# Appendix A

# Public Meeting Transcript

South Carolina Department of Health and
Environmental Control
State of South Carolina
County of Greenville

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | ) | |
| | ) | Transcript |
| | ) | |
| In Re: Proposed Plan | ) | of |
| CSXT Bramlett Road Site | ) | |
| | ) | Public Meeting |

Date: June 6, 2024

Time: 6:00 p.m.

Location: Mountain View Baptist Church, 111 Cagle Street, Greenville, South Carolina

Reported by
Cindy H. Patterson

APPEARANCES

DHEC Officials Present: Greg Cassidy
Lucas Berresford
Kristy Ellenberg
Elisa Vincent

CSX Official Present: John Dillard

Duke Energy Official Present: Mike Ruhe

Also Present: Pastor Stacey D. Mills
Mountain View Baptist Church
Greenville, South Carolina

Representative Chandra E. Dillard
District 23, Greenville County

Alan Mitchell
Greenville County Councilman
District 23

Senator Karl B. Allen

Lillian Brock Flemming
Mayor Pro Tem; District 2 Representative

Speakers From the Public: Courtney Cannon
Katherine Amidon
Nikki Oliver
Janice Williams
John Heiser
Sherry Barrett
Melanie Brown
Brenda Pennie
Christopher Dillard
Emily Poole
Jacquelyn Smith
Erika Hollis
Josie Newton
Tammie Childs
Tammie Sullivan
Francena Davis
Lester Childs
Mike Winiski
Colleen Kilgore
Charles Gardner

Charles Kilgore
Ursula Singleton
Scott Johnston
Jennifer Fouse Sheorn
Kiersten H. Mills
Adrienne Floyd
Bob Lloyd
S.T. Peden
Edgar Pruitt
Frank Halleman
Claudia Smith
Mattie L. Lowden
Bobby Lowden
Lydia Freund
William McKinney
Shirley King

PROCEEDINGS

PASTOR MILLS: Well, good evening, everybody, and welcome to Mountain View Baptist Church. Tonight we are really pleased to be able to provide a space for community gathering and conversation. Your presence here is very meaningful to us. Mountain View Baptist Church was founded in 1908, so you join us here at the 116th-year anniversary of the founding of Mountain View, and we're very honored. Thank you. Thank you.

I'd like to acknowledge our representatives who really have spearheaded and championed the cause of community work in our community. Representative Chandra Dillard is here tonight. Ms. Dillard, would you be recognized and stand? County Councilman Alan Mitchell is also here. This is his district. Councilman Mitchell is right here. This is also Senator Karl Allen's district. I see our City Councilwoman Lillian Flemming walking in the door right now. She's waving, so please give her a round of applause.

We'd also like to pause and acknowledge any other elected official who's here in the room with us tonight. If you'll stand, regardless of your affiliation, we'd like to acknowledge you. And in

their absence, let's give them a round of applause.

We also want to say thank you to other organizations and advocates who have made this a priority to be here as a listening session. We're grateful for that. Tonight marks, really, a benchmark for us as a community to listen to the presentation and have an opportunity to pose and have our questions answered. We're grateful for DHEC and their team, who have been working with us in small groups along the way to get to where we are tonight. A lot goes into this, so I hope that you will be attentive to the information shared.

Just a bit of housekeeping, there's a set of restrooms -- there's three over in this corner -- whether you believe that or not, you'll get there and see, I promise there are -- over my left shoulder to your right, and then downstairs if you need to be accommodated.

Thank you again for being here tonight. We think that this is a wealth of information. Also, our friends at Duke are here, so we want to acknowledge them. CSX Railroad also are here tonight. Thank you all for being here. Welcome DHEC and their team as they give guidance to the rest of the evening.

MR. BERRESFORD: Well, first of all, I would like to thank Pastor Mills for allowing us this opportunity to meet in this lovely venue and for all of his assistance along the way of this long process that we've been going through. My name is Lucas Berresford. I'm the program manager for the State Voluntary Cleanup Program at DHEC. I was also the project manager on this site for a number of years before I moved into that role. Greg Cassidy with DHEC is the project manager for this site, and he will be providing part of this presentation as well.

If I could just get all of the DHEC employees to please stand up and let everybody see. We have quite a contingent to make these happen, and we're very thankful for all the help that we are getting. When we get to the conclusion of the presentation, Elisa Vincent and Kristy Ellenberg will be carrying around mics for questions and answers. So if you'll just raise your hand, they'll work their way to you. So with that, let us begin.

So a little bit of housekeeping. As many have probably heard, DHEC will be splitting into two agencies in a month. So come July 1st, we will be Department of Environmental Services. That will

not change the people that you see here. We will all still be working on this project and moving things forward, but instead of being DHEC, we're going to be the Department of Environmental Services. All of the website information and other information that have been provided on this site will remain active, and you'll be able to get that information in the same way.

So a real quick agenda -- we're going to talk a little bit about the site history. The site history is vast, as this site goes back into the early 1917 timeframe, is when it began operation. And then we're going to talk about the Focused Feasibility Study and the proposed plan and the evaluation of cleanup alternatives. And then we will talk about DHEC's preferred alternative, and all of this is a forum to start our public comment period on the proposed remedy, which will begin today.

So this is a historic picture of the former manufactured gas plant. It was on the corner of East Bramlett and Washington Street. And you can see all of the operations that occurred in the 1950 aerial photo here. So kind of going with that site history, the site in 1917 was built by Southern

Public Utilities. And just so you understand, every major city across the country used manufactured gas in the early 1900 to 1950s. It was the predecessor to natural gas, and it was used for heating and lighting and kind of the cornerstone for development of cities across the country. In 1935, Duke became the owner of the property, and around 1952, the manufactured gas plant ceased operations.

In 1958, many of the structures were taken down, and in 1967, it was transferred to CSX. I think one of the important things that we think about here is the manufactured -- all these manufactured gas plants across the country operated near some type of water source. They needed it for their process, they needed it to deal with their waste product. You're going to hear us talk about the words "coal tar" a lot tonight. In summation, that's one of the main byproducts of this process. It would burn coal, take the gas off, and you'd be left with this tarry sludge material known as "coal tar." And historically, it would flow down these drainage channels that are up on this figure in blue and over into a wetland area. And that poses one of the major problems here with the cleanup, is

that material has been deposited out there in that wetland and needs to be addressed.

In 1970 to about 1980, the facility itself was used as, like, a trucking facility, and then since 1980, it's been vacant.

To compound this a little bit, in 1988, Robert Vaughn began operations of an unpermitted landfill on the far side of Bramlett Road. And in the previous figure, this is where all of those water bodies flowed with the coal tar. So the coal tar is down there, and then it gets covered up with 8 to 10 feet of construction and demolition debris.

In '93, DHEC notified Mr. Vaughn to cease operations, and in '94, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers notified CSX that the landfill violated the Clean Water Act, and it was closed. I think this manufactured gas plant process all took place between 1970 and the mid-1950s. In that timeframe, we didn't have a lot of environmental regulations in place to govern how things were disposed of, how chemicals were used and handled. Those started to come in, in the late '70s, early '80s, and then more and more as we moved forward in time. So all of the activities and operations were done prior to many of the regulations we see today.

So this layout shows what we refer to as Parcels 1 through 5, and you'll hear us talk about the Legacy School property as well. Parcel 1 is where the former manufactured gas plant operated. There's been several operations on Parcel 2, different things there, but it was not really where the operations were, the manufactured gas plant, but there were some drainage features that kind of went through Parcel 2. Parcel 3 is what we commonly refer to as the "Vaughn Landfill." The area in green on here is the approximate footprint of where that landfill is located. Before the landfill, most of this area was wetland. And then as you move to Parcel 4 and 5, that's kind of where the drainage channels move through the property and out the other end, and it's mostly wetland in that area.

So I said we're going to talk a lot about coal tar. These pictures kind of illustrate the different types of things that we see when we're talking about coal tar. It doesn't all look alike, but it's an oily, greasy material, a lot of black staining, has a consistency similar to roofing tar, to put it in perspective. And we're going to keep calling it "coal tar," but coal tar contains a

mixture of volatile organic compounds and semi-volatile compounds. But the primary ones that we deal with are benzene and naphthalene, and those are the ones that we see throughout the groundwater at the site. But there's also toluene, ethyl benzene, benzo[a]pyrene, benzo[a]anthracene, benzo[a]fluoranthracene (phonetic), and xylenes. So they're all kind of mixed together in this thing we call "coal tar." But rather than repeat all of those different compounds, we're going to simplify things and just talk about coal tar tonight.

So historically, in 2001 to 2002, Duke Power performed a removal action at the former manufactured gas plant parcel. They took out about 61,000 tons of contaminated soil and debris and removed it. And then after the removal, until present, they've been doing groundwater monitoring and assessment at the site.

In 2013, this -- this site, up until about 2013, had been handled by our Bureau of Water at DHEC. It got transferred into Land and Waste Management, and we contacted CSX and Duke Power about joining the Voluntary Cleanup Program. In 2016, a Voluntary Cleanup Contract was executed between the Department and Duke, and the VCC

required them to conduct additional assessment and evaluate cleanup alternatives for the site. A public meeting was held in 2016 to kick off the investigations.

So this map kind of gives you a look at what we had before. In the 2017 timeframe, we had about 19 monitoring wells. All the assessment that has been done between there and today, we have over 70 monitoring wells that are monitoring the groundwater across all of those different parcels. Over 104 soil and sediment borings were installed. A series of 16 test pits were dug to understand site conditions a little better, and 94 soil samples were collected, 45 surface water samples were collected, and 29 different sediment locations had samples collected from them.

And what we have here in yellow shows the footprint of the groundwater contamination at the site. The majority of it is contained on Parcels 1, 2, and 3. And the concentrations here are mostly benzene and naphthalene.

As part of the remedial investigation and assessment, Duke assessed all the former stormwater ditches and their pathway. And so all of these samples show various sampling points to determine

the extent of the coal tar and those former stream beds. And what we see here is -- the red dots on this map show where we found coal tar, so you can see that it kind of follows the stream path down through Parcels 4 and 5. And the yellow here shows where there was contamination but not coal tar, and then the green were clean sample points. So all of these samples were collected during the investigation.

And what we have here is a sliced look at the subsurface as we move from Bramlett Road to Willard Street, and the black here indicates the presence of coal tar material. So you can see that there's a lot more than was initially expected, but there's also a layer of clean sediment that sits on top of it. Just given the timeframe that this material was deposited there, nothing's been out there since the '50s, so Mother Nature has covered over it. So it's not a direct contact issue for people out there, but there's still a lot of coal tar out there that needs to be addressed.

Surface water and sediment samples were collected from the Reedy River, as there was some concerns that there may be potential for contamination to be migrating there. But the

samples that were collected did not show any active discharge to the Reedy River from the site. Duke Power did some mitigation measures. They put in some check dams and some barriers and redid the drainage way as it moves toward the river there just to make sure there's no possibility of future contamination or ongoing contamination coming from the site and getting to the river.

So one of the questions that everybody's probably thinking is, are there health risks from this contamination? And our simple answer is no, because to have a health risk, there has to be an exposure point where someone is coming in direct contact with this material. When we look at the Vaughn Landfill, it's under 8 to 10 feet of debris. There's no direct exposure route complete there to get to the tar, and when you get to the sediment in the wetland, it is also covered over with clean sediment, so you would have to work really hard to dig down to get to this material. The area is serviced by public water, so there's no private drinking water wells here, so there's no risk of exposure to contaminated groundwater. And our samples of the Reedy River did not show impacts, so it's not migrating out there.

So at this point, we've completed the remedial investigation, and the next thing was a Focused Feasibility Study. And what that did was evaluate the cleanup alternatives and the potential cleanup alternatives, which leads us to why we're here tonight, which is to present the preferred alternative and the proposed plan to the public and take public feedback. This meeting will open a 60-day public comment period. We want to hear your feedback. We want to get your comments. If you think we're picking the right remedy, we want to hear it. If you think there's a better solution, we want to hear it. And then we will evaluate all those comments before a final decision is made and a record of decision.

And at this point, I'm going to hand it over to Greg Cassidy to talk about the Feasibility Studying and the evaluation of alternatives.

