South Carolina Department of Health and
Environmental Control
Bureau of Land and Waste Management

Proposed Plan for Site Remediation
J.P. Stevens Chemical Plant #1
(Piedmont) Site
410 Old Pelzer Road
Piedmont, South Carolina

Transcript

of

Public Meeting

Date: November 9, 2017
Time: 6:35 p.m. - 7:35 p.m.
Location: Piedmont Community Center
1 Main Street
Piedmont, South Carolina

Reported by
Vickie M. Hester

APPEARANCES

For DHEC:

Pat Vincent
Community Information Coordinator
Judy Canova
Project Manager
R. Gary Stewart
State Remediation Section Manager
SC Department of Health and Environmental Control
2600 Bull Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

INDEX

Introductions by Pat Vincent: 3
Proposed Plan Presentation by Judy Canova: 5
Question and Answer Session: 24

ATTACHMENTS

There are no attachments to this hearing.

PROCEEDINGS

PAT VINCENT: Hello there. I want to thank you for coming out tonight for the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control's meeting regarding a former JP Stevens site in Piedmont. The address for the site is 410 Old Pelzer Road in Piedmont. We're here today for several things. We wanted to share some information about the facility, what's been discovered as far as contamination at the site, and also to provide an opportunity to answer your questions and receive some comments from you regarding the proposed cleanup options that the Department has suggested that we use. So we're here to get your comments. We are very interested as an agency in hearing from you regarding the selection that we have. My name is Pat Vincent, and I am with the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control. And I am with the Bureau of Land and Waste Management, one of the many branches of the -- of the Department. I assisted the site team today with the logistics. We've got a beautiful place here at this community center. We have also Judy Canova. Judy is our engineer, and she has been the project manager for

the site for -- since the early nineties. So she does have a good history with the facility. We also have -- she will doing the presentation in a few minutes as well. We have Gary Stewart. He's our boss. And so he is the Manager of the State Remediation Section. We also have -- to my left and to your right is Vickie Hester. She is recording our meeting today. She will be providing us a transcript so that we will be able to put that on the website for you as well so that you can review that. Do we have any others that -- did Councilman Ballard make it? He was hoping he would be here and may have come in late. We have sign-in cards in the back. If you will kindly be sure that you sign that -- sign in for us. That will assure that you will be on our mailing list for future mailouts about the site. We have many environmental reports that we have provided to the Anderson County Library, their Piedmont Branch. We call that batch of environmental reports our administrative record. And you can go to the library and look at those. You can make copies of those. Before you hit the print key, let me tell you that some of those reports are quite large. So you may be -- I would suggest that you be selective

on what you print while you're at the library. Let's see. We have our proposed plan in the back. We have several copies. Please be sure you get one of those. That might be handy to you as we're going through the presentation. And I think that's it. So, Judy, if you would like to come forward.

JUDY CANOVA: Thank you guys for coming out tonight. I appreciate your time. As Pat said, the purpose of our meeting is to present to you some information that we have on the JP Stevens site and to get your comments and your thoughts and concerns about what we would like to propose to do to clean up the problem there. I'm going to talk a little bit about the site history as well as some investigations that have occurred at the site. I will go over site conditions and some previous remedial activities that have occurred out there. And then we'll talk a little bit about the site risks and the cleanup alternatives. And then we will evaluate those alternatives and give you a preferred cleanup alternative. And after that there will be a time for comments and questions. And I'm hoping that we will be able to complete my part of the presentation in about 30 minutes. And I hope that your butts don't get numb before I

finish. Next slide, please. So this is a map. I'm sure everyone in here knows where the JP Stevens site is located. It is between Highway 20 and the Old Pelzer Road. And we call it the JP Stevens site because that's how it started out. It has changed hands a few times. But that's what we're going to call it tonight.

