GM POWERTRAIN BEDFORD CORRECTIVE ACTION
COMMUNITY LIAISON PANEL (CLP) MEETING MINUTES
MEETING NO. 2

DATE: October 4, 2002
TIME: 11:00 A.M. EST
LOCATION: GM Powertrain Bedford Plant
RECORDED BY: Sara Varty

ATTENDEES:
LaNetta Alexander – ISDH
Tom Brent – Bedford Resident and Environmental Professional
Janie Craig Chenault – County Commissioner
Paul Ford – General Motors
Barbara Gibson – Bedford Regional Medical Center
Bill Giles – IDEM
Stanley Glenn – City Council Member
Bob Hamilton – Hamilton Real Estate
Cheryl Hiatt – General Motors
Stuart Hill – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Mark Johnson – ATSDR
Paul McBride – County Health Sanitarian
Jim McGuigan – Conestoga-Rovers & Associates
Ed Peterson – General Motors
Peter Ramanauskas – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Larry Smith – Bedford Resident
Steve Song – Environ
Sara Varty – Conestoga-Rovers & Associates
Mayor John Williams – City of Bedford

ABSENT:
The following members were invited but could not attend:
Reverend Rodney Reynolds – First Pentecostal Church of God
Adele Bowden-Purlee – Bedford Chamber of Commerce
Karla Fortner – Bedford Resident
Tammie Jean – Shawswick Township Assessor
Robbin Ricketts – Bedford Regional Medical Center

11:10 – Meeting called to order by Sara Varty.

- Sara provided an overview of the purpose and agenda for the meeting.

– Attendees introduced themselves.

– Sara presented the Old Business from the 09/10/02 meeting.

- The Panel approved draft Meeting Minutes from the last meeting. Final Meeting Minutes will be distributed via email and will be placed

in the public repositories and on the web site. Email was agreed upon to be the preferred method of distribution of the Meeting Minutes.

- Sara asked if there were any nominations of new members. Cheryl indicated that Panel members should contact her if they would like to nominate anyone. Cheryl also indicated that the following people have joined the Panel since the last meeting: Robbin Ricketts (nurse at Bedford Regional), Karla Fortner (Bedford resident), and Larry Smith (Bedford Resident).
- The next CLP meeting was proposed for November 1, 2002 at the GM Bedford Plant from 11 a.m. to 1 p.m. This time and date was approved by the Panel members.
- Sara asked if there was any objection to publishing the names of the Panel members. There were no objections. Sara identified that a Press Release was currently being prepared and will be distributed to the Panel members for approval at the next meeting.
- Jim indicated that he spoke with Tim Terry regarding the potential fill materials located in an area on the south side of town, an issue Janie Chenault raised at the last CLP meeting. The potential for fill material to have been transported to this location will be investigated by speaking to the truckers who supposedly transported the materials. Jim indicated that GM was very interested in any information from the community regarding this type of situation.
    - Mark Johnson asked what type of materials would be in the potential fill area. Jim indicated that the type of material was not known but may be foundry sand or other types of former waste materials from the GM plant.

11:25 – Sara began the discussion of New Business and asked the Panel members if there were any new issues that they wanted to discuss.

- Janie asked if the sale of the church had been finalized.
    - Cheryl indicated that the appraised value and property protection plan had been presented to the Church board, but that the Church property had not been sold to GM. Reverend Reynolds is also a member of the CLP.
- Janie asked if any checks had been written or cashed for purchasing properties.
    - Cheryl indicated that she was not sure exactly how many people have signed up for the program but some checks have been written.
- Janie indicated that she had received questions from the tax assessor's office.
    - Cheryl indicated that Tammie Jean from the Tax Assessor's office will be a new CLP member but could not attend the

meeting today.

- Cheryl indicated that a list of contact information for the members of the CLP is provided in Attachment A of the handouts.

11:27 – Ed provided an overview of the data packages that are delivered to residents following the collection of samples on their property. Jim provided an explanation and interpretation of a sample data package (Attachment B of handouts).

