

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

* * *

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Public
Hearing, Chemical Recovery Systems Proposed Cleanup
Plan commencing on Thursday, July 26, 2007 at
6:00 p.m.

* * *

Appearances:

Briana Bill Moderator
Gwendolyn S. Massenburg EPA Project Manager
Audience Members

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 MS. BILL: We're going to get started.

3 Can everybody hear me okay?

4 I'm Bri Bill, and I'm the Community Involvement
5 Coordinator with the Office of Public Affairs, U.S.
6 Environmental Protection Agency in our Chicago
7 regional office. I'm with Gwen Massenburg, who's the
8 Remedial Project Manager for the Chemical Recovery
9 Services site. There's also some other EPA people
10 that will be coming in, and we've got a fellow from,
11 Larry Antonelli, from the State.

12 Raise your hand.

13 He might be answering some questions later on.

14 So we're here tonight to present our proposed
15 plan for cleaning and managing waste at the Chemical
16 Recovery Services site. And I say proposed because
17 EPA has not yet made a decision on what we're going to
18 do, and that's one of the reasons we're here tonight,
19 is we want to get your feedback on our cleanup plan
20 that we're going to be presenting.

21 We will be taking verbal comments tonight
22 towards the end of the meeting, but if you brought
23 written comments, you can hand them in as well. When
24 we start the hearing part of our meeting, we won't be
25 responding to your comments tonight. We'll be

1 preparing a written response when we're getting closer
2 to making our final decision, which we expect to be in
3 September. So I just wanted to mention, if you
4 haven't signed in, please feel free to do so. The
5 only purpose we use for the list is for mailing fact
6 sheets. We also have an agenda in the back. And I
7 have some additional fact sheets that we sent out to
8 community members.

9 Does everybody have one? If you don't, I've
10 got some extras. I didn't have a lot of them.

11 Yeah, that's it. Do you want to hold it up?

12 So just let me know if you need one.

13 I guess that's about it. I'm going to turn the
14 floor over to Gwen Massenburg. I just want to
15 mention, if you could hold your questions until the
16 end of her presentation, we will have a question
17 period before we start the time for comments. If you
18 can't hear or you haven't heard something she said,
19 you know, please raise your hand and ask for
20 clarification. We will ask at any time that you
21 speak, that you state your name and spell it, if it's
22 a difficult spelling, because we do have a Court
23 Reporter transcribing the meeting tonight. Thanks.

24 MS. MASSENBURG: Thank you, Bri.

25 Again, my name is Gwen Massenburg and I'm the

1 project manager for the site, and my goal tonight is
2 to introduce you to the site and also present to you
3 what the U.S. EPA is proposing to do for the site.
4 And as Bri has already mentioned, we will take your
5 comments before final decision is made.

6 As you know, the site name is Chemical Recovery
7 Systems. Tonight's meeting, we're going to talk to
8 you about the proposed selected remedy. I'm going to
9 give you a little bit of site background and history.
10 Talk about the risks that we found at the site. What
11 the cleanup goals are at the site. There's an
12 evaluation summary of the alternatives that we looked
13 at for a clean up for the site, and we're going to
14 tell you about the next steps and answer any questions
15 that you may have. And then, as Bri has already
16 mentioned, there will be a formal comment period.

17 This is an aerial photograph of the site that
18 was taken back in March 29th of 1986, and I use this
19 slide to sort of orientate everyone with the site if
20 you haven't seen the site. I'm going to try my best
21 to draw this, the outline of the site here. This is
22 the site. It's a 2.3 or about 2.5 acre site. Right
23 here is the entrance into the site from the City.
24 This is Locust Street going here. This is the river,
25 the east branch of the Black River. This is the river

1 right here. It flows in this direction. The remedy
2 that we're selecting or the remedy that we propose for
3 this site is, as I said, it's a 2.5 acre site.
4 There's two buildings on-site that we plan to
5 demolish. This is a building that we plan to
6 demolish. This is a building we plan to demolish.

7 Over here in this corner is the northwest
8 corner where we're proposing to excavate down to 4
9 feet, roughly about a half acre in this area right
10 here. The proposal is to excavate this area. The
11 balance of the site, it's proposed to place a 2 foot
12 soil cover on the balance of this site.

13 Again, this is the river that flows in this
14 direction. Ground water flows in this direction
15 towards the river. Again, this is Locust Street, and
16 this is the entrance into the site right here.

17 This is just a reiteration of what I just
18 showed you. In that northwest corner, we're proposing
19 that there are about 35 cubic yards to excavate down
20 to 4 feet. The reason why we're excavating down to 4
21 feet is because based on the studies that were done,
22 it shows us that's where the bulk of the contaminants
23 are in the soil that has the potential to continue to
24 leach down into the ground water and eventually into
25 the river. After we do the excavation, we're going to

1 backfill that 4 foot area maybe about 2 feet with some
2 type of clean fill material, and the top 2 feet will
3 be clean soil along with the balance of the site.

