VB/I-70 Superfund Community Advisory Group (CAG) Meeting Notes

Date of Meeting: Tuesday, May 16, 2018

CAG Members Present: Kimberly Morse, Lloyd Burton, Bridget Walsh, AE, Jim Garcia, Drew Dutcher, Sandra Ruiz-Parrilla, Candi CdeBaca, LaMone Noles (stepped in for Bridget Walsh as an alternate during the meeting), Tad Bowman

Ex-officio present: Celia VanDerLoop, Jack Paterson, Andrew Ross, Ryan Crum, Jesse Aviles, Tim Shangraw

Facilitator: Elizabeth Suárez

Introduction: Ms. Suárez invited everyone at the table to introduce themselves with their affiliations. Each CAG member received the monthly folder with printed materials. Ms. Suárez briefly reviewed the agenda for the night’s meeting.

Ms. Suárez stated that childcare was available for the CAG members.

AE noted that this was a changed agenda and whether the meeting would proceed given that several CAG members were not present. Ms. Suárez commented on how the amended agenda was brought forward.

Ms. Suárez read the by-laws related to conduct and requested feedback from the CAG members. She stated she is responsible for ensuring that the CAG is conducted per the by-laws and that she will not allow personal attacks in the CAG meetings.

Community Discussion:

Bridget Walsh noted that the intention of this agenda item was to welcome the new CAG members and allow them time to speak. Kimberly Morse confirmed this intention.

Lloyd Burton commented on the procedure for amending the agenda, providing a motion, and having that motion approved by the CAG. Elizabeth Suárez noted that it would be beneficial to have the amended agenda sent out to all CAG members in advance of the CAG meeting.

Sandra Ruiz-Parrilla asked for an interpreter and made a statement in Spanish. She brought questions from mothers within the Swansea community. What is the CAG meeting about? Ms. Suárez interjected and asked Jesse to respond to that question. Jesse Aviles noted that he has a meeting scheduled with Sandra on Thursday to discuss her questions. Sandra asked whether soil tests have been done at Swansea Elementary and acknowledged that that question would be answered by Jesse on Thursday. The next question related to the Colonial Manor Motel and the Swansea Elementary. She stated that the water at Swansea Elementary “started coming out yellowish”. She wants to understand why the water is yellowish. She asked this question of the Swansea Elementary administration, but they did not provide an answer. She requested an answer to that question for tomorrow as she is meeting with the community members. Jesse Aviles noted that this topic was not part of the OU2 site scope. Andrew Ross
noted that the demolition of the hotel was done by CDOT. He suggested that he would contact CDOT and provide feedback.

AE suggested that these conversations fall outside the scope of this CAG. She noted that these questions can be addressed to CDOT. She suggested that the CAG stay focused. Lloyd Burton discussed the by-laws and that the CAG is focused on all the VB/I-70 OUs and brownfields development within the OUs. He suggested that this CAG would also have representation from CDOT since they are the ones demolishing buildings in OU1. He suggested that CDOT should be present to address the potential environmental impacts of those demolitions.

LaMone Noles suggested a community forum be hosted to provide information related to the construction and associated environmental impacts in the neighborhood. Celia VanDerLoop asked for clarification regarding LaMone’s request. LaMone stated she was interested in the I-70 construction project and its impacts. Celia noted that the agency responsible for the I-70 project is CDOT and not EPA and DDPHE.

Jesse Aviles introduced Michael Wenstrom, EPA Region 8 Environmental Justice program. Jesse noted that the CAG members can talk with Michael about the broader issues relating to environment and human health in the community. Michael introduced himself and suggested that he may be able to help regarding concerns outside the Superfund process. He provided his contact information to Elizabeth Suárez.

