

**Saginaw-Tittabawassee Rivers Contamination CAG
Full CAG Meeting
Saginaw Valley State University Curtiss Hall
Monday, NOVEMBER 17, 2014
6:00 PM – 8:30 PM
DRAFT**

CAG Members Present

Charles Curtiss
Leonard Heinzman
Jim Koski
James Krogsrud
Judith Lincoln
Donna Mallonee
William Marsrow
David Sommers

CAG Members Absent

Drummond Black
Stan Gorzinski
Deborah Huntley
Armando Falcon
Michael Kelly
Rachel Larimore
Laura Ogar
Joel Tanner
Bryce Wakeman
Bob Wiese

Ex-Officio Members Present

Todd Konechne, Dow Chemical
Al Taylor, MDEQ
Mary Logan, EPA

Support and Agency Staff Present

Kip Cosan, Dow Chemical
Janelle Pistro, Dow Chemical
Diane Russell, US EPA
Doug Sarno, facilitator

Doug Sarno called the meeting to order at 6:10 PM. Agenda items included:

- CAG Updates
- EPA Project updates
- 2015 CAG Planning

Copies of all meeting summaries and presentations are available at www.saginawcag.com.

Materials and additional information on the Dow Chemical Site including all presentations from CAG meetings are also available at the EPA web site at <http://www.epa.gov/region5/cleanup/dowchemical/cag.htm>

1. CAG Updates

The CAG completed and provided its recommendations the floodplain soils proposed plan and also provide input to the CSTAG visit. These comments will be posted on the CAG web site.

The MSU Community Engagement Core program sent it regrets that it could not attend tonight's meeting but will return for the March CAG meeting. They are conducting a program on community outreach to look at public understanding and stigma.

MSU is also working on a mobile app for the fish advisory, working with the State to get this field-tested soon.

2. EPA Project Updates

Segment 2

Todd Konechne, Dow Chemical provided the update on the in-channel work on Segment 2. Sediment Management Areas SMA 2-3, 2-4, and 2-5 and Bank Management Areas BMA 2-3, 2-4, and 2-5 were completed this year. BMA 2-1 and 2-2 were previously addressed. BMA 2-6 is planned for completion in 2015. BMA 2-7 is on the border with Segment 3. The slide presentation included pictures and graphics of the work.

SMA 2-3

- Remedy included sediment removal in the dry using sheet pile, dewatering, excavation of sediment and placement in landfill
- 3,615 cubic yards of sediment was removed
- All sediments were dewatered in place
- Material directly loaded in trucks and delivered to City of Midland landfill
- Work performed June 6 to August 29
- Received access permission from property owner, worked to minimize impacts to property.

SMA 2-4

- Remedy included an armor stone cap, a geoweb cap with armor stone perimeter, and some sediment removal in the dry
- Very shallow area of the river, does not allow traditional barge approach to conducting the work. Custom approaches and equipment were used. Mats were used to create road on the river bottom for heavy trucks and loaders to bring in and place armor stone. Also used custom boat with hopper and conveyor to spread stone.
- 2,860 cubic yards of sediment was removed
- Work performed June 26 to October 6
- Dow owns a small piece of property that was used for access.

SMA 2-5

- Remedy included Geoweb cap with armor stone perimeter
- Geoweb is a self-filling cap system that traps depositing sediments, very manpower intensive to install the cap but requires less infrastructure for equipment
- Work performed August 2 to September 9
- Dow owned property on opposite side of the river and used that for access and boated materials and personnel across to the site

Bank Management Area Treatments used in Segment 2 included:

- Canopy and understory management to get sunlight access and ensure good growth of plants
- Bank smoothing
- Armor stone toe protection turf reinforcement mat
- Geoweb
- Surface erosion protection erosion control blanket
- Native seed with a cover cap
- Native plugs
- Shrub willows and tubular dogwoods

BMA 2-3

- 570 feet of bank

BMA 2-4

- 350 feet of bank

BMA 2-5

- 350 feet of bank

Public Question: How do you test if you have gone deep enough? We go 6 inches past where we think it is clean, past confirmation sampling has confirmed this is an effective approach. All clean surface material is re-used to cover the excavation. The river fills in any depression very quickly. We will monitor the caps.

Public Question: How well have previous areas held up to scouring? Flooding is ongoing, a few smaller spots have scoured and we have identified what worked and did not work well. Overall these have held up well. These were pilot studies and have helped us understand the best approaches.

CAG Question: Are there ongoing monitoring and maintenance required for these banks? Yes and we will conduct that on an ongoing access.

EPA Outreach

Diane Russell, EPA, provided this update. The presentation included a number of graphs to illustrate the information presented.

