

L&WM ORIGINAL
File# 95322

RECEIVED

MAR 12 2008

DIVISION OF SITE
ASSESSMENT & REMEDIATION



Southern Reporting, Inc.

Transcript of the
DHEC Public Meeting

February 5, 2008

In Re:
EFP Products State Superfund Site

COPY

Southern Reporting, Inc.
Phone: 803.749.8100
Fax: 803.749.9991
Email: SouthernReporting@sc.rr.com

The original sealed transcript filed in Pat Vincent's office.

State of South Carolina)
)
County of York)
)
)
South Carolina Department)
of Health and)
Environmental Control,)
)
Bureau of Land and Waste)
Management,)
)
)
In Re:)
)
EFP Products State)
)
Superfund Site)
)
)
)
)
)

Transcript
of
Public Meeting

The within public meeting was taken before Stephen K. Tackett, a notary public in and for the State of South Carolina, commencing at the hour of 7:07 p.m.,

Tuesday, February 5, 2008, at the office of Hunter Street Elementary School Cafeteria, 1100 Hunter Street, York, South Carolina.

Reported by
Stephen K. Tackett

Page 2

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

APPEARANCES

DHEC-BL&WM:

Ms. Angie R. Jones

Mr. R. Gary Stewart

Ms. Pat Vincent

Mr. Konstantine Akhvlediani

DHEC-Region 3:

Steve Moseley

Paul Edinger

TRC:

Jean Oliva

Robert Smith

SPX:

Dan McGrade

Enviro-Pro:

Tom Bolyard

STIPULATIONS

1
2 MS. VINCENT: Good evening. I want to thank all of
3 y'all for coming out tonight for the public meeting
4 for the EFP Products site that we have here in
5 York, South Carolina.

6 The department is available today for several
7 purposes. First, the department would like to
8 share some information with you regarding the --
9 the EFP Products site; and the second purpose is to
10 provide an opportunity with which the department
11 can discuss the proposed plan for cleanup at the
12 site and to respond to any questions that you may
13 have or comments that you may have. As you may
14 know -- that the site is located at 6247 Campbell
15 Road in York.

16 And we have several folks we'd like to
17 introduce to you today. My name is Pat Vincent,
18 and I'm with the State Remediation Section of the
19 Bureau of Land and Waste Management of the South
20 Carolina Department of Health and Environmental
21 Control, and I have helped the site team today with
22 -- or in the last few months with this: setting up
23 the location of this meeting today and forwarding
24 you the fact sheet and announcement of the meeting
25 today.

Page 4

1 And I am the one who goofed and put Thursday,
2 February the 5th. I'll go ahead and acknowledge
3 that; I apologize. We had several changes on those
4 schedules and with the holiday season, it was a
5 little hard trying to find everybody available, so
6 I apologize that that did occur.

7 I wanted to also let you know that we
8 publicized this meeting today in the Sunday paper
9 as -- and that was in "The Herald" as well as in
10 today's publication of "The Herald."

11 I also have -- with me today is Angie Jones.
12 Angie is our project manager. She's also the
13 spokesperson for the site, and she's reviewed all
14 the documents that are -- have been developed for
15 this site, and she will be presenting the
16 presentation in a few minutes to you.

17 I also have Gary Stewart. Mr. Stewart is with
18 -- the manager of the State Remediation Section, so
19 he is the supervisor of Angie and I. We also have
20 Konstantine Aquavediani -- Ahkviediani. Excuse me.

21 MR. AHKVIEDIANI: That's right --

22 MS. VINCENT: Yes.

23 MR. AHKVIEDIANI: -- so --

24 MS. VINCENT: He is with the -- he's a hydrologist, and
25 he's with the -- the department's hydrogeology

1 department. And so one of the things that he will
2 -- his concentration is, is with the groundwater
3 issues. And we also have some regional folks with
4 us today. Steve Moseley is here. Would you stand?
5 Thank you. And Paul Edinger. They are -- they
6 work out of the Lancaster office, but they also
7 serve you in this community.

8 There are some things I'd like to go over
9 before we get started. I want to make sure we
10 cover everything. We do have a sign-in sheet.
11 We're asking everybody to sign in today. One of
12 the things that that helps us with is providing
13 notice to you in the future, and if you ever want
14 your name to be removed from the mailing list, you
15 can always contact us. The sign-in sheet -- we ask
16 you, of course, to write legibly so that I can read
17 that later on. And this -- the sign-in sheet will
18 be placed in the bureau's file that's located in
19 Columbia.

