

**East Central Phoenix (ECP)
Water Quality Assurance Revolving Fund (WQARF) Site
Community Advisory Board (CAB) Meeting**

**Monday, April 22, 2019, 6 p.m.
Arcadia High School
4703 East Indian School Road
Phoenix, Arizona 85018**

MINUTES

CAB members present: Randy Dahl (CAB Co-chair), Thomas Lusk, Jolene Morris, Bernard Schober, John Hathaway, Kim Van der Veen, Carol Brady

CAB members absent: Nathan Nelson, Margaree Bigler

Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) Staff in attendance: Wendy Flood, Barbara Boschert, Tara Thurman (Community Involvement Coordinators), Tom Titus (ADEQ Project Manager)

Members of the public present: Kirk Craig (Geosyntec Consultants, ADEQ Contractor), Julie Riemenschneider (City of Phoenix), Karis Nelson (SRP)

1. Call to Order/Introductions

Mr. Randy Dahl called the meeting to order at 6:05 pm and introductions were held. Ms. Wendy Flood gave the new CAB members their CAB Notebooks, to be discussed at the next meeting.

2. Acceptance and/or Changes to August 2018 and September 2018 meeting minutes

Ms. Jolene Morris moved to accept the August 16, 2018 meeting minutes, it was seconded by Mr. Dahl; motion approved. One CAB member abstained.

No one was present that attended the September 2018 meeting. Mr. Dahl moved that those meeting minutes be tabled till next meeting. Seconded by Mr. Thomas Lusk; motion passed.

3. Presentation by ADEQ on East Central Phoenix WQARF sites Draft Remedial Investigation (RI) Reports for 32nd Street & Indian School Road and 24th Street & Grand Canal (See Attached Presentation).

Presentation was made by Mr. Kirk Craig of Geosyntec Consultants, as ADEQ Project Manager Dr. Matt Narter was absent. He covered the WQARF process and the information contained in the Draft RI for each site.

4. Discussion of the ADEQ Presentation by the Board

Mr. Craig answered questions regarding the delineation of the ECP plumes and the relative scale and concentration of the impacts using illustrations of the plumes and noted that these plumes are not atypical given the lithology and type of sources.

Mr. Craig described how it was determined that the vadose zone had been remediated. Ms. Kim Van der Veen inquired about rebound regarding the soil vapor extraction system. Further discussion was held on the SVE system.

Mr. Bernard Schober asked about the applicable regulatory standards, how they are established, and if impacts to insect and microbial life were considered. Mr. Craig gave a brief explanation as to how standards are established and noted that the applicable standards are dictated by the regulations. Such requests can be brought up for remedial objectives, coming up late in the meeting.

Ms. Van der Veen asked whether groundwater treatment and monitoring have been done in the same wells for the two sites discussed. Mr. Craig noted that groundwater treatment has not been implemented for these plumes and various remedial technologies will be contemplated as part of the feasibility study.

5. CAB and Public Comment on the Draft RI Report

Mr. Craig noted that the 60-day public comment period ends on May 6.

Ms. Flood stated that comments to the RI report can be mailed in (comment forms provided at the meeting), or attendees may provide their comments verbally at the meeting and they will be captured in the meeting minutes.

Mr. John Hathaway stated that the report takes a long time to download from the website and requested to have a copy that contains the report only, without the data. He also offered comments on the format and layout of the figures and text of the report.

There were no comments made by members of the public.

6. Presentation by ADEQ about Remedial Objectives

Mr. Craig continued presenting by covering the Remedial Objectives (RO) report. It will be an appendix of the RI and must be approved independently.

7. Discussion of the ADEQ Presentation by the Board

Mr. Schober asked if additional non-point discharge pollution, such as runoff from the streets, would impact testing. Mr. Craig responded that additional testing would only be contemplated if there were a potential for infiltration to impact the distribution or concentration of the contaminants. In general, that is not the case in Phoenix and if it were the case, it would be contemplated in the RI.

8. CAB and Public Solicitation of Remedial Objectives for 32nd Street & Indian School Road and 24th Street & Grand Canal

Mr. Schober offered an additional remedial objective: Whether there is a way to consider potential impacts to insects, annelids, microbes, etc. in the area where contaminants are or could potentially be. He noted that it should be considered even if they are not endangered/threatened.

Ms. Van der Veen proposed an objective regarding ensuring that the soil conditions at the site do not exceed the applicable soil remediation for given number of years (minimum of three years was mentioned).

Ms. Van der Veen also proposed confirming that the site soils do not exceed applicable SRLs with subsequent testing in 6 months, 12 months and 18 months, or a measurement of time, to ensure that it's still clean over a period of time. She added that similar language should be used for groundwater.

Ms. Van der Veen also proposed that the downgradient potential soil vapor pathways be monitored long term for the soil and groundwater objectives. Mr. Craig noted that vapor off-gassing associated with the relatively low level of downgradient plume impacts do not likely have the capacity to impact the associated soils above an applicable standard.

Ms. Flood stated that after the solicitations have been compiled, the RO report will go out for a 30-day comment period. These solicitations and comments will be included if applicable. There will be a responsiveness summary as to why comments are or are not incorporated.

9. Future CAB Meeting/Agenda Discussion

The CAB would like the next meeting to incorporate an educational component about site-specific technologies.

The next CAB meeting is scheduled for the first or second week of June. After discussion about the best day for meetings, it was determined that Thursdays are the best day of the week at 6:15 PM for meetings.

Topics for the next meeting are: CAB training, CAB notebooks review, site history (Ms. Flood to send link), site visit, site updates (if any), general information on remedial technologies, explanation of plume dimensions and conversions (common language terms) used in the presentations, and meeting frequency (setting up ahead of time).

10. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 7:55 pm.