

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

SUPERFUND PROPOSED REMEDIAL ACTION PLAN
DOUGLASSVILLE DISPOSAL SITE
UNION TOWNSHIP, BERKS COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

PUBLIC MEETING

Date: May 19, 1999

Time: 7:15 p.m.

Place: Union Township Municipal Building
Center Road
Douglassville, PA 19518

COMPUTERIZED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.
By: Cynthia J. Carson, CSR
25 Stevens Avenue, Suite 5
West Lawn, PA 19609

Phone: 610-678-6652

ORIGINAL

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

APPEARANCES:

VICTOR J. JANOSIK,
Remedial Project Manager
KIMBERLY LANE,
Community Involvement Coordinator
US EPA-Region III
1650 Arch Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

RICHARD A. MARTON
JOHN BOROVSKY
Barr Engineering Company
4700 West 77th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55435-4803

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 MS. LANE: My name is Kimberly Lane. I'm
3 the EPA Community Involvement Coordinator for the
4 Superfund site, Douglassville. I'd like to thank you
5 all for coming out and welcome you.

6 Basically, most of the people here are
7 either EPA or supervisors. We do have two supervisors
8 in the back, Leslie Rebmann and Nelson Ott, two
9 supervisors from the township. And we have Vic over
10 here. He's the Remedial Project Manager for the site.
11 We have some representatives from Barr Engineering
12 Company, and they are going to be doing a presentation
13 about the recommendation that we're using for the
14 cleanup of the site.

15 The purpose of tonight's meeting is to
16 present to you EPA's recommendation for cleaning up the
17 Douglassville Disposal Superfund site. This meeting is
18 required by Superfund law, the idea being that citizens
19 will have the opportunity to comment on the
20 recommendation that EPA has presented.

21 Also under the Superfund law, we have what
22 we call a 30-day public comment period. The public
23 comment period began May 10th; and it was published in
24 the Pottstown Mercury, as well as the Reading Eagle.
25 And the public comment period will end June 9th, 1999.

1 EPA will address any comments received
2 tonight or submitted to the EPA office in Philadelphia
3 before making a final cleanup decision. Everything that
4 we are saying here tonight is being recorded by a
5 stenographer. The transcript of this public meeting
6 will go into the record and will be available for your
7 review at the information repository. We have an
8 information repository set up here at the Union Township
9 building, and we also have one at the EPA office in
10 Philadelphia.

11 For those of you who have not had a chance
12 to read the proposed plan, I do have copies here
13 tonight. So, after the meeting, I can give you a copy,
14 if you would like. We do have a sign-up sheet in the
15 back in case anyone wants to be added to our mailing
16 list. I don't know if you're already on it or not. But
17 if you want to be added, please sign the sign-up sheet
18 that we'll have in the back at the end of the meeting.

19 The agenda is very simple. We're going to
20 basically present our recommendation to you, and then
21 we'll open the floor for any comments or questions that
22 you may have. And basically, I'll turn it over to Vic
23 now, who will give you a little background and history
24 of the site and a slide presentation.

25 MR. JANOSIK: I'm talking to mostly people

1 who are very familiar with the site already and a couple
2 of people who may not be very familiar. I'm Vic
3 Janosik. I'm the Remedial Project Manager for EPA.
4 I've been working on this project now since 1986; so,
5 I'm relatively familiar with it, probably as familiar as
6 anybody.

7 What I wanted to do initially was give you
8 a little bit of a chronology of EPA involvement with the
9 site and show you a few slides, a few of my almost 550
10 slides that I have in my office. I'm only going to show
11 you 15 of those. I'm sure you'll thank me for that
12 later.

13 EPA involvement essentially started in
14 about 1972, not with the Superfund program, but with
15 Hurricane Agnes. Hurricane Agnes, of course, caused the
16 Schuylkill River to rise; and lagoons that were at the
17 site flooded and washed some material down the
18 Schuylkill River. In 1979, that happened again; and EPA
19 came in and did some remedial work under the Clean Water
20 Act.

21 In the early 1980s, specifically 1982, we
22 became involved in doing what we call a preliminary
23 assessment and site investigation. The site was looked
24 at as being a possible Superfund site. And we assessed
25 the site, did some sampling, looked at the site as being

1 a potential contaminant for the Schuylkill River, which
2 is a drinking water source for a number of municipal
3 entities downstream, including Pottstown and Norristown,
4 Conshohocken, and the City of Philadelphia. The site
5 subsequently was put on a list of hazardous sites in the
6 United States called the National Priorities List or the
7 NPL; and that made it a Superfund site. And being put
8 on that list essentially mandates an ^{assessment} under law. We have
9 to address it from a point of cleaning it up. We have
10 to look at it harder for cleanup and assess various
11 types of cleanup options, which we have done.

12 Let me show you some slides now and get
13 you more -- introduce you more to the site.

14 The site operated under the name Berks
15 Associates from about 1939 or 1941 -- I keep hearing
16 both dates -- until about 1985. I understand that they
17 were on the site in 1939 but possibly didn't start
18 taking petroleum until about 1941. And they stopped
19 doing re-refining work on the site in 1985.

20 This is an aerial view of the site. This
21 is actually a photograph of -- let me walk up here a
22 little bit. This is the Schuylkill River, and this area
23 in here is the site. We're looking straight down at it.
24 This would be south. This would be north. The
25 Schuylkill River is north. Douglassville is over in

1 this area.

2 This is the tank farm area. You can see
3 the tops of the tanks. One of these tanks is over
4 600,000 gallons. We remediated this tank farm ending in
5 1991.

6 These areas over here were buried lagoons.
7 They show some vegetation on them, but they are very
8 oily soil underneath.

9 This entire area in here was contaminated
10 soil. This area here is what we are calling the Source
11 Area 2, filter cake waste. And this area right up in
12 here is Source Area 9.

13 This is a part of the tank farm. I guess
14 it's taking a picture toward the historic house that's
15 located on the adjacent property called the Rosetree
16 property.

17 There is some more of the tanks. If you
18 look at the water real closely that they are sitting in,
19 it is not necessarily the cleanest stuff.

20 This is a view of the tank farm, looking
21 over top of the large pile of filter cake waste. The
22 filter cake waste is about maybe an acre or more, about
23 12 to 15 feet deep. Filter cake waste was diatomaceous
24 earth. It's a gray powdery substance. It's the same
25 type of material that's used in home swimming pool

1 filters.

2 The contaminated oil, the used oil, was
3 run through by various means, a filtering process of
4 using diatomaceous earth. When the diatomaceous earth
5 became contaminated with the materials that the company
6 wanted to filter out of the used oil, then that
7 diatomaceous earth was so contaminated they had to
8 dispose of it someplace. And this is one of the places
9 they took it and dumped it, into this pile.

10 This is one of the areas north of the tank
11 farm and just south of the river. I put this slide in
12 there so you can see nothing grows there. If you look
13 at the date on the slide, it's March of 1987, more or
14 less early in this process. But this area had been
15 sitting vacant for a long period of time. And as you
16 know, whenever any kind of a field sets vacant, trees
17 and grasses start to grow on it. But as you can see,
18 there is nothing growing. And nothing is growing there
19 because the soil was too toxic for seeds to germinate.

