

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

CAG Members Present

Drummond Black
Armando Falcon
Michael Kelly
James Krogsrud
Judith Lincoln
David Meyer
Laura Ogar
David Sommers
Bob Wiese

CAG Members Absent

Jeffrey Bulls
Charles Curtiss
Matthew de Huis
Leonard Heinzman
Deborah Huntley
Ryan Jankowksi
Frank Kuszak
Rachel Larimore
Donna Mallonee
Joel Tanner
Brian Thomas
Paul Vasold
William Webber

Ex-Officio Members Present

Mary Logan, USEPA

Support and Agency Staff Present

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

Drummond Black called the meeting to order at 6:05 PM. Agenda items included:

- CAG Leadership Team updates
- CAG Retreat Results
- Project Updates
- Floodplain Cleanup Update

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. Segments 1 and 2 Updates

Mary Logan provided the update. Segment 1 is basically complete, moving into operation and maintenance mode. Three different types of caps have been installed-- geoweb, gravel, and low permeability liner with armor stone. Activities will be conducted to ensure they are all intact and in place. Also looking to measure the hydraulic performance of the cells that were built using sheetpiling.

The Segment 2 decision is final. At the CAG meeting in November, EPA had not yet selected the final remedy because of the government shutdown. That was finalized later in November. EPA picked a remedy very close to what was proposed in July. Of the five Sediment Management Areas (SMAs), two had previously been addressed. Of the seven Bank Management Areas (BMAs), two had also previously been addressed. The final selected remedies include:

- SMAs 2-1 and 2-2 monitor and maintain existing caps,
- SMA 2-3 proposed and selected removal,
- SMA 2-4 had proposed removal--selected a combination of removal and capping,
- SMA 2-5 proposed and selected capping.
- BMAs 2-1 and 2-2 monitor and maintain existing cleanups that stabilizes the contaminated riverbank and stops erosion,
- BMAs 2-3 through 2-7 – proposed and selected a cleanup method to stabilize the bank and stop erosion based on input from the property owner and features of the riverbank.

Dow is now in the design phase, the project will take two years, looking to address the remaining SMAs in 2014 and two or more of the bank areas, with the remaining cleanup up in 2015.

CAG question: What kind of reporting documents are produced from the monitoring activities from completed activities? There is an annual report that covers everything. Caps are monitored several times a year as well as following high flow events.

CAG question: Is the annual report placed on line? Not currently but this could be done.

CAG question: What is the schedule for Segment 3? EPA will look at this and report back.

CAG request: The CAG would like annual briefings on the annual report results.

2. CAG Leadership Team

The new leadership team was proposed and elected by unanimous vote:

- Judi Lincoln, President
- Donna Mallonee, Secretary
- Drummond Black, Treasurer

3. CAG Membership

David Myers, Laura Ogar, and Bob Weise agree to serve on the membership committee. David Sommers has a media background and volunteered to serve as a resource.

Communications Committee:

- David Sommers is working on the web site
- Armando Falcon will maintain the Facebook site

EPA expressed their deep appreciation to everyone who is retiring from the CAG.

4. CAG retreat results

The CAG reviewed the results of the January retreat and issues identified for EPA.

EPA asked for clarification of the comment that some people still are skeptical. It was explained that this was not meant as a derogatory comment toward EPA or Dow by the CAG, but a reflection of what is still being heard out in the community. This comment was made in the context that CAG members were pleased with how far they have all come in both knowledge and attitude toward the cleanup but that many in the community were still in the same place and the same level of knowledge as many years ago. The CAG is looking for ways to help members of the public to have the same level of understanding as the CAG and moving on with this project.

It was noted that the list of reflections were just itemizing individual comments, but it is important that these reflections are portrayed in full context.

CAG comment: It is not clear to folks the status of Immerman Park. It would be helpful to have information posted right there, create some better signage and information about the cleanup. There is a perception that people see folks in hazmat suits and then the message is that the park is safe, sometimes people have trouble getting the right message.

EPA requested the creation of an outreach subcommittee to help with its work. EPA is on an accelerated schedule to reach out to property owners. The committee would work with Diane Russell between CAG meetings to explore the kinds of materials and methods being used for outreach. The CAG agreed with this idea and identified several volunteers.

Committee volunteers: Rachel Larimore, Armando Falcon, David Sommers

The CAG should get out to some of the Service Clubs to provide speaking opportunities such as at Rotary Clubs to connect with community leaders. It is important to make sure that people do not represent that they speak for EPA when they do this.