MR. CASSIDY: I'm not quite as tall as Lucas is there, so I need to adjust a little bit. My name is Greg Cassidy. I've been the project manager for the Bramlett Road site since 2017. I'm going to take you through the Focused Feasibility Study and the evaluation of alternatives.

The Focused Feasibility Study looks at all the

data that was collected during the remedial investigation and then identifies the areas that will need to be remediated. Once it's been identified, these areas will -- what's been identified in these areas, we place them in what we call "operable units." The operable units we've identified for this site are soil and sediments, which is the Operable Unit 1. Operable Unit 2 is surface water, shallow zone groundwater, and transition zone groundwater. Operable Unit 3 is the deeper fractured bedrock groundwater. At this point, the Feasibility Study starts looking at all the remedies or tools that we might have that might work to clean up each of the operable units. For this Feasibility Study, a decision was made to look at addressing Operable Units 1 and 2. The impacts to bedrock groundwater were identified late in the remedial investigation process, and so Operable Unit 3 will be evaluated at a later time.

After evaluating the possible remedial options for the site, five remedial alternatives were retained to be evaluated. We just want to point out up front that these alternatives are conceptual at this point. While they've been reviewed by contractors for constructability, design details

such as truck routes, staging areas, or how water might be managed are not in a final-design work plan level. The level of detail will be in a final-design work plan after the remedy is selected.

The first alternative that was looked -- well, sorry about that. The first two alternatives are passive remedies of the five remedial alternatives retained. These are remedies where no treatment or removal is involved other than natural processes. The two passive remedies are no action and monitored natural attenuation and land use controls.

Let's look at Alternative 1, which is our no-action alternative. In this remedy, the site is left as is. There's no monitoring to see if conditions are improving. This alternative is required to be an alternative that can be used as a baseline for comparison to the other alternatives. It is very rare that this would be the selected alternative. Alternative 2 is monitored natural attenuation and land use controls. For this presentation, we tried to limit using acronyms in the presentation as best we can, but we will use MNA and LUCs a lot for not only this alternative,

but also for the other remaining alternatives you'll see tonight. So monitored natural attenuation is just long-term groundwater monitoring. It is used to see if groundwater conditions are improving over time, and then land use controls will be utilized to restrict groundwater or may limit the type of reuse at a site.

The remaining three remedies are active remedies. These are selective excavation, capping our monitored natural attenuation, and LUCs; excavation and partial landfill removal, monitored natural attenuations and land use controls; excavation and complete landfill removal, monitored natural attenuation, and land use controls.

Okay. For Alternatives 3 through 5, the proposed remedy is the same for Parcels 4, 5, and the Legacy School property. Those areas are highlighted in blue on this figure. Parcel 3 with the landfill, which is highlighted in red, is where there are differences between each of these remedies, and then our friends MNA and LUC will also be used with each of the remedies.

We're going to look at the Legacy School property. In all the active remedies, there will

be an excavation of sediments impacted with coal tar on the western portion of the Legacy School property. This area is mostly in the wetlands, but has a small area that comes up into the turnaround area on the western end of the school. The area that would be excavated would be up to 16-feet deep, and the total estimated excavated volume is 26,000 cubic yards. To excavate to this depth, a thousand-foot-long temporary sheet pile wall would be installed down 25-feet deep around the area shown in blue here. It is also possible that a temporary sprung building structure would be utilized to conduct the excavations in this area. This structure could be moved around and help control the noise and odors from the coal tar that is being removed.

Each active remedy would also excavate the drainage ditches on Parcels 4 and 5 on the south side of the site. The estimated excavation volume for these areas is around 5,000 cubic yards. And once again, we have our monitored natural attenuation and land use controls, which would be a part of all three of the active remedies.

So we're going to take a look at Alternative 3. Alternative 3 is the selective excavation and

capping. In this alternative, there is a northern and southern excavation area on the western side of Parcel 3, and that's kind of the areas in kind of the gray that's highlighted in blue there on the left side of that figure. That removal would total about 21,000 cubic yards. The area in pink would not be excavated in this remedy. It is an area where there's only trace amounts of coal tar which were identified during the remedial investigation. The rest of the Vaughn Landfill, shown in green here, would remain as well. Where you see the area in orange, there will be a 1425-foot-long permanent barrier wall installed. It will also go down to 25 feet below the ground surface. The area inside of the barrier would then be capped with a low-permeability engineered cap to control the infiltration of precipitation. In this alternative, we want to prevent the buildup of groundwater within the barrier wall, so we want to create an upward hydraulic head to extract the groundwater to the surface. To do this, 100 TreeWell phytoremediation installations would be placed within the barrier wall.

Phytoremediation is the process of utilizing trees to remove contaminants. These tree wells

pull contaminated groundwater up like an extraction well through the roots of the trees and treat the contaminated groundwater. There would be two groundwater extraction wells also inside of the barrier well that would be utilized until the trees are established.

Alternative 4 is the excavation and partial landfill removal. Under this alternative, the area you see here outlined in blue would be removed. This would include the part of the Vaughn Landfill with underlying coal tar. The area in green to the east side would stay in place. This is the area of the Vaughn Landfill without coal tar underneath. The total expected excavation volume for Alternative 4 would be around 154,000 cubic yards.

Alternative 5 is excavation and complete landfill removal. This is the easiest alternative to describe because all the Vaughn Landfill material and all the coal tar is removed on Parcel 3. You can see that area outlined in blue. And the total expected excavation volume for Alternative 5 is around 184,000 cubic yards.

So let's compare the active remedies in a few areas. I think this is a good slide to show some

things that should be considered when thinking about which remedy would be chosen. These are all very large removal projects and will involve a lot of trucks to remove this material. Selective excavation's biggest advantage, as you can see here, is that it would require half as many trucks as the other two options and be completed in half of the time. Excavation and complete landfill removal would remove the most coal tar and landfill material from the site, but it will take six to seven years to complete. "How long are you as a community willing to see work going on at the site?" is a question you will need to ask because it will -- these will be long removals. Our experience has been that truck traffic around these sites is usually steady but not overpowering, and the truck noise is similar to other traffic in the area. One other thing to note about these construction schedules is that due to seasonal weather and flooding, we'll likely only be able to work about eight months of the year.

So the Department evaluated all the alternatives utilizing the National Contingency Plan's criteria for selecting a remedy and has

chosen Alternative 5 as DHEC's preferred alternative. Let's take a look at the criterion that was used. Here are the criterion DHEC utilized to evaluate and compare the different remedial alternatives to select a remedy. The first seven criteria have been evaluated in the Focused Feasibility Study. The last one is community acceptance. Community acceptance is why we are here tonight and why your comments are important.

I'm going to go through those first seven criterion with you and explain what we are looking at when we are comparing the criterion to the remedial alternatives. So the first one is overall protection of human health and the environment. This is how each alternative achieves and maintains adequate protection of human health and the environment. The second one is compliance with applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements. This is how each alternative complies with federal and state laws and regulations. The third one is long-term effectiveness and permanence. This evaluates the effectiveness of alternatives in maintaining protection of human health in the environment

after response objectives have been met. The fourth is reduction of toxicity, mobility, or volume through treatment. This is how well the remedy can permanently and significantly reduce toxicity, mobility, and volume of the impacted media. The fifth one is short-term effectiveness. This evaluates the effect of the remedy on human health in the environment during construction and implementation of the remedial action. And the sixth one is implementability. This evaluates the technical and administrative feasibility of each alternative and the availability of materials and services required to complete the remedy. Now, the seventh criterion is cost. Here's a breakdown of the estimated cost for each of the alternatives. The active remedies range from close to $19 million up to close to $40 million. These are estimates and have a pretty wide plus/minus range of what the actual cost may be.

So that brings us to this chart where we compare how each alternative ranks in meeting each criteria we discussed above. Each alternative is ranked from 1 to 6 on how well it meets the goals of each criteria, with 6 being the most and 1 being the least. Alternatives 4 and 5 ranked very

strongly in the comparison in most categories. Alternative 3 comes out behind the other two, and that source material that's left behind in the cap and phytoremediation system would require a lot more long-term maintenance and upkeep to remain protectiveness (verbatim).

So that is the process we went through to choose Alternative 5 as DHEC's preferred alternative. When we have talked with stakeholders for the site, the message we have received is that there's a desire for all of the coal tar to be removed and the old Vaughn Landfill to be removed, and that people really have a sense that they want to get back that restored *landfill. In Alternative 5, all of the excavations will be backfilled with clean soil and sediment, along with the restoration of the wetland vegetation. The Vaughn Landfill footprint would be backfilled to match the existing contours of the surrounding wetland area. Also, best management practices such as silt fences, sediment tubes, rock ditch check dams, and turbidity curtains would be utilized to prevent sediment from migrating off-site. Excavation, transportation, and disposal has been successfully implemented to remediate

*Southern Reporting Note: Our office was alerted that the speaker, inadvertently said landfill instead of wetland.

other manufactured gas plant sites. The alternative would require some specialized equipment for working in the wetlands. There would also be installation of sheet-piling, dewatering operations, and treatment systems would be required.

Removing the coal tar impacted material and landfill material from the site is most protective of human health in the environment, provides long-term health -- provides long-term effectiveness and permanence, reduces toxicity, mobility, and volume of source contamination and is permanent and mitigates further groundwater impact. Community acceptance of this remedy is what we are asking for tonight. The Department will carefully consider your comments prior to the remedy selection. A public comment period will run from tonight until August 6th, where we will accept any comments you may have on the proposed plan that has been presented. Comments can be sent to me at the address listed here, and we'll share this again later on, too. The Department will select the final cleanup remedy after reviewing and considering comments submitted during this time. The public is encouraged to review and comment on

all the alternatives presented in the proposed plan. If you support the Department's preferred alternative or not, your comments can help shape how the Department looks at community acceptance of the preferred remedy.

All the information we have gone over tonight, including the proposed plan and the Focused Feasibility Study, is available for review on our website at scdhec.gov/bramlett. This schedule should give you an idea of when we think work may start on the site. We first have to get through the record of decision, which we expect to be completed in late 2024. There will need to be an agreement between the responsible parties to conduct this remedy. We expect that remedy implementation could begin within 12 to 24 months after that agreement occurs.

So now we're kind of to a point where we'll start looking to take any questions you might have.

MR. BERRESFORD: Real quick, when you do ask a question, please state your first and last name. We have a court reporter who's been recording the meeting for the record of decision in our administrative -- as part of our administrative process.

MS. ELLENBERG: Good evening, everyone. I'm Kristy Ellenberg, and Nate, I might need help turning on this microphone that we can use in the question period. A little technical difficulty there.

I want to thank everybody for being here this evening. I'm Kristy Ellenberg. I'm part of the Community Engagement Team for DHEC's Environmental Affairs. And obviously, I am shorter than Lucas and Greg. But again, thank you so much for being here. We take our commitment to community engagement so seriously at DHEC's Environmental Affairs, and so it means so much to see how engaged this community has been from leadership and neighborhood level and everywhere that we turn. And so even just seeing that we have such a full house tonight, it means so much to us and our commitment and this process.

And I do know we've got -- the pews are very full here at Mountain View Baptist Church tonight, but we also have other people who are joining us virtually online. I do want to say that it's very helpful for us to be able to stay in touch with you and follow up with you. For those who came in tonight, there were people at the back who were helping you be able to register and let us know how

to contact you. There's a QR code that you could even scan. So if you haven't done that, I encourage you to do that before you leave tonight. And that registration form is also available online. So if somebody's watching us virtually right now, I do want to encourage y'all to look at that site where you joined and be able to sign in, and that way we can continue to give you updates in this process as well.

And look at that. I can go mobile. How about that? So really, the key for tonight is to be able to listen, to be able to hear your questions and try to answer those, to be able to receive some comments that could be helpful for this process. So Elisa and I are going to be able to kind of move around. So if you have a hand raised, we'll try to get to you, and again, try to -- maybe I'll go on this side and she can start over there. Sir.

MR. DILLARD: Sure. Christopher Dillard. Good evening. Something I'm just sitting here thinking, so for whatever reason, if the City wanted to do or build anything on that land, how -- what is the process for them concerning what's going on with the land? Who would be responsible? For whatever reason, if they chose to build anything on it, the City got

hold of the land and bought it, what is the process? Who is responsible for cleaning that up for any business?

