

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

Minutes for Meeting Held  
Wednesday, April 14th, 2004, 10:00 a.m.  
Salem Baptist Church  
3131 Lake Street, Classroom 4

---

**OLS CAG Members Present:**

Janet Bohm—*Citizen at Large*  
Janet Bonet—*Citizen at Large*  
Sue Casteel—*Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry*  
Tanya Cook—*Governor's Omaha Advisory Council for Lead Safe Neighborhoods*  
Brenda Council—*Facilitator*  
Todd Davis—*Nebraska Department of Environmental Quality*  
Jonah Deppe—*League of Women Voters and Citizen at Large*  
Connie Determan—*MFG, Inc.*  
Barba Edwards—*League of Women Voters*  
Terrie Jackson-Miller—*Omaha Chamber of Commerce*  
Clifton Jones—*U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development*  
Robin Kammandel—*Metro Omaha Medical Society*  
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*  
Chris Rodgers—*Mayor's Office*  
Karen Shepard—*OPS School Board*  
Marian Todd—*City of Omaha Planning Department*  
Rebecca Valdez—*Chicano Awareness Center*  
Vernon Waldren—*Douglas/Sarpy County Extension*  
Warren Weaver—*City of Omaha*  
Cheryl Weston—*Lead Safe Omaha Coalition*

**Others Present:**

Todd Crawford—*U.S. Senator Chuck Hagel's Office*  
Karen Davis—*Congressman Lee Terry's Office*  
Mike Felix—*Nebraska Department of Environmental Quality*  
Nancy Gaarder—*Omaha World-Herald*  
Lucy Garza—*Office of Latino/Latin American Studies, University of Nebraska, Omaha*  
Dennis Grams—*Olsson Associates*  
Barbara Ihle—*University of Nebraska, Omaha*  
Charles Isom—*Congressman Lee Terry's Office*  
Debbie Kring—*Environmental Protection Agency*

Jan Lambert—*Environmental Protection Agency*  
Pete Lieben—*Guild Communications*  
Dan McGray—*ESI*  
Stacy Meacham—*MFG, Inc.*  
Anna Odipo-Nyambok—*Citizen at Large*  
Irene Perez—*Citizen at Large*  
Jennifer Rawley—*MFG, Inc.*  
Steve Sanders—*Environmental Protection Agency*  
John Sempek—*Citizen at Large*  
Reid Steinkraus—*Douglas County Health Department*

---

Ms. Council began the meeting by thanking Salem Baptist Church for providing the meeting space.

Introductions were made.

Ms. Council announced that the next CAG meeting would be an evening meeting in South Omaha on April 29<sup>th</sup> at Omaha South High School. Ms. Council stated that a CAG member had requested that in addition to the April 29<sup>th</sup> evening meeting, the CAG also hold its regularly scheduled meeting on April 28<sup>th</sup>. The Bob Campos training center in South Omaha was suggested as the location for the April 28<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Dr. Polk-Primm commented that she did not agree with having a separate meeting on April 28<sup>th</sup>. She stated that one of the reasons for going to south Omaha is to give the citizens an opportunity to participate and observe CAG meetings. She stated that the planned evening meeting is to replace the regularly scheduled meeting, so there would not be a need for two meetings.

Ms. Valdez agreed with Dr. Polk-Primm's comments. She stated that the purpose of the evening meeting is to give the community an opportunity to come and observe one of the CAG meetings.

Ms. Weston stated that she thinks it is important to have the evening meeting to inform the public of what the CAG is doing, but she feels that the group needs the regularly scheduled meeting as a working meeting to prepare for the evening meeting.

Dr. Polk-Primm made a motion to have the April 29<sup>th</sup> evening meeting at 7:00 p.m. serve as the regular CAG meeting.

Ms. Bonet stated she was confused about the purposes of the two meetings. She stated that she would like to get business done at the Wednesday meeting, and if the purpose of the evening meeting is to allow the public to be allowed, she thought Cheryl had a valid point.

Ms. Valdez stated that she thought the purpose of holding evening meetings was to allow the public to observe.

Ms. Weston stated that it was said that once the CAG got established, evening meetings would be held. She stated that she thought that if we held a meeting in the evening and asked the public to observe without participating, the individuals present might have a problem.

