

Ways that TASC can provide assistance through individual and technical experts:

- Answer questions about hazardous waste and potential health effects.
- Educate community about scientific engineering, human and public health or economic concepts related to hazardous waste cleanup.
- Help community understand cleanup.
- Explain cleanup process and how to become involved.
- Assist community in identifying possible land reuse or redevelopment options.
- Provide job training through Superfund Job Training Initiative (JTI).

TASC services can be tailored to the specific needs of your community. For example, JTI's are typically used in communities that are not wealthy and in need of cleanup. Superfund JTI certifies community members to be hazardous waste workers and allows them to get paid while the site is being cleaned up. TASC services provided to a community are intended to be separate from the EPA. How a particular goal is accomplished is up to the CAG and TASC. The EPA merely provides guidelines that need to be followed. If the CAG already has an expert in mind to use, a TASC director will check qualifications and if okay, TASC will pay the CAG's chosen expert to provide services to the CAG.

A handout which outlined TASC's services was provided by Mr. Lythgott to all members and observers in attendance.

Questions and Comments were taken from the CAG and answered by Mike Lythgott, TASC Work Assignment Manager, with the help of EPA Representative, Amelia Libertz.

Q-1. Is group facilitation a service that can be provided through TASC?

A-1. That is questionable and depends on finding an appropriate way to word the request in order to work within guidelines provided by the EPA.

Q-2. Is there a certain amount of money or time that we have to use TASC services?

A-2. Not exactly sure, but after a request for services is received, a needs assessment draft is sent back to the CAG; the CAG will have seven days to complete a needs assessment. The money appropriated for the service will depend on the needs assessment.

Q-3. Will questions be directed to the TASC coordinator?

A-3. Larry Johnson, EPA, and TASC will coordinate on questions from the CAG.

Q-4. Can we hire experts to review the documents and see if the proposed removal actions are effective?

A-4. Yes.

Comments made by CAG members on TASC services.-

- The CAG could use the upcoming workgroup breakout session to become more task oriented. Adding a seventh item to the workgroup guide entitled, suggestions for TASC contractor would be helpful.
- The dedication of the CAG is NPL listings so do not see why there are separate tasks. TASC services can be valuable in the future not necessarily right now.
- Any questions coming from CAG to TASC should be directed through the CAG CO-Chairs.
- TASC is a National Contract not a community grant, so will not stop funding if there is a continuing need for TASC services.
- The CAG should be operating from the perspective that there is a removal action coming. TASC could be used to help us understand if removal will be effective enough to cover health risks.

- CAG cannot start talking redevelopment or reuse of the site until we know if the removal action is effective.

CAG Co-Chair's Fred Conner and Bob Adams decided that the product of the workgroup breakout session would be faxed to TASC Work Assignment Manager, Mike Lythgott.

At this time, observers were given the opportunity to raise questions or comments. There were no observer questions or comments.

Workgroup Breakout Session Information

A handout titled, *The Working Group Approach*, was provided to all CAG members in attendance. The handout explained the concept of a working group, outlined the overall goals the CAG would like to accomplish with the help of workgroups and described the five proposed work groups. A *Breakout Session Discussion Guide* was included with the handout to help guide the discussion of each group as well as answer specific questions.

CAG Co-Chair Fred Conner explained that the working group approach will allow for CAG members to have more individual authority because the efforts and responsibility will be dispersed amongst each group. Workgroups are one approach to achieving the desired goals of procedural efficiency, more pro-activeness in overall approach and increased productivity. CAG member alternates and frequent observers were invited to join the workgroups pertaining to their interests in order to provide extra added input.

Five Minute Workgroup Reports

Each workgroup convened for 30 minutes and gave a five minute report to the CAG at the end of the breakout session. The previously mentioned *Breakout Session Guide* was provided and was to be filled out by the leader of each group and turned in to CAG Co-Chairs at the end of the meeting. **Each workgroup must be chaired by a CAG member and chairs listed are tentative until elected by CAG.**

1. *Rules Committee-*

- Chair -Joanne Walker, Larry _____, Eileen_____
- Help CAG by refining operating procedures, making sure charter is adhered to at all times and overseeing administrative functions of the CAG.

2. *Community Awareness Group (CA)-*

- Chair- Diane _____, Observer-Peter Lowery
- Plan to start by distributing information through residents associations.

3. *Health, Environment, Safety and Risk Group (HERS)-*

- Chair- Michelle _____, 9 members
- Group will be a streamline for Dr. Emmett and direct questions to him as a group. Plan to use ATSDR hotline and epidemiology experts.

4. *Removal/Remediation & Monitoring Oversight Group (R/R&M)-*

- Chair- Eric Lindult (alternate ?), Roman _____, Bob Adams, Possibly Eileen Fournier and Joanne Walker
- Plan to produce a summary of review comments on documentation of work to be done on the site.

5. *Future Plans Group-*

- Chair- Sal Bucotti,

- Would like to get all surrounding school districts involved somehow. Broke down site into three areas to develop future plans for BoRit area, reservoir area, and Mt. Pleasant to reservoir area. Some ideas for the areas included: retail stores, mix-use areas, trail systems and open space.

Next Steps and Action Items

A re-cap of membership and stakeholder discussions from the last meeting was given by Joanne Walker, tentative Rules committee Chair. Mrs. Walker reported that there were two open issues: finding a replacement for Ron Curtis in the local business owner category and the response to the letter sent by the CAG to the American Legion Post in West Ambler regarding their representation at meetings. First, Mrs. Walker informed CAG members that the Legion representative issue was solved by the presence of Eddie Curtis and the Legion does want to be involved. Second, Mrs. Walker said that there was one slot open for the business community in the Ambler area and Mayor Bud Wahl wants to nominate Architect Nick Phillips from Ambler Main Street Buisnesses. It was also noted by Mrs. Walker that any other nominations should be in the business owner category and should be e-mailed to Fred with background about the nominee. Discussion on the nominations will be continued at the next meeting. Mrs. Walker also stated that Rosalind Johnson is Flo Wise's alternate in order to clear up any confusion from discussion at a previous meeting.

CAG member Sharon McCormick reported that out of 4374 names on the petition from the area, 73 households were reporting asbestos related disease or death.

At 9:30pm the meeting adjourned.