

DRAFT minutes
Community Information Group Meeting
Motorola 52nd St. Superfund Site
September 21, 2011
Gateway Community College, Phoenix, AZ

Project Team and Regulator Attendees:

United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA): Janet Rosati, Remedial Project Manager (RPM), Leana Rosetti, Community Involvement Coordinator (CIC), Gerry Hiatt, Toxicologist, Martin Zeleznik (RPM),

USACE/Shaw Environmental, Inc. (Shaw): Sue Kraemer, Doug Hulmes

Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ): Brian Stonebrink, Project Manager (PM), Wayne Miller, Hydrogeologist, Travis Barnum (PM), Joellen Meitl (PM), Andre Chiaradia (PM), Felicia Calderon (CIC),

Technical Assistance Grant (TAG) Technical Advisor: Richard Rushforth

CIG Members:

Wendoly Abrego, Phoenix Revitalization Corporation
Mary Moore, Lindon Park Neighborhood Association
Rena Chase-Dufault, Lindon Park Neighborhood Association
Martha Breitenbach, Resident
Doug Tucker, Resident
Les Holland, Resident

Additional attendees:

Denise Moreno (U of A)
David Gordon (Malcolm Pirnie)
David Abranovic (ERM)
Eva Olivas (Phoenix Revitalization Corp)
Jenn McCall (Freescale)
Jennifer Botsford (ADHS)
Judy Heywood (APS)
Lisa Clifton
Rob Mongrain (Arcadis)
Sarah T. Wilkinson (U of A)
Shoshanna Kroeger (BioScience High School)

Steve Brittle (Don't Waste AZ)
Tom Suriano (Clear Creek)
William Neese (ADEQ consultant)
Claudia Garcia (US Army Corp)
Loren Lund (CH2MHill)
Arnim Wiek (ASU)
Rob Laumann (ERM)
Stacyl Whitaker
Richard Rushforth (TAG technical advisor)
Diane Lopez
Chris Estrada
Alexa Enriquez

A Community Information Group (CIG) meeting was held at Gateway Community College located at 108 N. 40th Street in Phoenix, Arizona from approximately 6:15 pm to 8:20 pm on September 21, 2011. Dr. Ruth Marston could not be in attendance to facilitate. Leana Rosetti, EPA, offered to be facilitator for the evening, which was approved by group.

The primary purpose of this meeting was to present the public with recent soil vapor and indoor air sampling data from OU1, inform them of upcoming OU1 investigations, provide an overview of the Five-Year Review Process, and provide a forum for interaction between stakeholders, regulators and the public. The discussion the OU2 Effectiveness Report was postponed to November.

Approximately 30 members of the public were present in addition to regulators and consultants. Numerous students from the Phoenix Union Bioscience High School were present as part of a class project. A list of the attendees, excluding the high school students as they did not have time to sign in, is above.

6:18 pm: Wendoly Abrego of the CIG began the meeting by giving introductions. Ms. Breitenbach, CIG member, asked all present to please refrain from using acronyms. Ms. Rosetti asked that the EPA and ADEQ representatives to introduce themselves. Richard Rushforth introduced himself as the new community technical advisor. Ms. Rosetti indicated the presentation material would be available next week on EPA's website.

Review of Past Business

A review of past business was begun. Ms. Moore, CIG member, requested that the questions on the OU1 Effectiveness Report from the TAG Technical Advisor be addressed.

ADEQ provided an update on the Kachina Joray site. Ms. Moore inquired about the Five-Year Review. Ms. Rosetti and Mr. Stonebrink explain that the OU1 and OU2 Five-Years Reviews have been combined into a single report. Ms. Moore asked about the length of the review and wanted assurance that no information would be lost. Ms. Rosetti indicated that the Five-Year Review had not been signed so tonight they would be presenting an overview rather than specifics of the report.

Ms. Rosetti asked for an update on the end use report. Mr. Wayne Miller from ADEQ explained that ON Semiconductor is still using the treated water. Jenn McCall has no new information concerning the end use of treated water. Freescale is in the process of addressing comments on the document. Currently there is no date set for the release of the report which will summarize the end use of treated water. Ms. Moore asked if addressing public comments would revisit discharge options again, or do they still plan on discharging to the cross-cut canal. Ms. Rosetti asked Ms. McCall if they will look at additional modeling; Ms. McCall indicated they will.

Steve Brittle, citizen, indicated that he had read Arizona and Phoenix in particular is facing a severe water shortage, and that "we should be reinjecting water rather than discharging to the canal." He then asked where he could send his comments, since the public will not be involved in the end use of the treated water decision. Ms. Rosetti indicated he could give them to Martin Zeleznik or Brian Stonebrink. He indicated he would send his comments to Ms. Rosetti.