So the area that we're going to be talking about tonight is up here in the top half. It's the area within the fence line of the former JP Stevens property. We had a meeting probably back in 2004 regarding this area off the site that is groundwater contamination. This blue area is the area of groundwater contamination. We call that a plume. And so this area already has groundwater recovery and treatment going on. But we want to talk to you about this area tonight. So it has -- the site has a pretty extensive history, and I'm just going to touch on a few key events. In 1970 the plant was built and operated by JP Stevens and Company. They manufactured textile coating and finishing products. And then in '84 the ownership transferred to Intex Products who produced specialty chemicals. In 1988 the site was purchased by Air Products and Chemicals, and was

used to make acrylic polymers. And then in 2008 Ashland purchased the plant and continued to manufacture acrylic polymers.

So the site has had quite a bit of investigation as well as some pilot tests. Pilot tests are small scale tests that we use to determine if a particular technology will work, or what the problems would be with a particular technology. The site investigations include soil and groundwater sampling, drinking water well testing, surface water sampling, vapor intrusion evaluation and, as I said, pilot testing of several technologies for groundwater treatment.

And this figure is one of the figures that's in the back of the room. And I do want to mention that all the figures I'm showing you up here are in your copy of the proposed plan. So if you have difficulty reading from a distance -- I think it's fairly legible. But if you would like to see it up close and personal, you have a copy in your proposed plan. And so this map shows the source areas on the site there in the yellow boxes. And when we call something a source, what that means is it is releasing contamination. And in this case it is soil releasing contamination to the underlying

groundwater. So we have a tank farm, the drumming room, the oil retention basin and part of the wastewater treatment plant are the yellow boxes which are source areas. And then we have these gray boxes that are former source areas; the sludge field here and the sprayfield there. Those areas have been addressed. The sludge field was excavated in 1993 along with the drums that were buried there. And the sprayfield had soil vapor extraction from 1998 to 2002. So those areas have already been addressed. The blue area is the general outline of the groundwater contamination within the fence line on this property.

And just in case you were not sure where the tank farm was, I have an aerial photograph showing the tank farm at the site. And this is a series of tanks that are used to hold chemicals that the facility uses to manufacture whatever they need. And so this is what the tank farm is.

There are several contaminants of concern at the site. I picked the ones that are the most important to us. Tetrachloroethylene, which is PCE, is the one that's the most common. It's present throughout the area of groundwater contamination. So you'll hear me talk a lot more

PCE than some of the other ones. We also have trichloroethylene, cis-1,2-dichloroethylene, vinyl chloride, chlorobenzene, 1,4 dichlorobenzene and benzene. And our intention is to pick some remedy that will address all the contaminants of concern at the site.

This is the -- a detailed map showing the groundwater contamination. Again we have the fence line here. The blue again is the extent of contamination. This is a color-coded scale. So the red dots right here and there are the areas where the highest contamination is present in groundwater. And this is where the tank farm is, and this is where the grease trap was.

So there have been several soil remedial actions to date. As I mentioned before, in 1993 the drum burial area and the sludge field was excavated. In 1998 there were two wastewater treatment basins that were excavated. And we have a third one that we are looking at as part of this action. In 2000 the accessible soil was removed from the drumming room. In 2002 the area below the grease trap was excavated. And from 1998 to 2002 the sprayfield had soil vapor extraction.

And this is a picture of the removal where

they dug up the soil from the -- one of the former lagoons on the site. That's a picture of what that looked like.

There have also been some groundwater and surface water remedial actions. In 1997 they installed an in-stream sparging system to treat contamination within the creek on the site. In 2003 a groundwater extraction and treatment system was installed at the property boundary. And in 2007 the groundwater extraction system was expanded to include the areas beyond the property boundary.

So based on these investigations, we have found the following site risks. Contamination has moved from the soil into the groundwater. Public water is supplied and available in the area. We have not found any drinking water wells or irrigation wells within the area of groundwater contamination. And we are expecting that deed restrictions will prohibit future use of groundwater on the facility property.

And this is one of the maps that you might have to look at in your proposed plan to see all the dots. But this is a well inventory within a half a mile radius of the plume. The blue dots are non-domestic wells. The green dots are domestic

wells. The yellow dots are wells that are not in service. And then there are fire hydrants around that show where the water lines are present for the public water supply.

