

**Saginaw-Tittabawassee Rivers Contamination CAG
Full CAG Meeting
Memorial Park, Freeland MI
Monday, March 28, 2016
6:00 PM – 8:00 PM
DRAFT**

CAG Members Present

Leonard Heinzman
James Krogsrud
Jim Koski
Joe Kozumplik
Terry Miller
Luis Mulford
Laura Ogar
David Sommers
Bob Wiese

CAG Members Absent

Armando Falcon
Drummond Black
Charles Curtiss
Michael Kelly
William Marsrow
Lee Pavlik
Nancy Pavlik
Joel Tanner
Bryce Wakeman

Ex-Officio Members Present

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

Support and Agency Staff Present

Doug Sarno, Facilitator

Doug Sarno called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM. Agenda items included:

- EPA Project updates
- 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

Retreat results

Doug provided an overview of results from the retreat.

Communication

Dave noted that he needs some assistance with Facebook to make sure it is set up to serve the CAG in the most effective fashion, Dave and Doug will work to find a solution for this.

Technical assistance

This group will have a strategy for review by the May meeting.

Membership

Nothing formal has happened to date, Dave will share examples of past press releases, the committee will send out a press release.

EPA website

EPA is in the process of updating its web site, in the meantime links are broken and documents are not there. EPA is working to get these working again. Doug will work with Mary Logan to set up a process for sharing presentation files.

2. Project Updates

Mary Logan, EPA, provided this overview which included much of what had been presented last fall.

2016 planned activities

- Segment 3 in channel and bank cleanup
- Continue Floodplain cleanup
- Propose cleanup plans for Segments 4 and 5, and public comment period.

Segment 3

3rd cleanup segment of the Tittabawassee River.

Approximately 4.2 miles long, 2 sediment management areas (SMAs) and 10 bank management areas (BMAs).

- SMA 3-1 will remove and dispose of the majority of sediment with an option for capping if needed based on in-field conditions for one of the areas,
- SMA 3-2 will be remediated by capping,
- All BMAs will be remediated by stabilizing the riverbanks.

Mary will distribute the Segment 3 action memo to the CAG, with responses to the public comment received.

Scope of work for 2016:

- 2 SMAs each about 0.4 acres
- 9 remaining BMAs, between 200 and 2,000 feet, approximately 1.3 miles total
- BMA 3-1 was constructed in 2015
- EPA also performed some canopy management in 2015 to get a head start
- All work will be coordinated with the floodplain cleanup.

Mary showed some photos which are contained in the presentation.

Floodplain Cleanup

- EPA selected the cleanup plan and began work in 2015
- There are a total of 700 parcels, covering approximately 4,500 acres in the 8 year floodplain,
- Property by property evaluations will be conducted as to whether cleanup is required, if cleanup levels are exceeded, then property owners are offered a cleanup and they will have input on the property specific plan and schedule,
- Cleanups will include removal of the top foot of soil which will be disposed in an appropriate off-site location depending on the level of contamination, then clean soil will be backfilled to the original grade and seeded with monitoring to ensure that the seed takes root.

Segments 4 and 5

- Begin 11.4 miles downstream,
- Segment 4 is 3.4 miles long,
- Segment 5 is 2.7 miles long,
- EPA currently identifying SMAs and BMAs to be cleaned up,
- Cleanup options will be similar to those used in segments 2 and 3,
- EPA is taking seriously the comments by the CAG to clarify differences in SMAs and BMAs,
- Anticipate a cleanup proposal in summer 2016 (no earlier than July) with cleanup activities to commence in 2017 and be performed over two construction seasons.

CAG Question: I have seen some planes flying over the river, is anyone doing aerial photography on the river? No, the project is not doing anything like that at this time.

CAG Question: Will homeowners be notified before the start of the proposed plan? Yes, for those whose properties will be adjacent to cleanup areas.

CAG Question: What about floodplain properties that were not tested? We will begin by looking at adjacent properties that were tested and determine whether we believe that additional samples are needed. If we have reason to believe that a property could exceed the standard, then we will seek to sample. If a property owner refuses sampling, we will track that property over time and hope to clean it up eventually, and try again when the property ownership changes hands.

CAG Question: Are we sampling areas as they are flooded to determine re-deposition and the need for additional cleanup? There is a post flooding monitoring plan to look at these properties after flooding season. We won't be resampling areas that have not yet been cleaned up. If there is no flooding on a property, then will wait until the next season.

CAG Question: Can we get access to that data? Yes.

CAG Question: Have habitat people looked at the areas being remediated to understand the impacts on the flora and fauna? The natural resource damage trustees look at the reports and comment on the reports and the remedies. All of those technical comments are part of the administrative record. In the future we will also be conducting ecological risk assessments.