Dr. Polk-Primm noted that she had been coming to CAG meetings since February and did not feel the need to have a meeting to prepare for another meeting. She stated that the CAG was having the meeting in South Omaha because the CAG has not had any other meetings there.

A vote was taken on Dr. Polk-Primm's motion of having the April 29<sup>th</sup> evening meeting at 7:00 p.m. serve as the regular CAG meeting. Votes were counted with 10 in favor, 4 opposed, and 4 abstaining. The motion carried.

Ms. Council noted that the CAG would determine the agenda for the evening meeting during today's meeting and would include time on the agenda at the end of the April 29<sup>th</sup> meeting for public questions.

Ms. Council asked for any corrections or additions to the minutes from the CAG meeting on March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2004. Dr. Pour noted that on Page 5, sixth paragraph, the text should read 10 µg/dL versus 15 µg/dL. Ms. Deppe moved to approve the minutes with corrections. Dr. Pour seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Council stated that a CAG member had approached her about the possibility of conducting a Saturday morning "retreat" for the CAG, and she asked the members for their thoughts on this idea. Ms. Kammandel asked what would be the purpose of a retreat. Ms. Deppe commented that one of the things she'd noticed is that not all CAG members are on the same page. She stated that she thought a retreat or extended meeting would give people a better understanding about the issues related to EPA and health. She further stated that she felt it would help the group get on the same page.

Ms. Bonet stated that her Saturdays are booked for the next several months, but stated that when EPA's Proposed Plan comes out, the CAG will need more than a two-hour meeting to go through the Proposed Plan. She further stated that she thought something like a retreat is needed, but Saturdays are not a preferred day.

Ms. Council suggested that Ms. Determan send out a survey to the group regarding potential meeting times and dates. She stated that the survey would include options for meetings between 8:00 AM and Noon and 1:00 PM and 5:00 PM.

Ms. Council went through the meeting handouts.

Ms. Cook noted that the correct addressee for the letter regarding funding for remediating lead-based paint should be the Governor's Omaha Advisory Council for Lead Safe Neighborhoods.

Ms. Todd stated that she thinks the letter is well written, but she wanted to call attention to the specific funding. She noted that this funding is already happening. She explained that the consolidated plan already includes Community Development Block Grant funding and some money to the Target Area Program (TAP) and Reinvestment Area Program (RAP).

Ms. Council asked if funding for window replacements and siding options are available under the current TAP and RAP. Ms. Todd stated that these options would depend on the individual unit. She noted that the programs are broader than just window replacements and siding.

Ms. Council asked if the letter should instead be phrased to ask for *additional* funding versus just funding. Ms. Bonet affirmed this and stated that additional funding was a better choice of wording. She further stated that she had been told that funding for siding is not currently allowed under these programs.

Ms. Todd stated that the funding does not address the large lead site needs. She stated that lead hazard control funding is needed. Proposals for those types of funds are typically targeted at households with children at risk. She noted that her office will look for support from the Governor's council or whoever would support that application. She again stated that this would still not address the broader need.

Ms. Council asked Ms. Todd to provide the CAG a timeline in terms of comment and submission periods for the different applicable grants.

Dr. Pour asked if the TAP money is available for interior lead-based paint.

Ms. Todd replied that both TAP and RAP address interior and exterior rehabilitation, including lead-based paint. She noted that TAP is more closely managed by city planning, while RAP involves a combination of city funding and private lending. Under RAP, the homeowner has more control in things such as selection of contractors and direction of the work.

Ms. Council asked if the combined funding for the TAP and RAP programs for 2004 was \$1 million. Ms. Todd replied that TAP funding for 2004 is \$750,000 and RAP funding is \$225,000. Ms. Bonet asked how many houses per year these programs serve. Ms. Bonet stated that she thought the number wasn't many, maybe around just 10 or 15. Ms. Todd stated she did not know the numbers, but could get that information for the group. She noted that the funds are usually for a total home rehabilitation, and therefore, only a limited number of homes are rehabilitated in a given year.

Ms. Council asked that under the assumption that a home needed only replacement of exterior lead-based paint, what would the likelihood be of getting funding under these programs. Ms. Todd replied that the TAP is generally for substantial rehabilitation whereas the RAP is more for fixing violations. She further stated that both programs are for more than just siding and windows.

