

## **Community Dialogue on the Management of Contaminated Soil: Meeting #1 Community Feedback and Recommendations**

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) is hosting a Community Dialogue on the Management of Contaminated Soil (Community Dialogue). The Community Dialogue will address the various aspects associated with decisions about the fate of contaminated soil, including its management, treatment, and disposal. The Community Dialogue is an environment for collaboration and meaningful discussion, incorporating many community views. The Community Dialogue will include a series of meetings that seek to:

- Clarify the basis for various community perspectives on how to best handle contaminated soil.
- Provide a greater understanding of the technical options for managing contaminated soil, and the potential benefits and drawbacks.
- Develop guidelines for the role of communities in DTSC's decision-making processes associated with the fate of contaminated soil in their community.

Below is the agenda for the first meeting on Saturday, October 28, 2017 along with the date/time, location, and meeting objectives. This is the first of three meetings to take place throughout the state.

**Date & Time:**

Saturday, October 28, 2017  
10:00AM-3:00PM

**Location:**

TEACH Tech Charter High School  
10000 S. Western Avenue,  
Los Angeles, CA 90047

### **MEETING AGENDA**

*Meeting objectives:*

- 1) A shared understanding of the goals and desired outcomes of the Dialogue.
- 2) A shared understanding of the scope of managing contaminated soil in California.

- I. Welcome (10:00AM-10:30AM)
  - Introductions (mix up introductions, no dichotomy for government non-govt.)
  - Community agreements

Overview of contaminated soil in California and desired outcomes for the Community Dialogue (10:30AM-11:45AM)

- DTSC background and overview presentations.

- Jane Williams, Executive Director, California Communities Against Toxics.
- Dr. Jill Johnston, Assistant Professor of Preventative Medicine, USC Keck School of Medicine.

II. Community participant share (11:45AM-12:30PM)

*(Lunch, 12:30PM-1:15:PM)*

III. Community participant share, cont'd (1:15PM - 2:30PM)

IV. Closing and next steps (2:30PM-3:00PM)

- Resource share.

**For additional meeting materials and presentations, please visit:**

[dtsc.ca.gov/ej-tribal](http://dtsc.ca.gov/ej-tribal)

### **Meeting attendees included:**

- Ana Mascareñas, Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)
- Robina Suwol, California Safe Schools
- Lisa Loppin, The People's Senate
- Jane Williams, California Communities Against Toxics
- Steve Becker, DTSC
- Ajit Vaidya, DTSC
- Floyd Villanueva, The People's Senate
- Marcia Rubin, DTSC
- Cynthia Babich, Del Amo Action Committee/Los Angeles EJ Network
- Mohsen Nazemi, DTSC
- Lida Moussarian
- Ingrid Brostrom, Center on Race Poverty and the Environment
- Jesse Marquez, Communities for a Safe Environment
- Juana Perez, Communities for a Safe Environment
- Yvonne Watson, Sierra Club
- Jill Johnston, University of Southern California
- Linda Cleveland, Watts Clean Air and Energy
- Monika Shanka, Physicians for Social Responsibility – Los Angeles
- Alex Villanueva, The People's Senate
- Xonia Villanueva, The People's Senate
- Lazaro Cardenas, DTS
- Amanda Dominguez, DTSC
- Manuel Lopez, DTSC

## **Community agreements:**

To maintain a productive and collaborative dialogue, meeting participants agreed to the following community agreements:

- Safe space and use of respectful language
- Right to ask, responsibility to respect other's questions
- Respect the agenda
- Different perspectives are ok
- Respect others voice
- Don't mistake passion for anger
- One speaker at a time.

## **Community Participants Feedback, Recommendations, and Action Items**

To accurately capture community feedback, DTSC collaborated with community partners in development of the design, scope, and desired outcomes for these meetings. To that end, DTSC has compiled the following feedback and recommendations from the October 28<sup>th</sup> meeting participants. The chart below includes Action Items that were collectively agreed upon by community participants throughout the meeting, and Additional Feedback provided during and at the conclusion of the meeting. Each has been organized and captured under one of six general categories:

- General comment
- Recommendation to DTSC
- Community need or concern
- Improvement to DTSC's communication platforms, i.e. public website and Envirostor.
- Outreach
- Technology

ACTION ITEM	TYPE OF FEEDBACK OR ACTION ITEM					
	Comment	Recommendation	Community Need/Concern	Website Support	Outreach	Technology
Delano Meeting: Extend time - Do an early workshop Focus on decision making		X				
Delano Meeting: Interactive webcast Content should be accessible				X		
Differentiate between the Sites: Level of oversight Type of legal underpinnings	Maybe a simple comparison chart would be helpful	X	X			
Enforce Public right to know		X	X			
Materials should be concise and relevant			X			
Disclosure of substance at Contaminated site in a timely manor			X	X		
Project Managers should have working knowledge about site cleanups and disposal of wastes: Less reliance on contractors		X				
Consistent distribution of public notices (larger radius, area NGO's & Groups)				X	X	
Consistent Project Approach			X		X	
Project team sharing with each other and community			X		X	
Public noticing of enhanced and new Envirostor website update					X	