Five-Year Review Process – Brian Stonebrink, ADEQ (6:30 pm)

Mr. Stonebrink gave a presentation on Five-Year Review Process. Ms. Breitenbach asked for clarification on URS; Mr. Stonebrink explained that they are a contractor to ADEQ.

William Neese, with URS, the ADEQ contractor, presented how the remedial action performance was evaluated for the Five-Year Review. Mr. Stonebrink asked the audience if there was anything they would like to discuss. Ms. Breitenbach indicated she wanted a discussion of bedrock remediation throughout all three OUs. She also asked about chloroform and stated 15 to 20 wells contained chloroform. Mr. Stonebrink indicated EPA will discuss chloroform in the later presentation. He further indicated that chloroform is not addressed in the Five-Year Review.

Ms. Breitenbach indicated she was hurt that she wasn't included in the community interviews. Mr. Stonebrink apologized for not including her and did not know how the oversight occurred. Ms. Breitenbach asked for a CD of the Five Year Review. Another citizen asked for a show of hands of those people that were interviewed for the Five-Year Review; approximately five hands were raised.

Ms. Rosetti explained that she puts a notice in the newspaper regarding interviews, and sends notification through the mail. She recalled having difficulty with Ms. Breitenbach's mail. Ms Rosetti indicated it is difficult to get responses from people.

Mr. Brittle asked if it is too late for people to be interviewed. Ms. Rosetti indicated it is for the latest Five-Year Review Report; and that they did interview Mr. Brittle. Mr. Brittle indicated he wasn't aware of all the material at the time. He also indicated that if not for Obama recently stepping in, the TCE standard would have been dropped to 1 ppb, from the current 10 ppb, and EPA could look foolish if they are basing everything on the current standard, and should consider starting over. Mr. Brittle also indicated the EPA should try harder when contacting citizens.

Ms. Moore indicated that she thought it would be a good idea to interview more people and do a supplement to the report. Ms. Rosetti indicated that the material covered in the interviews could not be incorporated into the report, even if they did a supplement, since the report has already been signed; and she did not want to give citizens a false pretense about their comments being addressed in the report.

Ms. Moore indicated she couldn't understand why other interviewees couldn't be included. Ms. Moore indicated there are addendums after 1 year from the Five-Year Review Report; and that would be good place to include comments from additional interviewees.

Rolf Haden (ASU) asked about new data that might not be included. Mr. Stonebrink indicated they have to have a cutoff date to be able to complete the Five-Year Review. Citizen asked if ADEQ feels comfortable sending out reports without new data. Mr. Stonebrink indicated that vapor intrusion, which was the most important new item, was included.

Mr. Brittle voiced concern about length of remediation time. Mr. Stonebrink indicated that the Five-Year Review does not address remediation time. He indicated that it was difficult to model and estimate length of remediation time. Mr. Brittle pointed out that South and North Indian Bend Wash Superfund sites clearly indicated 30 years. Mr. Stonebrink indicated its something they can look into. Mr. Brittle indicated that timeframe should be one the most important items in a Five-Year Review.

Les Holland, CIG member, indicated the current report is closed and CIG members will receive a CD copy of the Five-Year Review. He wanted the CIG technical expert to go over the report with them before the next meeting with ADEQ and EPA, which will be in January 2012. He asked if EPA will send out any additional information. Ms. Rosetti indicated EPA will send out a fact sheet. Ms. Moore stated the TAG would go over the Five-Year Review.

Ms. Rosati indicated that the soil gas, sub-slab, and indoor air investigations will be out and available for review as well. Ms. Moore wanted to make sure vapor intrusion remediation systems will not be overlooked. Ms. Moore asked if vapor intrusion issue will be included in next report. Ms. Rosati explained there will be a series of reports that will address the vapor intrusion issue.

Ms. Moore indicated that the knowledge of the area changes rapidly, and doesn't want the vapor intrusion study to be something done just once and forgotten about. Ms. Rosati and Ms. Rosetti indicated it will not be dropped and will continue to be evaluated in Five-Year Reviews.

Ms. Rosetti indicated they must move on to other topics due to time constraints.

Mr. Brittle voiced concerned that five years is too long in between reports, and would like JATAP data included in the Five-Year Review Reports. Ms. Diane Lopez, citizen, agreed five years is too long. Ms. Rosetti indicated there are Effectiveness Reports produced every year, which evaluate the remedies in place on a yearly basis.