Public Question: What is the trigger number for taking action after re-testing? Results so far have been encouraging and have not seen recontamination, we would use the same numbers we used for the original cleanup.

Public Question: Are bank cleanups also discretionary to the property owner? No, because these will result in erosion and additional contamination.

CAG Question: Other than Diane, do we expect any other loss of resources to the Flint project? No, we do not expect it.

CAG Question: Will the Dow/Dupont merger have any impact on the cleanup? No we do not expect anything to change.

CAG Question: Do you have an understanding of how many people have enrolled in the Dow program? From the large number of people who collected the information and spoke with Dow, very few have declined to participate. Dow is currently reaching out to all those who did not come in to hear about the program initially to see about their future participation.

3. MSU Superfund Research Program

The MSU Superfund Research Program is divided into two cores. Jim Dearing provided a presentation on the MSU Superfund Research Program Community Engagement Core. The other core is the Research Translation Core headed by Brad Upham. The overall research program engages about 70 researchers at MSU and other Universities

Each core has a research purpose and a community engagement purpose.

The community engagement core holds regular meetings with key organizations and community groups including the CAG and Midland High School. Under this program, MSU conducts two types of research. First is social science research, talking directly with stakeholders, seeking to understand local food and fish consumption, and analysis of news coverage of 246 EPA dioxin sites.

Study 1. 70 door-to-door interviews of 72 stakeholders last summer showed that people did perceive dioxin was a risk, and experienced strong initial reactions. People are generally relying on the information provided by government officials, and are avoiding consumption of locally caught fish.

CAG Question: Where were these people located? Along cleanup segments 2 and 3.

CAG Question: Do you intend to conduct interviews in more segments as Segment 2 is mostly industrial? We do not have an intent to do additional interviews on this set of questions, but we do plan to conduct another larger interview process.

CAG Question: Do you have any before and after data? No, we just conducted the one interview.

CAG Question: Can we get a copy of the final survey questions? Yes.

Study 2 is an angler intercept survey to understand fish eating behaviors among shoreline anglers and what they know about the risk, particularly with bottom feeding fish. This is not yet in the field. We should be out conducting interviews this summer season and are hoping to reach approximately 1,000 anglers on the Saginaw and Tittabawassee Rivers and also using the Kalamazoo as a comparison. Four teams of two with a wifi enabled iPad will conduct the surveys and the data uploaded from the field.

CAG Question: Why the differentiation between boat/dock fishing and shoreline fishing? Assumption is that boat fishermen are more sport fishers, less bottom fishing.

CAG Question: What are you looking for? To understand the relationship with fishing behaviors and knowledge about the health risks.

CAG Question: Will you be sorting response by river? Yes.

CAG Question: How do you avoid getting multiple responses from the same person? They will be asked.

The second type of activity is community engagement, including working with the CAG. We anticipate 4 to 5 additional data studies in the coming years, If the CAG is interested, MSU can provide any of the data collected in a wide variety of formats. (The CAG indicated interest in receiving this data.)

CAG Question: How did you define locally raised eggs, it is very important to understand how these questions were defined? It was not narrowly defined to the floodplain.

CAG Question: Is there anyway of getting to the number of people who are not fishing due to the potential for contamination? Not directly, there are questions about members of family in the angler survey, but not a broader approach to collecting data.

CAG Comment: These bits of data would actually be very interesting to understand the impacts of the contamination on fishing and recreational behaviors.

The MSU Research Translation Core establishes partnerships with government and non-government agencies, administers technology transfers, and looks to communicate and disseminate information.

Working at Midland High to introduce environmental science lessons and activities, and looking to do this at Dow High School as well. Uses an interdisciplinary approach with biology and chemistry to drive critical thinking about these issues with the students and understand how scientists look at these issues. Designed to have teachers ultimately take over the programs.

CAG Question: Do you have plans to include Freeland? Yes, we hope to begin this fall in Freeland and Saginaw.

CAG Question: Are you including cleanup topics? No, but do encourage students to get to CAG meetings and to pay attention to the cleanup program.

MSU has gene analyzing machines that they share with the high schools to look at DNA and genes and do analysis right in the field. We will use GPS units to help to identify hits in the field and then go back and take samples.

We are also developing a fish advisory mobile app in conjunction with the MI DHHS which will integrate all of the information relating to the current fish advisory. The app will help people identify fish, determine portion control, show how to clean fish and create a simple process for people to use.

CAG Question: Where is the MSU web site on this program? Within the Institute for Integrative Toxicology, all of the data is there.

<http://iit.msu.edu/superfund2013/index.html>

CAG Question: How are you selecting students? Working with teachers. We are working with AP classes on the more detailed work but also providing general introduction to other biology classes.

CAG Comment: We should look at license data to see if there is anything to learn.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

The meeting adjourned at 8:00