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MS. NARSETE: We are going to go ahead and begin. My name is Ginny Narsete. I'm with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. And tonight we're going to be delivering to you a proposed plan. And it's pretty much summarized in the Fact Sheet.

And some of you received copies of, of the more extended version. If you'd like to have these (indicating), I've got a couple more left. And I think I passed around just about every group. I got a couple more left in the back.

So let me talk a little bit about the logistics. First of all, thank you for being here in this rain. I have a bad hair day now. I got soaked. A little bit wet up here. So thank you for coming out tonight; I do appreciate it.

Why we are here is for the Dover Chemical Superfund site. And this is talking about the cleanup and how we're going to proceed and move forward. If you need to go the bathrooms, the keys are back there on the table: One says "ladies" and one says "gentlemen." You can figure out which one to use; right. Okay. And if you could kindly just turn your cell phones on silent or off, that would be great. And if you didn't sign in, you can sign
in later as you leave. Because we'd like to add you to the mailing list. And if you want to take extra Fact Sheets with you to give to your friends or neighbors, by all means, take them.

I'm going to make some introductions here. Linda Martin is with the U.S. EPA. And she'll be being giving a presentation for about 20 minutes, 30 minutes on the proposed plan. I like to hold your questions until the end if possible while she continues on.

Rik Lantz is a contractor with the U.S. EPA. He is our technical guy that knows a lot more than we do. I'm just kidding. I shouldn't have put that on there. Take that off.

And then Christy Hunt is with Ohio EPA. She's right there. Okay. And then Jocie Harhay is our court reporter. Because this is like a hearing and like an official meeting, we have to record everything. So when we go into -- when we call the comment period, got to give your name. And when you give your name, then you can make your comment. And I'll explain all that.

Lee Morrison, I'd like to thank you for coming. He's with the Times Reporter and he put a story in today's paper. Thank you very much. It's
really good.

Is that why you all came here, because you saw his great story? Right.

Also I'd like to thank Mayor Homrighausen. And we'd like to thank the Dover Chemical people for being here tonight. And we, today we met with Dave Douglas -- he's a city services guy -- and gave him a briefing along with the mayor on what was going on. So is there anybody I left out?

Well, all of you, thank you again for coming. Our agenda, again, is Linda will talk for 20, 30 minutes and give a presentation. This is really going to be hard to see for those in the back. But most of the stuff you see is in your booklet or the Fact Sheet, so nothing is being left out. And what we can do after the meeting, we can go ahead and take those slides and put them up on the website.

And if you look on the Fact Sheet, you will see that there is a website for all material that I've handed out and plus more. It's in this gray area where it says "share your opinion." And it says "online" and it has a website. It's got a lot of information there that you can look at. If you really get bored, you know, want to fall asleep,
it's there.

Anyways, let me explain a little bit about what this is all about. This is a public, basically a public hearing. We're going to be cleaning up the site. And to get public input, public involvement, we have a meeting like this. And this is a really nice turnout. We weren't sure how many people would be interested in coming, but this is a very nice turnout.

So Linda gives a presentation. Then we go Q and A for about ten minutes, questions and answers. Then we have a period called public comment. You can stay at your seats, stand up; you can give a comment on what you think about what you'd like to see as a cleanup. There's several alternatives that she's going to offer. You can talk about anything you want. But during that comment period, we cannot answer questions, we can't make any comments, we can't even acknowledge. Mainly all I do is say "thank you." So that's what the comment period is.

Now, there's several ways you can make a comment. You can go online. And you can look where says it "give public comments," and you can respond that way. One gentleman in the room has already
said he's done that. You can look inside; there's a
Public Comment Sheet. You can fold it over, stick a
stamp on it, and it goes right to me. You can text
me. I'll even give you my cell phone number. You
can call my voice mail at work and give me a voice
mail if that's easier for you. And then we just
record it. You can write a poem. You can sing a
song. You can do whatever. That will be your
comment. Okay. The most important thing, what's
easiest for you is the way we'd like to take
comments. Your comments are very important to us.
And it doesn't -- it really matters.

So I'm going to turn this over to Linda.
And then afterwards, Q's and A's. And I think
that's all I have.

So, Linda.