Ambient Air Data for Phoenix Joint Air Toxics Assessment Project (JATAP), Gerry Hiatt, EPA 7:15 pm

Dr. Gerry Hiatt (EPA) began his presentation on JATAP. He explained the relationship between indoor air, outdoor air and vapor intrusion.

A student asked if contaminants were primarily from the groundwater or ambient air. Dr. Hiatt explained the vapor intrusion pathway, household products that contain solvents, properties of TCE and PCE and air quality in Phoenix.

Doug Tucker, CIG member, asked about daughter products. Dr. Hiatt indicated some of the daughter products were sampled in JATAP. Mr. Doug Tucker indicated that TCE is no longer included in commercial products from the last few years. Dr. Hiatt indicated it is common to walk into a hardware store and find a product that was banned 20 years ago.

Mr. Brittle indicated he believes that the concentration in sub-slab and indoor air has to come from groundwater.

Ms. Moore inquired about JATAP sample locations, which happened to be Dr. Hiatt's next slide.

Ms. Lopez voiced concern about all the sample locations being on the west side of Phoenix. Ms. Rosetti indicated that EPA has collected several samples on the east side within OU1.

Dr. Hiatt explained that JATAP data come from permanent monitoring stations. He presented PCE and TCE results and discussed exceedences over the RBSLs. Dr. Hiatt indicated that VOCs in ambient air in Phoenix is higher than a lot of other urban areas.

Mr. Brittle asked about comparing data from OU1 with other areas in Phoenix. Dr. Hiatt explained that will be covered in his next presentation.

A student asked if vapor intrusion has gotten better or worse since 2005, given that groundwater is being treated. Dr. Hiatt did not want to guess. Mr. Brittle reiterated that off-gassing from groundwater contamination is happening throughout the Valley.

Ms. Moore asked about EPA's reassessment of the toxicity of TCE, and if that report had already been released, would the revised numbers influence the RBSLs?

Dr. Hiatt explained the reassessment to the rest of audience. He explained that the reassessment process is being reevaluated and the release of new toxicity data is currently on hold.

Ms. Breitenbach asked if there have been any changes in air regulations, to address the high levels of contaminants, in the Phoenix area. Dr. Hiatt indicated that air regulations are not his area of expertise; but he indicated that ADEQ and EPA have agencies in place that are trying to address the air quality issues.

Citizen asked when JATAP began. Dr. Hiatt indicated he believed 2002 was the first year. He thought that some 2006 data were included, but he has not reviewed all the data. Citizen inquired about trends (is the air quality getting better or worse). Dr. Hiatt indicated that was a good question.

Ms. Rosetti mediated and introduced Ms. Rosati.

OU1 Indoor Air Sampling/Soil Gas Results, Next Steps, Janet Rosati and Gerry Hiatt, EPA 7:30 pm

Ms. Rosati began her presentation regarding the recent sub-slab and indoor air quality sampling. She explained the sampling process. She answered specific questions about sampling locations (clarified on map slide).

Dr. Hiatt presented the results from the latest sampling round. In summary, there were no results that required emergency response or expedited mitigation and additional investigation is planned. Dr. Hiatt indicated that nearly triple the originally number of samples were collected. He explained that there is generally 100-fold attenuation from sub-slab concentrations to indoor air. Dr. Hiatt did not discuss actual numeric concentrations, because the data have not been validated yet. Due to privacy issues, he explained that specific residential addressees in which data were collected will not be disclosed.

Mr. Holland asked when the data validation would be completed. Ms. Rosati indicated within the next few weeks.

Dr. Hiatt continued with his presentation. He explained the pre-sampling survey of potential VOC sources.

7:45 pm Ms. Rosetti indicated they are running short of time. Dr. Hiatt finished his presentation as fast as possible. He quickly summarized trends and comparison to screening levels.

Student reiterated the privacy issue, and suggested that if there is a health issue, the residents should be informed and perhaps have a neighborhood meeting. Dr. Hiatt explained EPA will meet with homeowners first and explain the results and remedial options if necessary, to protect privacy.

CIG member asked about pre-sampling survey; Dr. Hiatt explained that they go over a very long checklist with the homeowner prior to sampling.

Ms. Moore asked whether another meeting would be held for the residents. Ms. Rosetti indicated that once EPA has received the validated data, they will talk to the residents where specific sample locations were collected before talking publicly about specific concentrations.