AE stated that she did not want anyone to feel impeded from going to CDOT or any other agency which might be able to address CAG members concerns in the community. She noted that concerns regarding the Colonial Manor Motel did not need to wait for the monthly meeting. She remarked that there are many different authorities that manage various projects in the neighborhoods and it would help if people recognized that different authorities were involved in different projects. She suggested that CAG members need to help the community understand the civil engineering and the different authorities responsible for certain projects.

Sandra stated she understands the purpose of this CAG is related to OU2 and not the Colonial Manor Motel. She believes all the environmental issue are related. She noted that CDOT does not answer questions from the community. She stated there are no water filters at the school which is a concern for her. Elizabeth Suárez suggested that Michael Wenstrom, EPA, could meet with Sandra to discuss her concerns.

Kimberly Morse acknowledged Sandra’s concerns and would also like CDOT to participate in the CAG meetings. Andrew Ross stated that he has invited CDOT to attend and they have chosen not to participate. Andrew said he would try to set up a meeting with CDOT, Sandra, and parents from Swansea Elementary to discuss their concerns.

LaMone Noles noted that she has not seen representation from elected officials at the CAG meetings. Ms. Suárez noted that Jack Paterson regularly attends from Councilwoman Ortega’s office. LaMone stated that the CAG needs to hear from other representatives of elected officials.

Lloyd Burton moved that the CAG should issue a request to the acting director of CDOT to provide a representative to attend the CAG meetings. Candi CdeBaca amended that motion to have a technical person from CDOT attend the meetings. Lloyd accepted that amendment. Drew Dutcher seconded the
motion. Drew noted that CDOT often evades the questions stating their plans are not finalized. Sandra Ruiz-Parrilla would like CDOT to meet with parents at the Colorado Miners center. Sandra is okay having CDOT attend a CAG meeting where the community can then ask questions.

AE suggested questions be provided to CDOT in advance should they attend the CAG meeting to allow for greater productivity.

The CAG approved the motion to send a request to CDOT to have an environmental project manager attend the CAG members.

**Water Quality and Liner Questions:**

Elizabeth Suárez invited Chuck Norris and Tim Shangraw, Engineering Management Support, Inc., to the CAG members’ table.

Chuck noted that he will not be commenting on the liner tonight since there will be a final report generated that he will review and comment on at that time.

Chuck provided an overview of the site history. His main interest is what remains within the landfill onsite and how the groundwater moves through that landfill on its way to the South Platte River. What is the waste within the landfill? There has been a substantial amount of excavation onsite; however, he believes little has been provided to the public regarding the contents of the soil / landfill that have been removed. He is aware asbestos-containing-soils have been removed.

Tim asked for clarification of Chuck’s questions. He understood them to be: Are there new groundwater flow conditions given the installation of the open channel and sheet pile wall? What do you believe is in the waste debris which remains onsite? Chuck responded that those are his questions. Regarding the waste debris, Chuck indicated his opinion that the landfill debris has not been characterized.

Tim discussed that the sheet pile was left on the upgradient side of the channel to keep groundwater below the level of the liner. Regarding the rate and direction of groundwater, there is not a significant difference in those conditions based on the construction of the open channel. He suggested that Chuck could read Addendum 3 to the Final Design Report for more information related to groundwater flow. Chuck noted he has read that report and is interested in actual conditions vs. modeled conditions. He noted that the model does not have boundary conditions that extend through the landfill area. Tim disagreed and noted that the boundary conditions have been well defined and that the groundwater flow direction has not changed.

Tim noted that the landfill consists of municipal solid waste and construction debris and was characterized during the Remedial Investigation and prior to open channel construction. There are numerous reports that summarize this data, including the Remedial Investigation (RI) Report, the Data Summary Report, and Addendum 1 and 2 to the Final Design Report.

