001455

BLACK & VEATCH

1145 Sanctuary Parkway
Suite 475
Alpharetta, Georgia 30004 USA

Tel: (770) 751-7517
Fax: (770) 751-8322

Black & Veatch Special Projects Corp.

June 4, 2001

Mr. Maher Budeir
Remedial Project Manager
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
South Site Management Branch
61 Forsyth St. SW
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

RE: Transcript of the Koppers Proposed Plan meeting

Dear Maher:

Enclosed are an original transcript as well as a certified copy and condensed version of the proceedings of the Koppers proposed plan meeting held on May 21, 2001. I have prepared copies of the condensed transcript to share with two persons who have requested copies:

Mr. John Mousa
Alachua County EPD
201 S.E. 2nd Avenue, Suite 201
Gainesville, FL 32601

Ms. Shirley Bryan
Alachua County Commission
P.O. Box 2877
Gainesville, FL 32602

If you have a question about the transcript or if I can be of service in any other way, please call me at 770-521-8134.

Sincerely,

BLACK & VEATCH SPECIAL PROJECTS CORP.

Mary A. Wenska

Mary A. Wenska

cc: J. Benante, EPA
L. Spencer, EPA
J. Jenkins, Black & Veatch
J. Mousa, Alachua County EPD
S. Bryan, Alachua County Commission

IN THE MATTER OF:

CABOT CARBON/KOPPERS SITE

PROPOSED PLAN

RECORD OF DECISION AMENDMENT

PUBLIC MEETING

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS had at the County Administration Building, 21 Southeast First Street, Gainesville, Florida, on the 21st of May, 2001, commencing at 6:30 p.m.

REPORTED BY: CANDICE ARENS, IL CSR
JOHNS, STEPHENSON & DUNNE/
ADVANTAGE COURT REPORTERS
515 North Main Street, Suite 300-B
Gainesville, FL 32601
(352) 373-7778

MEETING INDEX

SPECIAL APPEARANCES

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY (EPA)

MR. MAHER BUDEIR,
Remedial Project Manager

MS. JOANNE BENANTE,
Chief, North Florida Section

MR. BILL O'STEEN,
Groundwater Assessment Specialist

MR. KEVIN KOPOREC,
Human Health Risk Specialist

MS. MARY WENSKA,
EPA Contractor for Community Involvement Support

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

MS. BETH COPELAND,
Community Involvement

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

MS. TRACIE VAUGHT,
Project Manager

MS. PEG BONYATA,
Former Site Project Manager

I. INTRODUCTION.

18:36:58 MS. WENSKA: Good evening, ladies and
18:37:02 gentlemen. I would like to welcome all of you
18:37:09 tonight. This is the Cabot Koppers Proposed Plan
18:37:14 meeting for an amendment to the Record of
18:37:16 Decision. What that means is that it is a meeting
18:37:18 which is required under Superfund Law to give the
18:37:23 community a chance to learn about what is being
18:37:26 proposed and what other alternatives were
18:37:28 considered to clean up the Koppers site. And I am
18:37:32 sure all of you are here tonight because you are
18:37:35 interested in that.

18:37:36 And because you are here, the format of
18:37:38 this meeting also includes the opportunity for you
18:37:41 to express concerns or opinions or questions that
18:37:43 you might have about this site. Over here we have
18:37:46 a Court Reporter, and she will transcribe the
18:37:50 meeting for us, so that we'll be able to have a
18:37:51 record of not only what EPA and other agencies
18:37:54 explain, but also what was on your mind, so that
18:37:58 on a later date, those questions and concerns can
18:38:01 be responded to.

18:38:03 Now that I have your attention, let me
18:38:05 get to the heart of the matter. Tonight, EPA
18:38:09 representatives from Atlanta, from Region 4, are

here to talk with you, along with many representatives from the Florida Department of Environmental Protection and representatives from the Florida Department of Health. It's the desire of all of those who have come tonight to share information with you to give you a chance to listen to what is being considered for the Koppers site. It is also the desire of those who have come tonight to give you a chance to speak.

I am Mary Wenska, I work on behalf of EPA Region 4, and I will act as the facilitator for tonight's meeting. The thing about facilitating, and it's really fun for me to be here for you, is it's my job to keep us on track. So I wanted to start at 6:30, and I want you to know time is of the essence, there's lot's to talk about, so we want to end about 8:30. But if we haven't gotten to all of the questions you may have, we can stay after and talk a bit, but our meeting will end at 8:30.

I would like to introduce the people here, and turn the meeting over to them as we go through the agenda. Did everyone get a packet like this? If you open it up, on the inside, it says that there's a listing of times and people

speaking. That's one of the things you will want to follow. But there's lots of other information in there, and if you didn't get to pick one up, please do before you leave.

Also, I want to see if there's any public officials, any folks who represent the citizens of the area, I would like to say hello and recognize you tonight. We are all just in the same boat then, we are all the common folk who come out and want to follow and know more about what's happening. Okay.

I would also like to encourage you, if you haven't done it, before you leave to sign our sign-in sheet. There's a place for names and telephone numbers and addresses, so we can contact you and you can become part of the site mailing list. There's not a lot to do then except to bring on the stars.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It seems that half an hour of public comments may be insufficient. Are you going to have another meeting or something or extend? Because I want to speak and I know there's other people here that want to speak, and I would like some answers.

MS. WENSKA: We will do the best we can

to take all the comments in the time allotted. If we need to do something, we will try to work that out after the meeting is over. I appreciate you're concerns about it and we will try to get to them.

I would like, though, before we go through the speeches, to introduce to you the folks who are in the audience that are going to be speaking from EPA. If all of the EPA folks would stand up and identify themselves, if you go around the room I would like for them to say their name so at least you can hear and see their presence.

MR. BUDEIR: I am Maher Budeir, I am Remedial Project Manager for the project.

MS. BENANTE: Joanne Benante, North Florida Section EPA.

MR. KOPOREC: Kevin Koporec, and I am the Health Risk Assessor for Region 4.

MR. O'STEEN: I am Bill O'Steen, I am a Hydrogeologist of EPA Region 4.

MR. ROMERO: David Romero, Remedial Project Manager for North Florida.

MS. PHILSON: I am Caroline Philson, I am the attorney for the Superfund Program in Atlanta.

MS. WENSKA: Those are the representatives from the Atlanta Region 4.

Florida Department of Environmental Protection representatives, if would you stand up and introduce yourselves.

MS. VAUGHT: Tracie Vaught, Project Manager, Tallahassee, Florida.

MS. BONYATA: I am Peg Bonyata, I used to be the Project Manager for the site.

MS. WENSKA: Now, from the Florida Department of Health.

MS. COPELAND: I am Beth Copeland, with the Florida Department of Health out of Tallahassee, and our job is to come in and make health assessments of chemicals that are found by EPA. And so that's why I am here.

MS. WENSKA: I think the local Health Authority is here.

MR. MYERS: I am Paul Myers, Environmental Health for the County Health Department.

MS. WENSKA: Are there any other agency officials present that I may not have had a chance to note?

MR. RUSSO: I am John Russo with the

Alachua County Environmental Protection Department.

MR. SCHERT: John Schert, University Professor.

MS. WILSON: I am Emily Wilson with the Department of Health and Epidemiology.

MS. WENSKA: Anyone else? I hope, ladies and gentlemen, you can see there are many people available to meet with you and talk with you after the meeting or to listen to your concerns tonight about this site.

What I would like to do now is quickly go over the agenda so you will know more closely what we are going to be doing. Health issues, Beth Copeland will be speaking to those in the next 15 minutes. And then after that, Joanne Benante from EPA Region 4 will give you an overview of the Superfund process, give you a chance to understand what this meeting is about and where it fits in the process.

And then to the heart of the matter. Maher Budeir is the Project Manager of the Koppers site, and he's going to describe to you the alternatives and the preferred alternatives that EPA is proposing for the Koppers site. After

that, as soon as we can get through that, then as many questions and comments we could take we would be happy to get. We appreciate your attention and we look forward to explaining and talking to you about this site.

Beth, I would like to invite you then to talk about the health issues.

II. HUMAN HEALTH ISSUES

MS. COPELAND: Thank you. As I pass by here, I want to remind you that we have for you, first of all, just fliers on what the Department of Health in Tallahassee is doing over here. And this is just a sheet of paper that tells you that there's a resource guide, which of course is out of date, it's government and six months later some of the numbers are different, but this is a guide where you can call anybody about any sort of environmental issue.

The rest of these are what we call Toxic Fact Sheets on the chemicals that the Department of Health found to be of concern. That does not mean that they were the major candidates that we focussed on, but these were the ones that came up on the top of the list. We have fact sheets that will tell you everything that we know

about that particular chemical and its effect on people. So help yourself please to those.

Again, I am Beth Copeland, and I am the communications person for the Department of Health, it's Bureau of Environmental Epidemiology. And I go around and talk to people and take them our message. Our unit is small, and my job is to listen to people to get the information. Sometimes we just don't know things that the community knows, that's a situation we run into, we have no idea what the history was until we started talking to the people that were there. And when we are gone, you are still going to be here, and we want to know what you know, we want to know what you are concerned about.

When you talk to us about a health concern, this is the Department of Health, and I will have the numbers all evening here for you to call, when you talk to us about that concern, we will investigate that concern and give you an answer. So whatever concerns, you let us know, and it will be taken care of, or at least researched to the best of our ability to do so.

So now, the start of this little show is just about what our meeting is on. And it's a

piece of information that works as well for the Department of Health.

There is some talk, we did a health study here in 1981, we did a second study in 1993 and a third study in 1995. And those are available now at the library, I put more copies over there today. Also, if you want copies of those, ask me after the meeting and I will mail you a set of all of the studies we have done so far on the assessments. And if there is new information, if there's been new technology that's came up about the way we do our work, and if there are new circumstances, then we will do a new health consultation if that's what the community wants us to do.

So actually pretty much what I was going to do is a quick overview because we have found this to be helpful. I made this originally for the media and for city officials, and guess what, the folks said we never understood this until you showed it to us, the community. So it's a brief overview. And then Joanne may be following up with almost the same thing, and I am sorry if it's a repeat.

So who does what at a hazardous waste

site? Over here is one of the slides. This is a poster, because it's really important to understand the community is really frustrated, they have a question about clean up or about health, they call somebody and they say, "Oh, not my job, you need to call this person." I know that you know we have never done that to anybody, but that kind of thing happens. And so it will help you to know that each piece of a hazardous waste site cleanup process is handled by different agencies. So let's go with this.

This is what it feels like. Over here is the poor fellow who discovered the mess and all of the stuff that goes on and there are people coming in their moon suits and their telephones and they're scientists. It gets very confusing to the average person on the street to understand what's happening, so here we break it down. And on the left side are the Federal agencies involved, and there are some others and we will get to that in a minute. On the right, are your State departments that are involved. State departments are, for the most part, totally funded by the Federal agencies. But that's because we are their hands and feet and we can get down into

the community, we know you better than someone in Washington knows you.

