

STATE OF OHIO
NEASE CHEMICAL SITE
PROPOSED PLAN MEETING

PROCEEDINGS HELD BEFORE THE U.S.
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, AT THE
SALEM PUBLIC LIBRARY, 821 EAST STATE
STREET, SALEM, OHIO 44460, TAKEN ON
THURSDAY, JULY 31, 2008, COMMENCING AT
6:30 P.M.

CORSILLO & GRANDILLO
COURT REPORTERS
700 CITY CLUB BUILDING
CLEVELAND, OHIO 44114
216-523-1700

APPEARANCES:

- Susan Pastor
Community Involvement Coordinator
U.S. EPA
- Mary Logan
Remedial Project Manager
U.S. EPA
- Sheila Abraham
Ohio EPA

MS. PASTOR: I'm Sue Pastor,
and I work for the U.S. Environmental
Protection Agency. I work under
these chemical products along with my
coworker, Mary Logan. She's the
technical mind behind this product.
Along with her, she works closely
with Sheila Abraham, and she works
for the Ohio EPA.

I just want to tell a little
bit about us and what I'm here for.
Mary will go and talk a little bit
about what we're proposing for Middle
Fork and Little Beaver Creek. And
Sheila can talk a little bit about
how she's involved and her thoughts
about this product. And we'll be
happy to take your questions followed
by comments or questions that you
have on your mind.

Comments are more of a
statement or your opinion, something
where maybe you read the information
and you want to say you're in favor,
you're not in favor.

And we have a court reporter
taking the whole meeting down -- the
whole proceeding. So there will be a
transcript on our web site, and a
copy will make its way here in the
library.

So if you pick up this little
mail or piece here, and this is
pretty much a summary, but if you
really like what you're reading and
you really want to get into it, we
have a lot of heavy-bound documents
here, and you can read more about it,
if you like.

As far as comments, the
comments that you make, that will be
for the record. So the court
reporter will be particularly
interested at that time to have your
name. And if you're affiliated with
an organization, that would be good
to know as well.

If that's something you don't
want to do tonight, you want to read
up a little more, you can also mail

1 that to us. We can take your comment
2 in writing. There's a little sheet
3 in the middle here, and you can write
4 it there. You can fax it. And all
5 that information is here on where to
6 do that.

7 And you can send your
8 comments electronically, too.

9 We're in the middle of it, so
10 as long as you're postmarked by
11 August 13th, we'll be in good shape.

12 The library closes at 9, so
13 we're going to try to wrap up around
14 8:30 and be on our way out by a
15 quarter to 9. And the gentleman
16 outside the door is probably going to
17 give me a sign to remind me of that.

18 And we'll just kind of move
19 it along, if that's okay.

20 Anything else before I
21 forget?

22 Well, we are here to tell you
23 about how we're proposing to do this
24 cleanup. And at this point, it's
25 just a recommendation, and we'll

1 explain what we want to do.

2 And you can ask questions,
3 and we'll do our best to answer them.

4 This is a Superfund site, a
5 federal Superfund site involving a
6 lot of lengthy investigation and
7 studies and a lot of field work. And
8 we've done all that. And that brings
9 us here where we are today.

10 We have documents that
11 outline some of the options that we
12 can do about the cleanup around the
13 creek. We will select an option, and
14 that will be outlined in a document
15 called a record of decision. And
16 that will be done by September. It's
17 not final today. It's just a
18 proposal, so keep that in mind.

19 And the comments that you
20 will be making today or anytime in
21 the common period, that will all be
22 put together in the record of
23 decision document, and that will be
24 called a responsiveness summary. So
25 you will be able to see those, too.

1 So I think we want to keep
2 going. I'm going to let Mary talk
3 about how she's going to propose
4 cleaning up the creek.

5 MS. LOGAN: First of all, I
6 want to say thanks to everybody who
7 have come out tonight. I know that
8 you have families and obligations and
9 other work-related pressures, so
10 thank you for taking the time out of
11 your schedule for being with us.

12 I am very pleased to be here
13 myself. I know that the Nease
14 Chemical site has been something that
15 this community has thought about for
16 a long time. And tonight, we're
17 proposing what will be the last part
18 of the cleanup plan.

19 I will talk a little later of
20 how we go about implementing our
21 cleaning up the plan. But I think
22 tonight is a good start in finally
23 getting some decisions about the
24 plant and the contamination that has
25 come from that plant for a long time.

1 I'm pretty pleased to be
2 proposing this to you.

3 The structure of my talk is
4 going to be fairly brief, but I'm
5 going to first talk about what the
6 EPA is doing in terms of the cleanup,
7 and I'll talk about other
8 alternatives being considered.

9 Then I'll step back and give
10 you a little bit of a background,
11 what did we find at the site, and how
12 it fits in with what we decided to
13 propose in the cleanup option.

14 And then I'll give you a
15 little technical information of how
16 that cleanup might be done.

17 And then finally, explain
18 some of the rationale and our
19 thinking of what went into why we
20 determined this was the proposal we
21 would go with.

22 So bear with me, because some
23 of the technical information will
24 come a little bit later in the
25 program.

1 Our cleanup plan is going to
2 address three components.

3 The first is Feeder Creek
4 sediment. Feeder Creek is not going
5 to be seen on a lot of your maps.
6 It's a small creek that drains the
7 Nease Chemical Plant, it flows down
8 from the plant and carries some
9 contamination into the Middle Fork of
10 Little Beaver Creek.

11 Middle Fork of Little Beaver
12 Creek has two components where we
13 found contamination.

14 One is the sediment itself
15 and Floodplain soil.

16 Floodplains are low areas
17 next to the creek, where during heavy
18 rains and flooding, contamination can
19 be washed up on the shores.

20 All of the remedies that
21 we're thinking about would involve
22 disposal of the soil and sediment at
23 the Nease Chemical Plant. It would
24 be placed with the other existing
25 contamination at that plant, and a

1 clean cover soil would be placed over
2 all that soil so that there was no
3 way anybody could have contact with
4 that contamination.

5 And again, all of the plans
6 that we're thinking about involve
7 monitoring both before, during and
8 after, and in construction of the
9 remedy.

10 The monitoring before would
11 involve additional samples to really
12 refine the areas that need to be
13 cleaned up.

14 During the construction, we
15 would monitor to make sure that
16 nothing was being stirred up or
17 nothing was moved downstream.

18 Afterwards, we would be taking
19 samples to ensure the fish were
20 getting cleaner and the conditions
21 were what we expected after the
22 cleanup.

23 Our recommended alternative
24 is what we're calling Alternative C.
25 What this would involve is all the

1 sediment in Feeder Creek would be
2 removed. The water would be taken
3 out of that creek. The sediment
4 would be taken out by construction
5 equipment and would involve all the
6 sediment.

7 For the Floodplain soil, what
8 we're doing is called targeted
9 removal. Not every area of the
10 Floodplain behaves the same. Some
11 areas get more contamination than
12 others.

13 So we would be looking at the
14 most contaminated areas of the
15 Floodplains to be excavated by
16 conventional equipment, and it would
17 be a cleanup goal that would be
18 protective of the human health and
19 the environment.

20 Similarly, with the sediment
21 in Middle Fork, we would be looking
22 at a targeted approach where we would
23 be getting the pockets of the most
24 contaminated sediment.

25 By and large, we found that

1 the most contamination is within six
2 and-a-half miles downstream of the
3 Nease site. But within that six
4 and-a-half miles, not all of that
5 sediment is equally contaminated.

6 So we would be getting the
7 most contaminated pockets out, again,
8 to meet the cleanup goal that is
9 protective of human health and the
10 environment.

11 The estimated cost of this
12 remedy is about \$3.8 million. And
13 that cost would be adjusted as we get
14 better engineering designs to further
15 refine what we're going to be doing.

16 This schematic is a cartoon
17 like schematic of the targeted
18 approach. This is where --

19 Let me take a step back.

20 Let me explain what the
21 numbers here are that we're calling
22 river miles.

23 As a matter of convention,
24 when different agencies are talking
25 about areas in water bodies, we

1 assign river miles.

2 The Middle Fork of the Little
3 Beaver Creek flows north at this
4 point and is flowing back south.

5 River mile 0 is somewhere
6 down here close to the Ohio River.

7 We're just using river miles
8 because it gives us a way to talk
9 about where we're dealing with. So
10 if we're not local or somebody
11 doesn't know a designation, we can
12 know where we're talking about.

13 The Nease facility is about
14 River mile 37.6, and the
15 contamination was flowing mostly
16 within a 6 and-a-half mile zone
17 downstream of that.

18 There are different places
19 within this sediment where it's more
20 contaminated.

21 Also along the Floodplains,
22 there's a few areas we know about
23 that are more highly contaminated
24 than others. We have samples in
25 different Floodplain areas that

1 are less contaminated, but we will be
2 doing a -- a predesign study before a
3 remedy's actually built to really
4 refine where these areas actually
5 are.

6 One of the alternatives
7 we're always required to evaluate is
8 no action. And this is because if we
9 never did anything, how bad things
10 would be.

11 In this case, we don't
12 believe that the no further action
13 would be protective, but what it
14 would involve is basically doing
15 nothing to the Floodplain soil of
16 Middle Fork, doing nothing to the
17 sediment in Middle Fork.

18 And right now, at the Nease
19 plant, there are sediment traps that
20 are keeping contamination from
21 washing into the Middle Fork. Those
22 existing sediment traps would remain
23 as part of that remedy.

24 Another alternative,
25 Alternative B, is very similar to

1 what we're proposing, in that all the
2 contaminated sediment would be
3 removed from Beaver Creek. The
4 Floodplain soil would be treated the
5 same.

