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 transcipt 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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. AHKVIEDIANI: That's right --

MS. VINCENT: Yes.

MR. AHKVIEDIANI: -- so --

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

site.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

It also -- the deed restriction also prohibits

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

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

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

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

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

Chromium has exceeded that regulatory level,

.1 milligrams per liter in both shallow, intermediate, and deep bedrock wells on-site. The nearby residential wells that we have sampled have never showed any site-related contamination, and they have been sampled since 1997. They are sampled quarterly.

This first map shows the shallow -- what we call "saprolite" -- shallow groundwater contamination. This area is also the area where our soil contamination was. The old disposal well, the old plating baths are located in this area.

Okay. The next slide -- this slide shows the bedrock contamination -- the deeper contamination. Once again, here's -- here's Campbell. So it's a little bit larger area of contamination in the bedrock, and then we have an area over here of deeper bedrock contamination near this former lagoon.

But you can also see -- I think one of the reasons why a lot of people showed up was because of where they live and they're concerned about groundwater potentially impacting their drinking water wells since you're not on city water out here. What I can tell you from this is that those of you that are living, you know, half a mile or a

mile away are not in any harm.

From this map, I can show you that I know where the contamination is, if -- it's right here on the property. Now, granted, this figure right here, I do know that my contamination has been detected in this well right on the property line, but I also have a boundary well over here. It's located off the property, but it has not shown contamination, so I know that the contamination has not migrated past this area. Groundwater flow in this area does flow toward the southeast, and I believe the neighborhoods here tonight are located, I guess, northwest of this property. So I do understand your concerns, and I just -- I wanted to go ahead and clarify that. We know exactly where the groundwater contamination is on this property.

So just as we set our goals for the soil, we also set our goals for the groundwater. We want to restore that groundwater, because it is a drinking water source of the state. So we want to restore the groundwater to that .1 milligram per liter, making it safe. While that's being remediated, we want to prevent any exposures to that groundwater where it exceeds that .1 level. We also want to limit any migration of the chromium-contaminated

groundwater any farther than it's migrated already.

So in order to meet these goals, we have four -- let me clarify that -- we have five alternatives for groundwater remediation. The first one, just like for the soils, is no action. We are required to consider this just as a baseline for comparison with our other alternatives. There would be no active groundwater monitoring. Right now, I said, we're doing some quarterly and some annually, but with this option there would be no monitoring. There would be no deed restrictions placed on the property, no protections for contamination migrating any farther, getting to nearby residential wells. One good thing is there's no cost.

The second alternative is extraction, treatment, discharge -- basically, pumping the groundwater out of the ground. There would be some studies to determine our best system design. Then we would pump the groundwater out of the ground. We would treat it on-site. We would continue monitoring the wells to make sure that our pumping was effective; we would place restrictions on the property, because this would not occur quickly, with this pumping activity; we would have to get a

sewer line run to the property, because once this water has been treated, it will be discharged to the -- the sewer and eventually to the POTW. The estimated present worth value of this alternative is $7.7 million.

The third alternative incorporates a little bit of the second alternative I mentioned: pumping. We would remove the groundwater in the source area where I mentioned the plating baths and the disposal well were located under the building. We would extract the groundwater from that area, once again treat it, and discharge it to the sewer. Outside those areas, if you remember to the -- the figure to the right where I showed the lagoons -- there was some off -- there was some contamination there in the -- in the deep bedrock. Outside the source area, we would have some in situ treatment. That just basically means "in place," so the groundwater would stay in the ground, and -- and our remedy would be inserted into the ground. We would continue monitoring. There would be groundwater restrictions -- groundwater use restrictions on that property so nobody could drill a well and drink from that contaminated area. Once again, water supply and sewer would have to be

supplied in order for this remedy to occur. And this alternative is a little more costly at $8.1 million.

The fourth alternative does not include any pumping. It is all in place. It is all in situ treatments. We would continue monitoring the wells, probably a different monitoring network than we have right now, but we would continue monitoring to make sure that plume decreases, but it does not increase. Deed restrictions would still be placed on the property to make it protective for residentials nearby. And this alternative also has a contingency for future water supply. If residential wells become impacted, we would need to make sure that these residences were hooked up to city water.

This alternative is broken down into two options. The first option, 4A, we want to inject this material to remediate the chromium in both the shallow and the deep aquifers. So we want to target both areas where we have exceeded that .1-milligram-per-liter limit. So the estimated present worth of injecting into both the shallow and the deep is about 2.6 million.

Now, the other option for this alternative is

to only inject in the deeper bedrock aquifer. The shallow groundwater really hasn't changed much since about 1996, so the contamination is -- it's pretty localized and -- and hasn't moved very far, but it still exceeds the -- the cleanup levels that DHEC wants to protect the groundwater. So this second remedy, GW-4B, would only inject into the deeper groundwater. Estimated present worth: $1.1 million.

So there you have the alternatives described. So then what I do is I take those same evaluation criteria, and I compare all these alternatives and see which one ranks at the top, once again, with community acceptance being very important.

So the first alternative, no action, is not protective of the environment. It's a -- in order to reach this MCL as chromium breaks down, it would take years. So reaching this 0.1 milligram per liter is -- is highly unlikely. There would be no long-term protections. There is no short-term risk since nothing would be occurring at the site, but these remedial objectives would not be achieved if -- if nothing occurred at the site.

The second alternative was the pump-and-treat method. Long-term protection would be achieved

with this, because in the long-term, there would be deed restrictions. People would not be drinking from the contaminated aquifer. Eventually, all the contaminated water would be pumped and treated. It does require a long-term operation and maintenance of a treatment system. Now, through our pre-design studies, we would be able to tell you exactly how long this pumping would occur, but as of right now, I -- I don't know. It would be many years. There is some short-term risk associated with the workers that would be handling this extracted groundwater and any of the sludge that occurs from the remediation of the groundwater. And once again, you -- we would have to construct a -- a water and a sewer line, so that's very costly and time-consuming as well.

The third alternative: incorporate a little bit of the pump and treat with some of the in-place. Once again, long-term protection -- is protected, is provided. Still, the short-term risk -- pretty much everything that I said with the -- the pump and treat. The one issue with this that differs is the in situ may reduce the overall time frame for the remediation to occur. It might occur faster if you're -- if you're placing something in

the ground to help break down that chromium. A negative with this is the permeability of the saprolite. That means the -- the porosity and -- and the compaction of the clays that are very shallow. It may prohibit the material from reaching into the groundwater. So that -- that's one issue that we'll have to study during some of our design studies. And once again, long-term operation and maintenance.

The fourth alternative reduces toxicity, prevents exposure. There is a contingency action of the water line in case residences are exposed. Faster reduction in chromium because you're going to treat both the shallow and the deep aquifer at the same time. Once again, the -- the compaction of that shallow soil, that -- the saprolite may complicate this remedy. You would have to install an extensive injection system, multiple points drilled into the ground so that you can get your material into the ground. So -- so a system will have to be developed, and that will take time and -- time and money.

The second option for -- for this alternative was treating only the bedrock. Similar to the first option, but you're only targeting one

aquifer. Although there would still be long-term protection, it will reduce the toxicity mobility, but we're not -- not expected to impact any of the shallow groundwater.

DHEC has selected alternative GW-4A, which was the in situ injection into both the saprolite and the bedrock. It does provide protection to human health and the environment; it reduces the groundwater contamination because you're actively treating it. There will still be monitoring ongoing to make sure that the plume is decreasing in size. And once again, the contingency action has been provided, that public water may be supplied if necessary.

So the next step -- DHEC has evaluated the investigation results; DHEC has evaluated the feasibility study, which is at the library. What I've done was taken this document -- basically, tweaked it down into the fact sheet that you were provided, and that's what I've presented here to you tonight.

So after explaining this proposed plan to you, we welcome any comments. So for the next month, we'll take any of your comments -- tonight and until early March. Once we've all decided on the

remedy, I will write a record of decision so that the company knows exactly what is expected of them, which alternative has been selected, and what DHEC and the community would like to occur at this facility.

Okay. After this record of decision has been written, where we select the remedy, the consultant and the responsible party will have to come up with a design. So the day after the -- I write the record of decision, you probably will not see activity at the site. There will be some studies and some discussions with the department, some designs so that we make sure we're -- we're going down the right path. So this remedial design will be submitted to the department. We will review it, and then we can begin implementing the remedy.

So once again, the administrative record is at the York County Public Library. We will accept comments over the phone, via e-mail, written, and I would like to answer any questions you may have here tonight, and -- let me first say that if I can't answer everything, I have some other folks here that may be able to help me answer some of those questions. Yes, sir?

MR. PENLAND: What is considered a shallow well and deep

well as to -- talking about the depth?

MS. JONES: Uh-huh.

MS. VINCENT: Please tell us your name.

MR. PENLAND: Steve Penland. Steve Penland.

MS. JONES: The -- the question was what do we consider to be shallow and what do we consider to be deep bedrock? Make sure I -- make sure I answer this correctly, Jean.

Some of our wells that were installed in the saprolite go down to, say, 45/50/55 feet and then our bedrock is deeper than that. It's 75 to 80. (To Ms. Oliva) Is that correct? Close? Okay.

MS. OLIVA: It -- it starts at about 50 --

MS. JONES: It -- it --

MS. OLIVA: -- and continues down.

MS. JONES: I would say that the -- the difference right there starts at around 50/55, but I mean we've -- some of our wells are 120/140 foot deep.

MS. VINCENT: Next question. Hold on just a moment. Let me get me you on the mike. Please announce your name too.

MR. SMITH: My name's Tom Smith. I'm -- I was the local developer over there with Homestead -- did the three developments, so I've got a -- sort of, a litany of questions. And I'm also the councilman,

and I also live out there.

MS. JONES: Okay.

Mr. SMITH: And there -- there -- there's concern to me as far as how we got to this point, because as a developer, we -- we did environmental assessments on all of our properties out there and -- and I talked to you, Angie --

MS. JONES: Uh-huh.

MR. SMITH: -- the other day, and this was not caught, you know? And there seems to be a breakdown in the system, meaning, you know, while these preliminary investigations were going on, you know, why wasn't local DHEC aware of it through the system --

MS. JONES: Uh-huh.

MR. SMITH: -- you know? Because there's no way to really, you know, find out about these things. I mean, you know, when we did the -- the Campbell property, there were some tanks that had to be removed over there. They were done. Over at Vander Lakes there was a -- a ditch -- a trench that was dumped on for years; we found that and tested those, but there was nothing -- and we used two environmental companies, so there was a, you know --

MS. JONES: Well --

Page 30

MR. SMITH: -- we could have used --
MS. JONES: -- once again, can I ask you the time frame? When -- when were these --
MR. SMITH: This was --
MS. JONES: -- developments --
MR. JONES: from '80s --
MS. JONES: Okay.
MR. SMITH: Okay. -- through the mid '90s.
MS. JONES: Okay.
MR. SMITH: And what -- what concerns me is that even up into '97, '98, '99, when Vander Lakes was going on, which is really the closest property local DHEC still permitted wells to be placed out there.
MS. JONES: Uh-huh.
MR. SMITH: So there's a -- there's a -- there's a problem with the system.
MS. JONES: Well, I believe they were able to let those wells be installed because there was no concern for groundwater contamination in the area you're talking about.
MR. SMITH: So you guys knew that -- you know, there was no concern even if they're 1300 feet away or 1500 feet away? I mean, you said a half a mile. You know, what -- what's the -- you know, I know some of the adjacent properties have been tested and --

MS. JONES: Uh-huh.
MR. SMITH: -- and so far, luckily, nothing's escaped --
MS. JONES: Uh-huh.
MR. SMITH: -- you know?
MS. JONES: Uh-huh.
MR. SMITH: But water has a funny way of traveling --
MS. JONES: Uh-huh.
MR. SMITH: -- in different areas, and I don't know that any of us could -- you know, can really say for sure if -- I mean, can you say for sure that it's --
MS. JONES: Well --
MR. SMITH: -- safe?
MS. JONES: -- we have shallow wells; we have deep wells; you know, we have them located all over that property.
MR. SMITH: Right.
MS. JONES: The site's littered with wells, and we feel we have a very good hold as to, you know, how deep the contamination is, how widespread it is --
MR. SMITH: Right.
MS. JONES: -- and that's -- that's why that -- the blue -- the blue area --
MR. SMITH: Sure. No. I --
MS. JONES: -- on the map -- you know, we -- we know

where it is.