MS. ELLENBERG: So, Lucas, if the City bought that land or if there's a change of ownership of the land --

MR. BERRESFORD: Well, certainly, if anybody looked to take ownership of the land, we would encourage them to go through our Brownfields Cleanup Program to get protections from any liability for the existing contamination of the site. That would kind of be a first step we would recommend. The work, the remediation work, we're working with the responsible parties to get all of this work done. So hopefully, at the end of the day, we do have a piece of property that can get put back into a reasonable use.

Now, a lot of the area that we're talking about cleaning up is wetland. So whatever could be built in those wetland areas would be limited. But there are other pieces and parts of this that could be redeveloped. The manufactured gas plant property itself has already had a removal conducted there. There's -- I think, in the course of the removal on Parcels 1 and 2, there's a very small amount of soil that will be removed,

and then there won't be any restrictions to reuse of those properties.

MR. PRUITT: My name is Edgar Pruitt. I have a question. This is a two-part question. I happened to be involved in the Love Canal cleanup in Upstate New York in the early '80s, and they had done a cleanup part of that project, but after an earthquake, it broke the project loose, and all of a sudden, the contaminants started to come forward, and all these kids got cancer. I mean, a whole school got cancer from that. So what I'm asking is, are your studies factoring in the effect of an earthquake and releasing these toxins back into the environment or back into the surface soil?

MR. BERRESFORD: I think the beauty of the remedy that's being proposed for cleanup is that all of this material is going to be gone. it's all going to be dug up, it's going to be sent to a proper disposal facility, and long-term impacts after the course of the removal action is done is some groundwater monitoring of any residual material that may have migrated to the groundwater, and then kind of an evaluation to see, okay, did the removal actually clean up the groundwater, or is there more action that needs to be done for that. But as far as

moving material, since it's not being left in place under the proposed alternative, that wouldn't be an issue because it would be gone.

MS. ELLENBERG: I see another hand here.

MR. GARDNER: Good evening. My name is Charles Gardner. A couple of parts to this question. When you start talking about removing this and digging it up and all this, one of the things that you mentioned was a 25-foot retention wall. How did you come to 25 feet? That's not very deep. The other is, when you start to turn over all the soil, is there any possibilities for contaminating the river? And are there possibilities for airborne contaminants to be released as a result of all the truck movement and excavation?

MR. BERRESFORD: Those are some good questions. I'm going to try to work my way through them. The reason they looked at a 25-foot sheet piling wall in that area was they're looking to go down about 16 feet to excavate, and you always want to drive down deeper than you're excavating, so just as a safety factor to ensure everything stays in place. The contamination in that area goes down about 16 feet, so by driving 25 feet down, you're locked in below the area that you're trying to excavate to.

It's one of the basic safety factors for using sheet piling for those type of excavations.

We've worked on a lot of these manufactured gas plants, and the concerns about odors and vapors and all like that, there's a lot of things on the market to help knock those down. There's a lot of sprays and foams that suppress the odor, allows the material to get put in the trucks and taken off. We just recently did a very large removal near a residential area in Columbia, the same material. And actually, surprisingly, through about a two-year process, we didn't have any odor complaints or complaints of truck traffic because everything kind of blended into what was already going on in that area. And it was a big concern of all of the citizens before the action actually started.

Was that all the parts of your question?

MR. GARDNER: The digging up on the (inaudible).

MS. ELLENBERG: So --

MR. BERRESFORD: Okay. Okay. As far as --

MS. ELLENBERG: -- is there any danger of contamination in the river during the digging?

MR. BERRESFORD: There's some safety precautions that would be put out. So when they would be excavating

in the lower area that would have the most potential to migrate to the river, there would be a series of retention areas to keep any of the contamination from migrating off into the river. And then as they move back, those would be put in place to keep from re-contaminating the area that you just cleaned up, because you don't want this stuff moving into an area you just spent a few months cleaning out. You don't want it to migrate into it. So there'll be a -- in the design, there'll be a series of what -- protective steps put in place to assure that that doesn't happen.

MR. GARDNER: I assume that there would be a type of monitoring of the --

MS. ELLENBERG: There's --

MR. BERRESFORD: Yes, sir. That's something that's pretty much looked at on a daily basis when they're going through their safety checks, is to make sure all of those safety factors that are put in place to prevent things from migrating are working the way they should be. And if they need to stop work and make sure that they fix those, those things will be done.

MS. ELLENBERG: And just for everyone's benefit, that follow-up question was there would be monitoring of

that situation as it progressed.

We've got a question over here.

MR. MCKINNEY: Yes. My name is William McKinney. Y'all were saying that y'all have done studies on the river and all that, but I want to know -- I grew up over here, and I played back there. Have there been studies that people who grew up -- how that -- to see how that affected us, you know, because I played -- I went to Hattie Duckett before it became Legacy. I went to Hattie Duckett, and I also went to Parker High School, and I also played back there in that wetlands. My tennis shoes got that tar all over it. I got a lot of whoopings for that. So, you know, is it a study for people -- I'm 71 years old. Is there a study for people like myself?

MR. BERRESFORD: That's a really good question. That's also a really hard question to answer because we don't have a lot of data prior to 2000/1990s timeframe as to the contamination, where it was, and where it was getting to. So we can speak to how things are kind of today, but we really can't speak to the past and potential exposure pathways and things that were there back when the plant was operating, back, you know, before the landfill went in place. We can only really look at it in the

time that we were able to collect data and study it.

MS. ELLENBERG: I see a question here, and then maybe we can get to this row.

MS. BROWN: Hi, I'm Melanie Brown, and I'm really pleased to see that SC DHEC is recommending Alternative 5, because although the contamination has occurred today, we're now being responsive to the generations that come behind us. So I'm really glad to see that. I also recognize that it is a longer journey, so I did see six- to seven-year cleanup. Do you-all have experience or examples where projects like this have been able to create workforce development programs? Because there is an economic component that could reinvest back into the community through job creation with something like this.

MS. ELLENBERG: So, Lucas, can y'all speak to any job creation that's happened with some similar actions or remediations?

MR. BERRESFORD: I would say I don't really have any good examples of where that's occurred during the course of the cleanup. But we have worked with many companies across the state to clean up sites and then get them back into reuse and, you know,

businesses and other things in places that had a blight of contamination. And so in the long term, after remediation is done, there's potential for a lot of redevelopment of the area that could provide some of those opportunities.

MS. ELLENBERG: I'm seeing a hand up close over here.

MR. LLOYD: Thank you. Bob Lloyd. I wanted to ask somewhat of a related question. The redevelopment and creation of jobs and so on might be a ripple effect later on, but you mentioned having experience with a project in Columbia that probably relates to some of the criteria that you're using here. Do you have other examples strictly from an environmental standpoint of what we might call "success stories" in the state?

MR. BERRESFORD: Well, with this -- let's just talk about manufactured gas plants in general. Between Greg and myself, we've worked on ten of them in the state of South Carolina. EPA was the lead on probably the most notable, which the Charleston Aquarium now sits on. And there's a lot of other commercial development that has occurred around where this contamination was in the past, and EPA worked with the responsible parties to get those cleaned up. Recently, we have worked with Dominion

Energy to clean up a large area of the Congaree River where coal tar had gotten into. That was about a two-year project, but there was an area of the riverfront that was not being developed because of this stigma, and now we're hoping in the coming years that that's going to lead to some more redevelopment of the riverfront there because it's a prime piece of land to be developed.

We're in the process of, through our Brownfields Program, working with some people to redevelop the former manufactured gas plant in Columbia. There were two. One of them has already been redeveloped and has several businesses on top of it and some residential housing, apartments. So a lot has been done on these manufactured gas plants, and almost exclusively the remedies have been digging the material out and getting rid of it. Things -- different things have been tried, but ultimately, we end up coming back after evaluating it over a few years and saying, "No, we've got to go back in and dig this material out." It's just -- all the things that are in it and the way that it moves, it just is -- once it's removed, the groundwater starts cleaning up, the concentrations start dropping. We've seen great

effects from all ten of the ones that we've done removals on.

MS. ELLENBERG: We have another question here.

MS. PENNIE: My name is Brenda Pennie, and you have a contamination clump close to the Legacy School. How close is it to the school, and will you have to evacuate the school, or how would you handle that?

MR. BERRESFORD: The contamination actually does not go under the school. There's a driveway kind of around the school. There are some impacts under that. It's about 16-feet deep that they would have to go, so certainly, working with Legacy to find the best way to do that. The majority of the contamination over there is in a wetland area that is actually outside of the Legacy fence.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: I have two questions, too. The largest one is, as you're doing all this excavation, what happens to the materials that you've dug out?

MR. BERRESFORD: In the majority of the cases, they've either gone for incineration or disposal at a landfill.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Okay. And the Vaughn Landfill was -- I guess you would call it a "rogue landfill," described as a "C&D," but God only

knows, in a nonpermitted landfill, have you had time to do the testing to be sure that there's not a lot of other poisonous and difficult -- and VOCs in that area?

MR. BERRESFORD: There's been a lot of testing through and around the landfill. Have we dug into the material to see what, actually, we're going to run in front of in a few places? But you're absolutely right, and that's part of some of the thought behind removing everything, is, if we leave something -- and we have done these removals where we take a part of the problem away and we go, "Okay, it's going to get better." And then after monitoring it, ten years later, we're going, "Well, it didn't get better. What happened here?" And we end up having to go back and do the same thing again.

So here, looking at the full picture, trying to get all the impacted area from -- be it landfill or be it coal tar contamination out gives us the best chance of success in the long-term.

DR. KILGORE: Dr. Colleen Kilgore. My question is to do with the amount of 39.5 million for Alternative 5 in that have you looked at -- does it include inflation and unforeseen events? Because a lot of

times you start with a project, and it goes a lot -- you know, the money goes up, and then we're back at the table thinking about it. So I want to know, is there any money that's added to that, or are you considering that so that this project will actually come to -- and then, because the one you did previously, you said two years. We're talking about six years. A lot of things change in six to seven years.

MR. BERRESFORD: Greg talked at the end about an agreement between the responsible parties and DHEC to perform the action. That's not saying if the action costs more than $39 million, well, that's it. It's saying, "You're going to conduct this action in its entirety." The one that we did in Columbia, the initial volume was estimated as 53,000 cubic yards. It was 160,000 cubic yards. And it was supposed to take a year. It took three years. But at the end of the day, all of that material was removed down -- in that case, I think we went over 30 feet in downtown Columbia against one of the busiest streets without any interruption of anything.

So as far as the financing, that's to be taken care of by the responsible parties after they get

in their agreement with us.

MR. CASSIDY: Yeah. When we talked about cost, one of the things I mentioned is there's a pretty wide plus/minus range around those costs, and those ranges are like 30 to 40 percent. So there's an expectation you could be at either end of that stick. When you look at -- with inflation, who knows how high it's going to go, the way things have been going so . . .

MR. BERRESFORD: And one more thing on that. The timeframe is really an estimate. We're saying seven years; it could be five years, it could be ten years. It just depends on how many issues and things get run in through that process. But once the process starts and the work begins, we're committed to see it through to the end.

MS. ELLENBERG: Okay. I think I have four people with questions over here.

MR. MILLS: Thank you. My name is Stacey Mills, and I represent Mountain View Baptist Church and the Parish House Community Development Corporation. And I'd like to say that there are a lot of regrets around where we are and what brings us here tonight in terms of this community kind of being pushed to the side or ignored in this process in terms of the

people who have lived here and for generations have encountered negatively the interactions with the site unknowingly. The question that I raise, however, is the timeline that we are currently in, in terms of the VCC and from Feasibility Study to tonight's meeting, has afforded the community and the congregation to ready itself for or through the process of a community-led master plan. What has been your experience for those types of plans led by the community in relationship to the cleanup efforts in your past experience?