6 But the difference is that
7 the sediment in Middle Fork of Little
8 Beaver Creek would be remediated by
9 what's called monitored natural
10 recovery. And what that does is
11 allow natural processes -- so
12 biological breakdown, adherence to
13 organic carbon, or other processes
14 going on to clean up the creek
15 naturally. But you ensure that
16 that's happening by monitoring it.

17 A big part of that monitoring
18 natural recovery to be successful is
19 that you have to control the
20 sources. So we would have to
21 continue with the cleanup at the
22 plant site and make sure no
23 contamination got into the stream at
24 that point.

25 I want to give you a

1 background on the Nease Plant and how
2 the contamination got there and
3 what we found that led us to the
4 proposed alternative that we are
5 talking about tonight.

6 The Nease Plant site is --
7 the boundaries are about here.

8 And in the 1960s and into
9 the early 1970s, Nease Chemical
10 Company made a lot of specialty
11 chemicals at the plant site. There
12 were no environmental regulations at
13 the time.

14 So what they did was dug some
15 holes in the ground. They called
16 them ponds, and they dumped waste
17 water into the ponds.

18 In addition, there were
19 some areas where drums had been
20 buried, so the soil got very
21 contaminated as well as the pond
22 areas did.

23 When Nease Chemical decided
24 to close up shop, they filled in some
25 dirt into the ponds, but most of the

1 contamination was left in place.

2 Feeder Creek kind of feeds
3 through the plant site and meets up
4 with Middle Fork, which is right
5 here.

6 Contamination was washing
7 down.

8 In addition, contamination
9 leaked into the ground and continues
10 to be in the soil at the plant site.

11 This is a bigger schematic of
12 what we've been using.

13 As you can see, Nease is west
14 of Middle Fork. Middle Fork flows
15 north and then takes a turn and flows
16 south.

17 Our investigations included
18 samples along the entire 40-mile
19 stretch of Middle Fork of Little
20 Beaver Creek. But most of our
21 samples were closer to the plant
22 site.

23 We also emphasized a couple
24 of things.

25 There is a structure in

1 Lisbon around river mile 12.5 that
2 we call the Lisbon dam. And
3 sometimes when contaminated sediment
4 moves, it goes behind these
5 structures.

6 So we looked behind the dam
7 down there, and we also looked in an
8 area called Egypt's Swamp, because a
9 lot of times, contamination builds up
10 in swampy areas.

11 So there have been samples
12 taken quite extensively through this
13 system.

14 We've tested fish, sediment
15 and soil, and we also tested the
16 water itself to see what kind of
17 chemical contaminants were out in the
18 system.

19 As I said, we're focusing on
20 the 6 and-a-half miles nearest to
21 the plant site.

22 And this is a little bit of
23 a technical diagram. But what this
24 axis is showing you is the levels of
25 mirex. Mirex is the contaminant of

1 most concern. The higher the level,
2 the higher the level of
3 contamination.

4 On the horizontal axis, what
5 we're showing is river miles.

6 So this translates to where
7 the Nease site comes in, and this is
8 moving downstream from the Nease
9 site.

10 This area here is the 6
11 and-a-half miles, and you see the
12 levels of contaminants in the
13 sediment are much higher than the
14 levels further downstream.

15 These are the results from
16 that 2006 for the Floodplains. And
17 again, nearest to the plant site and
18 in the first 6 and-a-half miles is
19 where we're finding higher levels of
20 contamination.

21 Now, this is going to explain
22 a little bit about how the
23 contamination moved.

24 As I said, the old plant site
25 generated a lot of chemicals. They

1 dumped the chemicals into the ponds
2 and onto the soil, and those went
3 into Feeder Creek. From there, they
4 moved into the sediment in Middle
5 Fork, and the sediment washed up onto
6 the Floodplains.

7 The ponds and the soil, we
8 picked a remedy to clean those up a
9 couple years ago. So we're going to
10 be cleaning up the ponds and the
11 soil, and we'll take care of the
12 problem at the site.

13 What happens to the
14 contaminants that are in the Middle
15 Fork is they can build up in fish,
16 they can build up in cattle that
17 forage, and any person or any animal
18 that eats the fish can be potentially
19 exposed to the contaminant.

20 In addition, small animals
21 come in direct contact with the dirt
22 and the sediment, and they can have
23 exposure problems from the
24 contaminant mirex.

25 As I mentioned, mirex is our

1 main contaminant of concern. Mirex
2 is a complicated chemical, and it's
3 very similar to PCB's. It's a very,
4 very unusual and rare chemical. It
5 was banned from the U.S. Production
6 stopped in 1978.

7 It breaks down very slowly
8 into the environment.

9 It can build up into fish and
10 other food items. So consumers that
11 eat those contaminated foods can get
12 some exposure that way.

13 Mirex is believed that it may
14 cause cancer and other health effects
15 for humans, and it can cause damage
16 to animals in the ecosystem.

17 Now, from what we have done,
18 currently people are not at risk for
19 mirex in the Middle Fork system. The
20 ways that you might be exposed to
21 mirex would not currently cause you
22 risk. However, in the future, if you
23 eat a lot of fish or if cattle were
24 to return to the Floodplains and get
25 contaminated, there's a potential

1 that there may be a risk to lives.

2 Small animals could be at
3 risk just from being in the areas
4 that are contaminated.

5 One of the things that I do
6 want to mention is the Ohio EPA has a
7 fishing advisory for a portion of
8 Middle Fork, which advises you to eat
9 no more than one meal of carp per
10 month and no more than other fish per
11 week. That's both from mirex and
12 mercury.

13 So I think we want to
14 encourage people to follow Ohio EPA's
15 fish advisory to reduce the potential
16 risk of exposure to contaminants.

17 I have a few pictures. The
18 next four slides are going to be
19 pictures to give you an idea of what
20 the cleanup might look like.

21 These are not from Middle
22 Fork. These are from other
23 projects. And some of the projects
24 that I'm picturing here are much
25 bigger water bodies, so the scale may

1 be different.

2 I mentioned that Beaver Creek
3 and maybe Middle Fork might be
4 excavated in the dry. That means
5 taking the water out.

6 This is a good picture of what
7 Beaver Creek might look like in
8 construction. The water is routed
9 somewhere else. You basically take
10 the contamination out and get rid of
11 it.

12 A little bit more complicated
13 excavation other than drying involves
14 putting in walls made of metal,
15 pumping the water to the other side,
16 and then you can get your
17 construction equipment down into the
18 sediments that are on the dry side.

19 This is a large slide, but
20 it's showing excavation in the dry
21 behind sheet pile walls.

22 And this last picture shows
23 -- what they did here is re-routed
24 the creek itself, and this was where
25 the former contaminated creek was.

1 and they're doing the excavation that
2 way.

3 For dredging wet removal, this
4 would be something that might be
5 considered for Middle Fork.

6 But these are all much bigger
7 projects than what Middle Fork would
8 be.

9 You can have two basic kinds
10 of dredges.

11 One is a hydraulic dredge.
12 It sucks the contamination using
13 pressure from the bottom.

14 These two are hydraulic
15 dredges. They churn and they pull in
16 the contamination.

17 These two pictures are
18 mechanical dredges where you reach
19 in with an arm and scoop things up in
20 a bucket and take the contamination
21 out that way.

22 And given the size of
23 Middle Fork, if we were going to do
24 wet dredging, we probably would be
25 looking at something that was done

1 from the shore and scooping it out
2 like that.

3 But we would consider the
4 best method.

5 And finally, you might have a
6 diver assisting in a smaller dredge.

7 The Floodplain soil is a
8 little bit different in that using
9 conventional construction equipment,
10 back hoes, tractors, things like
11 that.

12 This is not Middle Fork. But
13 a lot of times, creeks look like
14 this. They have nice vegetation up
15 to the creek edge, but you still
16 might have contamination in and among
17 the trees and the shrubs.

18 Sometimes the contamination
19 is so extensive that you have to cut
20 down all the trees and do excavation
21 of everything, and that leads to
22 basically bare soil that has to be
23 reseeded with some trees planted.

24 What we're trying to do with
25 the targeted approach is work among

1 the vegetation and save as much as we
2 can and just get the most out.
3 Because right now, the stream quality
4 is pretty good. And when you take
5 down the trees, the water gets
6 warmer, things can happen to the
7 stream.

8 So we're going to try to
9 minimize how much we can take down,
10 if that's possible.

11 And the last set of pictures
12 I wanted to show you is when you get
13 the soil and sediment out of the
14 system, if it's wet, you need to dry
15 it out. You can put it on some
16 gravel and let the water drain from
17 it and capture the contaminated
18 water. Move the dry sediment to
19 where you want it.

20 Or you can use bags of
21 netting where the water seeps out,
22 the contaminated sediment stays
23 inside, and then you dry out the
24 sediment that way.

25 Once you get the soil or the

1 sediment, you need to process it and
2 you need to put it in trucks and move
3 it to where you're going to dispose
4 it, which is what we plan to put it
5 back on the Nease Chemical site.

6 Switching gears, all
7 Superfund sites use nine criteria to
8 evaluate remedies.

9 Every site has to make the
10 first two criteria. They have to be
11 protective and they have to meet the
12 legal requirements that apply to the
13 remedy.

14 But then among the others,
15 long-term effectiveness and
16 permanence, reduction of toxicity,
17 mobility or volume through
18 treatment, short-term
19 effectiveness -- we try to balance
20 among those criteria to get what we
21 believe is the best balance of all
22 those. And then we would modify the
23 remedy based on what the state and
24 community believes. And these are
25 called modifying criteria.