MR. SMITH: And -- and -- look, I've been developing for 25 years. I'm very familiar with --

MS. JONES: Right.

MR. SMITH: -- environmentals and -- you know, in fact, we -- we talked. We've got one up on Pole Branch Road. We had to drag water a mile and a half up the road, because we did an environmental assessment, found out there was contamination, so we put in monitoring wells, yet local DHEC didn't know about it.

MS. JONES: Uh-huh.

MR. SMITH: We had to find out about it, and DHEC UST knew about it since '92, so there's a concern there, just over all --

MS. JONES: Okay.

MR. SMITH: -- and we'll talk about that.

MS. JONES: Okay.

MR. SMITH: The next thing is, though, is the history of this site. What -- what triggered -- I mean, it's -- it -- it's been monitored for so long, what finally triggered the cleanup? I mean, what's -- what -- what triggered it? I mean, if you knew you had problems out there --

MS. JONES: Uh-huh.

MR. SMITH: -- years ago, why -- why did -- why did -- why did it take so long to get this site to -- to come to this point?

MS. JONES: That's a good question. Let me --

MR. SMITH: And then, you know, as -- as far as the adjacent property owners, you know, what can they -- these are questions I know they have. What are they going to be able to do with their property, whether it's -- you know, there is no water and sewer out there. Most of the property zoned behind that property and around it is zoned industrial, and water and sewer will probably run through those properties one day, but as far as the residential or the farmland around it, you know, can these people put wells if they needed it for irrigation or -- or, you know, can future homes be put out there? Or, you know, is DHEC going to say, "Look, if you're within 500 feet or 1000 feet of this site, no more wells of any type so we don't draw down and pull out these contaminates"? Or --

MS. JONES: I'm sure the location of where those wells would potentially be installed would be of concern to --

MR. SMITH: Right.

MS. JONES: -- DHEC, yes. But --

MR. SMITH: Okay.
MS. JONES: -- that's why if we can get out there, you know, right now and start this remedy --
MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.
MS. JONES: -- we don't even --
MR. SMITH: Does local DHEC right -- right now know about this?
MS. JONES: Yes.
MR. SMITH: DHEC -- as far as somebody wanting to build a house out there right now?
MS. JONES: Yes.
MR. SMITH: Okay. And I just -- you know, I'm just curious about the -- the questions -- as far as the cleanup, it seems to me, on the proposal for the -- the soils, you know, if -- if No. 2 is done, you know, first of all, who's going to continue to make sure that that floor stays in place and that roof stays okay and --
MS. JONES: The property owner.
MR. SMITH: The property owner. Okay. What happens if the bus hits that property owner?
MS. JONES: If the what?
MR. SMITH: What happens if that property owner disappears? What happens? Okay.
MS. JONES: Then I guess that's when the -- that's when

the local DHEC and -- and state DHEC goes -- goes to make sure that --

MR. SMITH: But why would we --

MS. JONES: -- there's a new property owner that -- that knows about it.

MR. SMITH: Okay. Well, I don't know if a -- you know --

MS. JONES: It's not --

MR. SMITH: Taking on a contaminated site -- I don't know --

MS. JONES: It -- it's a corporation.

MR. SMITH: Okay. I know, but if -- if they sell to somebody and they --

MS. JONES: Uh-huh.

MR. SMITH: -- somebody takes it on, they get it real cheap, and they do it, and they feel okay with it for whatever reason --

MS. JONES: Uh-huh.

MR. SMITH: -- and if something happens to that person, does it fall -- does it fall back on the previous owner?

MS. JONES: Gary, do you want to answer? Because this happens quite often.

MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

MR. STEWART: Yes. When we place -- require

restrictions to be placed on a property, they're required -- the property owner is required on an annual basis to provide us information showing that the restrictions are still in place and they're still being protective. It's on our back to make sure, on an annual basis -- and I think the basis -- I -- I think our stuff is due, like, May 29th of each year.

We require parties to notify us, and we have to verify that everything is still in place. That can be verified through drive-bys on a periodic basis, various measures just to make sure the restrictions are still in place. And if a -- if a party goes belly up, there's -- there's not a whole lot we can do about pursuing that party, but we do have a state fund, the Hazardous Waste Contingency Fund, which can be used to address situations such as this if a private party's unable to.

MR. SMITH: But as we have a private party right now, why would we have them take it out? You know, instead of being stuck with this thing in 15 years if somebody goes belly up, and then the taxpayers have to pay for the cleanup.

MR. STEWART: Well, under the laws and regulations we deal with -- we deal with the Superfund Law, which

has -- has also been adopted as state law -- we're required to select and implement remedies that are cost-effective and protective of human health. The -- the Alternative No. 2 is protective of human health and it is more cost-effective than Alternative No. 3.

MR. SMITH: And I -- I -- as somebody that, you know, is a councilman and somebody that lives out there, and I got neighbors and friends and family, I just think -- you know, I -- my uncle taught me this in business: If -- if -- if the bus hits you, what are you left with? And if the bus hit somebody over there, you're left with that contamination when you had a chance for the party -- now, I don't know who the company that owns it now, if they were responsible for this or was it the company before or before or before -- you know, I don't know.

But the fact is if you have somebody that has finances and is able to clean it up and it was the -- you know -- you know, everybody needs to take care of their own responsibilities and it shouldn't fall back on us. That's all I'm saying, because you're asking us for a recommendation. As a councilman in this area, I would say they need to clean that thing up -- you know, it -- it -- so

that we don't get stuck with it. You guys shouldn't have to --

MR. STEWART: And we --

MR. SMITH: -- mess with it either.

MR. STEWART: -- we appreciate your concern in that --

MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

MR. STEWART: -- area and -- and that's part of the reason we're here tonight. We want to hear what you think. We want the company to know what you think.

MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

MR. STEWART: We're here with a proposal tonight. It's not carved in stone that this is the remedy. We go back, and we evaluate all the comments, and we can change the -- the remedy before it's actually put in place.

MR. SMITH: That -- that's -- I just wanted to --

MR. STEWART: Right.

MR. SMITH: -- put that out there just so that it was put out there that, you know, we got to think down the line, you know --

MR. STEWART: Right.

MR. SMITH: -- because apparently whoever put this in the ground wasn't thinking too far down the line.

So as far as the cleanup on the GW-4A, where

has that done been -- you know, where has it been done before, how --

MS. JONES: The in situ? Yes. It's --

MR. SMITH: Yeah. And was it --

MS. JONES: It's been done at numerous sites.

MR. SMITH: With -- the same contaminates?

MS. JONES: Yes.

MR. SMITH: Okay. And how long did you see the effects? I mean, how long did it -- I mean, I know it's tough to say on -- each site's different, but was it three years or five years or -- you know, where you really saw something effective?

MS. JONES: (Mr. Akhvlediani) Which -- would you know? Have -- have you had any chromium sites where you can tell what it -- the time frame --

MR. AKHVLEDIANI: It's hard to tell. It depends on the site.

MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

MS. JONES: (To Ms. Oliva) Would -- would you know, Jean?

MS. OLIVA: It -- it can -- it can --

MR. AKHVLEDIANI: -- range --

MS. OLIVA: My name's Jean Oliva; I'm with TRC.

MS. JONES: Jean prepared this plan, this -- this feasibility study, so she's highly familiar with

the -- the investigation and the -- the alternatives.

MS. OLIVA: Yes. This has been used on -- on some sites. I -- as you mentioned, it depends on the site conditions and on the levels of contamination. At lower levels of contamination like the -- the areas around the -- the areas around the outside of those blue circles, those should be able to be remediated within, I would think, one or two years. In the center we have some -- in the source area, we have some higher level and that might take a little longer to get those cleaned up.

MR. SMITH: That's all I got.

MS. JONES: Okay. Okay.

MS. VINCENT: Thank you.

MS. JONES: There was a question over here. I'm not sure --

MS. VINCENT: Did we finish with Mr. Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yeah. I'm done.

MS. VINCENT: Okay.

MS. JONES: Okay.

MS. VINCENT: (To Ms. Jones) Sorry. (To Mr. Hurley) If you'll announce your name too.

MR. HURLEY: Carl Hurley. I live at Leland Court, so I'm within the 1-mile radius. I also have an MPH,

and I -- you guy's have done a great job.
MS. JONES: Thank you.
MR. HURLEY: Anybody here qualified to speak to the health risk of chromium?
MS. JONES: No. No.
MR. HURLEY: So they --
MS. JONES: The -- the question was, was anybody here tonight to speak as to the health effects of chromium, and unfortunately, no, we did not bring anyone since we know that no one is currently being exposed.
MR. HURLEY: But there's potential exposure. Can you get those and have them mailed to us?
MS. JONES: Yes, I can do that.
MR. HURLEY: Thank you. Okay. You mentioned city water supply if any of the residential wells become contaminated. At whose cost? city water supply? Who --
MS. JONES: The line --
MR. HURLEY: -- pays --
MS. JONES: -- the line would be installed at the cost of the responsible party.
MR. HURLEY: So there'd be no cost to the homeowner?
MS. JONES: For the installation of that water line, no.
MR. HURLEY: Okay.

Page 42

UNKNOWN MALE: You have to pay for the water meter.
MS. JONES: Probably.
MR. HURLEY: Any way I can get my well tested?
MS. JONES: Not by DHEC regarding -- related to this site. We -- we don't feel the need to go out and sample private wells since we know where the contamination is on this property.
UNKNOWN MALE: Even -- even if you --
MR. HURLEY: Now, the groundwater --
UNKNOWN MALE: -- know the groundwater is --
MR. HURLEY: -- flows in -- underground, and we don't know where that goes.
MS. JONES: But -- but the two maps that I -- I -- I placed up there, we know where the contamination is. We know where -- we know which way the groundwater is flowing, and we know where currently the contamination is.
MR. HURLEY: Okay. On behalf of a homeowner, I'd like DHEC to at least reassure me by testing my well.
MS. JONES: Thank you.
MS. VINCENT: Hold on just a minute, sir.
MR. HILTON: Hi, I'm John Hilton.
MS. JONES: Hello.
MR. HILTON: You didn't answer the question about which way the water is flowing under the plant.

MS. JONES: Southeast.
UNKNOWN MALE: Do you have a well there?
MR HILTON: Thank you.
MS. JONES: Yes.
UNKNOWN MALE: Does it have contamination?
MS. JONES: The question was which way is the groundwater flowing, and I said toward the southeast, which is away from the residential development. He asked if a well was installed in that area; I said yes. And then the third question was: Was there contamination in that well? And the farther-most well that we have in that location, no, there was not.
MR. PENLAND: Steve Penland. I can address some -- maybe some of the health concerns. I did a map of the folks who lived down Campbell Road and within, really, a half a mile of the 24 houses that's there, there's been 11 cases of cancer. In those 11 they're cluttered around on both sides of the plant, and I was going to supply that with y'all -- with a copy of all the -- the cancer, that -- from long-term residents. Now, someone that's lived there for maybe two or three years, it's not, but -- but the cases are -- are right there from all the way down the road, and that -- and that was the

reason that I would like to get my water tested.