People tend to have a long memory for bad news. Need to keep reminding people of the positive to help overturn some of these long-standing opinions.

Brad Upham comment: MSU is developing mobile apps to communicate with the public, as people are starting to use these apps much more frequently than the web. MSU is looking for partners to help develop these apps, starting with the State to help communicate fish advisories. MSU might be able to assist EPA in creating apps to help communicate with folks about the Superfund cleanup.

The CAG also recommended we take advantage of festivals and other events to reach out to people.

5. Tittabawassee River Floodplain Update

EPA announced that Don DeBlasio and Patti Krause both took the early retirement from EPA so they will be looking for a replacement community involvement coordinator.

The Dow video to provide site history and current conditions is complete and can be found at www.epa.gov/region5/cleanup/dowchemical/

EPA will talk about floodplain outreach in May, tonight focused on the technical aspects. Mary Logan presented this information.

2014 will be the year of the floodplain, this is one of the most important decisions EPA is making because of the impact it will have on people and their private properties.

This is a very large project, and will require a lot of management and coordination with landowners.

EPA is looking at the 8-year floodplain in the 24 miles of the lower Tittabawassee, which comprise segments 1 through 7. This is about 4500 acres total, not all of which will require cleanup.

Land use includes about 48% forest, 18% agriculture, 14% forested/shrub wetland, 18% agriculture, 11% unforested upland (prairie), and about 5% maintained. The presentation shows land use pie charts and samples of land use maps for segments.

Zoning and land use do not always clearly coincide. Areas zoned commercial and residential are often undeveloped and/or not maintained.

Extensive sampling was performed. EPA is looking at levels of contamination along with the use and conditions of the land to help determine the best approach.

Why cleanup the floodplain? Mary presented some slides produced by Dr. Helen Dawson on the potential health impacts of dioxin and potential environmental risk. Potential risk is determined by the potential hazard of the chemical and the potential for exposure. EPA performs a risk assessment and risk characterization for a situation and then applies overall risk management to determine an appropriate response. There is no automatic answer. The goal is to limit exposure to dioxins and furans. Exposure control can be achieved through removal of hazards (soil excavation), isolating hazards (covering soil), and/or controlling land use (institutional controls).

Mary offered that EPA provide a more detailed discussion of institutional controls if the CAG desires. The CAG is interested in this topic, and asked will this also be a topic for the landowners? Yes, this will have to be discussed with the general public. We will need more specific language for individual landowners. This will be included on the July agenda.

Site-specific cleanup goals. The current direction is to develop numeric criteria based on human exposure for both cancer and non-cancer risks. EPA is working with MDEQ to develop two cleanup goals, one to apply to residential maintained properties and another number to all other land uses. EPA is hoping to be able to achieve these standards, and will keep the CAG informed as this work progresses.

CAG question: What is the confidence of getting this two-tier approach approved, this would greatly simplify the approach? EPA is confident that this will move forward.

EPA will evaluate its remedies based on effectiveness, implementability, and cost.

EPA has screened out no action, in-place treatment, monitored natural attenuation, and treatment after removal as viable options for contaminated areas.

EPA will be planning for additional 2014 outreach activities and developing a proposed cleanup remedy and schedule. EPA anticipates a late summer or fall 2014 proposal for

public comment. Design will occur in late 2014 and 2015, with construction to begin in 2015 adjacent to Segment 2.

CAG comment: We need to make a focused effort to get some key floodplain people as new members of the CAG.

CAG question: What about upstream properties that are more highly contaminated, won't they contaminate maintained residential properties during floods? The contaminants in the river are of the main concern, these properties don't appear to be a major source for recontamination.

CAG question: How are we going to handle landowners that refuse cleanup? If you have a property that is causing recontamination then we will be more forceful, if your property only affects your own family then you would likely end up on a list of properties not cleanup up. Would like everyone to allow cleanup to move forward, but can't force everyone.

Midland cleanup has had an over 95% participation rate with about 50 property owners who have not responded, Dow is asking owners to reconsider. A trust fund will be put into place to allow folks to change their minds, or when property changes hands to have property tested and cleaned.

CAG question: Where is ongoing monitoring taking place on the rivers? EPA has taken almost 2000 samples along the floodplain, and will do additional work. Monitoring occurs at several points on the river on a regular basis which is identified in the annual report.

CAG question: Are there any activities which may affect the Segment 2 plans? This river has a lot of different flood events and we monitor after all of them. So far the caps have held up well.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.