1 Part of the process tonight
2 is that if you give us public
3 comments, that helps us understand
4 the community acceptance portion of
5 what we're proposing to do.

6 This is why we believe that
7 Alternative C is the best
8 alternative. It's the best long-term
9 cleanup solution.

10 I think that getting most of
11 the contaminated material out of the
12 system is going to increase the rate
13 of recovery and increase and minimize
14 the potential for downstream
15 contamination. It provides good
16 protectiveness for both the public
17 and the environment, but it balances
18 how much construction -- short-term
19 construction effects we have versus
20 the longer term recovery. And it
21 meets the cleanup goals the most
22 quickly.

23 I think Sue went over this
24 quickly at the beginning, but the
25 step is we will consider all of your

1 comments and we'll select a final
2 remedy in a record of decision, which
3 is an EPA document.

4 Then we will work with the
5 company that's currently working with
6 us to do the cleanup to sign a legal
7 agreement that they will do the
8 additional cleanup that we select.

9 We will then do the
10 investigations to further find where
11 the exact targeted excavations need
12 to be.

13 Then you get the engineering
14 firms in. They engineer and go about
15 how best to go forward with it.

16 And then, finally, the remedy
17 could be constructed.

18 At this point, it looks like
19 this process, once we sign the
20 record of decision, construction is
21 likely to be in 2011, because each of
22 these steps requires some time to do
23 it right. So we would probably be
24 targeting 2011 as the earliest date
25 we would be in the creek.

1 I want to take three minutes
2 to tell you about the plant soil and
3 ground water.

4 This is the remedy we picked
5 before.

6 As I said, you have to clean
7 up the plant site first, because if
8 you don't clean up the plant site,
9 there's contamination that still
10 could possibly move into the creek.

11 So we picked a remedy for the
12 plant soil and ground water, and the
13 company responsible for that work has
14 been working with us to get that
15 done.

16 The remedy we picked for the
17 plant soil and the ground water
18 involved -- the two worst ponds would
19 be treated by stripping -- using air
20 to strip the contaminants out and
21 capture those, and then the remaining
22 contaminants would be stabilized and
23 solidified in place.

24 And the other areas with
25 contamination would be covered with a

1 cap or a cover to prevent
2 infiltration of rainwater so that
3 stuff wouldn't be flowing to the
4 ground, and also would not be able to
5 be exposed to anybody from beyond the
6 site.

7 The ground water's
8 contaminated, and it would be
9 captured in a trench, pumped up out
10 of the ground and treated. And the
11 deeper ground water would be treated
12 underground with small particles of
13 iron to destroy the contaminants.

14 We've been working the
15 predesign investigations to design
16 this, and we found that during that
17 work, there was actually more
18 contamination in this area than we
19 had anticipated.

20 So what has also been done
21 since the remedy was selected is, a
22 lot of contamination -- it's almost
23 like pure product -- has been pulled
24 out of this area, this site. Some
25 additional work has been done.

1 Sometimes contaminants in
2 ground water can vaporize into
3 people's basements. So some work has
4 been done to prevent that from
5 happening to a couple of the
6 residents.

7 With the treatment of the
8 ponds, the laboratory tests were
9 completed in 2007, and they were very
10 successful in removing a large amount
11 of the contamination.

12 And we found that treatment
13 with a cement like substance would
14 immobilize the remaining
15 contaminants.

16 And then we have also done
17 some work where the nanoscale iron
18 has been injected into one of the
19 more contaminated parts of the ground
20 water, and we actually got very good
21 destruction of contaminants in that
22 area of the site.

23 We got destruction of
24 most of the contaminants, but we're
25 going to try to enhance the

1 recovery of the remaining by using
2 the microorganisms that already live
3 underground to have them digest
4 contamination.

5 That is the background on
6 what we have been doing since our
7 last remedy.

8 This slide says questions by
9 Sue. I think Sue is going to
10 introduce another speaker before we
11 take questions.

12 MS. PASTOR: We're going to
13 give Sheila Abraham from Ohio EPA a
14 couple minutes just so she can
15 introduce herself and tell you a
16 little bit about how she's involved
17 here.

18 MS. ABRAHAM: I don't really
19 need much time, because I think all
20 of us our focused on finding out
21 what's going to happen and all of
22 your questions.

23 The only couple of things I
24 want to say, one, Mary's gone through
25 most of the technical stuff. This is

1 one side, which is very important to
2 the State of Ohio, and we have been
3 working with the team of the U.S. EPA
4 and the company that's been doing the
5 other part of the cleanup. And our
6 goal is to get the best possible
7 cleanup that we can get. And that's
8 one reason why this whole targeted
9 removal approach is so attractive to
10 us as a state.

11 We have a great environment,
12 and we don't want to see all of it
13 destroyed for the sake of cleanup,
14 but there are some things that will
15 have to happen in order to get where
16 we need to be.

17 The other thing I would like
18 to emphasize is that Mary talked
19 about the fish advisory. Those of
20 you who are fishermen, I would like
21 to encourage you to go to Ohio EPA's
22 web site. We have fish advisories on
23 the web site. Very easy to find.
24 Any questions, come see me and I'll
25 be happy to show you how to get

1 there.

2 The State of Ohio is working
3 with the other divisions in the
4 state, ODNR and the Ohio Department
5 of Health. There is a state-wide
6 advisory for a period of no more than
7 one meal a week. That's a state-wide
8 advisory because of the contamination
9 of the creek.

10 In Middle Fork of Beaver
11 Creek, over and above that, we have
12 in one place -- and we can go over it
13 on the map. It's by Lake Road. It
14 cuts -- there's an advisory for just
15 carp.

16 So I would like to
17 reemphasize that.

18 And that's pretty much it.
19 We're here to listen to you. We want
20 to do what's best for the community,
21 because you're the community living
22 in this area, and we do for you what
23 we can.

24 MS. PASTOR: We'll take your
25 questions. So if you have one, raise

1 your hand and I'll recognize you and
2 ask away.

3 So who wants to go first?

4 AUDIENCE: I was just going
5 to ask what was going to happen to
6 the soil? She said it was going to
7 be treated and put back on the Nease
8 site.

9 MS. LOGAN: It will be
10 excavated. It won't be treated, but
11 it will be brought back to the site
12 with other contaminants. It will be
13 covered with clean material so that
14 nobody will be able to be exposed
15 to it.

16 AUDIENCE: That was also my
17 question in returning the soil to the
18 site. I thought the initial problem
19 with Nease was that the water -- the
20 contamination was leached into the
21 ground water and gone into the creeks
22 from the contamination drums. And so
23 putting the contaminated soil back
24 there, would that not repeat the
25 process?

1 MS. LOGAN: I think I was not
2 clear on that.

3 Because it was a chemical
4 manufacturing plant, we have over 100
5 different types of chemicals that we
6 actually found at the plant site.
7 The mirex that's in the creek is one
8 of the chemicals that we found at the
9 plant.

10 The things that leaked into
11 the ground water are what we call
12 volatile organics, or semi-volatile
13 organic chemicals.

14 What these are are solvents
15 that are easy to evaporate.

16 One of the most common things
17 people use is nail polish remover.
18 That's a volatile organic compound.

19 Because these things have
20 chemical properties that make them
21 evaporate easily, they also move
22 easily with water.

23 So those are the chemicals
24 that leaked at the plant site.

25 The mirex -- we found it in

1 the soil, we found it in some areas
2 of the water. The same reason it
3 goes into fish -- it also doesn't
4 move much when it gets onto a
5 particle of soil. It chemically
6 likes to hold onto the soil.

7 So the mirex is not the
8 chemical I talked about leaking.

9 MS. ABRAHAM: When we do take
10 it back to the old plant, we'll be
11 looking at all the precautions
12 necessary to make sure that it
13 doesn't leak in any way into the
14 water. We haven't found anywhere
15 outside in ground water, but we'll
16 make sure that we consider things to
17 prevent it from happening.

18 AUDIENCE: You mentioned that
19 iron would be used to stop the
20 toxins. What would the iron actually
21 do?

22 MS. LOGAN: Could you flip
23 back to the -- this is a zoom-in on
24 the plant site, and I didn't explain
25 that very well.

1 The theoretical areas we
2 would inject iron, we would inject
3 under the ground. So it's for these
4 chemicals to destroy those, because
5 we have a big ground water
6 contamination area here, and we would
7 want to put the iron in underground.
8 We would not be putting the iron in
9 the stream itself. Just basically
10 taking it out of the environment so
11 it can no longer build up into the
12 animals.

13 AUDIENCE: Can you elaborate
14 on the cementing process you talked
15 about?

16 If you take the contaminants
17 back to the site and you cover it
18 with the cemented material and soil,
19 that cement isn't going to last
20 forever.

21 MS. LOGAN: The cementing
22 process -- in these two most
23 contaminated ponds -- well, first, we
24 would strip as much as we could off
25 using air. It's a pretty simple

1 process.

2 You inject air through a
3 giant construction steel tube and
4 churn the material around while
5 you're injecting the air.

6 This is a hood, pulls suction
7 and pulls most of the contamination
8 out.

9 A lot of the contamination
10 would be removed from the old ponds
11 before we even used the stabilization
12 cement process.

13 What would be left behind are
14 the things that are less likely to
15 move in the environment.

16 So the cement matrix creates
17 a structure that traps the chemicals
18 in among the cement itself.

19 AUDIENCE: The cement doesn't
20 last forever.

21 MS. LOGAN: Right, but we're
22 hoping to have it bind within that
23 structure.

24 Ultimately, the top of that
25 would be covered with a cover that

1 consists of impermeable plastics and
2 the water is no longer going in this
3 area, and then clean soil on top of
4 that so that there's a habitat for
5 grass to grow.