4 We're going to prepare a storm sewer that runs
5 transverse through the site, and I'll show you a
6 picture of that. The proposal calls for fencing the
7 site, placing institutional controls, and all that is,
8 is restrictions that we place on the property. And
9 the restriction will restrict the use of the land, and
10 also the use of the ground water. And we're going to
11 allow the chemicals in that ground water to degrade
12 naturally, we call that natural attenuation, and we're
13 going to do monitoring, frequent monitoring to make
14 sure that the chemicals are, in fact, degrading to the
15 point that they're no longer harmful.

16 This is a drawn slide of the aerial that you
17 saw, and I put this slide in there just to show you a
18 few things. This site has a 200 history of being
19 located in an industrial area. Prior to it becoming
20 Chemical Recovery over maybe 80 years ago, it was a
21 former coal facility. And this is a railroad spur
22 that transverses through the site. And I guess the
23 cars containing coal came through the site, and they
24 either added the coal or took away the coal. These
25 hash marks that's over in this area, again, is a

1 reiteration of the area that we are proposing to have
2 excavated. And the rest of the site, again, is where
3 the soil cover is going to be placed.

4 But the main point of this slide is to show you
5 the sewer line that I'm talking about. This is the
6 storm sewer line. They have a manhole here, and it
7 transverses under the site all the way out into the
8 river. So the outfall is into the river, and that was
9 the main point of this slide.

10 To give you a little bit of history, I've
11 already spoke about it, but prior to 1960, as I said,
12 the Obitts purchased this property from Swires Coal
13 Yard, and from 1960 to 1974, Mr. Obitts ran a chemical
14 reclamation facility. And basically what he would do,
15 which was very ingenious, was go around to various
16 companies, either purchase their spent solvents that
17 they used to clean machinerics and things like that,
18 and bring it back on-site and distill it, clean it up,
19 and resell it back to companies, and so that's what he
20 did from 1960 to 1974.

21 Chemical Recovery came along and purchased that
22 same operation from Mr. Obitts, and continued the
23 operation from 1974 to 1981. Well, in August of 1980,
24 Ohio EPA, along with the fire marshall, identified
25 some environmental issues. So in October of 1980, EPA

1 filed a complaint based on the threat of fire and
2 explosion for the site. It had a lot of, the site,
3 there was a lot of bad practices that they were using
4 at the site and there was often citations given to
5 them by the fire marshall with the threat of fire and
6 explosion.

7 In 1981, CRS, that's what we call Chemical
8 Recovery, that's just an acronym for Chemical
9 Recovery, CRS ceased it's operations of the solvent
10 reclamation, removed tanks and drums. In 1983, there
11 was a formal Court order issued to Chemical Recovery
12 and had them, in the Court order, remove the immanent
13 and dangerous things on the site, basically what that
14 translated into was the drums, and had them excavate
15 contaminated soil, all the soil that was visible. And
16 I'll show you a picture and you can see what visible
17 contaminated soil looks like.

18 So what Mr. Obitts did, and Chemical Recovery,
19 was take this 155 gallon tanker truck, go around and
20 collect all dirty solvents, bring it back on-site and
21 distill it. Well, in this process, any time that you
22 have any places to place a connection, like here and
23 here on this pump machine, there's always risk of
24 leakage and seepage and spillage. You can't really
25 tell on this slide. I don't know if we can dim the

1 lights just a little bit, but anyways, this soil here
2 is wet from whatever connection it was connected to,
3 and it's proposed to be some type of organic solvent
4 on the ground. And, unfortunately, you can't really
5 see with the resolution and the lights, but this area
6 here shows you what visible contaminated soil looks
7 like.

8 Evidently, this 155 gallon tanker truck had
9 overturned, and you can see this gentleman here
10 actually collecting some type of liquid. I don't know
11 if it's solvents or what it is, but hopefully it's not
12 solvents because he doesn't have on any PPE, any
13 personal protective equipment, and to inhale these
14 chemicals could be definitely a health hazard. But,
15 again, as you can see here, all of this soil, whatever
16 turned over in this tanker truck could have possibly,
17 will definitely seep into the soil.

18 This is another photograph of just what visibly
19 contaminated soil looks like. You can't really see it
20 here with the resolution, but evidently this tank
21 here, and this is where they connect a hose or
22 something to, all of this is wet, liquid material, and
23 this is stained soil all in here.

24 This is just to show you a distillation process
25 to let you know, this little 2.5 acre site was really

1 in the business. I mean, these tankers are what they
2 were using to distill, and probably what happens is,
3 they put the solvent into one tank and then it gets
4 distilled, goes to the next tank, goes to the next
5 tank, goes to the next tank, goes to the next tank.
6 The purpose of this slide is, again, to show you where
7 all these connections happen. Anywhere that you have
8 any kind of connections, there's a possibility of
9 leaks and seepage.