And you mentioned five residential wells. I only know of three of my neighbors who said they were getting their wells tested.

MS. JONES: And I might've misspoke earlier when I said five. I -- five initially were sampled; then I think we were down to four. One of them may have been at that -- the little store that was formerly located across the street.

MR. PENLAND: Yeah. That's -- that's the Martins.

MR. MARTIN: That's my well.

MR. PENLAND: The Martins, the Carpenter, and the Davison.

MS. JONES: I have four wells that we -- that we sample, and I can -- I can show you the date on the -- there are four residential wells that are sampled.

MR. PENLAND: Can you -- I've listed three of them. What's the fourth one? Is it on the plant?

UNKNOWN MALE: Steve, that's mine.

MR. PENLAND: Oh.

UNKNOWN FEMALE: Yeah, but you would be Davison, you know, because --

UNKNOWN MALE: That's right.

MR. PENLAND: Yeah.

MS. JONES: This is public information, so I --

MR. PENLAND: Uh-huh.
MS. JONES: -- can give the addresses.
MR. PENLAND: Okay.
MS. JONES: 6357 Campbell.
UNKNOWN MALE: Yeah, that's --
UNKNOWN FEMALE: But you --
UNKNOWN MALE: -- that -- that'd be my mother-in-law. She's passed away --
MS. JONES: Okay.
UNKNOWN MALE: -- but that well was tested.
MS. JONES: Okay. And 6270 Campbell?
MR. MARTIN: That's mine.
MS. JONES: Okay.
UNKNOWN MALE: 6270 would be --
MR. PENLAND: -- Martin.
UNKNOWN MALE: Yeah.
MS. JONES: 6145.
MR. MCLEAN: That's mine.
MS. JONES: 6115.
UNKNOWN MALE: That's the same well. Same well.
MR. PENLAND: Same well.
UNKNOWN MALE: Those two addresses are on the same well.
MR. PENLAND: Yeah.
(Multiple attendees speak simultaneously without benefit of the microphone.)

Page 46

UNKNOWN MALE: I'm sorry.
MS. JONES: That's okay.
MS. HALL: What -- what types of cancer was --
MS. JONES: Just a moment.
MS. HALL: What type of cancer --
MS. JONES: What's your name too, please?
MS. HALL: Sherry Hall. What -- what -- what was the type of cancer that was found?
MR. PENLAND: Four breast cancers, one prostate, two brain cancer -- what was a -- what was a -- the Chambers. Because they lost two -- two in their family.
MS. PENLAND: Oh. Very complicated cancers.
MR. PENLAND: Yeah.
MS. JONES: There has been no cancer cluster study performed in this area that I'm aware of.
MR. PENLAND: Uh-huh.
UNKNOWN FEMALE: My mother just -- excuse me -- was diagnosed with ovarian cancer, and she lives on Campbell Road.
MS. JONES: It's very hard to associate --
MR. PENLAND: True, but -- but with 24 families --
MS. JONES: Yes, sir.
MR PENLAND: -- and to have 12 cases -- I didn't even include the 13th one which is a mile away --

MS. JONES: Yes, sir.
MR. PENLAND: It -- it just about -- we just lost another Campbell -- person by that name.
MS. JONES: We haven't -- we haven't determined there to be any correlation between this site's contamination and exposures off the property. I -- I don't have any better answer for that since we have not conducted a study to evaluate that.
UNKNOWN MALE: Are you planning on doing a study to do that?
MS. JONES: Yeah. Well, we can take that list back and give that to someone else that's more qualified to answer that question.
MR. HALL: Charles Hall. Are you planning on doing an studies to that?
MS. JONES: As I just said, we can take that list back and -- and see -- sorry. We can take that list back. Since I'm not qualified to -- to state whether a study should be done or how it could be done, I can take that list back and this information and -- and let those people -- somebody else determine that. But yes, I can -- I can relay the information. Absolutely.
MS. CRAGO: My name is Tammy Crago and I have lived off of Paraham Road near the Vander Lake ferry for the

past ten years. I left a message on your machine probably about a week and a half ago and did not hear back from you, so I have several questions I would like to be answered.

First, I'd like you answer Tom's question. You all have been testing in this area since 1997 --

MS. JONES: Correct.

MS. CRAGO: -- and -- and we just were informed of it a week and a half ago. Why? What -- and what prompted you to finally send us something?

MS. JONES: That's a good question.

MS. CRAGO: And I want an answer, please.

MS. JONES: Okay. You will. We were using that time to collect information. We did have information available, and I could have come to you whenever the investigation was complete. I could have come and said, "Here's our data; here's what we know." I waited until now --

MS. CRAGO: That would've been nice, because I have three small children, and I could have gotten my well tested to make sure they were safe.

MS. JONES: We would've made sure that we sampled any well that -- that we thought there would've been a concern in. And we -- if -- if this contamination

had been migrating off site, we would've come to you much sooner. I'm sorry. We used this time -- the past year and a half to evaluate our options for cleanup so we could come to you and tell you how we were going to proactively address this contamination. We were not as concerned with the community, because we know the contamination is limited to on-site.

UNKNOWN MALE: You know that now, but not -- not for a -- last 13 years where people would be -- could -- could be getting contaminated.

MS. JONES: That was why we were doing our studies. You know, we sampled --

UNKNOWN MALE: Yeah. But --

MS. JONES: -- these residential wells --

UNKNOWN MALE: -- but you're saying that you knew it was chromium there, right? It was like 15 years back when you were studying to see where the chromium was. You didn't know where it was, but nobody around was informed about it. I bought a house -- you know, next -- I mean, I -- I bought a house out east side of Paraham and Campbell Road. I wouldn't buy a house if I knew there was going to be --

MS. CRAGO: Me either.

UNKNOWN MALE: -- contamination of chromium next to me.

MS. CRAGO: And we built there.

MS. JONES: And I believe that's why we -- in 1997 we started sampling the nearest residential wells that -- that would've shown any impact. We sampled those -- those five that I mentioned earlier which we're down to four now. That's why we initially went out and sampled those to make sure there was no hits in those. And if there was no hit there, we didn't feel the need to go any further.

But -- but back to your question, ma'am. I apologize. I -- I think Gary and I might have gotten our signals crossed in -- in who was calling somebody back. I thought maybe you had already received a phone call, and I do apologize that -- that we didn't call you back.

MS. CRAGO: For anybody who's interested, I am having my water tested at Prism Laboratories. That's in Charlotte. And also, I know there's a Carolina Water. It's -- it cost me $100 to have my well tested for metals including chromium and the -- what's it called?

MS. JONES: Hexavalent?

MS. CRAGO: Hexavalent chromium --

MS. JONES: Uh-huh.

MS. CRAGO: -- which we've got that test back; it was

okay. We're waiting for a few more days for the other test to come back.

But I don't think that we should have to pay to have our wells tested. You're testing some of these wells quarterly, so that means you must be concerned that the contamination could spread.

And my next question is: If this site is disturbed, is it going to increase the chances of the chromium spreading and contaminating the wells that are not already contaminated?

MS. JONES: If the area over that plating bath area, that -- the -- the -- the floor, if that is disturbed, there is a potential, yes, that that contamination -- when it rains or any rainwater infiltrates it, that it could spread and it could get into the groundwater, yes.

MS. CRAGO: So that's the reason why you think it would be safer for our health to keep that building there rather than take it down?

MS. JONES: The keeping --

MS. CRAGO: I don't want to just do -- do the easy -- get -- take the easy way out and the most -- you know, the cheapest way out, because this area's growing by leaps and bounds --

MS. JONES: Right.

Page 52

MS. CRAGO: -- and --
MS. JONES: By keeping that --
MS. CRAGO: -- we want what's best.
MS. JONES: By keeping that floor in place, you -- you're preventing any exposure to that soil. You're preventing it from migrating any farther away. That's why any kind of -- I mean, you could -- you could demolish -- if there were no building there -- if we'd have found this contamination outside the footprint of the building, we would have evaluated removal, which would've been very easy since it's outside. We would've also evaluated just placing a cap over that -- that -- that would be one option to limit any migration. So these are all alternatives that we would look at and compare against each other.

And in this case, we just feel that the limitations of -- of removing that soil and removing that floor are -- are a little tough or a little more expensive or just -- or just not as acceptable as possibly leaving that floor in place. We feel they're both protective for -- for future migration, for future contact. We feel that the alternative we selected is protective.

MS. CRAGO: But I -- I feel like -- I feel my concerns

are what's going to happen 15/20 years down the road? And you said it's going to be restricted for residential use. Could another industry come in there and use that area?

MS. JONES: Yes.

MS. CRAGO: And so that could -- that's ridiculous. If another industry is allowed to come in there and use that area again, then they could disturb the chromium that's already in the ground and -- and cause more contamination.

MS. JONES: Well, that's why the restriction would be placed on the property. They would have to maintain that -- that floor -- that cap over that area. They could not come in and do anything to destroy --

MS. CRAGO: Plus the people who'd be working. There would be -- I don't know who would want to work there.

You told us the -- the levels of chromium found in the soil. You never did tell us the levels found in the -- the -- the shallow water and the bedrock. What were those levels?

MS. JONES: Oh, that's -- that's -- okay. Good point. It -- it was on that map; it's just very hard to see up there.

Page 54

MS. CRAGO: I think we saw the soil; I didn't --
MS. JONES: Uh-huh.
MS. CRAGO: -- see the -- the water.
MS. JONES: You're right.
UNKNOWN MALE: The -- the target minimum was 0.1 milligrams. Did you -- I never did hear what the exception was.
MS. JONES: In the saprolite, the shallow?
UNKNOWN MALE: Or either.
MS. JONES: Okay. Well, I -- I -- I'll give you both, but in the shallow, the highest level of total chromium was 20 micrograms per liter compared to that .1.
MS. CRAGO: Micrograms or milligrams?
MS. JONES: I'm sorry. Milligrams.
UNKNOWN FEMALE: Yeah.
MS. JONES: Excuse me. Excuse me.
MS. CRAGO: Big difference.
UNKNOWN MALE: So 200 times?
UNKNOWN FEMALE: Wow.
MS. JONES: The numbers ranged from non-detect, .4, .3, 12, 13, and 20.
MS. CRAGO: And what about the deep water?
MS. JONES: I'll give you a range: .2, .5, 2, 16, 110, 120, 300, and 380.

MS. CRAGO: And that's just why you did not inform us of that.

MS. JONES: I'm sorry it was not able to be read on the map. I apologize.

MS. CRAGO: I also want to let everybody know, if you're interested, you can purchase something at Lowe's or Home Depot called a "reverse osmosis system." It's a cost of about 150 to $170. My husband installed it under our kitchen sink this weekend, and it takes -- it's supposed to take out everything including chromium.

UNKNOWN FEMALE: Your well tested negative for hexavalent chromium?

MS. KREGO: Yeah. It -- that -- we -- we haven't gotten the other test back yet.

UNKNOWN FEMALE: Well -- so -- so that -- there's a chromium -- free -- that occurs naturally?

MS. CRAGO: Right. Right.

UNKNOWN FEMALE: And that's okay?

MS. CRAGO: Right.

MS. VINCENT: And you're next.

MS. PENLAND: Thank you. I have a question. I noticed on your evaluations you talked about the risk to workers --

MS. JONES: Yes, ma'am.

