



APPEARANCES

DHEC officials: Pat Vincent  
Gary Stewart  
Lucas Berresford  
Christopher Ramaglia, Project Manager

Speakers from the public: Linda Phillips  
Diane Gerald  
Tennille McDaniel  
Van Kennedy  
Dupree Atkinson  
Cynthia Brown  
Lynn Battle  
Cecil Owens  
Ginger Williams

INDEX

Introductions by Pat Vincent: 3  
Proposed Plan Presentation by Christopher Ramaglia: 4  
Question-and-Answer Session: 22

ATTACHMENTS

There are no attachments to this public meeting.

PROCEEDINGS

1  
2 MS. VINCENT: Thank you-all for coming out tonight. The  
3 South Carolina Department of Health and  
4 Environmental Control has hosting this public  
5 meeting regarding the Arvin Meritor Site. We're  
6 here for several purposes. To -- first is to  
7 update you with some information regarding this  
8 site, and, second, to provide you an opportunity  
9 with which to ask questions of the Department and  
10 have us an opportunity to respond to those  
11 questions.

12 I'm Pat Vincent. I'm with the Bureau of Land  
13 & Waste Management, as the other folks here. We  
14 have Chris Ramaglia here, as well. He's the  
15 project manager for this site, and he'll be  
16 speaking to you today. In -- in a few minutes,  
17 he'll be presenting some information to you about  
18 the site. We have Gary Stewart here. (To Mr.  
19 Stewart) Do you have a hand up? Mr. Stewart's the  
20 manager of the State Remediation Section under the  
21 Bureau of Land & Waste Management. We also have  
22 Lucas Berresford here. He is with the State  
23 Remediation Section, as well.

24 You may not be able to notice, but behind me I  
25 have a court reporter. Her name is Starla, and

1 she's taking -- making a record for us of this  
2 meeting. And so we'll want to -- when we get to  
3 the question-and-answer session, we'll want to make  
4 sure that we can hear you clearly, so I -- I may  
5 try to bring the mic to you. So that's what we  
6 need to do to make sure everybody can hear all the  
7 questions and get your answers.

8 So, to that, I'm going to go ahead and let  
9 Chris start his presentation.

10 MR. RAMAGLIA: Can everybody hear me okay? It sounds  
11 like it's working.

12 Thanks, Pat. Like Pat said, my name is Chris  
13 Ramaglia. I'm a project manager of this site  
14 currently, so I'm going to go ahead and walk you  
15 through this presentation.

16 So here's our agenda. Introduction's kind of  
17 already taken care of, but I want to start with a  
18 brief site history. We'll talk about what's  
19 happening at the site, what actually occurs at the  
20 facility. We'll move into a discussion of some  
21 cleanup alternatives that have been considered for  
22 cleaning -- cleaning up contamination at the  
23 facility. We'll talk about DHEC's preferred  
24 cleanup alternative and the proposed plan, which  
25 most of you look like you actually have in your

1 hand currently. And, at the end, there'll be some  
2 time for comments and questions. If you have any  
3 comments or questions during the presentation, just  
4 hold on to those, and we'll get to those at the  
5 end.

6 All right. So a site history: In 1968 -- if  
7 you're familiar with the area, 1968 began  
8 construction of the facility. In 1970, Arvin  
9 Meritor began operations. Operations at the  
10 facility are associated with the manufacturing of  
11 gas springs, vacuum actuators, and window  
12 regulators for motor vehicles. From '76 to '89,  
13 the building structure remained relatively  
14 unchanged, and then, over the course of the next  
15 decade, some building renovations and additions  
16 took place, including the construction of a  
17 training center in the location of a former  
18 retention pond. I'll show you a -- an image -- a  
19 bird's-eye view aerial photo of this site here, in  
20 just a second. And then, in 1990, a former  
21 retention pond was closed. (To Mr. Berresford) So  
22 continue.

23 Okay. So I'm going to kind of use this little  
24 laser pointer to point to some areas just to kind  
25 of keep in the back of your mind. You could also

1 -- it's kind of small, probably, from where some of  
2 y'all are sitting, but just to familiarize you with  
3 what -- where things are at, at the facility. So,  
4 in this -- the northern area, there's the chip  
5 wringer area. We'll talk a little bit about that  
6 during the presentation. The southern end of the  
7 facility is what they call a "vacuum actuator  
8 assembly area." I will talk a little bit about  
9 that, and then the training center that I mentioned  
10 in the previous slide is actually just off of this  
11 image. It's up here in the northern end. That's  
12 where the retention pond used to be.

13 And this road right here, actually, is  
14 Tranquil Church Road. The address -- the official  
15 address is 144 Tranquil Church Road. Seventy-six  
16 is actually right out here, so, if you follow  
17 Millers Road west back out to 76 and continue on  
18 76, the property will be on the right-hand side,  
19 just to give you -- it's just a few miles from  
20 here.

21 All right. Continuing on with some site  
22 history, some of the investigations that have taken  
23 place. So, in 2004, Phase I ESA, or Environmental  
24 Site Assessment, took place and identified several  
25 recognized environmental conditions. There was

1           enough of a concern, at that point, to come back  
2           and do a Phase II ESA in 2005, so -- which detected  
3           some VOCs, or volatile organic compounds,  
4           specifically solvents.

5           When they're making gas springs, vacuum  
6           actuators, window regulators, they use solvents to  
7           kind of clean these things up, and so that's a  
8           contaminant that -- a predominant contaminant at  
9           this site. So they detected these VOCs in  
10          groundwater in multiple site locations, and then,  
11          in 2006, Arvin Meritor, AVM Inc., entered into a  
12          voluntary cleanup contract with the Department to  
13          perform and fund the investigation. So AVM's well  
14          aware of what's happening and they're willingly  
15          participate -- participating in the cleanup and the  
16          funding of the cleanup with the Department.

17          And, just let me put it out there now: The  
18          contamination we're going to be talking about is  
19          only on-site. None of it has actually left the  
20          property, so it's not in anybody's neighborhoods.  
21          It hasn't crossed the street. It's just confined  
22          to the site, so, just for a little bit of comfort,  
23          that's what's going on.

24          In 2006, there was an Interim Action to  
25          address contaminated soil. They pretty much came

1 in and just said, "Let's go ahead and get this soil  
2 out of here." It was in the -- kind of in the  
3 middle of the property. I -- I didn't -- I should  
4 have pointed to that a second ago, but this zinc  
5 plated area is where they removed a ton of visibly  
6 contaminated soil down to about 2 feet below the  
7 surface.

8 In two thousand -- 2007 to 2008, there was  
9 initial and secondary phase of the Remedial  
10 Investigation, where they did a whole bunch of  
11 sampling to delineate or to figure out exactly  
12 where the contamination was on-site. And then,  
13 from 2009 to 2012, there was some additional  
14 supplemental investigations to further delineate or  
15 understand where the contamination was.

16 So, again, this is just a list of, like,  
17 everything that has been happening at this site  
18 over the past number of years so that we have a  
19 good understanding of where the contamination is.

20 (To Mr. Berresford) Continue.

21 All right. So the next four or five slides is  
22 going to be this map that's over here on this piece  
23 of paper here, and I'm going to walk through the  
24 major constituents -- the major contaminants of  
25 concern on this site.

1           So this is the facility, and, in this  
2           particular slide, we're -- we're talking about PCE,  
3           which is tetrachloroethylene. It's a -- it's --  
4           it's a solvent. And in the red is where that  
5           contaminant is located on the site. All right.

6           So the PCE and its reductive dechlorination  
7           breakdown components, so essentially these  
8           contaminants, when they're in the environment, they  
9           break down over time into other contaminants. And  
10          so PCE and it's -- those reduction -- reductions of  
11          it are located right here near the chip wringer  
12          area -- area. Excuse me. (To Mr. Berresford) All  
13          right. Continue.

14          The next slide -- again, this is the same  
15          image, but now we're looking at TCE, which actually  
16          breaks down from PCE. So it makes sense that it's  
17          actually in the same area. So this, again, just  
18          gives you an idea of where it's located on-site.  
19          Some of it is also down here in the southern end of  
20          the site. Again, this is right off of 76 at the  
21          front of the property. So you have the chip  
22          wringer area right here, and you have the vacuum  
23          actuator assembly area right -- right here. (To  
24          Mr. Berresford) Continue.

25          I'm looking at another contaminant,

1 trichloroethane, in groundwater. It's located down  
2 here by the vacuum actuator assembly area again.  
3 So just -- again, just trying to familiarize you  
4 with where things are located on the site -- where  
5 the contaminants of concern are. And stepping  
6 through to 1,1-dichloroethylene. It's located up  
7 near the training center -- the northern end of the  
8 property and just out the backdoor here near the  
9 chip wringer area and then, again, near the vacuum  
10 actuator assembly area right there. And I believe  
11 this is the last one. It's 1,1-dichloroethane,  
12 kind of in the same areas.

13 All right. So, in summary, the main areas of  
14 concern are the training center in the northern end  
15 of the property, where the retention pond used to  
16 be; the chip wringer area, which is kind of out the  
17 backdoor, also near the northern end of the  
18 property; and the vapor degreaser area or the  
19 vacuum actuator assembly area, which is towards the  
20 front of the property. (To Mr. Berresford) Well,  
21 actually go back one slide. I want to explain  
22 something.

23 Something unique about the groundwater flow in  
24 this -- or under this facility is right here in the  
25 middle. This is a groundwater divide, so you'll

1 notice contaminants that have been on the north end  
2 of the groundwater divide actually will move to the  
3 north over time, and contaminants that happen on  
4 the south end of the groundwater divide will move  
5 to the south end. So that's kind of why the plumes  
6 are shaped the way they are, kind of showing which  
7 direction they're moving, so just keep that in  
8 mind.

9 All right. So the Focused Feasibility Study  
10 was approved by DHEC in 2015. I actually have a  
11 copy of it up here. It's a rather large document.  
12 What you have, a proposed plan, is kind of a  
13 abbreviated version of this large document, so, if  
14 you have any super specific questions about this  
15 site later, I might have to refer to this.