6 The levels at the site are
7 probably a thousand times higher than
8 what's in the stream.

9 So what we're dealing with in
10 bringing the material back on the
11 site is actually bringing cleaner
12 material on the site than we
13 currently have in some places, and
14 then covering it all and managing
15 this for the future.

16 There's a long-term
17 obligation for the future of this
18 plant, and there's an obligation for
19 inspections of the remedy. There
20 will be monitoring, maintenance of
21 the cover and a long-term plan.

22 What we think is, you have a
23 smaller area, it's easier to maintain
24 it for long-term.

25 MS. ABRAHAM: Cement is not

1 what will prevent the mirex from
2 coming into contact with anybody.
3 There are other safeguards over and
4 above that that will help.

5 AUDIENCE: Do you have any
6 idea how many cubic yards of dirt
7 you're talking about removing in that
8 6-mile stretch back to that site?
9 You're talking 44 acres, you're going
10 to have a mountain of dirt.

11 MS. LOGAN: We're talking
12 about in the stream itself -- and I
13 couldn't bring it to a scale that
14 would make sense on this overhead
15 slide.

16 What we're talking about is a
17 little over 12,000 cubic yards of
18 contaminated soil and sediment.

19 What I was telling people
20 when I was talking to some of the
21 folks back at the table, one of the
22 things that is hard to envision, but
23 it is the case in Middle Fork, is
24 that in the 6 and-a-half miles,
25 there's a lot of areas at the creek

1 bottom that doesn't have any
2 sediment. It's just washed clean and
3 not a lot of contamination.

4 So there is not a huge volume
5 of material in the creek beds
6 itself.

7 And within that area, not all
8 of it is contaminated, or not all of
9 it is equally contaminated.

10 The same with the
11 Floodplains. I was talking to some
12 folks who live near there who are
13 living near a relatively clean area,
14 even though it floods.

15 So we're targeting the most
16 contaminated areas.

17 For example, in this treatment
18 process, we anticipate we're going to
19 be treating 50,000 cubic yards or
20 more. So we're bringing maybe a
21 quarter of that on the site.

22 AUDIENCE: I think you're
23 underestimating that. There's --
24 none of that dirt's never been
25 moved. You're talking about coming

1 in there -- and I don't know how many
2 inches of soil you're talking about
3 within the first half of the mile
4 maybe of that plant. And you're
5 talking about 6 miles.

6 MS. LOGAN: I don't know that
7 your property is one of the ones
8 that's targeted for most of the
9 contamination.

10 AUDIENCE: I don't know why
11 it wouldn't be. It's within that 6
12 and-a-half miles of the plant.

13 MS. ABRAHAM: Are you
14 Mr. Slanker?

15 MR. SLANKER: No. I'm here.

16 AUDIENCE: I own the property
17 next to Phil Slanker right there at
18 the plant. It's in the Floodplain
19 area of what we're talking about.
20 And it's been flooded over several
21 times.

22 I mean, I was in a meeting
23 back in the '70s. A lot of people
24 don't realize the stuff that was made
25 there. Nobody has any idea what

1 agent orange is. It was burned off
2 and it came from that plant.

3 MS. LOGAN: Actually, agent
4 orange was not made at that plant.
5 The records we have indicate that it
6 was not.

7 MS. ABRAHAM: You make a good
8 point, and we might come up against
9 something unexpected. And Mary's
10 worked on quite a few sites. I've
11 worked on quite a few sites. And
12 you're right that we all of a sudden
13 find something we didn't expect. But
14 that's part of what we're trying to
15 build into the remedy process.

16 So if you wind up with
17 something, we still have the ability
18 to deal with it.

19 Our goal is to protect human
20 health and the environment however we
21 get there. This is what we
22 anticipate.

23 If something else happens?
24 Probably.

25 MS. LOGAN: Now, you're

1 talking about something really close
2 to the site. And what we found is
3 that not all of the areas in the
4 Floodplains are equally
5 contaminated.

6 There is a complex hydrology
7 and geology that goes into moving
8 sediments and particles. And I try,
9 when I come out to these meetings,
10 not to talk in technical jargon, but
11 a particle of sediment that's in the
12 water has different properties
13 depending on its weight and
14 composition, and depending how the
15 flow in the stream is going.

16 For example, in Middle Fork,
17 we have a number of different
18 gradients, and that is how steep the
19 creek is as it moves downstream.

20 So if you have a pretty steep
21 gradient and a narrow channel and
22 water is moving faster, stuff in that
23 would move along faster.

24 If you have a wide area and
25 it's fairly flat, things tend to

1 settle down.

2 Not everything is not equally
3 likely to have contaminated deposits
4 on it.

5 So for those of you in the
6 audience that are here and have
7 property within this 6 and-a-half
8 mile stretch, we're not saying we're
9 definitely going to be excavating
10 your property. We know there are
11 four areas that exceed are cleanup
12 goals right now. We have not found
13 every area in the 6 and-a-half area
14 stretch to be equally contaminated.

15 MR. GILBERT: How come
16 there's still chemical trucks coming
17 and going there at 3, 4:00 in the
18 morning?

19 And I called you, Sheila,
20 about a year and-a-half after I
21 called the Perry Township Police --
22 my name is John Gilbert -- and I
23 never got a good answer back. And
24 they're beating around the bush on
25 this.

1 There's chemical trucks --
2 why are they in there, 3, 4:00 in the
3 morning?

4 MS. PASTOR: We have someone
5 to help answer your question.

6 MR. TOMALSKI: We work with
7 organics. We have a pump and
8 treatment system. We're pumping
9 chrome water, which is highly
10 contaminated. We collect it in a
11 tank. And once or twice a month,
12 a truck comes on the site, just as
13 the truck you're seeing, and picking
14 up the water and taking it to a
15 treatment facility.

16 The 4:00 in the morning,
17 it's not wise. Constance is the
18 company, and it should not happen
19 anymore that somebody comes in the
20 morning at 3:00. He should be there
21 at 8:00, 9:00, and he should talk to
22 our onsite engineer from Salem.

23 There's nothing chemically
24 going in. It is being pumped out of
25 there.

1 MS. ABRAHAM: I went with one
2 of my hazardous waste inspectors, and
3 Riner -- we always do it, but we
4 asked questions about the truck and
5 looked at all the manifests and
6 everything that went up.

7 We can assure you that I and
8 my inspector are fully satisfied that
9 this is far than a normal delivery.

10 You know how truckers are.

11 MR. GILBERT: But this is
12 still a nightmare that's going on.

13 I live around that area, and
14 we're not stupid people. You don't
15 know exactly what you're dealing
16 with. You have no idea how long it's
17 going to take for mirex to break
18 down.

19 So you can try to snow some
20 of us. But this guy right here and
21 the other people living right by this
22 -- you don't know what you're doing.
23 I'm not trying to sound nasty, but
24 you really don't. This is a lot of
25 speculation that's going on in here.

1 AUDIENCE: I just want to
2 know where they're taking the
3 contaminated water.

4 MR. TOMALSKI: In Dayton,
5 Ohio.

6 MS. ABRAHAM: If anybody has
7 questions about it, you can come to
8 my office, I can mail you the
9 hazardous manifests.

10 We're truly not trying to
11 snow anybody. There has been a lot
12 of data collected at the site. I
13 mean, Riner can tell you, I've been
14 working at the site, not as a project
15 manager, but in other capacities,
16 trying to get it to where it is. And
17 there's a lot of data. We're looking
18 at lots of different things.

19 And honestly, I can only give
20 you my professional opinion, that
21 it's not a snow job.

22 MR. GILBERT: Well, that's
23 your opinion. But we've lived
24 through it.

25 MS. ABRAHAM: I understand.

1 And believe me, we feel for you.

2 AUDIENCE: What is the
3 specific gravity of mirex? Do you
4 know, approximately?

5 AUDIENCE: Mirex is actually
6 a solid. It's not a liquid. It was
7 manufactured as a white crystal and a
8 solid. It's stuck to soil particles
9 that move like that.

10 AUDIENCE: Would it be
11 greater than 1?

12 AUDIENCE: Yes.

13 AUDIENCE: Heavier than
14 water, then?

15 AUDIENCE: Yeah.

16 AUDIENCE: It's not water
17 soluble, right?

18 AUDIENCE: It's not water
19 soluble. It sticks to particles.

20 AUDIENCE: Can you tell them
21 what the half life of mirex is?
22 Isn't it 100 years?

23 MS. LOGAN: Half life is
24 basically the time it takes for the
25 concentrations to become half of what

1 they currently are.

2 The way the chemicals break
3 down in the environment, it depends
4 on how much organic carbon there is,
5 what the temperature is, what kind of
6 microorganisms exist.

7 So no, that question cannot
8 be answered with an easy number.

9 AUDIENCE: I think there is
10 an answer, and it's close to 100
11 years.

12 AUDIENCE: If you know our
13 environment, you know what the
14 temperature range is. And the
15 studies that you've done, you should
16 be able to come up with some estimate
17 of half life.

18 MS. LOGAN: One of the
19 things that we've considered is this
20 monitored natural recovery,
21 Alternative B, that we're not
22 proposing, and we estimated that it
23 will not reach the cleanup goals for
24 30 years or more in this environment.

25 AUDIENCE: I came in a little

1 bit late.