Citizen asked if one house is impacted; "Can it be assumed that their neighbors are also impacted?" Dr. Hiatt responded that it was certainly possible. She suggested that it would be more powerful to have a neighborhood meeting. Dr. Hiatt indicated they will meet with residents one on one, and then have a public meeting.

Ms. Lopez asked if EPA could ask the resident to waive their privacy rights, indicating she would. Ms. Rena Chase-Dufault, CIG member, voiced her concern about property values if their homes are labeled as contaminated. CIG member and resident discussed the pros and cons of disclosing data to the public.

Ms. Rosetti and Dr. Hiatt mediated and explained that sample data collected within private homes is not public data.

Mr. Tucker explained that the bottom line is that this information must be disclosed at time of sale, per Arizona real estate law. He applauded the EPA's effort to keep the appropriate data private.

Dr. Hiatt reiterated they will not reveal specific concentrations from specific private residences.

Ms. Rosetti indicated they are running out of time for the meeting; Dr. Hiatt indicated they will be around after the meeting to answer questions one on one, and resumed his presentation. He discussed general findings of sub-slab, indoor and outdoor sample results. He reiterated the summary: no emergency response needed, but additional assessment will be conducted. He indicated that some elevated indoor air concentrations are likely from other sources inside homes.

Mr. Holland asked when the next round of sampling will occur. Dr. Hiatt answered first week in October.

Mr. Brittle indicated he would like to see all data (sub-slab, indoor, outdoor and JATAP data) side by side. Dr. Hiatt indicated they will do that once they have validated data.

A student asked about specific locations for the next round. Dr. Hiatt clarified where the next samples will be collected.

8:05 pm Ms. Rosetti indicated they are short on time; discussed available time for Mr. Stonebrink's second presentation. Citizens do not want to be rushed for their questions and elected to skip Mr. Stonebrink's presentation. Citizens requested another meeting be held in November.

A student points out that a person can sue if they get sick from contamination, but that doesn't help the fact that he got sick. Ms. Rosetti indicated that is correct; it is the EPA's role to prevent illnesses not lawsuits.

Ms. Rosati reminded everybody that no one is drinking the contaminated water. Drinking water supplied to the neighborhood comes from different sources. Ms. Rosetti indicated that vapor intrusion is the only pathway from contaminated groundwater to homes.

A student asked for confirmation from Ms. Rosetti, regarding a specific (unnamed) individual that had gotten sick after purchasing his home, if he could have been affected by vapor intrusion. Ms. Rosetti indicated that vapor intrusion could not be ruled out; but this particular person bought his house in the last five years; and the EPA is discussing 30 year exposures. She also pointed out that she did know exactly where this person lives, but thought that it was outside of the current study area; which is the area that the EPA has determined to be the worst case scenario.

Mr. Brittle indicated he thought that until the 1980's some drinking water contained PCE. Someone asked where this water came from. Mr. Brittle indicated the 64th Street treatment plant operated by the City of Phoenix. Mr. Tucker and Mr. Brittle indicated that once they found out about it from their water quality tests, the City ceased providing this water for drinking.

Ms. Lopez indicated that contaminated water was being delivered to a treatment plant last year; which was operated by American Water Co. She expressed her skepticism regarding water treatment in general in Phoenix.

8:10 pm Ms. Rosetti indicated they have to end the meeting and allowed one more question.

Student indicated that the EPA doesn't have to reveal specific addresses but can present the specific numeric concentrations. Ms. Rosetti agreed and that once they have the validated data they will release specific concentrations. The student asked when the new data will be released. Ms. Rosati stated approximated 25 days after they received the validated data. Dr. Hiatt indicated there will be two sets of data, one in the summer and one in the winter, and explained seasonal differences can influence data.

Student asked if the data collection will go on forever. Dr. Hiatt indicated just two sample events: the one just completed and a second round this winter.

Ms. Rosetti said she will try to setup a meeting in November; she asked if there are specific items they would want to address in the January CIG meeting.

Ms. Breitenbach asked about all the different groundwater plumes and she didn't understand why they are treated separately, why is the West Van Buren plume separate from the Motorola 52nd Street plume. Ms. Moore thought the Superfund contamination boundary should be further west and asked how Superfund works with West Van Buren WHARF site. Mr. Brittle indicated there should be discussion on which entity (ADEQ or EPA) should be the lead. Mr. Tucker clarified there are other responsible parties in the other groundwater plumes (WQARFs etc.) He indicated that each of the sites should be discussed. A public discussion followed with suggestions of the citizens having their own meeting on the subject.

Ms. Rosetti received agreement from the audience that the 2nd week of November would be good for the next meeting.

8:20 pm Meeting adjourned.