16 So that was approved by DHEC, the Department,  
17 in 2015. It evaluates the cleanup alternatives  
18 that are discussed in the proposed plan, and it  
19 establishes our Remedial Action Objectives, which  
20 are actually in the next slide.

21 So Remedial Action Objectives are goals,  
22 essentially. For this site -- for the cleanup is  
23 to prevent the ingestion of contaminated  
24 groundwater -- obviously, that's a big one -- to  
25 restore that groundwater to Maximum Contaminant

1           Levels, or MCLs, which is essentially a level for  
2           each contaminants established by the EPA -- a safe  
3           level for those contaminants to be at in the  
4           groundwater.

5           All right. So this gives you an idea of what  
6           is happening on-site. In the left column here, you  
7           have the compound or the chemical -- the chemical  
8           compound. In the middle, you have the MCL, or the  
9           Maximum Contaminant Level, established by EPA. All  
10          of them are MCLs actually, except for this middle  
11          one, which is the tap water value. That's also  
12          established by EPA. The reason that's there is  
13          because this particular compound does not actually  
14          have a MCL. So these are the MCLs, and this is the  
15          highest on-site concentration of each one of these  
16          compounds. So this kind of shows you where we're  
17          at, and, in the middle, it shows you where we want  
18          to get to.

19          All right. So moving on to our remedial  
20          alternatives, the ones that were evaluated. Again,  
21          this is in your proposed plan. We looked at four.  
22          We looked at Alternative 1, which is a No Action.  
23          I'll talk about each one of these in more detail in  
24          just a second. Alternative 2 is what they call  
25          "Monitored Natural Attenuation" or MNA.

1           Alternative 3 is Groundwater Extractions, kind of  
2           what it sounds like. Alternative 4 is In Situ  
3           Chemical Reduction and Enhanced Bioremediation.  
4           So, again, we'll walk through each one of these.

5           All right. So No Action: It's exactly what  
6           it sounds like. It's literally doing nothing at  
7           the site. It's required by the National  
8           Contingency Plan to look at this as a baseline for  
9           comparison. It's not what is being considered for  
10          this site. It's just a baseline for us to look at.  
11          So it's not an active treatment; there's no  
12          monitoring that takes place. Time frame to  
13          remedial goals -- so, like, naturally, these  
14          contaminants will actually break down in the  
15          environment. It just takes an incredibly long time,  
16          so a hundred-plus years. And being that nothing is  
17          happening, obviously, it doesn't cost anything to  
18          do it. So this is our baseline. So everything  
19          kind of will get referenced off of this.

20          Monitored Natural Attenuation is Alternative  
21          2. It's not an active treatment, but, like I said,  
22          over time these contaminants actually will break  
23          down in the environment. And so, with MNA, we're  
24          actually just observing or making sure that that is  
25          actually happening. So institutional controls

1           would be implemented, so these are essentially deed  
2           restrictions to prevent the use of groundwater over  
3           time. So it's better than doing nothing, but we're  
4           not doing anything actively to actually remedy the  
5           situation. So they would monitor the groundwater.  
6           The time frame, since it's not a active remedy,  
7           still is that hundred-plus years because you're  
8           just watching what is naturally occurring anyway.  
9           But, being that there is some monitoring that's  
10          happening, the net present worth of that  
11          alternative is \$868,000 roughly.

12                   Groundwater Extraction: This is the first of  
13          the four -- of the alternatives that were  
14          considered, this is the first of the active remedy,  
15          so we're actually doing something to help the  
16          situation. Groundwater is extracted, and ex-  
17          situ -- ex-situ treatment means that the water is  
18          actually treated on the site, just above ground.  
19          There would be institutional controls again. So  
20          some of those deed restrictions, just to make sure  
21          that there's no consumption of the groundwater.  
22          There'd be long-term groundwater monitoring. The  
23          time frame to the remedial goal for this is reduced  
24          to an estimated 30 years because we're actually  
25          doing something. So we're pulling the water out of

1 the ground. There's infrastructure that's built to  
2 treat it on-site, essentially, just above the  
3 ground. I can -- if you have questions about that  
4 later, feel free to ask, and I'll get into some  
5 specifics. The net present worth of this --

6 MR. BERRESFORD: Oh, sorry.

7 MR. RAMAGLIA: Woop. That's okay.

8 -- is about \$10 million, just over,  
9 because the infrastructure needed to be, you know,  
10 built on-site. All right.

11 And the last alternative is In Situ Chemical  
12 Reduction and Enhanced Bioremediation. So it's the  
13 -- it's kind of a twofold alternative. Two things  
14 are happening. There's an injection of zero valent  
15 iron, which is the chemical part of this  
16 alternative. There's also the injection of carbon  
17 amendments, things like lactate, molasses, whey.  
18 They're injected into the source areas in the  
19 downgradient areas in -- in the direction where the  
20 plumes are moving, so, if it's on that north end of  
21 the site, they're kind of moving to the north; if  
22 they're on the south end of the site, the  
23 contaminants are moving to the south. I'll have  
24 this image in a slide here in just a few minutes  
25 and kind of gives you a better picture of that.

1           There -- in this alternative a -- what they  
2           call a "permeable reactive barrier" would be used.  
3           That would be used downgradient to kind of catch  
4           the contaminants, if they're moving away from the  
5           source areas, and treat them both chemically and  
6           biologically. Institutional controls, again, are  
7           implemented. Long-term monitoring to evaluate the  
8           treatment effectiveness. We need to know how good  
9           it's working. And the time frame to this remedial  
10          goal is an estimated ten to thirty years. The net  
11          present worth is 905,000.

12          So now I'm going to talk about the evaluation  
13          criteria. So these are each of the criteria that  
14          we looked at to evaluate each one of those four  
15          alternatives to try and figure out which one would  
16          be the best option. I'm just going to read through  
17          those really quick.

18          The overall protection of human health and the  
19          environment. It's kind of an obvious one.  
20          Compliance with ARARs, which are our state and  
21          federal regulations. So these top two are actually  
22          the two most important. If one of the alternatives  
23          doesn't meet those top two, then it's essentially  
24          wiped off the table. Because these are both  
25          focusing on human health and the environment, it's

1 state and federal regulation. Specifically, it's  
2 those MCLs that we looked at. So kind of where we  
3 are currently, and the MCLs are the numbers that we  
4 want to get to.

5 Long-Term Effectiveness and Permanence; the  
6 Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility, or Volume through  
7 Treatment; Short-Term Effectiveness;  
8 Implementability -- how easy is it to make this  
9 happen -- Cost; and then Community Acceptance,  
10 which we're doing tonight, so . . .

11 Okay. So this might be a little bit small,  
12 but I'll kind of explain what's happening here. So  
13 this is the Comparative Analysis Chart, so on the  
14 left-hand column here is the criteria -- those  
15 seven that I just listed. Going horizontally here  
16 are the four alternatives, and then -- so we took  
17 each alternative and evaluated it on a scale from 1  
18 to 5 for each criteria. So 1 means no go; it's not  
19 good; 5 being perfect. So just to give you an  
20 example, so Alternative 1, in regards to overall  
21 protection of human health and the environment --  
22 Alternative 1, if you'll remember, is No Action.  
23 So it's not protecting much so it got a 1.  
24 Alternative 4, is the In Situ Chemical Reduction  
25 and -- and Bioremediation. That's that -- an

1 active treatment. It's actually going at the  
2 contaminant and working to degrade it. It's a lot  
3 more effective at protecting the human health and  
4 the environment, so we gave it a 4. So we just did  
5 that for each alternative. We kind of go through  
6 all seven criteria.

7 On the next slide, it will show you the  
8 totals, so the total score for each alternative.  
9 Alternative 1 would be 15; Alternative 4 would be  
10 26. So it kind of goes up towards the end, so you  
11 kind of get an idea of what our preferred remedy is  
12 and what I'm about to talk about here in a second.  
13 So Alternative 4 being a better option.

14 Okay. So the Department's preferred remedy is  
15 Alternative 4 being the best option. Again, it's  
16 In Situ Chemical Reduction and Enhanced  
17 Bioremediation. It is an active treatment. It's  
18 -- it's accomplished kind of like in a twofold  
19 method, like I said earlier, with the injection of  
20 zero valent iron into the source areas in  
21 downgradient flow direction to promote chemical  
22 degradation. And then, also, the injection of  
23 carbon amendments, like that whey, molasses,  
24 lactate, are injected to promote microbial activity  
25 that will create an environment favorable for the

1 biological treatment of the contaminated  
2 groundwater. So it's essentially the food the  
3 microbes in the environment use to -- to eat, to  
4 survive, to thrive, to grow and to more effectively  
5 degrade the contaminant. And our data collection  
6 on those reports, that history that I showed you  
7 supports that this remedy would be effective and  
8 suitable. And the net present worth, again, is  
9 that 905,000. (To Mr. Berresford) Next slide.

10 So this is the image that's actually right  
11 here on this piece of paper, as well. So, if  
12 anyone wants to come up and look at the image a  
13 little closer and have some questions, feel free to  
14 afterwards. I'll come over here with you, but this  
15 kind of gives you a -- an overview of what the  
16 Alternative 4 would look like. And so, again, we  
17 have that groundwater divide, so things that are  
18 moving north, north of it, and south, south of it.  
19 And so our predominant source area is right here on  
20 the north end. That's near the -- the backdoor of  
21 the chip wringer area. And then another source  
22 area is right here near that vacuum actuator  
23 assembly area on the south side of the property.  
24 And so we would do the chemical and biological  
25 injections in both of those areas, and then, if you

1           remember, I mentioned the permeable reactive  
2           barriers, kind of a wall downgradient to catch  
3           contaminants that sort of get beyond that source  
4           area. The permeable reactive barrier, or PRB -- so  
5           I don't have to continue to say that -- would be  
6           downgradient right here and downgradient right  
7           here. So, again, just kind of gives you a little  
8           bit of a -- an image of what that will look like.

