

**Phoenix-Goodyear Airport (PGA) Area/Western Avenue Plume
Community Advisory Group (CAG) Meeting**

**Thursday, November 7, 2013
6:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.
Goodyear Justice Center
195 N. 145th Avenue, Goodyear, AZ**

DRAFT MINUTES

CAG Members in Attendance:

Diane Krone
Lisa Amos
Jeff Raible - Co-chair
Frank Scott – Co-chair
Karl Havlicek - Alternate
David Ellis
Earl Smith

ADEQ Staff in Attendance:

Delfina Olivarez, Western Avenue Project Manager
Travis Barnum, PGA North and South Project Manager
Wendy Flood, Community Involvement Coordinator
Harry Hendler, Project Manager, Federal Project Unit
Brian Stonebrink, PGA South Project Manager

Facilitator:

Marty Rozelle

EPA Staff in Attendance:

Cathrine Brown
Amanda Pease

Others in Attendance:

Ailiang Gu, ITSI Gilbane; Nancy Nesky, ITSI Gilbane; Nimisha Patel, AMEC; Harry Brenton, Matrix New World Engineering; Stephanie Lyn Koehne, AMEC; Nadine Scouden, ECO; Mark Holmes, City of Goodyear; Jeff Sussman, Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company; Ron Clark, Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company; Briana Velasco, AMEC; Joe Husband, Phoenix Goodyear Airport; Paula Chang Haley & Aldrich; Chris Legg; Brown & Caldwell; Greg Mammini, Clear Creek Associates; Julie Riemenschneider, City of Phoenix; Brian Waggle, Hargis+Associates, Inc.; Michael R. Long, Hargis+Associates, Inc.; Kathy Hunter, Hargis+Associates, Inc.; Bill Barnard, Management company representative Pebble Creek; Phil Marter, Pebble Creek General Manager; Bob McDermott; Emily Roth; Marilyn Havlicek.

Welcome and Introductions – Co-Chair called meeting to order and explained how the CAG meeting runs. Introductions were made by CAG Members and audience.

Western Avenue (WA) WQARF site: Delfina Olivarez, ADEQ Project Manager

ADEQ presented a quarterly update on groundwater monitoring, Draft Feasibility Study Report and final results of the Time-Series groundwater sampling of (COG) well #1.

See slide presentation

A CAG member asked for a definition of monitored natural attenuation and if that was the solution for removing contaminants from COG-01. The ADEQ responded, the earth is removing contaminants naturally through dilution and dispersion as the groundwater migrates in the aquifer. The ADEQ will not be using any other remediation but will monitor the progress of the natural reduction of contaminants. This is the remedial alternative that was selected in the feasibility study as the best alternative to meet the remedial objectives of protecting groundwater for municipal and irrigation purposes

A CAG member asked for confirmation as to whether COG-01 has had contaminate levels above the standard. ADEQ's consultant responded that there is no historical data showing PCE concentrations from COG-01 above the standard, the highest has been 4.68, which was recorded after the well had been shut down for a period of 2-3 months. That occurrence correlates with the data gathered from the time-series test. This is the remedial alternative that was selected in the feasibility study as the most feasible, practicable, cost effective and sustainable alternative to meet the remedial objectives of protecting groundwater for municipal and irrigation purposes.

A CAG member asked if the City (of Goodyear) is happy with the selected alternative for this well. The City responded that they reviewed the feasibility study and their preference would ultimately be a zero. However, because COG-01 is part of the Cities' network and groundwater from the well is blended with water from other wells, the City is confident that the contaminant levels will stay below the MCL. During review of the Feasibility Study, the City considered other alternatives including retrofitting the well, replacing the well in the same location or drilling at another location. The City's concerns for these issues were addressed in the comments to the study and are actively working with the ADEQ on the issues with the well.

A CAG member wanted to confirm that there will be continued consistent monitoring of COG-01. The ADEQ consultant responded that the monitoring schedule will remain the same for approximately 1 year. A review of the data will be done after that time to see if changes are needed.

A CAG member asked if COG-01 pumps in to a reservoir or tank and if there is an opportunity for blending. The City of Goodyear responded that the well is never run by itself and there is a series of wells that come on as part of the network; there is a constant blending before it is distributed to the reservoir.

A CAG member asked if the feasibility study was published. The ADEQ stated that it was and is posted on their website and the CAG members were notified. The proposed remedy and its estimated cost will be in the Proposed Remedial Action Plan which should be ready for public comment around May 2014.