Chuck noted that the laboratory analysis was not provided in the RI Report for the landfill borings. Tim stated that the analysis was included for lead and arsenic in the RI Report. Chuck was interested in other analysis of the landfill material besides metals. Tim noted that the Data Summary Report documented 16 soil borings where 15 were completed as piezometers. Soil samples were analyzed for volatile organic compounds, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act metals (RCRA 8 metals), and toxicity characteristics (toxicity characteristic leaching procedure analysis (TCLP)).
Chuck wanted to know if any of the landfill soils removed from the landfill area were characterized once excavated. Tim responded that no further analysis of the soil was done prior to removal to the Denver Arapahoe Disposal Site (DADS), as there was no reason to do so. The determination had already been made that non-hazardous waste would be disposed of at DADS. Chuck asked if there was a visual characterization of the soils. Tim noted that a certified asbestos building inspector (CABI) / hazardous waste inspector was onsite performing visual inspection to determine whether soils had asbestos or visual indications of hazardous waste. Tim noted that the waste material was consistent with what was found in the soil borings. Chuck stated that none of the excavated material was sent to a lab for analysis. Tim stated that this was not necessary because the soil had already been characterized as TCLP non-hazardous.

Kimberley Morse noted the Data Summary Report indicated there was minimal asbestos in the soils; however, a large volume of excavated soils was disposed as asbestos-containing soils. Tim noted that in terms of asbestos-containing soils that CCoD decided to be conservative and remove soils that potentially could be asbestos-containing soils.

Chuck followed up on Tim’s assertion that there was no hazardous waste excavated onsite. Tim noted that this statement was based on TCLP analysis. Tim discussed the screening process for soils. There were CABI’s onsite performing inspections for asbestos or hazardous waste. Visual and volatile organic compound (VOC) monitoring was performed. Chuck asked what the personal protective equipment (PPE) level was for those construction personnel handling asbestos containing soils. The PPE level was level C within the exclusion zone where a person would be wearing a Tyvek suit, gloves and boots, and a respirator. Tim restated that no additional screening of soils was done during excavation because there was no visual or VOC indicators of hazardous waste.

AE requested confirmation that the City was being conservative as it related to asbestos regarding removal of soil. Tim stated that was correct. AE asked if Chuck would have preferred additional sampling to confirm the chemical characteristics of the soil during excavation. Chuck clarified that he does not believe there was sufficient characterization of the landfill waste. He is trying to figure out what type of waste is left within the OU2 landfill.

Lloyd Burton noted that he thought we had 10 times more groundwater flowing through the site than anticipated and that is why CDOT raised the subgrade of I-70. He noted the amount of contaminated soil removed from the site and suggested we could do more proactive testing now. Andrew Ross stated that CDOT raised the subgrade to stay out of groundwater so they’re not in a perpetual pumping situation, not because of groundwater flow rate. He also noted that CDOT will be doing about 2000 soil borings in advance of I-70 construction, the data will be public information and that we should all be looking at those data.

Jesse Aviles commented that the soil sampling and screening strategy was appropriate for the site.

Drew Dutcher asked if Chuck would have more questions. Drew asked if the cost of lab testing was a factor in not testing the excavated material. Jesse noted that CCoD managed the waste per the regulations.

Tim indicated he keeps hearing the statement that the landfill material was not tested. He stated that is an inaccurate statement. Soil borings were completed throughout the landfill areas and the channel profile prior to construction, which were chemically tested. Kimberley Morse noted that there was a
discrepancy between pre-construction data and the amount of asbestos-containing soil removed from the site. Tim noted that you cannot see the fine particles of asbestos; thus, CCoD was conservative and removed soil that was suspected asbestos-containing soil.

**GLO Environmental Monitoring and Maintenance Plan: (Ms. VanDerLoop)**

Celia VanDerLoop reviewed the Global Landing Outfall Environmental Monitoring and Maintenance Plan including the plan goals, monitoring and maintenance activities, the schedule for those activities, indicators of concern, and the schedule of plan approval. She noted that the plan has been placed in the OneDrive and the CAG can provide feedback to Jesse Aviles. Celia noted that this plan may be superseded in the future by a long-term monitoring and maintenance plan.