9           Okay. So the proposed plan is what y'all have  
10          in your hands. It presents, again, DHEC's  
11          preferred remedial alternative, what we just  
12          discussed in the presentation. The proposed plan  
13          -- if you -- there should be more copies if you  
14          haven't gotten one. There might be some more in  
15          the back. If not, they can be found on DHEC's Web  
16          site, so, if you want to jot that down, feel free  
17          to or come up and I can -- I can give it to you.

18          And so, after all public comments have been  
19          considered, what the Department does is it puts  
20          together its Record of Decision, which is  
21          essentially the step that says, "Okay. Now we're  
22          going to go ahead and implement this preferred  
23          remedy." (To Mr. Berresford) Go to the next  
24          slide. And there's one or two more.

25          But that doesn't happen before the public

1 comment period. So the public comment period will  
2 begin today -- does begin today and ends on July  
3 13th. So, for the next 30 days, you-all will have  
4 time to submit comments, questions, concerns to the  
5 Department, and those are considered before an  
6 actual proposed plan -- or the plan to implement  
7 the remedy actually happens.

8 The administrative record is essentially all  
9 those documents that I kind of walked through in  
10 the history, everything -- the ESA that was done,  
11 the Remedial Investigation, the Focused Feasibility  
12 Study. All these are in the administrative record.  
13 It can be found at the Marion County Public Library  
14 or from DHEC's Freedom of Information office. So,  
15 if you want to jot down the number there or if you  
16 want to stop by a library, just so you can get a  
17 more thorough look. The proposed plan is kind of  
18 like the abbreviated version of all that, so, if  
19 you want to get down to the nitty-gritty, all those  
20 documents are available to you. All right.

21 And so the question -- obviously, we're going  
22 to have some time for questions and comments.  
23 After today, though, if you have any more questions  
24 that you didn't, you know, think about today or  
25 whatnot -- I'm the current project manager. I will

1           be leaving the Department, actually, in just a  
2           couple days, so Lucas Berresford is going to be  
3           taking over as project manager. Gary Stewart will  
4           also be available to -- to answer questions, so his  
5           information is here. Lucas Berresford's  
6           information is on the front page of the proposed  
7           plan, so I think that's it.

8   MS. VINCENT: All right.

9   MR. RAMAGLIA: Yeah.

10  MS. VINCENT: So now we're going to come to our time of  
11           question and -- and try to answer those questions  
12           for you. What we'd like to do is I'd like to take  
13           the mic to you so that we can make sure the people  
14           behind you can actually hear what you're saying, as  
15           well, and -- so, if I can do that real gingerly.

16           And, also, let me -- let me tell you this, as  
17           well: that we understand -- I -- I recognize I'm  
18           not very comfortable talking into a microphone  
19           myself. If you happen to be one of those folks, as  
20           well, and want to talk to us after we close the  
21           meeting, we will be here a little bit later, as  
22           well. Okay?

23           Who has the first question?

24  MS. PHILLIPS: Just so I will know exactly how to  
25           address the facilities, I see where it says

1 "formally -- former AVM," and then on the second  
2 page it says, "Former Arval Meritor" or whatever.

3 What is the real name of the  
4 facilities --

5 MR. RAMAGLIA: They're currently --

6 MS. PHILLIPS: -- now?

7 MR. RAMAGLIA: -- AVM, Inc.

8 MS. PHILLIPS: It is now? So it's not formally --  
9 former AVM?

10 MR. RAMAGLIA: No. If it said that, that might have  
11 been a typo.

12 MS. PHILLIPS: Oh.

13 MR. RAMAGLIA: It -- it said -- are you saying it said,  
14 "former AVM" or "former Arvin Meritor"?

15 MS. PHILLIPS: It says -- on the -- on the first page,  
16 it says "former AVM."

17 MR. RAMAGLIA: Okay.

18 MS. PHILLIPS: Second page it says "former Mera --  
19 Meritor Artor" whatever.

20 MS. VINCENT: Arvin Meritor.

21 MR. RAMAGLIA: Arvin -- Arvin -- Arvin Meritor.

22 MS. PHILLIPS: Arvin -- okay.

23 MS. VINCENT: Uh-huh.

24 MR. RAMAGLIA: Yeah. They're AVM.

25 MS. PHILLIPS: So they're still AVM?

1 MR. RAMAGLIA: Yeah.

2 MS. PHILLIPS: I -- I still have a question --

3 MS. VINCENT: I --

4 MS. PHILLIPS: -- but maybe I should let the -- go  
5 ahead.

6 MS. VINCENT: Hold on.

7 AVM is the -- the company that entered into  
8 the voluntary cleanup contract that is performing  
9 the work.

10 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay.

11 MS. VINCENT: Yeah.

12 MS. PHILLIPS: So it's -- okay. AVM.

13 I don't want to take up all of the time, but I  
14 have a couple questions.

15 MR. RAMAGLIA: Okay.

16 MS. PHILLIPS: You said it was built -- what year was  
17 the facilities built?

18 MR. RAMAGLIA: 1968 was when construction started, I  
19 think.

20 MS. PHILLIPS: 1968?

21 MR. RAMAGLIA: And 1970 they began operations.

22 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay. And then -- and, when the  
23 contamination was discovered --

24 MR. RAMAGLIA: Uh-huh.

25 MS. PHILLIPS: -- I think in 2004 -- is that the first

1 time?

2 MR. RAMAGLIA: That's when they did the first  
3 environmental site assessment.

4 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay.

5 MR. RAMAGLIA: So they went out, kind of observed the  
6 site, and noted that there were some areas of  
7 concern, and so they came back and did Phase II,  
8 which is where they actually detected solvents --

9 MS. PHILLIPS: Right.

10 MR. RAMAGLIA: -- those volatile organic compounds.

11 MS. PHILLIPS: And this was the EPA doing that?

12 MR. RAMAGLIA: This was the Department.

13 MS. PHILLIPS: DHEC?

14 MR. RAMAGLIA: Yes, ma'am.

15 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay. In 2004 --

16 MR. RAMAGLIA: Uh-huh.

17 MS. PHILLIPS: -- when you discovered it --

18 MR. RAMAGLIA: Uh-huh.

19 MS. PHILLIPS: -- why we were not notified then that  
20 it's possible some contamination could be there?  
21 Why we didn't have this meeting? I'm just trying  
22 to understand.

23 MR. RAMAGLIA: (To Mr. Gary Stewart) Can you answer  
24 that?

25 MR. STEWART: I'll try to --

1 MR. RAMAGLIA: I'm going --

2 MR. STEWART: -- try to explain that.

3 The contamination was actually discovered by  
4 the company, AVM. They were doing work on their  
5 own. I don't know what purpose they were doing  
6 that for. Sometimes it's to get a loan or  
7 something like that. The Department was not aware  
8 of it until actually two years later, 2006, when  
9 they entered into the voluntary cleanup contract.

10 At that time, the Department did not have all  
11 the same resources we have now for -- for doing  
12 public participation and things like that. We try  
13 -- we try to get notices out now when we enter into  
14 a contract with parties. Back at that time, we  
15 didn't. Now, if we -- if we enter into a contract  
16 with someone today, there will be a notice in the  
17 newspaper either right before we sign it or right  
18 after. Ten years ago we didn't do that.

19 That's one of those things that the -- the  
20 Department has improved on. We -- we recognize  
21 that we weren't as good as we should have been at  
22 getting notice out, so we try to do a better job  
23 with that now earlier in the process.

24 MS. VINCENT: Those are great questions.

25 I would like to ask if you will give us our --

1           your name --

2   MS. PHILLIPS:   Okay.

3   MS. VINCENT:   -- so that the court reporter can record

4           that.

5   MS. PHILLIPS:   Linda Phillips.

6   MS. VINCENT:   Thank you.

7   MS. PHILLIPS:   One more.

8   MS. VINCENT:   Okay.

9   MS. PHILLIPS:   Okay.  You said that you know where the

10           -- the contamination is located.  How do you know

11           it's not across the street?  Did you go and test

12           across the street?  How far did you test to know

13           that it stops here?

14  MR. RAMAGLIA:   Right.  It's a good question.

15                   They have what they call "sentinel wells,"

16           which are wells just kind of outside the property,

17           and so the -- the wells kind of go from the source

18           area out.  So it's -- the whole process -- it --

19           it's a process of delineation, so figuring out

20           exactly where that contaminant is.

21  MS. PHILLIPS:   Uh-huh.

22  MR. RAMAGLIA:   And so they kind of -- once they figure

23           out where that hot spot is -- and they kind of have

24           a -- an idea of where it is by just some facility

25           like observances, right?  And so they can say,

1 "Well, you know" -- for example, the chip wringer  
2 area: "Knowing the process there, this is probably  
3 a likely source. If there is a contaminant, we're  
4 going to look here first." And so, usually, they  
5 can kind of figure out, before they even sample,  
6 where most -- most likely where things would be.  
7 And so they'll start there and then kind of move  
8 out away from those source areas with wells.

9 And, as you're monitoring those wells, in the  
10 hot zones -- the source areas, the contaminant  
11 concentrations are going to be very high,  
12 obviously. The further you move away from it, that  
13 -- you -- you watch that concentration kind of  
14 lower and lower and lower and lower. And so you  
15 keep doing that till you can actually map out where  
16 the contaminant is -- the plume is.

17 Does that make sense? So they've gone further  
18 out beyond the property boundary to make sure that  
19 it's not off-site. Does that answer -- hopefully?

20 MS. PHILLIPS: Yeah.

21 MR. RAMAGLIA: And in the Focused Feasibility Study --  
22 in the Focused Feasibility Study, they have all the  
23 monitoring wells that were installed, and you can  
24 actually look at the concentrations from each one  
25 of those. So it's a lot more detailed than just

1 the proposed plans you have, and this isn't even  
2 the -- this -- there is multiple documents that are  
3 this thick. So there's a lot of sampling that has  
4 occurred over the years.