Three areas of outreach:

- **General**, make ourselves available to the community to talk about the work, local office, attend events
- **Project-specific outreach**, including CAG meetings, public meetings, meet with groups and one-on-one meetings
- **Cooperative agreement** with Michigan Department of Health to work with local partners to transmit information on fish advisories—the Eat Safe Fish brochures.

Goals of outreach are to provide the public accurate, timely and understandable information, provide opportunity for public input, consider that input, and assist the public in understanding project decisions.

A wide variety of tools are used as laid out in the Community Involvement Plan (CIP) including a local office, the CAG, public meetings, listserv, mailing list, newsletters, fact sheets, project materials, local events, and working with state and local partners.

Results include 173 events held and/or attended since 2010. A larger proportion of project-specific actions have been conducted in recent years, including the floodplain meetings. Over 109,000 Eat Safe Fish brochures and others distributed since 2011.

2014 Floodplain Outreach was conducted to inform owners, share materials, obtain input on proposed plan, and keep property owners informed throughout the project. Met with many members of the public, held public meeting, and created a variety of materials and graphics to communicate the project.

2015 focus will be on Segment 3, continued floodplain outreach, continued general outreach, and continued work with MDCH under cooperative agreement.

Public Question: Is the Eat Safe Fish an MDCH brochure? Yes.

Public Question: What was ratio for event vs. contact with fishermen—how many events resulted in contact? Almost all events resulted in some contact.

Overall Site Progress

Mary Logan, USEPA, provided the presentation.

The Superfund site is comprised of 24 miles of lower Tittabawassee River, 22 miles of the Saginaw River and portions of the Saginaw Bay. It has been broken into manageable projects to allow us to move forward. Active cleanup began in 2007 as pilot projects or to address high levels of contamination. 2011 began the comprehensive cleanup approach from upstream to downstream, which is now ongoing. The Tittabawassee River has been divided into 7 segments of approximately 3 miles each.

Segment 3 is about 4 miles long and a proposal will be released in summer 2015 with cleanup expected to begin in 2016. Expect the work to be very similar to that being done in Segment 2.

The Tittabawassee Floodplain cleanup was proposed this year for the 4500 acres in the 8 year floodplain along the 21 miles of the Tittabawassee River. There are 700 property parcels with approximately 600 property owners. EPA is currently evaluating public comments for this plan and will be finalizing it over the coming months. Work will begin in 2015.

CAG Question: How many private property owners are there in Segment 3? More than in Segment 2, getting into the more heavily populated areas, but do not have a precise number.

Public Question: Will the Saginaw River get as much attention as the Tittabawassee River once we get there? Focus has been to get the cleanup done on Tittabawassee River first. For the Saginaw River, we will need to think differently as there are other possible sources of contamination and other potentially responsible parties.

Public Question: What was the primary chemical composition of the DNAPLs? Primarily chlorobenzenes. We have not found evidence of DNAPLs outside of Segment 1.

Public Question: Wasn't the Saginaw River dredged for PCBs? It is routinely dredged for navigation by the Army Corps, not for environmental contaminants.

3. 2015 CAG Planning

EPA expected feedback from the CAG in 2015:

- Segment 3 proposed plan summer 2015
- Informal feedback on the Tittabawasse River Floodplain

Tentative 2015 Meeting dates

The CAG will be moving its meetings to Memorial Park if the facility is available on the given dates

- Monday, January 19 (CAG retreat)
- Monday, March 16
- Monday, May 18
- Monday, July 20
- Monday, September 21
- Monday, November 16 (consider a week earlier, this would be the beginning of hunting season)

Discussion of Potential Topics and Speakers for 2014

- Update on Midland area cleanup (March meeting)
- AOC program (tentatively March)
- Detailed discussion on institutional controls –really need this on layman’s terms in as comprehensive a fashion as possible (July)
- NRDA program and activities
- Long-term monitoring (what is being planned, done, no real lead time needed)
- Revisit MSU ecological studies
- Status of the dioxin reassessment (not likely to happen in the near future)
- USACOE dredging activities and intersection with cleanup
- Sediment trap update

CAG Question: What is the status of sediment traps? The Army Corps competes every year for money to work on the river, it is not likely to get funding to dig sediment traps, The Corps has done two studies on the efficacy of whether or not it would do much of benefit. The 16th Street turning basin is *de-facto* sediment trap now and it is cleaned out every year. EPA will be working with the Army Corps on potential sand cleaning technologies, and that would be a good time to get them in to talk with the CAG

Public Comment: The environmental community is frustrated with the lack of attention to the sediment trap technology, and also to the great amount of dioxin being left in the ground for the residential proposal under the floodplain project.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.