

**Saginaw Tittabawassee Rivers Contamination CAG
Summary of Full CAG Meeting
Saginaw Valley State University – Regional Education Center
Monday, February 28, 2011**

CAG Members Present

Drummond Black
Leonard Heinzman
Deborah Huntley
Ryan Jankoska
Michael Kelly
Judith Lincoln
Janet McGuire
Annette Rummel
Joel Tanner

CAG Members Absent

Charles Curtiss
Michael Espinoza
Wendy Kanar
David Meyer
Laura Ogar
Paul Vasold
William Webber

Ex-Officio Members Present

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

Ex-Officio Members Absent

Joe Haas, US FWS

Support and Agency Staff Present

Mary Breeden, US EPA
Don de Blasio, US EPA
Blair Giesken, CAG Volunteer Transcriptionist
Cheryl Howe, Michigan DNRE
Heriberto Leon, US EPA
Janelle Pistro, Dow Chemical
Doug Sarno, Facilitator

Doug Sarno called the meeting to order at 6:04 PM. Agenda items Included:

- New members and membership changes in charter
- CAG Articles of Incorporation
- Approval of high-use properties recommendation
- Scheduling upcoming information sessions
- Potential response options for Island MM

1. New members and membership changes in charter

- Four individuals are recommended for membership by the leadership team. They fill the demographic needs created by the vacancies of Michelle Hurd Riddick, Carol Chisholm, Ron Campbell, and LaMetria Johnson-Eaddy. The new members are Jeffrey Bulls, Matt de Heus, Bob Weise, and Rachel Larimore. They were approved by consensus.
- A fifth individual, Cynthia Aguiano has been discussing her interest and will be provided an application. She is Hispanic and also brings a younger demographic to the board.
- Updates to the Charter regarding membership terms were previously distributed and were reviewed and approved without changes.

2. CAG Articles of Incorporation

- Changes required for the 501c3 incorporation were included in the charter revisions
- The incorporation documents are available to anyone who wants to view them during or after the night's meeting, and that if it were any of the member's desires to have the document made available in electronic format, they would be distributed
- The CAG is being incorporated as a 501c3 organization for the protection of the individual CAG members
- There will be a short Directors Meeting before the next meeting in March to sign off on the incorporation documents
- Judith Lincoln had agreed to a 1-year term as President, Deb Huntley to a 2-year term as Treasurer, and Wendy Kanar to a 3-year term as Secretary, though directors and positions will be reviewed annually.

3. Approval of high-use properties recommendation

The latest version of the recommendation was previously distributed to CAG members for comment. All member comments were incorporated and no objections have been identified with the recommendation. No further comments were provided and the CAG approved the document by consensus. The leadership team will sign, date, and submit the document to the USEPA on the CAG's behalf.

4. Scheduling upcoming information sessions

- The high-use property recommendation indicates the desire of the CAG to learn more about dioxin and relocation. The CAG wants to review and understand the range of information available and have dialogue around it. The University of Michigan has just updated its dioxin exposure study which was distributed to

CAG members. The EPA Science Advisory Board has also advised the EPA in creating other additions to existing studies.

- It was noted that one purpose of the CAG is to understand the scientific information that is out there and to better understand the risks. A meeting on the latest Dioxin issues and existing studies needs to be set up as soon as possible.
- Mary Logan asked if the group wants experts other than EPA scientists to come to present to the CAG. She noted that the CAG should decide how to engage these various experts to bring them all to the table. The CAG noted that it would be interesting to hear discussions between scientists and experts with different viewpoints.
- Mary Logan noted that the health risks of dioxin have been under discussion for decades and that there are 2,000-3,000 studies on this topic. It is not a yes or no issue. It is also important to note that exposure studies, such as done by the University of Michigan, and health risk studies address two distinct issues.
- It was suggested that it might be helpful to have these two issues discussed at separate meetings so as not to confuse the discussions. It was also noted that arranging speakers could be a scheduling challenge and may take several months.
- The CAG agreed to invite speakers to regular CAG meetings, rather than special meetings, as long as it is well promoted to the community.
- A concern was expressed that only 9 CAG members are present at tonight's meetings and that people need to be present and commit if they expect to be educated. It was noted that the meeting night was changed to accommodate the ex-officio members as the regular meeting night fell on a federal holiday for the second consecutive month. As a result of the change, quite a few members were unable to attend.
- A concern was expressed that the document distributed to the community by the University of Michigan did not reflect the true situation and instead that it sent the message that the community doesn't need to worry about Dioxin.
- Mary Logan noted that an EPA speaker with expertise in relocation issues would be willing to come speak to the group. She noted that a relocation decision is not like deciding between a list of pros and cons, rather it's a series of standards and regulations that decisions are based upon. The CAG agreed to place a presentation of EPA relocation policies on the April agenda.
- Mary Logan noted that the group has also asked questions about the effects of Dioxin on wildlife, not just human health. The Michigan State University study looks at dioxin from an environmental perspective. The CAG expressed interest in having this study explained at a future meeting and inviting the authors.
- From a scheduling standpoint, Mary Logan noted that input on two items will be very critical over the next few months. The EPA will be going out for public comment in spring on the Island MM action to be discussed tonight. Later in the spring, EPA will be going out for public comment on cleanup of Segment 1, which is scheduled to begin cleanup activities starting in 2012.