- Jim indicated that the attached sample data package was only a small piece of the actual data package. The figures in the package are based on aerial photography, topographic mapping, and sampling locations that are surveyed by licensed surveyors.
- Sample locations are assigned arbitrary numbers that correspond to the sample results in the data table. Open/closed circles indicate whether the sample is below/above the screening level of 2,200 ppb PCBs. Most samples were collected in the creek and floodplain areas however, additional samples may have been collected from select areas away from the Creek where there is a potential for contamination to exist or where residents have requested sampling.
- The summary table presents the data for each sample identified on the figure. Information in the table includes sample ID, date of sample, sample depth, and analytical data. PCB results are listed as different aroclors that are basically different commercial mixtures of PCBs. The screening level is based on the sum of the concentrations of each detected aroclor.
- PCB results for water samples in the table are expressed as µg/L (which is the same as parts per billion or ppb) instead of µg/kg (also parts per billion or ppb) like the soil samples. The results reported as dissolved were for samples prepared by taking the collected water sample and utilizing a filter to remove suspended solids.
    - Mark Johnson asked if filter size was 45 or 0.45 microns and if water samples were analyzed for filtered and unfiltered. Jim indicated that 0.45-micron filters were used and that the majority of the water samples are analyzed for filtered and unfiltered PCBs.
- Lab reports for each sample are also attached to the data package. Jim explained the qualifiers that are used. Cheryl indicated that the lab checks all of the data initially and then GM runs a QA/QC check separately.
    - LaNetta Alexander asked how often MS/MSD samples were collected. Jim stated that a Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) was prepared that identifies all methods and quality assurance requirements, etc. for the investigation work. MS/MSD samples are collected at a minimum of 1 in 20 or one per sample collection set.

11:53 – Jim presented an overview of the status of the on-Site and off-Site investigation and provided an overview of the investigation program for the people that did not attend the first meeting.

- An oil seep was observed in the creek during heavy rains in the spring (during ongoing reconnaissance of the Creek in heavy rainfall events). The oil is heavier than water and was pooling on top of the rock at the bottom of the Creek near Outfall 002. It was collected using wet vacuums and during low surface water flow conditions, turkey basters. In addition, the creek water was routed around the seep area and dams were put in to prevent the possibility of oil flowing down the creek. A new oil collection system was installed just downstream from the first system, since the first one can no longer be accessed due to a denial of access by the property owner.
- The number of resident sampling requests has decreased, however samples are still being collected, based on a case by -case evaluation.
- Meetings with federal, state, city, and county agencies have been held over the last 3 days to expedite the permitting process for the Interim Measures Creek cleanup.
- Packer testing is being conducted at on-Site monitoring wells to determine the groundwater yield from fractures in the rock. Packers are expandable gaskets that isolate different portions of the rock within a monitoring well so that testing can be done at discrete intervals. In this type of geology, most groundwater movement through the rock aquifer will be through fractures and not through the rock matrix.
- Additional rock monitoring wells are being proposed along the east side of the property near the outfall to the Creek. Drilling will be performed on an angle to the surface to try and intercept as many fractures as possible. This will help GM understand the flow of groundwater through the rock in this area.

12:00 – Ed presented an overview of the Interim Measures process that will be occurring for the Creek cleanup.

- Interim Measures are cleanup actions undertaken before all of the studies are completed and approved by the U.S. EPA.
- The area to be addressed by this Interim Measure is the Pleasant Run and Bailey's Branch Creek area from the GM Outfall downstream almost to Salt Creek. The Interim Measure will include Creek sediment as well as floodplain soil. There is very little sediment in the Creek, so much of the focus will be on the floodplain soil. The screening level was 2.2 ppm (this is a U.S. EPA developed screening level). A screening level is a risk-based calculation performed prior to a more detailed Site-specific calculation, which is called cleanup criteria. The cleanup level has been determined to be 2 ppm, based on the Site-specific factors applicable to this area. The area above 2.2 ppm is shown on a map distributed to the public (the area above 2.2 ppm is highlighted in yellow and this is the general area of cleanup).