20 This picture isn't too clear. Let me turn
21 out the light here. On the right-hand side, you can see
22 soil where almost nothing grows. And on the left-hand
23 side, you can see what is, at this particular moment in
24 time -- this, again, is 1987 -- the remains of a
25 cornfield. And the area where the cornfield was is the

1 portion of the site where the soils hadn't been
2 contaminated on the surface; and the area where nothing
3 is growing is where the soils had oily substances
4 incorporated into them. So, you can see that there is
5 quite a bit of toxicity in the soil on the right-hand
6 side, whereas the left-hand side, there had been no oil
7 incorporated in the soil. It's used as a farm field.
8 There is a bit of a difference there.

9 EPA did a number of studies at the site,
10 including two, what we call, remedial investigation
11 feasibility studies. This is one of our in-house
12 biologists doing a wetland survey at the site.

13 In 1988, based on the information that we
14 had and based on the threats that we had calculated at
15 the site, we wrote a Record of Decision, a formal
16 document, delineating that the tank farm portion of the
17 site should be taken down and the materials disposed of
18 off site. The materials ⁱⁿ ~~and~~ the tanks were disposed of
19 by incineration off site. The tanks themselves were,
20 for the most part, recycled.

21 We removed, as I recall, 122 vessels of
22 various sorts, ranging from 600,000 gallons to only
23 several hundred gallons in size: underground tanks,
24 vertical tanks, stainless steel tanks, wooden tanks, and
25 a number of vehicles that also had contaminated oil

1 products in them from the site.

2 These are people packing up materials from
3 inside the tanks, and they are putting it in drums for
4 shipment off site for incineration.

5 Here's part of that cleanup process also.

6 And when we were done remediating the tank
7 farm where all the tanks had been, this is what we left,
8 an open field.

9 In 1989, we wrote another Record of
10 Decision. And that Record of Decision called for, among
11 other things, the covering or capping of the area, the
12 northern portion of the site.

13 There is a Conrail right-of-way that runs
14 east-west through the site. And on the northern side o
15 that Conrail right-of-way, we had the contaminated soil,
16 the soil that I showed you previously in previous slides
17 that was contaminated. We decided that that be covered,
18 and this is part of that covering process. We call this
19 a modified soil cap. You can see some gravel in the
20 foreground, some membrane between it, and the soil
21 that's being put on top. The gravel portion is to
22 prevent the oil from coming up into the soil that's laid
23 on top of it.

24 That remedial action, which covered about
25 15 acres or so, was completed in 1993. And you can see

1 the date on this slide down at the bottom right-hand
2 corner in April of 1993. This is what that site looked
3 like after we remediated it. And previously, it looked
4 like bare soil.

5 Again, here's a shot of the filter cake
6 waste pile. You can see it; it's rather thick. We're
7 looking north to south here at the tank farm, which, of
8 course, the tank farm is no longer there. But that
9 waste pile is still there. That waste pile is a major
10 concern of this public meeting tonight.

11 Here's a slide of contractors with a
12 backhoe sitting near the pile of filter cake waste,
13 digging out a portion of the filter cake waste and
14 piling on plastic to test various physical properties of
15 it. I put this slide in because you can see that the
16 filter cake waste is a black, oily, oozy type of
17 material; and it's, as I said before, diatomaceous earth
18 filter cake waste. And it's about 37 percent oil, but
19 it also contains hazardous substance contaminants,
20 including lead and low levels of PCBs and what we call
21 volatile organic compounds.

22 And that's the end of that.

23 Now, what we're proposing here today in
24 our proposed remedial action plan -- we have copies of
25 it up here -- we had looked at three alternatives in a

1 recent document called a Focused Feasibility Study,
2 which the people that we call the potentially
3 responsible parties, the people that we essentially
4 blame, if you will, for the contamination at the site,
5 the potentially responsible parties put together a
6 feasibility study. And in that feasibility study, they
7 looked at three possible alternatives for the
8 remediation of this filter cake waste.

9 I have to back up a little bit. Back in
10 1989, which, as I said before, we wrote a Record of
11 Decision; and in that Record of Decision, we had
12 delineated a remedial action for that pile of filter
13 cake waste; and the remedial action we had delineated
14 was on-site incineration.

15 Well, through a long legal process, which
16 I won't bore you with because I don't know all the
17 nuances of it, the PRPs, the potentially responsible
18 parties, told us that they would rather do a
19 stabilization remedial action for this filter cake waste
20 rather than the on-site incineration.

21 We asked them -- and they volunteered,
22 actually -- to do what we call treatability studies on
23 the filter cake waste for the stabilization process to
24 see if it would work.

25 They took the oily material. They

1 subjected it to various types of tests, various types of
2 chemical and physical tests. And those chemical and
3 physical test results were then evaluated by EPA
4 research and development people. And when we looked at
5 the test results of the stabilization process that they
6 proposed, which is lime-based stabilization, our
7 research and development people judged that process had
8 worked adequately to be protective. And that's one of
9 the criteria that we require, as far as a cleanup is
10 concerned.

11 So, we asked the potentially responsible
12 parties to write a feasibility study, or they proposed
13 to write a feasibility study, and to evaluate the
14 stabilization alternative and compare it with a couple
15 of other alternatives.

16 The two others were, again, our on-site
17 incineration alternative, which we had chosen in the
18 1989 decision, and off-site incineration so we could
19 scoop the material up and haul it someplace to a
20 commercial incinerator for off-site incineration.

21 And in doing that, they came up with
22 scenarios for protectiveness, for implementability, for
23 compliance with various state and federal laws, and
24 other types of criteria, including cost. Most people
25 are more concerned about the cost than some of the other

1 things.

2 The on-site incineration, when the PRP
3 group did their feasibility study, they judged that the
4 on-site incineration would probably cost somewhere in
5 the mid-30-million-dollar range, 34-, maybe \$38 million.
6 They judged that the off-site incineration would
7 probably cost in the 60- to mid-60-million-dollar range,
8 and that the stabilization alternative would probably
9 cost somewhere around 13- to maybe \$17 million. I think
10 the latest assessment is about 13 million. So, there is
11 a very drastic difference in the amount of money
12 that was involved in remediating this material.

13 Now, as far as the protectiveness of the
14 remedies was concerned, when EPA looked at the three
15 alternatives and their protectiveness, we judged that
16 they would probably be equally protective. But, of
17 course, the costs were not equal. And another major
18 consideration was that the potentially responsible party
19 group has told us that they were willing to implement
20 the stabilization remedy, whereas they were not
21 necessarily willing to implement the on-site or off-site
22 incineration remedies.

23 When EPA went through the evaluation
24 process and looked at all of the alternatives, looked at
25 the protectiveness, looked at the times involved, looked

1 at the costs involved, we decided that the on-site
2 stabilization process was, indeed, a viable process.
3 And we have chosen it as our preferred remedial action
4 alternative in this proposed plan.