2 What other ideas does anybody
3 have? Why does it have to go to this
4 plant?

5 My parents, their land abuts
6 the side of that. They're on the
7 other side of that fence.

8 So why does it have to go
9 back to the plant? Why can't it go
10 back to a dump site already for that?

11 MS. LOGAN: Well, we actually
12 considered the option of taking it to
13 another dump site, and part of the
14 reasoning that we put into not
15 proposing that is because there are
16 not a lot of landfills that handle
17 mirex material, and we have more
18 mirex on the site that we're going to
19 be managing for perpetuity.

20 So the stuff we're taking
21 back to the site is cleaner than what
22 is currently there, and it will be
23 left there.

24 We feel that we can put it
25 under a cover, monitor it and manage

1 it better in one place than to take
2 it to a number of different landfills
3 that won't be monitoring for that
4 chemical.

5 AUDIENCE: But there's people
6 that went through lawsuits and
7 fighting that. That stunk so bad at
8 my parents' place for years while
9 they were operating. And the plant
10 was blowing it up and they were
11 getting it fixed.

12 But it doesn't make sense
13 that those people have to go through
14 that all over again when they're
15 going to have all this massive
16 amounts of dirt sitting back there.
17 You're going to have runoff.

18 MS. LOGAN: We're going to
19 cover it with clean material and
20 monitor it.

21 AUDIENCE: So how is it going
22 to go from the trucks into the site?
23 It's going into the air, right?

24 MS. LOGAN: Part of our
25 construction plans would be to do air

1 monitoring.

2 And no, it tends not to
3 evaporate to the air because it tends
4 to stick to the soil particles.

5 So we would do some
6 monitoring.

7 The chemicals your parents
8 were smelling probably were different
9 chemicals, and some of them smell
10 more than others. And I think
11 probably what they were smelling are
12 the things that are now our problem
13 in the ground water.

14 AUDIENCE: What happens with
15 the property value to all those
16 people there? They've got wells.
17 You have test sites on Coran's
18 property that you guys are supposed
19 to be testing. What's in the water
20 on their wells?

21 You have two families back
22 behind my parents, and so what
23 happens with that when you bring more
24 dirt in?

25 MS. LOGAN: One of the things

1 -- and this is not going to satisfy
2 you.

3 But one of the things that
4 EPA does not deal with is dealing
5 with property value. Our mission is
6 to put together an assessment of what
7 the problem is from an environmental
8 and public health perspective, and
9 clean up that problem.

10 What we hope is that when the
11 cleanup is complete, the property
12 values can do whatever they're going
13 to do in the natural market. And
14 when we're done with the job, it'll
15 respond to market pressures.

16 But we do not deal with
17 property values as part of the
18 Superfund process.

19 AUDIENCE: How many sampling
20 sites are there between -- in that
21 6 and-a-half mile stretch in the
22 stream itself and in the Floodplains?

23 MS. LOGAN: Can I ask for
24 your help on that, Steve?

25 STEVE: In that section,

1 several hundred.

2 MS. LOGAN: We had close to
3 400 in the whole 40 miles?

4 STEVE: But there's much more
5 concentration in that area.

6 AUDIENCE: Are they all
7 monitored in the same frequency, or
8 are they all one-time samples?

9 MS. LOGAN: We have had a
10 number of samples over the years.
11 The most recent samples were in 2005
12 and 2006. But there are samples
13 going back from the '80s, '90s, late
14 '90s. And we did different locations
15 sometimes. We did different fish
16 more often. I think the Department
17 -- Ohio Environmental Protection
18 Agency has done fish sampling.

19 We have a lot of data, and
20 it's not the same every year, and
21 it's not in the same and every
22 location.

23 AUDIENCE: According to your
24 cleanup rules, specifically on Middle
25 Fork of Little Beaver Creek, what is

1 actually the level of the mirex that
2 would trigger the site to be cleaned
3 up? Is it the same for Floodplain
4 soils as well as the sediment?

5 MS. LOGAN: No. The levels
6 that the cleanup targets were
7 developed as ranges, and the levels
8 are different in Floodplain soils in
9 the sediment.

10 So, for example, in the
11 sediment, we're more concerned with
12 mirex getting up into the fish.

13 And it was a developed range
14 that what -- we're looking at is
15 about -- well, it's a range, but it's
16 probably about half a part per
17 million to about .7 -- three quarters
18 of a part per million.

19 A part per million is a
20 measure of chemical contamination
21 where you have one part of
22 contamination in a million parts of
23 soil or a million parts per
24 sediment. And it's really hard to
25 envision how small that number is.

1 It's -- one inch in almost 16 miles
2 is about a part per million. It's a
3 small number.

4 But that's the range we're
5 looking at for the sediment.

6 For the Floodplain soil,
7 we're more concerned with the small
8 mammals that live in the Floodplain,
9 and if there were cattle foraging in
10 the Floodplains.

11 But the targeted range is
12 about 0 to 13 parts per million.
13 What we picked for the plant site was
14 1 part per million for the cleanup
15 goal for mirex. And I think that's
16 one of the numbers we're looking at.

17 MR. SLANKER: I'm Bill
18 Slanker. We have 140 acres right
19 against the site. Everything that
20 came off the site that this gentleman
21 owns came on us first, then went down
22 to Mr. Griffith's property and went
23 down to everyone else's.

24 We had cattle there. I have
25 seen cows with no hair, no hide. We

1 saw it. We saw the ponds go over.
2 In the ponds, all the fish all end up
3 on the bank dead.

4 When you bring all this stuff
5 up there on the site, is it going to
6 come back and bring some of that
7 liquid back down? The neighbor girl
8 had a good idea to do that if that's
9 going to do that. We don't want to
10 see it happen.

11 MS. LOGAN: I guess you made
12 several things.

13 I don't think there's anybody
14 who would say that that plant was --
15 well, it was operated in a way that
16 caused a lot of environmental damage,
17 but it was operated at a time when
18 there was no environmental
19 regulations. It was a very
20 contaminated site.

21 MR. SLANKER: We heard the
22 barrels explode.

23 And we moved here in 1949,
24 and we got the cows. The last cow we
25 had on our property was back in 1982

1 before my dad passed away in '84.
 2 The cattle was all gone. We couldn't
 3 raise them. We would try to keep the
 4 fence up and they would still get
 5 out. We tried to keep the fence
 6 upright. I know that's not your
 7 fault.

8 I'm trying to say,
 9 Mr. Bricker's right. He had no
 10 cattle over there, but had stuff on
 11 his property that all went down his
 12 way, too.

13 MS. LOGAN: Our intention is
 14 that when it's taken back to the
 15 site, it's managed in a way that it
 16 is not running off into your
 17 property. And we will monitor and
 18 inspect to ensure that.

19 MR. SLANKER: There's tons
 20 and tons of slack up there and tons
 21 and tons of troughs up there. I know
 22 it's catching water and catching
 23 stuff, and they got to take the water
 24 and dispose it.

25 I just wanted to bring it up

1 that I don't want to see it go back
 2 up there myself and come back down
 3 and we can't do nothing.

4 AUDIENCE: Do we have an
 5 option at all, or is this it?

6 MS. PASTOR: This is what
 7 we're proposing. This is a
 8 recommendation.

9 AUDIENCE: So we could do
 10 petitions and maybe stop?

11 MS. PASTOR: You can do
 12 petitions, but we're in the middle of
 13 the comment period, and what you're
 14 able to do is voice your opinion.
 15 You can do that for the record.
 16 We'll move into the comment portion
 17 of the meeting tonight.

18 Petitions, it's not really up
 19 for a vote. If people have general
 20 concerns, maybe you can actually read
 21 some of the information, and perhaps
 22 we've missed something. This is the
 23 time to bring that to our attention.
 24 Maybe not necessarily tonight, but
 25 during the comment period, which runs

1 through the middle of August still.

2 Certainly, this is just a
 3 proposal.

4 We have been known in certain
 5 cases to modify our recommendation.
 6 It's not cast in stone tonight. We'd
 7 like to think that it's a good
 8 proposal. We've done a lot of work,
 9 a lot of research and a lot of
 10 studies. As you know, it's taken us
 11 a lot of time to get to this point.

12 AUDIENCE: I think it's good
 13 that you guys have a proposal, but
 14 that plant was supposed to be a good
 15 proposal for this town. And the
 16 people that brought it in did not
 17 live around it.

18 MS. PASTOR: And that is what
 19 Mary was explaining when there was no
 20 environmental laws.

21 AUDIENCE: There's always the
 22 best of intentions, but things go
 23 wrong. And things could go wrong
 24 bringing that crap back in.

25 MS. LOGAN: I've gotten more

1 than 20 years of experience in
 2 Superfund cleanups for the U.S.
 3 Government, and I know that
 4 communities are very frustrated
 5 sometimes when they've been living in
 6 sites that are contaminated. And I
 7 know that for us to come in and say
 8 trust us to do the right thing is
 9 very hard to sometimes swallow.

10 But I think that one of the
 11 things that I have seen in my
 12 experience is sometimes people don't
 13 want -- not in my backyard.

14 But quite honestly, the
 15 problem is here and has been here for
 16 a long time, and trying to ship it to
 17 someone else's community -- when you
 18 have contamination -- we've already
 19 picked a remedy for the site soil and
 20 for the ground water, and there's
 21 going to be contamination staying at
 22 that plant site at higher levels than
 23 what we're talking about. And we
 24 took comments on that remedy a few
 25 years ago.

1 The site itself has got mirex
2 on there. We are going to have to
3 monitor and measure it, and we
4 believe we can do this in a way to
5 keep it from getting out into the
6 environment.

7 AUDIENCE: Why do you have to
8 go to the plant, put the concrete
9 over the whole area there and take
10 that dirt from downstream that's so
11 contaminated and have someplace
12 that's made for that type by the
13 government? They've got these
14 massive sites that that stuff goes
15 into.

