

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

CARTER CARBURETOR ROUNDTABLE NOTES

Tuesday, April 24, 2012

Herbert Hoover Boys and Girls Club

2901 N. Grand Avenue

7:00 –8:30 p.m.

Attendees: Residents, local organizations, state and federal representatives, contractors other interested and the community at large.

Agenda

7:00 - 7:10 p.m. Welcome, Introductions and Next Meeting (Facilitator)

7:10 - 7:15 p.m. Notes from Last Meeting and Process (Community Involvement Coordinator)

7:15 - 7:20 p.m. Site Updates (Project Manager)

7:20 - 7:50 p.m. Question and Answer

7:50 - 8:30 p.m. Next Steps Roundtable Discussion

Adjournment

Roundtable Discussion

- The Roundtable began with opening remarks by the facilitator. The facilitator presented a chart that represented several EPA processes to engage and educate the community and interested stakeholders about the Carter Carburetor Site. These processes are those that EPA has used to date. This was for the purpose of clarifying what EPA has been doing at the Carter Site. Some of the following actions have taken place to date:
 - Superfund Program interactions with the site Project Manager
 - Public Meetings/Public Availabilities to inform Carter stakeholders
 - Public meeting milestones that are important in our process
 - Community interviews conducted with residents in the community that live near the site and interviews conducted with other interested stakeholders
 - Roundtable discussions about community concerns regarding the EPA process and the site.

All processes are still occurring interchangeably based on community need and the best approach to better inform stakeholders about the site progress.

- A roll call was done to announce all participants. There were approximately 25 – 30 people in attendance. Participants included, but were not limited to, nearby residents of the Carter site, local environmental organizations, state health representatives, federal congressional staff, contractors, city of St. Louis representative, community college representative and other interested stakeholders.

CARTER CARBURETOR ROUNDTABLE NOTES

Tuesday, April 24, 2012

Herbert Hoover Boys and Girls Club

2901 N. Grand Avenue

7:00 – 8:30 p.m.

- There was discussion on the next meeting date and the type of session that should be hosted by EPA. It was decided that the next EPA session for interested Carter stakeholders would be in the form of a public meeting to accommodate the request of certain participants. This does not mean that Roundtables or any other process will not be used in the future due to the changing dynamics of community input and need.
- There was some dissatisfaction expressed by one of the residents in the community about the Roundtable format and that her contacts wanted the public meeting format to discuss concerns about the Carter site. Also, the participant expressed that she and other community members are tired and would like to see a cleanup of the site; they want to know what is going on right now. They want to know when the cleanup is going to happen. The participant also stated that she and her contacts want a public meeting with minutes.
- The EPA Regional Administrator (RA) was in attendance and was able to hear the concerns of residents nearby the site. The RA expressed the facilitator's role and work with the Agency and the importance of it. He also expressed what EPA has been trying to do with the cleanup.
- Next, a site update was provided by the Project Manager as follows:
 - EPA is still in legal negotiations with the responsible parties. EPA cannot talk about the details of the negotiations. EPA is hopeful that the negotiations will go well.
 - There was a break in at the Carter building. The project manager makes daily trips to the site and noticed the break in. The break in was taken care of a couple of months ago (in March). The break in occurred in the dock area. EPA placed a fence on the interior of the dock area. There have not been any break-ins since.
- **Question:** Could it be possible to get temporary lighting at the site?
- **Answer:** This question is currently under review by EPA. EPA will inform the public when a decision is reached.
- **Comment:** Noticed that EPA has been saying what can't legally be discussed.
 - Response: There is progress being made. ACF is willing to do tremendous things to finalize this process. It is closer than it was 20 years ago.

CARTER CARBURETOR ROUNDTABLE NOTES**Tuesday, April 24, 2012****Herbert Hoover Boys and Girls Club****2901 N. Grand Avenue****7:00 – 8:30 p.m.**

- Another participant expressed support to the residents nearby the site and their concern that the format of the Roundtable did not seem to be a partnership with all participants, including represented organizations and other entities. “It seems like there are areas where we are not equal. Can you explain what our roles are?” The other participant is tired and fed up. This has been going on for a while with no answers where it will end. What do you think?”
 - **Response to comment:** “This is a dynamic process. Question: What can we do to make it better? Should we have public meetings or roundtables?”
 - **Question:** “What is the difference? The community is asking for public meetings. Is that a problem that the community cannot get a public meeting? That is what a partnership is.” “Being a resident in this community, it could be more inclusive to have things done that they want done. Cannot understand public meetings versus roundtables.”
 - **Question:** “Why was it changed from public meetings to roundtables?”
- The facilitator explained the interchange of processes used to provide outreach to the community. He stated that if the participants feel this roundtable is not where the neighborhood needs to be right now they should let EPA know. If this is something that is needed, let EPA know.
 - **Question:** “Can the roundtable serve as a steering committee to help set agendas, to help steer discussions?”
 - **Comment:** “There has been a lot of progress since October 2010. There have been public meetings. At some point in time, you have to have a direction. The government is a very complex law that is the CERCLA law and there are multiple stakeholders involved and should be multiple stakeholders involved.” “I live in this community as well. There are many environmental justice issues in this community; Carter Carburetor is only one...and we should be looking at methods and past practices for resolving those issues.”
 - **Comment:** “There are people in different capacities coming to the roundtable. The roundtable can serve as a planning entity to plan for larger community meetings. TASC has worked with us previously.”