More about site risks. Contact with contamination in groundwater, soil, soil vapor and surface water is unlikely if you are outside the fence line. But if you are inside the fence line and you are a site worker, a construction worker or a trespasser, it is possible that you would contact some of the contamination at the site. Creeks beyond the property boundary meet the standards for surface water. And we have found no vapor intrusion concerns for nearby residents. Vapor intrusion happens when contamination in soil or groundwater goes into the air. But we have not found that to be an issue at this site.

We have established a number of remedial action objectives for the site. And that guides the selection of the remedial alternative. So our objectives are to protect human health from exposure to contaminants of concern, to prevent transport of contamination from sources into the underlying groundwater, to prevent migration of contamination in groundwater and surface water. We

would like to restore groundwater throughout the area to drinking water standards, which we call those MCLs or maximum contaminant levels. We would like to achieve site-wide compliance with surface water quality goals. And we want to eliminate the potential for contamination to discharge to streams.

Now, we have established clean-up goals. And again, these are for some of the selected chemicals at the site. For PCE where it is present in soil and it's acting as a source of groundwater contamination our clean-up goal is 5 milligrams per kilogram. And for groundwater the goal is .005 milligrams per liter for PCE.

So based on those objectives and goals, we have six cleanup alternatives to talk about, and we would like to hear from you about which ones you are thinking you would like. The first alternative would be no action. Second would be monitored natural attenuation which we abbreviate MNA. Third would be groundwater recovery and treatment with MNA. Fourth, in-situ chemical oxidation or ISCO with MNA. Fifth, in-situ bioremediation with MNA. And sixth, zero-valent iron with MNA. And I'm going to tell you what each one of those are.

So Alternative 1 is the no action alternative. We have to evaluate that as a baseline for comparison to everything else. It would include no active remediation or monitoring. All groundwater and surface water treatment would be discontinued. The regular facility and site maintenance practices would continue. There would be periodic regulatory reviews. The estimated cost would be zero dollars. And the time to reach our remedial goals would be over 100 years. So if we chose this no action alternative, we would have some environmental concerns. If the sources in the soil are not cleaned up, then releases of contamination to groundwater would continue. If groundwater continues to receive contamination from the soil without any treatment or containment, the plume which is the area of groundwater contamination could expand, and it could affect water wells at a distance from the site. And streams can also be affected by contamination if the plume expands.

Alternative 2 is monitored natural attenuation. We call that MNA. The way monitored natural attenuation works is over time there is dilution and dispersion and degradation of contamination. It's just the natural process. And

so what this alternative would include would be basically the no action alternative, but also monitoring to show what the contamination is doing and hoping that it would decline. It does work for relatively low concentrations of contamination. This alternative would continue groundwater and surface water monitoring. It would discontinue all groundwater and surface water treatment, and there would be no active remediation for source areas or groundwater. And the estimated cost for this would be slightly over five million dollars. And the time required to reach remedial goals would be over 100 years based on our best estimate.

Alternative 3 is groundwater recovery and treatment with monitored natural attenuation. And that is something that is already going on at the site. They already have wells that are pumping contaminated groundwater out of the ground and treating it. So this alternative would maintain and expand the current groundwater recovery and treatment system. There would not be any active remedial alternatives for source areas. Once the bulk of the contamination is addressed with groundwater recovery and treatment, there would be a transition to monitored natural attenuation. The

estimated cost of this alternative is approximately 14 and a half million dollars. And the time required to address the contamination would be 100 years. I would like to say that the existing system is going to continue operating for the remaining alternatives that I'm going to talk about. So you're going to hear that again and again.

The next thing is a map that shows the conceptual layout for groundwater recovery and treatment wells. All of the red dots are groundwater recovery wells. The ones that are in the blue circles are ones that are currently operational or present. And the ones that are circled in red would be the ones that are proposed under this alternative.