16 MS. LOGAN: I've tried to
17 respond. I think the best thing for
18 you to do is to make an official
19 comment during the comment period
20 saying that that that's your
21 preference. We will consider that
22 before we select our final remedy.

23 MS. PASTOR: And maybe we'll
24 take a couple more questions and
25 we'll go into that comment portion.

1 AUDIENCE: It seems like we
2 keep coming back and hearing the same
3 thing all over again.

4 Last time, I think you said
5 it was about \$19 million to spend on
6 that cleanup, and now it's down to \$3
7 million. Is that right?

8 MS. LOGAN: This is an
9 addition. This additional \$3.5
10 million is in addition. So the total
11 cost is now \$24 million. This is not
12 in substitute. It's in addition to
13 that.

14 AUDIENCE: I never took
15 chemistry and I avoided physics, so I
16 don't feel qualified to comment, but
17 it strikes me very unusual that
18 you're going to have an excavation of
19 that soil of that place and put it in
20 the ponds. Is that my understanding
21 of that? The ponds that are still
22 there? I thought the ponds had been
23 eliminated.

24 Is Rutgers Nease? It's not
25 just Nease, isn't it?

1 MS. LOGAN: Right. Nease is
2 gone. And Rutgers has never operated
3 at the plant site, but they bought
4 the Nease Chemical Company that had
5 plants all over the U.S. So Rutgers
6 got stuck with the problem,
7 basically.

8 So Rutgers was not making
9 chemicals there, but they're doing
10 the cleanup.

11 You're asking about in terms
12 of the ponds.

13 The ponds have been filled in
14 with dirt, and we're going to do
15 additional filling in. The stuff
16 from the Floodplains and sediments
17 may go into the ponds and it may go
18 into other areas, because we need to
19 level off -- shape the plant so the
20 way that the water flows through it
21 doesn't carry contamination.

22 So there's going to be a lot
23 of placement of dirt and movement to
24 make sure that the water, when it
25 rains, flows so it doesn't carry

1 contamination.

2 So it may go into ponds or
3 other places at the plant site, but
4 it will be under clean material.

5 AUDIENCE: What is the
6 difference between plan A and plan B
7 for this?

8 MS. LOGAN: Plan A is do not
9 think.

10 Plan B is clean up the banks
11 and clean up the small creek that
12 drains the site, and let nature clean
13 up Middle Fork of Little Beaver
14 Creek.

15 And plan C involves us, which
16 is what we're proposing, getting the
17 worst contamination out of Middle
18 Fork as well as the Floodplains.

19 AUDIENCE: I don't trust
20 nature to clean it up. Nature's
21 never had to fight anything like
22 that.

23 Incidentally, I've lived near
24 Middle Fork of Beaver Creek all my
25 life, and since 1975, I've watched

1 Middle Fork of Little Beaver never
2 freeze for ice skating. Never. And
3 we had ice skating parties every
4 winter as I grew up. The creek will
5 not freeze anymore. There's nothing
6 in it that does that. I was just
7 wondering if EPA was aware of that.

8 Also, at the county fair
9 that's going on now, EPA had, in
10 concert with the ODNR booth, and were
11 saying how many beautiful fish are
12 now edible in Middle Fork of Little
13 Beaver. All sorts of fish. I never
14 heard of them before.

15 And I said nobody better
16 catch them and eat them, because the
17 only fish that anybody's ever caught
18 in Beaver Creek in Lisbon has been
19 people fishing for carp that they fed
20 to their cats. That was that.
21 That's what happened in Beaver Creek
22 in my lifetime.

23 MS. ABRAHAM: I think I would
24 like Steve to help. Steve is with
25 the Ohio Department of Natural

1 Resources, and he's also the scenic
2 rivers manager.

3 There are parts of Middle
4 Fork of Beaver Creek -- looking at
5 the creek itself is scenic.

6 Our agency is of the opinion
7 that Middle Fork of Little Beaver
8 Creek would be a much better habitat,
9 but our technical people believe that
10 it's Lisbon's spillway that's
11 preventing that from happening, but
12 the mirex itself -- but I would like
13 Steve to answer the question, if you
14 could, on the variety of fish.

15 STEVE: Well, there have been
16 a number of fish surveys down in the
17 lower portion of Little Beaver
18 Creek.

19 But there really are a
20 diverse population of fish, and it's
21 been documented over 40 different
22 species of fish in Little Beaver
23 Creek.

24 AUDIENCE: Now?

25 STEVE: Yes.

1 In fact, August 9th we're
2 going to be doing a fish monitoring
3 demonstration down at Beaver Creek
4 State Park as part of a big youth day
5 that we're having down there. And
6 the monitoring portion will start at
7 2:00 and go to 4:30.

8 So everyone's welcome to come
9 out.

10 And we'll be using electric
11 fishing, which we apply electric
12 charge to temporarily stun the fish
13 and put them in aquariums for people
14 to see to identify the different
15 species. We don't get every species
16 when we do that. Typically, we'll
17 get between 15 and 20 different
18 species of fish when we do that
19 demonstration.

20 AUDIENCE: That's not what
21 was listed at that booth.

22 STEVE: So we plan to do that
23 again, just a week from Saturday on
24 the 9th.

25 AUDIENCE: You're talking

1 about starting this in a few years,
2 correct?

3 MS. LOGAN: Yes.

4 AUDIENCE: I guess the first
5 question is, is it necessary to wait
6 a few more years?

7 Secondly, from people that
8 have lived in this area for a long
9 time, they've heard, "We're going to
10 clean it, we're going to clean it,
11 we're going to clean it."

12 What assurance do we have
13 that it is in fact going to start
14 then? And what do you estimate as
15 the time to the point when you're
16 saying, "Okay, we're now in the
17 monitoring mode," as opposed to a
18 further cleanup?

19 MS. LOGAN: Well, I think --
20 the Superfund process is a lengthy
21 process, because the problems that
22 we're dealing with our complex, and
23 especially when you're dealing with a
24 6 and-a-half mile stretch of river,
25 you have -- even though the amount

1 we're taking out is a lot, you have a
2 lot of complex engineering that goes
3 into where do we have to go to get
4 access to the river, how do we move
5 it in, how do we move the equipment
6 in, how do we get the sediment out,
7 how do we truck it back to the
8 disposal site.

9 So that process of designing,
10 doing the engineering and the
11 planning, getting permission from the
12 property owners, that we will have to
13 get access from, takes time.

14 So that's part of what's
15 built into the time.

16 The other thing that's very,
17 very important, we've already picked
18 a cleanup for the plant site itself,
19 and we're in the process of designing
20 it, but it hasn't been built yet.
21 You want to clean up the source of
22 the problem before you clean up the
23 downstream portion, because we would
24 hate to clean up the creek first and
25 then have something happen to

1 recontaminate it.

2 So there is portions of it
3 that has to go in advance, or at
4 least concurrently with the creek
5 cleanup.

6 So that's what we will be
7 doing in that time period between the
8 time we get into the actual -- the
9 big equipment in the creek.

10 Once we get started, though,
11 we anticipate that the job can be
12 done in one construction season so
13 that really most of the removal and
14 trucking will be done in a year, or
15 less than a year of construction
16 season.

17 AUDIENCE: And you're
18 estimating by 2011. So by 2012,
19 we're in the monitoring season?

20 MS. ABRAHAM: Not quite,
21 because once we do construction, we
22 like things to settle down before we
23 actually begin the monitoring. So we
24 like the ecosystem to recover.

25 We're doing a big cleanup in

1 Ashtabula. We're going to be waiting
2 for at least three to five years to
3 begin monitoring. You have to give
4 the ecosystem time to recover.

5 So if we finish construction
6 in 2011, five years, that's when we
7 will begin monitoring. And then,
8 depending on what comes out of that,
9 we'll get results out of that.

10 MS. LOGAN: We will not fail
11 to monitor -- what she was talking
12 about was the fish.

13 What we will do immediately
14 upon completion is monitor -- if
15 there is any sediment left in the
16 river, whatever levels of that, and
17 if they've reached our cleanup goal,
18 at that point we would officially be
19 in the monitor period.

20 So we will be in monitoring,
21 but we'll have a schedule for when we
22 take samples.

23 MS. ABRAHAM: So the creek
24 would be safe to contact, which it
25 still is now. But for the fish, you

1 might have to wait a little longer.

2 AUDIENCE: Once all the
3 cleanup is complete and you've gone
4 through all the stages, is any
5 portion of the 40 miles that we're
6 dealing with, would there be any
7 advisories, warnings, cautionary
8 figures or anything posted that we
9 would need to be aware of in that
10 period?

11 MS. LOGAN: Well, I think
12 that in terms of the fish, as Sheila
13 said earlier, there's probably --
14 because the mercury, that's totally
15 unrelated to the Nease site, there
16 will be limitations on how much fish
17 you eat because of the mercury and
18 possibly the carp for awhile, because
19 of the mirex.

20 In terms of the postings, we
21 believe that the assessment we have
22 done would allow the Department of
23 Health to reconsider and to make a
24 determination on what kind, if any,
25 advisory will be necessary.

1 From the Superfund point of
2 view, there is no risk from direct
3 contact right now. It's safe to go
4 in the creek.

5 MS. ABRAHAM: To follow-up on
6 what Mary is saying, for the fish, we
7 don't know until we have actually
8 done the cleanup and come back and
9 monitored. And Ohio EPA has this
10 regulation program where we do the
11 fish monitoring. Pretty much every
12 stream in a certain sequence, once
13 every five years, once every seven
14 years.

15 So we do that with Nease
16 along with Rutgers, but we do our own
17 separate monitoring. And the results
18 of that will be determined.

