

**Community Advisory Group (CAG)  
for the  
Omaha Lead Site**

Minutes for Meeting Held  
Wednesday, March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2004, 10:00 a.m.  
Omaha Public Schools TAC Building  
3215 Cuming Street, Room 406/408

---

**OLS CAG Members Present:**

Janet Bohm—*Citizen at Large*  
Janet Bonet—*Citizen at Large*  
Councilman Frank Brown—*City Council*  
Dr. Richard Brown—*Charles Drew Health Center*  
Bryant Burnett—*Environmental Protection Agency*  
Sue Casteel—*Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry*  
Todd Davis—*Nebraska Department of Environmental Quality*  
Jonah Deppe—*League of Women Voters and Citizen at Large*  
Connie Determan—*MFG, Inc.*  
Carole Woods Harris—*Douglas County Board of Commissioners*  
Clifton Jones—*U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development*  
Bob Litle—*Asarco*  
Jeff McDermott—*Union Pacific Railroad*  
Dr. Donna Polk-Primm—*Nebraska Urban Indian Health Coalition*  
Dr. Adi Pour—*Douglas County Health Department*  
Dr. Shireen Rajaram—*University of Nebraska, Omaha*  
Arson Rayford—*Omaha Housing Authority*  
Dr. Everett Reynolds—*NAACP*  
Chris Rodgers—*Mayor's Office*  
Rebecca Valdez—*Chicano Awareness Center*  
Warren Weaver—*City of Omaha*  
Cheryl Weston—*Lead Safe Omaha Coalition*

**Others Present:**

Siobhan Blackwell—*Creighton University*  
Todd Crawford—*U.S. Senator Chuck Hagel's Office*  
Mike Felix—*Nebraska Department of Environmental Quality*  
Erin Grace—*Omaha World-Herald*  
Barbara Ihle—*University of Nebraska, Omaha*  
Debbie Kring—*Environmental Protection Agency*  
Jan Lambert—*Environmental Protection Agency*  
Tim Langan—*Senator Synowiecki's Office*  
Stacy Meacham—*MFG, Inc.*  
Carrie Miller—*Douglas/Sarpy County Extension*  
Jennifer Rawley—*MFG, Inc.*

Steve Sanders—*Environmental Protection Agency*  
Marian Todd—*City of Omaha Planning Department*  
Todd Wyatt—*University of Nebraska Medical Center*

---

Ms. Council began the meeting by explaining that a South Omaha location was preferred, but a location could not be secured for the meeting. Ms. Council advised that Ms. Weston had secured a room at the Salem Baptist Church for the meeting on April 14<sup>th</sup> at 10:00 a.m. Ms. Council stated that the following CAG meeting, on April 28<sup>th</sup> (**Note: The meeting will be on April 29<sup>th</sup>**), would be held in South Omaha in the evening. The meeting location in South Omaha is to be announced. Ms. Council stated that Mr. Rodgers had suggested Metro Community College's South Omaha Campus as a South Omaha meeting location.

Ms. Council announced that in an effort to involve more of the public and parents, Ms. Janet Bohm and Mr. Del Gines had been invited to join the CAG. Mr. Gines could not attend this meeting.

Introductions were made of those in attendance.

Before proceeding with the meeting agenda, Ms. Weston wanted to discuss something that had happened at a recent meeting of the Governor's Omaha Advisory Council for Lead Safe Neighborhoods. At that meeting, an offer was made by the Nebraska Department of Environmental Quality to provide a facilitator for CAG meetings. Ms. Weston stated that members of the CAG that were present at the meeting had made it clear that a new facilitator was not necessary and the offer was not appropriate. Ms. Weston stated that any problems the CAG may be encountering were due more to trying to catch up and get on the same learning curve versus problems with the facilitator. Ms. Weston stated that she thought the facilitator was doing fine with the group and suggested the group keep the meetings moving forward. Ms. Council asked if there were any other comments. Ms. Bonet stated that everyone on the CAG is to be complimented for his or her efforts and that an additional facilitator is not necessary.