Page 56

MS. PENLAND: -- so I'm assuming you'd know what those risks to workers are if you evaluated them. Could you tell us what those workers would be exposed to over there on that site? What their health risk would be?

MS. JONES: If they were removing the soil, for instance --

MS. PENLAND: Yes, yes.

MS. JONES: -- in that area?

MS. PENLAND: If any -- I'm assuming you mean -- I'm back to her disturbing --

MS. JONES: Right, right.

MS. PENLAND: -- issue here.

MS. JONES: Okay. One risk I was thinking of was heavy machinery. And we evaluate everything. But in the -- the other risk would be highly contaminated soils with chromium. They would have to wear certain protective clothing in order to be able to remove this soil.

MS. PENLAND: And what would that do them if it got on them? That's the -- I mean, that is the health risk: not the wearing of the suit --

MS. JONES: Well --

MS. PENLAND: -- but the fact that they need to wear the suit. So I'm assuming there's some kind of risk

that you know about that you would put this suit on them.

UNKNOWN MALE: Skin contact.

MS. PENLAND: If you --

UNKNOWN MALE: Skin contact.

MS. PENLAND: And what would that do to them?

UNKNOWN FEMALE: Are you talking about just if somebody went to work there, or --

MS. PENLAND: I'm talking about the risk that --

MS. JONES: Okay.

MS. PENLAND: -- were on every one of her evaluations that talked about workers being exposed.

(Multiple attendees speak simultaneously without benefit of the microphone.)

MS. OLIVA: I was to preface by saying that I'm not a risk assessor, but my understanding of the reason why chromium is a concern with respect to health -- the main reason is due to inhalation, and that's why excavating the soils inside a building would pose a -- a potential risk.

MS. PENLAND: Well, is it going to get in the air if they remove it -- is it going to get in the air if they remove it and be down our road?

(Multiple attendees speak simultaneously without benefit of the microphone.)

MS. PENLAND: Well, true. Okay.
MS. VINCENT: May I ask your name?
MS. PENLAND: Judy Penland.
MS. OLIVA: If -- if excavation of the soil were to occur, it would be done under controlled circumstances to minimize any escaping of the -- the -- the -- the soil into the air outside the building. And that would be part of the environmental health and safety program.
MS. JONES: Did -- let me make sure we finished answering her question.
MS. PENLAND: No. I'm not done.
MS. JONES: Okay. Then let's make sure we finish her question.
MS. PENLAND: My other question was: Say you do all this and you've got the deed restrictions. Is that going to keep some other company from coming in there and deciding they want to build on that property, and they start messing with that soil that's down in that old lagoon or over here on the side the -- that's contaminated?

I -- I know that that lagoon was, at some point, very seriously contaminated because a dog on the road went over there, drank some of the water, and died right beside the pond. I know that for a

fact. Saw it with my own eyes.
MS. JONES: Uh-huh.
MS. PENLAND: So I -- I know that at some point that's been very dangerous.
MS. JONES: Those restrictions will be placed on the property. They --
MS. PENLAND: And they won't be able to build where any of this soil is located?
MS. JONES: Correct. That -- that restriction is placed on the property.
MS. PENLAND: And just for clarification on the cancer issue --
MS. JONES: Yes, ma'am.
MS. PENLAND: -- every property that -- the houses across the road and the houses to each side of that plant have had cancer. All of those in the perimeter.
MS. JONES: The ones that we were sampling?
MS. PENLAND: Yes.
MS. JONES: Okay.
MS. PENLAND: Yes.
MS. JONES: Okay.
MS. PENLAND: I know -- I know one of them. I think all of them --
UNKNOWN MALE: All three of them.

UNKNOWN FEMALE: All three of them.
MS. PENLAND: Then there's cancer there.
MS. JONES: Okay. Jean, you might want to clarify something I answered about the . . .
MS. OLIVA: With respect to the lagoon, that area was excavated in the 1980s. It's the material that had been disposed of in that area.
MS. PENLAND: So it's not there anymore?
MS. OLIVA: That's correct.
MR. MARTIN: That -- that's not true. It smells like a radiator shop down there if you go around in the evening. You ride a tractor around it, you go down next to the woods, it smells like an old radiator shop with its acids flying around.
MR. HENSING: Hi. I just wanted to take a minute. I was on the internet researching hexavalent chromium cleanup while you guys were talking, and I actually found a similar -- I don't want to play -- I don't want to take anything away from your excellent work or anything like that, but I wanted to throw this out there.

There was a metal plant in Washington State during the '50s and '60s that was cleaned up recently in 2002. They -- they mentioned in the report that I read from the EPA many of the things

that were mentioned tonight. The first thing they tried was to remove all the dirt, which was one of the proposals I think that was mentioned, and that was ineffective. So the next thing they did was they actually razed the building. They leveled the building and they injected some kind of chemical into the soil which they said eliminated all traces of chromium within a few days. It's some kind of catalyst that reacts with it, or whatever, and transforms it to some non-dangerous/-lethal form of the thing.

So I'm wondering why you would be leaning towards leaving the floor and leaving the building intact versus maybe going more aggressive and getting rid of it within a few days. My name is Robert Hensing.

MS. JONES: That was just not an alternative that we evaluated. If -- if you're suggesting it, we will take that into consideration.

MS. VINCENT: We have a question here.

MS. JENKINS: Hi, I'm Lesa Jenkins. I live on Leland Court and I'm, kind of, in this profession. I'm in environmental engineering. Just wanted to let you know -- a lot of your questions had to do with your wells and your water source. Campbells Road is a

ridge line.

MS. JONES: Thank you.

MS. JENKINS: Everything that's on the Rock Hill side flows towards Rock Hill; everything that's on the Clover side flows towards Clover. This site is on the side. However, on -- for DHEC, just to quieten some of this, at $100 per family, how much would it cost, you know, to go ahead and conduct this so that it would quieten some of the concerns -- and have these wells tested? You're talking about a -- versus these million dollars, this is just a drop in a bucket. Ten thousand for 100 residents at $100 a pop. If you use your lab, it would be less than that.

The other thing was on the site: the soil cleanup. What I saw up there was -- at first, when I evaluated your Option S-2, I liked it; I thought it was good. Then I got to thinking about as long as that building's there, we have an eyesore that nobody's going to use, which affects the property value, eventually, in our community. I think the best alternative probably would be to get rid of that soil, and like they said, the lagoons. If the dog died, he probably drank water that was in the lagoon at the time and that's not the case no more,

but that's -- I just want to let them know about the ridge line, and --

MS. JONES: Okay.

MS. JENKINS: -- about the water actually --

MS. JONES: You're absolutely right about the ridge line. Thank you for bringing that up.

MR. HILTON: Thank you. John Hilton again. Thank you for your comments. Is there any definition to the circle on the map up there?

MS. JONES: That -- that's a 1-mile radius --

MR. HILTON: One mile --

MS. JONES: -- from the --

MR. HILTON: -- radius from --

MS. JONES: -- site, and that's --

MR. HILTON: -- the point --

MS. JONES: -- the same map that we have over here.

MR. HILTON: Okay. I think that's it.

MS. FERRARO: Hi. I'm Julie Ferraro. My first question is: What is the deadline for DHEC's decision on the site? Was there a deadline set?

MS. JONES: That March 5th date, or March -- I'm sorry -- 7th.

MS. FERRARO: So you will have a decision as of March 5th?

MS. JONES: We would like to have all your comments

received by that time, and then we will -- we will start evaluating your comments --

MS. FERRARO: Right, but what --

MS. JONES: And so it will be shortly --

MS. FERRARO: -- what is --

MS. JONES: -- shortly thereafter. I'm not sure if it will be a week or -- or two weeks --

MS. FERRARO: And then once you do have your written decision, how long will you give the SPX to clean that up?

MS. JONES: They will --

MS. FERRARO: To be --

MS. JONES: -- they will immediately begin working with designs, but there -- there is no specific time frame for when the contamination has to be cleaned up.

MS. FERRARO: So that could take years --

MS. JONES: It --

MS. FERRARO: -- more?

MS. JONES: It could. It could.

MS. FERRARO: So potentially, from all this amount of years, we can be still be affected by the groundwater and everything else, because it can -- it was ten years since you've tested it, now it could be another ten years before we start seeing

anything, and by that time, who knows how many more people are going to die.

MS. JONES: That's why our monitoring would continue while they are conducting this remedy and while they are placing -- getting their tests together -- I'm sorry -- their plans together --

MS. FERRARO: Uh-huh.

MS. JONES: -- for the remedy. They will be continuing to monitor the wells that we have been sampling quarterly and annually. They will continue to do that.

MS. FERRARO: And I just want to say I am for having DHEC come out and test everybody's wells. I think that would be a minimal thing to appease the community, and I don't think that should be a whole lot to ask considering how long we've had to wait on the decision for this.

I think, just to appease the community and put everybody's mind at ease, it's not that -- you know, if you just go within your mile radius or however, you know, big you would want to go -- what you've sent out as far as all your -- your -- your letters right now, I think that wouldn't be such a huge thing to ask DHEC to do.

MS. JONES: And which community do you live in?

MS. FERRARO: I live in Vander Lakes.

MS. JONES: Vander Lakes. Okay. Thank you.

MR. CLARY: My name's Chris Clary. I live on Tamarack Drive, Campbell's Crossing. To what extent did you do your underground water testing for all the aquifers in the area?

MS. JONES: "To what extent" meaning what was the deepest?

MR. CLARY: Yes. How did you determine which way the water's flowing?

MS. JONES: Jean or Tom, you may be better qualified to answer this question, but the . . .

MR. BOLYARD: Tom Bolyard with Enviro-Pro. We did the assessment VRI on the site out there, drilled most of the monitor wells, and our ongoing -- doing the ongoing sampling on the site up here. We have, as -- as Angie indicated, about 30 wells across the site: shallow, deep, intermediate. And basically, every quarter we do a portion of those; every year we do all the wells and come up with a groundwater contour map that shows the groundwater flow. So every year, we, you know, measure all the levels on all the wells, and I can tell you that the groundwater flow hasn't really changed out there for the -- about the last 12 years that I've been

involved.

MS. JONES: But is -- is your question why do we put the wells where we put them and how deep did we drill them?

MR. CARY: I have a pesticide license because I have a little landscape business on the side that required to have that. And in studying to get the license, they tell you, you cannot really, truly, accurately determine which way the groundwater is flowing underneath the soil because of the difference and the variations of pressures. It's like standing on a mountain and saying, "All the water runs downhill." That's not true. It could be forced upward; it could be forced to the left, right, north, south, not just southeast.

MS. JONES: Uh-huh. But I -- I think what Tom was trying to explain was we have enough wells in that area, and --

MR. BOLYARD: We have a whole network of wells. It's not just one or two bedrock wells out there. You know, there are --

MS. VINCENT: Tom, they can't hear.

MR. BOLYARD: Okay. We -- we take water level measurements in all the wells, and it's a network of monitored wells out there, shallow and deep

bedrock wells. And like I said, over the last several years, you know, we have developed this database that shows which way groundwater's moving. It's moving, basically, to the southeast and then to the east-southeast and a little bit around there. You know, it's not all moving directly in one line, of course, because the topography changes. And the bedrock wells, it is more difficult to determine than a shallow well, for instance. But with a network of wells out there, you can -- you can characterize the groundwater flow.

MR. CLARY: Do these wells trap?

MR. BOLYARD: If --

MR. CLARY: Does any of the chromium get through?

MR. BOLYARD: No. They don't trap anything. It -- it flows through.

MR. CLARY: That's my concern.

(Multiple attendees speak simultaneously without benefit of the microphone.)

