



MEETING MINUTES

COMMUNITY INFORMATION GROUP MOTOROLA 52ND STREET SUPERFUND SITE June 16, 2010, Burton Barr Library 12:30-2:30pm Phoenix, AZ

Attendees:

Barbara Murphy, Freescale	Maria Mahar, APS
Betty Brannan	Marisa Sanchez
Brian Stonebrink, ADEQ	Matt Fesko, ASU
Diane Lopez	Monica Ramirez, U of A
Donn Stoltzfus, City of Phoenix	Patrick Freeman, Orange Coast Analytical
Doug Hulmes, Shaw	Rena Chase-Dufault, Lindon Park Neighborhood
Felicia Calderon, ADEQ	Assn
Gary Piers	Ruth Ann Marston
Harry Hendler, ADEQ	Sadie Jo Smokey, AZ Republic
Jamey Watt, EPA	Samantha Ramirez
Janet Rosati, EPA	Scott Goodwin, ADEQ
Jenn McCall, Freescale	Sue Kraemer, Shaw
Jerry D. Worsham II	Sue Moyer, Phoenix Revitalization Corp. (PRC)
Joe Murphy, City of Phoenix	Tami Eliserid, Marcos de Niza, PRC
Joellen Meitl, ADEQ	Tina Zamaona, Marcos de Niza
Josephine Duffy, Greater Green Gables Nbh. Assn.	Tom Suriano, Freescale
Karol Wolf, SRP	Tommy Bleasdale, ASU
Leana Rosetti, EPA	Troy Kennedy, Honeywell
Les Holland	Walter Micitowitz
Liz Walker (Bess)	Wayne Miller, ADEQ
Lorana Mineer	Wendoly Abrego, PRC
Loren Lund, Honeywell	Wendy Flood, ADEQ

The Community Information Group (CIG) meeting was held at the Burton Barr public library in Phoenix, Arizona from 12:00 to 2:30 pm on June 16, 2010. This meeting was the initial CIG meeting for the Motorola 52nd Street Superfund Site. The purpose of the group is to provide a public forum for community members to present and discuss their needs and concerns related to the Superfund decision-making process and to give the community more responsibility in the process, and in the outreach effort.

The June 16th meeting focused on informing the public of the history, status and upcoming activities planned for the Motorola 52nd Street Superfund Site. The second half of the meeting focused on content and organization of the CIG with the goal of receiving input from the public on how the group should be run. Approximately 20 members of the public were present in addition to regulators and consultants. A list of the attendees is attached to this summary.

Overview of Motorola 52nd St. Superfund Site – Leana Rosetti, EPA

Leana Rosetti, the Community Involvement Coordinator for EPA, began the meeting with an overview presentation. The presentation summarized the Motorola 52nd Street project history, accomplishments to date, and planned future investigations and remedial actions.

Ms. Rosetti presented maps of the three OUs, and described the remedial actions being implemented in OU1 and OU2. She indicated that groundwater pump and treat systems have been in operation since 1992 in OU1 and 2001 in OU2. Ms. Rosetti showed how the groundwater concentrations were decreasing in OU1 and OU2, which explains the plume separation shown on the plume maps. However, she stated that there are some pockets of higher concentrations shown, which were pointed out on the map. She explained that groundwater is currently monitored in OU3 and contaminant concentrations are declining, which is partly attributed to the OU2 treatment system cutting off further contamination from coming into the OU3 area.

Ms. Rosetti indicated that most of the contamination sources in the soils had been cleaned up, which were also the sources of the groundwater contamination. The presentation indicated that volatile organic compounds (primarily chlorinated solvents) are the primary chemicals of concern. The treatment systems have been effective and have removed over 20,000 pounds of VOCs from OU1 and 11,500 pounds of VOCs from OU2.

Ms. Rosetti noted that the most difficult challenge to complete the remediation is the presence of dense non-aqueous phase liquid (DNAPL), or the chemical contaminants in their undiluted liquid form. As the DNAPL is heavier than water and does not readily dissolve in water, it has sunk to the bedrock underlying the former Motorola Site and seeped into fractures in the bedrock. Currently, there are no practical ways to remove the DNAPL from bedrock. However, Freescale Semiconductors is currently conducting a bedrock pilot study to research remedial options that may remove some of the DNAPL.

A citizen asked if "there was hope in staying the course" that the area would clean up. Ms. Rosetti explained the OU1 and OU2 treatment systems were effective and that they were working to clean up the dissolved plume, but that the DNAPL would be more problematic to remove.

A citizen inquired if the DNAPL "moves", Ms. Rosetti responded by indicating not really; the DNAPL is essentially "stuck" in the bedrock fractures.

In response to previous public request, Ms. Rosetti showed a comparison of the Motorola 52nd Street Site with a site in the San Fernando Valley, California. The two sites had many parallels in size, contaminants, and lengthy timeframes from discovery to implementation of cleanup.