Ms. Kammandel asked how homeowners are made aware of the availability of these funds. Ms. Todd noted that the City does marketing through neighborhood organizations. Some general notices of funding are published in newspapers and are targeted at income eligible families.

Mr. Doolan asked what the qualifications are for eligibility. Ms. Todd stated that it is for homeowners with low to moderate income.

Ms. Bonet asked how many homes are on the waiting list. Ms. Todd stated that she did not bring that information. Ms. Council asked Ms. Todd to provide that information to the group at a later meeting. She stated that the intent of the letter the CAG is writing is to make funding available, principally for siding and window replacements. She stated that the CAG could request in their letter that funding be directed through TAP and RAP and request that a Lead Hazard Control Program be specifically developed to assist with these items under the Community Development Block Grants.

Ms. Bonet stated that this was a way to get the ball rolling and that TAP and RAP are currently the only programs to do this under. She stated that the group is not limiting itself by sending this letter and can always write another letter later. She explained that the current letter is being addressed to the Governor's Omaha Advisory Council for Lead Safe Neighborhoods because of its make-up of bankers, realtors, etc.

Ms. Cook then explained that the Governor's Omaha Advisory Council for Lead Safe Neighborhoods is comprised of 28 people. She stated that every member does not attend each and every meeting. She stated that the Council includes representatives from the federal delegation, the mayor's office, people with real estate interests, and business owners. She stated that one role of the group is to educate the public and that the charge is to advise the Governor on the status of EPA's progress at the Omaha Lead Site. The Governor's Council was something that the Governor asked be developed.

Ms. Council asked if the letter should be addressed directly to the Governor with a copy to the Governor's Council. Ms. Cook agreed with this and stated that copies should also be directed to the directors of NDEQ and HHSR&L. Ms. Bonet asked if a copy should also be sent to HUD. Ms. Cook stated that she thought the HUD contact to send the letter to is named Stan Quy. Ms. Weston recommended that the letter also be copied to Mayor Fahey. Mr. Rodgers stated that the copy should go to the city planning director with a copy to the mayor's office. He further stated that in the letter, it would be worth mentioning that the CAG would like to see separate funding set up for these items.

Ms. Todd stated that she appreciated Ms. Bonet's leadership with this task, but felt that the CAG needed to step back one step. She stated that she thought any program would need to be based on an inspection first that would make sure that lead hazards are actually present before funding is released.

Ms. Council stated that another draft of the letter would be written to include a request that funding be established for a Lead Hazard Control Program utilizing Community Development Block Grant funds and whatever other funds are available to the City and State. She stated that the new draft would be emailed to all members for review. If no comments are received, the letter will be sent to the Governor, with copies to the previously mentioned parties.

Ms. Council then continued with the summary of handouts.

Ms. Casteel added that she brought copies of articles on effects of lead on behavior in response to a request made at the last CAG meeting for this type of information.

Mr. Isom from Congressman Terry's office then distributed a copy of a letter that had been written to the Congressman as a follow-up to a meeting Congressman Terry had requested with EPA regarding the Omaha Lead Site.

Ms. Bonet gave thanks to the Omaha World-Herald for keeping the issue in the newspaper and noted that the paper serves as an important source of information.

Ms. Council then asked EPA for an update on testing at public housing.

Mr. Doolan stated that all public housing would be sampled within the next few days. He stated that EPA worked with Frank Brown, Warren Weaver, and Brad Ashford to get lists of housing and that the numbers to date indicate 125 public housing properties. This count includes buildings and units. Each building counts as a residence. Large common areas and play areas are being sampled. He stated that EPA covered all areas children play in, and although the analysis is not complete, as of this morning, no properties tested have qualified for time-critical soil removal. He stated that even though 13 children with elevated blood lead levels were identified in these properties, soils tested at these properties are very low in lead content.

Ms. Shepard asked what kind of history is taken when a child with a high blood lead level is identified. She asked if former residences, day cares, relative's homes that the child visits, etc. are identified. Mr. Steinkraus noted that the Douglas County Health Department conducts a very extensive history for all children identified.

Ms. Shepard asked if the additional properties that the child spends time at (or has spent time at in the past) are tested. Mr. Steinkraus stated that soil at these properties is not tested.