PGA NORTH & SOUTH SITES – Travis Barnum, ADEQ and Catherine Brown, EPA

ADEQ introduced new PGA South Project Manager, Brian Stonebrink and both ADEQ and the EPA presented a quarterly update on current trends, analysis and groundwater statistics; recent activities; source area investigations to date; Proposed Plan timeline and activities and upcoming plans for the sites. Each member of the CAG received a copy of the Final Source Area Remediation Focused Feasibility Study (SARFFS)

See slide presentation

PGA SOUTH

A CAG member asked when extraction well E-103 will be installed. PGAS consultant responded that it required on-site access from the land owner before it could be installed and the process is in progress.

A CAG member wanted to know the install location of extraction well E-103. PGAS consultant indicated that it is northwest of E-102.

A CAG member asked where the GAC-04 replacement well will go. ADEQ responded that it will be at Litchfield Road and Goodyear Parkway near entrance to the Phoenix Goodyear Airport.

PGA NORTH

EPA informed the CAG that due to the shut down the schedule had to be updated regarding the proposed plan. All CAG members should have received the Administrative Record for previous work conducted at the site. The SARFFS looked at all the remedies that would clean up the source area and helped to prepare the proposed plan (PP). EPA announced the public meeting will be held at Estrella Community College on February 5 and the CAG meeting will be the following night, February 6 covering the PP.

Once the PP is published, the public comment period starts. EPA will try to time the publication to be two weeks before meetings. A postcard announcing the comment period and the PP locations for review will be sent out; EPA also went over the locations where the PP will be located.

A CAG member asked if they will get to review the PP prior to the public meeting. EPA responded that they would make copies of the plan available to the CAG and other stakeholders, like the City of Goodyear at the public meeting. The PP will not be a large document, it will be written in a customer, community friendly manner and will not require a lot of time for an in-depth review; it will be a much simpler document than the SARFFS.

A CAG member asked if the CD's presented at the meeting would include pros and cons of the remedies. The EPA indicated those would be in the Proposed Plan. The CD included Administrative Records which include reports from the completed remedial investigations that led to decisions on remedies for the site. The two items are connected, but the Proposed Plan will present EPA's preferred alternative and the reasoning behind that decision.

A member stated (Mr. Smith) that he wants to get together before the public meeting in order to have joint, agreed upon comments. This is supposed to be a committee to represent the community and we (CAG) are not able to do so with the schedule provided. Also, attending a meeting (formal public meeting) and giving individual comments defeats the purpose of this group. Another member stated they want to have input prior to the general meeting, to digest it and have a consensus of opinion; to come as a group. The Co-chair stated this can be discussed

further in the agenda; there will need to be multiple meetings. EPA does understand there is a lot of information to review, which is why documents were presented to the CAG ahead of time.

The comment period was announced to be 30 days following the publication date. A CAG member expressed concern that the current length will not allow enough time for public comment.

An audience member asked if beneficial reuse would be part of the Proposed Plan. The EPA stated that beneficial use would not reintroduce treated water to drinking system. It would be used for irrigation. It was also asked if there are any proposals from the agency to use the treated water for public drinking water supply. The EPA responded not at this time. The development of the current proposed plan would be for an enhancement to the remedy at PGA North only and is for the source area; it will be a Record of Decision (ROD) Amendment to the current remedy.

A CAG member asked if all the off-site wells were in preparation for the new treatment. An AMEC consultant responded that they are not. It is part of their ongoing investigation, which also includes annual well installs (approximately 12/yr) to help monitor TCE and PCE contaminates. There has been a large focus south of I-10 for their in-depth groundwater investigation for Subunit C using a new sonic drilling technique. The groundwater investigation is still ongoing. However, using this new data allows them to understand the layers through Subunit A through C to aid the remediation efforts. They are currently in the process of preparing the Subunit C Capture Zone Report that will help determine where capture isn't happening and then a plan can be developed for remediation.

A CAG member asked why results in well EPA MW10A are so erratic. The consultant for PGA North responded there is seasonality associated with fluctuating water levels. This well is also close to well COG-3 and there is some influence from that well when it is pumping.

Call to the Public –

A CAG member (Mr. Halveick) voiced concerns with information contained in the Community Involvement Plan (CIP):

- There was a lack of well locations listed in the Final, that were listed in the May draft.
- Why statements in Amendment 17 with regard to the movement of the contamination toward the Pebble Creek community and the process for ensuring the contaminants were in the drinking water were not addressed in the CIP. The member wanted to alleviate any concern that there was a health risk to those residents.