5 MS. MCDANIEL: Is that information from DHEC or from the  
6 people who were doing this prior to you-all?

7 MR. RAMAGLIA: So there's a environmental consultant  
8 that AVM as the -- so AVM signed the VCC, the  
9 voluntary cleanup contract, with the Department.  
10 There's a environmental consultant that actually  
11 goes out and does the sampling and they submit the  
12 work to the Department to evaluate. Does that make  
13 sense? Yeah?

14 MS. GERALD: Diane Gerald. I had the two questions,  
15 also, that Linda had, okay?

16 You said there was no concern how they test  
17 beyond -- coming, you know, across the road.  
18 That's where we live. Okay. First of all, we  
19 didn't hear about it until now, so, if it's no  
20 concern and you test here and the -- and -- and the  
21 chemicals are no farther than here, why are we here  
22 tonight if it's not any concern?

23 MR. RAMAGLIA: We just want to involve the public just  
24 to let them know about what's happening in their  
25 neighborhood. I mean, flat out, that's really it.

1 I mean, that -- that's why up front, in the  
2 beginning of the presentation, I wanted to make  
3 sure that everybody knew there is no concern in  
4 your neighborhoods. You know, it's not off the  
5 property, but, to do it without involving the  
6 public -- we -- we just don't want to do that.

7 That's part of our process, so . . .

8 MS. GERALD: That's true, too, but, from there to now,  
9 we are here, and you are answering these questions  
10 in this state. But we live in that area, and we  
11 are still concerned. Even though what you said, we  
12 are still worried, you know?

13 MR. RAMAGLIA: Yeah. No, I understand.

14 MS. GERALD: It's -- it's not -- it's not feeding us  
15 what we need to hear. We need to be tested on each  
16 property to see if any contamination is across that  
17 street, and AVM will need to supply that.

18 MS. KENNEDY: Van Kennedy. My question is: Since I'm  
19 relatively new, I don't know what AVM actually --  
20 what they do. If you could break that down --

21 MR. RAMAGLIA: Sure.

22 MS. KENNEDY: -- so that I can better understand why,  
23 you know, the contaminants --

24 MR. RAMAGLIA: Sure.

25 MS. KENNEDY: -- are out there.

1 MR. RAMAGLIA: Sure. So the three products that they  
2 produce at -- on-site are gas springs, vacuum  
3 actuators, and window regulators.

4 MS. KENNEDY: Uh-huh.

5 MR. RAMAGLIA: To be completely honest, I don't know  
6 what each one of those individual parts are, but  
7 they're for motor vehicles.

8 MS. KENNEDY: For motor vehicles?

9 MR. RAMAGLIA: They're -- they're for -- for motor  
10 vehicles, yeah.

11 MR. ATKINSON: For hatchbacks. On the back of your car,  
12 those two, little shock absorbers.

13 MS. KENNEDY: Yes.

14 MR. ATKINSON: That's what they make.

15 MS. KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

16 MR. RAMAGLIA: And, in that process, they use these  
17 solvents for -- for cleaning and stuff like that,  
18 and so that's why those contaminants are being used  
19 on-site.

20 MR. ATKINSON: PCE is a degreaser, isn't it?

21 MR. RAMAGLIA: Right. Correct.

22 MR. ATKINSON: They use in dry cleaners.

23 MR. RAMAGLIA: They do.

24 MS. BROWN: My name is Cynthia Brown. No disrespect, I  
25 have little respect for DHEC. When I taught at

1 Marion High School and we had, you know, like a  
2 tuberculosis outbreak. Yeah. They sat on it for a  
3 year and a half. And every teacher and every  
4 student had to be test. At that time, I test  
5 positive, not for tuberculosis, but I had to  
6 undergo some severe medication.

7 I have been complaining for the past year to  
8 the Clemson University people about a concern I  
9 have on my property. I have complained to the  
10 water department for testing. Now, I concur with  
11 my neighbors. We've lost a lot of lives out here  
12 within the past ten years -- a lot. And we within  
13 a 1 1/2-mile-radius from this plant.

14 Now, AVM sat on this for two years. That gave  
15 them a little time to cover up and clean up what  
16 could've crossed the street, and we not going to  
17 let it stop here. We have a neighborhood council.  
18 We going to proceed to make sure that all of those  
19 folks who have died in Williams' Park did not get  
20 any contamination from that drinking water.

21 We have seen people come out and pump water in  
22 our neighborhood. They didn't tell us why. Just  
23 came out and ran the water about a half -- half of  
24 the day, but never told us why.

25 So we are concerned. We not going to believe

1           you just because you say contamination is just on-  
2           site. Because I concur with my neighbors: If it  
3           were on-site, we wouldn't need to be here. We're  
4           here for a reason. We are here for a reason.

5           On-site: You don't need a meeting. It's  
6           contained. The fact that this meeting was called,  
7           we plan to proceed and find out as much as we can  
8           with this. We just not going to take the  
9           presentation. We just not going to take your word.  
10          We're going to do some documentation on some health  
11          issues, do a lot of research.

12          And I want to know, if it's groundwater, when  
13          does anything become airborne? If water is in the  
14          ground and you're dealing with evaporating -- I'm  
15          getting tongue twisted -- evaporation, do the  
16          chemicals ever get into the air?

17   MR. RAMAGLIA: Are you asking now?

18   MS. BROWN: Yes.

19   MR. RAMAGLIA: I'm still listening. Sorry.

20          So they -- they actually sample on-site for  
21          air, specifically, in -- in -- in the facility  
22          because of the workers. They want to make sure  
23          that they're not actually breathing any of that in  
24          so they actually do --

25   MS. BROWN: That's just the on-site air, but not air in

1           -- in the surrounding area?

2   MR. RAMAGLIA: Right. Right. So on -- I'm sorry. So,  
3           yes. On-site, specifically, inside the facility  
4           for the workers.

5           I mean, and I -- I respect your -- your  
6           questions and concerns, obviously, very much. And  
7           so it's, obviously, no -- no disrespect to your --  
8           your concern. It's justified, but we're not here  
9           trying to hide anything from anybody. We're here  
10          to -- to make it known to the public, and, based on  
11          the research, like, and the time it takes for --  
12          for remedies to actually work on these contaminants  
13          for -- it's -- AVM couldn't have gone out and --  
14          and just started treating and hiding things. It  
15          doesn't work that way. It takes a very long  
16          time --

17   MS. BROWN: They did it for two years.

18   MR. RAMAGLIA: -- so . . .

19   MS. BROWN: They -- they hid it for approximately two  
20          years. You didn't know -- I just heard somebody  
21          say for two years AVM didn't tell DHEC.

22   MR. RAMAGLIA: (To Mr. Stewart) Do you want to speak  
23          about that?

24   MS. BROWN: You said that for two years -- for two  
25          years, sir. They didn't even tell DHEC. That's a

1           problem. That is a big problem. This is 2016. We  
2           are talking, sir, 12 years ago. When a company  
3           discovered the problem, probably panicked.  
4           Wouldn't even tell DHEC. When they found they  
5           couldn't control it, then they told DHEC. That's  
6           all I have to say.

7   MS. VINCENT: Thank you, Ms. Brown.

8   MS. KENNEDY: I have a follow-up to that. Does DHEC --

9   MS. VINCENT: Let me -- let me get the mic to you.

10  MS. KENNEDY: Oh, sure.

11  MS. VINCENT: Thank you.

12  MS. KENNEDY: I have a follow-up. Does DHEC -- okay.

13           Right now, from what I -- my understanding is that  
14           AVM's doing it themselves. What about DHEC? What  
15           is DHEC doing? Are you out there testing?

16  MR. RAMAGLIA: We're working -- so there's an  
17           environmental consultant that AVM is working with.

18  MS. KENNEDY: Okay. Let me ask this question. The  
19           consultant: Who is the consultant? Is that for  
20           DHEC or for AVM?

21  MR. RAMAGLIA: The consultant -- their name is EnSafe,  
22           and so they're the ones actually going out and  
23           doing the --

24  MS. KENNEDY: So who's paying them? is my question.

25  MR. RAMAGLIA: So the -- the funding is coming from

1 AVM --

2 MS. KENNEDY: Okay.

3 MR. RAMAGLIA: -- through the --

4 MS. KENNEDY: See, that's a concern. Why isn't DHEC  
5 test -- you know, have their people out testing, as  
6 well?

7 MR. RAMAGLIA: (To Mr. Gary Stewart) So do you want  
8 to . . .

9 MR. STEWART: The work that's -- the work that's being  
10 done by AVM is being overseen by DHEC. They hire  
11 the consultant; the consultant writes work plans  
12 and reports. We review those. Our technical  
13 people review those. Their samples have to be  
14 collected by certain procedures that are approved  
15 by DHEC.

16 MS. KENNEDY: Uh-huh.

17 MR. STEWART: They go to laboratories that are certified  
18 by DHEC.

19 MS. KENNEDY: Uh-huh.

20 MR. STEWART: They go under what's called the "chain of  
21 custody." When a sample is collected, the bottle  
22 is sealed. There's a -- like a piece of tape that  
23 goes on it and a seal that goes over it. It's put  
24 in the cooler. The cooler is sealed. It goes to  
25 the laboratory. Everybody that touches it signs

1 off on it.

2 So the laboratory's actually certified for all  
3 the -- all the lab work they do. If they  
4 -- if they analyze for metals, they have to be  
5 certified for metals analysis. If they analyze for  
6 the volatile organic compounds that we talked about  
7 here, they have to be certified for that. So we  
8 know we're getting representative data -- data that  
9 is good.

10 If it -- if it shows there is a contaminant in  
11 that water, we believe it. If it -- if it shows  
12 it's not in that water, we believe that because it  
13 -- it's gone through all these quality assurance  
14 checks along the way. The company has the  
15 responsibility to collect those samples and to do  
16 that under their contract with DHEC.

17 MS. KENNEDY: Okay. And how often were the samples  
18 taken?

19 MR. STEWART: (To Mr. Ramaglia) What frequency did they  
20 -- how many times: ground sample?

21 MR. RAMAGLIA: I'd have to look specifically -- I -- I  
22 don't remember off the top of my head.

23 MR. STEWART: Well, we -- we -- we'd have to follow up  
24 with you on how often it's been sampled. I -- I  
25 don't know the answer.