MS. MARTIN: All right. Good evening,
everyone. Thank you for coming out. As Ginny
mentioned, this is a presentation on the proposed
cleanup for the offsite water plume associated with
the Dover Chemical facility.

This (indicating) is just kind of a general
overview of the Dover facility and the plant area
and the canal/lagoon area located along I-77. Most
of you may be familiar with the plant and where it's
located. It is an active chemical manufacturing facility, and it has been in operation since about 1940.

Due to site activities in the '50s, '60s, and '70s, contamination from the site entered the environment. Part of it was through disposal on the facility itself. Part of it was storage of chemicals on the facility. And other times it was unintentional spills and leaks that just happened as part of the natural manufacturing process. And at the time that all that happened -- you know, that was happening everywhere -- it was kind of a thing that happened.

Since about 1981, we, U.S. EPA and Ohio EPA, have been investigating Dover Chemical and working with Dover Chemical to figure out all of the contamination that is associated with the facility. We've done numerous removal actions at the facility where we literally went in and removed soil. We've done a number of interim actions where we covered up areas on the plant to keep contamination from moving offsite. We have also done a number of remedial investigations. And that is what has allowed us to figure out what the nature and extent of all the contamination is across the site, where it's
located, and that kind of thing. And then we've also done a number of what we call feasibility studies which are studies that we do to figure out how we're going to alleviate the contamination.

With all of that investigation work going on, we've divided up the facility, the contamination associated with Dover into four areas of concern. It makes it a little bit more manageable to handle. We have the onsite stuff, and that would be onsite soils, which I mentioned earlier we have done quite a bit of the removal work on the facility and actually off the facility too to take care of soil contamination.

We have onsite groundwater. And onsite, we have an active pump-and-treat system that we've been enhancing over the years to make sure that we're fully capturing all the contaminated groundwater that is located underneath the Dover property so that it is no longer flowing off the property.

And then there was also the canal/lagoon area which is the, if you look back at that map -- I think I can go back -- that is the area on the left-hand side of I-77. That is also an area that has been remediated and addressed as part of some of the activities in the onsite work.
And then finally we get to the offsite groundwater plume which is the last part of the remediation that needs to -- something needs to happen to take care of that.

All of the onsite work is being addressed by Dover Chemical under an order with U.S. EPA. And it's called the Non-Time-Critical Removal Order. And all that is is a legal document that, that they, that Dover Chemical entered into with U.S. EPA to conduct the work and continue to clean up the problems that are located onsite.

The offsite groundwater contamination, as I said, will be addressed by this proposed plan. And what will happen is once we get comments back and we decide that this is whatever the remedy, we will enter into another legal document called a Record of Decision with Dover Chemical. And they will implement the cleanup at the, at the groundwater plume.

So kind of a background on the offsite groundwater plume: Since about 2000, we decided that the offsite groundwater plume that we knew existed wasn't really defined, and we didn't really know the nature and extent of the whole thing. So we worked with Dover Chemical between about 2000 and
2008 to install an array of groundwater monitoring wells throughout the town and through your city to, to figure out where that plume was and, and what was in that plume.

And we continue to do what's called ordinarily groundwater monitoring. So every quarter we're out, Dover Chemical is out sampling. U.S. EPA also comes out. And we split samples to make sure the information that Dover Chemical is providing is accurate. And it is. We find that it is. And with all of that investigative work in the offsite groundwater plume, it's been divided up into three areas. And if you look at our crude drawing here, we came up with this. Dave thought it might be easier for people to kind of understand how this works.

But, you know, you have your ground surface. And then below the ground surface about anywhere between 10 to 15 feet --

It just depends on where you are; it depends on what season you're in. You know, it could be up or down.

-- there's the groundwater table. And in order to evaluate what we have in the groundwater column, we divided the groundwater up into different
zones. So Zone A is a zero to 9 feet below the water table line. So we have monitoring wells installed throughout the city in this A zone. And we collect samples from that and monitor that.

Then we have a B zone which is 35 to 50 feet below the water table line. And then we have a C zone that we are also monitoring that is 80 to 90 feet below the water table line.