- Areas will be restored following excavation of contaminated soils. Areas will be backfilled with clean material and re-vegetated to minimize erosion.
- The scope of the Interim Measure will include work plans, designs, permits, and working with regulatory agencies, the City and the County.
- The method of cleanup will include removal of contaminated soil around the creek channel and floodplain. The stream will be diverted around the work area to provide dry work conditions (work areas will generally be 500 feet or less in length and those areas will be blocked off from creek flow while cleanup activities are taking place - once cleaning is complete, the work area will be moved downstream to the next section). Water that accumulates in work areas will be treated and discharged to the creek. There are two options for disposal of the contaminated soil that are currently under review with the U.S. EPA.
- The upstream properties will be addressed first. Cleanup will occur in the contaminated area above 2 ppm along the creek. A work plan has already been submitted for Parcel 22 and additional work plans will be submitted next week. The work on the upstream parcels is scheduled to be completed this fall.
    - Barbara Gibson asked how deep the excavation would be. Ed indicated that we would remove as deep as we need to reach the cleanup level. Generally, we think that it would be around 1 to 2 feet deep. Once we believe that the cleanup criteria has been met, we would perform soil verification sampling to document it was clean.
    - Mark Johnson asked if the 2 ppm cleanup level applied to both soil and sediments. The answer is yes.
    - Mayor Williams asked what was the furthest distance from the creek with contamination. Ed indicated that the distance from the creek varies in the floodplain area and referred to the "yellow map". There are higher levels in the steep sided channels upstream, however there is a larger volume of contaminated soil at lower concentrations in the floodplain area of the downstream region.
    - Mayor Williams asked what would happen to the properties following cleanup. Ed indicated that if GM owns the property then they will sell it and the owners may use the property without restriction.
    - Larry Smith asked about response to residents requesting soil sampling. Jim indicated that if there were a reasonable potential for contamination then GM would sample. Ed added that there are two main reasons for sampling: investigation of areas based on experience and sampling for owner peace of mind. However, this is still tempered by previous sampling

results and the location of the property in relation to the contaminated areas.

- Larry Smith asked about inconsistent well sample results on his property (GM sampled two different times and found different results) and he is concerned with contaminated water potentially affecting the community. Ed indicated that sometimes there are natural variations in levels due to the flow of water in the bedrock. GM will continue to sample to confirm the results. Camera and instruments were used in this well to determine the depth, rock characteristics, and to view any fractures.
- Mark Johnson asked where City water wells were located. Jim indicated that Bedford does not have wells, as they get their water from the White River.
- Mayor Williams asked what levels of PCBs were found in the spring samples. Jim stated that most samples were non-detect however higher levels were reported at the spring in the creek near the plant where oil was observed.
- Janie Chenault asked why owners would not permit GM on the property to operate the oil collection system. Ed stated that they were in the process of trying to work out an access agreement.

- Cheryl indicated that GM is continuing to address groundwater issues and proposed discussing the groundwater issue at a future CLP meeting. The Panel members agreed that they would like to know more about that issue.

12:40 – Steve Song presented an overview of Human Health Risk Assessment and PCBs Blood Testing. These topics have previously been presented to residents at the neighborhood meetings.

- The purpose of the Risk Assessment is to determine exposure pathways and levels of exposure for those pathways, and how to correct any unacceptable levels of exposure.
- Steve discussed the main concepts of risk, exposure, and hazard and reviewed exposure scenarios. GM is working with U.S. EPA and IDEM to identify all current and reasonably expected future exposure scenarios in the affected area.
- Other information covered included dose estimates, health effects of PCBs, dose-response relationship, effects of PCBs on animals, effects of PCBs on humans. A summary of most of this information has been provided in the ATSDR PCB Fact Sheet.
- Steve described how information is used on this project by determining how high the levels are, how close people are to contaminated areas, and how accessible the area is. Cleanup levels are chosen to be protective of reasonable maximum exposures under current and

reasonably expected future exposure scenarios.

- LaNetta Alexander asked if GM is evaluating exposures from fish and milk. Jim indicated that fish have been tested in the creek although fish of edible size are not present in the contaminated area. Cheryl indicated that the focus is currently on creek cleanup levels for residential exposure, however, other exposure scenarios are being evaluated.

1:15 – Steve continued with his presentation on PCBs blood testing.

- Blood testing can determine if there has been an exposure but cannot tell when or how the exposure occurred. Because PCBs were extensively used in industrialized countries and are present in air soil and food at varying levels, PCBs are expected to be present in blood samples of the general United States population at a range of background concentrations. Results above this background concentration range might trigger additional tests to determine if any health effects exist.