5 That's where we stand today, and that's
6 what the proposal says. If you haven't gotten a copy of
7 the plan, there is one in the public repository here.
8 But we have a number of copies. It's about 15 pages,
9 with a couple of drawing attachments at the back. If
10 you'd like a copy of it, you're certainly welcome to one
11 or more if you need them.

12 Now, as far as the stabilization process
13 is concerned, for those of you who don't understand what
14 stabilization is, we're looking at a process that
15 essentially mixes lime and possibly other ingredients in
16 with the material.

17 And Barr Engineering Company is here
18 representing the PRP group today to give a brief
19 discussion of the stabilization process and their
20 involvement in the upcoming remediation. From Barr
21 Engineering, we have two people. We have Rick Marton,
22 who is sitting over here on the side; and this man over
23 here who decided to dress exactly the way I dressed
24 tonight, John Borovsky is here from Barr Engineering in
25 Minneapolis, Minnesota.

1 So, I'm going to turn this over to Rick
2 Marton; and I think he has a few slides that he wants to
3 show.

4 MR. MARTON: I'll try not to be too
5 redundant with what Vic has told you. But as Victor
6 said, John and I are with Barr Engineering. We're a
7 company headquartered in Minnesota, with offices in
8 Missouri and Michigan. But we also do work in other
9 parts of the company. We're a design and consulting
10 engineering company that has over 20 years of experience
11 in remediation; with that, a variety of types of sites,
12 including sites like this that have oily waste.

13 We became involved with the PRP group
14 seven years ago this month, I think, during the time
15 frame that the cap was being completed on the north side
16 of the site.

17 And what I want to do is go through fairly
18 quickly the remediation alternatives evaluation that Vic
19 alluded to or mentioned, and also a little bit more
20 about the proposed remediation, and then open it up for
21 questions, if you have any, about the proposed
22 remediation.

23 We completed the Focused Feasibility Study
24 and evaluated as much as EPA did, data that were
25 collected based on soil borings and trench soil samples

1 and other types of investigations. And again, the
2 primary contaminants are oil and different organic
3 compounds found in oils, lead, and low levels of PCBs.

4 In addition to the slides that we have
5 here, we've got a couple of posters that you might want
6 to glance at that could be helpful. This one shows the
7 different source areas. And north of the rail bed is
8 the area that has been capped already. And we're going
9 to be focusing on the cleanup of the area south of the
10 rail bed.

11 And over there, you can see pretty much
12 the same area with an aerial photograph. And the areas
13 that are colored in sort of an orange color, or whatever
14 you would call that, are areas where we're proposing and
15 EPA is proposing to excavate the filter cake waste
16 material and also some ditch sediments that are
17 contaminated with the waste and treat them with
18 stabilization.

19 The green areas would get a cover, a soil
20 cover. So, Source Area 1, again, was the processing
21 facility and tank farm area. Source Area 2 contains the
22 filter cake. There is also, as I was saying, a couple
23 of ditches.

24 If you look over here, there was some
25 drainage from Source Area 2 where there are sediments

1 that are contaminated with some of the waste material.
2 Over here there is a drainage-way, where there is ditch
3 sediments that are contaminated with some of the waste
4 material. And also there is a culvert that goes under
5 the rail bed where there was some migration of the waste
6 material through the culvert and into a ditch area on
7 the north side of the railway. And those ditch
8 sediments will be excavated and managed with the filter
9 cake material.

10 There is Source Area 9. That's where the
11 long ditch is.

12 This is another slide showing you what the
13 filter cake material looks like when we were out
14 collecting samples for the treatability testing for
15 stabilization. So, you can see that there. In some
16 areas, there is a veneer of cover soil that was placed
17 over the filter cake. In other areas, the filter cake
18 is completely exposed.

19 This is a view of that ditch that runs
20 through Source Area 9.

21 And as Vic was saying, we looked at three
22 alternatives in the Focused Feasibility Study, the
23 on-site incineration, with stabilization of the
24 incineration residuals, if that was needed.
25 Incineration does not destroy the inorganic phase; so,

1 there still would be quite a bit of metals, particularly
2 lead, that might have required stabilization to
3 immobilize them. And then placement of that material
4 back into the Source Area 2 excavation.

5 The second alternative called for
6 excavating the filter cake and the contaminated
7 sediments and incinerating the material off-site,
8 hauling it off-site to a commercial facility where it
9 would be incinerated, stabilized if necessary to
10 immobilized inorganic contaminants, and disposed of at
11 an off-site facility.

12 The third alternative, which is the EPA's
13 preferred alternative, is the excavation, stabilization,
14 and disposal of the material back into the excavation
15 area.

16 What is stabilization? It's kind of a
17 cumbersome definition, but it really is based on
18 introducing reagents or other additives into the waste
19 so that you can improve the material handling
20 characteristics and also immobilize any of the
21 contaminants in the material so that they are not
22 released into the environment.

23 It works by -- one way that it works is it
24 reduces the solubility of contaminants and also works
25 the absorption of contaminants, to keep them from

1 moving.

2 Now, the reagents that we will be using at
3 the site are lime-based, which is calcium oxide or
4 calcium hydroxide, with possible other additives that
5 will increase the effectiveness.

6 We collected a number of samples from
7 Source Area 2 and sent them to a lab in Georgia called
8 Kiber, who does a lot of testing for EPA. They are an
9 independent treatability study lab that specializes in
10 stabilization processes. And the lab would blend the
11 waste with various proportions of the reagents and then
12 test to see whether performance criteria were being met.

13 Now, the performance criteria basically
14 are tests that will determine how much the contaminants
15 will or will not leach out of the material after it's
16 been stabilized. Then there are physical
17 characteristics, such as the stabilized material will
18 not have any free water or free oil phase.

19 This is just a pile of some of the
20 material that's been stabilized with the lime. You can
21 see that the lime has been mixed throughout the waste.
22 That little device up there measures any emissions that
23 might be coming off the material, any gases.

24 So, the alternatives again: Alternative
25 1, which is the stabilization alternative, calls for

1 excavation, treatment by stabilization, backfilling in
2 the Source Area 2, and then covering of Source Areas 1,
3 2, and 9; so, the areas that you see there, the green
4 and the orange areas.

5 Alternative 2 was the similar to
6 Alternative 1, except the treatment technology would
7 have been incineration.

8 The third alternative calls for excavation
9 of the material and hauling off-site for treatment.

10 We went through a fairly involved process
11 of evaluating and comparing the different alternatives,
12 and I won't get into a great detail of that. But EPA
13 has a procedure where there are a number of criteria
14 that need to be considered. And what we're listing here
15 are some of the more significant differences that we see
16 between the different remedies.

17 Alternative 1, the stabilization remedy,
18 is protective of human health in the environment. That
19 conclusion is reached based on the testing of the
20 materials after they've been stabilized and also
21 considering the environment in which they will be
22 placed.

23 It will take a shorter time to implement.
24 It can be done in about a year, anywhere from 8 to 16
25 months. We expect the actual on-site time for

1 excavation and stabilization of the material to occur
2 over a three- to four-month period. And then most of
3 the rest of the time is placing the cover soils and
4 restoring the site.

5 The remedy is effective at stabilizing
6 both the lead and other metals and organic contaminants
7 so they are not released into the environment. And it's
8 the most cost effective.