Improved/timely document uploading efforts to Envirostor <u>Must be a standard practice throughout DTSC</u>		X		X	X	
Critical remedy Selection/decision documents uploaded to Envirostor			X	X		
<b>ACTION ITEM</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Community Need/Concern</b>	<b>Website Support</b>	<b>Outreach</b>	<b>Technology</b>
Project related transparency (Need all documents uploaded to Envirostor (i.e. CEQA) regardless of the agency lead or document author)		X	X	X	X	
Raw data reporting limits vs. Cleanup goals			X	X		
Management of "Orphan sites"	There should be a specific discussion to get a handle on this situation of lack of funding to address these type of sites "year after year".	X	X			
Orphan vs: abandoned Transparency around raw data Terminology	Orphan is abandoned	X	X			
Data of Hazardous Waste- consider change	Reporting of Hazardous Waste	X				
Clarification of what is considered hazardous waste (excavated vs. disposal vs. treated vs. in-place)		X	X	X		
Definition of			X	X		

Brownfields						
<b>ADDITIONAL FEEDBACK FROM COMMUNITY PARTICIPANTS</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Community Need/Concern</b>	<b>Website Support</b>	<b>Outreach</b>	<b>Technology</b>
Clarification of no-hazardous manifest	X	X	X			
Independent ability for staff to assess various technologies		X				X
More transparency with remedy selection		X	X			X
Community input to affect outcome of a project (define the process)		X	X		X	
Citizen science efforts for communities		X	X			X
Rapid soil screening methods			X			X
Worker protective clothing needed per worksite activities and message it sends to communities and aerial disposition of toxics compared to cumulative impacts	Is protective clothing not being worn by workers to lessen the concerns from the community around contamination levels at a site?	X	X			
Owning when mistakes are made and remedy a solution	People make mistakes - admit them and create a path for moving forward.	X	X			
Will presentations be available online?	X					
Be transparent as to what agency knows and does not know!		X	X			
The agency needs to really value the "community acceptance" part of the nine criteria		X	X		X	

ADDITIONAL FEEDBACK FROM COMMUNITY PARTICIPANTS	Comment	Recommendation	Community Need/Concern	Website Support	Outreach	Technology
Educate around "community acceptance", let communities know and help them to articulate their needs leading to their solutions		X	X		X	
Watts: I also doubt the results based on the fact that the work men didn't wear protective gear.			X		X	
Watts: The dirt didn't get watered down every day. The contaminants blew into other parts of the community.			X		X	
Watts: From the info displayed at this meeting, I am in doubt about the testing results that were given to the Watts community regarding the contamination in Jordan Downs.			X		X	
Watts: I am weary of the training that observers received on how to determine the level of contamination. The # of sites that lack observers who are tasked to report on observations throughout the cleanup process.			X		X	
Presenters need sufficient time for their presentations, please schedule more time or less presentations per	X					

meeting to allow for public input.						
<b>ADDITIONAL FEEDBACK FROM COMMUNITY PARTICIPANTS</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Community Need/Concern</b>	<b>Website Support</b>	<b>Outreach</b>	<b>Technology</b>
Transparency in soil data collection, testing protocol & reporting of results.		X	X		X	
Weighting community acceptance much higher (not as last considerations). Reduce influence of responsible parties in determining remedy. Investigations happened by ability to find RPs.		X	X		X	
Explain Financial constraints on orphan sites	X	X				
Best Available Control Technologies BACT type systems for using on cleanup technology		X	X			X
Caps do not work...will always eventually fail.	X					X
What is the impact of uncertainty, use precautionary principle: When to relocate community?	X	X	X			
Determine alterations to generation H. W. look at the whole life of a product. The goal of minimizing H. W.	X	X				X
Need new technologies Need to use new technologies	X	X				X
Use different approaches to the development of new technologies	X	X				X



<b>ADDITIONAL FEEDBACK FROM COMMUNITY PARTICIPANTS</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Community Need/Concern</b>	<b>Website Support</b>	<b>Outreach</b>	<b>Technology</b>
Create Office of New Technologies	X	X				X
Reward use of new Technologies	X	X				X
Believe in new Technologies	X	X				X
Update or replace the Hazardous Waste tracking system		X	X			
Need to develop the capacity of the state to certify/vet out and classify technologies. This is critical because the contractors hired by the agency pick a technology that is cheap and one they know (flavor of the day).	X	X	X			X
More Enforcement	X	X	X			
(REAL) Community involvement. More involvement than RPs and the lawyers	X	X	X			
Hire the best pay more if need be	X	X				
Important to me: Transparency & Community Involvement in decision making process.	X	X	X			
Paramount: Adequate testing to ensure the results are reliable and valid (Safe for Kids)	X					

ADDITIONAL FEEDBACK FROM COMMUNITY PARTICIPANTS	Comment	Recommendation	Community Need/Concern	Website Support	Outreach	Technology
Paramount: concerns regarding testing by DTSC at Village Skate park. Ok given based on one days of testing. Inadequate.	X					
Paramount: DTSC testing lead to discovery of arsenic in groundwater well near Carlton Forge. This lead to extensive investigation but then all information was removed from Envirostor website. Why? Lack of transparency is CONCERNING?	X					

DRAFT