20 Secondly, the department has also established
21 an administrative record for this site. The
22 administrative record is a -- a group of documents
23 that the department has relied on in making its
24 decisions -- the technical decisions regarding the
25 site. And we have that stored at the York County

Page 6

1 Public Library, and that's at 21 -- (clears throat)
2 excuse me -- 21 East Liberty Street. And so you
3 can go and look at -- there. It's not the
4 department's full file on this site, but it does
5 give you the documents that we relied on in making
6 decisions.

7 We also -- you can come down to the -- the
8 department's office and review any of our files
9 there with a -- a Freedom-of-Information request,
10 and we'll make those files available to you as
11 well.

12 There is also a gentleman that I probably
13 should introduce to you. Steve Tackett is here
14 with the mouthpiece on his mouth. He is actually
15 our court reporter for tonight. He will be
16 transcribing the meeting word for word so that we
17 can be sure to recollect all the questions and
18 comments that you may have that may be presented to
19 us later. And we do have microphones that will be
20 coming around to make sure we -- we've captured all
21 your questions and comments.

22 I think Ms. Jones will be here to provide you
23 with some background information regarding the site
24 and provide you some investigative results as well
25 as providing a -- a summation of the alternatives

1 that the department looked at in trying to decide
2 how to clean up the soil and groundwater at the
3 site.

4 You, as the public, and -- are allowed the
5 opportunity to provide us written comments
6 regarding the site and those comments have to be to
7 us by March the 7th. And you can send those to --
8 to myself, Pat Vincent. I am on a fact sheet here,
9 and I also have my business card here if you didn't
10 get a fact sheet in the mail. Next I will let
11 Ms. Jones take over.

12 MS. JONES: Thanks, Pat. First, I want to thank
13 everyone from the community for showing up tonight.
14 I -- I really appreciate this. As Pat said, I will
15 give a brief history of the site and talk about the
16 investigations and, really, what led us to come
17 here tonight and ask for your input on the remedy
18 of this cleanup. So I'll talk about the
19 investigations; I'll give you a description of each
20 cleanup alternative; and then I'll also present to
21 you the one that the department has preferred.
22 It's our proposed remedy that you would've received
23 in your fact sheet.

24 And then I'll open up the floor to comments
25 and questions, so if we could hold the questions

Page 8

1 until the end, I think my presentation may take
2 about 15 to 20 minutes, unless I speak faster than
3 I think.

4 In the early '50s, a company called "Metals
5 Protection Company" operated a plating business at
6 the site. Steel plates were rinsed through various
7 methods after they were dipped into chromic acid
8 baths. When these plates were drained, they were
9 drained by various methods. One was into a rock
10 field sump, which was built over an abandoned well.
11 That well was about 50 foot deep. We consider this
12 to be our main source area for the groundwater
13 contamination at the site. Some rinse water was
14 also pumped into a settling basin, and these early
15 rinsing methods did not remove all the chromium
16 from these plates, so it -- it's in the
17 groundwater. It -- its -- has percolated into the
18 groundwater.

19 Then throughout the '60s, '70s, and '80s, the
20 ownership transferred numerous times, finally to
21 EFP Products, which is the name that's still in
22 front of the building at the site. In 1990 there
23 was a merger; SPX Corporation assumed all the
24 liabilities of a previous owner, so SPX is the
25 responsible party for performing the remedy at the

1 site.

2 Then in 1991 DHEC began discussions with both
3 EFP, who was operating at the site, as well as SPX
4 about the chromium contamination on the property.
5 Several reports were developed, and in 1994 a
6 groundwater report was submitted to DHEC which
7 really showed us how much contamination was on the
8 property.

9 That following year in 1995, we entered into a
10 consent agreement with SPX. Through this consent
11 agreement, SPX is required to perform a remedial
12 investigation to determine the nature, the source,
13 the extent of any contamination on the property.
14 They're also required to conduct a feasibility
15 study, which is the phase we're at now. The
16 feasibility study evaluates options for cleanup
17 after the site has been determined to be fully
18 investigated.