10 This is what the site looked like in full
11 operation. As you've already seen this site, it was
12 the first slide, but it was alleged that at one point
13 this site had more than 4 to 9,000 drums on-site. The
14 fire marshall and OSHA and all of the regulations
15 says, any time you stack drums, you need to have a
16 pallet on the bottom and a pallet in between drums,
17 and you should not stack them more than four high.
18 And you can really see that these drums have to be
19 stacked higher than four drums stacked.

20 This is a distillery building. Back here, back
21 in this area is where the river is. And this street
22 right here is Locust Street, just to give you your
23 bearings of where you are.

24 As I said, the fire marshall was really adamant
25 about this site. As you can see on this door, it

1 says, no smoking. Down here is about five or ten
2 cigarette butts. And so the practices on-site were
3 not very health conscious or safety conscious, and
4 this is what happened. The fire marshall here, I
5 don't know if you can really see him, but this is the
6 fire marshall on one of his routine inspections and
7 there's an explosion that happened at the site.
8 That's the same building that said no smoking with the
9 butts on the floor.

10 So, again, this is a drawing of the actual
11 site. What I want to show you here, I know you can't
12 really read it, it's too small, but what I do want you
13 to pay close attention to is these red dots. These
14 are where the monitoring wells were placed to collect
15 ground water samples. There were about six to eight
16 wells placed at different positions on-site, and,
17 again, the ground water flow is in this direction.
18 This is our most contaminated well here, Monitoring
19 Well 6. It has very high contamination of volatile
20 organic compounds, which we also call solvents,
21 the tetrachloroethylene, benzene, trichloroethylene.
22 So, again, I just want to let you know, we believe
23 that the source of this particular monitoring well may
24 be the sump pump that's located right here. And
25 that's why one of the remedies to the site is to close

1 the sump pumps, to make sure that these sump pumps are
2 closed because all it does is, it might be the source
3 that's contributing to the contamination to this
4 monitoring well here.

5 There were a total of 12 monitoring well
6 samples collected at the site. This is soil boring.
7 Again, I apologize because we don't have the lights
8 down, but it's just to show you these soil boring
9 locations. Everywhere you see the little green dots
10 are where the soil samples were collected, and we
11 collected them in intervals. And what that means, we
12 dig a hole, we take the sample from the zero to 2 foot
13 interval, then we take the sample from the 2 foot to
14 the 4 foot interval, from the 4 foot to the 6 foot
15 interval, the 6 foot to the 8 foot, and we keep going
16 until we hit bedrock. And there was a total of about
17 112 samples collected for soil.

18 Hand auger are these samples here, and
19 basically it's trying to depict where the samples were
20 collected on the river bank, on the steep river bank,
21 I mean, the slope of the river bank. And there were
22 five of those.

23 Sediment and surface water samples were taken
24 from the river, the surface water and the sediment
25 samples. The contamination that we found was arsenic,

1 and it was not greater than the Ohio water quality
2 standards, but it was, contamination was significant
3 but it was not greater than what Ohio EPA and the
4 water quality standards will allow for surface water.

5 This is our upgradient or upstream sample.
6 This is supposed to be our background sample. The
7 site is supposed to influence or contribute its
8 contamination within this area. And this was selected
9 to be our background sample, and we found arsenic
10 there in concentrations as much, if not more, than the
11 arsenic that we found along here.

12 This is a slide just to show you all of the
13 sampling that was done. This is what we call our
14 remedial investigation. The soil samples were
15 collected, ground water samples were collected,
16 surface water samples were collected, and sediment
17 samples were collected.

18 Cleanup goals; well, our cleanup goals, after
19 the investigation was done at the site, the goals were
20 to prevent contact or direct contact risk to people
21 and to wildlife, to the chemicals found in the soil
22 and the underground water. That's one goal, we want
23 to prevent people from coming in contact with, people
24 and animals from coming in contact with the
25 contaminated soil. We want to reduce the source that

1 we believe is contributing to the ground water
2 contamination and the river, and we want to have the
3 water restored back to drinking water standards.

4 Right now the water is not suitable to drink.
5 There was a study done and no one in the area of a two
6 mile radius has taken water from the site or using
7 private wells or anything to that regard.

8 So who has the risk here? This site, like I
9 said, is located in an industrial/commercial area, and
10 so we looked at the risks associated with the
11 industrial/commercial area. And there's risks to an
12 outdoor construction worker. If he was to go without
13 anything being done to the site, then he would have a
14 higher than normal risk of potentially getting cancer
15 or other health diseases.