MR. BERRESFORD: I think when we're pairing DHEC with the community and getting an idea of their plan and what their purpose is and how they see their community in the future, I think it helps a lot. I think the communications we've had through the past public meetings are what led us to propose this as our alternative, because on multiple occasions, we heard members of the community saying, "We want it all gone. We don't want you to leave part of it. We want it all gone. We want the problem out of here. We want it put back to as pristine as you can get it." And that's our goal here. And hopefully -- I know that in Spartanburg, there was a community-driven redevelopment that has been

highly successful on the national scale, and hopefully, we will see the same thing here.

MS. ELLENBERG: Another question.

MR. CHILDS: Hello. My name is Lester Childs. So it sounds like we have already been doing -- I think it was Alternative 2, basically monitoring the land for the last seven years. What have you learned in those seven years? Is it migrating? Is it getting worse? What is going on from the data that you found through the last seven years?

MR. BERRESFORD: Okay. Over the last seven years, a lot of what we were doing was trying to find the extent of it. We knew there was contamination there. There was a long history of monitoring that led us to say, "We need to do more, we need to look more, we need to assess more, we need to figure out what's happening here." And over these last seven years, that's been exactly what's happened. It's been phase after phase of additional assessment to figure out exactly where the tar material has migrated to, how much is there. I think what we found was a little surprising, that there was more there than we initially thought was there, which is what drove us to get to this point of proposing the removal action.

The contamination in the groundwater is typically how we monitor these sites. Those concentrations have been fairly steady over time. We don't see a lot of fluctuation in that. We don't see -- we haven't seen anything in the surface water down the Reedy, where it potentially could have discharges from that wetland to the Reedy River. We haven't really seen that. So it's pretty stable, but there's a lot of contamination there, if that makes sense.

MS. ELLENBERG: Thank you. Lucas, we got another question here.

MS. WILLIAMS: Hi, my name is Janice Williams, and I'm a member here at Mountain View. And I just want to make sure I was understanding the question that Mr. McKinney had posed to you just a few minutes ago. Because of the fact there have been so many families that lived over in that particular area, is there any possibility that at some point in time, that there could be some type of health issues that could come up? Because, I mean, if the contamination, from what I'm hearing, is bad now, then it sounds to me like it's been something that's been progressing over the years. So if you had folk that have lived over there and didn't

realize that it was contaminated, you know, and as he was saying, you get older and then you have -- what you call it? -- well, cancer cells or whatever the case may be that comes up, would that actually have anything to do with that? Or can it affect -- can it be affected to us later on?

MS. ELLENBERG: So, Lucas, the question, again, is about health impacts from previous exposure, past exposure over the course of this contamination.

MR. BERRESFORD: I'm an engineer by trade, not a toxicologist or anything like that. We do have a health side of the State that can maybe answer some of those questions for you. I'd be happy to take your information from both of y'all and try to find someone who might can follow up and answer those questions better than I, because I do not have the answers to those questions, unfortunately.

MS. ELLENBERG: And maybe this is a good point to -- when Lucas started out -- on July 1st, we will become Department of Environmental Services. We're currently Department of Health and Environmental Control. We're still going to be partnering and working closely with the Department of Public Health that's going to also be launching on July 1st. So I know we can -- we have someone who's

kind of a designated kind of bridge to Department of Public Health and our health side of the agency. So I think maybe that's something that we can try to work to follow up on, if that would be helpful. And thank you for -- we appreciate his engineering expertise, right? Thank you so much.

MR. PEDEN: I have one comment. My name is S.T. Peden with the Minority Economic Development Institute, and a young lady back here broached the subject of during all of this cleanup, there will be a lot of jobs. I realize you're going to go with larger contractors, but consideration should be given to people who are interested and have businesses in this area that have been affected, be given an opportunity to be a part of this money that's being spent to clean it up as well. We've lived in it for years. Now the money starts to get -- if we aren't careful, all the money goes to the cleanup, and we're left out of that part. So we would ask that you consider with -- when you're selecting contractors, that they have a commitment to the utilization of minority businesses in the cleanup product.

MS. ELLENBERG: Thank you for sharing that comment. Another question here.

MS. J. SMITH: Hello, I'm Jacquelyn Smith. I'm a member of Mountain View Baptist Church. I'm also a material scientist in this area for a local engineering firm. I was looking at your PowerPoint. I have a couple of questions in regards to your hydraulic controls that was a potential or possible solution to cleanup. So when you're talking about phytoremediation, it's usually used for low to medium amounts of toxins in an area. What would you say from your lips is the toxicity level of that area? That's my first question. And two, how did we get that number of possible trees that are going to be used for that? And three, how many times do you expect to have to replace those trees? Four, when it comes to that, what is our solution to getting rid of those trees, and what's our carbon output for that? That's it.

MR. BERRESFORD: Now, I would start by saying that's why we're not proposing Alternative 3.

MS. J. SMITH: It's up there.

MR. BERRESFORD: A lot of these things were looked at, and when you start looking at could something be done to create a hydraulic uphead that could pump out the area, the answer is possibly there could. I think one of the reasons it scored low is because

kind of whether it would work or not is a little in question here, especially with coal tar material. And is it going to be able to create a good enough vacuum there to pull that material up? There was also some just general concerns -- as you mentioned, we have had some success with phytoremediation on other sites. Typically, the contamination is very shallow, and we're talking about things around the Charleston, Myrtle Beach type areas, not Greenville. So when evaluating it, once again, those were things that made that remedy score lower in the evaluation criteria. Could it be done? Possibly. Would it work? Maybe. Those aren't really things that we want to select as our preferred alternative. We would prefer to pick things that we have a proven track record of it working, where we've done it, we've seen success. So that's kind of why that got left out.

The other option would be if you could not get the tree wells to work. You have a groundwater extraction system doing the same job. That's why extraction wells were being put in there in the beginning, because the tree roots wouldn't go down deep enough to create that hydraulic head. Those systems where they can be effective at containment,

once you start one of those, they run for a very long time. As long as we have materials still in place, it's going to be very hard to clean a whole lot up.

MS. ELLENBERG: I had another question here.

MS. C. SMITH: I'm Claudia Smith. You may have answered this, and I may have missed it, but you did say there was an area where Mother Nature provided a remedy by laying clean soil over an area. Did you say that that's an area where you would not be evacuating and cleaning up? And then my other question is -- I kind of get lost, even with GPS. So you may have answered this, and I missed it because I'm not that really good looking at maps and knowing where you are. But with respect to the area that you are going to evacuate, clean up, get rid of everything, does that area butt up against, for want of a better word, the area near the Reedy River where you've already done cleanup? You have "confidence," I think, was your word, that there's not going to be any contamination in the river. Well, all the areas where you are now proposing to do the cleanup, are all of those areas going to butt up against that area So we then, too, will have the confidence that all the surrounding areas

are just as clean as the one that you have the confidence in?

MR. BERRESFORD: I'm going to try my best. Yes. Basically, a new drainage system was put in where the water that kind of comes down off of the landfill toward Willard Street crosses over the Reedy River. A lot of engineering controls were put in place to prevent any sediment or contamination from migrating further and going out to the Reedy River. Those are going to remain in place. The area that we're talking about now is moving from that back up toward the manufactured gas plant. So the goal is to make it all so all the tar is gone. Where we said that things had -- Mother Nature had covered over, that's great from a, "You're not going to walk out there and step in it," but it's not a long-term solution for it being there. So all the areas where coal tar is present in Option Number 5, it will be removed.

MS. ELLENBERG: Lucas, I was trying to see if we can pull that map back up. It might be a helpful slide to have up there as we continue these questions.

MR. BERRESFORD: And one thing, when you see these areas, coal tar is very noticeable. When you see it, you know you're in it. So this is, once again,

an estimate of what would be excavated. When we get out there and actually begin the work, If there's coal tar, they're going to get it. They're not going to leave it. That was the whole purpose of the remedy.

MS. ELLENBERG: And maybe, Lucas, just to help people kind of -- can we get our bearings of where the roads are, where -- I see the Reedy River up there.

MR. BERRESFORD: Right. Up at the top is --

MS. ELLENBERG: We might have a little pointer up there that could help.

MR. BERRESFORD: Yeah. (To Mr. Cassidy) You have a pointer? Oh, it doesn't show on the slide. Up at the top of the screen is East Bramlett Road. Coming down here is North Washington and then --

MR. CASSIDY: West Washington.

MR. BERRESFORD: West Washington, excuse me. My eyes are not as good as they used to be. I apologize. And then Willard Street is down here on the bottom. The Reedy River is over here on the left side.

MS. ELLENBERG: So, yeah, sometimes I have to get my bearings on a map, too. I see a question here and then some at the back, and then I'll come back to the middle.

MR. JOHNSTON: I'm Scott Johnston with Johnston Design

Group, and we worked with the community on the community-led master plan. And that last slide, actually, is very helpful if we can put it back up there.

As you're aware, there's been -- this community has had to deal with a lot of flooding over the years. And some of that was, frankly, probably aggravated by the rogue landfill, where the grades were increased, creating more runoff. Has there been thought given to when the soil is replaced after the cleanup, about bringing hydric soils in, restoring wetland, perhaps getting it back to its more natural, original grade to help mitigate some of that downstream flooding?

MR. BERRESFORD: I think that's kind of a plan to be worked out in the design and restoration plan. But that is -- the general concept is the majority of this area will be put back into a natural wetland form, which hopefully, does have some of the positive impacts on drainage and things like that, because we've noticed that a lot of areas that were completely covered in water, when some work was done to some of those drainage pathways, they drained out pretty good. But hopefully, getting everything cleaned out and restored will have a

benefit to the community.

MR. LOWDEN: Yes. My name is Bobby Lowden. I grew up here in this area, and I've been hearing things here that -- from my -- one of my deacons that I work with here in this church. I was involved in some of that bad stuff we were doing here, going swimming in the tar and where we shouldn't have been. But what I want to know is, like, up in Virginia with -- where they have the -- excuse me, I'm a little confused right now. But I've heard of McKinney talking about what happened to him. But there are people here that I grew up with that was here. They are gone. Hundreds of them are dead that grew up in this community. And I was sitting there thinking about it. I left here when I was 21 years old, and I can think of only five people that's still living that I grew up with. So something is wrong. They're doing something about Camp Lejeune. There's something going on here, too. That's about all I have to say.

MS. ELLENBERG: Thank you. Thank you for that comment. And again, Lucas, I think we can try to do some additional follow-up after tonight, looking at the health questions that are being asked tonight. So thank you so much. Got a question here.

MS. MILLS: Hi, my name is Kiersten Mills. I grew up here, and I've enjoyed watching Greenville grow. Wasn't there a sister site or another site that's similar to the Bramlett site? And how long was the timeline, and what does it look like today?

MR. BERRESFORD: There was another site in Greenville. It was on Broad Street. It had a very similar removal done on it that was done on the landfill -- not landfill -- on the former manufactured gas site plant here. Actually, more material was removed on the manufactured gas plant at Bramlett than was on the Broad Street site. They had a developer who came in who wanted to redevelop the site, and I believe there's -- I don't know if they're apartments or condominiums, but that is what has gone up on that facility after the removal was complete.

Now, comparing apples to apples, they weren't dealing with contamination in the wetland that had traveled down old stream beds. They weren't dealing with the landfill that had been put on top of the material. So they basically were going in and excavating out the coal tar, removing it, bringing in clean material, and then were able to redevelop that problem.

MS. ELLENBERG: So I have a question here.
MS. FREUND: Hi, my name is Lydia Freund, and I'm a city resident. I'm wondering, CSX is still going to own this property. Are we, with our tax dollars, enriching them by cleaning up the mess they made, or -- that's question number one. And how much of this property, this land is protected by wetlands, you know, laws and protections, legal protections? I'm just concerned that CSX is still going to own this property and tons of tax dollars are going into clean up their mess.
MR. BERRESFORD: Well, that's a good question. I want to start by saying it's not tax dollars that are being used to clean up this mess. The DHEC works under an agreement with responsible parties. The responsible parties are the ones funding the cleanup for these sites, so it's not tax dollars being spent to clean up the site. CSX does own all these properties, and they've been working with us and meeting with us as we've moved through this process.
MS. FREUND: They will still own the property?
MR. BERRESFORD: Unless they decide to do something else with the property, they will still own the property.

MS. FREUND: So I'm assuming it can't be developed because there's easements, and if it's wetland, it can't be developed.