5. Potential response options for Island MM

Mary Logan presented plans and options for an accelerated action at this small island in the river. This island has exhibited significant erosion over time and has relatively high levels of contamination. As a result, this is an area that has a high potential for significant impact on the system and early action could be useful in preventing contaminant movement. Work would be conducted this summer.

EPA has identified three possible options for early action:

- 1) Stabilize the island as it is. Logs and armor stone would be used to stabilize the island and stop it from eroding any further. Monitoring would ensure that the remedy is effective. Cost would be approximately \$250,000.
- 2) Remove some of the contaminants from the island and stabilize what's left. Dry removal of materials above the waterline and placement of stabilization barrier and enough fill to compensate, essentially putting the island back in it's place. This could be a potentially permanent fix. Cost would be approximately \$500,000.
- 3) Remove all the contaminated sediment from the island, essentially removing the island from the river. Cost would be approximately \$1 - \$2 million.

EPA plans to release a proposal to the public this spring. EPA has a regulatory obligation to determine urgency, and has determined that they have time for public input, but that it is appropriate that Island MM be addressed this year. EPA has not yet identified a preferred option, and is looking for CAG feedback to help identify key community concerns. EPA evaluates effectiveness, implementability, and cost as primary factors in making its final decision, while public input is also an important factor.

The following issues and questions were raised by CAG members:

- It was questioned whether this type of action (gathering of public comment, informal feedback, public process) is necessary for each and every small contaminated area. EPA noted that unless something is of complete and undeniable urgency, they can't justify moving forward on cleanup without public process. As the project progresses, actions will be bundled together so that each individual property or land feature doesn't have to be addressed and brought to public comment period completely separately. The current "piecemeal" approach is a result of the fact that the cleanup is just getting started, and that this process of grouping will get better and easier over time.
- It was asked if all three options were considered interim options, and if any of the three are likely to make less further work necessary. EPA noted that all are considered interim and that they can't fully understand the long-term effectiveness until implementation, however EPA would not present an option unless they believe it will be effective.
- It was asked if information on the flow within the river systems could be made available. EPA noted that they will take this information into consideration during development of options and that the CAG should be able to see information on the flow of the river systems to help understand impacts of different options.

- It was asked if caps have been designed and used in similar situations. Dow noted that there is a lot of history and information on what type of water events move sediment and other materials along the river. Underwater caps, bank stabilization work, and a new type of geoweb cap at Reach J have all been used to date and this experience will be used in creating a final design. They are very confident that they can design a stable cap, but have not designed it yet.
- It was asked how access to the island would be achieved. Dow noted that permission would need to be obtained through a private property to construct access from the bank to the island. It was asked if this would be the first time that access through private property would be required to conduct a cleanup activity. Dow confirmed that it would be the first time.
- It was asked if the island serves any ecological benefit or needs to be there for any reason. Dow noted that this is not something currently being studied.
- It was asked if it is the role of the CAG to contact residents close to high-use properties to encourage their participation. EPA noted that this is not the role of the CAG and that it's part of the umbrella of work that the agencies and Dow are doing.

The following issues and questions were raised by members of the public:

- It was asked what could be done to stabilize the island until action was taken. EPA noted that two of the options presented already are interim-action stabilization projects.
- It was noted that there are other wildlife studies in addition to the MSU study mentioned earlier, and that, in fairness, these other studies should be considered by the CAG as well.

CAG members organized into two groups to conduct a more detailed discussion regarding key community concerns. Findings of the small groups included:

- Group 1 noted that while it may be difficult to determine the rate of erosion at this time, perhaps there are private and public sources of information available to show historical rates and causes of this erosion. The group felt that spending the money on a permanent segment cleanup instead of focusing on these types of small interim treatments might be more useful. The group was concerned with the word "interim" and the need to revisit these actions again before the project is complete.
- Some public might view it as futile to spend such a large amount of money on such a small project while others would want the absolute most that could be done right now.
- The quality of life of the people who live directly near that island should also be considered. It was noted that in terms of the long-term overall cleanup solution, it's everyone's business and everyone's opinion should be considered, but that perhaps for these small properties and interim cleanups it may be more important to gather the views of those who are directly affected by or live near the properties.
- Group 2 discussed the importance of cleanup to the health of the community and what kind of inconvenience the work on the island might cause to neighbors. The

group talked about the three alternatives and that one of them simply eliminates the island. More information is needed regarding the current use and value of the island.

- It was also noted that impact on the environment should be factored in before evaluating cost.
- It was noted that if we waited to reach this area going segment by segment, it could take up to 5 years and this should be considered.

EPA announced that for future meetings, they will work to have materials prepared in advance of the meeting to allow for more preparation time for the CAG.

As much public comment was taken earlier, there was no additional public comment.

The Meeting was adjourned at 8:50 PM.