Dr. Polk-Primm pointed out that other lead sources besides soil could be the cause of the elevated blood lead for a particular child and noted that in this area, lead-based paint is a huge problem. Dr. Pour clarified that the Douglas County Health Department continues looking until they find the potential sources of exposure.

Ms. Weston asked if any of the children Dr. Brown was tracking (and had asked about at a previous CAG meeting) were identified in the properties EPA tested. Mr. Doolan stated that he did not know. Mr. Doolan stated that Mr. Steinkraus had given EPA addresses for 13 children with elevated blood levels. Mr. Steinkraus stated that the 13 children he referred to EPA were related to public housing. He stated that Dr. Brown would need to provide information to crosscheck to see if those kids are in public housing. Mr. Doolan stated that EPA had not received anything from Dr. Brown. Ms. Council stated that she would talk to Dr. Brown to determine if he had given his records to anyone. Mr. Rayford stated that there is a confidentiality issue on both sides that needed to be worked out.

Ms. Weston asked Mr. Steinkraus if the Douglas County Health Department provides the addresses of all children with blood lead levels at 10 µg/dL and above to the EPA. Mr. Steinkraus reiterated that children with blood lead levels 10 µg/dL and above are referred to EPA. Ms. Weston then clarified that at 15 µg/dL, the Douglas County Health Department looks into a child's history and conducts follow-up. Dr. Pour affirmed that this is correct.

Ms. Kring stated that to her recollection, Dr. Brown was tracking 43 children at his facility with elevated blood lead levels, and he wanted to know if any of these children were from public housing. Ms. Council repeated that she would talk to Dr. Brown to determine the status of this issue.

Ms. Council then asked for a report from the census subcommittee.

Ms. Weston stated that she would submit a written summary to the CAG regarding her review of the census data and information supplied by EPA. She stated that Mr. Bahnke of EPA needed to get back with her on several questions and that she would include his responses in her written summary to the group.

She stated that one of the questions that came up was the difference in "properties" versus "population". She stated that the hazard-ranking source appeared to be based on population, but EPA has continually referred to 65,000 *properties*. She questioned if this reference should have instead been to 65,000 *residents* (not residences).

She stated that according to Mr. Bahnke, at that time, EPA needed an estimate of properties, and their contractor, Black and Veatch, had told EPA there were 65,000 properties. Ms. Weston stated that the EPA's use of population numbers in order to determine the area of observed contamination was misleading. Discussions had been centered on 65,000 properties but the CAG is now being told there are only 37,000 properties. She stated that the data indicated that the number of children under age 7 has

also been drastically reduced. She questioned how this could have happened and stated that she did not think it was consistent.

Ms. Weston went on to state that EPA has not been clear in past presentations regarding the status of superfund actions. She acknowledged that Mr. Doolan had once commented that the census information is complex, but given the correct information, she felt that the group should be able to understand it. She stated that EPA needed to present things more clearly and that based on the inconsistencies she was finding, she is now concerned about the accuracy of the EPA's Proposed Plan.

Dr. Rajaram asked if the initial census estimate of 65,000 was based on the 1990 census and the latest estimates based on the 2000 census, and, if so, if this could explain the differences.

Ms. Weston stated that there was a big difference, but the biggest difference is between number of properties versus number of residents. Ms. Council stated that it sounded like there was confusion between the terms "residents" and "residences". Ms. Council then moved on asking for a report from the repository subcommittee.

Dr. Polk-Primm noted that the subcommittee had a wonderful meeting that included Mr. Bahnke of the EPA. She summarized a couple of key points. First, she noted that EPA's repository would be kept separate from the CAG's. She stated that the CAG would provide materials from each meeting in binders to be placed at each of the repository locations. She stated that the subcommittee had also agreed that a repository is needed on the western side of the site at the Willa Cather Library. She stated that the subcommittee had also talked about setting up smaller repositories (educational outlets) at critical sites throughout the community.

Dr. Polk-Primm continued her summary stating that her favorite idea is the use of kiosks, placed in popular public areas, to get information out. She asked the group for any other suggestions for disseminating information and asked that people provide suggestions for the educational outlet locations. Ms. Deppe stated that she thought the kiosk idea was a great one and asked what the group thought about setting one up at an upcoming health fair on May 15<sup>th</sup> at Omaha North High School.