9 Alternatives 2 and 3 are the two
10 incineration alternatives. They are also protective of
11 human health and the environment, but they would take a
12 longer time to complete. We've estimated it would be at
13 least 18 months of on-site work for incineration of the
14 material on site. And also Alternative 3 would probabl
15 be a year and a half for excavating, staging the
16 material, loading it in the trucks, and hauling it
17 off-site for incineration.

18 The off-site incineration remedy would
19 result in a significant amount of truck traffic to and
20 from the site, as approximately 37,000 cubic yards of
21 this material would have to be placed into trucks and
22 hauled.

23 The on-site incineration remedy would
24 involve not as much movement of materials off-site, but
25 there would be quite a bit of equipment that would be

1 needed and very complex incineration equipment at the
2 site. And both of those alternatives, again, we
3 estimate quite a bit higher in cost than the
4 stabilization alternative.

5 The preferred alternative, excavation of
6 the source material, the filter waste, the filter cake
7 waste, basically the material would be excavated,
8 stabilized, tested to make sure that it passes all of
9 the testing requirements to demonstrate that it will
10 immobilize the contaminants, and then placed back into
11 Source Area 2. Again, the areas would be covered; and
12 the institution of controls would be applied to the
13 site.

14 This one is basically just a reproduction
15 of what's up there.

16 This is a cartoon that shows conceptually
17 the main steps of the process for the preferred
18 alternative. The material would be excavated. It would
19 be treated. That, right there, is a particular type of
20 treatment process called the Pugmill. But the Pugmill
21 or other processes are commonly used for mixing the
22 reagents with the waste material. The material would be
23 then placed back into the excavation and then covered,
24 and the site would be restored with vegetation.

25 This is a cartoon of what the site would

1 look like afterwards. Right now, the area north of the
2 rail bed is revegetated; and the area south that we
3 would be remediating would appear somewhat similar to
4 what the area north does now.

5 The next steps in the process -- well,
6 we've completed the Focused Feasibility Study report;
7 and it's been accepted by EPA. The proposed remedial
8 action plan has been provided by EPA. And now we're in
9 the formal public comment period; this meeting, being a
10 portion of that.

11 At the end of the public comments, EPA, in
12 consultation with the State, will develop an amendment
13 to the 1989 Record of Decision which will change the
14 selected treatment technology from incineration to
15 stabilization.

16 Barr Engineering, working with the PRP
17 group, is beginning the remedial design, which we intend
18 to complete this year. EPA and the State and their
19 subcontractors will review the design. We are
20 evaluating contractors that have extensive experience at
21 this type of remedy implementation. A contractor will
22 be selected; and then our hopes are that we will be
23 ready to go into the field next spring, in 2000, and
24 begin the remedy.

25 How will this affect you? The more

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

significant ^{waste} ~~waste~~ that we see that this remedy will affect the people that are either driving on the road by the site or living or working near the site will be that there will be some extra traffic in the area. There will be workers coming and going from the site. We expect, for the three or four months that the actual excavation and stabilization is taking place, there may be approximately 15 people working on site. There will be some truck traffic, basically bringing the reagents to the site. There will be something on the order of 10 to 20 to 30 percent or possibly higher of reagents added to the material; so, there is going to be quite a bit of lime based reagent that's brought to the site.

Air emissions and odor control will be monitored and controlled as necessary. This is frequently a concern of people that are living near remediation projects.

Site appearance will be improved. It will look a lot better without that waste pile. And the work will be completed in approximately one year.

Operation and noise would be limited to daylight working hours.

We're here to take any questions that might come up.

MS. LANE: At this time, we will open the

1 floor for comments and questions. Before you make your
2 statement, I'd ask that you say your name aloud so the
3 stenographer can include you in the transcript.

4 Are there any questions or comments at
5 this time?

6 MR. KATAUSKAS: I want to introduce
7 myself. My name is Phil Katauskas. I represent
8 Conrail. And Cyndi has my card; so, she can spell my
9 name. Sometimes I think that's the only reason I carry
10 them around.

11 Just to clarify one point, there is an
12 abandoned -- you all know there is an abandoned rail bed
13 up there, and it's no longer owned by Conrail. In 1991
14 or 1992, Conrail sold it to the Schuylkill Greenway
15 Association. And you may know that the Schuylkill
16 Greenway Association is a non-profit organization,
17 basically a nature conservancy group. And they are
18 planning --

19 Are you from there?

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

21 MR. KATAUSKAS: I'm taking your thunder.
22 They are planning to make a hiking trail,
23 I think, from Reading to Valley Forge.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Actually, the
25 ~~headquarters~~ ^{headwaters} to Philadelphia.

1 MR. KATAUSKAS: Well, the point is that
2 Conrail hasn't owned anything out there since '91 or
3 '92, and that rail bed -- and, Vic, you can correct me
4 if I'm wrong -- is not the subject of any clean-up
5 action and never has been.

6 The other point I'd like to make is that
7 when Victor and Rick talked about the capping in the
8 northern lagoons up here, that was all ordered by EPA
9 but voluntarily done by a group of over 20 companies.
10 Conrail was included. That cost over \$1 million, and it
11 looks to be a success. It looks pretty nice out there.

12 The other point that I wanted to make was
13 that Barr Engineering -- so there is no
14 misunderstanding -- does not work for EPA. A group of
15 nine companies, including Conrail and eight other
16 companies, hired Barr Engineering back in 1992 or '93;
17 and we've been working with Barr to try to find what we
18 believe is an acceptable remedy for the site, for EPA,
19 and for the neighbors. And I think we've come upon one.
20 And, of course, the companies, including Conrail, had
21 been funding all those studies; and we've been
22 submitting them to EPA for their review.

23 I'll take any questions, if you have any,
24 about Conrail or their involvement. Other than that,
25 that's my comment.

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

MR. MARTON: Thanks, Phil.

MS. REBMANN: I'm Leslie Rebmann,
R-e-b-m-a-n-n, from the Union Township Board of
Supervisors.

I guess the first thing I'm wondering is
if you could explain a little bit about the excavation
process, what exactly will occur, what kinds of
things -- it seems to me you'll be stirring up what's
there; and I'm wondering what will happen, in terms of
what might be released either in the way of toxic
materials or even just dust and so forth into the air
and if there might also be some odors involved at that
point.

MR. MARTON: First, we are bound to compl
with State and Federal rules that both apply to ambient
air concentrations of hazardous constituents and also
protection of the workers at the site. And that's part
of what we are evaluating during the design processes.

Some types of controls are necessary and,
if they are, what will they be? Certainly we are going
to make every effort possible to control odors. And you
are right, when the material is stirred up, there is a
chance that there is going to be some odors; and there
are different ways that you can approach that.

In this type of work, there are foams that

1 can be sprayed over the material that's exposed so that
2 it suppresses the odors. There is equipment called
3 oxidizers that can actually dampen down the odors.
4 There are a number of other controls both in the way
5 that you do the excavation and what you do if there are
6 odors coming off of the material.