MR. BERRESFORD: There would be limits on the area that was wetland that could be developed. Parcels 1 and 2, there's really nothing that hinders development of those two parcels in the future, because that's where the former manufactured gas plant was. And there's been various businesses on the other property in the past. When we moved to the Vaughn Landfill area on Parcel 3, the majority of that is going to be restored as a wetland, so there would be limits on what could be done there as well.

MS. FREUND: Are there sections of the property that CSX could, at their option, choose to cap over?

MS. ELLENBERG: So property they could sell or give or donate or develop in some way?

MR. BERRESFORD: I mean, I'm not going to speak for CSX under any circumstances there. They're going to have to make the decision on what to do with their property. Certainly, there's areas of that property that could be redeveloped. There's going to be areas that, just due to it being a wetland, are going to have great limitations on what can be done there. I know there was some talk of -- you

have the Swamp Rabbit Trail that runs down there. Maybe some nature trails through there or something along that might be the best end use that could be facilitated for that. But once again, the property belongs to CSX, and that's a decision for CSX, not DHEC.

MR. DILLARD: You want me to speak to that?

MR. BERRESFORD: (To Mr. Dillard) You want to come up?

MR. DILLARD: Yeah, sure.

MS. FLOYD: Excuse me. I just wanted to say something before -- I wanted to -- my name is Adrienne Floyd, and I was interested in you talking about how the engineers are protecting the Reedy River. I wanted to know which way is the wastewater flowing? And if it's not flowing toward the Reedy River, is it coming back toward Bramlett?

MR. BERRESFORD: Everything is basically flowing down parallel to the Reedy River. And then there's an outfall that comes down by Willard Street where the water drains off to --

MS. FLOYD: So it drains back toward us?

MR. BERRESFORD: -- to -- it comes down here, and then it goes over to the Reedy there. And at the point where it's going over to the Reedy River, down off this figure here, that's where samples have been

collected. That's where we're not seeing impacts. That's where engineering controls moving back toward Bramlett have been put in place to keep contamination from moving.

MS. ELLENBERG: I've got a question back here after John is --

MR. DILLARD: Yeah, thanks. John Dillard with CSX. Just wanted to speak to the property aspect of it. Certainly, we will retain ownership of the property, but certainly open to conversations about what, you know, it looks like in the future. We've had some initial conversations with Pastor Mills to understand, you know, what the community might like to see, particularly on that wetlands parcel. You know, outdoor classroom space and things like that have been proposed, and nothing final yet, but we're certainly open to those conversations going forward.

MS. ELLENBERG: Okay. I have another question back here.

MR. HALLEMAN: Excuse me. My name is Frank Halleman. Excuse me. Allergies. My name is Frank Halleman. I live here in Greenville. I've had the privilege -- not privilege, I've had the task to work on a number of utility toxic cleanups in South Carolina

and here in Greenville. And I've had the opportunity to review the records here of this site. So I'd like to ask -- make a comment, public comment for the record, and also ask a couple of questions. One is, I do think it is long past time that this illegal landfill and the toxic coal tar in the area and this illegal ditch that carries contaminants to the Reedy River be cleaned up, should have been done years ago. What I'm most concerned about in this proposal is that there's no proposal to clean up the groundwater. But I think it's important, if you review the records, to realize we're here because DHEC, not the gentlemen here, but their predecessors, and Duke Energy put us here. This -- as the chart showed us and as the records show, this illegal landfill operated for six years. Anyone could see it, any agency, any company, but nothing was done to stop it until 1993 and 1994. And when the dump was finally closed in 1994, neither DHEC nor anyone else did anything to make it be removed. So the existence of the landfill is no excuse for delay. It shouldn't have been allowed to remain. And if you look at the records, believe it or not, thereafter, Duke went to DHEC and used the illegal landfill as an excuse

not to remove the coal tar, and DHEC accepted that excuse at that time, in the '90s.

This site has been studied, monitored, measured for 30 years, and it's still sitting here in the center of the city of Greenville, in this community by the Reedy River on the edge of now Unity Park. And as the commenter suggested, it is in stark contrast to what has happened in the rest of the state and in Greenville. The point she made is absolutely true. There are two of these sites in Greenville that polluted Lake Conestee. That's one of the major reasons Lake Conestee is so contaminated. The one on Broad Street, right near McDaniel Avenue, was excavated to the bedrock. The groundwater was pumped and treated. There was a little -- that's according to -- the records say that groundwater was treated. And by the way, there was a stream that flowed through what is now the quarry park that conveyed that contamination to the Reedy River. You can see it. Whereas that site was renovated and now has luxury apartments on it and a bank, this site is still sitting here.

But it's not just in Greenville. I worked on a site in Conway, South Carolina. Santee Cooper was forced to remove 3 million tons of coal ash out

of the center of Conway through beach traffic. They started in 2014, right before this VCC. They finished by 2020, and that site's now a city park, and we're still sitting here talking about this. Duke Energy, in its hometown of Charlotte, was required to remove 4 million tons of coal ash from a site. They started in 2016 when this VCC hearing was held, finished in 2020, four years ago, and we're still sitting here. Now, that's like 20 times the size of this site. This is not the largest site in the world, but we're still sitting here dealing with it.

Now, as I say, what concerns me is it's good the landfill's finally going to be removed. It's good the coal tar is going to be removed. It's good the ditch is finally going to be cleaned up. But the problem is, you keep referring to something you call "monitored natural attenuation," and everybody needs to know that means, "Do nothing." That's what that means, "Do nothing." That means you sit there and watch and wait for the pollutants, many of which they didn't put on the sign up here on the screen are known carcinogens. And you let those dilute and flow out into the surrounding environment, and this has been going on

for decades, and they're still there. Why is there any belief that this is going to flow out instead of to treat the groundwater and remove it from flowing toward the Reedy River? I will say, I must disagree with you that there's no evidence of contamination of the Reedy River. We supplied that evidence to you a few years ago, and we actually met with DHEC and went over the results of the study of contaminated sediments flowing through that ditch and the evidence of testing of sediments in the river showing contamination.

So I applaud you for removing this thing finally, after 30 years of study, but we need a complete cleanup, not just a partial one.

So when you talk about monitored natural attenuation, I have a couple of questions on that. Why do you have any belief that monitored natural attenuation will remove contaminants, not just let them dilute, flow in the Reedy River, flow in surrounding groundwater, but actually will be removed? What's the evidence of that, given the fact it's stayed in the environment for years already? And secondly, if you do believe it's going to happen, will you tell us where the contaminants are going to go and when they will be

eliminated?

MR. BERRESFORD: I want to make a couple distinctions before I start taking your question apart and giving you some answers. Coal ash and coal tar are not the same thing by any stretch of the imagination. But when you say "monitored natural attenuation," part of the plan and part of the remedy will call for a five-year review. It's what we've done on all of the manufactured gas plant sites when we've done removal. You are removing 180,000 cubic yards of material, of tar material. You're also going to have to dewater a lot of these areas because you're in a wet area. So a lot of water is going to be removed, pumped out, treated, disposed of through the course of a seven-year process. There's no way to install a groundwater treatment system now because it's just going to be completely ripped out as they're doing the removal action. But there will be a lot of groundwater mitigation that must be done as part of the removal action to get the material dewatered to the point that it can be excavated. So there's a lot of remediation that's going to occur over the seven-year span. Once that is all done, we need to monitor and understand what's left. And I can't

tell you what's going to be left there today because we don't know where we'll get to with this remedy. Once the remedy is complete, we usually do a period of monitoring. We're making sure the wetland's replenished and growing properly.

It's going to be a big mess when we start trying to tear out a wetland area and replace it. It always is. It takes a couple of years for it to really take shape and form and get restored, and we've done that over countless places across the state.

So monitoring is always a component of an active remedy, because you need to see what the results of that remedy are. I can't sit here and tell you there's not going to be a groundwater treatment piece that needs to be done on this site until after we get everything removed and can see what happens. What I can do is compare it to other manufactured gas plants across the state where once we have completed the removal, the concentrations and the size of the plume have shrunk dramatically. That's not always to say that there wasn't a polishing step that needed to be done to finish it off and clean it up. But until the removal is complete, you really can't evaluate accurately what

would be needed for groundwater.

So the plan, as is proposed, is to do the removal. Once the removal is done, monitor the results, get an understanding of what is left in place, and then make a determination on is there additional action needed to address the groundwater at the site. Because there's not really anything you can do and put in place that's not going to get run over and torn up through the part of this excavation.

MS. ELLENBERG: Okay. I know we have a number of hands. You've got one --

MS. VINCENT: Yeah, we've got one up here.

MS. ELLENBERG: Let's go here.

MR. KILGORE: Would you clarify something for me? Charles Kilgore. I -- from what I'm hearing, what you're saying is going to be DHEC's recommendation, so -- and I think the -- my inference and, I think, a lot of our inference is that this is what's going to happen. But is there -- is your recommendation binding? Can Duke Power say, "No, we're not going to do that. We're going to take the $22,000 settlement," and do that? How legally binding is your -- or how strong and legally binding is your recommendation?

MR. BERRESFORD: I think that's a good question. Just so you understand the process, what we're putting forth is a proposed alternative to the public. We want feedback, we want comments, we want to be able to take those into account. Some of them may be simple things that are concerns that the public has that can be designed for in the remedy. All of those things, we want those comments. They're very helpful to us, and they help us shape what the final remedy is going to look like, because like Greg said earlier, it's conceptual now. Our goal over the next couple years is to work with the responsible parties to make it solid, to make a good design document that we can come back to you with and say, "This is how we're going to address it. This is what you're going to see." And I can commit that we will come back before we start any action to meet with y'all again and show you the plans and walk through the plans and let you understand what's there.

What happens once we've gotten all those comments and we've responded to them is we draft what we call a "record of decision," and that is DHEC's environmental decision of what needs to happen at this site. Once we have that, we go to

the responsible parties with that and work on getting an agreement in place for them to implement that remedy. I don't think any of the parties are looking at the $22,000 option as a viable alternative. I don't even think any of the parties are looking at the $1 million option as a possibility. Those are things we have to evaluate. They're in all the feasibility studies. We quickly shoved them aside, and we looked at the active remedies. And that's what you saw Greg talking about in so much detail, were those three levels of active remedies. We're proposing the most conservative cleanup that we can have as an option. I think in the long-term that's going to serve us so much better than the others.

But we'll draft the record of decision. We will then give it to the responsible parties, we'll try to get the agreement in place, and then the lawyers kind of work out the details.

MR. KILGORE: So you're basically saying what you're proposing as Option 5 may or may not come to pass? It may be Option 4 once you've had conversations with, I'm going to suppose, Duke, state legislature, whoever else is going to put money forth for this? You're saying right now that

Option 5 may not come to fruition, or it may, but let us not assume that that's going to be what's happening?

MR. BERRESFORD: I'm saying unless something comes out of this public comment period to change the proposal for Number 5, that's the alternative that DHEC's moving forward with.

MR. RUHE: And this is -- my name is Mike Ruhe. I'm with Duke Energy, and we support that entirely. We support (inaudible due to audience applause).

DR. KILGORE: Again, Dr. Colleen Kilgore, Mountain View Baptist Church. I'm the health minister here, and I know that you're in the environmental area, but until July the 1st, you're still DHEC, right? So everything is in one. So I'm concerned that there are people in this congregation, members who have suffered from leukemia, you know, kidney cancer, a lot of blood cancers, and other cancers that are inflicted by benzene, toluene, naphthalene, and all those things. They're all carcinogens. So I wanted to go on record that it was presented here so that we will address that at a later time, because this needs to be done. There's a lot of people here who are suffering from those things.

MR. BERRESFORD: And even though we'll be different

agencies, we will still share resources and be able to go to our health department and say, "Hey, we needs some help with this problem. Can you point us to the right direction?" So just because we're changing agencies doesn't mean it's changing the services that are provided to the community.

MS. KING: My name is Shirley King, and I'm also a member of Mountain View Baptist Church. And actually, I would just like to piggyback on what Dr. Kilgore just said. It would seem that the natural occurrence would be, if this toxin has been in this community for as long as you have stated, then there are people that live in this community, and that would always present some sort of health issue. So I would like to piggyback on what she said and to strongly, strongly say that there has to be some thought to investigating the impact of these toxins on the residents of this community.