19 MR. BRUNK: If 2011 is your
20 projected cleanup time, do you have a
21 time that the creek property owners
22 will know what is planned for their
23 particular portion of property?

24 MS. LOGAN: I would say that
25 we will probably -- we will be

1 negotiating with Rutgers to do the
2 work. So in 2009 or 2010, we'll be
3 doing some additional sampling and
4 should be able to have those
5 conversations with the property
6 owners.

7 There's certainly some
8 property owners where we already
9 believe, based on the data we have,
10 that we will need to do work on those
11 properties. But for some of the
12 others, we need to do some additional
13 sampling in that stretch.

14 MR. BRUNK: So do the
15 property owners that you know that
16 are going to need attention, do those
17 property owners know that?

18 MS. LOGAN: Yes.

19 MR. BRUNK: I don't know
20 that, so that would assume that my
21 property is not a priority?

22 MS. LOGAN: What is your
23 name, sir?

24 MR. BRUNK: Brunk, B-r-u-n-k.

25 MS. LOGAN: At this point,

1 yours is not one of the properties
2 that we know to be contaminated to
3 the extent that we need to clean up.

4 AUDIENCE: I think the
5 question we should be asking is, what
6 are the severity of the health
7 effects of mirex? But if our
8 objective is to look at the options
9 for cleanup, should we not be asking
10 the question -- and I certainly see
11 your comparison of the alternatives
12 and the adherence to certain
13 bacteria.

14 But should we not be asking
15 the question, what are the potential
16 risks in the three -- or two, because
17 I think the no action is really not
18 an option. There are really two
19 choices.

20 Are there risks associated
21 with either process that we're not
22 aware of that would be potential
23 risks aside from potential unforeseen
24 things? Are there risks for
25 diverting the water? Are there risks

1 for dredging the sediment up? What
2 risks are associated with each so you
3 can make the decision as to which is
4 the most appropriate?

5 MS. LOGAN: One of the
6 criteria, the short-term
7 effectiveness criteria, actually is
8 intended to take those short-term
9 risks of the remedy itself somehow
10 under consideration.

11 So risks for how much truck
12 traffic is there in the community?
13 Is there resuspension of the
14 contaminated material?

15 I would say that from the
16 point of Feeder Creek -- both of the
17 options are the same -- there is
18 relatively no short-term risks if we
19 develop a plan where the construction
20 workers are operating the way they
21 need to. The diversion of the water
22 is relatively simple.

23 So typically for the
24 construction workers, there's a
25 health and safety plan and parameters

1 that say this is the way you need to
2 do it and you're protected while
3 doing the cleanup.

4 In terms of the Floodplain
5 soil and the sediment in Middle Fork,
6 we will need to consider resuspension
7 of the material when we're working
8 with the sediments.

9 So there's a couple of ways
10 you deal with that. You generally
11 start your construction upstream and
12 move downstream.

13 So if a little -- if you're
14 doing it while it is wet, then your
15 next phase downstream should catch
16 that and it should flow down itself.

17 We have not decided from an
18 engineering perspective whether it's
19 better to do it in wet dredging or
20 dry excavation. If we do dry
21 excavation, that minimizes even more
22 what might be released to the water
23 while you're doing the work.

24 I think comparing option B
25 and option C, the monitoring natural

1 recovery doesn't disturb the sediment
2 at all, so you don't have
3 resuspension issues, you don't have
4 construction issues, but you have
5 uncertainty of how fast the system
6 would recover itself. That's sort of
7 the biggest unknown risk.

8 And with the Floodplain soil
9 construction, what we will do is do
10 some engineering to make sure that
11 stuff doesn't run into the creek
12 while we're doing the soil excavation
13 itself.

14 AUDIENCE: I suppose when you
15 have a torrential downpour that you
16 create a risk of the sediment that
17 you just dredged up --

18 MS. LOGAN: In the case of
19 Feeder Creek, typically you have a
20 system that routes the water that
21 accounts for some contingency of what
22 if we have too much rain, because you
23 might have a plan that says if this
24 starts happening, here's what we do
25 to shut down construction.

1 If we were to use something
2 like sheet piles -- you have to pull
3 the water out of this area anyway.
4 It would fill up with water again and
5 have to be pumped out again.

6 AUDIENCE: To where?

7 AUDIENCE: Would it be
8 clocked on either end of the
9 excavation area?

10 MS. LOGAN: Yes.

11 You see that little wall down
12 there? It's usually blocked up all
13 the way.

14 And you would fill this end
15 over to cover that side and let the
16 water flow on this side once you're
17 done with that.

18 AUDIENCE: The sediment is
19 the most concerned component.

20 MS. LOGAN: We have never
21 found mirex in the water of Middle
22 Fork.

23 AUDIENCE: So when you pump
24 the water, you're not carrying
25 mirex?

1 MS. ABRAHAM: As long as we
2 keep the mirex --

3 STEVE: Filter it.

4 AUDIENCE: So when you're
5 creating the dry beds, are you
6 pumping the water out to the surface
7 of the land, or are you creating
8 another channel?

9 MS. LOGAN: Generally, I see
10 it gets pumped out at some end
11 directly back in through a filtration
12 system.

13 Have you seen other methods?

14 MR. TOMALSKI: You're not
15 pumping it up to the land. You're
16 diverting the water. It stays within
17 the stream channel. You may divert
18 it through pipes, or Mary said a
19 sheet wall, it goes back to the
20 remaining --

21 AUDIENCE: It depends on the
22 amount of water you have in the
23 channel. The amount of water around
24 the water where we dig for material.

25 AUDIENCE: If plan C would

1 come to fruition, what other
2 monitoring for other contamination
3 might be done when you're dredging
4 for material? You're not just
5 talking about mirex being in that
6 area. You've talked about other
7 runoff from the plant, the lead and
8 how much air contaminants from other
9 materials.

10 MS. LOGAN: Actually, our
11 monitoring would focus on mirex.
12 Because while there is a number of
13 chemicals at the plant site itself,
14 what we found at Middle Fork was that
15 mirex is really the only contaminant
16 related to the plant that we are
17 concerned about. So we would monitor
18 for things like suspended solids, how
19 many particles are there so we're not
20 transferring dirt.

21 But mirex would be the focus
22 of our monitoring.

23 MS. ABRAHAM: We actually
24 looked at this when we were doing the
25 risk assessments. We looked at all

1 the chemicals that we could analyze
2 for and try to see which of them came
3 from the plant. And we finally wound
4 up with mirex that we had accounted
5 for. And that was pretty much it
6 from the plant site. We have looked
7 extensively.

8 AUDIENCE: You indicated that
9 the material was going to be taken
10 back to the Nease site and capped
11 with, I assume, a high density
12 polyethylene liner?

13 MS. LOGAN: Some portions
14 will have a plastic liner, and some
15 portions will have a clean soil only,
16 and it will be depending on the
17 concentrations of mirex and our needs
18 to reduce infiltration.

19 AUDIENCE: Is any of it going
20 to have a bottom liner?

21 MR. GILBERT: That's going to
22 leach. It's going to leach. There's
23 no other way that you can't remove
24 that soil and take it someplace else,
25 because people who live around that,

1 we're stuck. And that's the bottom
2 line, whether you want to admit it or
3 not.

4 MS. ABRAHAM: I would ask you
5 to come to our office in Twinsburg --

6 MR. GILBERT: I've dealt with
7 this before. It's a runaround.
8 We're stuck with it, and that's the
9 way it's going to be.

10 You're bringing the soil
11 back. You think you're going to be
12 able to contain it? You're not going
13 to be able to contain it.

14 MS. LOGAN: What you're doing
15 now is making a comment about what
16 you feel about our --

17 MS. PASTOR: So let's move
18 into the comment portion of the
19 meeting, and we'll make you the first
20 commentator, if you don't mind.

21 MR. GILBERT: I've already
22 made my comment.

23 MS. PASTOR: Well, for the
24 court reporter, your name, please?

25 MR. GILBERT: My name's John

1 Gilbert.

2 MS. PASTOR: Thank you very
3 much.

4 So I think we've got all the
5 questions out for now.

6 But this is the comment
7 portion of the meeting, so you will
8 be able to state your opinion, your
9 thoughts for the record. It's just
10 comments. And the court reporter's
11 taking it all down and taking
12 everything down.

13 And your names, please.

14 And if you're affiliated with
15 a public entity, spell your name.
16 She'd appreciate that. And we'll put
17 that -- that will be part of the
18 official record. We'll respond to
19 that.

20 MR. GILBERT: You're not
21 doing anything to help out the
22 citizens of Perry Township and
23 Salem. You're not doing enough.

24 MS. PASTOR: And we're taking
25 your comment down.

1 If you don't want to speak in
2 a room full of people, you can send
3 me those comments and you can e-mail
4 those. But for those who want to
5 speak, have a verbal comment, now
6 would be the time.

7 MR. BRICKER: Abe Bricker,
8 owner of property along Middle Fork.

9 I'm certainly for you
10 cleaning up this problem, and I feel
11 for the people that live right
12 there by the site. And I can
13 certainly -- I think if we would
14 pinpoint the people that would have
15 to take to the nearest site, I think
16 the nearest site is in Ohio, in
17 Dayton, Ohio, where they're taking
18 that other stuff. And that would be
19 a tremendous cost to haul all this
20 dirt there. And we already have a
21 site here that's already here that's
22 already polluted. And it does make
23 sense to me to keep it there. We're
24 going to have to live with looking at
25 it, and three or four years, I'm

1 assuming, to get it drained out and
2 purified again.