7 We're looking at that, and we're also
8 evaluating -- well, there has been work done in the
9 past; and we're going to do some more of it, in looking
10 at what might be released during the process. The
11 things that -- you know, volatile organic compounds are
12 concerned; and we are going to be taking precautions.
13 And, if necessary, all of the mixing equipment would be
14 enclosed to capture emissions if we find that we need to
15 do that in order to keep the emissions at very low
16 levels.

17 MR. JANOSIK: If I may say something along
18 those lines. I noted previously that we had taken down
19 the tank farm. And the tank farm, of course, had quite
20 a number of tons, thousands and thousands of gallons of
21 waste oils and sludges in the tanks, as well as, on the
22 outside of the tanks, there was some of this filter cake
23 waste that we had to excavate in areas in order to
24 remediate that tank farm area.

25 During that tank farm remediation, we put

1 up air monitors around the perimeter of the work areas.
2 And to my knowledge, during that entire process of
3 taking down the tank farm, we didn't have any
4 exceedances of the air quality standards that are set up
5 by the Federal Government and the State Government for
6 human health purposes. We didn't have anything that
7 would be detrimental to human health or the environment
8 cross the boundary lines. In fact, we found that the
9 greatest number of emissions -- we had one of our air
10 monitors rather near Route 724. And that was the one
11 air monitor picking up the most air pollution, and that
12 was because of the automobile traffic, rather than from
13 our own work that was on the site.

14 MS. REBMANN: And was that work doing any
15 kind of earth disturbance similar to what you're doing
16 here?

17 MR. JANOSIK: There was quite a bit of
18 earth disturbance, yes. We had to dig up that entire
19 area. At the time, as I understand it, that entire area
20 was oil soaked. And we had to dig a number of tanks out
21 of the ground, some of which were over 10,000 gallons.
22 Ten-thousand-gallon tanks, we had to dig those out of
23 the ground. Many of those tanks were completely
24 surrounded with contaminated soils and septic oils that
25 had sat under the ground and had gone sour, if you will

1 over the decades. And even with all of that and our men
2 working on the site in the masks that you probably saw
3 in my slides, we had no emissions beyond human health
4 standards that went past the boundary lines. And we
5 monitored the entire process the entire time, and we
6 will do the same thing in this process also.

7 There is a very formal design process that
8 goes on. What we're doing here is just kind of setting
9 up the concept of what EPA and, of course, PRP prefer to
10 do at this particular point in time. So, it's a
11 conceptual thing. There is an entire design that has to
12 be set in place. We go through a very formal process of
13 determining exactly what has to be done under various
14 conditions in order to ^affect this remediation. And
15 that design process will not only be formulated by Barr
16 Engineering, but it will be looked at by EPA and the
17 Army Corps of Engineers who will be conducting
18 oversight, if you will, of this entire process for EPA
19 and with EPA. And, of course, the State of Pennsylvania
20 will be involved the whole way also.

21 MS. REBMANN: Will this be coordinated at
22 all through the County Soil Conservation District?
23 Typically when you would do this kind of activity at a
24 local level, you would have an ENS permit, something on
25 that order, because of soil disturbance and concerns for

1 runoff. Obviously, erosion wouldn't be a problem here.
2 But will that be coordinated at all? That would be the
3 local agency that would be doing this for DEP typically.

4 MR. JANOSIK: Let me try to address the
5 permits issue first. Whenever we do work on a Federal
6 Superfund project, the law specifically exempts us from
7 getting permits of any kind, even Federal permits. We
8 don't have to get permits to do this work.

9 However, we do have to meet the
10 substantive requirements of State and Federal
11 environmental laws. And we have listed those in the
12 proposed plan, the air emission standards and so on.

13 As far as surface water discharges are
14 concerned, let's say, to the Schuylkill River, or
15 erosion standards, those will all be considered within
16 the design documents. And sometime during the design
17 process or nearing the end of the design, we can come
18 back and present the design documents to Union Township
19 or work with Union Township in any way that you deem
20 necessary in order to make sure that the local
21 requirements are addressed. But no permits will be
22 gotten.

23 MS. REBMANN: So, basically, you take care
24 of your own oversight, is what you're saying.

25 MR. JANOSIK: Absolutely. Like I said,

1 the oversight will be from the United States
2 Environmental Protection Agency, the Pennsylvania
3 Department of Environmental Protection, and the U.S.
4 Army Corps of Engineers.

5 MS. REBMANN: Is this a process that has
6 been used at other sites to any extent?

7 MR. MARTON: Yes, as a matter of fact, it
8 has been. And, I don't know, I've actually anticipated
9 that question. And if you'd like, I've got a whole list
10 of sites that I could give you.

11 But the bottom line is that this type of
12 lime stabilization has been used for years at petroleum
13 refinery sites and also Superfund sites and other types
14 of cleanups.

15 MS. REBMANN: I would appreciate a copy of
16 that list, if you have one.

17 MR. MARTON: There are a number of
18 well-qualified contractors that we've been working with
19 and interviewing and making sure that they've got the
20 experience with very similar types of materials and
21 similar types of sites that implement this.

22 MS. REBMANN: Those would be people who
23 are accustomed to handling this?

24 MR. MARTON: That's exactly right. One of
25 our major prequalifications for consideration was that

1 they've got a significant amount of experience at this
2 type of work.

3 MS. REBMANN: You mentioned there would be
4 other additives in addition to the lime-based additives.
5 Can you elaborate on that just a little bit?

6 MR. MARTON: Lime, at its most basic, is
7 calcium oxide or calcium hydroxide, quick lime or
8 hydrated lime. And there are other additives that we
9 have tested during the design phase. And the selection
10 of the contractors, we're going to narrow in more
11 exactly on exactly what reagents will be used and at
12 what proportion.

13 But there are other things that have been
14 tested and proposed by various other contractors, such
15 as adding phosphates, which tend to blend or precipitate
16 out the lead to even decrease the mobility of lead and
17 other metals further. Carbonates can be used to also
18 have the same type of effect as phosphates. There are
19 materials that have been proposed that have some
20 pozzolanic properties.

21 We are by no means going to be making this
22 into a cement. It's going to be a soil-like material
23 that can be easily picked up and handled and placed and
24 compacted much like a soil. But pozzolanic means that
25 there are some types of reactions with aluminosilicates

1 that may also add to the benefits of stabilizing the
2 inorganic constituents.

3 MR. BOROVSKY: Vic, we might also want to
4 mention that several of the contractors are anticipating
5 addition of materials to just help with the
6 material-handling characteristics. Victor, in his
7 presentation, was talking about it being soupy,
8 sometimes tar-like and so on. .And, so, just for the
9 ability for equipment to be able to handle the stuff and
10 not get stuck in the buckets and that kind of a thing,
11 they may initially use materials that just generally
12 improve its handling property so that they can mix it
13 and handle it easier so it isn't so messy. And it has
14 less to do with the chemical characteristics or
15 immobilization, but they trying to improve how the
16 material handles so they can do the other things they
17 need to.