Ms. Council asked for any corrections or additions to the minutes from the CAG meeting on March 17<sup>th</sup>, 2004. Mr. Burnett stated that on page 6 of 9, the text should read that Mr. Gunn replied that the memorandum only applies to "time critical" removals, not "emergency" removals. Mr. Burnett added that on page 7 of 9 "emergency" should be changed to "time critical." Ms. Council asked if Mr. Burnett offered the corrections on Mr. Gunn's behalf (as Mr. Burnett was not present at the CAG meeting on March 17<sup>th</sup>, 2004). Mr. Burnett stated that the corrections were on behalf of Mr. Gunn.

Ms. Bonet asked Mr. Burnett to explain the difference between time critical emergency removals. Mr. Burnett replied that an example of an emergency removal would be removals done in response to an emergency spill.

Ms. Weston stated that on page 6 in the 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph, the Reverend's last name is Gould. Mr. Rodgers stated that on page 7, the phrase "would not be wiped out" should read, "could not be wiped out." Ms. Council added that "administration" should read "current administration."

Ms. Deppe moved to approve the minutes with corrections. Ms. Bonet seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Council stated that CAG members would receive an approved copy of the minutes. A copy will also be sent to EPA for submission into the Administrative Record.

Ms. Council reminded the CAG that the website is still under construction and not yet available to the public. She stated that comments from the CAG, made at the last meeting, regarding the CAG website have been taken into account and that no new comments had been received since the last meeting. She asked if there were any more content issues that needed to be addressed before finalizing the website.

Ms. Bonet asked if the website can be modified after the website is made available to the public. Ms. Council replied that it could be modified at any time. Ms. Council also requested that neighborhood photos be forwarded to Ms. Determan. Ms. Determan added that MFG, Inc. is working with Ms. Valdez to translate the homepage and, based on the amount of interest in the site, additional information may be translated in the future.

Ms. Weston moved to approve the website, stipulating that changes could be made in the future. Ms. Bonet seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Ms. Council reviewed the documents distributed to the CAG for the meeting. She stated that the Washington D.C. article was handed out because it discussed the effects of introducing chloramine into the water system, as has been done in Omaha. Dr. Pour stated that she had sent a letter of request to MUD and NHHSS to look into the issue of adding chloramine to the water. Dr. Pour stated that at this time Omaha has complied with the water standard for lead; however, she added that because of the concern raised in Washington D.C., MUD should do some additional sampling. Dr. Pour has made this request of MUD. Ms. Bonet thanked Dr. Pour.

Ms. Council stated that the "Lead Poisoning Prevention Program in New York City" handout was provided to the CAG because it describes a proactive comprehensive approach that effectively reduced blood lead levels in New York City.

Ms. Council stated that one of the questions raised by the CAG at a previous meeting was in regard to feasibility studies. An example of a feasibility study (for Leadville, Colorado) was provided to the CAG. Ms. Council suggested that CAG members read the executive summary at a minimum. She said that the executive summary explains the purpose of a feasibility study.

Ms. Council stated that an example of a Proposed Plan (for Leadville, Colorado) was also provided to the CAG. This Proposed Plan recommended selecting an alternative that included a multi-media plan addressing many potential sources of lead.

Ms. Council reminded CAG members to review the Community Involvement Plan and provide comments to EPA by Monday, April 5<sup>th</sup>. She stated the handout titled "Community Involvement Plan Questions" outlines the review that MFG, Inc. performed and raises questions about addressing all concerns identified by the community and identifying Spanish-speaking areas.

Ms. Council asked the CAG to review the handout entitled, "Risk Assessment Questions."

Ms. Weston asked if the Community Involvement Plan would be final after April 5<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Kring stated that the Community Involvement Plan has total flexibility and that changes can be made to the Community Involvement Plan at any time.

Ms. Council stated that an example of a Community Involvement Plan had been provided to the CAG as a handout for the meeting for comparative purposes.