MS. ELLENBERG: Thank you.

MS. VINCENT: We've got a question right here.

MS. LOWDEN: Are you going to make a statement to what was just said?

MR. BERRESFORD: I mean, I think it goes back to -- we will have to go back and talk to some people from the health side and see if we can get them back in

touch with the members of this community to try to answer some of those questions better, because we --

MS. LOWDEN: Okay.

MR. BERRESFORD: Honestly, we just don't have the best answers for that department.

MS. LOWDEN: My name is Mattie Lowden. I'm a member of Mountain Baptist Church. In reference to the question that Kiersten Mills asked -- can you hear me?

MR. BERRESFORD: Yeah.

MS. LOWDEN: Okay, I saw you're --

MR. BERRESFORD: I just can't see you from the spotlight.

MS. LOWDEN: You can't see me?

MR. BERRESFORD: There you go.

MS. LOWDEN: Okay. In reference to the question that Kiersten Mills was asking pertaining to East Broad Street, I might have missed it, but did you explain how long it took you to decide to do a study there and to clean up -- how long it took you to do the cleanup?

MR. BERRESFORD: The Broad Street cleanup and the cleanup of the manufactured gas plant site here at Bramlett happened in about the same timeframe. In

the early 2000s, they both occurred. There was some assessment that had been done prior that said, "Okay, we've got some issues, we need to deal with it." And the stance was, "Let's go do a removal out here at the manufactured gas plant." So that was done at both of them.

The manufactured gas plant site itself has been cleaned up for 20 years, thereabouts -- 20-plus -- 2002. However, it's owned by CSX. CSX has not developed that property. That property could be developed in a very similar way that Broad Street was done. The difference with Broad Street was we had a responsible party in there doing the cleanup, and there was an active developer trying to develop the site at the same time. So the removal was completed there, and then the property was developed. Here, the property is owned by CSX. It's their priority to do what they choose to do with the property, and it has not been developed. That property could be redeveloped very easily. The wetland is more problematic due to all the things that we're dealing with there. But once again, that's CSX property, too. So there were some different drivers there with other parties coming into redevelop the site. There's no reason

this one couldn't be redeveloped in a very similar way.

MR. WINISKI: Yeah. Hi, my name is Mike Winiski, and I wanted to follow up on Mr. Gardner's question from earlier. So it's my understanding that as you excavate the coal tar, right, which contains volatile organic compounds, things like xylene and naphthalene, is there a risk of those VOCs going into the air and causing health issues? And if that is a risk, is there a plan to monitor the air for those compounds?

MR. BERRESFORD: I think that's a very good question. On all of the manufactured gas plant sites, when we do excavation, there is air monitoring. There's air monitoring not just at the excavation site, but at the perimeter to make sure there's nothing leaving the site. There's oftentimes misters that are used to knock down the vapors, treat the vapors as they come off. There's foam and things that are injected over the material, so when it sits out at night, it's not off-gassing toxic fumes. And all of those details and aspects would be addressed in the design document that we would have to approve before we could start the removal action.

MS. SHEORN: Hi, Jennifer Fouse Sheorn. You mentioned

the scope of this project taking up -- seven years is your guesstimate. I did not hear you say -- with the male Dr. Kilgore, you mentioned it might take a few more years after you take this back. Can you say the whole scope of the project from right now to finish?

MR. BERRESFORD: I guess my question is, what are you considering finished?

MS. SHEORN: Everything cleaned up.

MR. BERRESFORD: That's a lot more difficult question, because what ultimately is going to happen is over that seven- to eight-year period, the soils, the sediments, a lot of the shallow groundwater issues are going to get addressed. There are some deeper groundwater contamination that we all know is a problem, but we want to see the impacts of what this removal will have on it. There's going to be a groundwater monitoring component for this site well into the future, no matter what we do. Even if we put an active groundwater treatment system out there, it's -- those typically run a 30-year timeframe before they clean up everything. What I can say is what we've seen in the past is the area of impact shrinks greatly in the groundwater after the removal is completed.

MS. SHEORN: So let me ask this: When is your start period? That's what I'm trying to get at, the start to finish, but let's start with start.

MR. BERRESFORD: Well, the first step is public comment period. We have 60 days to receive comments. We will respond to all the public comments that we get. They will all become a piece of our record of decision that documents the decision that we're making. All of those will get evaluated as the community acceptance portion of the Feasibility Study, because that's not something that anybody other the community can give to us, is whether they accept the remedy or not.

The next phase is us getting an agreement. We're thinking -- well, excuse me, the next phase is the record of decision. We're thinking by the end of this year, we finish that. Once we have that, we will supply that with a new agreement to the responsible parties to get an agreement to execute the remedy. Once we have that, we're talking about a year to get a design document, get all the contractors in place, get all the equipment and stuff that's needed to perform this remedy pulled together to begin. So at the earliest, if everything went perfectly, we're probably about two

years out from everything going. And there's just really not a lot of ways, given the complexity of all the issues here and all the agreements and things that will have to be worked out to facilitate this, and we want to do it in the safest, most effective manner that we can.

MS. ELLENBERG: And, Lucas, I might ask a question on top of that, which is we're going to have continuous opportunities for the community to be involved and other opportunities for them to be engaged and informed and participate; is that right?

MR. BERRESFORD: Yes. Once we have a design, once we have more specifics that we can tell you exactly, "This is how the material is going to come out, this is what you're going to see, this is what's happening" and the staging of it, we want to come back to the community. We want to have another one of these meetings. We want to show you all the details and get feedback and hear your thoughts and concerns, because those things can often be addressed when there's concerns about something maybe that got overlooked in the course of the design. Sometimes some simple changes can make a world of difference to the community, and we want

to make sure that we hear those messages.

MR. HEISER: Hi, John Heiser. I want to go back to your chart where you had the criteria laid out with the different proposals, and Proposal 4 and Proposal 5, both have a total score of 30. There is a $6 million difference between the two. When you go to the responsible parties and say, "We recommend Proposal 5," by what criteria? What kind of teeth do you have to do Proposal 5 over Proposal 4? Because the environmental impacts and the overall health to humans is exactly the same, and I don't see any teeth in you going in with Proposal 5 over Proposal 4.

MR. BERRESFORD: I think through this whole process, we've been working with the responsible parties. They've been a part of this from the beginning. The community has echoed the concerns that they wanted all the material gone. We don't know all the material that's in that landfill. When you're poking holes through a landfill, trying to determine where the coal tar is, there's areas you can't get through because it's full of concrete and rebar, and you can't get a sample there. So all of this is a conceptual idea of where the tar is. What we typically see is that footprint expand when

excavation begins. And there's also an emphasis of not wanting to have to come back and deal with something that was missed, because ultimately, that becomes way more expensive than dealing with it on the front end. So there's a lot of unknowns that full-scale removal, taking everything out, restoring it to a natural wetland solve. And potentially, it solves a lot more of the problems on the back end with the groundwater after the removal is complete.

MR. HEISER: And the responsible party looks at it the same way?

MS. ELLENBERG: So the question is, does the responsible party look at that the same way?

MR. CASSIDY: Well, I just want to go back to your first question. Basically, these scores are the same for Alternatives 4 and 5. One thing that's not on this chart that is one of the criteria and we utilize is community acceptance. And so that's kind of what we're here tonight to see is, does the community accept Alternative 5 more than Alternative 4 or something totally different? So community acceptance plays a huge role, almost more important than any of these other criteria at the end of the day.

MS. ELLENBERG: And so from that community engagement perspective, the conversations that we've been able to have in the past, the planning that y'all have been able to do, the master planning that y'all have been able to do, those things have helped strengthen the process and the evaluation that y'all have been using; is that a fair statement? Obviously, I'm on the community engagement side, so I don't want to misstate something like this.

MR. BERRESFORD: Yeah. I firmly believe that the reason we have Alternative 5 up here is, I think there was a lot of feeling from all the parties involved that the community was not going to willingly accept anything other than the best cleanup alternative out there. And so that now comes our job to work with the parties, get agreements in place, and get it put into action. And once again, I just urge everybody -- it may sound simple, but sending Greg an e-mail that says, "Hey, I'm from this community; I support the decision for Alternative 5," is very helpful to us, because if we get a lot of the community members stating their preference, don't think, "Well, DHEC's made up their mind, and it's Number 5. I don't need to say anything." Your voice does count. We want to hear your voice.

It's very important to us. It is a very distinct piece that we can't carry forward without y'all's help.

MS. POOLE: My name is Emily Poole, and I'm an attorney with the South Carolina Environmental Law Project. I have a few questions about the groundwater still, because I hear you saying that you've done cleanups where you've left things, and then you've realized that you have to go back. And I think a lot of people here are very concerned that you not putting the groundwater treatment in this remedy is doing exactly that, that you're going to have to come back. So why can't we put that in this record of decision? Why can't we put treating the groundwater in this record of decision? Even if it goes second, why can't that be in this record of decision? And also, another concern I have with the groundwater, because groundwater moves, if you're not treating it now, what are you going to do to contain it and to make sure it doesn't keep moving? Because we have had 30 years waiting for a cleanup, so the groundwater has moved in ways that we would have never expected in those 30 years. And we don't want these seven years of cleanup for the same thing to happen. Thank you.

MR. BERRESFORD: I think the part that gets missed because there's not a design document that shows all the details is -- yet, is that groundwater -- nothing's going to be done with groundwater during this removal. And that's not the case because there's no way to remove this material that's in the water table without removing groundwater, pumping groundwater, treating groundwater, removing the contaminated soils. And then what you have left is kind of a clean column for water to flow through. And hopefully, you've removed all the contamination, you've pumped the water to get that contamination, and you really have to evaluate how well that has worked before you start trying to design a system, because maybe you would put a pump-and-treat system in today because that would be the best thing. But maybe -- after the removal in seven or eight years and looking at what's happened to the groundwater, maybe there's some injectable technology or something that would be better and get it cleaned up quicker.

So the reason we don't choose groundwater pump-and-treat now is we don't truly understand the impact that this removal is going to have, and we can't until we actually implement it. And then

there's all the pieces and parts that go with it. Where there will be water that has to be treated, areas will have to be dewatered to excavate out the contamination. Now, what effect does that have on the overall site? And if we pick pump-and-treat, we may be coming back in eight years and saying, "We really think we made a mistake, because this is the better choice."

So the goal is always to pick the best choice of a remedy for the situation. And the problem is we can't speak to what that situation will look like in seven years. So we've got to collect the data, evaluate it, and then see, "Okay, we already have one component we know we have to revisit." If we have to add back in all the groundwater to that component to address it in the future, after the removal is complete, then that's what we'll do, and we will come up with the best alternative to deal with all of it.

MS. POOLE: Is there any way that you can commit yourself to that now in this record of decision? Because you -- we have a VCC in place now that gets us here, and then you're going to have to do a new VCC. And so we don't want to have to do a third VCC. And so is this something that you can be

committing to yourself -- like, committing DHEC and the responsible parties to?

MR. BERRESFORD: What we will typically have anytime there's a remedy is what we call a "five-year review period." And what that five-year review does is it evaluates how effective that remedy was. And it looks at the data, how -- what was -- "Was there anything left?"

"No."

"Okay. What's the conditions for the groundwater? Are they getting better?" Because once everything's removed, you should start seeing positive trends. If we're seeing great positive trends, maybe we're coming back and saying, "Hey, this worked way better than we thought. We've got some small pockets here that we need to deal with, and that's probably best done this way." But it's going to have an evaluation period on a five-year basis, post removal, until everybody is satisfied that the site is cleaned up. And that will be in the record.

MS. AMIDON: I have an easy question and then a couple comments. So with the change to DES happening July 1, can you confirm that Greg Cassidy's e-mail address that has been listed on this paper will be

live through August 6th to ensure people's comments are provided and given?

MR. BERRESFORD: Absolutely.

MS. AMIDON: Great. That was your softball. Now, a few comments. Okay. One, just in thinking about the wetland area, I think many of us here in this room would support that it gets fully remediated with invasive species removed, native plants reinstated. And I would suggest that CSX gives that property to the community, and it goes under conservation easement so that it can be an educational piece for the community.

