

BoRit Asbestos Superfund Site Community Advisory Group Meeting

Ambler/Upper Dublin/Whitpain, Pennsylvania

(Revised Minutes)

Date: Wednesday, June 6, 2012

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

Meeting called to order by Co-Chair David Froehlich at 6:40 p.m.

Item #1: Welcome & Announcements

February/April meeting minutes discussed. Gordon Chase commented that he felt that the process of receiving the meeting minutes from EPA was taking too much time. A question was raised as to what would be an acceptable period of time. Co-Chair Dave Froehlich commented that between two and two and half weeks would be acceptable. Vance Evans of the EPA commented that he would consult with his peers regarding this time frame. No corrections were made to February minutes. Mr. Froehlich made a motion to approve the February minutes. All approved. No corrections were made to the April meeting minutes. Mr. Froehlich made a motion to approve April minutes. All approved.

Item #2: Area of Concern Statement

An Area of Concern (AOC) proposal was submitted by Dr. Ted Emmett during April's CAG meeting. At that time, the decision was made to give the CAG more time to review the proposal. Dr. Emmett noted that when the AOC Statement was first proposed, the exact wording became an item of discussion and a decision was made at that time to form a sub-group to discuss the AOC Statement wording. The wording of the AOC Statement as presented to the CAG this evening is as follows:

"The area of concern for the CAG is based on, but not specifically confined to, the BoRit Asbestos area as defined by the USEPA. We are concerned about community exposures at or extending beyond the administrative boundaries that EPA has established. Thus the area of interest for the CAG is not strictly governed by fixed geographical boundaries but rather by the existence, discovery or likely presence of potential exposure to toxic contamination from past manufacturing activities in AMbler and adjacent communities that used asbestos. Other toxic waste components that are present or mixed with the asbestos-containing waste are also of concern to the CAG."

Dr. Emmett indicated that there were two issues of particular interest to the AOC sub-group. These issues are:

1. Boundaries of Risk: Has there been any spread of the AOC? Are the boundaries as currently stated by the CAG precise?

- a. Dr. Emmett also mentioned the importance of a look back to the remediation done in 1984, which addressed only half of the AOC. It would be undesirable to have a repeat of these events.
2. Health Risks (i.e., Lung Cancer/Mesothelioma): Other agents that that could possibly be present at the site that might influence the risk of asbestos and risk in general. Risks to residents can depend on many factors, not just asbestos contamination. This could influence any decisions regarding the CAG's scope.

Comments, questions, and concerns that were raised following Dr. Emmett's discussion of the AOC statement are as follows:

- Mr. Eric Cheung noted that regardless of what the CAG proposes regarding the AOC, it does not necessarily influence EPA in regards to their AOC. Mr. Cheung would like to make sure that the understanding amongst the CAG is that they cannot do anything formally in regards to EPA, only in regards to the CAG's scope.
- Mr. Sal Bocutti stated that he feels it is in the CAG's best interest to investigate the issues. It is his plan to vote for this wording of the AOC as it gives them both information and authority regarding the CAG.
- Ms. Susan Curry noted that the letter M in the word Ambler in the 3rd line of the AOC statement was improperly capitalized. She also proposed adding the word "BoRit" before the word "CAG" in the 1st line of the AOC statement. She noted that when working outside of the current BoRit AOC, the CAG may not have support from EPA in those matters.
- Ms. Lynn Hoffmann commented that it may be in their best interests to develop the AOC verbiage more seriously, especially for the upcoming comment period. She noted that the CAG was part of this process for a reason; to have their voices heard.
- Mr. Vance Evans of the EPA noted that some sites take on a life after the work by EPA is completed, so it may be in the CAG's best interest to get additional info. Mr. Evans mentioned that he sees the possibility of the CAG going on as a group into the future, long after BoRit work has been completed.
- Mr. Gordon Chase mentioned that by extending the scope of the CAG, EPA may no longer be the appropriate agency. It could possibly be a PADEP issue. He also noted that since no one actually lives directly on the Site, that in essence, everything they are interested in is outside of BoRit's current boundaries.
- Ms. Beth Pilling noted that she likes the intent of the wording but is worried about "scope creep". Ms. Pilling mentioned that she feels she may not have time to participate in an expanded scope if it involves other communities. She noted that as the wording is currently

stated, no parameters are set. And though she likes the meaning of the statement, she is unsure of specific parameters.