16 And, again, it's from the direct contact with
17 the chemicals in the soil, inhaling the fumes from the
18 chemicals in the soil, and coming in contact with the
19 ground water. If a temporary person was to come
20 on-site, their risks would also be higher than normal
21 for the potential of getting cancer. However, if a
22 child trespasser, as it is now without anything being
23 done to the site, was to go on the site, he had a low
24 risk because the contaminates that are a concern are
25 in the ground, underground, unless they were digging

1 around or something to that effect. So the risk for a
2 child is very low. The ground water, again, is
3 contaminated but no one is using it as a drinking
4 water supply, and there would be harm to wildlife,
5 burrowing type animals if they, too, were to remain on
6 this site without anything done.

7 So, after the remedy that we have proposed to
8 you tonight is done, this is what will happen. The
9 soil will be safe for an indoor worker, an industrial
10 or a commercial worker working with restrictions, and
11 the restrictions are that they cannot dig past a
12 certain depth. And the vapors will be safe to those
13 outdoors, but if someone was to try to reuse this
14 facility, this 2.5 acre of land and wanted to place a
15 building on the land, the developer or the owner would
16 have to get in contact with us, let us know where
17 they're placing the building because we want to have
18 the building vapors evaluated. So there are certain
19 places on the site that the soil is not as
20 contaminated, but there's certain places on the site
21 that we wouldn't want a building placed on it without
22 some engineering control, slab on grade or some type
23 of venting going on such that the contaminant vapors
24 from the soil wouldn't leach into the house or the
25 building, sort of like what radon does.

1 And the volatile organic chemicals that we have
2 at this site, what we're calling solvents, are
3 definitely volatile, and so that means that they will
4 dissipate in air very easily. So there's a lot of
5 vapor issues when you're talking about volatile
6 organic chemicals. That's where, I think, the word
7 came from, volatile, because it's volatilizes, it
8 mixes in air easily.

9 These are the alternatives that were evaluated
10 for the site. A no action alternative, and its cost
11 is, of course, no dollars. If you don't do anything,
12 it won't cost anything. And the Environmental
13 Protection Agency always includes no action as a part
14 of their remedy to sort of be the base line.

15 The second alternative we looked at, and as a
16 matter of fact, Alternatives 2 through 5 are a group
17 of various different covers with an impermeable
18 membrane or plastic liner. In that corner where I
19 showed you where we're proposing to excavate, that's
20 where the impermeable membrane is also proposed to go
21 if that remedy is selected.

22 So we have a soil cover with that impermeable
23 membrane we're calling a barrier here, and its cost is
24 approximately 1.3 million. A stone cover, instead of
25 where the soil is on the rest of the balance of the

1 site, they would put a stone cover there. We could do
2 the same with asphalt. We could put an asphalt liner
3 on top of the area where we're proposing to put the
4 soil, of course, with that barrier in that northwest
5 corner over that half acre of the site. We could
6 place concrete there over the two acres and have the
7 barrier on the northwest corner. So the barrier is
8 for the northwest corner, the same place we're
9 proposing to excavate in the northwest corner. The
10 alternative that has been proposed thus far we call
11 Alternative 6, and it's basically a soil cover with
12 excavation in that northwest corner, that 0.5 acres.

13 This cost that's associated with this
14 particular remedy is incorrect. We're looking at now
15 a range of 2 to 3 million dollars for this particular
16 remedy. It was calculated incorrectly.

17 And the other alternative, Alternative 7, is a
18 total site excavation where we excavate the complete
19 2.5 acres. And its cost, you have a range here of
20 7.9, that is when you excavate the material, you have
21 to analyze it and find out how to dispose of it. So
22 if most of the material after excavation is not
23 hazardous waste, but just goes to a municipal
24 landfill, then the remedy would cost 7.9 million
25 dollars. But if most of the material is hazardous

1 material, it has to go to a hazardous type landfill,
2 then that drives the cost up to the point that it
3 would be roughly 24 million dollars to excavate the
4 complete site if all of the excavation material is
5 hazardous. And we don't know until you actually
6 excavate and collect samples of whether it's hazardous
7 or nonhazardous.

8 The other things that we're going to do, we're
9 going to do air monitoring. The other thing that the
10 proposal calls for is air monitoring while their doing
11 the excavation. Of course, tear down the office
12 warehouse building and the shell of the Rodney Hunt
13 Steel building. I showed you those buildings.

14 They're going to regrade and landscape the site
15 and slope the river bank, and apply some type of
16 erosion control on the river bank, repair the sewer
17 line in conjunction with the City, and install a
18 perimeter fence all around the site. Right now the
19 site is fenced on all sides except the side that the
20 river faces.