On the left, we have the Federal Environmental Protection Agency and the Federal ATSDR, that is the Agency for Toxic Substance and Disease Regulatory, sort of a sister agency. Most people are familiar with CDC, except that this agency deals with sicknesses caused by environmental causes. On the other side is the Department of Environmental Protection. We have been introduced to some of our people in the State Department of Health.

In the middle, most important piece, is you, your community and your local health department. From start to finish, it's you. We need to know from you when we are writing up what's been going on at this site, we need to hear from you. Sometimes we find out that the site was used for something we never knew in the past until we hear from you. As we go, we need input from the community. This is what guarantees you are going to get the best solution possible.

Next would be the County Health Department. And what they do, they can be the first person who hears about there's a mess out

there. A fellow finds something and calls somebody and it ends up with the Health Department and Environmental Health calls over there. They may refer it to the State or Federal agency after they go out and take a look at it. They may test the wells or make some other tests. They can get early input from the people who live around there: What do you think this is? What's been going on out there? And they are part of your community.

And the State Department of Health has a direct link with your local Department of Health and they are here right in the middle of it, so they are the liaison. The Department of Environmental Protection usually takes more samples. Remember, this is a very brief and summarized overview. They look around and they get to ask these questions: What's here and of course how much? How much is here? Table salt can be poisonous at a certain level. So it's very important to know how much of the chemical is there.

They take a look and see, gosh, this is going to be a tiny little thing, I think we can handle it, or this is a biggie, we better get on the phone and call EPA, we need help. They also

work with the responsible party, whoever was responsible for this mess. They work with them to try to get them to help clean it up and they call in EPA when it's needed.

The Department of Health conducts the public health assessment. We don't come in until late in the process, in fact, in terms of how long it's been going on. DEP may be involved for a time, a year or two years, then EPA comes in, maybe involved for two years, at some point, EPA signals us there's something here they would like for us to check for health, we come out to do a public health assessment, there's several kinds we do, we get community input, which make recommendations to other agencies.

The Department of Health does not make rules and regulations or fine people about hazardous waste sites. Our power comes from information and education, we tell the community, we tell the press what we found and what we recommend needs to be done to protect people's health. And that's where you, the people in this wonderful country of America, have the right to stand up and say this is what we need.

And of course, we are working closely

with all the other agencies. EPA does everything. Joanne is going to go over that in a minute. They have a few things they add in. They can make these rules and enforce them, where we cannot, they have large clean-up engineers, they can enforce payment to get a place cleaned up. They keep the community informed, they give grants so the communities can have the funds to hire someone to come in and explain these highly technical reports that come out. And if there is a danger to people, they call the State Department of Health to come in and see what needs to be done.

Briefly, the connection between the Agency for Toxic Substance and the Department of Health is they fund it 100 percent. We are a section of six people for the entire State of Florida. There's a map on the back wall showing the sites that we are working on currently. It's a tremendous amount of work, but ATSDR takes care of everything we do. They fund it 100 percent, and other states, there are 24 or 25 other states, they contract with them to do their own work.

Two things briefly. A lot of people don't know about OSHA and NIOSH that are so helpful for the community. OSHA regulates the

currently working people. If you quit your job this afternoon, tomorrow morning they can do nothing for you. If you are not currently working at the place, there's nothing they can do except you have the right to get some data. That data is going to be your medical records, any medical records that the company may have about you and any records they have about environmental hazards that were there while you were there if they did air monitoring or whatever was done. So OSHA can help you get those things.

NIOSH, on the other hand, is the research arm. They are brought up often. But what they do is they get out and see, well, now, OSHA said this is safe, we are not sure, let's go out and get some more info. And then they say, we don't think that's a right number, let's change it. They don't have the power to change it, but one thing they can do is sometimes they can look at a past work condition. That's very difficult. It's very difficult for any of us to dig up information from the past if they were not keeping records about what was in the air, what was in the water, what would be dumped on the ground, there's no way to know what happened in the past. So it's

hard to make an assessment about what health effect it might have. NIOSH has the ability to do some of that.

Each agency takes the same sample data, DEP gets samples and local Health Department gets samples and EPA gets samples. And the Department of Health does not take samples, we take what everyone else has and work on that. Each of us compares the amount of chemical that was in that sample with what our guidelines say. We'll talk a little more about that in a minute. If the amount of chemical in that sample is higher than what our guideline says, it becomes a contaminant of concern. That's the label you will hear for that agency.

And why do those lists differ? We see every once in a while we get questions from the community that's confused, because EPA says these are our contaminant concerns, we publish our list and it's going to be all of the same chemicals but a lot less. They may have 30 or 32 at one of our sites, and we only came up with six or eight. Here's the reason: First, there's little known about a lot of contaminants, so it's going to be -- it's a new science.

EPA and DEP also have to be concerned about the effects on small plants and animals, one-cell plants and animal. DOH, Department of Health, is interested solely in the health of human beings. We are always looking at big people, little people, pregnant women, elderly, children, people with disabilities. Right now we have over 500 Superfund sites in the State of Florida. We have around 60 working MPL sites -- that's an EPA category they will talk more about -- and our team currently has 25 that are hot. These sites seem to never close, never finish. EPA does close down a few, but they can come -- we call them dormant because they can awake at any time.

We had this site, we were through doing our part, and things have changed, so here we are back on this site. When we have these partnerships, the community, the media, the responsible party and other agencies, we get the best solution for that specific community.

So here is some stuff to remember. First of all, we have a tollfree number. It's going to be printed on all of our materials up there. Any time you can use that one, I urge you

18:56:53 to. And again, I am Beth Copeland, the supervisor
18:56:53 of our little section. And we are always open for
18:57:08 your questions. I will close this down and that
18:57:08 will do mine right now.
18:57:09 MS. WENSKA: Thank you very much, Beth.
18:57:09 And I know you might have some thoughts for Beth
18:57:12 and questions, and she will be available to us as
18:57:15 soon as we get a chance to get a little further
18:57:17 along in the program.
18:57:18 If you want to follow some of the
18:57:20 slides that are being shown, they are behind your
18:57:21 agenda, so you will be able to follow and make
18:57:24 notes if you like.
18:57:25 The next person who will be speaking is
18:57:29 Joanne Benante, Chief of the North Florida Section
18:57:31 of EPA Region 4 in Atlanta. She will be talking
18:57:34 about the Superfund process.
18:57:37 MS. BENANTE: Can you all hear me or
18:57:38 would you rather me use the microphone?
18:57:43 UNKNOWN PERSON: The microphone.

III. OVERVIEW OF THE SUPERFUND PROCESS

18:57:44 MS. BENANTE: No problem. Is this
18:57:46 better? Okay.
18:57:48 I am going to talk a little bit about
18:57:51 the Superfund process in general to help you

18:57:54 understand a little bit about what we have to deal
18:57:57 with on the Superfund.
18:58:11 What is Superfund? Back in 1980,
18:58:17 Congress passed the Comprehensive Environmental
18:58:22 Response, Compensation and Liability Act, called
18:58:25 CERCLA, also known as Superfund, to deal with
18:58:29 hazardous waste sites that were abandoned and were
18:58:31 highly contaminant.
18:58:32 In 1986, they amended that law to
18:58:35 include some other things. We learned some things
18:58:38 over the six years on how to do Superfund better
18:58:40 and it was amended in '86 to make the law better.
18:58:45 From that, EPA took the law that was
18:58:50 given to us by Congress and developed regulations.
18:58:51 Those regulations are called the National Oil and
18:58:55 Hazardous Substance Pollution Contingency Plan,
18:58:57 NCP. That's what guides us at EPA. That's what
18:59:02 NCP is.
18:59:04 What did the NCP say we can do or we
18:59:06 cannot do? A lot of times in the law or
18:59:09 regulations there are things maybe personally I
18:59:10 disagree with or maybe things I do like, but I
18:59:14 have to follow the NCP, the agency has to follow
18:59:16 the NCP and the laws that were set out by Congress
18:59:19 on the how to deal with Superfund or surplus

18:59:23 cleanups.
18:59:25 Under Superfund, there are basically
18:59:27 two different kinds of response actions: Removal
18:59:33 actions and remedial actions. Removal actions are
18:59:35 the short-term smaller cleanups. They could
18:59:38 include emergency responses, for example, if
18:59:40 there's a train wreck or a tanker spill or
18:59:44 something that has to be dealt with immediately.
18:59:46 And they can evacuate people if need be, clean it
18:59:50 up within a few days or few hours, they take care
18:59:53 of it. Or there may be a little longer removal
18:59:56 actions that -- I think up to $2 million and six
18:59:59 months to a year to clean it up, and those are
19:00:02 smaller type cleanups, believe it or not. Under
19:00:04 the Superfund program, those are removal actions.
19:00:06 The next set is remedial actions.
19:00:08 These are longer term, very involved cleanups.
19:00:13 And I know one of the questions you are asking,
19:00:17 because you live near the site and a lot of times
19:00:18 we get this question in remedial actions, is why
19:00:20 the heck is this taking so long? You have been
19:00:22 studying this site for 10 years, when are you
19:00:26 going to clean it up? And all I can say is that's
19:00:31 how long it takes. We want to do it right and we
19:00:32 want to do it the best way we can, and sometimes

19:00:34 it takes 10 years.
19:00:36 This particular site, I think, was
19:00:37 operating since 1918. Well, it may take ten years
19:00:41 or it may take 20 years to clean it up. We can't
19:00:44 do it in a year or two. The remedial response
19:00:47 actions are long-term big deal cleanups.
19:00:53 Now, through both of these processes,
19:00:55 and in particular the remedial one, because it
19:00:58 takes so long, there's community involvement. We
19:01:02 come out at different times, and we will talk
19:01:02 about that a little later, to make sure we have
19:01:04 community involvement in the process. Because
19:01:06 oftentimes you are living near the site, you have
19:01:09 to deal with it. I am in Atlanta, you are next
19:01:11 door, you have to deal with these. We want to
19:01:14 know what your input is, what we can do to try to
19:01:18 make this cleanup better for you or other
19:01:19 residents that live nearby, in the community
19:01:22 nearby.
19:01:22 Also, under the law and regulations, we
19:01:25 have technical assistance grants. I am not sure
19:01:26 offhand if there's a technical assistance grant at
19:01:30 this site. But EPA will give a community group up
19:01:33 to $50,000 to hire someone to interpret a lot of
19:01:36 this data, scientific data, that can be confusing

and try to boil it down to something that makes sense to the community.

Here are some of the steps in the remedial process. Since the Koppers site is going through the remedial process, I am going to focus in on that.

First of all, with any site, there's discovery of the site. And that may happen in a number of different ways. Years ago, I think we required notifications of different industries to inform EPA of their operations and we discovered a lot of sites that way. Oftentimes, discovery comes from the State, they may be inspecting the site over here across the street and they take a look and they will discover a Superfund site over there.