1 MS. KENNEDY: I'd appreciate that. Thank you.

2 MR. ATKINSON: My name is Dupree Atkinson. I own the  
3 whole property on the left-hand side, so it's not  
4 moving towards me. And these folks got a right to  
5 be concerned because there's a high water table out  
6 there. That water table out there is extremely  
7 high. How many of y'all are on well?

8 (Multiple simultaneous responses  
9 from the public.)

10 MR. ATKINSON: Are y'all on well water?

11 (Multiple simultaneous responses  
12 from the public.)

13 MR. ATKINSON: Are y'all on city water?

14 (Multiple simultaneous responses  
15 from the public.)

16 MR. ATKINSON: Y'all all on city water?

17 (Multiple simultaneous responses  
18 from the public.)

19 MR. ATKINSON: Y'all on well water?

20 (Multiple simultaneous responses  
21 from the public.)

22 MR. ATKINSON: You got a deep well at your place?

23 (Multiple simultaneous responses  
24 from the public.)

25 MR. ATKINSON: And y'all all live across the street over

1           there across that railroad track that way?

2                           (Multiple simultaneous responses  
3                           from the public.)

4   MR. ATKINSON:   I'd be concerned, but, I mean, I don't  
5           know.  And I can -- but -- if you're on city water,  
6           you shouldn't be concerned by that, should you?

7           But the water table out there is high.  It's real  
8           high because it's on the top part of that bay, and  
9           that bay -- that bay is wet.

10  MR. RAMAGLIA:   What -- what I'd -- what I'd recommend if  
11           -- and I agree, like, your concerns are valid.

12           Obviously, I agree with you, but, if you want to  
13           have a little bit more confidence in -- in the data  
14           and the work that's been done, I encourage you to  
15           -- to go to that administrative record.  We gave  
16           you some of the links if you -- I'll go back and  
17           get them for you if you want to write them down.

18           Contact the Freedom of Information office at DHEC.  
19           Get that administrative record and read through it.

20           I mean, it's -- it's a lot.  You'll see --

21  MS. KENNEDY:   Okay.  We -- yes.  Read through -- it's --

22  MS. GERALD:   We want action.  We want to be tested.

23  MS. KENNEDY:   We -- we want DHEC to do something about  
24           it.

25  MR. STEWART:   At the end of the meeting, everyone who's

1           drinking from a private well please come down and  
2           give us your name and address, and we will follow  
3           up. I can't -- I can't promise you that your well  
4           will be sampled. We will follow up. We got to  
5           look and see where they're located in comparison to  
6           the contamination. We will be --

7   MS. KENNEDY: Well -- well, you know, the community at  
8           hand -- all of it, you know? I mean, people who  
9           eating Dry Dock, you know, all community. All of  
10          us right there in the same vicinity. It needs to  
11          be tested, and I think this is a -- the position  
12          that DHEC should take --

13   MR. ATKINSON: If you have a well --

14   MS. KENNEDY: -- and not rely on --

15   MR. ATKINSON: If you got a well --

16   MS. KENNEDY: -- on -- on the -- on --

17   MR. ATKINSON: -- I would take a water sample, and I  
18          would take it to DHEC, and I'd get them to check  
19          it.

20   MR. STEWART: Well --

21   MR. ATKINSON: That's what I'd do. You can't do that?

22   MR. STEWART: -- the problem -- the problem with that is  
23          that if someone takes a sample and just brings it  
24          into DHEC, we don't know how it's been collected or  
25          anything like that. So it wouldn't be a valid

1 sample, but, I mean, we want to make sure that we  
2 have accurate samples.

3 MR. ATKINSON: I understand that. Well, I understand  
4 that. But --

5 MR. STEWART: But -- like I say, after the meeting,  
6 please come -- please come give us your name and  
7 address after the meeting.

8 MS. BATTLE: Lynn Battle. My question is: On Page 7,  
9 you have the chemicals here, but you haven't  
10 offered us any documentation as to the health risks  
11 to the public --

12 MR. RAMAGLIA: Okay.

13 MS. BATTLE: -- for the contamination.

14 MR. RAMAGLIA: Okay.

15 MS. BATTLE: That's Number 1.

16 MR. RAMAGLIA: Okay.

17 MS. BATTLE: And then, Number 2, even if we are not on  
18 well water, has our water company been notified, or  
19 has water been tested with that company, MarCo?

20 MR. RAMAGLIA: So -- so, in response to your -- the  
21 first question --

22 MS. BATTLE: The first question is: As a -- as a member  
23 of that community, what health risks,  
24 hypothetically, would I know to look for if I was  
25 exposed to this contamination, and then, Number 2,

1           why is there no documentation for, you know, the  
2           retributions of these chemicals?

3   MR. RAMAGLIA:   Okay.   So --

4   MS. BATTLE:   I mean, you're telling us it's there, but  
5           you don't tell us what it does to us --

6   MR. RAMAGLIA:   Okay.

7   MS. BATTLE:   -- what we should look for --

8   MR. RAMAGLIA:   Sure.

9   MS. BATTLE:   -- so we can be well-informed.

10  MR. RAMAGLIA:   Sure.   So, specifically, the contaminants  
11           of concern, they're volatile organic compounds.  
12           It's the fancy name for them.   They're solvents, so  
13           they're used to clean things.   Specifically, those  
14           risks you -- I'm not saying there is a risk  
15           because, again, we are confident that it's not off  
16           the property.   So we're confident that it's not in  
17           your wells.   I still understand the concern, but  
18           just to put that out there.   We're confident that  
19           -- via the data that that has been done all along  
20           through the monitoring, but, specifically,  
21           hypothetically speaking, if there was a risk,  
22           they're carcinogenic.   So they're cancer-causing  
23           contaminants.

24  MR. OWENS:   Cecil Owens.   You spoke a while ago about  
25           the contamination in 2004.   And I think that you

1 brought up that someone else was testing the water  
2 or had the results. Who was that?

3 MR. RAMAGLIA: In 2004, they -- am I saying this  
4 correctly? -- AVM did, for whatever reason, their  
5 Phase I ESA, so they were looking at potential  
6 areas of concern. They went on to do the Phase II  
7 ESA, which is where they actually detected the VOCs  
8 in the groundwater. After that, according to what  
9 Mr. Stewart said, the Department got involved. The  
10 VCC contract was arranged, and then this whole  
11 process continued. So I'm not quite  
12 understanding --

13 MR. OWENS: Do you have the results from that test back  
14 in 2004 versus what you got now?

15 MR. RAMAGLIA: Right. So the ESAs -- the result --  
16 everything that was done in those ESAs Phase I,  
17 Phase II, and then even in between the Focused  
18 Feasibility Study -- this document here -- there  
19 was the Remedial -- Remedial Investigation report  
20 document. All those reports are in that  
21 administrative record that I -- that I talked about  
22 so --

23 MR. OWENS: All the contamination?

24 MR. RAMAGLIA: Right. So everything that is known at  
25 the site is in all of those documents, and all of

1           that is at the library and at the Freedom of  
2           Information office. So you can -- you have full  
3           access to all of that.

4   MR. OWENS: Okay.

5   MS. VINCENT: (To Mr. Ramaglia) And explain what an ESA  
6           -- for everyone -- to remind them since the -- the  
7           screen is gone. ESA.

8   MR. RAMAGLIA: Sure. So, in 2004, there was a Phase I  
9           Environmental Site Assessment. That's what "ESA"  
10          stands for. They went out, and there was some  
11          areas of concern. It was enough for them to go  
12          back and actually do some sampling and do the Phase  
13          II Environmental Site Assessment, which is where  
14          they actually detected that in the vicinity of  
15          those areas of concern there were actually VOCs in  
16          the groundwater. Is that -- does that clear it up?

17   MS. BATTLE: I don't think you answered my second  
18          question about MarCo Water.

19   MR. RAMAGLIA: About what?

20   MS. BATTLE: Were they -- MarCo water. The second part  
21          of my question.

22   MR. RAMAGLIA: The water distributor? Okay.

23   MS. BATTLE: Were they notified? Is anything being done  
24          with them?

25   MR. RAMAGLIA: Can I get back to you? I -- I don't want

1           to guess on that. I want to give you an actual  
2           answer.

3    MS. KENNEDY: I -- I am going to check with MarCo myself  
4           to find out what's going on, you know, because I am  
5           very concerned about this. I have to leave for  
6           another meeting, but I'm really concerned about  
7           this. I'll do a follow-up.

8    MS. WILLIAMS: My name is Ginger Williams. And my  
9           question is: How often will we be updated on the  
10          progress being made on everything -- the status of  
11          the decontamination from this point forward?

12   MR. RAMAGLIA: So, for the next 30 days, it's that  
13          public comment period, so anything that you would  
14          like to make comments on, have questions about send  
15          into -- your contacts at the Department will be  
16          Lucas Berresford, right here, and Gary Stewart.  
17          And then, after that, the Record of Decision is the  
18          next document in this process that takes place.  
19          Obviously, all those questions or comments are  
20          taken into consideration by the Department, and,  
21          based on those, in light of everything that -- all  
22          the sampling that's happened over the number of  
23          years, the Record of Decision makes the decision on  
24          what's going to happen at the site. So our  
25          preferred remedy for this site is the Alternative

1           4, which is that In Situ Chemical Reduction and the  
2           Bioremediation, so those injections and those  
3           different things to remediate the contamination,  
4           right, and so --

5   MS. WILLIAMS:   Okay.   So, I guess --

6   MR. RAMAGLIA:   Go ahead.

7   MS. WILLIAMS:   -- what I'm -- I'm asking -- I understand  
8           what you're saying.

9   MR. RAMAGLIA:   Okay.

10  MS. WILLIAMS:   But what I'm asking is:   How often --  
11           after the 30 days and the public comments come in,  
12           how often are you going to let us know a status on  
13           what's going on, as far as decontamination:   the  
14           levels?   I mean, how often are we're going to know  
15           as the public?