Ms. Council asked the group if they would like to have the CAG actually set up a booth at the upcoming health fair, which is being hosted by Sisters Together. Ms. Deppe volunteered to chair a subcommittee leading this effort. She made a motion for the CAG to develop a booth for the health fair and Dr. Polk-Primm seconded. The motion carried unanimously. Ms. Deppe requested that anyone interested in helping with the booth contact her.

Ms. Council then stated that the CAG website is up and running. She noted that the front page is currently being translated into Spanish. She stated that if anyone had suggestions for the website, to give them to her or Ms. Determan.

Ms. Weston asked if EPA could provide a link on their website to the CAG website. Ms. Kring stated that it could be done and then asked if the CAG would create a reciprocal link to the EPA website.

Dr. Polk-Primm commented that she may have volunteer staff available that could translate information for the website into other languages.

Next, Dr. Pour gave a presentation to the group titled Childhood Lead Poisoning in Douglas County.

Following Dr. Pour's presentation, Ms. Kring asked if there was a way to measure how outreach activities have added to educational levels in curtailing lead levels in the community. Dr. Pour stated that she did not have that data and the only way to assess that would be through a subjective survey. Dr. Pour stated that based on a local survey conducted regarding hazard concerns, Omaha is probably the only community in the United States where 7.7 percent said their biggest health concern is lead poisoning. She stated that this response shows some of the awareness of the issue in this community.

Dr. Polk-Primm brought up the need of making sure that Medicaid screening is done. Ms. Deppe replied that there is a mandate from the federal government for such screening and that the CAG could send a letter asking that this be enforced in the state. Ms. Deppe further suggested that the CAG could bring the mandate to the attention of those who should be complying.

Dr. Pour noted that primary prevention is the most important thing to do for children. Ms. Deppe stated that she thinks screening is still important and it is needed to identify children who already have elevated blood lead levels.

Ms. Davis stated that she would like to expand this and go beyond kids that are on Medicaid. She talked of the need to educate all pediatricians and general practitioners. Dr. Pour stated that a risk questionnaire has been developed but that it never hurts to remind physicians.

Ms. Davis asked if, as a parent with a child approaching the 10 µg/dL level, she could request medication to treat her child. Dr. Pour responded that no medication is given at that level. She stated that the source needs to be identified and parents need to know what to look for because at that level, no one will come to your house to assess the source. She stated that blood lead levels would decrease when the child is removed from the source of lead exposure.

Mr. Rodgers asked Dr. Pour if at the next meeting she could provide information regarding the new philosophy of the CDC on housing. Dr. Pour stated that Ms. Kathy Leinenkugel from her office would be attending an upcoming conference on the issue and has been looking into best practices used in other communities.

Ms. Weston noted that the Lead Safe Omaha Coalition had worked with Dr. Pour and Dr. Raymond to prepare a flyer that was sent to all physicians to encourage testing. She stated that it makes a difference when the whole Omaha community looks at the problem.

Mr. Doolan stated that one of the things done in Jasper County, Missouri to encourage blood lead screening was that school districts could not enroll children into kindergarten unless blood lead screening had been completed. Ms. Deppe stated that she had past experience with such a program and it was not always successful.

Ms. Council moved forward on the agenda. She asked EPA if there were any updates on the status of their Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study.

Mr. Doolan stated that EPA was trying to stay on schedule and the documents should be released by the end of month.

Ms. Weston, reading from a document regarding the National Remedy Review Board (NRRB) for Superfund projects, asked if and when EPA would be submitting anything to the NRRB regarding the Omaha Lead Site remedy. Mr. Doolan replied that a submittal had been made to the NRRB around the first of March 2004. Ms. Weston questioned EPA regarding the timing of this submittal and asked if public comment and involvement from potential responsible parties (PRPs) was obtained prior to the submittal. Mr. Doolan replied that usually the public and PRPs are allowed to comment but he did not know if that occurred in this case.

Ms. Weston asked if the CAG would be given an opportunity to submit comments to the NRRB. She noted that the CAG had not received anything to review and questioned if Union Pacific had received anything. Mr. McDermott replied that Union Pacific had not received anything to review.

Ms. Weston stated that she would provide Ms. Determan a copy of the document she was reading regarding the NRRB to distribute to the CAG. Ms. Weston asked if the State had been invited to comment on EPA's submittal to the board. Mr. Davis replied yes.