- Ms. Lynn Hoffmann asked what the purpose would be of the CAG going on after the BoRit site is remediated. She asked Vance Evans if EPA would be involved in CAG meetings after the site has been remediated. Mr. Evans responded that though he is unsure if EPA would be involved in post-remediation CAG meetings, EPA would be involved with the site in the form of Five-Year Reviews. EPA may not be involved in regular CAG meetings but may have interaction with the group.
- Mr. Joe McDowell of EPA stated that he has seen sites where EPA has had involvement post – ROD in which EPA shared designs and met with municipalities, etc. Ms. Lynn Hoffmann asked if the EPA may not be involved post-remediation. Mr. McDowell responded that yes, EPA would be involved but it really depends on the community’s needs.
- Mr. Jim Blanch of Whitpain Township commented that he seconds what Ms. Pilling said regarding clarity of parameters of scope expansion. He remarked that perhaps the focus should be on the BoRit site for the time being.
- Ms. Susan Curry also agreed with Ms. Pilling regarding the need for limitations or parameters regarding the expansion of the CAG’s scope. Ms. Curry remarked that she feels the phrase “and adjacent communities” in line 3 of the AOC statement as it currently reads is vague. She suggested voting on the statement tonight with an addendum that the CAG needs further clarification from the AOC sub-group.
- Mr. Otis Hightower mentioned that he sees CAG and EPA mentioned in the wording of the AOC statement but that there is no mention of the community. He asked the CAG if people just walk away from the community after cleanup. He noted that people in the community have suffered and died. He remarked that he keeps hearing a lot about the CAG and EPA but not about the community. It was recently brought to his attention during a meeting on Monday, June 4 that there is still asbestos visible on the perimeter of the site and noted that there is a community living in the vicinity of the site. Mr. Hightower commented that he fully supports the expansion of the scope and asked the CAG to please think of the community.
- Mr. Gordon Chase noted that the CAG did discuss the issue of setting parameters last year. The CAG decided at the time to not place specific parameters but to instead give themselves the flexibility to investigate those matters they felt important. Mr. Chase remarked that he is hesitant to set specific borders because new information may be learned in the future that is outside of those boundaries.
- Mr. Eric Cheung noted that this expansion language came about because it was something the CAG is interested in. Control of “scope creep” will be controlled organically by the group simply by the fact of if something or somewhere is brought up that is not interesting to the group as a

whole, the group will shoot down the idea. He remarked that all the language in the AOC statement is doing is giving the CAG the authority to do these things, and that the CAG has control in the group from keeping it from getting out of control.

- Mr. Vance Evans of EPA noted that he is continually looking for ways to engage and empower the community of West Ambler so that it can take on a life of its own within this project. He commented that the meeting on Monday, June 4th was positive and that it sparked the community to set in motion new habits. He noted that he is aware the community is interested but it's a matter of EPA and the CAG finding the correct way to engage this community. EPA is still working on the possibility of conducting small groups with members of the West Ambler community to explain science in layman's terms and helping residents to understand that even if they don't own the property, they are all connected. Mr. Evans noted that he is hopeful that Mr. Hightower's presence at CAG meetings will help to facilitate a connection between West Ambler and CAG activities.
- Ms. Lynn Hoffmann noted that the AOC issue was raised because Sharon McCormick was reading reports of contamination in other communities. She remarked that there has to be some engagement between the CAG and EPA regarding this contamination. She suggested that the scope could include a general "if you see anything"-like wording as opposed to finite parameters.
- Ms. Beth Pilling remarked that she feels as if the CAG is all saying the same thing but that the CAG has a history of disagreeing on the particulars regarding the expansion of scope. She understands how hard it would be to set parameters and wondered how the CAG would agree on this issue.
- Co-Chair Dave Froehlich suggested that perhaps the focus should not be geographic but rather should be on topics or problems related to the underlying cause of why there is a problem at the BoRit site.
- Mr. Gordon Chase noted that the AOC statement does say "past manufacturing activities in Ambler".
- Ms. Susan Curry suggested that if the CAG should strike the phrase "and adjacent communities", then the statement would be acceptable. Dr. Ted Emmett agreed.
- Mr. Chase remarked that Ambler is actually a very small area.
- Ms. Bernadette Dougherty noted that the CAG discusses this over and over but asked what power extending the scope actually gives the CAG. She asked what the CAG can do to actually make a difference.

