CAG Action Group Meeting Notes
August 17, 2004
(Herculaneum City Hall)

Members Present: Greg Bieber, John Chamis, Susan Lang, Catherine Malugen, Carol Miller, Tim Myers, Gerty O'Leary, Larry O'Leary, Leslie Warden, and Karen Whitfield

Visitors Present: Lauren Abele, Maxine Lipelis (Washington University School of Law) and BJ Eavy (University of Missouri Extension)

The meeting convened at 7:00 p.m.

Tim Myers brought photographs showing smoke coming from Doe Run and reported there was a strong metallic odor Saturday and Sunday (August 14 and 15). It will be important to cross check air monitoring on Broad Street for those dates. Some people had heard that Doe Run ceased production for a few days so the overall average of lead in the air would not exceed quarterly standards. The fact that the agencies are reporting that there is redeposition and that there are these incidents of reported smoke and odor demonstrate that remediation is not eliminating risk of health problems from lead.

There are reports of property owners feeling pressured to have their yards remediated. One reason why a property owner might object to yard excavation is because it could kill valuable trees such as the black oak. Also, debris is washed down into the sewers so they have to be unclogged. Some residents report that their yards are being excavated for a second time. Are the agencies aware of this?

Suggestions to create equity and support residents were:

- Ask agencies to ensure that damages caused by yard excavation would be covered
- At the general CAG meeting encourage property owners to fill out the complaint forms (City Hall)
- CAG (Problem Solving Priority Focus Group) will collect and document problems connected with yard remediation
- Hold EPA accountable for recontamination
    - How much money has been spent on clean-up?
    - How can residents live in limbo for another 10 years while more studies are conducted?
    - What will make Doe Run adhere to remediation protocols?
    - Should there be a video camera to monitor operations?
    - Why is Doe Run asking for re-occupation in the buy-out zone when the settlement agreement prohibits it?
    - Review the State Settlement Agreement to determine gaps (What does that agreement not cover that is presenting health or financial problems for Herculaneum residents?)

The relationship between CAG and Herculaneum Today and Tomorrow was discussed. Doe Run receives positive public relations coverage from participating in the revitalization planning.

A717 30278512 2.0
Superfund
0400

Does this (a) detract or re-focus from the clean-up efforts; and/or (b) divide the community so there are "two sides" instead of one united community voice?

The following considerations are relevant in defining the relationship among CAG, HTT, and Doe Run:

- *All* businesses were asked to participate in the Herculaneum visioning workshop.
- Doe Run, like any business or any individual, does what is best for its own good.
- Doe Run owns land in Herculaneum.
- Herculaneum Today and Tomorrow has no resources.
- Revitalization planning funded by EPA from a different source than EPA clean up funds.
- The visioning process that HTT promoted is done – to date, no project has been proposed.
- A discussion about a HTT website doesn't make as much sense as the City of Herculaneum having a website.
- The visioning process is tied to the City of Herculaneum's strategic plan (conducted by the Jefferson County Economic Development Corporation through funding from Gebhardt).
- Businesses have approached the City about a transportation development hub. Working with these businesses presents an opportunity for cost sharing and revenue generation.

Revitalization in principle is good. The question is whether revitalization activity is possible or advisable while contamination is still occurring. Does the focus on revitalization detract from clean-up efforts? This discussion highlighted the need for CAG to have goals. CAG is looking for **solutions** to all the issues discussed each month (road dust, interior lead standards, redeposition, buy-out, re-occupation, green space, discharge permits and slag pile alternatives) and wants **firm due dates** for these solutions to be in place.

To formulate goals, CAG Action Group suggested meeting 7:00 p.m. Tuesday September 7, 2004 at City Hall. Students from Washington University School of Law will help facilitate this planning session. Between now and then, people are encouraged to think about solutions they would like see happen by a specific date. Solutions fall into three categories: (1) Lead clean-up; (2) Property buy-out; and (3) Compliance with laws and standards. These goals would be brought to the general CAG meeting on September 21, 2004. CAG goals could then be conveyed to public officials and the media.

Agenda items for the September 21 General CAG meeting

- Yard excavations (fill out complaint forms; document pressure and additional costs/losses)
- Nomination of Larry O'Leary to the Core Leadership Team
- Support from EPA for a facilitator
- Presentation of goals (draft) for CAG approval

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.