CARTER CARBURETOR ROUNDTABLE NOTES

Tuesday, April 24, 2012

Herbert Hoover Boys and Girls Club

2901 N. Grand Avenue

7:00 – 8:30 p.m.

- **Comment:** “I was at the October 2010 meeting and the premise was that we were setting up a participatory process. Don’t care how meeting is formed. Will this be participatory or is it a done deal; is this just a process of pretense of participation?”
 - **Comment:** “Content of the negotiations are being kept secret. What can be done with this site in a broad view...basically, those efforts have been hammered...called this out to EPA in October 2010.”
- The facilitator asked everyone if it was time to conduct public meetings at this time?
 - **Comment:** “I think that when we are talking about the roles...are there differences to be made? We expected to be in the design stage of cleanup by now. These decisions are not being made and we are not in a place to make them. Maybe there needs to be a pause. Truth is, we don’t have a say. Until there are decisions to be made, maybe we have to wait until negotiations are done.”
- The facilitator asked the group what they thought, and asked should there be another time for the group to come together. The facilitator stated that we thought meeting each month would be productive; however, because the negotiation process plays such a large part, we have limitations.
 - **Comment:** “I think that we have a public meeting...how you start up is how you end up...children were around to go on the site 20 years before a fence was put up. You didn’t get the community involved. A lot of people remember that and they don’t trust you. That is why you have to rehash and correct things at each meeting because of the way you started out. You show no respect for us or our children, no education process in place. A lot of people are mad and angry.”
 - **Comment from a participant:** “There has been education done. We have had several meetings explaining the different cleanup options. People were given the color coded charts. Maybe it could have been a more constructive way. The Boys and Girls Club has been involved from the beginning. We have reached out to families whenever there was a public meeting, we distributed flyers and information has been distributed.” **Comment:** “I’m talking about 26 years ago. You have a contaminated building...a youth recreation center right across the street...you have a school a block away.

CARTER CARBURETOR ROUNDTABLE NOTES

Tuesday, April 24, 2012

Herbert Hoover Boys and Girls Club

2901 N. Grand Avenue

7:00 – 8:30 p.m.

- EPA did not do enough at the beginning to show interest in the community. People remember how it started.”
 - **Comment:** “When people don’t trust, it is hard to regain the trust. The way it happened from the very onset, they felt that no one cared. The way it was approached, it created distrust. So to regain that trust, you should always be in communication with the community ongoing and show that you care enough. A lot of people in the community don’t feel comfortable.”
 - The facilitator stated that we have tried to reach out to the community. He then asked the group what they would like for EPA to do. Question: “Should we take a breather?”
 - Question from participant: “Are you sampling in May?”
 - Answer: EPA is going to sample this week. This will be the last round of sampling; that is, if we don’t detect anything.
There was additional discussion about the sampling process.
- The facilitator asked how the group felt about having a public meeting sometime in the summer; EPA will decide when the meeting will be held according to community need.
 - **Comment:** “I don’t think we should stop the process. We need to move ahead.”
Need the dialogue with different people on level playing field to resolve the issues. We need to continue on from this point. We may never get it back going if we stop. We need to identify what we can expect from our actions. Can we work together equally? It may take a while, either we are going to get it done or not.”
 - **Comment:** “Some may want to work on a work plan. What is the mission of the roundtable?”
- The facilitator asked the group what they wanted to accomplish with the roundtable...besides figuring out when the next meeting, what could this group do.
- The Regional Administrator expressed to the group that the ongoing discussions have been valuable because the key decision makers are at the roundtable engaged in the discussion, and it is good for decision makers to hear from the community. He also explained how EPA

CARTER CARBURETOR ROUNDTABLE NOTES

Tuesday, April 24, 2012

Herbert Hoover Boys and Girls Club

2901 N. Grand Avenue

7:00 – 8:30 p.m.

is governed by the law and it is valuable for EPA to hear their concerns. He said that in many ways, it is in the roundtable participants' power to move us forward which is bringing the community together to clear up information about the site.