MR. BOLYARD: Well, that's -- again, that's why we have a network of wells and that's why we sample the -- the bedrock water supply wells around the site, to make sure that that isn't happening; that it's not going half a mile away from the site.

MS. FERGUSON: My name's Debby Ferguson. Your network or wells, is it -- is it all around the perimeter, upgrade and downgrade of groundwater flow on the site?

MS. JONES: Yes, it is.

MS. PENLAND: How deep is the deepest --

UNKNOWN MALE: 140.

MS. PENLAND: Judy Penland. How deep is the deepest well that you dug? Or, you know, gone down?

MR. BOLYARD: It's at a -- right now, about a 150 feet.

MS. PENLAND: Okay. And our well is 320 feet, you know. Have you gotten to that water down there?

UNKNOWN MALE: And the water supply of all the surrounding -- most of them are 200-plus feet.

(Multiple attendees speak simultaneously without benefit of the microphone.)

MS. HENSING: I -- I have one quick question. Kelly Hensing. Can we -- can we as a public say, "Yes. We like your proposals, but as to testing the well water in the 1-mile radius" -- I mean, can that be taken into consideration if --

UNKNOWN FEMALE: And make DHEC have to pay for it?

MS. HENSING: Yes.

MS. JONES: That part I don't know. Well, we will definitely take it into consideration.

Page 70

UNKNOWN FEMALE: Well, wouldn't it -- wouldn't it be more -- wouldn't it be a good -- wouldn't it be a good part of their corporate social responsibility plan to do that? And can't they take out some type of environmental liability insurance to where if they took out a $2 million policy and it cost less than that to clean it up, they get the money back, or if it cost more than that, they have to pay for it? Can't their environmental consultant come up with some type of environmental liability insurance policy for that?

MS. OLIVA: That's nothing I've done before.

UNKNOWN FEMALE: There -- there are policies out there that do it, because when you buy and sell property, you can get the environmental liability insurance premiums to do it.

MS. OLIVA: I don't think it's quite as easy as that.

MS. VINCENT: I don't think they can hear her.

MS. OLIVA: I don't have personal experience with it, but I don't think it's quite as easy as you're making it sound.

UNKNOWN FEMALE: I -- I know it's not but --

MR. HALE: Frank Hale. Could you describe this treatment method, GW-4A? What -- what material do you inject and how does that work, exactly?

MS. JONES: The -- the -- the -- we would have to do some design studies to determine what type of material would be injected. What their -- we don't -- Jean, I don't believe we've decided on what that material would be to this point.

MS. DICKMAN: Hi, I'm Colleen Dickman, and I live in Vander Lakes in the 1-mile radius -- actually four-tenths of a mile from the plant. Our well is 325 feet and that's -- and you guys went, what, 150? So I'm really concerned about that. That was the first question. And is it standard for you to do the 1-mile radius, or is there some concern -- why did you pick the mile? I mean, there must be some risks in that.

MS. JONES: Okay. To answer your first question, the deepest well on-site was around 150. The residential wells that we are currently sampling around the property are much deeper, say, 220. So -- so we have gone deeper on -- on the residential wells. We realize that the -- the private wells are -- are deeper.

That one-mile radius -- I started getting a lot of phone calls from people after I sent out the flyers, and I was trying to figure out where they lived in relation to the site, so I just -- I

thought this map would represent the subdivision and just to give you an idea -- and me -- how far away you were from the site. There -- there's no standard for listing a 1-mile. I just wanted to show people when they came here where their house was in relation to the site from an aerial shot.

MS. DICKMAN: And I also think that --

UNKNOWN MALE: Did you inform --

MS. DICKMAN: -- DHEC should --

UNKNOWN MALE: -- everybody in a mile --

MS. DICKMAN: -- consider --

UNKNOWN MALE: -- 1-mile area?

MS. DICKMAN: -- testing our wells to --

MS. JONES: Okay.

MS. DICKMAN: -- within the 1-mile radius. Vander Lakes.

MS. JONES: Thank you.

UNKNOWN MALE: I don't know if my home is within a 1-mile area, but I didn't get nothing from you guys in the mail. The only copy I got was from my --

MS. VINCENT: Repeat --

UNKNOWN MALE: -- homeowner's association.

MS. JONES: His question was that -- or he -- he made the statement that he did not receive a flyer in the mail; he's not sure if he's within that 1-mile

radius. That 1-mile radius was not exactly where we --

UNKNOWN MALE: But what address -- to what address -- you know, that Campbell Road?

MS. JONES: You're on Campbell Road?

UNKNOWN MALE: I'm on Campbell Road. I'm at 6715.

MS. VINCENT: That was sent a flyer. Yes, that was sent a flyer.

MS. JONES: Pat, you may be able to help me answer this one. We looked online for the county website to see what properties were near the site. I -- I took a map, and I -- I drew the -- the main roads that I thought that those people would want to know what was happening at the site, not necessarily that they were in any risk; but if they were concerned about what was happening in their community, I wanted to send them the information. And there were certain roads that I had to select, and certain roads that I did not select. And we did put it in the newspaper as well, but --

UNKNOWN MALE: Did -- did -- do you know -- I mean, this is at 6247?

MS. JONES: Yes.

UNKNOWN MALE: Where was the mile go to? To what -- I said, if -- if I were to do a study like that to

send and inform all the neighbors, I would say, "Okay. That mile goes to 6720 or to 6713 -- you know, and I'm on 6715. So I don't know if it's -- I'm outside the mile range or -- or the study that you done to send out flyers is not including everybody that is affected or could be affected.

MS. VINCENT: The county provided the department with a list of residents within a mile radius. If your property boundary touched that line, even if you jutted out and had 25 acres further out, you were provided a notice. So I suspect if you didn't receive the fact sheet, it may be that that could be the situation.

Also, the department took the -- the information that was provided by the county and -- and also cross-referenced with 411.com trying to see if we can get anyone who may be a -- a renter or that wouldn't come up as a -- a -- as an owner of the property within that area. That is what we can come up with --

(Multiple attendees speak simultaneously without benefit of the microphone.)

MS. JONES: Basically, we tried our best. We relied on the county website, and that's why if -- if -- if you do put your name on this mailing list, we can

make sure that you receive a flyer in the future.
MS. VINCENT: When you sign --
UNKNOWN MALE: Did -- did -- did you do a mailing?
MS. JONES: Did we do a mailing?
UNKNOWN MALE: Did you mail out notifications?
MS. JONES: Yes.
UNKNOWN MALE: No.
MS. VINCENT: And I actually have extra copies here, if you'd like to have a copy.
UNKNOWN MALE: That's not the point.
UNKNOWN FEMALE: That's not true.
MS. JONES: Okay. I --
UNKNOWN MALE: This document was provided by some neighbor that got it off the website before you shut it down before all of us could print it off.
MS. VINCENT: I'm -- it -- it's available on the website. I -- I have checked that, and it is available. We may -- we have had some temporary server issues that have temporarily knocked us off completely, but I'll be glad to -- if you will -- I'm sorry. If you will kindly leave -- be sure your name is on this sign-in sheet, I will be sure that you will get other notices. But that's -- and we do -- like I said, we have extra copies if you did not receive one or did not see it on the -- the

website.

MS. JONES: Sorry. She -- she -- she's taking the microphone around so that it can be recorded.

MS. HALL: Sherry Hall, Campbell's Crossing. I just want to know that if the -- what amount of chromium -- as the years have gone by, has it increased in these wells, has it decreased, or what are the most recent levels, and are they increasing?

MS. JONES: Jean, do you know that off the top of your head? I -- I can say for the saprolite area, I know that that -- that blue circle that -- that's relatively stayed constant since '97.

MS. OLIVA: Yes. And -- and --

MS. JONES: Same for --

MS. OLIVA: -- the same --

MS. JONES: -- the bedrock?

MS. OLIVA: Yes. The -- they've both stayed fairly constant. When EFP was operating, they were using one of the wells up in the northwest corner, and since they left, the concentrations in that area have gone down.

MS. JONES: I believe that well was pulling that plume toward that well, and once they stopped pulling off of that, the levels have -- have receded.

MR. HILTON: Hi, John Hilton again. Thank you for

making me feel comfortable about my well possibly not being contaminated, but what I find really irritating is that I live within a mile of the plant. I had to find out through a neighbor who somehow found out. Your website's been down every since he told me about it. I pay, as many of these people do, the salary of the people that evidently work in this county who can't find me at my house. That really burns me up. Everybody -- the IRS -- everybody else can, but on something like this, you can't find me to send me a letter?

MS. JONES: I apologize. If -- if we didn't get the letter to you --

UNKNOWN FEMALE: None of us got a letter. I mean, no one --

MS. JONES: And -- and you're in the --

UNKNOWN FEMALE: -- no one --

MS. JONES: And you're in --

(Multiple attendees speak simultaneously without benefit of the microphone.)

MS. JONES: And you're in Campbell's Crossing or Vander Lakes? Okay. I do not -- I -- I -- if -- is Campbell's Crossing within one mile --

UNKNOWN FEMALE: Yes.

UNKNOWN MALE: Yeah.

Page 78

UNKNOWN MALE: Yeah.
UNKNOWN FEMALE: My house is in that circle.
MS. JONES: Okay.
(Multiple attendees speak simultaneously without benefit of the microphone.)
UNKNOWN FEMALE: Paraham Road is off Campbell.
MS. JONES: I just want to make sure I know where it is. This is Campbell. Is this Paraham?
UNKNOWN FEMALE: That is Paraham, yes, ma'am.
UNKNOWN FEMALE: No, no, no, no.
UKNOWNN FEMALE: Yep.
UNKNOWN MALE: To the right of your fingers, Vander Lakes, and to the left is Tamarack, Campbell's Crossing.
(Multiple attendees speak simultaneously without benefit of the microphone.)
UNKNOWN FEMALE: There you go. Campbell's Crossing.
UNKNOWN MALE: That's Campbell's Crossing.
UNKNOWN FEMALE: That's right. That's Campbell's Crossing; that's Vander Lakes.
UNKNOWN MALE: That's Vander Lakes.
(Multiple attendees speak simultaneously without benefit of the microphone.)
UNKNOWN FEMALE: So basically -- basically, the rural people got the letters, but people in the community

did not -- where the majority of people would be.

MS. JONES: And I was thinking it was just the opposite when I looked on the map and saw Vander Lakes. I -- I thought they were included on our mailing list and not the Campbell's Crossing. I -- like you said, I would've preferred it to be just the opposite. I apologize if we did not send it to the correct location.

UNKNOWN FEMALE: It should've been sent to both of them. They're both on there.

MS. JONES: Correct.

UNKNOWN FEMALE: It should have been -- been a little more thorough.

MR. ALEXANDER: Yeah. Nelson Alexander. I live in Vander Lakes. I got two questions. One, I want to know if maybe the drought had something to do with prompting your decision to tell the people in the area.

And the second thing is that I was -- built in that area, basically, because it was a booming area and your house were going up in value. And if you say that SPX is responsible for cleaning up their site, if I'm getting ready to sell my house this year and y'all put this in the paper -- and you sent a lot of these notices out that evidently

Page 80

didn't get to some people, but they got to a lot of people -- now that you've opened up a can of worms, what am I going to tell someone who wants to buy my house?

UNKNOWN MALE: See, by knowing that, you're responsible to notify the people that are buying your house of the potential risk of the chromium.

MS. JONES: Well, we notified the public because this site is in your community, not necessarily because I felt that you were drinking contaminated water.

MS. CRAGO: But answer the first question he had.

MS. JONES: Right. I -- I -- that's what -- I was going to ask him the first question. Can -- can you --

MS. CRAGO: What prompted you to --

MS. JONES: Oh, was it the drought.