And oftentimes, the sites are discovered by the community groups, they will call and tell EPA there is a site I live in, blah-blah-blah, and they will want the State out there. And oftentimes, we get Superfund sites that way, as well.

The next step is to do a preliminary assessment where in Florida the State goes out there, looks at the site, finds out what

operations are going on and tries to determine whether or not it could be a Superfund site. If they think this is a potential Superfund site -- actually, let me stop right here. I am using the wrong terminology.

Once we discover it, it becomes a Superfund site. That's why there's 500 Superfund sites. Now, a lot of times through the process they get kicked out, because of no further action or they may be cleaned up or under the short-term removal emergency response action. Only a few of those come through the National Priority List, or the NPL long-term site.

So we go through this pipeline from remedial assessment, is the site bad enough to be an NPL site? If the answer is yes, we go to the next step: Site inspection, making some samples. And if the samples show we have contaminants out there that are above the action level, no, kick it out, yes, we will go onto the next step, which is an expanded site investigation, let's go out and take a few more samples and make sure we do have a bad site.

And if we do, then this site gets proposed on the National Priorities List as

finalized on the National Priorities List. And these are the worst toxic sites in the nation. And I guess there's about 50 of them, I think, Beth said here in Florida. A lot of those, as they go through the process, as the review incidents will show, but right now there are 50 active ones.

Then we do this big long-term remedial investigation to try to determine the rate and extent of contamination: Is it in the soil, is it in the groundwater, is it in the surface water, is it in the sediment? We try to find out all of the contamination out there and how far it extends and from that try to figure out how best to clean it up.

The next step, the Feasibility Study, goes through all the different alternatives there are out there to clean up that site, what's best for that site. We have to look at a no-action alternative, but we may look at some kind of buyer remediation, some kind of solidification tapping, low temperature thermal absorption, lots of different technologies out there for different kinds of waste. And that Feasibility Study will look at all of those and compare and use the nine

criteria that's set out in the NCP, those are our regulations, that nine criteria to balance to try to select a remedy.

This is the next step, we come out, like we are today, with a proposed plan on how we plan to clean up that site. And we get the community's input on that proposed plan.

From that input, we go onto the next step of finalizing the Record of Decision. This is a document, legal document, that says this is what we are going to do to clean up this site here in the Koppers site. Now, oftentimes, as you see here tonight, we will have to amend that because the technology we selected didn't work or we found more contaminations, or whatever the factors are, we may have to amend that. And that's something we are doing here tonight.

The next step is the Record of Decision or remedial design, where we go back and figure out all of the things we need to do to implement what's the time line, what's the schedule for these events, who do we have to get to dig it up, what kind of aspects of technology are needed to stabilize it and all of those sorts of things. Those come in in the remedial design. And

eventually, we implement a remedial action of the site. We actually go out and do the work again. It may take 10 years to do that. I know it's a very frustrating thing on these sites.

Now, as I mentioned before, public participation is needed in all of the aspects of these. Once we propose a site for the MPL, we go out, we have community input then. The remedial investigation stage, especially if it's a tag area, we have input there. At the proposed plan stage, as we are right now, we want to get the community's input.

Remedial design, before we go out and actually implement the site, we want to come back out and say, okay, tomorrow the trucks are going to be out there digging it up and this is what we are going to be doing, so you know what's going on.

Then of course there's the remedial action stage. This is pretty much throughout the process, we are always there for community input and we come down at any time the community wants us to update you, fact sheets and things like that.

Just one more thing. This process that

I just went through, especially after we list it on the MPL, there's two routes we can take. One is a fund lead and what we call the PRP lead. If there are parties out there that are operating the site or past owners or operators, under Superfund, we always say enforcement first, let the polluter pay. If we can go to the polluter, we try to get into a legal document with them and we want them to pay for the clean up of the site. And through legal documents and that oversight we make sure they do that right.

If there are no potential responsible parties and it's an abandoned site, then we use the CERCLA and the Superfund. The Superfund is that years ago there was a tax, I think since '95 there's no more tax, on the chemical and control industry. And that tax was put in this big trustfund, the Superfund. And we use that money still today, there's some of it we use to clean up these abandon sites. Those are the two routes, there's the PRP enforcement lead or affirmative. At the Koppers site, we have a PRP enforcement lead.

Now, for the Koppers site, the Cabot Koppers site, these are the stages we are at. Of

course the Koppers proposed plan, that's why we are here tonight. And the Kopper's portion of the site, this is a little further along, there's actually a remedial action on that portion of the site.

And that gives you an idea of where these two portions of the site are in relation to the process.

MS. WENSKA: Thank you, Joanne. I know you have heard a lot of terminology and a lot of information, and I wanted to let you know that in your folder, as you look to the left in your folder, is your agenda and the slides that you are seeing tonight. But as you look to the right, there's a lot of background information about the Superfund process. There's also a copy of the proposed plan. If you didn't get one in the mail, there's one in there for you to look at.

And I also want you to know that what has been talked about tonight you can comment on not just tonight, we do have the Court Reporter here tonight, but the comment period lasts a lot longer than just tonight's meeting. If you were able to receive one of these in the mail, then you know that the comment period began on May 7 and it

goes through June 5. And you can e-mail comments, you can send comments, you can phone or talk to Maher or Joanne later about any other arrangement you might need to make to comment on the process.

So I wanted you to know there's lots of information to back up what you have been hearing here very quickly and that you can comment at another time if you don't feel you like you have had a chance to digest all of that tonight so far.

I am pretty much a task master on time, and I know that's a concern of all of yours, but we happen to be running a little ahead, so it looks like you may have more time for questions than we first thought. I hope that's the case.

Maher Budeir is the EPA Remedial Project Manager for the site. And Maher is going to go through some of the information that is in this proposed plan. His slides are inside your folder. And Maher is going to tell you about how they got the proposed plan and more specifically what the plan is about and why EPA considers this to be appropriate for the Koppers site.

IV. THE PROPOSED PLAN

MR. BUDEIR: Thank you, Mary. Before I get started, I would like to make it clear, that

19:10:39 just in case to avoid any confusion, this Record
19:10:45 of Decision amendment or proposed plan for Record
19:10:48 of Decision amendment is to re-open the remedy on
19:10:51 the Koppers portion of the site.
19:10:53 As Joanne has mentioned, the original
19:10:57 Record of Decision was issued back in 1990. And I
19:11:01 am going to go through the history a little bit
19:11:04 and the remedial action that has taken place for
19:11:10 the Koppers portion of the site.
19:11:12 The Koppers portion of the site, that
19:11:15 is running on a different schedule for reasons
19:11:17 that I will discuss in a few minutes or maybe you
19:11:20 have already seen it in the proposed plan. I just
19:11:23 wanted to make that clear that really re-opening
19:11:27 the Record of Decision is to amend the selected
19:11:30 remedy on the Koppers portion of the site.
19:11:38 I would like -- I do have a lot of
19:11:42 slides here on the history of the site, and many
19:11:45 of you may be familiar with it, some of you may
19:11:49 not be, I am going to try and not spend too much
19:11:51 time on it to try to get to spend more time on the
19:11:54 reason we are here today, to talk about the
19:11:58 proposed plan, the alternatives that we have on
19:11:59 the table, the EPA's preferred alternative and
19:12:04 what the community's concerns are, which hopefully

19:12:09 would lead us to the select alternative. And that
19:12:11 may or may not be the same one that is currently
19:12:14 EPA's alternative.
19:12:21 I am going to start with the site map,
19:12:24 most of you are familiar with it. That's
19:12:26 basically Main Street along the right portion of
19:12:30 the map and 23rd Avenue along the bottom. The
19:12:36 site is outlined in blue, and in the right-hand
19:12:40 corner is the Cabot portion of the site, which
19:12:43 currently holds the shopping center that's there.
19:12:47 The Koppers site is the 90 acres that are
19:12:57 immediately west of that. And the shaded areas in
19:12:57 the dark are the areas where we know there is
19:12:59 major contamination that we think that remedy
19:13:06 needs to be implemented.
19:13:08 There's some definitions you may hear
19:13:15 as acronyms, I thought I would present them to
19:13:18 you. The PAHs is the group of chemicals commonly
19:13:22 found on wood treating sites, as well as other
19:13:24 industrial sites. And DNAPLEs is a key term, it's
19:13:30 basically heavy oil that can be found in the
19:13:34 environment. It's obviously released from certain
19:13:37 industries, it can be -- or different chemicals
19:13:42 can be DNAPLEs, it's dense non-aqueous phase
19:13:46 liquid. This is basically heavy oil that can sink

19:13:52 in the ground water and tends to linger around for
19:13:54 a long time. It makes it difficult to deal with.
19:14:07 The site was listed back in 1983 on the
19:14:08 National Priority List, in 1988 an order was
19:14:12 signed between EPA and Cabot and Beazer to do a
19:14:23 remedial investigation Feasibility Study.
19:14:27 Remedial investigation was completed in 1990, so
19:14:29 was the Feasibility Study. It was approved back
19:14:32 in May of 1990. The public meeting was held for
19:14:42 the initial Record of Decision, initial proposed
19:14:47 plan back in August of 1990, and the Record of
19:14:49 Decision was issued in September of that year.
19:15:24 The Record of Decision, basically,
19:15:26 these were the major components for the Cabot
19:15:29 portion of this site, the institutional controls,
19:15:33 as well as ground water extraction system, it also
19:15:39 called for lining the North Main Street ditch.
19:15:43 For the Koppers portion of the site, it
19:15:45 called for excavation of contaminated soil from
19:15:51 the north and south ponds and also in-situ
19:15:55 bioremediation institution controls of the process
19:15:57 area. One other component that was in the Record
19:16:06 of Decision was sampling for the creek,
19:16:09 Springstead Creek, which runs around the northern
19:16:13 border of the Koppers property to see if there was

19:16:16 any risk involved with that.
19:16:19 What actually happened are these
19:16:21 events, and we can go through them rather quickly,
19:16:25 I am not going to necessarily go through every one
19:16:28 of them, but basically, I can sum it up in a
19:16:30 couple of sentences maybe so we can move on to the
19:16:33 proposed plan. And on the Cabot portion of this
19:16:38 site, Cabot has implemented the remedy as it is in
19:16:44 the Record of Decision, they lined the ditch and
19:16:47 there is a ground water recovery system that is in
19:16:50 place.
19:16:51 On the Koppers portion of this site,
19:16:52 there was a lot more investigation done in order
19:16:56 to implement the remedy. And in the process, and
19:17:00 this is the reason we ended up here today, and in
19:17:03 the process of doing some more investigation, they
19:17:06 put in some more pits and ditches and borings, if
19:17:10 you will, and realized that contamination in the
19:17:15 ground, in the soil, is a lot deeper than what was
19:17:19 originally thought.
19:17:20 This investigation was carried back in
19:17:23 the middle 1990s, we realized at that point that
19:17:27 there is going to be a need since contamination
19:17:30 was of a different character than what we
19:17:34 originally thought, we knew there was a need for

us to go back and amend the remedy.