21 Again, here's the institutional controls. And
22 basically these controls are placed on the land such
23 that whomever comes along and purchases the land or
24 use the land, they will know that there's a soil cover
25 there that needs to be protective, or some type of

1 cover there needs to be protective, and where they can
2 and cannot dig and how deep they can dig, if they dig
3 at all, where they to have to have permission from the
4 Environmental Protection Agency, both Ohio and EPA.

5 There will be no ground water use. The ground
6 water use is restricted until the water is restored.
7 It is our objective, EPA's objective to restore any
8 drinking water source back to drinking water
9 standards. Even though no one is using the water, it
10 still is a mandate to restore the water.

11 And how we're going to do that, we're not going
12 to do any pump and treat. We're just going to let the
13 ground water attenuate naturally. And basically, as I
14 said already, what natural attenuation is where you
15 allow the chemicals to break down naturally. And
16 already we know that's happening on the site because
17 we can see the chemicals. We can see what we call the
18 parent chemical, and we see that its concentration is
19 getting smaller, smaller, smaller as the, what we call
20 darter chemicals that come after the parent chemicals
21 break down. We see those chemicals there, too, and
22 that's a strong line of evidence that the chemicals
23 are degrading.

24 And there's also a 30 year operation and
25 maintenance. And basically what that is, is any time

1 that you leave any type of waste on-site, you have to
2 go back and review every five years, what we call a
3 five year review, to make sure that the remedy is
4 working. And during those five year reviews, that's
5 when we look at the ground water to make sure that the
6 ground water is, the concentrations of the chemicals
7 are degrading. And at each five year review, we will
8 evaluate to determine, well, it's happening or it's
9 not happening. And if we determine that it's not
10 happening, then a more aggressive remedy will take
11 place to make sure that those chemicals degrade back
12 to the standards that we can allow people to drink the
13 water if they needed to drink the water.

14 There's an evaluation criteria in our
15 regulations that we take each alternative and we
16 evaluate them against what we call the nine evaluation
17 criteria. And the first one, of course, is to make
18 sure any remedy that you propose, it has to protect
19 overall human health and the environment. It has to
20 be in compliance with state and local regulations. We
21 look at the long term effectiveness and the permanence
22 of that remedy. We look to see, does it reduce the
23 toxicity and the mobility of the chemicals or the
24 contaminants or the pollutants. We look at the short
25 term effectiveness of that particular remedy that you

1 might use for the site. We look at the
2 implementability of it, and that just simply means how
3 easy is it to construct. We look at the cost.
4 There's state acceptance. We would like for the state
5 to concur with whatever remedy we select, and we also
6 would like to hear what the community has to say about
7 the remedies that we propose to select.

8 So each one of those seven alternatives that I
9 presented to you, we evaluate each one of those
10 against these nine alternatives, and this is the
11 evaluation summary. Of course, Alternative 1 was a no
12 action alternative, and so that one doesn't fly, but
13 Alternative 2 through 5, it protects from direct
14 contact with the soil. It's not as effective in
15 reducing the chemical concentration migrating into the
16 ground water and the river. It has short term
17 effectiveness, but we're a little questionable about
18 the long term effectiveness with the liner. And all
19 of these, 2 through 5, just to recap, are the various
20 different covers, the soil cover, the asphalt cover,
21 the concrete cover, those covers with a barrier, and
22 that was 2 through 5.

23 Again, there's 6. It protects the receptor or
24 the person or the animal from direct contact with the
25 soil. It removes the source material, that material

1 that we believe is the most concentrated in the
2 northwest corner of the site. It reduces chemical
3 migration because we're getting rid of the source
4 material that exists in the soil. We believe it has
5 short term and long term effectiveness. Of course, if
6 you remove it, then it can't do anything because it's
7 no longer there.

8 Alternative 7 does all of those things that
9 Alternative 6 and 2 through 5 does, but it doesn't
10 give you as much bang for your buck, meaning that it's
11 effective, but it's very expensive and there's no more
12 protectiveness given, so you're not getting the value
13 from your money. When you're not getting more
14 protection, it's not a good remedy because it's not
15 providing you more protection. And that's what we're
16 here for, is to provide the protection. And so its
17 protection is no better, but the cost is very, very
18 high.

19 Again, I just want to reiterate what our
20 proposed remedy is. It's to excavate that northwest
21 corner down to about 4 feet. Backfill that material.
22 Take that material off-site. A 2 foot soil cover over
23 the rest of the site. Well, it's going to be over the
24 complete 2.5 acres. The first top 2 feet will be
25 clean material. The bottom 2 feet from the excavation

1 area will be some type of clean material, too. It may
2 not be soil, but it will be something to fill that
3 hole up, but the regulation requires the top 2 feet to
4 be clean soil.