The fourth alternative is in-situ chemical oxidation with monitored natural attenuation. So in-situ chemical oxidation is something that you might be familiar with. I don't know how many of you use hydrogen peroxide if you have a cut on your finger to kill the bacteria. But that hydrogen peroxide is actually an oxidant, and you get it at low concentrations in the grocery store or drug store. But if you get higher concentrations of

that or other oxidants that are even more powerful than hydrogen peroxide, it can actually destroy the contamination in place. We don't have to bring it out of the ground. We can actually inject it into the area of contamination. This had a successful pilot test on the site, which was good news. So this alternative, we use chemical oxidation to treat the soil and the groundwater in areas of concern. And as I said, we would keep the current groundwater recovery and treatment system going. This alternative also includes contingency measures if additional treatment is determined to be necessary. And once the bulk of the contamination is addressed by this technology, the site will transition to monitored natural attenuation. The estimated cost for this option is slightly over 17 million dollars. The time estimated to address the contamination at the site would be 15 years. And chemical oxidation is a component of all the rest of the alternatives I'm going to talk about because it treats all the chemicals present at the site.

And so this is a map showing what it would look like. These little red boxes are where in-situ chemical oxidation would be used to treat source areas. The purple rectangles are where

chemical oxidation would be used to treat groundwater. And then the red dots again are the groundwater recovery wells that would continue to operate as part of this alternative.

The fifth alternative is in-situ bioremediation. Believe it or not, there are bacteria and microbes in the subsurface that like to eat some of these chemicals. There are certain ones that they like to eat. And so it is a technology that could be possibly applied at the site. And Clemson laboratory did some testing with the groundwater at the site and discovered that in some places it would work, and other places it wouldn't work. So for this alternative we would use in-situ bioremediation to treat the areas where it was shown that it would probably work. And that would be the groundwater and selected source areas. And in-situ chemical oxidation would be proposed for the remaining areas. Again, the groundwater recovery and treatment system would continue to operate, and there would be contingency measures if additional treatment is needed. Again, once the bulk of contamination is addressed, then the site would transition to monitored natural attenuation. The estimated cost for this alternative is 18.8

million dollars approximately, and it would take about 20 years.

So this is the conceptual layout for Alternative 5. Up here is where we would have the in-situ chemical oxidation, because we do not expect that bioremediation would work. The yellow squares down here, the wastewater treatment plant and the former oil retention basin would receive in-situ bioremediation. And then the groundwater in all of these areas would be treated using in-situ bioremediation. The red dots are the groundwater recovery wells. They're about the same on every map.

And the final alternative is Alternative 6 is zero-valent iron with monitored natural attenuation. It's well-documented that zero-valent iron works to destroy perchloroethylene under a lot of different conditions. So in this case zero-valent iron would be used to treat key source areas. Because it won't treat all of them, we would have to use in-situ chemical oxidation for some of the other ones, and in-situ bioremediation would be proposed for groundwater treatment. We would maintain the current groundwater recovery and treatment system. We would use contingency

measures if additional treatment is needed. Again, the site would transition to monitored natural attenuation once the bulk of the contamination has been addressed. The estimated cost for this option is slightly over 19 million dollars, and the time is about 20 years.

And this next map is going to be the most complicated one of all. The in-situ chemical oxidation is up here in the grease trap, the tank farm and the drumming room in these little red squares. The zero-valent iron would be in the wastewater treatment plant and former oil retention basin. And then in-situ bioremediation would be in these purple rectangles. And the groundwater recovery wells would continue to operate.

So that's quite a few options. We have a number of criteria that we look at when we choose what we think would be the best option to clean up a site. And that includes overall protection of human health and the environment, compliance with state and federal regulations, long-term effectiveness and permanence, reduction of toxicity, mobility or volume through treatment, short-term effectiveness, implementability, cost and finally community acceptance. And that's one

of the reasons we want to hear from you, because we want to know what you think.

So I'm going to summarize these different criteria and compare the different alternatives for you. And I'm going to try to be fast. Protection of human health and the environment; we're going to prefer alternatives that are going to protect us. We don't want anything that's going to be harmful for people or harmful for the environment. Those technologies that are faster at addressing the problem would rank higher for this criteria. So in this case no action and monitored natural attenuation rank the lowest, and in-situ chemical oxidation ranks the highest.

The next criteria is compliance with state and federal requirements. We can't pick a technology that is against our laws or against our guidance for -- for what's in our laws. So you have to consider that. And those technologies that are more likely to achieve state and federal requirements, like our drinking water standards, quickly would have a higher ranking. So again we have no action and monitored natural attenuation being the lowest, and in-situ chemical oxidation ranks the highest for this criteria.