The remedy of the Record of Decision of 1990 did not anticipate such volume of contamination and such phase of contamination to be present. The sampling of the Springstead Creek was completed, as well. And there were several studies that were performed by Beazer. Beazer is basically the responsible party that is taking responsibility for cleaning up the Koppers site.

And the Feasibility Study of 1997, EPA reviewed that and did not find it to be satisfactory, it was resubmitted in 1999. It was a lot better, we thought there was a lot of work to be done.

I took over the project last year and we amended, we decided to amend, the Feasibility Study ourselves, rather than go back to another iteration and we came up with what you see now as the proposed plan. And this is the result of the Feasibility Study, the result of the combination of efforts of Beazer along with what we have done. And we amend it and put together a series of alternatives and we have also put in the proposed plan what we see as the selected alternative as of now.

And I say that because, you know, I will go through the process of selecting these. Before I do that, let's look at some pictures so you will see what has happened and why the decision came back.

These are some of the pits and this is what they look like, four foot in on the Koppers site, and you will see that it's basically a simple ditch that was dug in to see the profile, to see that contamination. What seems to be clean soil at the top may have contamination in the deeper zones, and that was the main reason why we started to realize that the removal that was called in in the initial Record of Decision may not be appropriate and we needed to revisit that.

So the goal of this proposed plan is basically to come up with a remedy or select a remedy that will work and will clean up the site to levels that will pose no risk to workers, trespassers or residents nearby or anyone else, as well as the environment. So that's really the goal.

How does the EPA evaluate the cleanup criteria? There are basically nine criteria we go by, and there are really three groups, and you

will see as we go through them they are in three colors. The first two are called threshold criteria, which are basically criteria that have to be met. And if they are not met, the alternative has to be thrown out. And those are the human health and environment protection and the compliance with the laws. And again, these are the threshold alternatives that have to be met.

The next five are balancing criteria, meaning we would look at other alternatives and see how many of these criteria does each alternative meet, and those are long-term effectiveness; reduction in toxicity, mobility or volume; implementability; short-term effectiveness, as well as cost. So cost is a factor, as well as effectiveness and all these other things.

We look at each alternative, we balance these against each other and we see which one of the alternatives meets more of these criteria. And at this point, after the first several criteria are met, we come up with a proposed plan and we put together what we think is a preferred alternative. We base it on the first seven

alternatives.

And once we are in the public comment period, like we are now, we come to the last two criteria. And these are the two additional factors that help us make the selection, meaning the input we get from this public meeting, from the written comments that we get from your response through the different media to EPA is going to be a factor in making a final determination.

And a final remedy is then selected based on all of these nine criteria together. So what we have now on the table and what the plan calls EPA preferred criteria is really not selected criteria. And let me make that clear that to date there is no selected alternative on how to clean up this site, it's only after we have the public participation process complete we will sit down and figure out are we going to or what we thought was a preferred alternative still valid or should we change it, should we amend it, should we add another component. And that is really the bottom line. That is why this process is really important, it is going to help shape what the remedy is going to be like.

19:23:24 In the process of risk evaluation, we
19:23:28 look at evaluation on who can be exposed. And in
19:23:33 that, we do not only look at the facility itself,
19:23:37 but we look at the neighboring properties, as
19:23:40 well, we look at the property used on and around
the facility.
19:23:46 We select the chemicals of concern, and
19:23:49 that's basically from the history of the site, and
19:23:53 with this site, you know, being a Superfund for
19:23:57 about 17 years or so, we think we have a very good
19:24:01 handle on what the chemicals of concern are. And
19:24:02 in this case they are basically the PAHs, the
19:24:11 pentachlorophenol, you know, components of
19:24:13 creosote, arsenate and chromium. It's your common
19:24:19 wood treating facility that has used the three
19:24:23 different processes in their history of operation.
19:24:30 And the last thing we determine is how
19:24:33 clean is clean. And this basically is when we go
19:24:37 back to our experts that are in the risk
19:24:39 assessment business and they tell us what is an
19:24:42 appropriate number to clean up this site. And
19:24:44 this is a major component of this proposed plan,
19:24:47 as well. How clean should we expect this site to
19:24:53 be when we are completely finished? How much
19:24:57 exposure is left out there? And to what level do

19:25:00 we clean up chemicals? There is no absolute
19:25:02 numbers, we cannot clean up almost anything down
19:25:05 to 0, but there is a number that our risk
19:25:09 assessors will say this is a safe number and this
19:25:12 is what we need to shoot for when we clean it up.
19:25:18 And these are the cleanup alternatives
19:25:20 that we have looked at in this proposed plan.
19:25:23 First of all, we all start with the baseline of
19:25:37 the do-nothing alternative. In this case, since
19:25:37 the Koppers site already has containment, you
19:25:38 know, ground water treatment system in place, our
19:25:42 starting point is going to be to keep that ground
19:25:44 water treatment system as is.
19:25:46 The second alternative is basically to
19:25:47 keep it as is plus add institutional controls.
19:25:53 The third one is the same, except we add
19:25:59 additional wearing cover to take care of some of
19:26:02 the risks that exist, potential risks, from
19:26:08 contaminated soils.
19:26:14 The fourth one is to put in wearing
19:26:18 cover, which is basically a cover of gravel or
19:26:21 some type of work material plus biotreatment wall,
19:26:26 which is a partial wall installed in the ground
19:26:29 and goes to the depth of contamination and it
19:26:33 helps or it enhances bioremediation of

19:26:39 contaminants in the ground. And that's basically
19:26:42 what it is, it's really a simple physical type of
19:26:45 solution that we would hope that it could enhance
19:26:50 your natural bioremediation that takes place.
19:26:56 Number five is low permeability cap,
19:27:02 which states the hard cover of concrete or type of
19:27:08 cap along with the wall that surrounds the areas
19:27:13 or the source area where the heavy contamination
19:27:16 system is. We have several areas that -- if you
19:27:18 remember we saw on the site map where we think
19:27:22 most of the contamination is, and we know those
19:27:26 are basically our source areas. And this
19:27:28 alternative basically puts in a barrier, a
19:27:33 physical barrier, in the ground to surround that
19:27:36 and contain it and keep it in place, so that there
19:27:40 is no mobilization of contaminants anymore. We
19:27:44 are not getting rid of contaminants, we are not
19:27:46 removing the contaminants, but we are containing
19:27:50 them and keeping them from contaminating any
19:27:51 ground water.
19:28:06 Alternative number six is similar to an
19:28:08 earlier alternative, only in this case we are
19:28:11 adding the component which includes the removal of
19:28:15 some of the surface soils. And this is in the
19:28:17 areas where we know surface soils are

19:28:20 contaminated, we would remove them and we would
19:28:24 look at different alternatives on how to treat
19:28:26 those soils and either put them back in place or
19:28:29 we ship them outside. We look at those
19:28:33 alternatives and what we are going to do with
19:28:38 those soils. Along with doing that, we would
19:28:38 still put in the biotreatment wall.
19:28:43 Alternative seven is removal of surface
19:28:47 soil, which is the same as six, plus we would add
19:28:51 instead of biotreatment wall, we would add a
19:28:56 complete physical barrier to sit around those
19:28:57 areas and contain those areas of heavy
19:29:01 contamination.
19:29:09 Alternative eight is removal of surface
19:29:30 soils, plus treatment extraction, to in-situ
19:29:35 bioremediation plus institution of controls. The
19:29:37 combination of several technologies to be
19:29:40 implemented obviously in different portions of the
19:29:43 site.
19:29:51 Alternative nine is basically the
19:29:55 Hawthorne clay is the clay we believe exists at
19:29:58 about 30-foot depth. And that it as deep as we
19:30:02 know contamination to be in the source areas. So
19:30:08 it does include removing everything, all the media
19:30:12 that exists between the surface and all the way

down to 30 feet deep. And that's pretty important, you would see that's one of the probably most expensive alternatives. It does have a lot of risk associated with that, as well.

Alternative 10 is removal to the Hawthorne clay, plus in-situ treatment, containment of biotreatment wall. Because the site is an operating site, we know neither of these two alternatives -- we would not be able to implement those site-wise, meaning those are going to be areas that are very difficult to implement that because there's a plant operating and there is tax and there is process areas. So we are not going to be able to remove the earth from underneath those areas; therefore, there is going to be something left behind.

And for these areas you cannot remove, we would propose to do one of these two technologies, whether it's containment of biotreatment or in-situ treatment -- I am sorry, biotreatment, or biotreatment basically. The issue with these two alternatives, and I am not going to discuss every single alternative, its negative and positive, but the issue of these alternatives is they are expensive and you would

think if you were going to put up the expense or the extravagant expense, that you would expect the contaminants to be gone, but they are not going to be.

That's the problem with this site, because it's been an operating site, you will not be able to remove everything even if you wanted to, not to mention the fact that removal by itself, it's a contamination of this mess and this type of source, it has its own risks, you know, during the removal process. So it seems to be a removal is a great thing to do; however, there is major drawbacks to it.

Remember the six and seven options had surface soil contamination. These are the sub-alternatives on what should we do with such contaminated surface soils. And the first one is keep it on an on-site landfill, meaning just gather it and put it in an area, maybe line it and put it in the landfill on site. The second one is on-site incineration. The third one is on-site thermal desorption, bioremediation, washing, stabilization and backfill and then off-site incineration, meaning just haul it off site to another facility where it's incinerated in the

landfill.

And the last one, which is the EPA preferred one, is stabilization, backfill and put an impermeable cap on top of it. That's, you know, that's the one that EPA included in their preferred. So we are basically selecting at this point 7-A to be the alternative. And that is to remove the surface soils, solidify and stabilize it, put it back in place and put a permeable cap on top of it.

As far as for the deep contamination, we are proposing to put in a slow water or some type of physical barrier all the way around the areas of heavy contamination. And again, those are areas of relatively smaller areas, we are not talking about the whole site having to have wall around it, it's just those areas of heavy contamination.

It's basically a solution of containing the waste on a limited portion of the site. And the big advantage to this type of solution is the rest of the site, we have a 90-acre site, most of it can be rehabilitated and can be reused and is being cleaned up to high standard.

And you have the smaller portion of the

site, where you are containing the waste, it's going to be there for a long time, but it's not going to move. The mobilization is going to be monitored, the physical barrier around it, we are hoping there's going to be a Hawthorne clay that is going to contain it from migration.

And from the top portion of it, there's going to be impermeable cap that's going to be monitored in the long term, and hopefully, the surface and the cap will not be a big expense, but it is part of the solution. And there's a lot of new technologies these days that allows us to put in a cap that can be relatively inexpensive and can work for a very long time.