Dr. Pour stated that the short reviews put together by MFG, Inc. were tremendous and encouraged the group to read each list of questions closely. She stated that, although the group may not always agree with all information, MFG, Inc. has the expertise to point out to the CAG what important concerns and questions may need to be considered.

Ms. Council invited Mr. Rayford to provide an update on public housing issues. Mr. Rayford stated that a list was requested (by EPA?) and that any additional information would have to be requested. He further stated that a request would need to be sent to the Executive Director of the Omaha Housing Authority.

Dr. Brown asked who made the request to the Omaha Housing Authority. Mr. Rayford stated that whoever is in charge of the testing made the request. Dr. Polk-Primm stated that she thought that the question regarding who made the request is what led to the current discussion. Dr. Polk-Primm reminded the CAG that Dr. Brown was finding children at the Charles Drew Health Center with high blood lead levels, and Dr. Brown did not know if the children lived in the nearby public housing and if so, if that housing had been tested. Dr. Polk-Primm asked Mr. Rayford if he was saying that there must be a request put into Mr. Brad Ashford, Omaha Housing Authority Executive Director.

Mr. Rayford stated that he thought that cooperation had already occurred to allow sampling of public housing properties. He added that a request would only need to be made for any additional sampling.

Dr. Brown stated that he has a list of 46 children with high blood lead levels. He asked if the soil had been tested at Pleasant View, the public housing area adjacent to the Charles

Drew Health Center. Mr. Burnett stated that the soil there had not been tested yet, but is scheduled to be tested shortly.

Dr. Brown made a formal request to prioritize the housing project next to the Charles Drew Health Center as well as any other large public housing complexes. Dr. Brown suggested tomorrow or next week. Mr. Burnett stated that EPA would prioritize those sites. Mr. Burnett asked if the children with high blood lead levels Dr. Brown referred to have been reported to the Douglas County Health Department. Dr. Brown stated that the children had been reported to the Douglas County Health Department.

Mr. Burnett stated since the children had been identified and sent to the Douglas County Health Department, EPA would have the address of the children. Ms. Weston stated that the address will be to a specific unit and will not indicate if it is in the Pleasant View housing complex.

Dr. Polk-Primm asked if just the individual addresses of the children with high blood lead levels would receive soil testing. Mr. Burnett stated that the entire housing area would be tested. Dr. Polk-Primm asked if EPA had an example of how sampling has been done at a public housing area. Dr. Polk-Primm also asked how EPA was proposing to perform soil removals at public housing areas. Mr. Doolan stated that at any type of complex, EPA would sample the entire common area and would remove any area exceeding the cleanup number.

Ms. Council stated that there appeared to be a problem with coordination. She asked if someone could be assigned to oversee this matter to ensure coordination with the Omaha Housing Authority to match the children's addresses with particular housing complexes. This way, if a child is identified with a high blood level living in Pleasant View, testing of all of Pleasant View would occur.

Dr. Rajaram asked if 10 or 15 µg/dL was being used to define an elevated blood lead levels. Dr. Pour replied that 10 µg/dL is the threshold. Dr. Brown stated that the children identified at the Charles Drew Health Center have blood lead levels at or above 10 µg/dL. Dr. Rajaram asked if priority for sampling is given for children above 10 µg/dL, not 15 µg/dL. Mr. Burnett stated that 10 µg/dL was correct. Ms. Weston stated that the 15 µg/dL threshold is used for case management.

Dr. Pour stated that part of the difficulty is caused by database confidentiality. She stated that the CAG needs to ask EPA to do broader sampling if one child is identified within one of the large public housing complexes. Mr. Burnett stated that that is the current methodology used by EPA at public housing complexes and apartments.

Ms. Deppe asked if the Douglas County Health Department could ask parents to sign an agreement stating that it is okay to pass information on to the Omaha Housing Authority. Dr. Pour replied that she could not distinguish which children's addresses are Omaha Housing Authority properties.