A citizen inquired about federal and state cooperation. Ms. Rosetti responded that EPA and ADEQ must both agree before actions are taken. Harry Hendler, ADEQ Federal Projects Unit Manager, stated that ADEQ's role is to ensure that local interests and concerns are properly addressed.

Ms. Rosetti brought up some frequently asked questions. One is, why is the cleanup taking so long? Ms. Rosetti answered that the legal work takes time, the investigations take time and the treatment takes time, making it a slow process.

Another frequent question is whether the vegetable and fruits grown in home gardens are safe? Ms. Rosetti responded the roots are shallow and do not encounter the groundwater, and if they did, EPA's research has shown that the amount that might be absorbed would be minimal and would not be a health concern.

Another question is if anyone uses the groundwater for drinking water? Ms. Rosetti informed the group that the impacted groundwater is not being used for drinking water. The drinking water source is from surface water -- lakes, or rivers.

Finally, a frequent question is when the site would be cleaned up? Ms. Rosetti indicated that at this time an exact date couldn't be established for the completion of the remediation. However, EPA is working toward the final Record of Decision, which will finalize the remedy and establish an estimated timeframe for the cleanup.

A citizen asked if they looked for the same chemicals in the soils as they do in groundwater. Ms. Rosetti confirmed that the chemicals of potential concern are tested in both soil and groundwater.

A citizen inquired if we can learn from mistakes made by other states and countries that have similar problems. Ms. Rosetti responded that she is sure there are similar sites in other states and likely in other countries. However, the U.S. is likely ahead of the curve in remediation technologies when compared to other countries. She added that technologies and lessons learned from other sites within the U.S. are considered when evaluating remedial options.

A citizen asked how close the groundwater is to ground surface. Ms. Rosetti responded that the shallowest depth to water is approximately 40 feet in OU1. Janet Rosati, EPA Project Manager, indicated depth to water is approximately 95 feet in OU3.

Ms. Rosetti continued with the presentation describing upcoming activities for each OU as summarized below:

OU1:

- Ongoing groundwater extraction.
- Extraction of DNAPL from bedrock pilot study.
- ON Semiconductor is using the treated water but will be closing soon, so an evaluation has been done to find other options to discharge the treated water. Wendy Flood, ADEQ OU1 project manager, indicated a draft document on the end use was in review by EPA and ADEQ on the various options being proposed.
- EPA is in the process of negotiating with Freescale to perform a soil vapor sampling program in the residential areas near the former Motorola facility to evaluate the vapor intrusion pathway.

OU2:

- Facility specific Remedial Investigations (RIs) are ongoing.
- Honeywell has completed their RI and is working on a Feasibility Study (FS).
- Honeywell is operating a bio-enhanced soil vapor extraction (BSVE) system to remediate jet fuel contamination in the vadose zone.
- Consent Decree is in place with ADEQ to operate the OU2 groundwater pump and treat plant.

OU3:

- EPA is working with the PRPs to complete their facility specific investigations.
- Honeywell and APS have agreed to work together in the OU3 Working Group to complete the RI/FS. An Administrative Order on Consent has been signed and the work is expected to start by the fall.
- EPA and ADEQ are currently reviewing the RI/FS workplan.

A citizen asked why APS is part of the process. Ms. Rosati explained there is a Consent Order in place with Honeywell and APS and that the other parties were invited but not all had signed up.

A citizen asked if kerosene was used at Honeywell, where did the jet fuel originate from? A Honeywell representative indicated that no refining of hydrocarbons occurred at the site. The jet fuel is utilized to test their engines.

Ms. Rosetti's continued her presentation and indicated that the Five Year Review is due next year for the Motorola 52nd Street Site. She encouraged the public to participate in the process and indicated that they were looking for volunteers to participate in community interviews.

OU1 Soil vapor sampling update and OU3 update – Janet Rosati, EPA

Janet Rosati, EPA Remedial Project Manager, began her presentation on the OU1 soil vapor sampling program for the vapor intrusion to indoor air pathway. She explained how vapors can migrate from contaminated soil and/or groundwater and collect inside buildings. Freescale is going to assess the residential areas first and follow with a facility evaluation for soil gas and if needed, indoor air sampling.

Ms. Rosati indicated EPA is close to signing an Administrative Order on Consent with Freescale for the residential soil vapor sampling and potential indoor air sampling. Sampling locations will be based on historical data from four soil vapor surveys conducted by Motorola, which included the residential areas. A community meeting in the neighborhood will be conducted prior to the proposed two rounds of soil vapor sampling, the first sampling is to assess the area and the second to confirm the results. Sampling locations will be below the pavement and as close as possible to homes, schools and other identified sensitive receptors. Soil vapor data will be compared to health-based screening levels to determine if indoor air sampling is needed. Because the vapor intrusion pathway is complicated EPA would like to collect subslab, indoor air and outdoor air samples to interpret the indoor air results using multiple lines of evidence. If remediation is needed, it will be similar to radon gas remediation techniques, which are fairly simple and very effective.