5 They're going to seed it and landscape that 2.5
6 acre site. The storm sewer is going to be repaired
7 and a fence is going to be put up, and apply those
8 institutional controls, it's just restrictive, in some
9 type of restrictive covenant or other controls. And
10 restrictive covenant is just a legal term for putting
11 some type of control on a piece of land. And the
12 covenant will say that we need to prevent the use of
13 ground water, potable and nonpotable. All that means
14 is drinking and nondrinking.

15 Like washing your cars, we don't want you to
16 wash your cars even with this water coming from the
17 ground for the simple fact that, if you're like me
18 when I wash cars and I'm thirsty, I'll just drink from
19 the hose, and that's the problem that we are concerned
20 about and that's why we don't want you to use it for
21 nondrinking water purposes or any type of purposes
22 until it's restored back to drinking water standards.
23 And the proposal calls for a 30 year operation in
24 maintenance or more if necessary. And, again, that's
25 where the five year reviews come into place, and the

1 five year review simply says, is this thing working.
2 If it's not working, what do we need to do to make it
3 work. So every five years we go through that.

4 And ground water monitoring, again, we believe
5 that the ground water, not that we believe, the data
6 shows that the site has been, the chemicals on-site
7 have been degrading based on the concentrations that
8 we noted when the first soil sample or the first, not
9 soil sample, the first ground water sample was
10 collected back in the early '80s and the last sample
11 was collected in 2003, and you can see a difference in
12 the concentrations of the chemicals that existed back
13 in the early '80s. They're still there, but the
14 numbers are going down, meaning they may have been
15 100,000 or 200,000 back in the 80's and now it's
16 75,000 or whatever.

17 So the next steps; what we're proposing to do
18 is review and respond to your comments that you give
19 us tonight. And we will respond to your comments in a
20 document we call the record of decision, and the
21 record of decision is a document that we put into
22 place to show whomever is going to do the work, what
23 it is that needs to be done.

24 We're going to negotiate with the potentially
25 responsible parties to have them come to us and

1 hopefully sit down and we can negotiate a document we
2 call, a legal document we call a consent decree for
3 the responsible parties or potentially responsible
4 parties to do the actual work that we're proposing for
5 you tonight, and to do the work we call the remedial
6 design and the remedial action, and all that is, is
7 design what you need to do and do it. That's simple,
8 isn't it.

9 Okay, so Bri can take any questions that you
10 might have.

11 MS. BILL: Sure. And I want to
12 mention, too, Gwen has a couple of extra copies of the
13 presentation if you'd like one and we'll also be
14 putting it on the web site. So before we open the
15 floor to comments on the proposed plan, we wanted to
16 give you an opportunity to ask any questions that you
17 have about what Gwen's been talking about.

18 Any questions?

19 And if could you just everyone please remember
20 to state your name so she can hear you.

21 MR. CONLIN: Ted Conlin, Ohio EPA in
22 the Black River RAP, Remedial Action Plan. The
23 upstream swing in the water slate in the east branch
24 of the Black River you said was elevated with, I think
25 you said with arsenic.

1 MS. MASSENBURG: Yes.

2 MR. CONLIN: It was higher than what
3 you saw essentially coming off-site.

4 MS. MASSENBURG: Yes.

5 MR. CONLIN: At the site right along
6 the river bank where the Chemical Recovery company was
7 located.

8 MS. MASSENBURG: Yes.

9 MR. CONLIN: Have you gone further to
10 try to identify why that was higher in that area
11 upstream? Because I don't think there should be any
12 flow reversals in the east branch of the Black River
13 at that site.

14 MS. MASSENBURG: No, but the thing is,
15 is, if I could show you. Okay, say we collect our
16 sample about here.

17 MR. CONLIN: Right.

18 MS. MASSENBURG: There's a chemical
19 company that sits right here that could be
20 contributing to the site. We don't know where the
21 contamination is coming from and we didn't try to find
22 out whether or not this chemical company is the one
23 that's contaminating the soil, I mean, the river or
24 not, but all we know is that our upstream sample, our
25 background sample was as contaminated or more

1 contaminated than the sample that our site didn't have
2 any influence over. So basically what I'm saying is,
3 the ground water flow is in this direction. And so
4 with the arsenic, the concentrations being higher over
5 here, we have no idea where it's coming from, but
6 because, again, this chemical company exists up here,
7 and there may be some other companies upstream of our
8 site, we can't say that all of the contamination is
9 coming from our site because of that background sample
10 being contaminated.

11 MS. BILL: Does that answer your
12 question; sort of?

13 MR. CONLIN: Basically.

14 MS. BILL: Okay.

15 Yes.

16 MR. KORZAN: Terry Korzan, City of
17 Elyria Wastewater. In your evaluation of
18 alternatives, you say that Alternatives 2 through 5
19 are not as effective in preventing further
20 contamination of the ground water, but I always
21 thought that if you asphalted the area, that made it
22 more impervious cover so that you didn't have to worry
23 so much about rain water and whatever's percolating
24 down through the upper layers and actually getting,
25 moving the solvents down further into the ground

1 waters.