MS. CRAGO: -- to start acting now? We -- we --

MS. JONES: This --

MS. CRAGO: -- think you still should answer that.

MS. JONES: Okay.

MS. CRAGO: You've been testing this place for over ten years.

MS. JONES: Correct.

MS. CRAGO: What -- what magically happened --

UNKNOWN MALE: Yeah.

MS. CRAGO: -- at that site that you are just now

notifying us?
MS. JONES: I got this document, and I reviewed it, and I came to a decision as to what would be the best remedy to --
MS. CRAGO: It took ten years to do that?
MS. JONES: To -- to complete the investigation; to install the wells; and to investigate under the plating bath area --
MS. CRAGO: You're telling me that took ten years?
MS. JONES: Yes, ma'am. Yes, ma'am.
MS. CRAGO: There's something wrong with that picture.
MS. JONES: Yes, sir.
MR. WEBB: I'm Alan Webb. I live at -- in Campbell Crossing, and I had a question about the injection of the material. Is the proposal that that will change that hexavalent to something else? And is that a permanent change? That's number one question.
MS. JONES: Yes. The answer to that -- to both those questions is yes.
MR. WEBB: Okay. And the other thing is, you know, I'm -- you know SPX didn't cause the problem -- whatever their company name is.
MS. JONES: Correct.
MR. WEBB: And somebody back in the '50s caused the

problem. I've been involved with these types of sites all my life and ten years is -- is probably it, but if she came to us a while back and she had one-tenth of the information and told us that there was contamination, we'd all be on her back and all threatening to take her out to the nearest tree and "Bring your own rope because we're going to hang you."

You people are beating up the wrong person. You know, I think that the state -- it has taken charge and is making that -- that property owner responsible to clean up the mess.

And if you haven't got 100 bucks in your pocket to go test your own well, you're in bad shape. I'm sorry. But if you have, go test it; if you haven't, see if you can get a loan. It's not a big deal, and I'm going to sleep well tonight. I don't know about the rest of you, but I'm a mile away from this thing and it's -- and it's contained pretty much on the site, so what -- what's your gripe? Your griping about not getting a notice, but you're all here. So you all know about it. Do you just want to complain about something?

UNKNOWN MALE: Yeah, I want to complain, because what happens next time there's something worse and we

still don't find about it, unless we hear about it from the neighbors? That's the problem.

MR. WEBB: Well, I mean, obviously, she's been working on it; she got her information together --

UNKNOWN MALE: It's not her that did it. It's the local authorities.

MR. WEBB: Well, they're not here, so why are we beating them up?

UNKNOWN MALE: Well, that's what needs to be communicated to them.

(Multiple attendees speak simultaneously without benefit of the microphone.)

UNKNOWN FEMALE: They're here to take our questions.

MS. JONES: I -- I appreciate your comment and at other sites that may not have information on a -- on a county website, we have gone door to door. We did not go door to door here. I apologize for that. I thought that, by hitting the county website, I was getting the residences that I needed to get. I cannot apologize any more for that, so I see both sides at the table here.

I -- I do also understand that some people want to be notified, and now some people are upset that now that that has been brought to light, their property values may be decreased; or it's been --

been brought to -- to light, or -- I -- I guess I can't win. I'm in a catch-22 there. I need to tell the public what's going on, and you also don't have any reason to be concerned about your property based on where it's located. So that may be one factor that I'm trying to give you here.

MR. MARTIN: Bill Martin. I'm at 6270 Campbell Road, right across the road from it, and I'd like to know what the deed restrictions are going to be on it -- how far away from the contaminated site?

MS. JONES: The restrictions will be placed on the EFP property -- only on that property.

MR. MARTIN: Okay.

MS. JONES: Not -- not on -- not on your property.

MR. MARTIN: Well, back before EFP closed up, I used to get a printout every quarter when they tested the water, and I haven't received once since they closed that business up. And they do test my well every quarter, but I'd like to get a printout on it so I know what's happening with it.

MS. JONES: That's -- you're absolutely right. I didn't realize that -- that EFP was handling that. We can get that information to you. We can -- because it's submitted to DHEC and then I can turn around and send it to you. Absolutely.

MR. MARTIN: My well is about 150 feet from one that's contaminated.

MS. JONES: Absolutely.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you.

MR. PENLAND: One -- one quick question. Steve Penland. Just one quick question: I don't want to do any rumors, but -- but I was told three weeks ago that -- that a contract had been put out to purchase that property -- the 25 acres and the -- and the site -- from a -- from a trucking firm out of Charlotte, North Carolina. And I -- and I don't know that as a fact. It was just something that was passed on to me by a neighbor on it, and -- and so this would be something that would be rolling through that you need to check into.

MS. JONES: Okay. I -- I'm not aware of any contract on that property, but it would not change the actual remedy that would occur on the property.

MR. DICKMAN: My name's Ray Dickman, and I was just wondering how old that building is and how long is it going to be maintained for since you don't want any groundwater --

MS. JONES: Uh-huh.

MR. DICKMAN: -- getting into it --

MS. JONES: Uh-huh.

Page 86

MR. DICKMAN: -- and has anybody checked that building lately?
MS. JONES: How old is the building? I -- Jean, do you know?
MS. OLIVA: I believe it was built in the early '50s.
MR. MARTIN: It was built in 1955.
MS. JONES: Oh, the entire building?
MR. MARTIN? No.
MS. JONES: Oh --
MR. MARTIN: Just out where they chrome-plating bath --
MS. JONES: Okay. That front part area?
MR. MARTIN: The front part of it --
MS. JONES: -- was in the '50s. And --
MR. DICKMAN: Is anybody maintaining right now?
MS. JONES: The question was: Is anybody maintaining that building right now?
MR. MARTIN: No.
MR. DICKMAN: Keep it structural, because you're saying you don't want groundwater in there.
MS. JONES: Correct.
MR. DICKMAN: And how are you going to keep it from getting groundwater in it if the roof's leaking?
UNKNOWN FEMALE: Structural integrity's what they're saying.
MS. JONES: He -- he can answer that question. Sorry.

I'm going to pass that one off.

MS. VINCENT: Hold on just a moment, sir. Your voice isn't carrying well.

MR. PETERSON: Chase Peterson for SPX Corporation. We -- we -- we're responsible for that site, and we're responsible for maintaining that building, and to prevent rainwater from getting into that building and percolating through that concrete floor -- and maintaining the concrete floor -- the integrity of the concrete floor. And so we'll have to be doing inspections of the building; make reports to the agency; periodic reports on the inspections. And we'll hire an independent consulting firm, and they'll come in and do those inspections and submit the report to the agency and will make any repairs that are necessary.

UNKNOWN MALE: What are your future plans for that site?

MR. PETERSON: Well, we'd like to sell it to someone and -- and then -- then they'd be responsible for -- and we -- we'd still be responsible for maintaining those -- making sure those deed restrictions are in place, but the party that takes it over would have to assure us in a contract -- you know, maintain the floor, maintain the roof, and everything.

UNKNOWN MALE: Is somebody maintaining it now? is what

I'm asking.

MR. PETERSON: Well, yeah -- yeah. I know. Well, what happened -- what happened is -- what happened there is we go into the building -- we periodically inspect the building and the area where the plating was to make sure there's no water in there, but the -- the tenant was EFP products; they were leasing the building from SPX Corporation, and they vacated -- terminated the lease and left. They cleaned up the building, cleaned everything out, all the hazards. We made sure they cleaned all the materials out of the building, but when you have a vacant building like that -- we boarded it up; we locked it up. Tried to lock the gates, but all the copper wire, you know, was stolen out of that building, which happens to us whenever there's a vacant building -- you lose -- people come in and vandalize it, and -- and we lost a -- we lost a quite a bit of copper wiring. And that's why the telephone poles are down. They were taking the wires off the poles and the poles fell. Yeah. So -- so we have -- we have somebody coming because the pole is leaning down -- this pole was leaning down. They're coming in to -- we called BlueTec Energy out in there; they're coming in and put the

poles back in place.

UNKNOWN MALE: When was the last time it was inspected?

MR. PETERSON: Huh?

UNKNOWN MALE: When was the last time it was inspected?

UNKNOWN MALE: We -- we inspect it every quarter when we go out there and do our sampling. About two or three years before EFP left -- before EFP left the site about two or three years, which would be four or five years ago, I guess, they redid the floor and all the plating baths. They resealed the floor, and so it's -- it's in great shape right now -- the -- the critical plating bath areas on the site.

MR. STEADMAN: Paul Steadman, adjacent property owner, and I have a couple of questions. First of all, the monitoring wells and the private wells, when they're sampled quarterly and annually, does that just detect chromium on the day of the sampling, or is there any way to detect whether or not there's been any trace through there since the previous time of the sample?

MS. JONES: That -- that water is collected that day, so it's what was in that well that -- at that time it was sampled.

MR. STEADMAN: So anywhere between one and four days, if

you will, per year you're checking to see if there's chromium present on those one to four specific days?

MS. JONES: Yes.

MR. STEADMAN: Okay. And I'd say in the past ten years we've had more drought than we have had annual -- well, normal rainfall, at least historically -- and if we were to have normal rainfall, do we know how that would affect the migration of the chromium to other wells off the site?

MS. JONES: I can't speak to that. It would -- we've seen the trends that we have so far. It would depend on the amount of rainfall, the frequency of that rainfall.

MR. STEADMAN: Okay.

MS. JONES: I -- I -- I couldn't answer that.

MR. STEADMAN: Okay. And do we know what the effect would be -- that as this property is potentially developed in the future and there's more wells placed on the property, whether it's for industry or for agriculture or for residential growth, do we know how that's going to affect the aquifer system and the migration off-site?

MS. JONES: Well, first off all, there will be no residential development on this property. You

know, the contamination is still on the groundwater right now and that's what we need to remedy before you could -- you know, you couldn't put a house there and have a --

MR. STEADMAN: Right.

MS. JONES: -- a well on it.

MR. STEADMAN: But if we had -- on the surrounding properties, if we added wells, how would that affect the draw and the plume and all that?

MS. JONES: It would depend on how deep those wells were installed --

MR. STEADMAN: Okay.

MS. JONES: -- and if they're pulling from that same aquifer that is contaminated or not.

MR. STEADMAN: Okay. So it seems to me, then, that to contain this site requires cooperation from the adjacent property owners or limits the adjacent property owners from what they can do on their property for fear or concern that it's going to -- we don't know the effect that it's going to have on this contaminated site. And if we leave the 90-fold contamination that's present underneath the floor of the building there and don't remove it, then we're just exposing ourselves to future risk, regardless of whether or not it's the -- the

facility is maintained or not.

And I'd just like to echo Tom Smith's concern that to choose S-2 as a solution for the soil contamination leaves it in the hands of a private party, whether it's a corporation or not. Corporations do go out of business, and it's still then left on the hands of the citizens or -- and taxpayers to then take care of the situation. So you're relying on a third party to make -- to determine whether or not Solution S-2 is going to be successful.

MS. JONES: I think it's successful whenever you look at our evaluation criteria. Is it protective? Yes. Is it -- you know, does it prohibit anyone from coming into contact with it? Yes. You know, it meets those criteria if that cap is maintained on it.

MR. STEADMAN: Yeah.

MS. JONES: Correct. And -- and once those -- so in order to keep that floor intact, you have a deed restriction on the property. So yes, there are a lot of things that have to occur in order to keep that soil where it is and for no one to come into contact with it. And those were the options that were placed in that alternative, and that's why

they were listed out that way. So we feel that we've -- we have made that alternative protective.