19 So that's what we're here tonight to talk
20 about: a summary of that feasibility study and the
21 options that were presented for the remedy. So let
22 me first start out by giving you some -- some
23 history of the investigations at the site.

24 Numerous monitoring wells were installed; I
25 believe there are close to 30 on the site. These

Page 10

1 wells are sampled, some quarterly, some annually.
2 There are also five residential wells that have
3 been sampled since 1997. I do believe we're only
4 sampling four of those wells now. One is no longer
5 in operation.

6 There were some surveys, geophysical surveys,
7 to identify some bedrock fractures, because we do
8 have groundwater contamination in the bedrock. We
9 investigated various areas on the property that we
10 thought may be potential sources: A sludge
11 disposal trench, some plating areas, there was an
12 old lagoon on the property. I believe our next
13 slide will show a map of these locations.

14 This is Campbell Road at the top here, so the
15 entrance to the facility -- you know, you come down
16 the driveway right here. There's an old plating
17 bath, and that 50-foot disposal well is on this
18 part of the property. Here's our lagoon location;
19 here's a sludge disposal trench. These were
20 various areas through historical sampling and
21 investigation that -- that were investigated
22 through the '90s.

23 So after installing these wells, collecting
24 these soil samples, performing these tests, what
25 did we find? We found that both the soil and the

1 groundwater was contaminated with chromium on this
2 facility, and the groundwater, both shallow and
3 deep, is contaminated with chromium.

4 So now, after the department has the data, we
5 need to decide what to do with the information we
6 have. So if we know the soil is contaminated, how
7 bad is it? So we have evaluation standards that we
8 look at, so I'm going to separate this presentation
9 into two topics. One, the soil -- and we'll talk
10 about the soil first, and then we'll talk about the
11 groundwater.

12 So the soil cleanup standard -- EPA has set
13 two limits for what they consider to be goals and
14 levels for direct contact or ingestion. For an
15 industrial area, that limit is 64 milligrams per
16 kilogram. For a residential area, that number is
17 30 milligrams per kilogram. So this is an
18 industrial site, so we're going with the industrial
19 number at 64 milligrams per kilogram.

20 Okay. So now that we know what our number is
21 -- our standards, our 64 and our 30 -- I can tell
22 you that from all the samples collected around that
23 site, samples outside the footprint of the building
24 range from 0 -- non-detect -- to 55 milligrams per
25 kilogram.

Page 12

1 So that 55 is above a residential number, but
2 it's below the industrial number. Now, beneath the
3 building where the plating baths were, the numbers
4 greatly exceed the residential and industrial
5 numbers, so we have exceedances under the building
6 very high above industrial standards.

7 And the next slide shows the area from my
8 first map. Campbell Road is up here and you pull
9 into the facility. This is the -- the area of the
10 plating bath, and we -- these are the sample
11 locations. And it may be hard to see, but these
12 numbers indicate the concentrations of the chromium
13 that were collected from this around the -- the
14 former plating bath area.

15 So we do know exactly where the soil
16 contamination is underneath the building. So once
17 we know what limits we've exceeded and we know
18 where we have exceeded those limits, the department
19 has specific goals. We want to prevent any
20 exposure to chromium exceeding that industrial
21 number; we also want to prevent that chromium from
22 migrating from those impacted soils and creating a
23 larger area of contamination.

24 So the document that DHEC reviewed, the
25 feasibility study, gave us three alternatives for

1 soil remediation, and I will explain each of these
2 three. The first one is no action. We are
3 required by the National Contingency Plan -- it's
4 just a regulation that we have to compare the other
5 alternatives to a no-action so you have a baseline.
6 This would be no active remediation, no deed
7 restrictions on the property and, of course, there
8 is no cost associated with this alternative either.

9 The second alternative that was evaluated was
10 basically no active remediation but deed
11 restrictions to be placed on the property. These
12 deed restrictions would ensure that the building --
13 the integrity of the floor was maintained. It
14 would also prevent the portion of the facility
15 being converted into a residential development. So
16 it can only be zoned industrial. The estimated
17 present worth cost for this alternative is
18 \$150,000. Now, that cost is made up by the legal
19 fees associated with placing the restriction -- the
20 deed restriction on the property, as well as
21 maintaining the -- the integrity of that floor and
22 -- and the roof over that area of the building
23 where the soil contamination was.