Okay. My name is Katherine Amidon. I've lived nearly a decade a half mile from this site in the Southernside community, and frequently walk and bike by the boundaries of the contamination. I'm also an environmental professional working locally here out of Greenville. I appreciate and understand that assessments of this nature all the way to the cleanup take a lot of time. And I also understand that the science and analysis required to make an informed decision is not a small feat. These are not quick projects, Brownfield Projects never are. They take a really long time.

What I cannot understand, though, is the snail

pace this particular project has proceeded, beginning over 30 years ago, with the investigation of the unpermitted landfill on CSX property, and also the lack of active participation from CSX. Duke has come to the table. CSX has not. The delays to remedial action without good reason that have prevented the Newtown Community from moving forward in any meaningful manner with implementing their plans to grow their community is quite unacceptable. That being stated, we cannot change the past, but we have a really awesome opportunity here to positively impact the future together.

So with that foundation, here's the crux of my comment which kind of blends some things, Pastor Mills said, and also Frank Halleman. For all of the comments that are voiced this evening and during the 60-day comment period that request additional remediation, additional asks, similar to what Emily just presented here, to what should really be the only alternative we are considering, which is Alternative 5, there should be no further delay to the progress forward to the remedial action. And what I mean by that is, if people ask for things that go a little bit above and beyond that Alternative 5, it shouldn't be an excuse to

extend the timeline by another year or two or three. This community deserves a comprehensive cleanup and the ability to move forward with their master plan in short order, with a clear, imminent schedule and reassurance that their residents and visitors will be safe from contamination in the future. Thank you.

MS. ELLENBERG: Do you have a -- did you want to address any of that?

MR. BERRESFORD: I can't agree more that we at DHEC really want to see this project move forward to clean up. That's why we're here tonight. That's why we're proposing the most effective alternative possible. We don't want to leave unknowns out there to deal with in ten years from now. We want to try to address all of them here. And as I said before, we will look at all the comments, we will try to address them, and we will try to do that if at all possible, through our record of decision.

MS. SULLIVAN: Hi, I'm Tammie Sullivan. I'm one of the ministers here. Before I make my comment, I want to read the scripture that Pastor Mills gave us, and I'm just hearing everybody comment, and what we're hearing right now are cries, cries of people saying now is the time, because it's been over 30

years. I'm reading from Isaiah 10, 1 through 3. "Woe to those who decree unrighteous decrees, who write misfortune which they have prescribed to rob the needy of justice, and to take what is right from the poor of my people, that widows may be their prey and that they may rob the fatherless. What will you do in the day of punishment and in the desolation which will come from afar? To whom will you flee for help? And where will you leave your glory?"

This is God talking. This is God talking about justice. I'm hearing the comments, and it's like there's an elephant in the room we don't want to talk about. In the Southernside, we have been overlooked, and this is the reason why it has been this long. Hear our cries. As the young lady spoke before me, it doesn't need to be delayed. It has been delayed long enough. Long enough. Hear our cries. We matter. We matter. We matter. And what I've been hearing, you know, even from what Kiersten Mills was saying and what we hear and see all the time, money talks. But guess what? We matter. Even if we don't have the dollars you think we should have, we are human. We breathe, we live, we bleed. We all have red blood. It doesn't

matter how much money you have. Please hear us. Look at every last one of us. We matter. We're here. We're people. And the dollar should not come before doing what is right, what is decent, what is just. So it's on record, right? We matter, please, because it would not only involve you. You keep saying other parties. And you know what? I commend you because you're on the hot seat. You're on the hot seat, and I've been praying for you. But please, all of you, you know who will be involved. Please tell them we matter and we are important. And it doesn't have nothing to do with a dollar sign. It's because God created us and we matter.

MS. SINGLETON: Hello, my name is Ursula Singleton, and I'd like to just piggyback off of the last two comments. I believe I heard you say it would be an estimated two years before any real work actually began, but I heard Duke Energy say they were committed to your proposal. So if all of the stakeholders are here, why can they not make that same commitment now so that it's not another two years on top of the 30 years on top of the seven years of the study?

MR. BERRESFORD: I think just as far as that goes, even

if we had an agreement in place and a decision made today, from the point that that's done and everything fell in place, just the working, the details for this, the getting the equipment lined up, all the pieces and parts to make sure that this can be done effectively and safely for the community, which is our number one priority, it takes time to line all those things up. It takes a lot of time to do a really good work plan to show, "This is how we're going to design this, this is how we know it's going to work." And I don't want to come back to this community and any of y'all with a plan that doesn't have all that in it.

So that's what Greg and I are committed to, to make sure that plan is the best plan that we need to implement that remedy. And with all the complexities we deal with and all the pieces and parts that have to be rounded up and pulled together, that just takes a lot of time and effort by the engineers much smarter than me, who have to put those plans together. Anytime we're dealing with the water issues that we will be dealing with through this project, it is a very tedious and prescriptive way that we have to go about dealing with it. And if we don't have a good plan, it's

going to fail, and we do not want that to happen.

So we want to get a good, comprehensive plan that spells out all the contingencies, that answers the majority of the concerns that we're hearing, and then we want to bring it to the community and show them, "This is how it's going to happen. Here, we have a better timeline of when it's going to happen, and you can expect to see things coming here."

Right now, it's all kind of up in the air off of how quickly we get through the comment period, we address the comments, we get a final decision document, and we can get an agreement in place. Once that happens, DHEC can start pushing for timeframes because those timeframes will be spelled out in that agreement when things have to be delivered.

MS. ELLENBERG: Lucas, I know we have a number of questions, some that need to hit the road really fast, so I want to have this lady speak real quick.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Quick, just want to go on the record. I've been to a number of these meetings about environmental issues and neighbors, a lot of public questions about cancer and related things, and a lot of promises of private answers.

That really just does not sit well with me. Those people should be at the next meeting. They should look face-to-face with the neighbors and answer the health questions for everybody because I've yet to hear back from e-mails and other things, not you specifically. But I just want to go on record and say they should be here. If it's not you, which I know it's not, no judgment, they should get whatever formal limitation they need to also be held to task for a public conversation here in the community about those things, not individual e-mails going out with who-knows-what answers to other people. I just -- I think that's dividing the power on purpose of the community instead of giving those answers when everybody's in the same room.

And I just -- sorry, I have to run to see my kids. But I -- that's a really important part that just gets missed over and over again with these, is not being held accountable for the health outcomes. It's just not happening.

MR. BERRESFORD: And I do want to say that there's a lot of data on this site. It's all available on our website. But when we had a public meeting, I think it was maybe two public meetings ago, the community

had some concerns about health. And we went out into the community, and we collected samples in the -- soil samples in the community. And what we found and provided those results in that meeting to the public is it was consistent with one exception. That was an area where some material had been burned, and burned material gives off some of the similar things. We had no coal tar contamination in any of the samples. We were consistent with everywhere else in Greenville County -- essentially, was the findings.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Yeah. Maybe that was confusing, sorry. You're saying you're going to e-mail people -- asked for contact information to give them answers, and I'm saying those answers should just be public at the next meeting. The people from DHEC or whoever who are going to address valid concerns from neighbors who are up here, it's confusing to me why that's just, "Oh, well, I'll let you know about that" when the question is asked. You know, and -- is that not --

MS. ELLENBERG: So what I'm hearing is it's not just about private health conversations, but about being able to have that health conversation in a more public way.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: But the answers should just be public at the next -- if he can't answer it, right, bring the people that can answer that question, like, for -- you know, for the next meeting.

MS. ELLENBERG: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Yep.

MR. BERRESFORD: Thank you.

MS. ELLENBERG: We've got a comment here.

MS. CANNON: Hi, Courtney Cannon here with the South Carolina Environmental Law Project. I'm the environmental equity and justice specialist. I just want to ask a clarification. So we've been talking about Alternative 5 all night, which is really great, where it seems like a consensus. However, you keep mentioning the word "conceptual." So that means that the community, if there's something -- say they do like Alternative 5 but they want to see more, they can still advocate for that, correct?

MR. BERRESFORD: We will take all comments under review that we get. And once again, it is conceptual, as this is a general layout of what we perceive the removal area to be now. Honestly, that's going to change when we start removing because they're going

to follow any tar that they find and make sure it's all removed. But certainly, there's a lot of concerns that we're hearing tonight that can be addressed through our public comment period, through our decision document that don't require us to start the process over, because I don't think anybody here tonight wants to see that. They want to see progress. They want to see things move toward an endpoint as quickly as possible. And that's what we want to see as well.

MS. CANNON: Right. My question was more that -- I just want to make clear that Alternative 5, if you do accept it and you think it's great, you can still add more. This isn't the end all, be all. And I just want to make sure that that's clear.

MR. BERRESFORD: Correct.

MS. CANNON: Okay.

MR. BERRESFORD: I think Alternative 5 is our alternative now, but I think we already recognize that there's more that may have to be done in the future after Alternative 5 is complete. And we're going to work on crafting a decision document that covers some of those issues.

MS. OLIVER: My name is Nikki Oliver. I'm a member of Mountain View. Just for clarification, so you're

going to get the comments within 60 days, correct? So what is your timeline to meet back with the community on what next steps are, and how are you going to meet with us, and how often as long as you're going through the project?

MR. BERRESFORD: The majority of what we will be -- we will keep -- every time we have a milestone, we will be updating our website to show the progress and changes of things. So once we have a record of decision drafted and signed, that will go on our website. I know we need to come back here when we get to the point before we start digging dirt. We need to have a plan in hand that shows, "This is how we're going to do things," and we need to share that with everybody in this room, and we're committed to do that.

MS. OLIVER: So is that going to be like a 90-day aim for you to have that plan in place? 120 days? 180? What are we looking at?

MR. BERRESFORD: I think once we get -- once we have the decision -- we will have that out by the end of this year that says, "This is our record of decision." That is our goal. We have to address all the public comments that we receive, and we will respond to all of them. So if you send us a

comment, you will get something back from us discussing your comment and how it will be addressed. And that takes a little time, especially with as many people as we've had here tonight and how many we may have online viewing. We may receive a lot of comments that we have to address.

MS. ELLENBERG: So those comments are very important that you're getting. And I think one of the commitments is how are we keeping the conversation going? I know our webpage is one way to share information. We are very fortunate that we have Pastor Mills and we have a lot of community leaders who may be able to help us get that word out. So I think we can look at that community engagement strategy to make sure we're sharing things. And I do want to reiterate, too, make sure we have a way to contact you with your e-mail address. That can also help us be able to share that information more directly. You know, like I said, the webpage is one resource, but I think we can have that commitment to a community engagement plan that helps look at the different ways to communicate and share information, especially with all the involvement we have up here.

MR. BERRESFORD: And I would say communicating with Pastor Mills is a great line to us. We have had a great working relationship with him that's gotten us to this point. If Pastor Mills says, "Hey, I think it's a good time" for us to come back and get together and talk, we'll be here. We've been here two or three other times when he's asked us to come. We will keep coming.

MS. HOLLIS: Hi, I'm Erika Hollis, and I just have a quick question regarding what was mentioned here about Option -- what we're calling "5-plus." So after the process of the public comment period and the public puts in -- you know, they want additional protections on top of Option 5 that you've mentioned, is there an opportunity after that? Say you go through all this process and you evaluate and you add additional elements to the cleanup. Is there an option for -- or is there a process for the public to comment on that? Or is it said and done at that point? I'm a little confused about how that all works. So say you come up -- you add the -- because we're looking, as was mentioned, for additional groundwater treatment and wetland rehabilitation, and that isn't in the current plan now. If you decide to do that, is

that a done deal and we can't add anything else to it after the fact?

MR. BERRESFORD: I think at this point, if we go in and add something like a groundwater treatment system that was not evaluated in the Feasibility Study --

MS. HOLLIS: Correct.

MR. BERRESFORD: -- that means we have to reevaluate alternatives and add in another alternative, which recreates that FS process.

MS. HOLLIS: Oh.

MR. BERRESFORD: We do not want to do that.

MS. HOLLIS: No, I understand that.