2 MS. MASSENBURG: You're absolutely
3 correct in your assertion there. What I was going to
4 show you was, I was going to go back to the slide that
5 actually had the most contaminated well that's
6 contributing to the contamination to the ground water.
7 And let me show you here, as I said earlier,
8 Monitoring Well 6 exists right here, and where we're
9 proposing to put the asphalt cover is on this area
10 here. The reason why we're not going to do that or we
11 think a better remedy would be is because the ground
12 water is already contaminated here. So the asphalt
13 cover over here, it's kind of overkill, if I may use
14 that, whereas we're more concerned about ground water
15 in this area where the contaminants of concern are
16 more in the soil here, whereas here in the soil area,
17 the contaminants of concern, concentrations aren't as
18 great. So we believe that the ground water has
19 already been contaminated where we were proposing to
20 put those asphalt covers, the concrete cover and that
21 type of cover. That was just to get rid of the direct
22 contact.

23 MR. KORZAN: Okay. So the soil in the
24 two acres has very little contamination, and it's just
25 that half acre that you're really worried about as far

1 as contamination in the soil.

2 MS. MASSENBURG: Yes.

3 MR. KORZAN: Okay. I'll think about
4 that for a minute.

5 MS. MASSENBURG: Okay. Think about it.

6 MS. BILL: Okay. Other questions?

7 Okay. Well, we'll start the comment period
8 now.

9 If you've had, in the last ten seconds been
10 able to rethink your issue and you want to make it as
11 a comment, this would be a good time to do it.

12 Again, during the comment time, we aren't going
13 to respond right now, but we will be reflecting on the
14 comments that we get tonight from the community and
15 any comments that people submit in writing during our
16 comment period, and it will be a part of our
17 responsiveness summary which is part of that final
18 document, it's called the record of decision.

19 Did you have another question or --

20 MR. KORZAN: Can I?

21 MS. BILL: Sure.

22 MR. KORZAN: As far as the contaminates
23 in the ground water now, you mentioned that these
24 plans would allow that to degrade naturally. Is that
25 water plume actually going toward the river, is it

1 staying still, or what is that plume doing?

2 MS. MASSENBURG: It's going into the
3 river. We believe it's going into the river. We're
4 going to have the contractor of whomever does the work
5 do an investigational study to make sure that the
6 contaminants are going into the river and not under
7 the river. Our concern, if it's going into the river,
8 it's better than going under the river in terms of
9 protecting human health and the environment.

10 MR. KORZAN: Is there any way for a
11 bioremediation? I'm not sure how fast the plume is
12 moving. Is there any option for bioremediation?

13 MS. MASSENBURG: In terms of any type
14 of microbes?

15 MR. KORZAN: Yeah.

16 MS. MASSENBURG: I know we spoke to our
17 people, our contractors, and no one really seemed to
18 know about organic solvents in terms of microbes that
19 will clean up that site like what we're looking for.
20 I know we have some microbes that will do the metals,
21 but in terms of the organic solvents, I'm not sure.
22 But, no, we did not look at bioremediation. We didn't
23 look at trees in terms of phytoremediation because of
24 the historical coal processing. We just didn't look
25 at those remedies at all.

1 MR. KORZAN: Okay. I thought there
2 were methods of using microbes to break down solvents.
3 I thought there was some stuff in the literature I had
4 read before. And, again, if the plume is moving too
5 fast, then obviously those techniques won't work, but
6 if the plume is basically sitting there for a period
7 of time, then that could be an option because
8 obviously we're trying to keep the river clean as
9 well, you know, instead of just allowing this stuff to
10 empty into the river.

11 MS. MASSENBURG: And you're proposing
12 to use bioremediation for the complete site or the
13 half corner, half acre?

14 MR. KORZAN: In particular where your
15 worst well is. And if it's one big plume, then
16 obviously you have to treat the one big plume, but if
17 you have several pockets of this stuff, then that
18 opens up different possibilities.

19 MS. MASSENBURG: Now, is the
20 bioremediation you're speaking about for the soil?

21 MR. KORZAN: No, for the ground water.

22 MS. MASSENBURG: Ground water?

23 MR. KORZAN: Right.

24 And they also have pump and treat
25 technologies, too.

1 MS. MASSENBURG: Yeah, we know about
2 pump and treat.

3 MR. KORZAN: Okay. Yeah.

4 MS. MASSENBURG: Pump and treat was not
5 proposed for this particular site and nor was
6 bioremediation.

7 MR. KORZAN: Okay.

8 MS. MASSENBURG: And it has to do with
9 the end use of it being mostly industrial/commercial,
10 and so that's why we didn't look at those remedies.
11 What you're talking is a valid thing to possibly take
12 a look at, but we did not look at those.