- Mr. Chase remarked that that is a very good question and that if the CAG is nothing more than a talking shop, then there is no point to it. He noted that RR&M does have evidence that the CAG is achieving positive results. He noted that they now have TASC funding to employ the services of a specialist in hydrology to assess the risk of contamination in public water sources. He noted that if the CAG had not had these discussions, this would not have been achieved and this work will be both quality work and performed by professionals. Ms. Dougherty asked Mr. Chase how this has affected the community. Mr. Chase responded that they are still in the study phase and that the site is much different geographically now than it was three years ago.
- Ms. Lora Werner of ATSDR remarked that these discussions really do have an effect on agencies' decision making process. Many of these issues, such as flooding, really do matter.
- Ms. Susan Curry proposed that the CAG vote on insertion of the word "BoRit" before the word "CAG" in the first line of the AOC statement. She also suggested the CAG remove the phrase "and adjacent communities" from line 3.
- Co-Chair Dave Froehlich remarked that it was his impression that if issues arise post-remediation, that EPA would be there.
- Mr. Otis Hightower commented that there is a difference between Ambler Borough and the community that lives near the site, which is actually more related to Whitpain Township. Mr. Hightower asked for further clarification of the elimination of the phrase "and adjacent communities" from line 3 of the AOC statement.

Co-Chair Dave Froehlich suggested the group vote on an amended AOC statement with the word "BoRit" inserted before "CAG" in the 1st line, the correction of the spelling of the word AMbler in the 3rd line, and the removal of the phrase "and adjacent communities" from the 3rd line. At this time, the CAG voted on the amended AOC statement. All were in favor save one dissenting vote.

The amended AOC statement as voted on by the CAG now reads:

"The area of concern for the BoRit CAG is based on, but not specifically confined to, the BoRit Asbestos area as defined by the USEPA. We are concerned about community exposures at or extending beyond the administrative boundaries that EPA has established. Thus the area of interest for the CAG is not strictly governed by fixed geographical boundaries but rather by the existence, discovery or likely presence of potential exposure to toxic contamination from past manufacturing activities in Ambler that used asbestos. Other toxic waste components that are present or mixed with the asbestos-containing waste are also of concern to the CAG."

Items, issues and concerns that were raised following the voting on the amended AOC statement are as follows:

Mr. Vance Evans of the EPA commented that he sees something missing in the current wording of the AOC statement. He recommend adding the wording "and impact" after "community exposures". Mr.

Froehlich mentioned that he sees what Mr. Evans is saying as non-contradictory with the broad consensus of the group.

Mr. Gordon Chase asked Mr. Jim Blanch to expand on why he thinks the expansion of the AOC is not a good idea. Mr. Blanch responded that his concerns are regarding how far it will expand to and what involvement Whitpain Township should have in this expansion. Mr. Blanch noted that from Whitpain Township's view, they would like to keep the focus on the BoRit site for now, though this could possibly change in the future.

Item #3: Workgroup Reports

HERS Workgroup from May 21, 2012

Lora Werner of ATSDR indicated that the next task for the workgroup will be to review a forthcoming report from PADOH (i.e.; The Pennsylvania Department of Health) regarding groundwater in the site area. This report will hopefully be published in July. If so, the workgroup may be able to complete its review by the August CAG meeting, but this will depend on reviewers' schedules. Ms. Werner indicated that the next major document the group will review will be EPA's Human Health Risk Assessment for the site, though this report may not be available for the workgroup's review until the end of the calendar year. The group is trying to build relationships with the community of West Ambler and has recently had some follow-up with members of the community. Ms. Werner indicated that the HERS group may possibly be recruiting a new member, Mr. Bruce Riegel, an Ambler resident and recently retired as regional administrator for the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA). Dr. Ted Emmett added that Mr. Riegel should be helpful in the independent review of health reports. Dr. Emmett also gave an open invitation to anyone in the CAG who would like to review these documents.