Dr. Polk-Primm asked what action would be needed to have EPA test all public housing. Mr. Burnett stated that EPA is currently testing public housing. Dr. Pour asked if public housing where there have been not children with elevated blood lead levels identified is being tested. Mr. Burnett said that yes, public housing areas without children with elevated blood lead levels are being tested. He said that the elevated blood lead levels are only used to prioritize yards for soil removal and that it is separate from sampling activities. Mr. Doolan stated that EPA had requested a list of all public housing and that EPA is in the process of testing all public housing.

Ms. Council asked if EPA could provide an update of sampling that has occurred at public housing at the next CAG meeting. EPA agreed to provide the update.

Ms. Kring stated that the priority placed on Omaha Housing Authority properties is comparable to the priority placed on daycares. Dr. Reynolds asked why daycares were sampled first. Mr. Burnett stated that daycares were sampled first because daycares are a known place where children congregate.

Ms. Council invited Ms. Weston to provide an update on census data. Ms. Weston stated that from what she has looked at, there are some questions that need to be asked of EPA. She stated the Mr. Bahnke has made himself available to go over the questions. Her goal is to meet with Mr. Bahnke before the next meeting.

Dr. Polk-Primm gave an update on the repository subcommittee, stating that the subcommittee's biggest issue to tackle is making sure that a broad representation of sites is established and that language used in documents is understandable to the public. She stated that the website will be an excellent resource for the public. Dr. Polk-Primm added that she and Ms. Determan would continue to work on establishing repositories.

Ms. Council stated that subcommittee meeting times will be posted on the website in the future and that email notification of meeting times will also be sent to CAG members.

Ms. Blackwell stated that many people do not have access to the Internet. She added that it might be helpful to create a list of places people can go for public Internet access. Ms. Blackwell was asked to work with Dr. Polk-Primm to identify public Internet access sites.

Dr. Polk-Primm stated that the Washington Post has a special website devoted to lead issues and suggested that the Omaha World-Herald do the same. Ms. Weston stated that the Omaha World-Herald has such a site and suggested that the Omaha World-Herald provide a link to the CAG website.

Mr. Wyatt asked if EPA included cigarette smoke exposure in the demographic survey. Mr. Doolan stated that EPA did not include cigarette smoke exposure in the Risk Assessment.

Mr. Doolan presented an overview of the Superfund process. A handout was distributed.

Mr. McDermott asked if the Potentially Responsible Parties search is ongoing. Mr. Sanders replied that EPA has not recently received any new information. Mr. McDermott asked about the properties listed in the Dynamac report. Mr. Sanders stated that EPA would sample around all of the properties listed in the Dynamac report to search for fugitive contamination.

Ms. Determan presented a flowchart explaining the Superfund process and how the different issues that the CAG has been discussing (such as sources, blood lead data, bioavailability, speciation, etc.) fit into this process.

Ms. Determan stated that, at the next meeting, Dr. Pour would present blood lead data. Dr. Pour stated that it is important to look at what the present levels are and that she would be presenting 2003 blood lead data.

Dr. Polk-Primm stated that she would like to see information regarding the effects of lead on children, such as the relationship between lead and behavioral problems.

Ms. Weston thanked MFG for the flowchart, stating that it would help everyone understand the Superfund process. Ms. Bonet asked what the color-coding on the flowchart represented. Ms. Bonet asked if the color-coding was to rank importance of items or to show what goes into each step. Ms. Determan replied that the colors do not represent importance. The colors show what documents/information go into each step.

Ms. Council stated that the CAG needed to identify what the CAG wants to provide to EPA before the release of the Feasibility Study. Ms. Bonet asked what the last meeting date would be before the release of the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study. Ms. Council replied that April 14<sup>th</sup>, 2004 would be the last meeting before the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study draft is released. Mr. Doolan stated that the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study would not be final until the Record of Decision is signed. Ms. Bonet asked if input needed to be provided to EPA by April 14<sup>th</sup> for comments to be considered when writing the draft Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study. Mr. Sanders stated that Ms. Bonet's statement was accurate.

Ms. Council stated that EPA had made it clear that there would be opportunity to comment after documents are released, but stated that the CAG has asked about providing comments before documents are published. Ms. Council stated that with this in mind, the agenda for April 14<sup>th</sup> would include any of the issues and concerns the CAG would like EPA to take into consideration when preparing the Draft Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study.