Long-term effectiveness and permanence looks at is it going to last. Are we just going to make it better for a year and then everything's going to go back, or is it going to stay -- is it going to be a permanent change to the environment? And so we prefer remedies that we're not going to have to go back ten years from now and find out oops, the contamination is back and we've got to do more. We want to select ones that it's done. When we're finished with it, we'll continue to monitor it. But we're not expecting to see any more problems. So the ones that rank the lowest with this are no action, monitored natural attenuation and groundwater recovery and treatment. And in-situ chemical oxidation ranks the highest.

Reduction of toxicity, mobility or volume through treatment is a bunch of words that mean we want to use treatment to make the area of contamination smaller or to make it less toxic or to stop it from moving. Those technologies that will do that rank higher. So again no action, monitored natural attenuation, groundwater recovery and treatment rank the lowest. In-situ chemical oxidation ranks the highest.

Short-term effectiveness looks at do we get a

benefit quickly from the technology and is there a risk to the community or to the construction worker that's involved in installing the system. For short-term effectiveness no action and monitored natural attenuation rank the lowest. In-situ chemical oxidation ranks the highest.

Implementability is an evaluation of how easy it is to do something. So the more difficult something is, if it takes a lot of permitting or there's a lot of uncertainty about whether it will work, if it's a new technology that hasn't been tested, those are things that we look at with implementability. So the easiest ones to implement are the ones that don't require any action like no action or monitored natural attenuation. Groundwater recovery and treatment doesn't take a lot of work because it's already been installed. So those would rank highest for this category.

And finally, I have the costs put up here for you. The cost goes up with the number of the option. So 1 is cheapest, and 6 is the most expensive.

And I put a little summary table together. Across the top we have the different options -- remedial options. On the side we have all the

criteria. And a red square means for that criteria that alternative is low or does not do well with that criteria. The blue squares are the highest ranking. So you can see Alternative 4 has most of the highest rankings for the different criteria.

So for this reason our preferred alternative is in-situ chemical oxidation with MNA. We believe this would be protective of human health and the environment. It would reduce contamination in the short and long-term. We believe it would meet regulatory requirements more rapidly. And it is cost effective. We also feel this is a permanent solution to the maximum extent practicable. And it meets our preference for remedies that involve treatment as a principle element.

So our next steps would be -- this meeting is the beginning of the 30-day public comment period. We'd be glad to hear from you tonight. But comments are due to us on or before December 11th, 2017. After we get those comments from you, we may modify the remedy or select another remedy if you give us new information. And then the record of decision will be written after the comment period is over. And that will identify the selected clean-up method. And we hope we have that done in

March of 2018. And after that record of decision is written, then the process of designing the remediation system and installing it will start.

As Pat said, there is what we call an administrative record. If you want to read some of the documents that were written that helped us make a decision or the recommendation that we're making tonight, you can read them at the Anderson County Library - Piedmont Branch. You can also get them at our Freedom of Information Office in Columbia. And we do want to hear your questions or comments tonight. But if you would like to write them to me, you can send them by email or to my address. And all this information is in the proposed plan, so you don't have to worry about getting it written down. It should be on the last page of the proposed plan. And again we do ask that you submit those to me by December 11th.

And with that, I wanted to give you all time to comment or ask questions regarding what we are proposing for the site.

PAT VINCENT: During the comment period if there are any questions that you would like to ask, I will come to you with the recorder so that our court reporter will be able to pick up your conversation. So who

has the first question for us? Please give us your name.

MIKE TAYLOR: Mike Taylor. Who will be participating in the cost of all this cleanup, JP Stevens or who?

JUDY CANOVA: That was an excellent question, and I meant to say that. But we are not spending taxpayer money to do a cleanup. So we're not going to be taxing you a extra dollar tax to clean this site up. But JP Stevens is a bankrupt facility. Air Products entered into an agreement with the state to perform the work. And so you all nod your heads and say yes, we're paying for the work back there. Okay.

MIKE TAYLOR: Doesn't the state have a fund set up for this cleanup?