RR&M Committee Report from May 23, 2012

RR&M Committee Chairman Gordon Chase commented that the group has been concentrating on groundwater. The main points of interest discussed in the previous months' RR&M meeting are as follows:

1. The approval of TASC funds has facilitated the employment of a hydro geologist, Mr. Stuart Wiswall. Mr. Wiswall will be employed by SKEO and working on behalf of the CAG. Mr. Wiswall's work is scheduled to be completed by June 22, 2012. His results will be delivered to the RR&M Committee who will then report these results during the August CAG meeting. The group has plans for a public proposal summarizing data given by hydro geologist. Ms. Susan Curry inquired if Mr. Wiswall had prior experience working with asbestos contamination. Mr. Froehlich responded that he does not have airborne asbestos experience. He then added that there may be TASC assistance for the employment of two specialists for both groundwater and airborne contamination.

2. Discussion followed of PADEP's response regarding testing of Ambler Borough wells 4 & 9. Testing will occur again in 2014 however, testing for asbestos is not a requirement. Ms. Lynda Rebarchek noted that Ambler Borough did test for asbestos as recently as 2011 and the results at that time were a "non-detect". She noted that no problems had been found whatsoever.
3. Mr. Chase indicated that he recently made a personal tour of the site. He noted that from EPA's viewpoint, the pile work is completed and the road surrounding it will be seeded over. The Rose Valley Creek work is going to be redone in June due to storms. However, no contractor has been approved for this and he is unsure of when this work will begin. Mr. Chase indicated that EPA OSC Eduardo Rovira has commented that because there are a number of trees surrounding the reservoir they could not properly remediate around these trees. Mr. Chase commented that this means they are, in effect, unremediated. Co-Chair Dave Froehlich noted that he would like to focus on reports from the committee at this time. Ms. Lynn Hoffmann inquired as to the point of these comments and Mr. Chase responded that they were just his personal comments. Mr. Otis Hightower noted that when issues like these are discovered, they should be brought to the forefront and not ignored. Mr. Froehlich responded that it has been discussed and not ignored. It is his feeling that this would not be the correct point in this meeting to bring up a broad subject of this nature but the issue can certainly be raised in the future.

Community Awareness Group

Ms. Lynn Hoffmann began by noting that both posters and business cards have been placed in three libraries and municipalities. Mr. Otis Hightower asked what communities the group was reaching. Ms. Hoffmann then gave a summary of the activities the group participates in such as ad placement, website maintenance and attempting to engage the community. Ms. Susan Curry commented that when she was part of the group it was their responsibility to give a voice to the community when issues arise. Ms. Hoffmann noted that the group originally intended to have an emergency plan set up with EPA, possibly a call that would go out to the community in events of an emergency. She remarked that it would be a good idea for CAG members to have a list of telephone numbers to call when they see something that needs immediate attention.

West Ambler Revitalization

Co-Chair Dave Froehlich asked Mr. Jim Blanch, Township Engineer of Whippen Township, to give a summary of recent meetings regarding the West Ambler area. Mr. Blanch gave a brief overview of the planning study currently underway for the West Ambler area. The committee is comprised of elected officials, residents and the Temple Center for Sustainable Communities. The committee's goals are to address 3 key issues:

- Storm water management controls- identify causes and choose short and long-term mitigation options including funding options. Most of the controls addressed would pertain to the Rose Valley Creek watershed, through Maple St. towards the Wissahickon.

- Brownfield revitalization
- Neighborhood revitalization – there is currently funding from a State grant that needs to be used before the grant expires in mid-2013. As a result, the Township is trying to improve the streetscape of Maple Street immediately. The grant is limited to sidewalk improvements and cannot be used for storm water management. The grant will be used for sidewalk improvements, grading and landscape improvements (tree planting). This process has already begun. Mr. Blanch noted that there was a meeting of West Ambler residents on Monday, June 4 and this was a good step as they needed to gauge the concerns of West Ambler residents. There will be 3 more public meetings between now and February 13th, 4 additional committee meetings and final recommendations should be available by May 2013. Mr. Gordon Chase asked Mr. Blanch to define West Ambler. Mr. Blanch responded that his definition was from the railroad to the creek and from Chestnut Street to Mathers Road. Ms. Lynn Hoffmann inquired if this information was available on the internet and Mr. Blanch responded that it is not, but that the website is currently being developed. Mr. Otis Hightower commented that it would be desirable if some committee members could attend public meetings. He noted that he hopes this is just Phase One of longer process. Mr. Blanch agreed, noting “that is the idea.” Ms. Susan Curry recommended the use of Silva Cells to Mr. Blanch for the purposes of tree planting. Mr. Blanch noted there was no final design yet and the committee was open to ideas.

