

## Community Advisory Committee (CAC) for Soil Study Wednesday, August 16<sup>th</sup> 2017 Meeting Notes

**In attendance:** Dr. Joe Gardella (JG-UB), Dr. Tammy Milillo (TM-UB), Dr. Mike Milligan (MM-SUNY Fredonia), Jackie James-Creedon (JJC-CSCR, Kenmore Resident), Katie Little (KL-UB, CSCR), Sue Mazur (SM, ToT Resident), Anne Bazinet (AB-ToT Resident), Rich Mpelezos (RM, Buffalo Resident)

**Absent:** Dr. Josh Wallace (JW-UB), Jay Farqueson (JF, Grand Island Resident), Maria Tisby (MT, ToT Resident), Jeanine Justen (JJ, Grand Island Resident)

Updates regarding the progress of Katie and Student team.  
Here is where we are as of 8/18/17

- reports that have been delivered to first 30 participants: **27**
- secondary consent forms allowing research team to use data: **18**
- residents interested in having soil sampled: **543**
- interested volunteers: **60**
- permission to enter property forms collected for Phase 1 of sampling. (residents and businesses): **143**
- points sampled so far: **84**

(JG) Relayed the story of the meeting at Tonawanda Coke. Stated that TCC is not happy with the situation, but they intend to comply.

Stated that representatives from the EPA (John Gabry) and DEC (Ben McPherson) have reviewed and approved the soil study procedure and Standard Operating Procedure (SOP).

Discussion of soil study sampling grid:

- Sampling grid was influenced by the Oct. 2009 DEC Tonawanda Community Air Quality Study - [http://www.dec.ny.gov/docs/air\\_pdf/tonairfinalrpt.pdf](http://www.dec.ny.gov/docs/air_pdf/tonairfinalrpt.pdf)
- Points were increased to create a new tentative map based on requests for more samples from the community and a discrepancy in the number of intended points/actual points.
- Additional points were doubled up in dense residential areas to offer more samples to interested residents and to increase chance of securing those sampling locations

CAC discussed pros and cons of new map with more points:

The following questions/concerns were raised and answered by Tammy:

- Will we miss a hotspot with the original, more widely spaced grid?
  - (TM) We will not miss a significant hotspot that would trigger a cleanup.
- Do we need the additional points to get an understanding of contaminant distribution?
  - (TM) No. The original map actually provides a more statistically sound model.

- The additional points will be difficult to secure at this stage of the sampling process.
  - (KL) while it is possible to get the additional samples, our students are going back to school and additional samples would take a significant amount of time to secure.
- Why are the clusters of points located where they are in the map?
  - (TM) We have to be careful when we add points to the map so that we don't unintentionally create an artificial bias, or hotspot. The clusters of points were located in residential areas to make it easier to secure those sample sites.
- There are too many points on Grand Island and not any along the shore directly west of TCC.
  - (TM) There isn't enough space to add another row of points along the shore west of TCC. More points can be taken (and they don't have to follow the grid) in the hotspot study.
- 2 inch samples. If we sample at 6 inches are we missing contamination that may pose a health risk?
  - We will be taking intermittent 2 inch samples in phase 1. If phase 1 shows that we need more 2 inch samples we will take more 2 inch samples in the hotspot study.

Based on discussion with Tammy the CAC was of the opinion that the original sampling grid would be a better choice for the soil study. Additional points/depths would be sampled in the hotspot study that will address the concerns of the CAC.

**Next meeting Wednesday September 20<sup>th</sup>, 2017  
3200 Elmwood, Room 210, 6pm**