3 I'm thinking they're probably
4 thinking about the cheapest way out,
5 and I'm assuming this would be it,
6 onsite, right there.

7 The neighbors are going to
8 take the brunt of it. They have to
9 look at it.

10 But I think it's they're
11 approaching it in the right manner.

12 It's just been way too many
13 years. It should have been done in
14 the early '80s. If it gets done by
15 '20, we'll probably be lucky.

16 But if it gets cleaned up, we
17 should all be happy.

18 MS. PASTOR: Who else would
19 like to make a comment at this time?

20 Yes, sir?

21 MR. ROLOSON: My name is
22 Steve Roloson. I'm with the Ohio
23 Department of Natural Resources, and
24 my position with the Department is
25 the Northeast Ohio River Scenic

1 manager.

2 It's been a long time getting
3 to this point, but we're pleased
4 we're finally here to this point.

5 We've recognized that it's
6 been a problem for some time, and the
7 Department's in the process of
8 preparing our official written
9 response.

10 But I have a few comments I
11 would like to make tonight based off
12 of what I have learned.

13 I just want to mention that
14 Little Beaver Creek and cleaning the
15 Middle Fork starting about 25 miles
16 downstream from the Nease site is
17 designated as one of Ohio's wild
18 scenic rivers. It was designated
19 back in 1974. And Little Beaver
20 Creek is a real treasure to the local
21 residents. It is a very high quality
22 system down in that part of the
23 watershed. It's not only a very high
24 local significance, but also a state
25 and national significance.

1 Little Beaver Creek is a
2 nationally designated scenic river,
3 also. One of only three in the State
4 of Ohio. It's really in the top 1
5 percent of all the streams in the
6 State of Ohio. Something the local
7 residents can be very proud of.

8 I understand their interest
9 in trying to protect where they live.

10 Relating specifically to
11 Alternative C, if you do proceed with
12 that, if you do, I would just like to
13 mention, rivers are very complex
14 systems. They're very dynamic
15 systems and changing all the time. I
16 would urge U.S. EPA and Ohio EPA,
17 when they're doing the engineering
18 cleanup, engineering of the removal
19 and engineering of the excavation and
20 of the sediments, provided that they
21 do go with Alternative C, that they
22 utilize firms that are familiar with
23 river restoration. That's a whole
24 area of specialty. Not necessarily
25 every engineering firm may have the

1 expertise and the staff to do that.

2 I encourage you to utilize
3 engineering firms that do have
4 geofarmologists on board and
5 understand river processes and
6 understand that restoring a river and
7 doing the rehabilitation, restoration
8 of the river requires a lot more than
9 just scooping out the sediments.

10 There's pool sequences,
11 there's gradients that need to be
12 maintained.

13 The substrative stream has a
14 certain stability, and I was reading
15 through the document, and it
16 mentioned there may be situations
17 where material may need to be put
18 back into the stream once the
19 contaminated material is removed.
20 And that has to be done very
21 carefully, because you're putting a
22 loose material back into something
23 that was somewhat stable and has
24 stabilized over a number of years.

25 So that would be one concern

1 that we have.

2 Knowing that mirex does
3 bind very tightly to the sediments,
4 concern about reintroduction of
5 material back into the water, and the
6 soil particles would stay in
7 suspension based on their weight and
8 river velocity. And if you have very
9 fine particles, they can stay there
10 in suspension for a number of hours
11 or days depending on the velocity of
12 the current.

13 And we're very interested in
14 protecting all of Little Beaver
15 Creek.

16 And material that's put into
17 suspension back into Middle Fork
18 could potentially reach our
19 designated portion.

20 So from the little bit that I
21 know at this point, it would seem
22 that looking at the removal in the
23 dry seems like it would be something
24 that you have looked at very closely.

25 I'm very familiar with the

1 project up in Ashtabula, and they
2 actually removed that. It was a
3 suction dredge and was put into these
4 very fine mesh bags where water --
5 and trapped all the sediment in those
6 large bags, and allowed water to come
7 out and sediment to be trapped in
8 these bags.

9 And I wonder if that's
10 something that might be looked at to
11 alleviate these residents' fears that
12 the contaminated sediments are not
13 leaving that Nease site.

14 We never know when there's
15 going to be an extremely hard
16 thunderstorm. And the material
17 that's brought in there may get moved
18 offsite.

19 So that's why I'm
20 recommending that it might be looked
21 at in those containment bags. That
22 type of technology could be utilized
23 to ensure that once that material is
24 excavated and is removed from the hot
25 Floodplain areas, that it stays where

1 you intend it to stay.

2 MS. PASTOR: Thanks for
3 that.

4 MS. COPEWEAVER: My name is
5 Mickey Copeweaver. I'm a resident of
6 Salem.

7 I would just like to point
8 out that I'm somewhat disappointed
9 with the lack of both county and city
10 officials being absent at this
11 meeting this evening. I would hope
12 that they're very well-informed on
13 what's being done. Other than one
14 individual, unless I'm missing
15 someone, I would like to think that
16 it's equally as great a concern for
17 our elected officials.

18 MS. PASTOR: Thank you.
19 Your name?

20 AUDIENCE: Have you ever been
21 to Nease? Have you ever been to that
22 property, you folks that are
23 commenting here today?

24 MS. PASTOR: Let's let
25 everybody get their comments out of

1 the way first.

2 AUDIENCE: I really would
3 like to know who has seen that
4 building.

5 MS. PASTOR: First of all,
6 does anyone else have anymore
7 comments that you would like to get
8 on the record?

9 Yes, sir?

10 MR. MRUGALA: It just seems
11 like this is a loosey-goosey type
12 thing up there, that once the door's
13 open, they can do anything they
14 want. There's no definite
15 guarantees. Everything I hear is
16 shouldn't, or things like that. And
17 there's not going to be a mountain of
18 toxic soil being brought in, but
19 what's one person's definition of a
20 mountain?

21 I grew up about a mile from
22 there, and my mother died from bone
23 cancer. And I don't want to see
24 anymore people dying of cancer at old
25 age. And we don't want to see

1 anymore brought in there. Take it to
2 an area where there's not close
3 houses. Certainly the cheapest way
4 is not the best way. Take it to an
5 area by some waste land. Take it to
6 a dump site, but don't put it around
7 these houses anymore. There's no
8 guarantees. A flood or whatever may
9 cause more problems.

10 MS. PASTOR: Thank you.

11 MS. BAKBRAHM: My parents
12 live out that way.

13 I am wondering how many
14 people were actually tested for
15 mirex. And I never heard, only from
16 the neighbors, who actually have it
17 in their system. Some of the people
18 do. And that was just from living
19 out there.

20 So I would like to see it
21 taken to another dump site and out of
22 the area and take it to Dayton, or
23 wherever it's supposed to be.

24 MR. GILBERT: Absolutely. It
25 should be removed.

1 MS. PASTOR: Someone else?

2 MR. GILBERT: The property
3 owners, they're the people that need
4 to pay for this. And I'm not trying
5 to start fights with any of you
6 people working for the EPA. You're
7 trying to help out. But the bottom
8 line is, Rutgers needs to pay for
9 that to try to help out the citizens
10 of Perry Township and the City of
11 Salem, all of us residents out here.
12 It's for our own good.

13 That soil needs to be
14 removed. Get it out of here somehow.

15 And they need to pay for it,
16 the property owners.

17 And I'm not saying anything
18 else.

19 MS. PASTOR: Anybody else
20 want to add a comment?

21 If you don't want to do that
22 tonight, then please send us a
23 comment via paper mail or
24 electronically or via fax. All that
25 information is in here. You don't

1 even have to use my comment sheet.
2 You can certainly use your own
3 paper.

4 And I'll close the comment
5 portion of the meeting tonight.

6 But the comment period does
7 run through August 13th, so if you
8 wanted to read more of what we're up
9 to -- if you want to read more and
10 look through this and call Mary or
11 Sheila and ask them some questions
12 before you make a comment, they're
13 happy to answer more questions.

14 If you want to read the
15 technical documents, you may.
16 They're probably a little hard to
17 take in. But Mary or Sheila could
18 point you to a section or paragraph
19 or a place so you don't have to read
20 the whole thing.

21 And otherwise, I guess we'll
22 -- thank you for coming.

23 MS. LOGAN: Well, we want to
24 take some more questions.

25 MS. PASTOR: Oh, yeah.

1 You want to know how many
2 people have been to Nease.

3 AUDIENCE: Is there was a
4 business on that property that's
5 working while EPA is doing the
6 cleanup? I mean, is Rutgers there
7 operating, or is Rutgers getting
8 snookered in buying Nease and not
9 knowing that everything was there?

10 MS. LOGAN: You asked about
11 that active building. There's a --
12 we're pumping water out of the ground
13 and treating it to clean it up. So
14 there's a building where the ground
15 water cleanup system is operating.
16 And that will continue to operate
17 until we expand on that system.

18 So it's a building, but it's
19 not a chemical plant.

20 AUDIENCE: It's still a
21 chemical plant?

22 MS. LOGAN: No. It's not a
23 chemical plant.

24 Basically it's just a shed
25 where we're pumping the water out and

1 cleaning up.

2 MS. PASTOR: Well, if there's
3 nothing else, then we thank you for
4 coming, and we can hang around and
5 answer a few more questions.

6 - - - - -
7 (Meeting concluded.)

8 - - - - -
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 C E R T I F I C A T E

2
3 I, Christine M. Schaeffer, Court
4 Reporter in and for the State of Ohio, do
5 hereby certify that the above and foregoing
6 is a true and accurate transcript of the
7 proceedings herein.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Christine M. Schaeffer,
Court Reporter