And we have explored options with our research groups and we have explored options of treating the soils. And we can go to the next slide.

Basically, treating with 7-A, which meets the threshold criteria, which are the first two criteria, protective of human health and environment and in compliance with the laws. For the exception of that area where the waste is contained, we have to get a waiver because this area will never meet the criteria; however, it is

contained from any exposure.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Just for clarification, your slide states 7-A, yet in your discussion --

MR. BUDEIR: You are right, it is 7-F.

It is a proven effective technology. That's the thing with the physical barrier versus the biotreatment barrier, it's a proven technology that has been used for a long time, it's been used for over 50 years actually in the different industries and so forth. Implementable, it's relatively easy to work with. The facility will probably have to work around it, it has to be designed and implemented in a way that, you know, where it doesn't disrupt the operations of the facility. However, compared to the other options, it's probably more implementable than the other ones.

Restores most of site for unrestricted use. And that's really the bottom line, most of the site is going to be cleaned up and it's going to be cleaned up to the essential criteria, meaning it is to the standard where you can build a home on it if you wanted to, you can let kids run and play on it and it won't pose a risk.

And you know, to me, that's a big component and that's also listed in the criteria. It does even include those areas where waste is contained. Because even in those areas where waste is in place, you are still going to have the hard cap and you are going to have institutional controls that will ensure that the cap stays in place and the use of the site is consistent.

So basically, you are turning over the whole site to be able to be unrestricted use with the exception of what is underground.

This is following the steps of what is going to happen. We basically are looking for comments, we would like to move into the phase of a selected remedy, but right now we have a preferred remedy, it is the State's input as well as the community's input that's going to either make this remedy that we are proposing a final one or will help us select a different one or will help us amend the selected one and add other components to it. And from there, we can issue a record.

Once that is finalized and all of the issues are addressed, we can move into the Record of Decision and we can go back and amend the

Record of Decision. As soon as that is done, we are hoping to enter into an agreement with the responsible parties and start the remedial design, meaning as far as the time line is concerned, if we are successful in amending the Record of Decision by September, let's say, we are hoping the design will be done over the fall and maybe the winter and maybe by spring we can see something physically being done and the amendment being implemented.

And this is the last thing, it goes back to the what Joanne was talking about, of course, the different steps, we will be coming back to you for comments on the specific design, for comments on the specific action, so that you know what is expected, you know what's being designed, you know what's going to be in the ground, you know how it's going to affect the site and maybe the province around it. That's all I have.

V. AUDIENCE COMMENTS

MS. WENSKA: Thank you. Don't go too far. I want to thank you all for your patience in our portion of the program. I want to also remind you that we are now in the public comments section

where we would like to hear from you and it will be transcribed by our Court Reporter.

This is not, though, the only time for you to comment, I want to reiterate that written comments can be given to EPA through June 5 right now. So please feel comfortable if you don't want to say something tonight or our time runs out, that you will still have an opportunity to comment. Okay.

Also, I want to let you know that there are just a couple of ground rules to make it orderly. We tried to show you in our own presentation way an orderly process, and if you didn't get anything else, you might have seen that all of this is part of a process. The way this meeting is handled, the fact that it's scheduled, it's all part of what's required under the NCP. And part of that is your commenting time.

And so in order to help us get your name correctly and understand your comment, if you wouldn't mind coming and using the microphone, it's hard to hear some of us, so if you would use the microphone, please state your name and spell your last name and make your comment. If it's easier for you to get to this microphone, you are

welcome to use this one.

The other thing I would like to ask is to allow yourself to hear what your neighbors might be thinking, as well, so if you could, limit yourself to one comment and then give a neighbor a chance to speak as well.

Any questions about the process? Well, by my clock, it's about 25 to the hour and we hope to end it at 8:30. So I invite someone, and you can go by raising a hand and I will call on you and we will keep the process going. Yes, sir. Come on up and please state your name and spell it and then your comment.

MR. MULLER: My name is Keith Muller. I am here to keep the Koppers bashing to a minimum. Approximately 15 years ago, I built David Norman's Produce, which is now Ward's Market, and it is now seeming -- the impact and community was a lot greater back at that time. And then possibly five years later I built the Glenwood Park, which is a metal building, two metal buildings, directly across the street from Koppers.

And the aroma, the traffic, just the general everything of the facility seems to have

improved I would say 1,000 percent since that time. I have run into some of these people that have worked in doing things out there, they seem competent, it seems like a good process. Although we need citizens input, we don't need crackpots with stupid remarks, we need more technological people that have been working on the property.

So as far as I am concerned, the people that have been doing this need to keep up the good work. Thank you.

MS. WENSKA: Mr. Muller, before you leave, could you spell your last name.

MR. MULLER: M-u-l-l-e-r.

MS. WENSKA: I see a hand in the back, please.

MS. FAIRFOREST: Hi, my name is Susan Fairforest, F-a-i-r-f-o-r-e-s-t. And I am a licensed clinical social worker here in Gainesville. Actually, I am the granddaughter of Dr. A.P. Black, who was an environmental engineer in Gainesville for many years as the head of the chemistry department in the University. My grand dad's primary interest was water sewage treatment, and he was a pioneer in his field.

I am here today because I live on

Springstead Creek. I live at 501 Northwest 37th Avenue, that's on Springstead Creek. So I brought a written statement saying: I live on Springstead Creek, within the city limits of Gainesville, Florida. I very much hope you will approve the use of the Superfund cleanup fund given to Alachua County to clean the soil and ground water at the old creosote plant location, which endangers the health and safety of the creek and the people, plants and animals who live and grow on her banks.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

MS. WENSKA: Thank you.

MS. FAIRFOREST: I am also speaking for -- this is going to come as a shock to the Green Party representative who's here, but I also went by the Green Party, and I am not a member yet, but I plan to join, and I asked them if they would sign a resolution, also. And we discussed it and they did.

And so their resolution says: "We, the members of the North Central Florida Green party, approve the use of the Superfund cleanup fund delegated to Alachua County to clean the soil and ground water at the old Creosote plant located

near the intersection of North Main Street and 23rd Boulevard in Gainesville, Florida, which affects the water which flows into Springstead Creek, which flows into Hogtown Creek, with enters through the greater part of the northwest section of the City of Gainesville. Be it resolved this 21st date of June [sic], 2001, and then all the Green Party members signed it.

MS. COPELAND: I have a quick question for you. The funds you are talking about, can you tell us a little bit more about that? Are those County funds that are used?

MS. FAIRFOREST: I thought this meeting was about the Superfund cleanup money being designated for the purposes of cleaning up that site.

MS. BENANTE: Actually, the site will be cleaned up and we are going to the enforcement first. And we will go back to the Beazer folks to pay for the cleanup of the site. And they also pay under Superfund for EPA's oversight of that.

So if there were more funds to do other things, there might be some other things in the community you can use those funds for. But that's very interesting, and I thank you for doing that.

MS. FAIRFOREST: I think I was just misinformed.

MS. BENANTE: If there are other funds out there in the County, there may be some other concerns that can't be addressed under the Superfund process that maybe can be addressed through that. So that's interesting to know. Thank you.

MS. WENSKA: Another comment or question from the audience? Yes, ma'am.

MS. POLLINI: My name is Linda Pollini, P-o-l-l-i-n-i. I am a little bit concerned about the chromated copper arsenate that's being used at the plant right now, and I understand that it is a pollutant and there's a lot of concerns about the arsenate getting into our systems and causing cancer and so forth.

And I heard that there's now an alternative to using this pollutant called ACQ. And I am wondering if there are going to be any plans to replace the chromated copper arsenate with ACQ on that site so then you wouldn't have to go back and clean up the CCA later. So that's my concern and my question, I guess.

MS. BENANTE: That's a very interesting

concern. I asked the company the same thing this afternoon when we did a tour of the site. And I read the articles in the newspapers regarding the playgrounds and things like that and the CCA was used to build a playground.

Right now, it's an interesting question, and I don't know if I really know the answer to it. But maybe I can give you a background. Right now, I think there is a lot of studies being done on the State level and even on the Federal level on CCA and the issues concerning that CCA. And hopefully, after they do their studies and they have a whole arsenic issue in general, they will come with some answer on whether or not using CCA to treat wood is good or not good or we should change it to another thing.

So I don't think there's anything we can answer today, but it's certainly an interesting question. Hopefully, we won't have to come back and have another amended ROD to deal with that. Hopefully, this ROD will deal with what's out there.

MS. POLLINI: Well, it is becoming a concern. And another -- like pressure treated wood, a lot of pressure treated wood that comes

from construction sites ends up being dumped in unfilled landfills. And in that, you know, in that case, it could also get into the ground water.

One other thing that I wanted to bring to your attention that wasn't mentioned in how to clean up the site was an article that I happened to come upon in Scientific American, February 1999, which talks about steam injection process for cleaning wells. And bear with me for just a second here, it says pumping was bringing up only 500 pounds of creosote a year. In 16 months, treatment extractions pulled out more than 900,000 pounds. And you know, that's a lot. And I think maybe you should look at this steam process as a way of cleaning that. Or have you looked at this at all?

MR. BUDEIR: Yes. I appreciate your comments. It is an effective technology. In the remedial business, every technology can work for a specific site. And that's why we go through the long remedial investigation to really diagnose how the material is deposited in the ground. And it depends on how well defined -- how well your material is defined in the ground and how much you

think is down there and if it is collected in a pool or is it sporadic throughout. That's basically what remedial investigation is all about.

And every site needs to be handled differently. And there are, again, a lot of sites where extraction can be more effective. It's a site-specific kind of thing.

MS. POLLINI: Looking at the article, it looks like it might apply to this site. And you know, 500 pounds as opposed to 900,000 pounds is a lot. I will leave the article with you.

MS. WENSKA: Other members of the audience who would like to comment? Yes, sir.

MR. RICHARDSON: I am David Richardson with Gainesville Regional Utilities, R-i-c-h-a-r-d-s-o-n. We have a Murphy wellfield, which is located within several miles of this site that we are discussing this evening. And in the range of alternatives that have been discussed, the preferred alternative, if I understand the major component of it, will utilize the continuity of the Hawthorne formation below and will see a slurry wall around whatever contamination is left in place.