JUDY CANOVA: We do have a contingency fund. If there is not a financially viable and responsible party and we feel like there is a risk to human health, we will use our own money to address it.

MIKE TAYLOR: Yeah, that's what I was thinking.

PAT VINCENT: And Intex Products also was an operator at the site. They also filed bankruptcy. Any other questions?

MARSHALL BEASLEY: My question is how did it -- don't DHEC supposed to go in and test this soil every so

often? How did it get this bad over these years, I mean, without it being checked or, you know, caught? How did it get this bad?

PAT VINCENT: And tell us your name, sir.

MARSHALL BEASLEY: Marshall Beasley.

JUDY CANOVA: That's a good question, and I would be asking the same question myself. I think that initially when the project began, contamination had already been released to the environment when we first found out about it. And then there was a process of taking samples to see where had the contamination gone and how far had it gone. And it's one of those processes where you hope that you get the area where it's contaminated. Your samples come back -- you take samples and then they come back and you realize we're still above our goals or we're still too high, so we need to take more samples further down. And so it's sort of a process of collecting samples over time. And it is an unfortunate thing that it took a while because the area of contamination was bigger than we expected. And the other thing that was part of the equation was some of these areas of contamination we didn't know about at the beginning. Like the oil retention basin was something that we were not

aware of when they first started doing work out there. And the drumming room and the grease trap all were discovered as part of facility maintenance practices and reported to us when they were discovered. So unfortunately we didn't know about all of the areas. So that's one reason that it was -- that the contamination was as extensive as it was -- or is as extensive as it is. The other part is there's a period of time where we have to look at how we're going to clean this material up. And that takes a period of time also to do these pilot tests and studies to see what will work. And this site is particularly complicated because it has a range of different chemicals. So there had to be some pilot testing which also sort of slowed the process down more than it would for another site that maybe only had one or two contaminants.

PAT VINCENT: Any other questions?

RUBY CLARK: I do.

RUBY CLARK: My name is Ruby Clark. I got -- came in here on the tail end of this. How dangerous is it for us that is in the immediate neighborhood?

JUDY CANOVA: Yes. So within the property fence line there is a problem if someone was to go into the stream on the property within the fence line of the

property. But outside of the fence line we are not aware of any risk to the community.

RUBY CLARK: Okay. But now, your stream is not restricted to inside the fence. Our streams are connected.

JUDY CANOVA: That's correct. We have a treatment system at the property boundary that treats the contamination in the stream. So samples of that stream just past that treatment system meet all of our requirements. So the streams are okay beyond the fence line. Now, I'm not going to tell you to go into that creek on the property. But I'm saying off the -- beyond the fence line it's fine.

GARY LABOMBAR: My name is Gary Labombar. I live about 800 feet from the plant. I don't have really any questions. I've just got comments about JP Stevens or the plant as I know it as Air Products. Now, we've been having meetings with everybody from Air Products on an average maybe every four months. And I can tell you that they are really thorough at making us feel comfortable living in the area. They answer any questions that we have. They give us a free meal. But it keeps our interest. They give us -- and they have -- any questions that we have, they attack them. If they can't answer them

then, they will by the next meeting. And I don't work for them. I'm not getting paid to say this. I'm just saying that I couldn't be any happier to have a neighbor than we have -- than these people here. DHEC ought to be very proud that they are giving us the cooperation that they do, because they make me feel comfortable living in the neighborhood. This lady's concerns, if everybody would come to the meetings that they would have -- and they invite everybody that's concerned around the neighborhood. If you would come to their meetings, you would find what I'm telling you to be true and you would get to know everybody. And they feel almost like family. I almost know all of them by name, to be honest with you. So if you want to feel more comfortable about where you're living, and your concerns, if you can't think of questions right now, please attend their meetings and you'll get information. If something comes up -- even if you have odors, they have us call. Any kind of strange odors we get, they -- they attack it right off the bat and they go and find out if it has anything to do with them. I can't tell you how pleased I am to be next door to these people right here.

JUDY CANOVA: They have done an outstanding job of reaching out to the community. And so if you are not on their mailing list for those meetings, I'm sure that somebody back there would volunteer to talk to you about getting on their list. I don't know who -- Jerry in the very back, raise your hand. Raise your hand.