18 MS. REBMANN: And that would be after
19 excavation but before stabilization?

20 MR. BOROVSKY: Some people proposed adding
21 some of that material directly as they were excavating.
22 Others have proposed the first scoop is going to be to
23 pick it up and place it someplace else where they can
24 add the conditioning agents. Others don't believe that
25 the type of equipment that they are proposing would be

1 hampered by it and might not use it at all, but it's
2 pretty much the contractor trying to work out what they
3 think would be the best method for doing this and the
4 best means, effective and safe for the people while they
5 are working with it, as well.

6 MR. MARTON: And the types of other
7 additives that we would be looking at are things that
8 are relatively inert. In other words, we would not be
9 introducing problems by adding other types of materials.

10 MS. REBMANN: I'm a little surprised that,
11 although this is something that's been done before,
12 there seems to be a lot of undecided things to this. Is
13 that typical? Does it vary from site to site? Is that
14 the reason for that? There are a lot of unknowns here.

15 MR. MARTON: It does vary from site to
16 site and from the type of materials and from also the
17 contractor. Some contractors have preferences for
18 different types of ways to approach this problem.

19 They are all going to be -- all the
20 processes that we're looking at are lime-based, and they
21 are all going to be held to the same performance
22 standards. But until we actually get a little further
23 with the design -- and we've done extensive treatability
24 testing, but until we are contracting or the PRP group
25 is contracting with the remedial contractor, we won't

1 know the exact amount of material that will be added.
2 And even in the field~~X~~ while you're mixing this stuff
3 up, you may do performance testing and find that you
4 need to add a little bit more or less, that type of
5 thing.

6 But we've got a wealth of information from
7 over three years of treatability testing of this
8 material to go by. And that's helping us in selecting a
9 remediation contractor because we're pretty sure what we
10 believe or know works, but we want a contractor to
11 propose what they think will work and then make sure
12 that it meets our specifications.

13 MR. JANOSIK: We're a little bit confused
14 about the process that we have to go through here. I
15 think the next step in the process for Barr Engineering
16 and the PRP group is that they are going to select a
17 contractor. And with that contractor and with Barr
18 Engineering and people in the field, they will then go
19 through a design process. They will design what that
20 contractor can do with his equipment, his particular
21 proposal.

22 There are probably a number of ways to
23 physically handle this material. Each individual
24 contractor has his own nuances about how to handle the
25 material and how to tweak it at various times in various

1 ways in order to meet the performance standards. But in
2 the Record of Decision amendment that we'll be writing,
3 there will be what are called performance standards.
4 This material, while we're doing it and when it's done,
5 is going to have to meet a certain set of criteria.

6 Now, that certain set of criteria, no
7 matter who does it, no matter how long it takes them to
8 do it, no matter what equipment they use, that material
9 is going to have to meet that minimum set of criteria
10 that we consider to be protective of human health ^{and} ~~in~~ the
11 environment. That's our major concern here before that
12 material is placed back into the ground.

13 MR. STONELAKE: I might be able to
14 supplement a little bit. I'm Ben Stonelake, and I'll
15 give you a card afterwards. I'm an attorney for the
16 former Pennsylvania Railroad and Penn Central Railroad.

17 One other thing that we've experienced so
18 far is that, of the vendors that we're interviewing, we
19 intend to select a construction contractor to work with
20 Barr Engineering Company to finish the design. And they
21 are all kind of a little protective of their favorite
22 formulas for how they want to blend things. And they
23 all have different experiences at different locations
24 with treating wastes of this type and treating other
25 types of waste. And, so, in the interviewing process,

1 they are a little reluctant to tell us everything about
2 how they want to do it because they don't want their
3 competitors to get an advantage from their past
4 experiences.

5 They all understand that whoever is the
6 winning contractor is going to have to totally disclose
7 just exactly what their mixes are, but they are trying
8 to protect as much proprietary information as they can
9 until they find out if they are the winning contractor.
10 Then that information has to be reviewed and approved by
11 Barr because we're not going to want to pay for
12 something that isn't going to work. And it's going to
13 have to be reviewed by the EPA and the Corps of
14 Engineers and DEP before that design will be finally
15 approved.

16 MR. KATAUSKAS: I'd like to point out two
17 things here, if I may. We spent almost three of the
18 five days last week interviewing four contractors. We
19 spent about three, three and a half hours for each set
20 of interviews; and that was after we received voluminous
21 proposals as to how they would do the job.

22 But the bottom line is that each of the
23 four contractors that we interviewed, we made it
24 clear -- and they understood walking in there -- that
25 EPA's performance standards have to be met. So, if they

1 take a batch of waste and run it through stabilization
2 and then test it and it doesn't meet the performance
3 standards, they have to re-treat it. It just goes right
4 back through the process again or they tweak something.
5 So, it doesn't go back into the whole as treatable waste
6 until it meets every single one of the EPA's performance
7 standards.

8 MR. MARTON: And, of course, we want to
9 have confidence that we're just -- it's not just a
10 matter of just meeting the performance standards. We're
11 looking for a process that's going to meet them and meet
12 them without any uncertainty.

13 And we actually have been looking at the
14 short list of contractors for a half a year now, and
15 they were given samples of the material so that they
16 could gain confidence that they were able to treat it.
17 But ultimately, what they proposed will, first of all,
18 go through Barr and the PRP group; and then EPA
19 ultimately has a say on approving the contractor also.

20 MR. KATAUSKAS: We've looked at every
21 aspect. We've looked at how many projects they've done,
22 what kind of waste they've successfully treated. We've
23 looked at their financial stability, are they going to
24 be able to pull the job off. We've looked at the
25 experience level of each of the people they might

1 propose to put on the site, to the extent they think
2 they know that at this point. But it's been a pretty
3 careful process.

4 MS. REBMANN: The next couple questions
5 that I have have to do with what happens to the site
6 afterward. And I guess, first of all, it appears as if
7 you're adding quite a bit of volume to what's there when
8 you talk about 10 to 20 to 30 percent that you're
9 adding. Is that going to increase -- obviously, that
10 would have to have an increase in the volume of what
11 you're handling. And you talk about bringing in
12 material also, and I'm wondering what overall effect
13 that has on the site.

14 MR. MARTON: Until we know exactly what
15 proportions we're adding and what reagents, we can't say
16 exactly. But we're anticipating something on the order
17 of a 20 percent increase in volume of the material.
18 It's going to be placed back into the excavation.

19 And actually -- I don't think we have a
20 good picture of this -- the filter cake is in a pile
21 with slopes to the left.

22 MS. REBMANN: It looks like there is some
23 wells on the side --

24 MR. MARTON: Right. There is a little
25 extra room in that hall, in other words. But the

1 elevation will be raised somewhat in all of these areas,
2 a couple of feet, something on that order. But it's not
3 as if it's going to be a big pile out there afterwards.

4 MR. KATAUSKAS: I'm sure you know better
5 than I, but I've been out there quite a bit over the
6 past six years or so. There is an 8-foot high rail bed,
7 anyway. So, even a 2, foot -- maybe 6 feet -- but the
8 rail bed is the balance on the north side. So, you're
9 not going to have a mountain. We're not going to put a
10 mountain that will stand out like that.