16  MR. RAMAGLIA:   Okay.   (To Mr. Berresford)   Is there a --  
17           is there a process for that?

18  MR. BERRESFORD:   That's -- part of these meetings is to  
19           see what the public interests are in sites.   Here  
20           there seems to be a fairly substantial public  
21           interest in the facility and what's going on.   In  
22           the past, we have sent out little postcards that  
23           say, "Here is the status.   This is what's  
24           happening," as things happen.   So, like --

25  MS. WILLIAMS:   And may -- and may I say, with the

1 postcards, I've called up a number of my neighbors  
2 who did not even -- was aware of it because they  
3 did not pay attention to the small postcard because  
4 they looked at it as something they would throw it  
5 in the trash because you have so much -- what's the  
6 word?

7 MS. BROWN: Junk mail.

8 MS. WILLIAMS: -- junk mail coming in. So they didn't  
9 -- they didn't really pay attention to that.

10 MR. BERRESFORD: And we try to not just send out  
11 postcards. We try to also get it in the newspaper  
12 so that people can see it in multiple places. But  
13 we're doing the best we can to get things out, and,  
14 as far as the volume, when you look at all the  
15 sites that we have to do these on, to get a large  
16 volume out we have to try to condense the  
17 information and then give it links to other places  
18 to find more information.

19 MS. WILLIAMS: I have one more question, too.

20 You said that you're going to do Alternative  
21 4. That's the -- that's that --

22 MR. RAMAGLIA: -- the preferred remedy.

23 MS. WILLIAMS: -- the preferred remedy?

24 MR. RAMAGLIA: Right.

25 MS. WILLIAMS: But it's not decided, so it's going to

1           have to be -- really, it's going to come to a  
2           conclusion after the 30 days and it goes through  
3           the decision-making process?

4   MR. RAMAGLIA:   Right.

5   MS. WILLIAMS:   So, in the process of the 30 days, while  
6           we're waiting, what is being done to make sure the  
7           contamination doesn't get into the water system due  
8           to the surrounding areas on the same water line?

9   MR. RAMAGLIA:   Right.  So these contaminants -- they're  
10           not -- it's not like a river.  It's -- it's not --  
11           they don't move very quickly.  It takes decades  
12           upon decades for this to move in the groundwater,  
13           to -- to transition to different areas.  And so 30  
14           days, geologically speaking, is an incredibly short  
15           amount of time.  It's -- it's not like a river, so  
16           it's not like someone's dropping it in the river  
17           and it's flooding over to the next property.  It  
18           doesn't work that way.

19                    I mean, if you look -- like, the data from  
20           2004 when the ESAs began and then the Phase II  
21           began, the remedial investigation began, the  
22           interim action happened, and the Focused  
23           Feasibility Study, and all that time the  
24           contamination is still on-site.  And so, again, I  
25           -- I don't know if that's comforting at all, but,

1 geologically speaking, 30 days is -- it's a  
2 millisecond. It's no time at all, so --

3 MR. BERRESFORD: And -- and, to one point you said,  
4 we're not worried about the contamination getting  
5 into city water lines and getting distributed like  
6 that. We don't see that as a realistic scenario  
7 for things happening. Now, people who are drinking  
8 well water, who have private wells, like Mr.  
9 Stewart said, come talk to us after the meeting.  
10 Let us get your location, and we'll go back and  
11 we'll look at it. And we'll see if we need to do  
12 something else in the near future in that interim  
13 time frame.

14 MS. PHILLIPS: I do have another question. You said  
15 that you just -- well, you -- the last time it was  
16 tested, I think, in 2015, right?

17 MR. RAMAGLIA: That's when the Focused Feasibility Study  
18 was completed.

19 MS. PHILLIPS: Oh, okay. Well, I don't the date of the  
20 last test, but four years/ten years ago we did not  
21 have a flood in -- in Marion County like we've had  
22 in the past. You said the contamination may not  
23 move fast, but, with the flooding that we have had  
24 here, I'm sure it moved faster than normal. But I  
25 -- my question is: Oh -- what are you doing now --

1           okay. For example, my property flooded out. It  
2           came from this direction. What do I do right now  
3           to test my water to see if it's contaminated or  
4           not? Because that was in October. I don't think  
5           you've done a test since October.

6   MR. RAMAGLIA: It -- are you talking about your drinking  
7           water in your home?

8   MS. PHILLIPS: Drinking water.

9   MR. RAMAGLIA: Are you getting city water?

10   MS. PHILLIPS: No.

11   MR. RAMAGLIA: You're talking about well water?

12   MS. PHILLIPS: You're talking about right here, yeah --  
13           Williams' Park.

14   MR. RAMAGLIA: Okay.

15   MS. PHILLIPS: So it's just well water. What is the  
16           answer to that?

17   MR. RAMAGLIA: Are -- are you --

18   MS. PHILLIPS: Since October?

19   MR. RAMAGLIA: Since October? I can't give you an  
20           answer at --

21   MS. PHILLIPS: So no testing --

22   MR. RAMAGLIA: -- right now.

23   MS. PHILLIPS: -- has been done since --

24   MR. RAMAGLIA: So --

25   MS. PHILLIPS: -- the flood? That's what you're saying?

1 MR. RAMAGLIA: I don't believe so. I'd -- to give you  
2 an exact -- or an exact answer, I can look at the  
3 Focused Feasibility Study.

4 MS. VINCENT: We'll get that answer for you.

5 MR. RAMAGLIA: But I don't think it's been done since  
6 the flooding. (Inaudible) speak to that.

7 MR. BERRESFORD: And I think the standard sampling at  
8 this site is like an annual sampling for  
9 groundwater. They go out there once a year and  
10 collect samples to makes sure things are staying  
11 the same, and what we've seen, over a period of  
12 time, is they have pretty much stayed the same in  
13 the wells. Now, as far as in the interim time,  
14 please, when we're done, come forward and give us  
15 your name and address. We're going to go back and  
16 look at all the names and addresses, where they're  
17 located and try to see if there are some locations  
18 that we need to sample.

19 Now, that being said, if we go out and sample  
20 four or five that are the closest to it and they're  
21 all clean, that gives us a good feeling that it's  
22 not going any further. And then the -- and then,  
23 you know, we've done something to help appease  
24 concerns. We don't necessarily think there is a  
25 concern right now, but we can understand yours.

1           And we will take all of those addresses back.  
2           We'll look, and we'll try to come up with a plan to  
3           address as many of your concerns as we can. We  
4           can't sample every single well, but we can come up  
5           with a plan that shows: "Let's start here," and  
6           then, if we should happen to see something, expand  
7           out from there.

8   MS. GERALD: Diane Gerald. Okay. You said as DHEC you  
9           can't sample each person's property, but that's the  
10           only way we're going to feel ensured. Okay.  
11           You're at DHEC. AVM created the problem. AVM need  
12           to take part in this and sample each person's  
13           property because they are the plant that caused the  
14           problem. DHEC can't do it all, then somebody --  
15           they'll need to go to AVM to ensure us. Okay. The  
16           Cunjon closed down because they had a problem. A  
17           lot of people got sick and everything. The company  
18           is gone. Okay. The word out now that AVM is going  
19           to close down. Okay. If they close down, create  
20           this problem, we stuck. Okay.

21           We need to be informed with a public meeting,  
22           just like we have now, within those 30 days.  
23           You're saying, "Call this/call that." I feel we  
24           should come back to another public forum and be  
25           advised on what's going on, what have been done

1           since we had this meeting. The soil test, all that  
2           information need to be in place when we come to the  
3           next meeting, where you done went to everybody's  
4           property, made everybody feel satisfied; then we  
5           can close the book on it. Until then, the book  
6           can't get closed.

7   MS. PHILLIPS: And I got one last question.

8           You said that you will be using Remedy 4, and  
9           it cost nine hundred and five thousand -- 905 --  
10          wait a minute --

11   MR. RAMAGLIA: That's right.

12   MS. PHILLIPS: -- \$900,000 and more? And it says  
13          "community acceptance." What options do we have?  
14          You -- you saying this is the remedy that you're  
15          going to use.

16   MR. RAMAGLIA: Well, no. This is our preferred remedy,  
17          so that's --

18   MS. PHILLIPS: This is your preferred remedy, and then  
19          you said "with community acceptance." What options  
20          do we have? And who's going to pay for this?

21   MR. RAMAGLIA: Again, AVM is in that voluntary cleanup  
22          contract, so they are funding the cleanup. So it's  
23          not coming from any of your pockets. This is AVM's  
24          problem. They've acknowledged it. They have  
25          entered into this contract with the Department, and

1           they are funding the cleanup.

2                    Again, like -- again, like Mr. Stewart said  
3           earlier, the -- everything that the environmental  
4           consultant does gets submitted through us, and we  
5           evaluate all the data, what they have presented to  
6           us. And so we -- we are working in tandem with  
7           them to make the best educated decision based on  
8           the science and -- and the sampling that's occurred  
9           over the history of the site. So I'll --

10   MS. PHILLIPS: My -- my question was: What options --

11   MR. RAMAGLIA: -- we'll -- did you have another question  
12           there?

13   MS. PHILLIPS: -- do we have?

14   MR. RAMAGLIA: Okay. So these are the options that have  
15           been presented. These are the alternatives.

16                    Again, based on the science, we think that this is  
17           the best option to most quickly remedy the site --  
18           most quickly get rid of most of the toxicities --  
19           or the concentrations. We want to get those down  
20           to the MCLs, which is those EPA standards.

21                    We think this is the best option to make it --  
22           prevent it from becoming mobile, to prevent it from  
23           leaving the site, and to reduce the volume.

24                    Because the -- that -- that's going to be treating  
25           the contaminant. And so, outside of these four

1 options, we don't want to do No Action, obviously.