JERRY HARTIG: Yeah, I'm Jerry Hartig with Air Products, and (inaudible) to my left here. And we both participate in what's called the Community Advisory Panel meetings that we have. And I would encourage you as -- you know, it's not just about a meal. I'm Jerry Hartig. I'm sorry. It really is about sharing information and keeping the community appraised of what's happening with the cleanup project. So it's -- I think it is a really good forum to exchange that kind of information.

JUDY CANOVA: And you are of course always welcome to call me. My number is in the proposed plan. If ever you have any questions or concerns, you can also contact me. And I am continuing to be involved with this project, and I've worked on it for a long time. And it's -- it's taken a long time. But I'm happy that we're at this point where we're able to make a choice about how to clean up

everything that's remaining out there. They have been pretty aggressive with putting in the recovery -- groundwater recovery wells, the groundwater treatment system and the surface water treatment system so that nothing goes beyond the fence line. And so we appreciate that. That has been very helpful.

RUBY CLARK: Again Ruby Clark. Based on what -- Mr. Taylor's question, in the worst scenario from the 15 years to the hundred years the expense is not going to come back on the Piedmont -- us?

JUDY CANOVA: That would not be my expectation.

RUBY CLARK: Is that a maybe?

GARY STEWART: No. I will say flat out no, it will not come back on the residents or anyone like that. If push comes to shove, the state would use our -- what we call our Hazardous Waste Contingency Plan. We sometimes call it our State Superfund. It doesn't have as much money as we'd like for it to have. But it's got enough that we can protect human health and the environment if we had to.

JUDY CANOVA: And that's Gary Stewart, my supervisor. So he's right.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You'd better say that.

JUDY CANOVA: I do want to keep my job.

MIKE TAYLOR: I was, you know, raised over there, you know, probably, you know, back when JP Stevens and everybody had it. You know, used to you could -- you know, you could just smell the odor, you know, everybody in the neighborhood. In the afternoon, especially when the humidity -- and the night, I mean, you could just smell it. And I'm sure you're breathed it in. You know, and it smelled -- it smelled just like antifreeze.

JUDY CANOVA: I've smelled it too. You know, I've smelled it before too. It's a real sweet smell.

MIKE TAYLOR: Yeah, exactly. Yeah.

JUDY CANOVA: Yeah, I think that was the polyvinyl alcohol that smelled so sweet like that. That's what I was told when I asked what that was.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Smelled a little bit like coolant, right?

MIKE TAYLOR: Yeah.

RUBY CLARK: Okay. Well, I'm not aware of that. But based on what Mr. Taylor just said, has there been a health issue for people who have lived here forever breathing?

JUDY CANOVA: Not to my knowledge.

MR. TAYLOR: Or worked there? Or worked there?

RUBY CLARK: Or worked there?

JUDY CANOVA: Not to my knowledge.
RUBY CLARK: Is that a maybe?
JUDY CANOVA: You know, I -- I would like to know everyone's health of every individual within the community. But that is not something that I'm aware of. Nothing has been brought to my attention regarding any health concerns from individuals that live near the site.
GAIL STRICKLAND: I've lived there 50 years. I'm Gail Strickland. I assume I'm healthy. The doctor says I am.
PAT VINCENT: Any other questions?
JUDY CANOVA: I would like to hear from you regarding in-situ chemical oxidation. Are you comfortable with that as an option based on the information I have presented to you, or do you want to take some time to look at it and let me know later? If you all are comfortable with that, I would appreciate it if you could let me know.
GARY LABOMBAR: You're talking about that Number 4, right?
JUDY CANOVA: Yes.
GARY LABOMBAR: I'm comfortable with that.
RUBY CLARK: So am I.
MIKE TAYLOR: Yeah, me too.