11 MR. JANOSIK: If I may address that a
12 little bit. When we did the northern portion of the
13 site, the railroad tracks run through the site in this
14 direction. That's west. This is east. This is the
15 northern portion of the site that we covered back in --
16 ending in 1993. In order to cover this entire area and
17 give it a proper slope for drainage, we need to raise
18 the elevation of this area about 8 or 9 feet at the
19 highest point. So, then it sloped down toward the side.

20 Now, we're going to have to raise the
21 elevation, or the PRP group is -- we're going to have to
22 raise the elevation also to mound it properly for proper
23 drainage. Ultimately, this property is going to have
24 deed restrictions put on it. And the deed restrictions
25 are going to disallow any type of drilling or

1 excavation, et cetera, that may disturb any of these
2 activities that we've done.

3 Everyone has to understand that we're not
4 cleaning this site to wilderness quality. These areas
5 here, this Source Area 1, for example, was the tank farm
6 at one time. That soil was grossly contaminated. It's
7 grossly contaminated with oil, although we put clean
8 soil on top of it. But underneath the ground, it's very
9 badly contaminated all the way down to the bedrock
10 surface. And the same is true with these areas over
11 here and areas that had oil put on top of them.

12 So, the subsoils are very badly
13 contaminated. We're cleaning the materials off the
14 surface, eliminating exposures to wildlife and to human
15 beings and, in that way, making the site protective.
16 But the site itself won't be available for building of
17 any kind at any time in the future. It will be a piece
18 of open space.

19 MS. REBMANN: Who will actually own the
20 property?

21 MR. JANOSIK: I guess that's a question to
22 be answered. But my understanding is the property is
23 still owned by Berks Associates and Lester ~~Shure~~ Schurr
24 (~~phonetic~~). I don't know what his tax status is on the
25 property. But the Federal Government will not be taking

1 it over, and the State Government will not be taking it
2 over, as far as ownership is concerned.

3 MS. REBMANN: But the deed somehow will
4 then be changed in such a way that it is then restricted
5 as to --

6 MR. JANOSIK: Restriction riders of some
7 sort or other will be put on the property. That's a
8 legal matter that I don't want to get too involved with,
9 but those will be put on the property.

10 It isn't the only property in this
11 category in the United States. There are quite a number
12 of others that have deed restrictions put on them.

13 MR. MARTON: I have copies of these tables
14 that show other similar types of sites where this has
15 been done, as well as copies of our slides for anybody
16 who wants them.

17 MS. REBMANN: That's all I have.

18 MS. LANE: Are there any other questions
19 or comments?

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Do I have to give
21 my name?

22 MS. LANE: You can just be a citizen.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How many wells were
24 drilled on that property to be monitored?

25 MR. JANOSIK: If I'm not mistaken, there

1 are about 40, 35 to 40 wells.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How many are
3 contaminated?

4 MR. JANOSIK: Almost all of them.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is there any
6 off-site contamination?

7 MR. JANOSIK: When you say off-site
8 contamination?

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Off of that
10 property.

11 MR. JANOSIK: As far as the soils are
12 concerned, not that I'm aware of, not that we've been
13 able to find. There is contamination of the
14 groundwater. The groundwater is grossly contaminated in
15 that area. We haven't seen any significant effect of
16 that groundwater on the Schuylkill River. So, in the
17 1989 Record of Decision, we made the decision to -- what
18 it amounts to is essentially -- not remediate the
19 groundwater.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: These PRPs, they
21 are the companies who the EPA considers contaminated it
22 the most?

23 MR. JANOSIK: Well, they are the companies
24 that we can legally point at and say that you are
25 responsible for the ^{waste} handling at the site. Whether, in

1 fact, the companies, as they exist today, actually did
2 the contamination is a matter of legal *interpretation.*

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Conrail is not even
4 Conrail. It is, but the Conrail then wasn't the Conrail
5 today. And the Conrail then was one of the biggest
6 customers that they had, along with the Army, the Navy.

7 MR. KATAUSKAS: The Department of Defense
8 was a big customer. You should know that Conrail wasn't
9 even created until 1976.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right, right. No,
11 it was completely different. But railroads were a big
12 customer.

13 I think what you're doing is what has to
14 be done. I'm just concerned that why are all these
15 people here and none of them are township people?

16 MR. JANOSIK: They were invited.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I just wondered
18 whether the government just makes --

19 MR. JANOSIK: We put newspaper ads in two
20 newspapers on May 10th. It was a quarter-page ad in the
21 Pottstown Mercury and Reading Eagle. Those are the two
22 major newspapers in this area, inviting people to this
23 public meeting.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I don't know.
25 Maybe there is another township resident. But I think

1 these are all government people.

2 MR. JANOSIK: Sometimes that happens.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That just concerned
4 me a little.

5 MS. LANE: Are there any other comments?

6 MR. OTT: My name is Nelson Ott. And I
7 just want to reiterate on what our citizen has commented
8 on. The PRP people, are they going to be relieved of
9 liability when this project is complete of any
10 groundwater contamination that does move out further
11 from the site in the future?

12 MR. JANOSIK: That's pretty much of a
13 legal matter that will have to be addressed in the
14 future. I really can't say yes or no ~~or~~ at this point
15 in time.

16 MR. OTT: If they are spending 13 million,
17 which they think is a lot and I think is a lot; but we
18 know the proper remedy is to spend the \$60 million. And
19 they are not willing to do that, correct? And you have
20 accepted this as an alternative to actually incinerating
21 and removing it?

22 MR. JANOSIK: Well, the incineration would
23 have removed part of it. The incineration residuals,
24 the ashes, essentially, which may have required
25 stabilization anyway because of the lead content, would

1 have been placed back into the Source Area 2 excavation
2 anyway. So, it was never all intended, even in the
3 Record of Decision of '89, that the material would all
4 be removed from the site. The ash would still be
5 landfilled back onto the site, essentially.

6 MR. MARTON: Are you talking about the
7 hauling off-site?

8 MR. OTT: If it was hauled off-site, it
9 wouldn't be on-site. But then you chose the site
10 incineration as your --

11 MR. JANOSIK: For that pile of filter cake
12 waste. But as I've pointed out, with 50 acres there,
13 approximately, the vast majority of it ^{has} ~~is~~ pretty badly
14 contaminated subsoils and badly contaminated
15 groundwater. What we're addressing here is in the
16 Source Area 2 remediation, if you look at the whole
17 site, it's only a fraction of the site. And even if we
18 were to scoop up all of Source Area 2, all that filter
19 cake waste, and haul it someplace, the rest of the site,
20 including all of the soil under Source Area 2, would
21 still all be contaminated.

22 MR. STONELAKE: And the groundwater flows
23 toward the river. So, if you have wells back off the
24 river, you don't have to be concerned about that.

25 MR. JANOSIK: We have looked at the

1 groundwater twice. We looked at the groundwater in
2 these homes along 724. The groundwater essentially
3 comes from the French Creek State Park. It rises up off
4 the terrain. It's a mounded area. And the groundwater
5 comes down toward the site and, of course, toward the
6 river and flows that way. So, we haven't found that
7 these wells up here have received any of the
8 contamination from the site. But the wells that are on
9 the site itself are -- many of those are very badly
10 contaminated. They show heavy contamination.

