

**Saginaw Tittabawassee Rivers Contamination CAG
Summary of Full CAG Meeting
Saginaw Valley State University - Curtiss Hall
Monday, July 19, 2010, 5:30 PM – 7:00 PM**

CAG Members, and Ex-Officio Members Present

Drummond Black
Ronald Campbell
Carol Chisholm
Charles Curtiss
Leonard Heinzman
Deborah Huntley
Michelle Hurd-Riddick
Michael Kelly
Ryan Jankoska
LaMetria Johnson-Eaddy
Wendy Kanar
Judith Lincoln
David Meyer
Laura Ogar
Annette Rummel
Joel Tanner
William Webber

Ex-Officio Members Present

Todd Konechne, Dow Chemical
Mary Logan, US EPA
Al Taylor, Michigan DNRE

CAG Members Absent

Michael Espinoza
Janet McGuire
Daniel Sosa
Michelle Steele
Paul Vasold

Ex-Officio Members Absent:

Joe Haas, US FWS

Support and Agency Staff Present:

Don DeBlasio, US EPA
Blair Giesken, CAG Volunteer Transcriptionist
Cheryl Howe, DNRE
Jeff Kelley, US EPA
Diane Russell, US EPA
Doug Sarno, Forum Facilitation Group

Doug Sarno called the Meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. The focus of the shortened meeting was to evaluate CAG operations and progress, and reflect on future activities.

Agenda items included:

1. New project
2. Comments on the Community Involvement Plan
3. Discussion and Review of River Tour
4. CAG Ground Rules and Operations
5. Upcoming items on the CAG calendar
6. Attendance and Involvement

1. New Project

Mary Logan, EPA, noted that a capping pilot study will be conducted in Reach JK in 2010. This is a brand-new project and she will discuss it in more detail at the public meeting;

2. Comments on the Community Involvement Plan

Deb Huntley noted that only one CAG member had responded or provided feedback to the CAG Leadership regarding the Community Involvement Plan. Additional comments included the following:

- A concern was expressed by a CAG with how the CAG's role was described in the plan on page 17. The CAG should be "one of the tools" and not "the source" of information. It should be made clear that we are simply an advisory committee enlisted to help facilitate the cleanup process. It was suggested to remove the words "the" and "focal point" to just say "The CAG Is a tool available...."
- It was noted that members need to work significantly within the CAG to present a more solidified front. The discussed document of member biographies should be brought to fruition and made available to the CAG.
- It was asked whether or not the CAG should be providing feedback or opinions on prioritization of projects. Mary Logan noted that, at this time, the EPA is not asking for feedback from the CAG on prioritization of projects, but may possibly ask for this type of information in the future.
- One CAG member noted that it seems that the CIP seems to be 90% of the CAG communicating the EPA's information to the community and only 10% of the CAG communicating the thoughts of the community to the EPA, when it should maybe be the other way around.
- Another member noted that we need to go out into the community and ask how they want to be engaged in this project and cleanup, as the general consensus within the community seems to be that they feel more disengaged at this point than at any other time.

Don DeBlasio noted that comments on the CIP should be in by August 6th so that the EPA can have a revised draft prepared for the next meeting.

The CAG decided a committee should be formed to work with the EPA on how to relay the CIP and other information to the community. Michelle Hurd-Riddick, LaMetria Johnson-Eaddy, and Ryan Jankoska volunteered to work on this group. The committee plans to meet and report back to the group at large at the August meeting. It was suggested that this also go out on VSpace for members not present tonight who would like to volunteer.

3. Discussion & Review of River Tour

Judith Lincoln initiated the discussion and expressed interest in there being another opportunity to experience and tour the river for those who couldn't attend the first tour. She asked for comments and reactions to the tour.