PAT VINCENT: Any other questions?
MIKE TAYLOR: You know, the fund -- all the companies around participate in the cost of this, don't they? You know, the fund for the cleanup over the whole state or just federal?
GARY STEWART: The fund that I'm speaking of, there's a federal Superfund which was a tax on the chemical and petroleum industry. I don't think there's money -- much money coming into that fund these days. The state fund was initially funded by a tax on waste that was disposed at the Pinewood Landfill in the center part of the state. That facility closed in the year 2000. Right now we get a small amount of money from the Legislature. We earn interest on the existing funds, and money that we recover when we -- excuse me. When we spend money, we're required to try to recover it. So if the parties stopped paying for this and we had to spend money, we would try to recover that money from those parties. That's where we get it from now.
JUDY CANOVA: So again, it does not come from the taxpayer.
RUBY CLARK: Ruby Clark again. If JP Stevens was liable, they've gone bankrupt, the state and whoever is going to clean this up at their expense,

why the meeting? What is coming to us -- to be concerned for health issues, to be concerned with the water if you have a well? Why the meeting?

JUDY CANOVA: So it's part of our process when we come to a decision about how we're going to clean a project up that we meet with the community to give them a chance to ask questions and to have input. Perhaps you would have preferred another alternative for some reason. Maybe you would prefer groundwater recovery and treatment for some reason that I don't necessarily know about. So we like to get input from the community so that we're all on the same page when the system becomes operational.

RUBY CLARK: But if you did the research, you know what's going to take care of everything. It's really not -- we're not going to pay for it. You let us know we're not going to be sick from it. But it's almost like there's a hidden -- why coming to us? Are we agreeing to something or we're not agreeing to anything? And if you know what's the best thing to do, why didn't you just do it? Why did you --

JUDY CANOVA: Because it's part of our -- it's part of our process.

GARY STEWART: Actually, the law that we work under, the state has adopted the Federal Superfund Law. And under that law there are public participation requirements. We're required to have a meeting when we're selecting a remedy. We're required to get input from the surrounding community. It's your community and you deserve to know what's going on in the community. And, you know, if you don't agree with what we're proposing, it's an opportunity for you to put that on the record and for us to go back and evaluate those comments. And sometimes we get to a meeting and people that are living around the site for all their lives, they know things that we don't know. They know what went on back -- when the trucks were going back in the woods over there, what was going on. You know, we learn things that we didn't know before we made the final decision. So it's an opportunity for the community have input and know what's going on.

JUDY CANOVA: So we do this for every project. Every project that I work on, when we get to this point, we have a community meeting. And we will be available if you have more questions. We have some of the main figures in the back; the one that shows the areas of contamination, the one that shows the

plume and the one that shows the technology that we're recommending. So we'd be glad to talk with you further about anything. And we'll be available back there in the back of the room. And thank you so much for coming.

GARY LABOMBAR: Just for the lady that's really concerned, please consider going to the meetings. I think it will make you feel more comfortable about any concerns that you have. And they'll address them immediately. If there's any questions after you leave here, just write them all down. And when they contact you and let you know when they're having the next meeting, bring them there. They'll be as thorough as they can possibly be. I can't -- I can't tell you how it's made me -- I was really upset when they had the first meeting. What was it, about ten years ago or something like that.

PAT VINCENT: '05.

GARY LABOMBAR: Oh, I thought it was --

JUDY CANOVA: No, it's about ten. It's been a while.

GARY LABOMBAR: I asked them is this going to be like Bhopal, India. Remember in Bhopal, India when they had that catastrophe there near the plant that killed all those people? I was concerned we had that situation. But ever since going and listening

to these people, they don't have those chemicals there and all kinds of -- they'll tell you exactly what they've got. And they'll take you on a tour there. And that's the best thing to do too. Go take a tour of the plant. If you ask them that, they'll take you on a personal tour. That's how nice they are. But please don't feel threatened or afraid to go and inquire about this.

RUBY CLARK: He referred to ten years ago. This has been going on for over ten years? Okay. We sent -- you sent a card out for this meeting about this issue. Did we receive a card ten years ago?

JUDY CANOVA: Yes, a card -- actually we went door to door and knocked on doors and handed them notices of the meeting ten years ago.

RUBY CLARK: Okay. They must have missed our house.

PAT VINCENT: Any other questions? We're going to go ahead and adjourn the meeting. And thank you all so much for coming out.

(Whereupon, there being nothing further, the public meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.)

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

(**Certificate accompanies sealed original only.)