MR. STEADMAN: I --

MS. JONES: They both will work. S-2 will work and S-3 will work. It's just a matter of which one is more feasible; which one makes more sense; which one's -- you know --

MR. STEADMAN: They both will work at the time they're implemented, but the -- the ultimate success -- I'll use that word -- that your cap -- that cap's -- integrity of the cap is maintained and is incumbent upon the person -- the person or corporation that purchased the property. And if they don't then do that, well then, who's to say that the integrity of the cap is maintained and that 90-fold contamination doesn't leach out any further into the soils or into the groundwater and --

MS. JONES: That's that once-a-year check that we've mentioned when a deed restriction's placed on a property, that it's reported back to DHEC to make sure that -- that we verify that the cap is in place, that the floor is intact. So we have certain protections that we feel work in certain instances with the deed restriction.

Page 94

MR. STEADMAN: Okay.
MS. JONES: I -- I do see your point. I -- I would love to, if there's contaminated soil, sure, dig it up and get rid of it, but out in the open somewhere, it makes perfectly good sense; underneath a building with a huge concrete slab that the building has a potential use for a future occupant, then -- then the line is not so -- you know, it's not so black and white. There -- there are other options you may be able to use.
MR. STEADMAN: Yeah. Two more points. And that is if the direction of the aquifer has been documented as being to the southeast from the contaminated site, while it's away from some of these residential neighborhoods, which is good, it's heading to Lake Wylie and also towards other growth areas that are not shown on this aerial photograph, and that --
MS. JONES: That's why the sooner we can get out there with the remedy, the sooner we can, you know, mitigate that.
MR. STEADMAN: And I would like to formally ask that DHEC would consider the potential remedy that Mr. -- I believe --
UNKNOWN FEMALE: -- Hilton.
MR. STEADMAN: -- Hilton proposed or mentioned that he'd

seen online where you can essentially use some type of -- it sounds like a chelating agent that would bond the heavy metal and render them non-toxic. I think that should be considered and also that you should consider extending water service out to any of the neighborhoods in the proximity to the contaminated site so that they don't have to worry about their groundwater and what -- even if you are checking them for the presence of chromium one to four days a year, that's a lot of water going through those wells in between on the other 300 days of the year.

And the other question is if -- how can somebody buy that site and continue another industry there if they can't have access to water?

MS. JONES: Maybe they don't need water. I don't know. Could it be a -- a storage unit? I mean, I -- I -- I --

UNKNOWN FEMALE: Where would you wash your hands?

MS. JONES: -- I was purely speculating as to the use of that building.

MR. STEADMAN: Right.

MS. JONES: Maybe they would want their own water line and maybe they wouldn't need to use water. I don't know. I was just stating there's a building out

there; it may have some purpose; it may not. I can't speak to that.

MR. STEADMAN: Okay. But just for industrial use going forward, that site is going to have to have water, and certainly, the neighbors will sleep better if they have city or county water out there. And I think that should be considered in one of the solutions particularly when some choices that could cost 8 million are not being chosen. Thank you.

MS. JONES: And there've been several comments -- and -- and then we'll get to you, sir -- about the -- the sampling the wells and running the water, and I -- I believe what the department has tried very hard to do is to put in as many wells as we thought -- in the areas that we thought would show the contamination. Where is it shallow? Where is deep? How far out is it -- has it extended? We feel that we know where that contamination is, and we did not feel the need to go and sample people's houses.

I do understand your concern, but, you know, from a scientific standpoint, we didn't see the need to go any farther. But I'm not saying that we're not taking that under consideration. We hear your concerns, very much so, but I wouldn't just

necessarily run out and sample subdivisions nearby my site, unless I had a reason to think that the contamination had migrated that far.

And also the issue about that -- your wells only showing four days out of the year. You know, once that -- it's not just one molecule that hits your well and then keeps on going. It's -- it's a plume that would extend. So if -- you know, once you start to see some detections in your well, you would still see that. I don't think it would show up and then -- you know, if it's moving away, it's going to be in your well from -- from one sampling event to the next.

UNKNOWN MALE: Independent of rainfall?

MS. JONES: Yes.

UNKNOWN MALE: But previously, I thought you said you didn't know what the effects of a non-drought condition would be to the plume.

MS. JONES: I said I couldn't quantify. And I know rainwater and precipitation does affect the aquifers, yes. I couldn't tell you how much. If -- if it rained ten days out of the year, would that mean it would move -- it would migrate, you know, 2 feet more per year? I -- I couldn't tell you that.

Page 98

UNKNOWN FEMALE: Will your questions and comments from this public meeting be documented online or do we have to take time off from work to go look in the record at the York County courthouse?

MS. JONES: We have a -- a -- I'm not sure how we will get the transcript out to the public. If that's a concern that you want -- you would like the recording from this meeting to be placed, maybe, online? Somehow if we could scan that in? We can look into that.

UNKNOWN FEMALE: Hi. It appears that the highest levels of contamination are deeper. So again, with the concern is if the on-site wells are only 150 feet deep and the surrounding wells that are being tested are only 225, how do we know how bad the contamination is at 300/400 feet? My well's 400 feet deep, and it's well into the bedrock, so, you know, where -- how are we going to be assured that a deep well's -- as deep as that is okay, because, obviously, the shallow water isn't so -- so bad, and as you get down it's .380.

MS. JONES: Uh-huh.

UNKNOWN FEMALE: That's quite considerably higher than it should be.

MS. JONES: Uh-huh.

UNKNOWN FEMALE: So are you going to be testing any deeper than that, or is that just as far as you're going to go is 225 feet and you're done?

MS. JONES: As of right now, yes. And -- and Tom, maybe help me out. I know we did some studies on-site. We -- we did go deeper on-site than that 150, and we just encountered bedrock. We did not encounter any fractures. So we feel that since your well -- we didn't go -- well, Tom, how -- how deep did we go?

MR. BOLYARD: About 240 feet. Our -- our deepest well was about 240 feet. We had no fractures for the last 60 feet; it was solid granite; and that's why we stopped going where we were. The -- the -- again, the --the placement of your well really is much more critical than the depth of your well. If you're, you know, not an adjacent property, then you're much, much less likely to be ever impacted by this site.

UNKNOWN FEMALE: And my other question is: Is there going to be any cost that will come back to the residents or is it -- will -- will it specifically be for the corporation?

MS. JONES: It will be for the corporation.

UNKNOWN MALE: I just want to let everyone know I got my

water tested this morning at Parr Laboratories. They're off the opposite way off Carowinds Boulevard. Forty-five dollars a sample, four metals.

MR. CAMPBELL: My name is Briant Campbell, and my question pertains to the size of these contaminated sites. Either in acres or square footage, what is the approximate size of the two blue circles on these maps over here to our right?

MS. JONES: Ooh.

MR. CAMPBELL: I mean, I'm wondering, are we --

MS. JONES: Yeah.

MR. CAMPBELL: -- talking about a half-acre? are we talking about a ten-acre site? I guess is my question.

MS. JONES: Well, the entire site is about 25 acres, so --

UNKNOWN FEMALE: We can get that information.

MS. JONES: Yeah. We can -- we can -- oh, yeah. And the building is about a 70,000-square-foot building, so we'd have to just -- I think they're playing around with it in the back.

UNKNOWN MALE: It's three-quarters.

MS. JONES: Yeah.

UNKNOWN MALE: That's 2 acres.

MS. JONES: We think maybe 2 to 3 acres? Two to 3 acres in size.
MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. Thank you.
MS. JONES: Sure.
MS. VINCENT: Who was next? I can't remember. Were you next? Anybody else have a question?
MR. SMITH: Hi. I just -- I hope that DHEC will take a -- a long, hard look it -- at this, as far as long-term. Okay? If the building -- whoever buys it -- I mean, I don't -- I don't know why somebody would, but if they did, to take on that problem and you don't have water and sewer out there -- there's nowhere nearby. I just don't see why somebody would -- would buy that site.
MS. JONES: I don't know. Water could be run out there. You know, we -- one of our options included running water and sewer, so that is a possibility. But I'm not speculating as to who should --
MR. SMITH: Right.
MS. JONES: -- buy or not buy that property.
MR. SMITH: No. But you know, whoever did buy it, I just think that -- that -- you know, I just question, you know, how responsible that that person would be if you knew exactly what was under it. I mean, you know -- there's a -- a time and

point when common sense comes into play, and as far as this site, the remediation of that really needs to be looked at, you know. And I'm sure, like this gentleman said, it's been done someplace before. There are plenty of these sites across the country.

MS. JONES: Uh-huh.

MR. SMITH: And how many of these is that -- when you do your evaluation process, is that how you do it? Do you look at sites that have been done before you, or you just say, "This is sort of a -- a basic example of how things are remediated"?

MS. JONES: You can do it both ways.

MR. SMITH: Okay.

MS. JONES: Any type of information that's out there, you can use that to --

MR. SMITH: Have you looked at -- you know -- you know, punched in contaminated sites that are -- were contaminated with chromium and other contaminates --

MS. JONES: Oh, yes.

MR. SMITH: -- that are similar? And then how were those sites cleaned up, and what was the best way, and -- you know, and -- because I would speculate that, you know -- you know, really, since the last 15 years, we haven't had a lot of continuous

cleanup, you know. That's pretty evident just like with the site with the history here. You know, I just don't think that there's a -- a -- it's been -- I mean, Love Canal was one of the first ones, and it just -- but what bothers me a little bit as far as the length of this -- I know the Pole Branch Road site, we put in monitoring wells over there at a gas station when we found it out -- our own monitoring wells -- and DHEC UST within a year had 15 other monitoring wells out there, and they actually have started the cleanup process, and this all happened within a couple of years. Now, with that said, they knew about that site since '92 also. So it bothers me that -- that -- and maybe it's funding. I don't know. I mean, it's always money, but it bothers me that these sites are left lingering, you know. And ten years is a long, long time to track the contaminates.

It seems to me with a couple/three years, you should know the scope of the plume, you would think. And if it's -- if the -- once the plume is there, it's not like -- I mean, if this thing has been contaminated since the '50s, the plume hasn't moved that far. That's the good thing, you know. So I would -- you know, I -- I just -- I -- I just

-- it bothers me that it did take so long.

And then it does bother me that I still think to this day that there's different departments that do not coordinate with each other within DHEC. I think you -- all you people are doing a fine job, but there's a -- there's something missing, because things are being dropped and one department doesn't know what the other one's doing. And -- and what I'm looking at is use this as an example, use Pole Branch Road as an example of -- of where things like this won't happen again.

MS. JONES: Thank -- I -- I -- I --

MR. SMITH: Okay.

MS. JONES: -- we will. I think we've learned from this. But I -- I think to follow up with -- you made a statement about, you know, "He looked online; he saw a remedy." So basically, that's an in-place remedy, what we're doing with the groundwater. We're not pumping out the groundwater; we want to inject something in place.

MR. SMITH: Right.

MS. JONES: Am I hearing from what you had looked up that you would also like to see that in-place treatment in the soils under the --

MR. SMITH: I don't know.

MR. JONES: -- building?
MR. SMITH: Either -- either, you know --
MS. JONES: As an option to evaluate.
MR. SMITH: As an option to knock the soils out. I just wouldn't leave them. I -- I --
MS. JONES: Okay.
MR. SMITH: I just -- you know, to leave them -- you know, again, 15 years from now, we may be back in this room saying, "Well, God. We should have got it out of there 15 years ago."
MS. JONES: Okay.
MR. SMITH: You know, that's what I'm concerned about.
MS. JONES: And -- and Jean, maybe you can fill me in on -- on the leachability of the soil. I mean, do you want to --
MS. OLIVA: Well, I -- I'd like to --
MS. JONES: Thank you. I promise, we won't forget.
MS. OLIVA: I'd like to maybe describe the geology a little bit better. The saprolite in the top 20 feet or so is very clayey, which makes it very difficult to treat. As it goes down, the clay breaks down; you get into partially weathered bedrock and then to bedrock. So we're going to be treating that more permeable zone beneath the clay. To try and get anything injected into that clay

material beneath those plating baths would be very difficult.