- One member noted that they were very impressed with the river and its beauty, but was disturbed that the floodplain near their home has the highest Dioxin contamination along the river.
- A member noted that the tour was the first time to truly understand what was going on at the River and what kind of remediation is taking place. It helped tremendously with understanding the different processes for remediation and provided a picture of why we have this project in the first place.
- A member commented that he learned most of the Dioxin that contaminated the area occurred over 30 years ago, and he commended Dow for the approach that they're taking and how they are prioritizing where to take action first. He further noted that one of the surprises was how little has been done in terms of the overall geography of the river, even though a major effort has been made, and a constructive step-by-step approach has been adapted. The tour helped to make clear that this is not a short-term project and that we need to start viewing it as such. We need to begin to phrase what we're trying to do in a constructive way so that the community knows the problem has been recognized and addressed, and that it is being worked on. We need to discuss what we're doing in a positive, forward-thinking way.
- Another member noted that the EPA and Dow need greater access to eroding banks and to the Consumers' Electric property to do testing and address other business.
- One member was very impressed with the remediation work that has been done so far and noted that this group would be well served after the initial introductions to the process are over to meet quarterly or even bi-annually to simply discuss remediation recommendations and other issues, rather than meeting each and every month.
- It was suggested that the CAG look into developing a reasonable set of expectations for what should be considered "good progress" and what would be reasonable for the community to expect over a certain period of time for remediation.

4. CAG Ground Rules and Operations

Wendy Kanar began the discussion noting that based on the last meeting, the CAG Leadership team thought it would be useful to re-evaluate how we're doing as a CAG and what we could be doing better. She reviewed the groundrules of the CAG and asked if anyone thought any changes were appropriate. There were no changes suggested. She then asked for additional comments and suggestions:

- A member noted that they was very uncomfortable at the last meeting with the exchange that occurred between a CAG member and a member of the public. It was asked what can be done to establish a further rule or address an uncomfortable/unprofessional environment or level of treatment. Doug noted that it is his responsibility as a facilitator to manage this and apologized for being absent at the previous meeting. He also noted that all members of the CAG should feel empowered to step in if they feel the level of conversation is inappropriate or disrespectful.
- It was suggested that at the beginning of each meeting we should reframe and readdress when the public comment segment of the meeting is and what is expected in terms of the structure of these comments (including the level of respect; language; ways to address issues, etc.)
- A member commented that the public should be able to speak both before and after the meeting to ensure that the public gets their chance to be heard in a timely manner. Others agreed that time for public comment should be available at the beginning and end to help to frame issues and questions.
- Doug noted that we need to set appropriate expectations for public comment at a CAG meeting. He suggested that the new Communications committee bring some ideas back to the group on how to move forward with this public comment segment within the CAG meetings.
- A member suggested that public comment should possibly have time limits and limitations on discussion of items not on the agenda. It was noted that a lot of this depends on the interchange taking place between the CAG and the members of the public present.
- It was noted that we need to be cautious of what guidelines we put on public comments because it might discourage public participation and appear disingenuous.
- It was suggested that the agenda should be posted publicly so that the community knows well enough in advance whether topics for that meeting are of interest to them.
- A member suggested that its fine to have the public comment portion at the end of the session, as any individual who is impassioned enough to come speak about the issue would have no problem sitting through a meeting to hear what is being discussed.
- A suggestion was made that individuals making public comment should provide their name and perhaps their contact information so that if their question cannot be addressed at that moment, it can be addressed at a later time.

- It was noted that much of the community doesn't realize that the CAG members are a group distinct from the ex-officio members and we need to do a better job communicating.
- Another member noted that we do need to have a website with the functionality to post the agenda publicly ahead of time and to have the general public be able to provide input or make general comments that can be processed appropriately. Once we have this function, we should also have expectations or frameworks for how these will be followed up and responded to by the CAG. These ideas were also referred to the new communications committee.

5. Upcoming items on the CAG calendar

Doug noted that due to the lack of time, we will discuss with this very important item at the August meeting. EPA was asked to identify where they see the CAG fitting in most effectively in the schedule of activities.

6. Attendance and Involvement

Judith Lincoln noted that the leadership team was very concerned about regular attendance by members. Those of us who miss meetings, should not come to a meeting a month or two later and expect the group to stop and discuss things that happened meetings ago. This is unfair and unrealistic. It was noted that several people have missed a great number of meetings and that it's hard to judge and assess this, but that we soon will have to ask ourselves as a group what is the expectation of attendance and involvement and do we need to be more forceful in enforcing the rules of our charter. It was noted that if the CAG is going to effectively represent the community all members need to be involved, rather than just the viewpoints of a small segment or committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:50 p.m. to allow transition into the public meeting. The next meeting is Monday, August 16th, 2010.