



MEETING SUMMARY

**Western Avenue /Phoenix Goodyear Airport Sites
Community Advisory Group (CAG)**

Technical Discussion Session

**Saturday, July 14, 2012
9:00 am – 12:00 pm**

**Phoenix Goodyear Airport (Executive Terminal)
1658 S. Litchfield Rd., Goodyear, AZ 85338**

CAG Members in Attendance:

Jeff Raible – Co-Chair
David Ellis
Diane Krone
Tim Birdsall
Karl Havlicek (alternate)

ADEQ Staff in Attendance:

Harry Hendler, Federal Superfund Program Manager
André Chiaradia, State Superfund Program Manager

Project Managers
Delfina Olivarez
Nicole Coronado
Travis Barnum

Facilitator

Dr. Marty Rozelle

Others in Attendance:

Nadine Johnson, Environmental Community Outreach (ECO) Association; Joe Husband, City of Phoenix, Phoenix-Goodyear Airport; Nancy Nesky, ITSI EPA consultant; Sandra Rode, City of Goodyear; Randy McElroy, ECO/TA; Mathew Thompson, ADEQ Intern; Brian Waggle, Hargis+Associates; Michael Long, Hargis+Associates; Pamela Bir, Consultant for Hargis + Associates; Jeff Littell, Brown & Caldwell; Chris Legg, Brown & Caldwell.

MEETING SUMMARY:

Harry Hendler welcomed everyone and thanked Joe Husband for the use of the facility. Everyone introduced themselves. Marty Rozelle reminded the group that this is not a CAG meeting so there will be no CAG business. It is a workshop and interruptions to presentations and questions anytime are welcomed. The meeting was recorded, but only a summary of action items will be prepared. Each member had a tabbed notebook filled with many maps, copies of presentations, and additional background information. The agenda included:

1. Introductions
2. CAG Orientation
3. WQARF and Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) Processes
4. Treatment Systems
5. Ongoing Investigations
6. Remediation Technologies
7. Call to the Public (5 minutes)
8. Adjournment

ACTION ITEMS:

The group identified three areas of concern and suggested follow-up action for each:

1. CAG members present felt that the USEPA has not been as engaged in the CAG meetings as they have been in the past. Members have the perception that the CAG may not be that important to the EPA. A specific example was cited from the May meeting. No EPA representative was present, and the EPA contractor stated she was not authorized to answer questions.

Action: This issue will be an agenda item at the August 2 meeting. Harry Hendler will speak with his EPA counterpart prior to that meeting. This was completed by Harry Hendler. EPA sent an email to the CAG on 7/27/12.

2. CAG members present want to know from USEPA staff how the PGA site clean-up progress compares with other TCE sites across the country.
 - a. Is the process moving as quickly as they expected?
 - b. Have the site(s) moved up or down on the National Priorities List?
 - c. Compare and contrast progress for PGA North and PGA South.

Action: Harry also mentioned this in his call. EPA currently is working on a response for the CAG.

- Several questions were asked about the Open Meeting Law (OML) that required more detailed answers.

Action: André Chiaradia will contact the appropriate person to discuss Open Meeting Law (OML) at the August meeting. CAG members are encouraged to submit specific questions or situations to Delfina prior to the CAG quarterly meeting and those will be passed along to the person who attends.

Meeting Evaluation

Marty invited everyone to provide feedback regarding what they liked about the workshop, indicated below with a plus symbol (+), and feedback regarding what they would like to change (or do better) in the future, indicated with a delta symbol (Δ).

+	Δ
+ The meeting was held.	Δ Initially thought too much time spent on the CAG orientation, WQARF and CERCLA items. However, discussions resulted in several action items.
+ Extensive materials in the notebooks.	
+ The obvious preparation effort says that the CAG is important.	Δ Locating items that were being discussed in the notebook was difficult. (It was explained that the book was resource for later reference).
+ Resulted in a good understanding of the remedial process.	
+ Got all my hydrology questions answered.	Δ Microphone passing back and forth is awkward.
+ Less formal format.	
+ Enough time for group to “drill down” into issues to fullest extent.	
+ Flexible facilitation – allowed discussion to go longer than initial time frames, but stayed on schedule overall.	
+ Maps that include only one item. They are so much easier to understand rather than having a lot of information on one map.	