Ms. Weston asked if the Community Involvement Plan could be added to the agenda for the next meeting. Ms. Council replied that the Community Involvement Plan would be added to the agenda.

With the next item on the agenda being bioavailability, Ms. Meacham asked if, in the best interest of time, a separate meeting could be held with EPA and interested CAG members to discuss questions on the bioavailability study. Mr. Doolan asked if Ms. Meacham was speaking on behalf of Union Pacific Railroad or on behalf of the CAG. Mr. Doolan stated that EPA was concerned about how the bioavailability questions provided by MFG. were presented in the package to the CAG. Mr. Doolan stated that he did not know if EPA should be discussing the issues with the CAG or with Union Pacific Railroad, and stated that EPA did not intend to provide a response to the comments. Ms. Determan stated that the purpose of the handout is to assist the CAG and provide the CAG with information and questions the CAG may want to address.

Mr. Doolan stated that he could briefly discuss the bioavailability study at the present time. Mr. Doolan provided a handout summarizing results of various bioavailability studies and testing that has been completed. Mr. Doolan stated that there are two ways to test bioavailability: either by expensive juvenile swine studies or by a leaching procedure. Mr. Doolan explained that for the juvenile swine study, two samples from four yards were used. Mr. Doolan explained that the relative bioavailability was determined from the experiment and that the absolute bioavailability is calculated as half of the relative bioavailability. The absolute bioavailability is used in the IEUBK model. Mr. Doolan stated that because the bioavailability of the two samples did not agree, the leaching procedure was performed.

Mr. Litle asked EPA what the default bioavailability percentage is that is used in the IEUBK model. Mr. Doolan stated 30% is the default. Mr. Doolan added that because Omaha's bioavailability value was determined to be higher than the default, the cleanup level would be driven down. Ms. Meacham asked if EPA had selected a number to use in the Risk Assessment. Mr. Doolan stated that Ms. Sue Dempsey used 44% in the Risk Assessment. He stated that he did not know how the outcome would change if 40% was used.

Ms. Weston asked if a cleanup level has ever been selected that was below 400 parts per million. Mr. Doolan replied that he did not know of any case where a number lower than 400 parts per million had been selected. Ms. Weston stated that if a number were selected below 400 parts per million, it would create more steps for EPA to go through, which would make the process take longer. Ms. Weston stated that these are the questions that the CAG has and stated that EPA is here to answer them.

Mr. Doolan stated that other community groups have provided official letters to the EPA and that EPA prefers letters. Ms. Council stated that information provided in the packets is sent to the CAG, not to EPA. The information sent is for CAG members to consider.

Dr. Pour proposed that the bioavailability questions provided by MFG, Inc. be forwarded to EPA from the CAG.

Dr. Pour asked how the samples were compared in the bioavailability study, given that the concentrations of lead in the samples were so similar. Mr. Doolan stated that the soil

concentration does not matter because the study was based on a dosing schedule, meaning that different doses are administered from one sample.

Dr. Pour asked if the methodology used in the bioavailability study is a peer-reviewed procedure. Mr. Doolan stated that the swine study protocol is peer-reviewed and was developed by EPA. Mr. Doolan added that the test tube testing has not been peer-reviewed.

Ms. Council asked if there was a motion to present the bioavailability handout to EPA from the CAG. Dr. Pour moved to submit the bioavailability handout to EPA from the CAG. Ms. Weston seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Ms. Council asked if EPA would like a letter to accompany the bioavailability handout. Mr. Doolan stated that he would like a letter from the CAG.

Mr. Litle stated that EPA had mentioned a number of things that could be done in lieu of soil removals. Mr. Doolan stated that such activities could include education, intervention, cleaning programs, a HEPA vacuum program, paint remediation, etc. Mr. Doolan stated that at the Jasper County Superfund Site, there were many different sources of lead, so an extensive health education program was created to address related concerns.