MS. JONES: So while it could work at one site that you -- that you found, it may not be very fruitful here.

UNKNOWN MALE: What about actually removing it?

MS. JONES: That is -- that is one of the options, and we've heard your -- your concern about it.

UNKNOWN MALE: It's just going to keep leaching back into the -- into the groundwater.

UNKNOWN MALE: Uh-huh.

MS. JONES: Well, --

UNKNOWN MALE: If it rains, it's going to keep on leaking -- leaching right back in. You've got to remove it.

MS. JONES: He -- he was making a statement that, you know, if we remove it, it does not continue to leach. And -- and my response to that would be that that's why we want to maintain that cover, that flooring right there, and then there's no way it can leach. There's -- there's no way to -- to push that contamination through. But -- but it was an option that we evaluated -- to remove it -- and we've heard your concern to consider that tonight.

Yes, sir.

MR. DICKMAN: Ray Dickman. Chromium and the hexavalent chromium, are you considering those the same chemicals --

MS. JONES: We're going --

MR. DICKMAN: -- as we're talking?

MS. JONES: Yes. Yes, I am. When I say "chromium," I -- I mean -- I'm talking about the total -- the hexavalent -- I'm talking about the chromium.

MR. DICKMAN: Are you going to remove the solids out of the plant that was left over.

MS. JONES: The solids in the plant?

MR. DICKMAN: The --

MS. JONES: When -- when EFP was operating?

MR DICKMAN: Yes.

MS. JONES: Yes. But they've removed everything from inside that building. It's -- it's been cleaned.

MR. DICKMAN: All right.

MS. JONES: That has been removed.

UNKNOWN FEMALE: Says in the report that the soil underneath the footprint is outside the industrial, but the surrounding soil is without -- is contaminated beyond the residential. So the out -- surrounding soil is also contaminated, not just what's under the footprint, correct?

MS. JONES: Correct. But I think -- correct. But I

think it was a little backwards. Outside the footprint is contaminated above residential, but not industrial, and since this is an industrial site -- industrial work -- it would be protective for an industrial setting. It would not be protective for residential.

UNKNOWN FEMALE: Right. So the soil is still contaminated, regardless of whether it's contaminated for industrial or residential.

MS. JONES: Yes.

UNKNOWN FEMALE: It's just a matter of a putting a label on it. It's still contaminated.

MS. JONES: It is still contaminated, so we would not want houses built there if those soils are left in place at that level. We have done the testing on those soils and they do not leach, so they are bound up in that soil. They're not going to leach into the groundwater and cause additional groundwater problems.

UNKNOWN FEMALE: The surrounding soil does not leach?

MS. JONES: Correct. But it is still contaminated. So you -- you wouldn't want to walk over there and dig it up and play in it.

UNKNOWN FEMALE: How is it possible that it doesn't leach? Is it -- I mean, rainwater will wash over

it, and it will -- how is it that -- how -- how does it not leach? I don't understand that.

MS. JONES: I think Jean would answer that.

MS. OLIVA: When Angie refers to "total chromium," total chromium consists of two different types of chromium: Hexavalent chromium and trivalent chromium. The trivalent chromium does not leach, so when we sampled soils and there were high levels of total chromium, but not of hexavalent chromium, we know that that's the trivalent chromium and that does not leach.

MS. JONES: Thank you, Jean. That was -- that was perfect.

MS. VINCENT: Any other questions or comments?

MS. JONES: There -- there's one more over here.

UNKNOWN MALE: You know, I -- I think you've heard from pretty much the majority of the people here on different subjects and -- and I, too, would think that depending on a third party to not disturb that soil or that slab or roll a truck up on it and break it or whatever it is, is not as responsible as removing the soil. So I would say I would be in favor of removing the soil, and I think that -- I think that's the message you're getting. I -- maybe I'm talking out of turn, but I think that's

the message you're getting, and that's what the community is saying. We don't want to take the risk down the road that something might happen. And just like you closing the door and -- and going on vacation for four months and coming back and finding out your water heater broke, I mean, we don't want that to happen. And -- and as -- as many different projects I've been involved with as a developer, when we came across bad soils, our -- our desire was to get rid of it. And that's what I think they're saying.

MS. JONES: I -- and I do -- that is what I think I'm hearing, and if there were other, future uses for the site that we already knew about -- you know, we're not saying that somebody else may want to come in and remove the building or move the soil. That could always happen in the future if -- if -- somebody chose to do something different with the property. I mean, these are all speculations, but I do understand that in all cases, we would love to just remove the soil, if it's feasible.

MR. KENNEDY: My name is Gary Kennedy. Can we have a show of hands for who agrees with that gentleman's comment? Thank you.

MS. JONES: No. Thank you.

MS. VINCENT: Any other questions or comments?
UNKNOWN FEMALE: Since you have had a big response to this meeting, will y'all have another meeting before you make your decision on the remediation?
MS. JONES: If -- if -- if you would like that.
MR. SMITH: I think that'd be good. And the Timbers that -- they didn't get advised. They're in the mile ring, and again, that's the other development up there. I know Colleen made me aware of it, and I got one because I'm a councilman, but --
MS. JONES: So -- so first of all, what I'm hearing is that we did not notify the proper people, correct?
MR. SMITH: If you do the 1-mile ring. I have -- you know, I didn't know where you -- where you --
MS. JONES: And that 1-mile ring, we just -- we had to pick some boundary.
MR. SMITH: Right.
MS. JONES: It could've been three-quarters of a mile if we chose it, but --
MR. SMITH: You got a very small portion of the 1-mile ring.
MS. JONES: Okay. So do you feel -- even though the contamination is limited to on-site, do you --
MR. SMITH: I'm not going to make that choice.
MS. JONES: Okay.

Page 112

MR. SMITH: I'm not DHEC; you are.
MS. JONES: Okay.
MR. SMITH: I mean, you know --
MS. JONES: Well, I'm just saying the concern from the subdivisions that -- that we've had here that the neighborhoods --
MR. SMITH: Well, you know, they're going to hear it from these people that are here --
MS. JONES: Okay.
MR. SMITH: -- and neighbors and -- you know, so I would -- I would put a letter in there and -- and try to, you know, just explain it as best as possible, put your number in there. Certainly, they -- they could call me if they'd like -- whatever. I don't care. But --
MS. JONES: Okay.
MR. SMITH: -- you know, just as a -- if you're going to test the wells within the 1-mile -- that's what we're talking about --
MS. JONES: That -- that -- that's been proposed and DHEC --
MR. SMITH: Right.
MS. JONES: -- will consider that, so --
MR. SMITH: Well, again, it's a cheap piece of mind for a lot of people out here, so -- you know.

MS. JONES: So the issues that I've heard tonight are: The -- some residential wells to be sampled by someone other than the property owner; the notification of the residents within that 1-mile -- some were notified, some were not; we need to do a better job notifying the public; the soil removal under the building to be considered as an option versus -- versus the remedy that DHEC selected: leaving it in place.

UNKNOWN FEMALE: S-3 instead of S-2.

MS. JONES: And any concerns about the groundwater remedy that I might've missed? We're proposing --

MS. VINCENT: A question -- a question arose about the depth of the wells --

UNKNOWN FEMALE: -- wells being tested.

MS. VINCENT: -- being tested and --

MS. JONES: The depth of the wells being tested -- well that -- we will take that into consideration too. The -- should DHEC sample the wells? If so, which ones? How far away? How deep?

I just want to make sure that I've -- I've grabbed every --

UNKNOWN FEMALE: In that mile radius.

MS. JONES: -- everything. And then also we need to alert the property owners of their sample data.

MR. GANGELHOFF: Paul Gangelhoff, Vander Lakes. I think also you need to put some kind of a time line on the remedy and not leave it open-ended.

MS. JONES: Okay. Okay. A couple more questions and then -- I appreciate you guys staying here. It's been about two hours.

MS. SNIKER: I'm Cheryl Sniker from Campbell's Crossing. I just want to add one more thing. I think you alluded to it; we didn't quite clarify it. If -- before this plan is implemented, once you've made your decision, that there's a follow-up meeting.

MS. JONES: And you would like that to be a formal meeting -- a presentation versus just a letter or a --

MS. SNIKER: Yes.

MS. JONES: Okay. Okay. That's --

MS. SNIKER: Especially since there's some indecision about what you're going to do in the final version for the groundwater. That would give us an opportunity to hear the whole story rather than just the proposal.

MS. JONES: So you're saying if we decide to go with Option S-3 versus S-2, come back and tell you that that's --

MS. SNIKER: No. Not for soil, for groundwater. Since

you didn't know about the injectable -- what was going to be used, how it was going to be done -- that was -- that's going to require some follow-up, and we would like to have the details of that.

MS. JONES: Okay.

UNKNOWN FEMALE: Disposing of the soil -- you know, we're -- just had a show of hands that everybody is concerned about the total removal of that soil.

MS. JONES: There -- there will be pilot testing. I -- I think the first step after that remedial design would be some bench scale to see what -- what injectant works to break down this chromium. Then they'll be a -- maybe a pilot study on the property to see how -- what our system looks like. Maybe once all that settles, then we can come and tell you if it worked or not or if we have to choose something else.

MS. SNIKER: Okay.

UNKNOWN MALE: I have a question.

MS. JONES: Yes, sir.

UNKNOWN MALE: Has any other cleanup been done on that site? I know for a fact that that small building adjacent to the big building there was used as a -- machine shop, and they just took the oil and the chips and everything and dumped it out the back

door on the ground. And I just was wondering if there was any other cleanup done there -- peripheral kind of cleanup as opposed to just the chromium.

MS. JONES: There have been several soil removals out there. Just in my reviewing the file I -- I've seen several. They were prior to the company entering into an agreement with DHEC, so there may not have been a lot of DHEC oversight at that time whenever they were removing that -- those soils or those piles. But it is documented that removal occurred, and I think we've confirmed that those samples -- that those locations were clean with our soil samples on the property. But -- but something has occurred out there.

MS. VINCENT: Is that all the questions? We're going to -- as we mentioned, the comment period for the proposed plan runs through March 7th. You can e-mail additional questions that you may come up with after you get home, sit down and talk with your -- your spouse, you know. Please feel free to call Angie on any of the technical questions. If there's somebody you think needs to get a notice of the -- the next meeting that we are proposing, then please let us know that too. If you will also turn

in your survey sheets to Mr. Akhviediana, and -- we'd appreciate it if you could do that and --

MS. JONES: Pat, I had two more questions. First of all, the York County Library, is that a convenient location for us to house this record? Is it fairly convenient for everyone?

And then second of all, the -- the -- I mean the notice was also placed in the newspaper. I believe that was the York newspaper -- or Rock Hill?

MS. VINCENT: "The Herald."

MS. JONES: "The Herald"?

MS. VINCENT: Rock Hill "Herald."

MS. JONES: Is that the -- the proper paper?

UNKNOWN MALE: Yes.

UNKNOWN MALE: Yeah.

MS. JONES: Okay. Thank you.

MS. VINCENT: Thank you. We're going to close the meeting.

(Whereupon, at 9:11 p.m., the meeting of the above-entitled matter was concluded.)

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

(**Certificate accompanies sealed original only.)