19:51:39 What kind of engineering controls and
19:51:44 testing is going to be provided during the
19:51:49 operation of the system to ensure that the
19:51:56 Hawthorne is continuous and the slurry wall is
19:51:59 continuous? Is there going to be testing that
19:52:02 will happen during the ground water pumping
19:52:03 operation?
19:52:05 MR. BUDEIR: Absolutely. It needs to
19:52:08 happen before that. Prior to the installation,
19:52:09 there needs to be -- we will go out and survey the
19:52:14 unit basically and make sure it is where we think
19:52:17 it is and figure out exactly how deep the wall
19:52:23 needs to be in one section. And you know,
19:52:26 obviously in that process you are going to double
19:52:29 check where the Hawthorne is and how competent it
19:52:32 is.
19:52:32 And we are hoping -- you know, there is
19:52:35 a possibility that in this process we discover
19:52:37 it's not as competent as we think it is. That's
19:52:40 when we need to prescribe an alternative remedy.
19:51:05 MR. RICHARDSON: Would that mean you
19:52:49 would come back and redo the Record of Decision
19:52:52 based on that, in the event you find something
19:52:55 down the road that's different than what you
19:52:57 understand right now, like that, like the

19:52:59 Hawthorne formation is not continuous under the
site?
19:53:04 MS. BENANTE: I think it's a
19:53:05 possibility. But at this time, I think we are
19:53:08 pretty competent from the information we have in
19:53:10 the remedial investigation.
19:53:14 MR. BUDEIR: Bill, maybe you want to
19:53:16 speak more to this.
19:53:16 But we have been examining that
19:53:17 question, and we looked at the Hawthorne there and
19:53:20 we looked at the regional information. And there
19:53:24 has to be a little bit more investigation to
19:53:26 survey exactly, but we are pretty sure it's a
19:53:29 competent unit. And should we be surprised to
19:53:33 find out otherwise, we -- by now we would have
19:53:36 known if it wasn't there. The creosote is heavy,
19:53:40 it's not going to sit there at 30 feet and not be
19:53:43 found much deeper if the Hawthorne was not
19:53:47 competent. And it was pretty much present in some
19:53:50 areas.
19:53:52 Other measures that are going to be
19:53:54 there in case there is any kind of minute leakage
19:53:56 in the Hawthorne or wherever, there is going to be
19:54:00 to compensate to make sure the slurry wall is
19:54:03 going to be maintained lower than it is outside.

19:51:05 MR. RICHARDSON: And that would be
19:54:09 monitored over time to ensure that condition
19:54:11 exists then?
19:54:13 MR. BUDEIR: Absolutely. Monitoring is
19:54:15 part of that, even the surface soil will be
19:54:18 monitored as part of that process.
19:54:23 MS. WENSKA: More comments? Any
19:54:24 others?
19:54:33 MR. BOYES: My name is Stephen Boyes,
19:54:37 B-o-y-e-s. I am a licensed professional
19:54:39 geologist, expert in hydrogeology, member of the
19:54:42 City of Gainesville Development Review Board, and
19:54:47 somewhat of a resident expert in the geology of
19:54:49 Gainesville and the performance of the Hawthorne
19:54:51 locally.
19:54:52 I have had opportunity to assess it in
19:54:56 a number of areas of Gainesville. It is not a
19:54:57 competent confining unit, it is listed as an
19:55:03 aquitard in recent publications. It leaks, it's
19:55:06 perforated by cars locally in a number of areas.
19:55:07 You will find as you investigate it that this site
19:55:10 leaks. And that's what we are finding at the Coal
19:55:16 Gas Station Plant, that's what we are finding at
19:55:19 the PCE sites in town quite a bit. It's that
19:55:23 upper plate is relatively thin, it's a couple of

19:55:26 feet, it's smack tight, it shrinks and swells.
19:55:30 As you know, DNAPLs do have an impact
19:55:32 as they dehydrate. It's containment of the impact
19:55:48 in the cona depression in the municipal wellfield
19:55:48 is probably not a smart idea at this location. I
19:55:49 really do not want to see my son reliant upon the
19:55:54 drinking water supply with this left as a time
19:55:57 capsule leaching at a rate of two to four inches
19:56:00 through these less conductive materials in the
19:56:03 immediate system, which is completely drained to
19:56:06 the wellfield at this location.
19:56:11 My background at this site includes the
19:56:14 1980 investigation, and I am also one of the
19:56:18 principal investigators that put it on the
19:56:19 Superfund list in 1983 in my work for the State.
19:56:25 Thank you.
19:56:26 MS. WENSKA: Thank you, Mr. Boyes.
19:56:28 Other comments from the audience? Yes,
ma'am.
19:56:36 MS. POLL: I hope you call up
19:56:38 Mr. Boyes and meet with him or take him to dinner
19:56:42 tonight because his comments -- he really has a
19:56:46 lot of knowledge that I don't think you all have,
19:56:48 following city government and planning development
19:56:52 and all of that, he is very well known and well

19:56:54 respected here.
19:56:56 I have some questions to ask. I am
19:57:00 Tara Poll, P-o-l-l. I have some questions to ask
19:57:02 regarding your separating out Koppers and Cabot,
19:57:08 only you found already that the limit you thought
19:57:12 was okay is not and you are going back and opening
19:57:14 this up. Have you done any kind of testing for
19:57:19 the part you think you did that was all right, the
19:57:19 lining in Main Street?
19:57:19 And then I saw, because I drove the
19:57:21 area, that you went across Main Street into the
19:57:24 east many hundreds of feet, across where our new
19:57:29 Dodge dealer is, by that area. And have you gone
19:57:31 back and retested there?
19:57:38 MR. BUDEIR: Yes, ma'am. I appreciate
19:57:40 your comments.
19:57:41 Those wells that you see east of Main
19:57:44 Street are monitored wells. Those are used to
19:57:49 measure the performance of the system that is in
19:57:51 place for the Cabot site. And it does not seem to
19:57:55 show any contamination is making it anymore there.
19:57:59 So just the fact that we have wells --
19:58:02 MS. POLL: Well, you took out from
19:58:03 there before a long time ago, you took truckloads
19:58:06 of dirt out of there, east of Main Street, and

19:58:11 disposed of it.
19:58:13 MR. BUDEIR: The truckloads, as far as
19:58:16 I know, as far as our records show, were taken
19:58:18 from the area where the street is now, where the
19:58:21 street was widened, too. And that is the area
19:58:24 where the pond was and that's where the removal
19:58:28 took place, basically, in the northeastern corner
19:58:30 of that Cabot site.
19:58:35 MS. POLL: No, no. You were across
19:58:36 east of Main Street with great big white shields
19:58:39 of stuff around and people working inside of it
19:58:43 way over on the east, hundreds or maybe 1,000 or
19:58:49 maybe 2,000 feet.
19:58:50 I am very concerned because as far east
19:58:53 as you went, if you dropped down just a few
19:58:56 hundred feet, that's my home. I am one of the
19:58:57 2,000 residents or so or more that live in that
19:59:00 area, and I don't feel like you have done anything
19:59:03 to really check how far the stuff went out because
19:59:07 I offer you the shallow well that is inoperable
19:59:11 right now on my property, all the homes there used
19:59:14 to have shallow wells put in for irrigation
19:59:18 before, this was 40 or 45 years ago, and they are
19:59:21 all still there. And I don't see where you have
19:59:25 gone -- as far east as you went, and if you

19:59:27 dropped down south, I know the stuff spreads, and
19:59:29 I don't see where you have gone to any of the
19:59:32 residents or any of the other homes that are
19:59:34 between 6th Street and the Koppers property.
19:59:39 There's a lot of houses in there and
19:59:41 apartment complexes on 26th, and where have you
19:59:48 gone there and tested, for those people, they
19:59:48 complain a lot periodically?
19:59:51 I do agree that what the man said that
19:59:55 the smell is better, but I feel that you need to
19:59:55 expand your testing and I think you need to go
19:59:57 back and look at the Cabot stuff, what were the
20:00:01 results and what are the results. If you say you
20:00:06 have a test well, you say you have a test well
20:00:06 there, what is showing up on that?
20:00:11 MS. BENANTE: We would definitely like
20:00:13 to sit down with you and --
MS. POLL: Well, completely surrounding
except for right on Main Street where it's
20:00:17 commercial and a little industrial park, all the
20:00:17 way around there, it's people living. And I mean,
20:00:20 his store is on 23rd Avenue, but right behind him
20:00:24 are all of these apartments and houses.
20:00:26 And you know, the way I see it this
20:00:28 contamination spreads and the clay layer is not

20:00:32 contiguous. We can give you the random work
20:00:37 behind my house where you can pull from the
20:00:39 planning department in Gainesville, the soil
20:00:41 boring things nearby there, and you will see it's
20:00:44 a mixed thing, Millhopper three, four and all
20:00:47 sorts of mixed stuff.
20:00:50 I also saw in your presentation and one
20:00:52 of those words where you spoke about money for
20:00:55 cleanup and or relocation. And is it possible
20:00:59 that maybe this site, being now, I know in 1918 it
20:01:03 was way in the boonies compared to what
20:01:06 Gainesville was, but right now it's kind of like
20:01:09 mid-town and the heart of Gainesville, it's less
20:01:21 than a mile from here or maybe a mile and a half
20:01:21 from where we are right now even, so is there -- I
20:01:21 mean, I understand cleanup, but if it continues to
20:01:23 operate, is it maybe not more appropriate out of
20:01:24 the wellfield, get some government money and let
20:01:26 them locate someplace where it's not going to
20:01:30 jeopardize the water for the future and the
20:01:32 residents around it.
20:01:35 You know, it's one thing to clean it
20:01:36 up, of course, but what about relocation because
20:01:39 whenever those trucks come in with the trees right
20:01:42 down by the side of my house, you know, the

timbers and stuff, they could go anywhere. There's nothing about this site that requires that they must be right there. And if they need the rail lines, there's other rail lines and there's other places to go.

So I think that might be part of the recommendation is that clean it up enough for the resident's standard, but move them out. Thank you.

MR. BUDEIR: I need to make probably one comment. The current operation is not -- it is not part of this plan, nor is it part of the authority of the Superfund. The current operation is a regulated activity and it's uncomfortable to have industry next to it. We may not like it, we don't have authority to dictate to property owners how to use their property. Actually, a lot of County folk and County Commissioners and you guys have a lot more authority to do that than the Superfund.

However, the operation itself, you know, the current operation, is not what is causing the ground water problem.

MS. BENANTE: That's regulated by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection,

they have regulations on how to operate.

MR. BUDEIR: The Florida Department of Environmental Protection has regulations on how to operate these chemicals. There is a risk in operating chemicals, and it is regulated and they are in compliance, as far as we know. And that is a completely different issue than what is causing the problem. We are not aware that current activities are continuing to cause problems at the subsurface. If it is, it is our business.

But you know, it's contamination that has been there since -- the creosote contamination has been there for years. And that is what we need to address, the creosote and arsenate and everything else that we have found that is a result of prior operations.

MS. BENANTE: I think we talked about it a little bit. There's different entities that deal with different things. And this site is somewhat unique because there is an operating facility. Normally, at Superfund sites it's abandoned or there's no more activities on the site, so there is that portioning out of those past shaded areas that we are dealing with in the Superfund and the continuing operations that you

may have a concern with, and a valid one, that are being dealt with under Florida Department of Environmental Protection, resource -- not CERCLA, but the Resource Confirmation Recovery Act, another area of the law that deals with that operating part of it.