Kimberly Morse asked why a liner was installed if all the water (surface and groundwater) flows to the river. Celia commented that the liner was installed to prevent additional water from running through the landfill waste.

Celia noted that impacts to the liner are likely to be physical or environmental, and not chemical. Thus, a visual inspection shall be performed in addition to a vegetation survey. A land survey will also be performed to assess settlement impacts. Celia discussed groundwater elevation monitoring, land use controls, and training for CCoD employees.

Celia discussed that there will be routine maintenance of the channel to manage the vegetation and minor erosion, which will not require reporting to EPA. She noted that EPA will be notified of significant events that have the potential to damage the liner, such as significant erosion or major settling. Appropriate actions will be taken to verify the integrity of the liner and repair the damage. Should a significant problem occur, the liner expert will consult with EPA and an electrical leak location survey may be performed.

Kimberly Morse stated the CCoD previously stated that the electrical leak location survey would be done on a periodic basis. She also asked why the visual inspection was not being conducted on an annual basis. Jesse Aviles noted that a two-year inspection interval was used for other hazardous waste sites; thus, he recommended a two-year interval for this site.

AE requested additional clarification on the visual inspection. Celia noted that this entailed the project manager walking a grid over the site and making notes of their visual observations, looking for erosion, settling, cracks in the channel walls, or deep-rooted species. The project manager will take corrective actions as necessary.

Celia noted the electrical leak location survey (ELLS) has not been eliminated. An ELLS will be conducted should a significant event occurs that requires an ELLS, following consultation with EPA and the liner expert which results in a recommendation that an ELLS is needed.

**Construction Scorecard Update: (Mr. Ross and Mr. Crum)**

A scorecard update was not provided due to lack of time.

**Community Discussion:**
Jacqui Lancing had a question regarding the cost of the ELLS and whether cost was a factor regarding periodic testing. Celia VanDerLoop noted the ELLS can be physically challenging to conduct due to the nature of the site, presence of soil layers and vegetation, and can be costly as a result.

Bridget Walsh requested that any information that goes to Sandra Ruiz-Parrilla regarding her questions for Jesse Aviles or CDOT be shared with the CAG. Jesse noted that Sandra can provide a summary of that conversation should she choose to do so.

Stephen Eppler noted the elevated effluent concentrations for selenium and E. coli at the GLO water treatment facility. Andrew explained that the E. coli exceedance in March. He stated that treated water had been left in a tank over a long weekend and had not been properly chlorinated prior to discharge.

Mary Hernandez asked whether this type of drainage system had been done before. Celia stated that pieces of this drainage system have been done before but not all in one place. She provided the example of the drainage system at RiverPoint (Sheridan Landfill) west of Santa Fe Boulevard and south of Havana Street. She stated that geosynthetic caps and liners are very common features at landfills and/or water retention ponds. Mary asked if there have been problems with liner systems. Celia stated that a liner system is a well-accepted design for covering municipal solid waste and is considered state of the art. Mary noted a Channel 7 news story indicating the potential for a 4-foot flood in the neighborhood. Celia stated that there is a potential for leakage and that is why we have a monitoring and maintenance plan.

Chuck Norris noted that bald spots in the vegetation could be due to methane leaks in the liner.

Bridget Walsh requested that all information provided to CAG members be provided to the entire CAG. Jesse Aviles noted that he will not provide a summary of the conversation with Sandra Ruiz-Parrilla and that Sandra can share the contents of that conversation with the CAG.

Jesse Aviles clarified that the CAG needs to request representation from CDOT. EPA and DDPHE will not make that request for them.

AE distributed the Denverite article, “Denver’s got the most polluted zip code in the country? Not so fast."

**Topics for the June Meeting:**

Elizabeth Suárez requested that topics for the June meeting be emailed to Kerra Jones at Kerra.Jones@denvergov.org this week.

Meeting concluded at 7:41 pm.