Mr. Doolan stated that on March 2<sup>nd</sup>, the NRRB provided draft comments to the EPA regional office to consider when preparing the Proposed Plan for the Omaha Lead Site. Ms. Weston asked if those comments would be given to the CAG. Mr. Doolan replied that EPA could provide those comments.

Dr. Polk-Primm asked if EPA's plan allows for addressing other sources of lead before doing the soil removals. Mr. Doolan replied that EPA does not have authority to address interior lead-based paint and that EPA typically does not include those types of things. He stated that the Proposed Plan would not include any alternatives for addressing lead sources other than soil.

Dr. Polk-Primm asked about dripzone contamination. Mr. Doolan replied that EPA could not address the soil if only the dripzone is contaminated. Dr. Polk-Primm asked if is this

was semantics. Mr. Doolan replied that if it is only a lead-based paint issue, EPA does not have authority to address the lead problem. Dr. Polk-Primm asked why a package could not be put together that includes all necessary agencies, to address lead-based paint and soil.

Ms. Deppe replied that to date, there has been no coordination between lead-based paint remediation and soil removal. Mr. Doolan replied that he thought a way to start coordinating that is needed. Mr. Davis stated that a meeting had been held regarding the need to coordinate between the City, County, and EPA to address this issue. Ms. Deppe replied that it is not happening. Ms. Deppe stated that EPA needs to look at how to coordinate with these other agencies. Mr. Doolan replied that EPA is working to coordinate activities.

Ms. Weston stated that what the CAG is saying is that the Omaha remedy should be a comprehensive plan. She stated that although EPA does not have the authority to do the paint remediation, EPA does have the authority to set up a comprehensive plan. Mr. Sanders stated that the Superfund Proposed Plan is not a comprehensive plan. Mr. Doolan stated that EPA cannot put any guarantees into the plan.

Dr. Polk-Primm asked EPA why they would replace a whole yard when lead-based paint will recontaminate it. She stated that EPA's handbook (referring to EPA's Superfund Lead-Contaminated Residential Sites Handbook) calls for coordination. Mr. Sanders said that he agreed but repeated that EPA does not have authority to address the interior lead-based paint.

Mr. Doolan acknowledged that the EPA handbook does say that lead-based paint should be addressed if EPA is going to do removals. He stated that the handbook says that other sources, like interior dust, should be addressed by other agencies and EPA should try to work with local agencies responsible for these areas.

Dr. Polk-Primm asked again about exterior paint and if there were any circumstances under which EPA could address it. Mr. Doolan stated that EPA can remediate exterior lead-based paint, and it is recommended in the handbook. He stated that it would have to be included in the proposed plan process.

Ms. Weston asked if EPA used comprehensive plans in Jasper. Mr. Doolan replied no.

Dr. Polk-Primm asked what the CAG needed to do next regarding the exterior paint issue.

Mr. Sanders answered that during the public comment period, the public needs to request that EPA address lead-based exterior paint.

Ms. Council asked EPA if they could provide the CAG a copy of what had been submitted to the NRRB. Mr. Sanders stated that what was submitted is not public record. Mr. Doolan added that it is for internal use only.

Ms. Council asked for clarification from EPA regarding whether EPA had in fact submitted a Proposed Plan for the Omaha Lead Site to the NRRB. Mr. Doolan replied that a draft had been submitted and that since this is a residential lead contaminated site, there are very few remedial actions that can be taken. Ms. Weston stated that Omaha is not like any other site. Mr. Doolan replied that although the size of the site is different from others, the action that will be taken would be just like every other site.

Dr. Polk-Primm asked for details regarding the NRRB. Mr. Doolan explained that the NRRB is an EPA peer review group that reviews proposed Superfund cleanup decisions and was created because of concern regarding expensive remediation.

Dr. Polk-Primm commented to EPA that it would be difficult for the CAG to understand the NRRB's comments to the plan if the CAG is not allowed to see the actual plan. She asked EPA why they would give the NRRB a plan that they do not have community input on. She asked what would happen if the board approved their plan and then, when the public finally gets to see it, says they do not approve. Mr. Doolan stated that in that case, EPA would have to go back and take a different direction.