Just so you know the distinctions, it's not something we handle under here, but if there's a concern, Florida DEP should be able to at least address that.

MS. POLL: Didn't you say there was money for relocation of this operation?

MS. BENANTE: I don't believe so. I don't think we discussed relocation, no.

MR. BYERLY: My name is Mike Byerly, B-y-e-r-l-y. And I wonder if we could get some reaction from some of the staff you sent here on the comments of Mr. Boyes regarding the permeability of the Hawthorne layer at this point? Or do you intend to do a thorough assessment of the Hawthorne layer as part of this process? And a little bit more comment, perhaps, on what's likely to happen if you find that in fact it's not load bearing.

MS. BENANTE: I think Bill O'Steen is

our hydrogeologist. Maybe you can talk about what he's been dealing with in the past.

Certainly we would want to sit down and hear your expertise and try to determine what's best. Certainly we don't want to do something on this site that's not going to work. That's not going to help anybody. So can you talk a little bit about that.

MR. O'STEEN: I am familiar with your reputation, sir, and I have a great deal of respect for you. You may not know me, but I do know a bit about you and I do have a great deal of respect.

I can't say that this plan is without some small degree of risk, that we might be doing the wrong thing. There are no guarantees. If there were, we would not need to monitor, we would not need to go out as a part of the implementation of this plan and actually do some testing to make sure there is at last over this area some lateral -- sufficient lateral continuity of the Hawthorne.

From what has been done at discrete sample points that are fairly widely spaced on both the Koppers portion of the Superfund site and

no question of that -- but the data that we have suggests that it's laterally continuous, it's a fairly thick layer here.

And I don't have the exact numbers for you, but something on the order of what we seen between the base of the surficial and the intermediate aquifer within the Hawthorne, it's on the order of about 30 feet, I think. And where we have the ground water quality data -- and one of the recommendations I have is that we need to go out and get some more recent data. But this site has been around for a long, long time, so we believe that based upon the approximate very rough ground water velocity as some of it moves vertically through the Hawthorne formation, that we would see the most significant ground water contaminants in the surficial aquifer, which is probably not clean in terms of the concentration distribution. We ought to be seeing that in the intermediate aquifer in some concentration if there was a significant concern about that vertical migration. And we are not seeing that. We might be seeing some low levels of some other contaminants, some of those may be coming from off-site areas, some of them probably related to

on the Cabot Carbon portion of the Superfund site, we have seen the Hawthorne continuous across that area. That's not to say that in between there might not be an area where it's thinner, conceivably even missing, we have no evidence for that.

We have seen a substantial thickness of the Hawthorne where it has been checked on this site. And I am certainly aware that within the general area of Gainesville there are many places where its thin, absent and this plan would simply not work.

A couple of points, we are relying on not only the information that we have about the Hawthorne formation continuity and thickness from site investigations, we are also looking at the ground water quality in a permeability part of what's known as the intermediate aquifer or actually the intermediate aquifer is within the Hawthorne. We have some ground water monitoring data from wells that are placed within the intermediate aquifer and those data suggest that whatever -- and there is some leakage of ground water across the Hawthorne, it's not a totally impervious barrier to ground water flow, there's

this site but at low levels.

We certainly intend to do monitoring, we are going to look at the Hawthorne formation as this plan is implemented. If there's a problem, we can stop right there and go back and re-access. We are going to be monitoring in the intermediate aquifer to see if we are turning up anything there.

And the simple fact of the matter is that over time as we monitor if we see something, the option is always available for EPA to come back and say, well, we had a reasonable expectation that this plan was going to work, all of the data suggested that it would be protective of human health and the environment, we are seeing that maybe that's not the case and we may need to take additional measures to deal with the concern.

So that would be my response saying that we are aware that this selected remedy is not without potential risks, but that we believe that the data that we have in-hand suggests that this plan will work.

MR. LINDQUIST: My name is Robert Lindquist, L-i-n-d-q-u-i-s-t. I agree with Steve. I have had a fair amount of experience working

with various wells in the area and wellfields. Are you familiar with the FTOC site?

MR. O'STEEN: You are talking about Fairbanks?

MR. LINDQUIST: Yes, sir. We have done a couple of pump tests down at the wellfield and we have gotten leaks around five times, 10 minus four per day, so we know it's not negligible.

The other thing I would like to know, again, in terms of the monitor well network, could you describe that in more detail, what you envision that is?

MR. O'STEEN: Envision or?

MR. LINDQUIST: Or plan or whatever.

MR. O'STEEN: Not really, because that would be -- I might make a recommendation based upon what we know. I think the first step is to go back out. And I have recommended this to the Project Manager that we go out and sample what few wells there are already and then we take a well --

MR. LINDQUIST: The intermediate aquifer?

MR. O'STEEN: Yes.

MR. LINDQUIST: What direction will water flow in the intermediate aquifer?

MR. O'STEEN: I believe it's in the same general direction as the surficial aquifer. I am not sure you can line up the flow path directly, but it's in the same general, I guess that would be south to north, more or less, direction.

We need to resample the wells that are out there already. And we need to take a look at the lateral opportunity of the Hawthorne formation in the areas where we are talking about putting in these containment areas, and take that data, I would suggest, and decide what supplemental monitoring may need to be done in the intermediate aquifer to make sure that we are covering all of our bases.

And I don't know that we have sufficient intermediate aquifer monitoring network out there now to look at what we are doing. I think we need to have more. But I can't tell you exactly what the scope of that would be at this point.

MR. LINDQUIST: Again, before you get into this too far, wouldn't it make sense to you to examine the intermediate aquifer if you were going to be monitoring that to find out?

MR. O'STEEN: Yes, it would. It's just a question of --

MR. LINDQUIST: In other words, I would like to hear more about it. I thought that would have been considered in greater detail.

MR. O'STEEN: It's a question of timing and exactly what needs to be done.

MS. BENANTE: I want to address that, if that's okay.

First, I want to say, boy, I am glad we have ground experts. I think I caught half of that discussion.

And secondly, I would love, if Bill, not me, could sit down with you and really talk about those issues, because these are things we need to know before we go forward with the design, and you know, whatever information we have we will share with you and go over that.

But as far as that question, that comes up a lot, under Superfund, how much do you study? Some people always want more and more, and we have to make that decision of do we have enough information to go forward with the remedy decision.

And we believe here that there is a

concern, we have to go forward with it and we do need to know that information, but we can get that in the future. We know we have something we have to deal with, let's make a decision on how to do that and go forward with it.

Certainly these questions that you bring up, I think it would be great if you did sit down with Bill and go over that and discuss these sort of things, they are very important issues.

MR. LINDQUIST: Any time you are ready to discuss it.

MR. BUDEIR: I want to add it's really a balancing act because there's a lot of this design -- it's a portion of the design, the monitoring network. You are asking Bill about the monitoring network, and that is a portion of the design, and it's a component of the design. And there's a lot of work to be done on that part. It's a balancing act on where do we want to put a proposed plan.

We are here to get the concept, to get a general agreement on the concept, is this the type of remedy that maybe the community will be able to live with, is the cleanup sufficient to certain standards. If we have, you know, the buy

off on this concept, then we go to the details and say, well, if we are going to accomplish this what needs to be done, how are we going to design this remedy. And the monitoring network is obviously a major component of that.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: I am Mark Goldstein, G-o-l-d-s-t-e-i-n. I have been living with this since it's placement on the Superfund site in the '80s. At that time, it came to my attention because I served on the City Commission and as Mayor of the City during that period.

Of course Gainesville wants to see the site remediated and of course we know you have procedures and of course we are pleased that you are discussing it with us in the depths of detail that you are discussing it.

But of course you recognize that we live here, you don't. That in fact we will have the consequences of your good intentions and your activities and you will have different sorts of consequences. If you are successful, you will have praise; and if you are not, you will be here forever at our site, and we will call you back whether or not you are in office at that time in the EPA, largely because we care very much about

the people that come to help us, and we, of course, as Mr. Budeir says, we are here for a concept, a concept.

But we have learned in the past that good intentions and good concepts need hard data, which you are very concerned about as your geologist just said.

And I am glad that you recognize the people that turned out here are a little different than the people that turn out in many of the places you go to fix things. They are exceedingly knowledgable and they live here and they have children here.

So it's not just an option that you communicate with them, it's not just an option that we buy off on your concept. It's not that simple. We buy off on your concept and you learn that the aquifer did not work from south to north, in fact when you check with your geologist, you will find it flows in a different area. The area you are going to monitor you put wells there, you will find that it goes from east to west.

So you need to line up those wells, even if we buy off on the concept, so it defines whether or not the outflow is going in the

direction, and it doesn't wind up at the Gainesville shopping mall.

So because the two aquifers interact in a very special way, which Mr. Boyes and Mr. Lindquist can tell you, that's important. Even though we buy off on the concept, you have to talk to us. Whether or not we buy off on the concept, you have to talk to us.

We have data which will save the government money, it will spend $8 million plus. We want you to spend it right because it's our money and your money, too. We appreciate the ordinance, we appreciate the presentation. We want to make absolutely sure that we are part of the process.

How big is the cap? What is the cap going to be made of in plan 7-A and how big is it going to be? How much paving or what substance are you going to put down?

MR. BUDEIR: I will address the cap issue. The impermeable cap calls for basically a hard cap. There is different technologies and we have learned and discussed that with our research folks.

There's different technologies these

days. And it can be concrete and it could be asphalt, there are components of asphalt, where you got a lot of the void space out of the asphalt, and actually it compares better than concrete as far as impermeability, however, it has the flexibility and ability to handle loads and dynamic loads better than concrete does.

So there are several options. And that's going to go back -- and again, the concept is impermeable cap, meaning something that's equivalent to an impermeable cap that will be a barrier between whatever is in the subsurface and whatever is on the top surface and will support whatever loads and use of property it is subjected to.

You know, I appreciate your comment and I really, you know, it does bring it to a point, you know, with me that I am glad there is an informed community and I am glad there is a community following on this. And absolutely hard data is the bottom line. And we are not going to go forward with anything without proving certainty and also making the community portion of the design as well as remedial action in the future.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: I appreciate that. Are

you pointing there to the lower barrier? That's a general area that the cap is going to be outlined by the black border?

MR. BUDEIR: These are the general areas that are subject to the cap.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: And on the other site, on the Cabot site?

MR. BUDEIR: The Cabot site has already been addressed, we are not re-opening the Record of Decision on that.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: Again, I appreciate the feedback and sensitivity and working with us and talking with us.

MS. WENSKA: It is coming on 8:20, so we have time if there are other comments. Yes, sir.

MR. MASSEY: My name is Gary Massey, M-a-s-s-e-y. I am no longer a resident of Gainesville. I think you know that.

MS. WENSKA: Yes, sir. Nice to see you again.