2 MS. PHILLIPS: Definitely not.

3 MR. RAMAGLIA: Right.

4 MS. PHILLIPS: But the next thing you put it to us, you  
5 said, "I'll -- we will -- we -- we are considering  
6 Number 4" --

7 MR. RAMAGLIA: Correct.

8 MS. PHILLIPS: -- "with community acceptance."

9 MR. RAMAGLIA: Correct. Which is why we're here.

10 MS. PHILLIPS: Then my question is: Do I have any other  
11 option? I think -- I'm with other neighbors: Come  
12 on my property and you test my water. You caused  
13 the problem.

14 MR. RAMAGLIA: And --

15 MS. PHILLIPS: Test my soil.

16 MR. RAMAGLIA: And, again, this is why Mr. Berresford  
17 was saying come give us your information.

18 MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.

19 MR. RAMAGLIA: If there is a plan, we would love to see  
20 that happen. Procedurally, I'm personally not sure  
21 how that -- that works. These guys are -- have  
22 been around a lot longer than I have.

23 Sure. That's -- that's a step, but, as far as  
24 cleaning up, maybe that gives you some assurance  
25 that it's not actually in your well, and that's

1 great. I mean, I would love that, but, as far as,  
2 like, making sure it doesn't get to that well,  
3 again, that's where the preferred remedy comes in.  
4 So we want to prevent future risks to the public.  
5 Does that make sense?

6 MS. PHILLIPS: No.

7 MR. BERRESFORD: And I think the key thing is, if we did  
8 come on properties to sample, we'd be looking at  
9 sampling the drinking water -- the groundwater.  
10 The soil contamination at this site is very limited  
11 right to the area. It's the -- the main source  
12 areas that Chris had pointed out on there.

13 MR. RAMAGLIA: And it's all been removed.

14 MR. BERRESFORD: And they did removals there. What  
15 we're left with, after they took out the  
16 contaminated soil, is this contaminated  
17 groundwater, and that, across the state, is  
18 something that's much more difficult to clean up  
19 than just digging up contaminated soil. So we --  
20 we would not anticipate any soil contamination out  
21 of that area right by the plant. Now, groundwater,  
22 it can move in ways -- and that's where we want to  
23 get with y'all and try to come up with a --

24 MS. WILLIAMS: Well, we telling y'all what we want you  
25 to do, and you're just talking around in circles.

1 MS. MCDANIEL: Tennille McDaniel. If the community  
2 decides not to accept Alternative 4 and they want  
3 more research or per se an attorney to look at this  
4 for them because the documentation is not something  
5 that we're used to reading --

6 MR. RAMAGLIA: Sure.

7 MS. MCDANIEL: -- can we ask for that? Because it looks  
8 like we need someone else to look at that  
9 information who will know what they're reading  
10 because, to us -- of course, I don't understand  
11 MCIs and, you know, the -- the --

12 MR. RAMAGLIA: Sure.

13 MS. MCDANIEL: -- information that you're providing. So  
14 what if they don't accept Number 4? Are you  
15 providing time for them to get an attorney to look  
16 at the information and then get back with you?  
17 Because, to me, you're not giving any options.  
18 You're telling us what you're going to do, and  
19 that's not fair.

20 MR. RAMAGLIA: So, again, give us your information, and  
21 let us try to figure out a plan to --

22 MS. MCDANIEL: But my question was --

23 MR. RAMAGLIA: Sorry.

24 MS. MCDANIEL: -- are you going to give the community  
25 time?

1 MR. RAMAGLIA: Sure.

2 MS. MCDANIEL: Because 30 days -- you may not be able to  
3 find an attorney in 30 days.

4 MS. VINCENT: Mr. Stewart will answer that.

5 MR. STEWART: We recognize that may not be enough time.  
6 That's our -- that's what we give as a standard.  
7 We can extend that. I'm willing tonight to -- to  
8 run it out to 60 days. What we would like to do,  
9 though, is get -- get something in writing from --  
10 from members of the community saying, "We need some  
11 more time to evaluate this. We want to provide  
12 input but we need some more time." Things like  
13 that, that come in writing, help us justify  
14 extending it further.

15 We -- we can't extend it out two years. We --  
16 we need to get something implemented so the cleanup  
17 can start. As you saw, the time frames -- even the  
18 shortest time frame is maybe 15 to 30 years, so --

19 MS. MCDANIEL: Yeah. But they had to wait -- the  
20 community had to wait for years to even be  
21 notified, so surely you can wait for them to get  
22 this -- the attorney or whatever representation  
23 they need. Because, like I said earlier, you're  
24 pulling in people who don't work with DHEC or  
25 environmental issues, so they need someone who can

1 understand the documentation. Holding up a  
2 notebook is not helping anybody.

3 MR. STEWART: We understand that. And -- and, like I  
4 said, we'll go ahead tonight -- I don't know what  
5 30 -- what date the 30 days is --

6 MR. RAMAGLIA: July 13th.

7 MR. STEWART: -- sometime, I guess, in August -- August  
8 13th or thereabouts.

9 MR. RAMAGLIA: July 13th.

10 MR. STEWART: Well, the current date is on July.

11 MR. RAMAGLIA: Oh, for 60.

12 MR. STEWART: We'll go ahead and extend it to August  
13 13th. If that falls on a weekend, we'll go to that  
14 following Monday. And, please, like I say, put  
15 things in writing to us. And -- and we will --  
16 we'll follow up with you.

17 MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. This is my last question.

18 It was stated earlier -- and it is so-called  
19 "rumors" going around that AVM is going to be  
20 closing and maybe shipping off overseas. So will  
21 they still be responsible for the funding behind --  
22 if they do, possibly, leave the area?

23 MR. STEWART: The -- the company, under the law, has  
24 liability. They have liability for -- for cleaning  
25 up the site. Now, the biggest thing that happens

1           when companies close up is sometimes they file for  
2           bankruptcy protection.

3   MS. WILLIAMS:   Uh-huh.

4   MR. STEWART:   If they file for bankruptcy protection,  
5           all bets are off because -- and -- and the reason I  
6           say that is the bankruptcy courts -- it -- it's  
7           very, very complicated.  I don't understand it,  
8           but, in those situations, where there's -- where  
9           there's not a company available to do the work, we  
10          -- we compare it to other sites like that around  
11          the state, and we have some funds that we can apply  
12          toward those sites.  So, if -- if they close shop  
13          and file for bankruptcy protection, you know, we --  
14          we -- we rank it with other sites like that across  
15          the state.

16  MS. GERALD:   Well, we would've known earlier, we'd --  
17           we'd have had time to do our thing, but, now y'all  
18           telling us on -- on the end.  You know, we up  
19           against a rock and a hard place.

20  MS. VINCENT:   Got another question over there.

21  MS. BATTLE:   My name is Lynn Battle.  I don't even know  
22           if it's a concern.  When you say "former AVM," and  
23           then you put that there as if you don't know the  
24           name of the company.  I am under -- been told that  
25           AVM is no longer, and it's another company.  I

1           can't bring that name up; it was told to me -- but  
2           that AVM does not exist. So is there a reason why  
3           you say "former" and then you inadvertently say you  
4           don't know? I mean, shouldn't we know the name of  
5           this company? And then my other question is: When  
6           you say "samples," okay -- I just wanted to clarify  
7           -- did DHEC take the samples or did AVM former, we  
8           don't know their name, take the samples?

9           MR. RAMAGLIA: So the facility, since 1970, has  
10           operated, it's been the same.

11          MS. BATTLE: Right. We always call it "AVM," but there  
12           is somebody --

13          MR. RAMAGLIA: Right. So --

14          MS. BATTLE: When it comes down to a carcin situation,  
15           we should know their name.

16          MR. RAMAGLIA: Sure. I -- I -- I don't know if someone  
17           bought them out, and maybe they changed their name.  
18           I haven't looked into that. If you would like me  
19           to, I'd be more than willing to.

20                   As far as the sampling goes, AVM acknowledged  
21           there was a problem, an environmental consultant  
22           has done the sampling. Like Mr. Stewart explained  
23           earlier, that the way that they do the sampling is  
24           very secure. There's a method -- a procedure for  
25           it.

1 MS. BATTLE: The environmental --

2 MR. RAMAGLIA: -- consultant: EnSafe.

3 MS. BATTLE: -- for -- for AVM?

4 MR. RAMAGLIA: Right. They --

5 MS. BATTLE: Okay. But the -- the State/the City who

6 represent the people independently, not just

7 themselves as a company, they are not involved in

8 -- in protecting the environment?

9 MR. RAMAGLIA: DHEC -- we -- we get the -- the data from

10 the environmental consultant, and that's --

11 MS. BATTLE: How do you know --

12 MR. RAMAGLIA: Because there's the --

13 MS. BATTLE: -- that that's factual?

14 MR. RAMAGLIA: Because there's a specific procedure that

15 they have to abide by to take those samples, to

16 send them into us, so, when we get those samples --

17 when we get that data, we trust and believe that

18 it's accurate because of the procedure. And they

19 document that procedure in their -- in their

20 documentation or in their paperwork, and so it's

21 not just kids going out and taking a sample in and

22 saying, "Here you go." They're -- they're doing --

23 they're obeying a procedure and they're following

24 that procedure. And they're submitting it to us,

25 and we verify that and look at the data so . . .

1 MR. BERRESFORD: And -- and one more -- one more thing  
2 on that. These consultants that are going out  
3 collecting the samples, they're licensed engineers  
4 and geologists by the State. They may take a job  
5 to go do the sampling for AVM, but, when they send  
6 in a report, they are stamping that the data in  
7 that has followed the procedures that have been  
8 done. And, if it turns out that they didn't for  
9 some reason, they can get into some serious trouble  
10 with --

11 MS. BATTLE: But they may already --

12 MR. BERRESFORD: -- licensing --

13 MS. BATTLE: -- be in serious trouble, so that's the  
14 real reason --

15 MR. BERRESFORD: The --

16 MS. BATTLE: -- why they may not be forthcoming.

17 MR. BERRESFORD: The consulting firm that's doing this  
18 work --

19 MR. STEWART: -- they're a consultant for us, also.

20 MR. BERRESFORD: Yes.

21 MR. STEWART: We actually are paying them to clean up  
22 sites for DHEC.

23 MS. BATTLE: You're talking about EnSafe?

24 MR. BERRESFORD: Yes.

25 MR. STEWART: Yes. EnSafe.

1 MS. VINCENT: We have another question?

2 MS. BROWN: When you introduced the young lady at the  
3 table my legal antennas went up. You said "court  
4 reporter." My son's an attorney. You got a court  
5 reporter. I understand the reason behind that  
6 court reporter. I do have some concerns. How do  
7 we get a copy of what the court reporter's going to  
8 type up? Can -- can we get a copy of that? Do we  
9 have to pay for it? Will you mail it to us?