MR. BERRESFORD: We want to move this forward, and I think the way to do so is hearing all those comments, addressing them in the decision document, spelling out a way that we can address it as we go through the process and evaluate it, and then make that decision. It may be as simple as saying groundwater as a whole is going to be lumped in as Operable Unit 2 and evaluated post removal.

MS. HOLLIS: Okay.

MR. BERRESFORD: That's a simple thing that could be written in and does not affect any of the remedies that are evaluated. So there's ways to do it. We just have to get all the comments, evaluate them.

If you make the comments, you'll get the response to those comments from us telling you, "Thank you for your comments. And here's how that -- we are looking to address it." So if you make the comments, we send you a letter.

MR. HOLLIS: Right.

MR. BERRESFORD: Feel free to pick up the phone, call Greg, call myself, we'll talk about it, we'll work through it. And then we're the ones drafting that decision document, so . . .

MS. HOLLIS: Well, the last thing we want to do is prolong this process. We just want to make sure it's the most effective cleanup, as you've stated. So thank you for clarifying.

MR. GARDNER: I'm speaking again. This is Charles Gardner. I have two requests or two suggestions. One, to the responsible parties, I'd like to ask you to intensify your conversation with Reverend Mills in putting this master plan together. Become a partner in that, and support him in every way that you can. You have an awful lot of resources that can be brought to the table that can help him facilitate that project. And I know that your assistance will be welcome there.

The other request is to you. It was brought

up earlier. You're talking about minority participation. In the contracting that you do, a lot of those contractors will be from out of this area. There'll be money coming out of this area, going to someplace else. It won't happen unless there's a deliberate effort to do it, to make sure that those contractors use minorities in the work that's to be done. And where possible, use some workers from this area, from this community. There are things that they can do, and there are other things they can be trained to do. It's going to take a seven-year period to do this. After the seven-year period is up, some people from this community need to have some skills they could take someplace else because they've learned those skills from working with this project. It won't happen unless there's a deliberate effort to do that. So I would encourage you to use contractors and make a part of that contract that they use minorities in that work, and where possible, to use individuals from this area that can do the work and that can be trained to do work in the future.

MS. ELLENBERG: Thank you, sir. (To Mr. Berresford) Do you want to add to that?

MR. BERRESFORD: I think that was very well said. I

will say that basically how this process will work is we'll have a contract with Duke and CSX and an agreement with them. They'll be the ones that are actually hiring the contractors to do the work, hiring the people to do the work. So I think sharing that message with them in the room is a very helpful thing to do. And I think if we can see ways to put things back in the community, use resources of the community, that is a great thing to do.

MR. GARDNER: It's easy to follow your normal practice and say, "Okay, we have (inaudible) minorities in the" -- is not enough. In this project, make a special effort that minorities are included in those contracts, in procurement, in every phase of that contract. It won't happen unless you put forth a special effort to get it done. And working with Reverend Mills in the master plan, there are an awful lot of resources that you have that can help him to push that plan forward. There may be -- well, there's an awful lot of resources that you have. Discuss it, you know, with him and his committee to make sure that you become a partner in the development of that.

MS. ELLENBERG: Thank you.

MS. DAVIS: Francena Davis. My question is, you had it up on the screen earlier that -- it said in order for this proposal to be accepted, which we know is Number 5, that we must submit it in writing to Greg. Could you put that back up on the screen again, please? Because I did get his address, but I did not get an e-mail address, and we don't want this to go forward saying that we did not submit all the requirements. So if you can put that address back up there again, I'd appreciate it.

MR. BERRESFORD: Sorry, we had a little technical shutdown there. The handouts on the back has his information on it. Also, if you scan the QR code and go to our website, all of his information is on there.

MS. DAVIS: So in order for it to be accepted, we have to -- we must submit it in writing?

MR. BERRESFORD: So I'm going to say this. All the responses and questions that we've had tonight, all the things that have said are officially a part of our administrative record for this site. It will be part of the decision document. So all the things that have been said here will be a part of that. We would encourage people to send an e-mail, send a letter, however you wish to do it, to Greg

as another level of support for what you would like to see here. We have seen community involvement change remedies in the past. We want to make sure that we're partnering with the community to get this job done and that we're seeing everything within the community. We think it's the best thing. We want to make sure that y'all feel the same way.

MS. BARRETT: My name is Sherry Barrett. I'm the land policy director at Upstate Forever. I had a question about land use controls. Could you clarify what that means and what some examples might be in this particular project?

MR. BERRESFORD: I'll take a shot at it. When we talk about land use controls, when we have groundwater contamination, we're typically talking about groundwater not being used for drinking water. The whole area is serviced by public water. That's not a real issue at this particular site. The Parcels 1 and 2 in the -- is looking at doing some very minuscule amount of removal that would have it to the point that it could be used for residential. So there wouldn't necessarily be those type of restrictions. But sometimes restrictions are put on the property that says, "No single-family

residence, no" -- things like that due to what material is at the site. Here, it's kind of a unique thing. It's probably more leaning toward the groundwater impact while we have groundwater contamination. And when we do that, we always have a way to lift those controls once we've cleaned up groundwater to the point that they don't require those restrictions anymore.

MS. BARRETT: A follow-up question: So in working with the Newtown Community on their master plan, do you see and have you discussed with them how these land use controls might influence the realization of that vision?

MR. BERRESFORD: On a limited basis, we've been talking with Pastor Mills. And ultimately, the goal of the remediation is to do so in a way that facilitates that vision, that leaves the property in a position where that vision could be a reality.

MS. BARRETT: Thank you.

MS. CHILDS: Hi, my name is Tammie Childs, and I have a question. As of today, you said -- and I'm trying to understand your PowerPoint. You said OU3 would be evaluated at a later time. Can you speak to that and how that plays into the alternative plans?

MR. BERRESFORD: When alternative -- Operable Unit 3 was

bedrock groundwater, really deep groundwater. When some wells were put in, there was some impacts noted to deep groundwater. I think we're not going to know until the removal is complete what impact we have on that, because this is one of the largest removals we've taken on, on these type projects. I think it's going to surpass the one that was done in Columbia, which was about 160,000 cubic yards of material. So once all that's removed, we will then do an evaluation of groundwater, some monitoring of groundwater, to see what it looks like after that's done, and then evaluate, kind of through a similar process of looking at different cleanup alternatives, to select the best possible one for groundwater.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Is it six years from now or eight years from now or ten years from now?

MS. ELLENBERG: So the question is, kind of, what's the timing of that since --

MR. BERRESFORD: I think that kind of falls in the ballpark, because we really can't do anything for groundwater until we've removed all this material. We have to get it out. And on a lot of sites, we have seen that once that happens, that footprint of groundwater contamination that may have been this

big has shrunk down to something that's like this big. And it completely changes the way that you would look at cleaning it up and what technologies you would use.

MS. CHILDS: So that's what I want to go on the record. You did mention that OU3 will be studied at -- not studied during this time, because it can't be, I guess.

MR. BERRESFORD: Yeah. Right.

MS. CHILDS: I'm not an engineer to know that that's true. I'm trusting that's what you're saying. But at that point when everything's dug out, then it could be another study that finds, "Oh, now there's still -- we got to do this entire process again, addressing the groundwater"?

MR. BERRESFORD: It would be a much shorter process because we've addressed the majority of the problem. Now we're looking at a much smaller area, a much smaller problem that we've got to address, and we don't have to go -- once we put monitoring wells back in place after the removal is complete, usually, within a year or two of that removal, we're pretty much seeing where we're going to be from a concentration standpoint. So we'll see areas that have completely cleaned up, we'll see

areas that need a little more work, and then we need to focus on those areas and see what needs to be done in those areas.

MS. CHILDS: Thank you for taking my question.

MS. NEWTON: I'll go. My name is Josie Newton. I am the watershed scientist with Friends of the Reedy River. As the gentleman said a few comments back, having the active partnership of responsible parties is critical here. Friends of the Reedy River sent CSX Transportation a letter on September 28, 2022, requesting CSX's partnership with Duke Energy to assist in the remedial action needed at this site. We did not receive a response from CSX, and it is our understanding that they continue to turn away from accepting full responsibility, especially for the illegal landfill which is on their property. Moving forward, how is DHEC going to better hold CSX responsible to come to the table as a responsible party?

MR. BERRESFORD: I think we have representatives from Duke and CSX who have voiced that this is a priority for them to get this job done. We're going to continue to work in any way we can with both parties to try to facilitate this cleanup, and we're committed to put forth the full effort to get

everybody to the table and get a solution here, I think is what needs to happen. It's what the community wants to happen. Now we have to find a way to make it happen.

MS. ELLENBERG: Are there any more -- I see another hand.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Just to clarify, are the responsible parties legally forced to clean up? Can they decide that they don't want to clean up?

MR. BERRESFORD: That's a good question. We operate under the CERCLA law in which the party can choose not to clean up, at which point the state would look to potentially do the work themselves and sue them to do the work or go through some type of enforcement matter to prod the work to get done. Here, we've had a good relationship working through this process to this point. I think we have some commitments moving forward to get us to an endpoint. So I don't necessarily see those roadblocks stopping us, but it's still a process that we have to work through.

MS. ELLENBERG: So now I don't see any hands raised. I do want to just end with a few quick notes. First of all, going back to what you said earlier, you matter, and we're here tonight. We appreciate all

of you being here, those who have joined us and left, those of you who have joined us and stayed. We appreciate y'all being here because this matters. Your being here matters. Our being here matters to us, too. And so I really appreciate everybody's commitment to this process.

This has been on the record. We've had our court reporter here reporting this throughout. And y'all have heard repeatedly how you can continue to give comment and feedback and reach back out to us. This is not the end of a conversation. This is the start of a conversation that's -- tonight, you know, we're starting a 60-day comment period, and then we're building on all the other conversations that have come before us, and we're going to continue to look at that communication and community engagement plan that goes forward from here, too.

And I just have to also reiterate, on behalf of the DHEC staff, a big "thank you" to Pastor Mills and this church for hosting us and welcoming us into the community and having this as the spot that we can have these conversations tonight. And I really appreciate that open door and that welcomeness to be here.

And so if we don't have any further questions for tonight, I know our staff will be here a little longer if somebody has another thing they would like to talk to us on the side about before we leave. But I would like to turn things over to Pastor Mills to close this meeting, if that's acceptable for everybody.

PASTOR MILLS: Thank you so much. Well, you guys are in church, so why not treat you like that? I'm just going to close in prayer. We've sat a long time. Thank you to everybody that's been involved and for all the comments that have been shared tonight.

Father, we are so grateful for this world that you have created and entrusted in our hands. We thank you, Lord, even for the spaces behind this church that have impacted the lives of generations of people who have lived in this community. We pray for healing of the soul, of the mind, of the body, Lord, that we will not go from here wounded, but encouraged. We ask for strength for those who labor behind the scenes to make these things possible, and that your will would be done in all things, and that in the end, we would return what you have entrusted into our hands to your safekeeping. Your kingdom come, your will be done

on earth as it is in heaven. Amen.

Thanks for being here tonight.

(Whereupon, at 8:35 p.m., the public 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.)

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA )
)
COUNTY OF YORK )

CERTIFICATE

Be it known that Cindy H. Patterson took the foregoing proceeding and hereby attests:

that I was then and there a notary public in and for the State of South Carolina-at-large and that by virtue thereof I was duly authorized to administer an oath;

that the deponent/witness, if any, was first duly sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, concerning the matter in the controversy aforesaid;

that the foregoing transcript represents a true, accurate, and complete transcription of the testimony so given at the time and place aforesaid to the best of my skill and ability;

that I am neither a relative nor an employee of any of the parties hereto, nor of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor interested in the outcome of this action;

that, if a recording of an event was supplied by another party for purposes of transcription and I was not present during that event, the foregoing pages were transcribed to the best of my skill and ability; additionally, any identifications of speakers were provided to me by the party supplying the recording;

that, in the event of a nonappearance by the witness, the foregoing details for the nonappearance are accurate.

In witness thereof, I have hereunto affixed my signature and title.

Cindy H. Patterson

Date: 6/25/2024
Notary public for South Carolina
My commission expires June 30, 2027
*Unless otherwise noted, this notary public administered the oath. Please refer to the transcript for any exceptions.