13 MR. KORZAN: Okay. Thank you.

14 MS. BILL: Question?

15 MR. MOGHE: Yeah, question.

16 My name is Mukund Moghe, M-U-K-U-N-D,
17 M-O-G-H-E. I'm city engineer for City of Elyria. My
18 question is, what is a timeline on this if everything
19 goes as we discussed today, the options and
20 selections, what is the timeline to get this done?

21 MS. MASSENBURG: Well, the actual
22 construction itself will not take longer than six
23 months. That's the actual construction, excavating,
24 putting the soil cover or whatever you do. What's
25 going to take some time is probably another year, so

1 we're talking about maybe a year and six months. Six
2 months for the construction and a year to bring the
3 potential responsible parties to the table to see if
4 we can find someone interested in doing the cleanup.

5 MR. MOGHE: And then another question
6 is, once this site is, you know, remediated, are you
7 not going to use that for 30 years for any purpose or
8 can it be used for something?

9 MS. MASSENBURG: Yes. It is the
10 initiative of U.S. EPA now to reuse these sites,
11 contaminated sites as best as we can. We do know that
12 there were at some point some interest of people
13 wanting to purchase the site from Mrs. Obitts. Once
14 it's remediated, then, you know, it's going to be
15 zoned hopefully as commercial/industrial, and so, you
16 know, if someone wants to purchase the property to use
17 it, they're more than welcome to do it as long as it
18 meets the standards that we've placed on it.

19 MR. MOGHE: Okay. Thank you.

20 MS. BILL: Okay. Other questions?

21 Okay. Well, we'll start the comments now.

22 Did you want to make a comment?

23 MR. KORZAN: Terry Korzan. I would be
24 in favor of Alternative 6 as EPA recommends, however,
25 I would like to see any options for a bioremediation

1 of the water plumes to be looked at. That's all.

2 MS. BILL: Okay. Thanks.

3 Other comments?

4 MR. CONLIN: Ted Conlin, again, and I
5 agree with your version 6, your method 6, but I
6 recommend that the landscaping and the sloping of the
7 river banks, that there is some sort of conservation
8 easement or covenant put on there to not disturb that
9 site. And I believe that the slope of the river bank
10 there is quite steep but is heavily vegetated, and I
11 would hope that with your resloping of that site, that
12 you replant with some woody vegetation along that site
13 to keep the habitat intact. Thank you.

14 MS. BILL: Okay. Thank you.

15 Other comments?

16 Okay. Well, we'll close the meeting. We'll
17 hang around if you have any questions. The transcript
18 for the meeting will be on our web site, as will the
19 presentation. The web site is on the bottom of the
20 agenda. If you'd like to submit written comments or
21 if you have some additional information that you think
22 that we should consider in our decision making
23 process, please submit them to us either on-line or in
24 writing by August 14th. Okay.

25 Go ahead.

1 MR. MCWILLIAMS: I'd just like to
2 request an extension of that timeline for the public
3 for written comments.

4 MS. BILL: Okay. That's something we
5 could consider.

6 Could you state your name, I'm sorry?

7 MR. MCWILLIAMS: Yeah, Doug McWilliams.

8 MS. BILL: Okay.

9 Go ahead.

10 MS. VINCENT: I'm Ann Marie Vincent.
11 I'm with the U.S. EPA Cleveland office. I'm the Black
12 River RAP Liaison for our Chicago 5 Region Office.

13 I just wanted to know if you could provide some
14 clarification for folks, that if they heard something
15 that they either agree with or support as a comment,
16 if it behooves them to also submit the same comment or
17 is it, once it's on the record, no one else needs to
18 bring it up. I just want them to know if there's mass
19 in numbers or once it's on the record, it doesn't need
20 to be stated again.

21 MS. BILL: Well, certainly we would
22 encourage, you know, anyone who has an opinion to
23 submit their comments. I mean, it's not a vote by
24 consensus, but if there are many people that have the
25 same issue, we'd like to know that. As far as how we

1 respond, how we prepare our responsiveness summary, we
2 don't typically list it as question, response,
3 question, response. If we have, you know, ten people
4 with the same issue, we will collate similar kinds of
5 questions and comments and respond that way. So, does
6 that answer your question?

7 MS. VINCENT: I just wanted other
8 people to understand that process that maybe isn't
9 transparent to them as opposed to those of us who deal
10 with this on a frequent basis.

11 MS. BILL: Okay. Thank you.

12 All right. Thank you everybody.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Mary A. Hammond, a stenotype reporter, do hereby certify that I attended the taking of the foregoing meeting, wrote the same in stenotype, and that this is a true and correct transcript of my stenotype notes.

Mary A. Hammond, Notary Public
My commission expires 12-25-07
Filed in Lorain County, Ohio.