Ms. Council asked what the 30% default bioavailability value meant. Ms. Bonet asked how EPA came up with 30%. Mr. Doolan replied that the default value means that it is assumed that the lead in soil is 30% bioavailable. Mr. Doolan stated that this value is an average of sites across the country.

Dr. Rajaram asked if EPA would be running the IEUBK model with the default and again with the 44% bioavailability to see the difference in the outcome. Mr. Doolan stated that he did not know, but that if the model were run using all default values, the outcome would be a cleanup level around 400 parts per million.

Ms. Weston asked if EPA was looking at various alternatives for Omaha, other than soil removal and phosphate treatment. Mr. Doolan stated that he did not think other alternatives were being evaluated. Ms. Weston reiterated that she was asking if EPA is planning on looking at other alternatives, such as the ones included in the Leadville Proposed Plan (provided as a handout to the meeting). Mr. Burnett stated that EPA is going to look at the alternatives identified in the Proposed Plan handed out.

Ms. Bonet moved for the CAG to submit a recommendation to the Governor's Advisory Council to utilize funding from the Target Areas Program and Reinvestment Rehabilitation Program to address external paint. Ms. Bonet added that the request would include providing siding and window replacement, as needed, at least within the Superfund site. Ms. Weston seconded the motion. Dr. Polk-Primm stated that the letter should make clear where this funding would come from to support this effort. Ms. Bonet stated that the funding is currently available through the TAP and RAP program. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Council stated that a draft of the letter would be presented to the CAG at the next meeting.

Ms. Council stated that the next meeting would be held on Wednesday, April 14<sup>th</sup>, 2004 at 10:00 a.m. at the Salem Baptist Church.

Handouts Provided for the Meeting (March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2004):

*Approved Minutes from 03/03/04* (Hardcopy provided by MFG, Inc.)

*Draft Minutes from 03/17/04* (Hardcopy provided by MFG, Inc.)

*D.C. Lead Tests Cast Doubt on EPA Standards* (Hardcopy provided by MFG, Inc.)

*Preventing Lead Poisoning in New York City* (Hardcopy provided by MFG, Inc.)

*Revised Residential Soils Feasibility Study, California Gulch Superfund Site, Leadville, CO* (Hardcopy provided by MFG, Inc.)

*Proposed Plan for Operable Unit 9, California Gulch Superfund Site, Leadville, CO* (Hardcopy provided by MFG, Inc.)

*Risk Assessment Questions* (Hardcopy provided by MFG, Inc.)

*Questions Regarding EPA's Relative Bioavailability of Lead in Test Materials from a Superfund Site in Omaha, Nebraska* (Hardcopy provided by MFG, Inc.)

*Community Involvement Plan Questions* (Hardcopy provided by MFG, Inc.)

*Sample Community Involvement Plan* (Hardcopy provided by MFG, Inc.)

*Sample Letter to Homeowners en Español* (Example of letter distributed with sampling results)(Hardcopy provided by MFG, Inc. on behalf of Union Pacific Railroad)

*Omaha Lead Source Area Boundary* (map)(Hardcopy provided by EPA)

*Feasibility Study, Residential Yard Soil, Oronogo-Duenweg Mining Belt Site* (Hardcopy provided by EPA)

*Record of Decision, Oronogo-Duenweg Mining Belt Site* (Hardcopy provided by EPA)

*Proposed Plan, Oronogo-Duenweg Mining Belt Site* (Hardcopy provided by EPA)

*Omaha Lead Site Superfund Remedial Response Process* (Hardcopy provided by MFG, Inc.)

*Secondhand Smoke Exposure and Blood Lead Levels in U.S. Children* (Hardcopy provided by MFG, Inc.)

*EPA Cleanup Ineffective* (Hardcopy distributed at meeting)

*2004 National Lead Poisoning Prevention Partners' Conference* (Hardcopy distributed at meeting)

*U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Discussion of the Superfund Process* (Hardcopy distributed at meeting)

Attachments to Minutes:

Sign-In Sheet (hardcopy to be delivered)