Item #4: Observer Comments

Ms. Flo Wise of the West Ambler Community Association (WACA) noted that she has lived in the area around Maple Street since she was 7 years old. She has memories of when the asbestos was first brought in. She noted that asbestos did not grow in this area; it was brought here by profiteers. When she was younger, she was very pleased with EPA when they initially cleaned up the area and installed a park. She noted that not one person from the community has had an issue with health problems unless they actually worked in the factories. Her sister passed away this year from cancer that was unrelated to asbestos contamination. She stated her point is she would like the CAG to not dismiss ideas of a new park on the site if EPA chooses to place one there. Her mission with WACA is to restore the community. All they are asking for is improvements, not necessarily expansion into studies. She feels it’s a shame that \$250,000 is being spent on sidewalks when those streets have no drainage. The residents of the community were grateful to receive the sidewalk improvements because it was all they could get. She closed by saying everyone should come together and the 17 acres of BoRit land should be made into a recreational facility for those communities that have nothing. Mr. Jim Blanch noted that these issues do concern Whippain Township. This is the reason they have involved Temple, Ambler and Upper Dublin Townships involved in the study.

Item #5 Action Items:

Ongoing items:

- Item #21: Draft of CAG meeting minutes to be provided to Co-Chair Bob Adams within 2-3 weeks of CAG meeting. Mr. Vance Evans will inform the CAG if the draft minutes will take longer than 3 weeks to arrive.
- Item #92: Sign-in list to be circulated at CAG meeting by Eileen Fornier. The list will then be forwarded to secretary Christopher Mondia who will attach to draft minutes.
- Item #93: Each CAG member is encouraged to distribute CAG meeting minutes to their constituents by e-mail.
- Workgroup reports: Summary of reports to be sent to Co-Chair Bob Adams and Secretary Christopher Mondia after workgroup meetings.

Current Items:

- Items #108 & #109: Mr. Stuart Wiswall has been contracted to review the EPA data reports and interpret the potential risk to drinking water (Wells #4 and #8). Will report to RR&M after June 22, 2012. Requesting an air data expert needs to be discussed at a RR&M meeting first.
- Item #126: Expansion of CAG scope – the CAG voted to adopt the new statement as amended.
- Item #48/118: Mr. Vance Evans brought the completed activities-to-date timeline poster. A presentation will be given at the August CAG meeting.
- Item #134: Requests repeated for self-nominations or other nominations to review documents. Mr. Bruce Riegel noted as new HERS committee member.

Item #6: Old Business/New Business/Next Steps

Mr. Peter Lowry had questions regarding the trees around the reservoir that Mr. Chase had mentioned during his RR&M group summary. He noted that he was very fascinated with there is about 100 trees still left standing around this reservoir when all other trees were removed. He is curious to know if the property owner, or Whitpain Township, had anything to do with the decision to leave the trees standing. Co-Chair Dave Froehlich noted that this was a good issue and that the proper place for its discussion should be in the RR&M committee. Once it has been discussed amongst the committee, that information will be shared with the CAG as a whole.

Mr. Gordon Chase noted that the fence line along Maple St. will be brought in a small amount (moved closer to the Site and further away from the sidewalk and street) and the asbestos along the fence line will be removed. When Mr. Chase asked Eduardo Rovira if the path at the top of the pile would be removed, Mr. Rovira noted that it would remain as a maintenance path and would be grassed over.

Ms. Lora Werner asked the CAG if they would like a presentation on ABS sampling at the next CAG meeting. The CAG responded that they would. Mr. Lowry asked for details regarding the bidding process

for contracts with EPA as it is in the CAG's best interests to know who is awarded these contracts sooner than later.

Meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m. by Co-Chair Dave Froehlich.

Next meeting is scheduled for August 1, 2012.