Ms. Weston asked EPA if there was community or PRP involvement with the NRRB. Mr. Sanders stated that he didn't know. Ms. Weston asked who from EPA was at the NRRB review. Mr. Doolan replied that it was Mr. Bahnke. Ms. Council asked what there is for the board to review if the plan only includes soil removal. Mr. Doolan replied that questions could include whether EPA addresses exterior paint, if EPA removes or replants trees and bushes, if EPA uses treatment, etc.

Dr. Polk-Primm again asked EPA why they did not ask for CAG input. Mr. Doolan replied that he had no logical response and that that is the way it is done.

Mr. McDermott stated that he thought that what happened was that there was not the communication that there should have been. He stated that he thought there was a snafu in the way this was handled and that communication with PRPs and the CAG was required. He stated that he would like a copy of what was submitted to the NRRB.

Ms. Weston, reading from the document she brought regarding the NRRB, noted that it clearly states the CAG and community should be involved.

Mr. Doolan asked that Ms. Weston please put a specific request in writing her question pertaining to the NRRB and EPA would respond.

Ms. Council asked if EPA had a response to the bioavailability questions submitted by the CAG following the last meeting. Mr. Doolan stated that the EPA is still working on them, but that he was prepared to give a two-minute explanation. Ms. Council stated that the group would wait for EPA's written response.

Dr. Polk-Primm asked Mr. Doolan to clarify the confusion about paint removal in relation to the handbook policy. Mr. Doolan suggested to Dr. Polk-Primm that she read

the handbook. Dr. Polk-Primm stated that she would do that but asked if EPA could quickly answer whether or not they could consider exterior paint removal. Mr. Doolan responded that EPA could consider exterior paint removal at homes at which EPA is addressing soil.

Dr. Polk-Primm asked if the EPA would replace sidewalks. Mr. Doolan replied that sidewalks would be replaced if damaged when completing the soil removals.

Ms. Council stated that the group had gone past the allotted meeting time and needed to adjourn.

Ms. Determan read the list of action items for the next meeting.

Handouts Provided for the Meeting (April 14<sup>th</sup>, 2004):

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

*Draft Minutes from 03/31/04 (Hardcopy provided by MFG, Inc.)*

*Draft Letter to the Omaha Advisory Council for Lead Safe Neighborhoods from the CAG*

*Memo and Attachment to EPA, Questions Regarding EPA's Relative Bioavailability of Lead in Test Materials from a Superfund Site in Omaha, Nebraska (April 2003), from the CAG (Hardcopy provided by MFG, Inc.)*

*Lead Sources (Hardcopy provided by MFG, Inc.)*

*Remedial Investigation Questions (Hardcopy provided by MFG, Inc.)*

*Feasibility Study Questions (Hardcopy provided by MFG, Inc.)*

*Proposed Plan and Public Comment Questions (Hardcopy provided by MFG, Inc.)*

*Letter RE: Community Involvement Plan for Omaha Lead Superfund Site from the League of Women Voters*

*Memo RE: Comment on the EPA Community Involvement Plan for Omaha Lead Site, March 2004 draft from Shireen S. Rajaram, Ph.D.*

*Suggestions on the Draft Community Involvement Plan for the Omaha Lead Superfund Site from Union Pacific Railroad*

*Midlands Voices: EPA Cleanup of Lead Now Seems a Mess (Hardcopy provided at meeting by Ms. Jonah Deppe)*

*EPA to Expand Lead Contamination Survey (Hardcopy provided at meeting by MFG, Inc.)*

*Madison County Lead Poison Program Gets Lots of Praise (Hardcopy provided at meeting by MFG, Inc.)*

*EPA Action Brings Better Lead-Based Paint Information to Tenants of 1,800 Apartments (Hardcopy provided at meeting by MFG, Inc.)*

*EPA Memo to Congressman Lee Terry (Hardcopy provided at meeting by Mr. Charles Isom)*

*Omaha Lead Site Superfund Update Fact Sheet (Hardcopy provided at meeting by EPA)*

*Childhood Lead Poisoning in Douglas County (Hardcopy of presentation provided by Dr. Adi Pour)*

*Bone Lead and Delinquent Behavior, Needleman et al. (Hardcopy provided at meeting by ATSDR)*

*The Effect of Lead Exposure on Behavior Problems in Preschool Children, Wasserman et al. (Hardcopy provided at meeting by ATSDR)*

Attachments to Minutes:

Sign-In Sheet (hardcopy to be delivered)