MR. MASSEY: I have a couple of inquiries. One is has the dioxin on the place been wiped out to your satisfaction as far as effects in the water and the soil around the

dealership or the site, specifically 2378-TCDD?

MR. BUDEIR: Basically, that dioxin in there has been a lot of surface soil samples that were taken specifically for dioxin. And we do have -- we have established or are proposing in the proposed plan the clean-up level on the surficial soil.

However, as far as interaction with the ground water, do you want to address that?

MR. KOPOREC: I am Kevin Koporec, I am a Toxicologist Risk Assessor with EPA Region 4. And basically what we have for dioxin, which is when we say dioxin what we mean is the 2378-TCDD, as this gentleman referred to, and basically what we have is a clean-up goal that's one part per billion or one microgram per kilogram dioxin TCDD in soil, in surface soil. And that concentration will be protective of human health, both direct contact, anybody from children to adults to pets or whatever playing on the soil, as well as be protective of the underlying ground water.

Now, as far as the exact number or exact concentration that would be needed to protect ground water, I would defer to Bill for that. But my understanding is that dioxin is so

immobile and so insoluble that that number will be protective of the underlying ground water, as well.

And I have to confess I am new in this project and I don't have this data in front of me as far as what levels we have measured at the site or off-site or whatever, but I am confident that the one part per billion is a protective number to clean up.

MR. MASSEY: As I understand it, and I know not much and have been unable to read the reports to a degree, although I have tried to learn at the first studies that were done, and at the time, when me and my employees were affected, there was no dioxin per the EPA, per the BER or whatever they call it now, the DEP or whoever. We were lied to then. Period.

I am not here to run Koppers down, I don't know anything about the place, I know that if I ended up staying in the place, I had an old salesman 30 years ago tell me if you keep on doing what you have been doing, you are going to keep on getting what you've been getting. And I know I didn't want anymore of this at that time.

But that place was a big problem when

everybody was telling everyone that it wasn't a problem. When Dr. Kay Jenkins from the EPA in Washington was telling people that there was dioxin in the Koppers wood preservative site that are running the pentachlorophenol process, her bosses were telling her no. Give me reason to have confidence.

I don't need you, I don't need anybody else when it comes to my health and my employees's health, some of which are already dead. So don't B.S. me. I don't care. You took 40 years of my life down the drain. Period. So yes, I am still bitter, I still wake up every night bitter and I will die bitter.

Tell me about Mr. Beazer bought some parts of Koppers, Lord Hanson bought Beazer, some parts of Beazer, I bought a share of stock of Lord Hanson and Hanson PLC. He just sent the liabilities, I guess he took all of the money, but he just sent the liabilities to two Swiss insurance companies per his corporate papers. What liability does Lord Hanson have in this, if any?

MR. BUDEIR: If I can ask somebody, a Beazer representative is present, if he's aware of

the relationship between Hanson and Beazer? We are aware that Beazer is our responsible party and it is the party that has signed the order with EPA and they are liable for the cleanup.

MS. BENANTE: For us, that's the bottom line, we have a responsible party that's willing to pay for the cleanup. And sometimes there are other liability issues, but from EPA's standpoint, if we can get someone to pay for it, we go forward with it. So the issue about --

MR. MASSEY: I can tell you that the people in Gainesville, a good portion of them, are pretty sharp people. I don't know this gentleman with the beard here, but I think that the citizens of Gainesville better listen more to what he has to say.

And Mr. Goldstein, I didn't recognize you, you have gray hair.

But thank you.

MS. WENSKA: Thank you. It's now coming close to the end. If there is someone who hasn't spoken yet and would like to speak, please raise your hand. I see one here and one here. Do you have something to say and then we will finish with this gentleman.

MR. BROURMAN: I am Mitchell Brourman, B-r-o-u-r-m-a-n, I am with Beazer East. And I am a representative of the company that was sent down to tonight's meeting to monitor the meeting.

I have been working on this site since 1992. My telephone number for anyone in the audience who has questions who would like to address those questions to the responsible party is (412)208-8805, and my mailing address is One Oxford Center, Suite 3000, that's Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219.

And the reason I spend the time saying that is because I know it will be recorded in the notes and those notes will be distributed to all of the participants in tonight's meeting if they so choose to get them. If you do have questions that we can answer as the responsible party, please feel free to reach out to us.

I think as a matter of record, it should be noted to the audience that the preferred remedy that EPA speaks of tonight is one that we have not commented on and is one that we have only had limited participation in crafting. And we are going to prepare our own set of comments on that proposed plan and we would urge EPA to distribute

those comments to the public, as well.

Thank you.

MS. WENSKA: Thank you. And you, sir?

MR. INGRAM: My name is Rodney Ingram, I-n-g-r-a-m. I understood you to say that the ground water, I guess you have different stratus layers, the top layer is contained on Cabot's property. Is that what I understood you to say?

MR. BUDEIR: There is a ground water treatment system that is contained in pumping the ground water from the Cabot property. And there is one that is pumping water around the perimeter, the northern and eastern perimeter of the Koppers property.

MR. INGRAM: So that then the surface, I guess, of the property surrounding Koppers are free of contaminants at this point and there won't be any spreading from Koppers back to say the old Cabot site?

MR. BUDEIR: Let me make sure I understand. The aquifer is not free of contaminants at the Koppers site. It's contained, meaning it is not releasing from the site.

MR. INGRAM: It's not spreading. So the old Cabot site then you said is cleaned up, is

finished, you are done with that?

MR. BUDEIR: It's not cleaned up and it's not finished. It is in the process, it's in the remedial action, which means the remedy has been installed and they are pumping also the ground water and it's being sent to the system. So there is contaminated ground water that is being pumped.

We don't anticipate anymore construction, meaning there is no -- we don't see a reason to do anything to amend the system or do anything different.

MS. BENANTE: Tell me if I am right in saying this. On the Koppers site, it's contained, on the Cabot site, not only is it contained, but we are pulling it back. Is that true?

MR. BUDEIR: The type of contamination on the Cabot site is different. You can call it containment, but there isn't that heavy DNAPLEs that we see on the Koppers site. And the system that is in place seems to be doing the job and we have no reason to reopen it.

MR. INGRAM: You said you wanted -- the goal then is to get both of those properties up to residential standard. What time frame do you

think we are looking at before the Cabot site would be brought up to the residential standard?

MR. BUDEIR: For the Cabot site, the Cabot site is commercial property, all of the Cabot site is. What we are discussing today as far as remedies and proposing remedies is for the Koppers site.

MR. INGRAM: The reason I am concerned is I am next door to that, and so I want to make sure there would be no more contaminants flowing from the Koppers site and also that the Cabot site, which I am just north of, is up to a standard that's suitable.

I guess it's not up to residential standards, but how long would it be up to the standard that is considered clean?

MR. BUDEIR: Let me back up a little bit. When we say residential standard, that is for surface soil, meaning for kids to be playing on the soil. That's for residential use. And that is why we are looking at that standard, that the area is surrounded by homes, and we are looking for the surface to be restored to a residential standard.

The ground water part of the equation,

there is no residential and industrial, there is one standard to be met, and that's what we are proposing, also.

MR. INGRAM: So how long -- like I said, I am just north of the Cabot, I am east of Koppers and just north of the Cabot. Would that be considered then at this point cleaned up to whatever standard you all have?

MR. BUDEIR: Where are you?

MR. INGRAM: (Indicating).

MR. BUDEIR: Part of the controls on the Cabot site, Cabot portion of the site, is for any development, if there is any developments or you can dig up any soils, if you can work with us or the County and Environmental Protection Division and let us know what kind of activities are going to take place if you were planning any construction. Otherwise, for commercial use, the property is probably good.

MR. INGRAM: That's what I wanted to be sure of. Thank you.

MS. WENSKA: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. Your former mayor told us that you were informed and we appreciate an orderly process.

On our side of the house, speaking on behalf of the agencies who are here, particularly EPA, whom I work for as a contractor in public involvement, you have been extremely informed and very much helping yourselves and us to understand better what is going on here at the site and in your community.

It is now 8:30, and before I let you go, I want you to know that if you are sitting in the audience and you think of something later or there's something you wanted to say and you didn't get to say it, in your packet, on the back, there is complete contact information for Maher, you may write your comments down and send it in. As long as right now it's postmarked on or before June 5th, it will be considered equally as the comments that have been taken down tonight by the Court Reporter.

With that, on behalf of the agencies here tonight -- and Maher, would you like to say something else?

MR. BUDEIR: There's one correction in the proposed plan we would like to make.

UNKNOWN PERSON: There's one correction, on page 4 of table one, where we list

all of the soil cleanup goals to protect the ground water, this is page 4 on table one, we want to correct one of the numbers on there. The cleanup goals for pentachlorophenol, which is just about on the bottom of the right-hand column, the value should be 0.03 rather than 30. So 0.03 is the correct number for the milligram per kilogram unit that you see at the top of the column. We wanted to make that clarification.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I have cancinogenic on mine, is it carcinogenic?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That should say carcinogenic. That's a typo, thank you for pointing that out. Also, while I'm up here, I'll point out on that same table, this is on clarification, the value for arsenic, the value 4.5 for clean up goal for arsenic is actually based upon arsenic in ground water down to 10 micrograms per liter, rather than 50 micrograms per liter. Many of you might know 10 micrograms per liter was the ground water standard for arsenic that was basically finalized by the Brown or Clinton Administration before George Bush became President, and George Bush in his Administration has taken it back and decided to

look at it some more.

But we still use 10 as a to-be-considered number that we consider to be protective of human health. And that's why in this case we do have a soil cleanup goal that's protective of the lower proposed standard.

JOHN LUCIND: I am John Lucind, with Alachua County, just on that same table, you list a compound called fluorene as an inorganic. Is that correct?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I don't believe so. That's a good correction you point out. That should be listed down in the organics. That is a non-carcinogenic compound to be listed with them. Thank you for that clarification.

MS. WENSKA: Ladies and gentlemen, we will conclude the meeting now. But we'll be around putting our things away if you have other comments individually. If you would like to stop by for a question, please do. We will be here for a few minutes after the meeting. Thank you.

(WHEREUPON, the meeting was concluded.)

State OF FLORIDA
County OF ALACHUA

I, the undersigned authority, certify that the above proceedings were stenographically reported by me.

WITNESS my hand and official seal this 30th day of May, 2001.

CANDICE ARENS
Court Reporter
JOHNS, STEPHENSON & DUNNE/
ADVANTAGE COURT REPORTERS

REPORTER'S DEPOSITION CERTIFICATE

I, Candice Arens, Court Reporter, certify that I was authorized to and did report stenographically the above proceedings and that the transcript is a true and complete record of my stenography notes.

I further certify that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the action.

Dated this 30th day of May, 2001.

CANDICE ARENS
Court Reporter
JOHNS, STEPHENSON & DUNNE/
ADVANTAGE COURT REPORTERS