11 MR. OTT: The reason I'm bringing it up is
12 because, here at the township building, we discovered we
13 have had a leaking fuel tank; and we've been required to
14 clean up this. In fact, we're in the last three or four
15 months of doing that, in fear of contaminating other
16 properties. And here we have a large property that we
17 don't know who is going to own it when it's all over,
18 and I feel as though the question has to be answered
19 before it's all over. Who is going to own the property
20 and who is going to be liable if this groundwater does
21 continue on to be contaminated?

22 MR. JANOSIK: We've looked across the
23 river, and we found none of the wells across
24 the river to be contaminated, the wells that we've
25 checked. And we haven't seen any significant

1 contamination of the river water or the river sediments
2 due to this site. In fact, some of the contaminants
3 that we find on the site, the contamination is greater
4 upstream than it is downstream, which means the
5 contamination is coming from upstream to a great extent
6 for the Schuylkill River.

7 The Schuylkill River is not a pristine
8 river, as you're probably well aware.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You're not going to
10 be able to bring a truckload in from someplace else?

11 MR. JANOSIK: A truckload of what?

12 MR. STONELAKE: The answer is no. We
13 ^w don't tolerate that, and they wouldn't either.

14 MR. KATAUSKAS: You mean somebody else's
15 waste? No.

16 MR. OTT: My second question is Greenway
17 is going to have a trail, I assume, someday. Is there
18 going to be any problem with kids on this land?

19 MR. JANOSIK: Once this is remediated, no.
20 The area that we've already covered is perfectly safe to
21 walk over. We've eliminated the exposure. The
22 exposures were due to direct contact, inhalation, and
23 possibly ingestion of contaminated soils. And those are
24 the exposure pathways that we're going to eliminate also
25 when we remediate Source Areas 2 and 9. The whole area

1 will be covered with clean soil. There will be a design
2 for that. It will be a couple feet of soil with
3 vegetation on top of it.

4 The Army Corps of Engineers, back in 1993,
5 designed a covering system, a capping system, if you
6 will, for that entire area, based on the on-site
7 incineration remedial action, our having put the ash
8 back into the Source Area 2; and then that area was then
9 built up, covered up. And the Army Corps of Engineers
10 designed a capping system, a covering system.

11 Barr Engineering may use all or some of
12 those concepts that were in that Army Corps of
13 Engineers' design, which the United States Government
14 paid for at that time. We were going to do essentially
15 the same thing under federal funding that the PRPs are
16 going to be doing, as far as covering is concerned, with
17 their own funds.

18 MS. LANE: Anyone else?

19 MS. REBMANN: I continue to be a little
20 troubled, as I think Nelson indicated, too, about the
21 future use of the land and the fact that we don't know
22 who is going to own it. And I'm looking for some
23 assurances, first of all, that the deed restriction is
24 enough of a restriction to make sure about what happens
25 here. It's the kind of thing that usually gets lost

1 down the line. I want to express some concern about
2 that.

3 And I guess also -- I think you've
4 probably answered this. But I want to make sure that at
5 some point, any point down the line, that cannot be used
6 for any kind of a landfill of any sort. Would that be
7 included in the deed restriction?

8 MR. JANOSIK: If a landfill is to be built
9 anyplace -- it can be built anyplace -- it has to go
10 through a permitting process with the State of
11 Pennsylvania. And the State of Pennsylvania is very
12 well aware, having worked with this site for 20 years,
13 very well aware that that is a hazardous waste site on
14 the Superfund. And I seriously doubt that the State of
15 Pennsylvania would issue a landfill permit for that
16 property.

17 MS. REBMANN: That doesn't really say it,
18 though.

19 MR. JANOSIK: Well, the Federal Government
20 doesn't issue the permits for municipal landfills. It
21 would be the State of Pennsylvania that would do that.
22 I seriously doubt that the State of Pennsylvania would
23 put itself in that type of jeopardy to issue a landfill.

24 MS. REBMANN: If this is deed restricted,
25 can it be deed restricted to prevent that?

1 MR. JANOSIK: I don't know if we would do
2 that under the Federal Government because that would be
3 a specific activity. What we would be restricting on
4 the property would be such things as excavation and
5 well-drilling and groundwater usage. We don't want the
6 area disturbed. After we've covered all of this area,
7 we don't want it disturbed; and we don't want it built
8 on.

9 Putting a landfill in requires building
10 and excavation. So, that would fairly well eliminate
11 anything that would result in earth movement of any
12 kind. A landfill would result in earth movement.

13 MS. REBMANN: I would assume that, but I
14 would like to go on record as stating that that is
15 really a major concern. And I would hope it could be
16 addressed somehow because that is something that I would
17 think most people in the area are concerned about.

18 MR. JANOSIK: We understand the concern.

19 MS. REBMANN: As an official, I'm
20 concerned because it would have tremendous effects.
21 What you're telling me is you can't assure me that
22 somebody couldn't come in and do that? I understand why
23 you're saying that.

24 MR. KATAUSKAS: It's not legal. You
25 couldn't really do that.

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

MS. REBMANN: Unless the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania said they could.

MR. KATAUSKAS: We have a representative from DEP.

They have to go through the same kind of permitting process. As I understand the permitting process, there would be a public comment period. So, if that would come up, they would have a meeting for public comments on the landfill.

MR. STONELAKE: If someone was so inclined, they could do it there or just about anywhere.

MS. LANE: Are there any other comments or questions?

(No response.)

MS. LANE: With that, we'll close the meeting. I'd like to thank Union Township again for allowing us to use the building. And if you would like a copy of the proposed plan, I do have copies available up front.

(The meeting concluded at 8:30 p.m.)

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

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately to the best of my ability in the notes taken by me during the meeting of the foregoing cause and that this copy is a correct transcript of the same.


Cynthia J. Carson, CSR
COMPUTERIZED REPORTING SERVICES, INC.

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

My Commission expires September 17, 2001

Notarial Seal
Cynthia J. Carson, Notary Public
West Lawn Boro. Berks County
My Commission Expires Sept. 17, 2001
Member Pennsylvania Association of Notaries

ERRATA SHEET

Date forwarded to witness:
July 1999

Re: Superfund Proposed Remedial Action Plan
Douglassville Disposal Site
Union Township, Berks County, Pennsylvania

No. 5-19-99

DO NOT MAKE ANY CHANGES IN THE TRANSCRIPT. IF YOU HAVE
ANY CORRECTIONS, PLEASE LIST THEM BELOW. UPON
COMPLETION, PLEASE SIGN THE BOTTOM OF THIS FORM.

PAGE LINE CORRECTIONS

The minor changes referenced below were made to the
~~body of this transcript~~ by Victor J. Janosik, EPA
Remedial Project Manager.

Page Line

6 8

9 18

25 1

31 14

37 2

38 10

43 23

46 2

47 14

48 13

Signature:

Victor J. Janosik

Date:

Aug. 3, 1999

RETURN THIS SIGNED FORM TO:

Marc Laquercia
Booz Allen Hamilton
841 Chestnut Street
Suite 707
Philadelphia, PA 19107