He wanted to emphasize that there are some positive things going on at the site since the Pebble Creek manager was present. He was reading a communication that had already been released and had more questions.

ADEQ CIC stated that any questions with regard to this document can be addressed individually or added as an agenda item for the next meeting.

EPA responded, as part of their interaction with Pebble Creek regarding well installation in the community, they received a brochure from the HOA that they use for potential homebuyers and asked to review it. One of the primary comments was that it needed to be updated as it was written in 2007 (what was inserted in the CIP). The CAG member wanted to point out that potential buyers should know that there have been changes to the document since that time and the levels indicated are not accurately reflected.

City of Goodyear notified and invited the CAG to a council work session scheduled for February 3, 2013 around 5:00 p.m. This meeting will present updates on the site to the City Council from various presenters. EPA and ADEQ representatives have been invited to attend, as well as Crane Co. CAG members were invited to attend.

CAG Business:

- ✓ Unanimous acceptance of August 08, 2013 meeting minutes.
- ✓ PGA CAG Outreach:

The CAG discussed other possible meeting locations.

ADEQ CIC summarized her contact with Pebble Creek and that a representative was in attendance tonight to observe the meeting. Mr. Bernard, who works for the Board, stated the concern was more on causing a panic if the information is taken the wrong way. He said he'd go back and talk with the board about meeting at the location. Ms. Krone felt it is beneficial to let the community know about the site regardless, there should be an understanding and they should not be afraid. There should not be so much worry about panicking the public; they have a right to know.

CAG Co-Chairs and the CAG further discussed the topic of information dissemination. The CAG asked why ECO does not present information and the CAG discussed and asked questions about ECO's role, how they interface with the CAG, what they do and would like to hear/get a presentation from them. They should be a partner and another tool for outreach to the community.

Mr. Havlicek questioned the public notice process regarding this site and the CAG. ADEQ CIC went over the process. She also stated all of the information is part of the CIP that was just finalized. ADEQ will discuss further at the next meeting, review and go over the plan and notification.

The CAG further discussed EPA changing schedule: only coming out twice year starting next year. The CAG further discussed this topic, how that will change the format and information presented at meetings, however the CAG will still meet 4 times a year. The CAG misses the PGA north presentation from the consultants therefore; format and content should be further discussed. The CAG stated there is a story to tell, especially in PGA North so the meeting should reflect such. The Co-chair asked to have it discussed at the next meeting.

The CAG wanted to announce that the PGA Tour was great and done very well.

- ✓ CAG prefers three meetings to effectively digest the documents and prepare their formal comments to EPA regarding the PP since the actual CAG meeting cannot be used as formal commentary for oral comments without a court reporter:
 1. Attend the EPA public meeting on February 5, 2013 to understand the document and EPA's position;
 2. Use the February 6th CAG meeting to ask questions, and solidify thoughts and comments of that meeting, EPA Q&A as they will still be in town; suggested this be the only agenda item to formulate board's official comments. Include discussion of outreach if time permits;

3. CAG business meeting on February 13, 2013 to prepare and write an official letter to the EPA with final board comments before close of comment period. It will also help the CAG to determine if they should ask EPA to extend comment period to 45 days.
- ✓ SARFFSs discussion meeting on January 15th. Final SARFFSs information included on CD that EPA handed out at the CAG meeting.

Future Meeting Agenda Discussion

The next CAG meeting is scheduled for Thursday, February 6, 2014 at the Goodyear Justice Center beginning at 6:00 p.m.

Action items:

1. Voting of Karl Havlicek from alternate to board member.
2. Clarification of charter membership language.
3. Discuss CIP, Appendix 17 questions that Karl Havlicek had from November Meeting.
4. Clarification of ECO's role and possible presentation.
5. CAG would like to have more collaboration with ECO and how it works with the public.
6. Review definition/venues of public notices for the CAG meetings.
7. Less information on PGA South and more time spent on issues at PGA North.
8. Due to reduced EPA visits, CAG would like to alternate between having presentations from the EPA and Consultants for broader details and perspectives. The CAG wants substantial information which is presented from both sides.
9. Review of what the CAG would like to see and in what format from the EPA due to reduced availability (twice a year).

Adjournment