- A question was raised by a participant:
 - **Question:** “Is the In-Situ Thermal Desorption (ISTD) going to be used? The community did not have a voice in which technology would be used at the site. Are there other alternatives as to why we have to use that particular technology?”
 - **Answer:** During the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) phase of this project, the site was divided into four separate areas and several alternatives were evaluated for each of these areas. The criteria used to evaluate these alternatives were: Effectiveness, Implementability, and Cost. Based on these criteria and information gathered at the site, EPA chose a preferred alternative for each of the four separate areas as follows:
 - **CBI Building:** Demolition and off-site disposal of contaminants
 - **Willco Building:** Partial demolition and replacement
 - **TCE Area:** In-Situ Thermal Desorption (ISTD)
 - **Die Cast Area:** In-Situ Thermal Desorption (ISTD)

During this process, the Potentially Responsible Party informed EPA that more information might be needed from the ISTD vendor to determine if ISTD was less than or nearly as costly as excavation and off-site disposal. For purposes of the EE/CA, ISTD was assumed to be less costly based on information from the PRP. In addition, the Superfund law suggests that during alternative comparisons, on-site treatment should receive preference over off-site disposal. Thus, EPA chose ISTD as the preferred alternative over excavation and off-site disposal and submitted the EE/CA to the public for comment.

CARTER CARBURETOR ROUNDTABLE NOTES**Tuesday, April 24, 2012****Herbert Hoover Boys and Girls Club****2901 N. Grand Avenue****7:00 – 8:30 p.m.**

EPA received numerous comments from the public which were addressed in writing in the Carter Carburetor Responsiveness Summary. Based on comments from the public and from information obtained by the PRP, EPA chose to implement the Preferred Alternative for each area at the site except for the Die Cast Area.

In the Die Cast Area, EPA chose to conduct a pilot study to obtain the needed information about ISTD, particularly for cost. Based on the results of this pilot study, the decision to use ISTD versus excavation and off-site disposal would be made. To date, EPA has not received the results of any pilot studies from the PRP. However, both alternatives would be protective of human health and the environment.

- **Comment from PRP:** “It is preferred because soil stays in place, this is why it is very effective. EPA also mentioned in the Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis three criteria in case the ISTD was not going to be protective of human health and the environment. They put in the option for excavation that we prepared and submitted. What we have done is a pilot study. We did a bench scale study in December 2011.
 - **Comment from participant:** “Even if PRP did this on their own, PRP needs to share that with the community. Just for the sake of communicating.”
 - **Comment from PRP:** “We have gotten the results back and have started to look at them. There are pros and cons to all of these options. There are various remediation options. PRP explained options and the ISTD process. It would be well over two million dollars to run ISTD. We will write a report from the bench scale study. However, based on preliminary discussions we have had, it appears that excavation will be the direction we are heading...should say, it is a definite.”
 - **Comment from EPA:** Nothing has been submitted to EPA for review by the PRP. EPA must review the information gathered by the PRP prior to making a decision.
- There was continued discussion on the excavation process and the time it would take to excavate (6 – 9 months), the cons of excavation such as dust, lot of traffic, noise, air, etc.
 - The participants were told that the PRP is considering all of the excavation concerns and assured the group that there will be monitoring in the community to make sure they know if

CARTER CARBURETOR ROUNDTABLE NOTES**Tuesday, April 24, 2012****Herbert Hoover Boys and Girls Club****2901 N. Grand Avenue****7:00 – 8:30 p.m.**

anything is leaving the site. They will make the data available within a week for the community. The PRP would also be willing to post information in a local newspaper such as the American. The PRP stated that they are making a lot of progress on this and that they hear the concerns of the community.

- **Question:** “Is there a risk of PCBs transferring into dioxins...is this a risk?”
 - **Answer from PRP:** No. The PRP also explained the process for reporting information to EPA and the community about risk or results.
 - **Comment from EPA:** Although not a risk for TCE, when Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) are heated to certain temperatures, they can form a class of compounds known as Polychlorinated Dibenzo-p-dioxins (PCDDs) and Polychlorinated Dibenzofurans (PCDFs). EPA is currently responding to the issue in a letter from the Missouri Coalition for the Environment as it pertains to ISTD. EPA is currently gathering information from scientists familiar with ISTD, chemistry of PCBs and toxicology.
- There was more discussion about the ISTD versus dig and haul processes at the site. Some participants felt that there was more information to share with the community from this discussion.
 - There was a question about how we will deal with the standing building. EPA recommended that the building be demolished. This was decided in the March 2011 EPA Action Memorandum.
 - There was additional discussion about past interactions with EPA and the community by participants and future use of the property.
 - The facilitator again asked the group what they would like to do for future interaction. There were comments made to suggest that we needed to continue forward, the next meeting should be in the form of a public meeting and the first or second Tuesday in June. The meeting was to be scheduled the second Tuesday in June on June 12, 2012.
 - The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.