A citizen suggested Maricopa Medical Center should be a "study area." Another citizen asked if sampling could be conducted in front of her house. Ms. Rosati explained sampling locations would be dependent on previously collected data, and encouraged citizens to provide comments on the sampling locations. She said the draft Soil Vapor and Indoor Air Work Plan will be shared with the community for their review and comments. Ms. Rosati stated that EPA hopes that soil gas sampling will begin this fall.

Ms. Rosati then discussed the field work planned for OU3. She indicated that there were several data gaps, most in the southern portion of the plume. The OU3 Working Group is planning to install 8 groundwater monitoring wells to fill in these data gaps. In addition, 3 soil vapor monitoring wells will be installed in the core of the OU3 plume where higher VOC concentrations were detected to evaluate the vapor intrusion to indoor air pathway.

A citizen asked how citizens' comments will be incorporated. Ms. Rosati indicated that flyers would be delivered to citizens with information, and community meetings will be held to incorporate public comments into the work plan.

Ms. Rosati indicated that 90 days after field work is completed in OU3 a draft Remedial Investigation Report and a Draft Groundwater Baseline Risk Assessment will be issued. 60 days after approval of both documents, the OU3 Working Group PRPs will submit a draft Feasibility Study Work Plan.

Don Stoltz from the City of Phoenix discussed potential interferences of the soil vapor sampling and drilling with residents and businesses and asked that the field work be coordinated with the businesses. ERM, the consultant for the OU3 PRP Working Group, confirmed that work will be coordinated with affected businesses and residents.

A citizen inquired why Sperry and Air Research were not PRPs. A representative from Honeywell indicated they purchased Sperry and Air Research and have essentially assumed their liability.

CIG guidelines and organization – Leana Rosetti, EPA

Ms. Rosetti began a new presentation regarding CIG procedures, plans and goals. Ms. Rosetti explained that from past experience and input from the community, the group needs to be inclusive and independent. The community leaders need to make a long-term commitment to the group for at least one year and be willing to share with the community and the larger population.

Ms. Rosetti explained the community's past frustrations with the open meeting law that had been associated with the site's previous Community Advisory Group (CAG). The CIG is designed to provide more flexibility than the CAG and it does not need to fall under Arizona Open Meeting Law. The CIG, being informational and not a body that "conducts business", would not have as many restrictions as the CAG had due to the Arizona Open Meeting Law. The group decided they would like to try the CIG approach, but can become a CAG if they want to at a later date.

She explained that EPA funds are reserved for a technical advisor to represent the community and explain technical issues at CIG meetings. These are Technical Assistance Grants (TAGs). The Linton Park Neighborhood Association had applied and received such a grant and had employed Mario

Castaneda to assist them in understanding the technical documents. The CIG would be a forum for the Technical Advisor and he can comment and speak on any issue. The Technical Advisor is managed by the non-profit that hired him.

Ms. Rosetti indicated they would like to have an Agency co-chair (Ms. Rosetti), and a community co-chair. The co-chair needs to work with the agency in planning meetings and agendas and facilitating meetings. They must be committed and able to share with the community and the larger population. She asked if anyone would like to be a co-chair for the citizen's group. They would help her to build agendas, and help to determine what should be presented and how.

Ms. Rosetti went on to explain membership in the group. The community members agreed that it will be open membership, and they encouraged each other to spread the word to obtain greater involvement.

EPA opened the meeting to questions and comments. A citizen commented she appreciates the efforts behind these meetings and expressed that EPA was doing a good job with explaining to the public.

A citizen had a question about the logistics of the plume map which Ms. Rosetti explained.

The absence of Ms. Mary Moore, community activist, was discussed; she has not been attending meetings lately due to illness in her family, although she had previously expressed great interest in CIG meetings.

Ms. Rosetti explained the general quarterly formats of CIG meetings moving forward, and planned to meet again September 22, 2010. Rena Chase-Dufault indicated that she would be willing to be the co-chair of the CIG. The next meeting would work on the organization for the following year.

Ms. Rosetti indicated the following subjects will be discussed in future meetings: schedule, bedrock pilot study (next report due in October), OU1 soil gas sampling workplan, Superfund process and community outreach ideas.

Citizens discussed using a school cafeteria for the meeting. One citizen suggested a site tour, another suggested a video. Another citizen suggested inviting the "Phoenix wake-up Group" to future meetings.

A citizen brought up the concern of too many meetings. Ms. Rosetti discussed focusing on the CIG and TAG meetings with the Lindon Park Neighborhood. As a group, they needed to make the meetings useful and focused. She encouraged everyone to share ideas to improve community outreach and provide more community interaction, which is a goal of the CIG.

Ms. Rosetti asked a show of hands of those who planned to return to the next CIG meeting.

Monica Ramirez of the Superfund Group at the University of Arizona indicated that they had a federal grant that could use the professors and staff in their group to explain technical aspects to the public, possibly the bedrock pilot study.

Ms. Rosetti closed the meeting.

Attachments:

M52 Overview presentation

OU1 Soil vapor sampling update and OU3 update presentation

CIG guidelines and organization presentation