- A statistical assessment of the data is used to determine if PCB levels are above background. As an example, the height of men in the U.S. was provided to show how "background" is statistically determined and evaluated. Using the average height of 5 feet 9 inches is not appropriate to say if someone taller is "unusually" tall. Instead, you would choose a 95th percentile of 6 feet 2 inches or 99th percentile of 6 feet 4 inches to indicate if someone were "unusually" tall. PCB concentrations in blood were shown for specific published studies of background populations. In these studies, the 99th percentile for background was approximately 20 ppb in blood. In addition, the presence of PCB in the blood does not necessarily indicate health effects. As an example, Steve discussed a study of workers who had high levels of contact with PCBs on their job (transformer workers). Health effects could not be clearly tied to a level in the blood, although this study reported no health effects below 200 ppb in the blood sample.

  - Mark Johnson stated that historic data used in the example may not be representative of current numbers and that the current average may be as low as 2 to 3 ppb. Steve acknowledged that the current numbers may be different from those in older studies but indicated that the examples presented were taken from the most recent published data where the statistics are available. He also emphasized that average concentrations should not be used for the purpose of identifying PCB blood concentrations that are unusually high compared to the range of background levels.

  - Mark Johnson stated that the liver is not the only area that may be affected and that 200 ppb levels in blood might not be true for all effects. Steve agreed with this point.

  - LaNetta Alexander inquired as to the length of time of the study

that Steve referenced in the presentation. Steve was not sure of the exact time frame but said that tests were performed over several months.

- Larry Smith said he spoke with a specialist in Bloomington who said that blood testing was not as representative of PCB levels as bone and fat testing. Mark Johnson indicated that blood testing is the recommended test by the ATSDR and it is generally performed rather than fat testing because it is not as invasive as a surgical biopsy of fat tissue and there is a large body of information available regarding background PCB levels in blood. There is no corresponding body of information regarding PCB background levels in fat or bone tissues.

1:40 – Cheryl discussed the blood testing letter that was provided to residents.

- Letters were provided to any resident who requested to have their blood tested (within reason). The blood test is free and is conducted in a local hospital. The sample is sent to an approved lab and the lab report is provided to the resident. GM does not receive any results.
  - Mark Johnson stated that he was not comfortable with stating a range of background PCB levels up to 79 ppb in the letter since it reflects historical levels. Ed agreed that the historical data is probably not representative of the current upper levels and stated that the range was taken from ATSDR materials in the early stages of our analysis. The letter had attached a table that was directly taken from the ATSDR toxicological profile which summarized the range of PCBs blood concentrations from every background study discussed in the toxicological profile. Since the letter was written, we have conducted a more in-depth review of the results from the more recent studies in the table.
  - Mark Johnson asked who has had their blood tested. Jim indicated that they only know how many (approximately 200) but do not know names or any results.
  - Mark Johnson is interested in getting the results as a public health service. Ed indicated that GM does not receive any results from the blood testing and cannot get involved in obtaining any information from the hospital, lab, or residents as GM has promised confidentiality of the results. GM suggested that ATSDR try to get consent from residents independently.
  - Mark Johnson asked if anyone has called for interpretation of the results. Cheryl said that approximately 6-10 people have asked for appointments with a toxicologist.

1:50 – Cheryl discussed plans for an upcoming community meeting and provided an overview of the Agenda for the next CLP meeting.

- Community meetings will be held to discuss issues depending on where residents are located. The date has not been set but is planned for sometime in November.

- The next CLP meeting is planned for November 1. Each meeting will go over old and new business. If there are any issues that Panel members wish to discuss then just let Cheryl know. Possible future topics include groundwater issues, tour of creek areas and on-Site areas. May be possible to use City bus for a tour.

1:55 – Ed brought up some additional issues that may be discussed further in future meetings.

- PCB warning signs will be posted at some locations along the creek in the near future.
  - Larry Smith indicated that some signs have already been posted independently by some residents.
  - Barbara Gibson also said that some people have asked about signs and that they are worried about dust issues during the cleanup. Barbara suggested providing ongoing information throughout the cleanup such as specific measures to reduce dust, waste, releases, etc.
- Cheryl asked Bob Hamilton about presenting information to the Board of Realtors and it was agreed that it makes more sense to meet with the board after GM has had the plans for the cleanup approved.

2:00 – Meeting ended.