10 MR. BERRESFORD: How does that work?

11 MS. BROWN: That's something my attorney can -- but the  
12 court reporter, whatever she's going to transcribe  
13 can --

14 MS. VINCENT: Uh-huh.

15 MS. BROWN: -- y'all get a copy of that?

16 MS. VINCENT: Yes, yes.

17 MR. STEWART: It -- it takes a few weeks for us to get a  
18 copy.

19 MS. BROWN: Right. It takes time for her to -- to work,  
20 and I can understand that. But -- so that was my  
21 question -- get a copy of it.

22 And you must understand that, if AVM withheld  
23 this information for two years, why would -- why  
24 should we trust them? We live in -- in America.  
25 We watch the news. People lie. I don't care what

1           you say in here now. If I know I'm facing a lot of  
2           lawsuits, I can pay people under the table.

3           I've sat in courtrooms and seen police  
4           officers lie until they were caught, so just the  
5           sentence, you know, "They did it. They followed  
6           the guidelines," doesn't hold too much water until  
7           a thorough investigation, undercover, as whether or  
8           not that is a genuine, true statement. That's my  
9           last comment.

10       MS. WILLIAMS: I think we have the same question,  
11       because my thing is -- and I said my -- that other  
12       question, I messed up some of them's name, but --  
13       (to Ms. Vincent) I don't need that mic, ma'am.

14           I want to know what -- where is the  
15       representative for AVM? If they're very concerned  
16       about our health and the -- keeping the  
17       contamination and making sure that we are  
18       decontaminated, where is the representative from  
19       them? Because you-all are representing DHEC, and I  
20       know you-all are up there doing your job. I'm a  
21       chemist, so I understand exactly what you-all are  
22       talking about; however, where's the representative  
23       from AVM to speak and to -- to ensure us as the  
24       individuals within the community?

25       MR. STEWART: I -- I can't -- we can't speak for AVM.

1           They -- they had the opportunity to come. We -- we  
2           can't speak for why they're not here. We don't  
3           know.

4   MS. GERALD:   Okay. They were notified that y'all was  
5           going to be here?

6   MR. STEWART:   Yes, ma'am.

7   MR. RAMAGLIA:  Yes, ma'am.

8   MS. GERALD:   And y'all gave them the opportunity to  
9           present themselves?

10  MR. STEWART:   They would've had the opportunity to make  
11           themselves known.

12  MS. GERALD:   Okay.

13  MS. PHILLIPS:  And my last question is: For legal  
14           purposes, what is the legal name of the facilities?  
15           I don't want to say "former this" and "former  
16           that." I need a name.

17  MR. STEWART:   We will go back --

18  MS. PHILLIPS:  Okay.

19  MR. STEWART:   -- and get you the legal name of the  
20           company and how they operate at this facility --  
21           under what name. Now, the name that we call the  
22           site -- we get what we call a "site discovery."  
23           Sometimes it's a phone call, sometimes it's a piece  
24           of paper that's sent in, or an e-mail. And someone  
25           sitting at a desk gets something, and that's how

1           they type it in, and that's how it becomes known,  
2           whether that's correct or not.  We -- and it's hard  
3           to get a site name changed in our databases after  
4           years and years and years.  So we will find out the  
5           actual company name for you and get back to you on  
6           that.

7   MS. PHILLIPS:  Thank you-all so much.

8   MS. VINCENT:  Do we have any other questions?

9   MS. PHILLIPS:  Now, these questions that we ask tonight,  
10          she's recorded them, so we don't need to put this  
11          in writing to you?  You have the answers  
12          -- I mean, you have the questions?

13  MR STEWART:  Right.  But -- but let me say one thing.

14          What we really want is some feedback on the cleanup  
15          plan.  We -- we want make sure your other -- all of  
16          your concerns are taken care of.

17                 In addition, we'd like some feedback.  Do you  
18          think this sounds like a reasonable cleanup plan:  
19          15 years, 980,000 or 30 years, 10 million or don't  
20          spend any money and it takes a hundred-plus years.  
21          We want some feedback on that.  If -- if you can  
22          send us something like that in writing, we would  
23          really love that.

24  MS. MCDANIEL:  But, before they can give you an answer  
25          on an appropriate cleanup plan, there needs to be

1           some investigation on properties, etc. So you  
2           cannot get an answer until research is done, or we  
3           would be shooting our own selves in the foot,  
4           period.

5   MR. STEWART: All right. Thank you.

6   MS. WILLIAMS: That's for the surrounding areas from the  
7           back of AVM, I think, to the front, the sides,  
8           everywhere. I think that's only fair.

9   MS. VINCENT: Any other questions?

10  MS. GERALD: And we need to meet again. We need to meet  
11           in a forum again.

12  MS. VINCENT: Any other questions? If we don't have any  
13           other questions --

14  MS. MCDANIEL: One more question.

15  MS. VINCENT: One more. Okay.

16  MS. MCDANIEL: I'm sorry.

17  MS. VINCENT: Hang on.

18  MS. MCDANIEL: If an answer is not given to you on the  
19           date that you just suggested, are you going to move  
20           forward before hearing from the community?

21  MR. STEWART: We are expecting a response from the  
22           community.

23  MS. MCDANIEL: Give me a final --

24  MR. STEWART: If -- if -- if --

25  MS. MCDANIEL: -- date -- a final date that you are

1 going to say, "Okay. I'm moving forward."

2 MR. STEWART: I can't give you that date tonight. We  
3 need to look at if -- you know, are there -- are  
4 there five wells that need to be sampled? We need  
5 to look at things like that and figure out how long  
6 it might take us to -- to address some of your  
7 concerns. So like -- like you don't know how  
8 quickly you can hire someone to look at it --

9 MS. MCDANIEL: Uh-huh.

10 MR. STEWART: -- we don't know exactly how quickly we  
11 can try to address your concerns.

12 MS. MCDANIEL: Uh-huh.

13 MR. STEWART: So right now we're sitting on 60 days to  
14 get comments in, and, if we don't hear anything  
15 within that 60 days, that doesn't mean on Day 61  
16 that we're going to sign the paper saying, "This is  
17 it."

18 MS. MCDANIEL: And you will inform the community before  
19 you sign a paper?

20 MR. STEWART: We will -- we will commit to being back in  
21 touch with you, yes.

22 MS. MCDANIEL: Can another meeting be held before you  
23 sign that paper besides a little postcard saying  
24 that, "We're going on with Alternative 4"?

25 MR. STEWART: Most likely.

1 MS. MCDANIEL: Okay. Thank you so much.

2 MS. PHILLIPS: And I think the -- the attendance here is  
3 very small because nobody knew. So, once this gets  
4 out over the whole Mullins area, even if -- because  
5 they may have Marion -- because they may have  
6 parents that live out there -- elderly people that  
7 can't get up and come to this meeting, their  
8 representatives will come. The reason it's small  
9 tonight because Marion County didn't know about  
10 this meeting, or they didn't take it as interested  
11 -- they didn't put an interest in it as they should  
12 have. But, when we leave tonight and y'all put it  
13 on the television tonight, I'm sure people are  
14 going to come.

15 MS. WILLIAMS: And I -- and I know what you were say --  
16 we were saying about the postcards, with the other  
17 options. Some of us are younger; some of us are  
18 more active: Facebook, Twitter, Instagram. We  
19 need it on -- up there. We need to know when the  
20 next meeting is, because I may not look at -- I'm  
21 going to look at my major bills, but, if I get a  
22 little teeny postcard, I'm thinking that it's going  
23 to be -- I'm just going to throw it away.

24 MR. BERRESFORD: And --

25 MS. WILLIAMS: But I look at my Facebook, my Instagram,

1           and -- and my Twitter every day, and I definitely  
2           will go -- constantly going on DHEC page.

3   MR. BERRESFORD:   And I'll say that, in the past, we have  
4           set up a dedicated Web page for sites.  We've --  
5           it's something that, if -- if we need to do  
6           something like that, we can look into it.  And then  
7           you can go back -- and, as we get information, we  
8           can add to it.  So, like, if -- if we get to the  
9           point where we've gone out and sampled, we've made  
10          the community feel a little more comfortable with  
11          the remedy, we're going to pick a remedy and sign  
12          it, we can get a notice out there.  We can get a  
13          notice out for a meeting, if we're going to have  
14          one, as well as -- now we've got a -- at least a  
15          decent base to start with here from the -- y'all  
16          coming.  And we do appreciate everybody coming out  
17          tonight and participating with us.

18   MS. PHILLIPS:   So the next time we have our meeting -- I  
19          think we should have it on the 15th.  We'll get  
20          Tonya Brown to come to the meeting because this  
21          meeting -- I mean, people -- we -- people need to  
22          know what's happening.  And -- and AVM not here:  
23          They don't even care about us.

24   MS. WILLIAMS:   We need a -- we -- we --

25   MS. PHILLIPS:   They not --

1 MS. WILLIAMS: We definitely need to have their  
2 representative at the next meeting.

3 MS. VINCENT: Thank you guys for coming. We're going to  
4 close the meeting out.

5 (Whereupon, at 7:33 p.m., the public  
6 meeting of the above-entitled matter  
7 was concluded)

8 (\*This transcript may contain quoted material.  
9 Such material is reproduced as read or quoted  
10 by the speaker.)

11 (\*\*Certificate accompanies sealed original  
12 only.)