24 The third alternative is the most costly:
25 800,000 to about \$1.5 million. This is excavation

Page 14

1 and off-site disposal. Basically, we would come in
2 and remove the concrete floor; remove those areas
3 of contaminated soil beneath that floor. We would
4 have to characterize those soils to see how they
5 would need to be disposed, and they would be
6 disposed of off-site at a -- at a proper facility.
7 We'd bring clean backfill in and replace the floor.
8 Now, if these soils -- if the contamination levels
9 were too high in these soils, they may need to be
10 stabilized if leachability was a concern. So that
11 -- that drives up some of the cost. Deed
12 restrictions would also be placed on the property
13 with this alternative. Once again, for
14 nonresidential development and maintaining the
15 floor over that area where the soils were removed,
16 but we would still need to maintain the integrity
17 of that floor.

18 So those were our three descriptions of our --
19 I'm sorry -- the three alternatives described. So
20 the department uses some evaluation criteria in
21 order to help us determine which of those three
22 alternatives would be the best one to select.
23 First of all, I have to make sure that each
24 alternative protects human health and the
25 environment and complies with state regulations --

1 state and federal regulations. Then I also look at
2 long-term effectiveness, reduction of toxicity,
3 short-term effectiveness, implementability, and
4 cost. I have to look at those and compare each
5 alternative against these criteria.

6 And the last evaluation criteria is community
7 acceptance. That's why we're here tonight to get
8 your input. If you have some concerns about the
9 remedy that DHEC has selected/proposed, then we
10 would like to hear your input, and that will help
11 us decide what our remedy would be.

12 So I took each alternative -- the first one
13 was no action. And this does not meet any
14 evaluation criteria that I just showed on that --
15 on that list. It is not protective of human health
16 and the environment; it does not prohibit that
17 material from moving; so we did not like this
18 alternative.

19 The second alternative was the alternative
20 where we just placed deed restrictions on the
21 property. If we can maintain the integrity of that
22 floor, and if we can keep precipitation from
23 hitting that soil and causing soil contamination to
24 migrate, this is very effective in the long term.

25 It also -- the deed restriction also prohibits

Page 16

1 any residential development on the property, so
2 that's protective over the long term. It's easily
3 implemented. You just go to the courthouse, place
4 a deed restriction on the property. And there are
5 no short-term risks. You don't have to come into
6 contact with the soil and the -- the workers who
7 are out there would not have any risk associated
8 with that.

9 The third alternative was the removal and
10 off-site disposal alternative. If you remove the
11 soil, you have greatly reduced your mobility of the
12 -- the soil contamination. It -- it can't go
13 anywhere if it's already been removed. The
14 restrictions are also effective long-term. One
15 thing that is a drawback to this alternative -- the
16 excavation activities may be limited due to the
17 presence of the building. First of all, you have
18 to remove the concrete floor, and I'm not sure how
19 thick it is, but it's -- it's -- it's substantial.
20 Also the height of the building and any -- any
21 shoring activities due to having to excavate this
22 property would be greatly limited by having that
23 building in place. So I'd -- I'd hate to tear down
24 that building and remove that flooring if it was
25 unnecessary.

1 And the other short-term risks associated with
2 the building is, once again, working in the tight
3 area inside that building with the large equipment
4 and then also managing the contaminated soil once
5 it's removed. So there are some risks to the
6 workers that would be performing this work.

7 Okay. The alternative that DHEC prefers is
8 No. 2, no action. Basically, no active removal,
9 but deed restrictions placed on the property. It
10 prevents any future exposures to the soil; it
11 prohibits the leaching of these soils into the
12 groundwater; and it's very cost-effective. So that
13 is the alternative that DHEC would like to
14 implement for the soils.

15 Now, I'd like to switch gears and discuss the
16 alternatives presented for the groundwater. We
17 know the groundwater's contaminated and the limit
18 that I must remediate that groundwater to is a
19 number established by the EPA, and DHEC has maximum
20 contaminate levels. Now, that level that is a safe
21 drinking water level is 0.1 milligrams per liter,
22 and I'll show you some other numbers here in a
23 minute so you can see how that compares to the
24 actual contamination on the property.

25 Chromium has exceeded that regulatory level,