So that's kind of important to know. And what we found is a majority of the contamination that we are interested in, that needs to have something done with it, occurs in the B zone. So we realized that the groundwater contact contamination plume that you see in some of the maps and some of the material that we provided is a good 30 to 35 feet below the water table line. And that could be another 10 feet below your, where your house is located. And so that's the B zone. The B zone is what we're targeting. And any remedies that we talk about, it is to be implemented in that zone in the water table.

This is a list of compounds that we found within the offsite groundwater plume. It's hard to read all of these compounds. But mostly it's chlorobenzenes in the area, and there are other
products. And those are related, those can
definitely be related back to the Dover Chemical
property. Therefore, we know that this
contamination plume is associated with the Dover
Chemical site and activities that happened there in
the past.

This gives you kind of a snapshot view,
which I think most of you have seen the pictures in
the Fact Sheets and that of where we believe the
offsite groundwater plume is. And please know that
it, you know, fluctuates and it varies depending on
the season, depending on the water table, and all
that kind of stuff. So it's kind of a snapshot.
It's a very good snapshot of where we believe the
contamination is. But you should also remember that
this is definitely the B zone that we are talking
about. So it's the 35 to 50 feet below the water
table line.

And you can see these (indicating) are our
B zone wells. These little dots on here, that
represents some of the monitoring wells that are out
in the community that we're monitoring in that zone.
There are other wells but this is just strictly B
zone. Once we know there's a problem, that we have
a contamination problem, in order for EPA to take
action, we have to determine if there's a risk to people.

What is important to point out is that no one is directly affected by the contaminated groundwater at this time that we're aware of. No one is drinking the contaminated groundwater. Nobody's exposed to contaminated groundwater. So our risk calculation is based on a potential. And that would be, you know, potentially in the future what is the worst case scenario. In our case, it would be that a person within a residence can use the groundwater for drinking, for residential use, showering, and that kind of thing.

So when we did our risk calculation, it was based on potential which is worst case scenario. And it's based on the inhalation of fumes of groundwater, if there's contamination in there from showering. It is based on ingestion, drinking the water. And it is based on dermal contact. So all those factors were fed into our risk assessment that our risk assessor did calculations for. And they did determine that the levels that we see in the groundwater do pose a potential risk. We have no direct risk at this point. But there is a potential risk which means that the EPA should really look at
taking action to clean that up so that there is no future risk.

And then once we get all the risk calculations, we come up with a list of chemicals that we will target as part of our cleanup. And those are very similar. The dichlorobenzenes, again, are the primary contaminants that are going to be targeted; and that's what we find here.

And, yeah, so now we have, we know we have a groundwater plume and we know we have a problem. So what are we going to do about it? Well, we went to Dover Chemical and we asked them to complete a feasibility study which is a study to figure out -- you tell us what alternatives you think might work in helping to clean up this site.

The document is submitted to both EPA and Ohio EPA for review and comment. And once everything was all said and done, we came up with four alternatives that we feel are good options to address this offsite groundwater plume associated with Dover in the B zone.

The first alternative is no action. And this is the alternative that has to be evaluated with every site. And it's used to establish kind of a baseline to compare other alternatives against not
taking any action at all. And that's generally no
cost and generally doing nothing, just kind of
leaving it out there obviously, not even monitoring,
so everything would be gone.

The second alternative that was presented
was a monitored natural attenuation. And that is
where we allow the natural processes already present
within the aquifer to kind of take care of the
contamination that's there. Dover has done some
work to show that there is some attenuation
happening naturally. It's not happening that fast.
But we do see that there's some, some cleanup
happening without any intervention. This
alternative also would include monitoring. So we
wouldn't do, really do anything; we would just allow
the plume to degrade naturally. But we would
monitor to make sure it was doing what it was
supposed to do.

The next alternative that we looked at was
an active alternative. And it's Alternative 3. But
it's divided up into three subparts. And the first
part is Alternative 3A. And I'll go to the map.
This is also in our proposed plan. It's just to
simply inject some chemicals into this secondary
source area that's marked on the map. And we think,
we believe that there is some absorbed material in
that area that is somewhat feeding the offsite
groundwater plume. So what we want to do is attack
that area aggressively and then monitor that and see
where that goes. So 3A -- that's the first of
three -- is simply doing that and not doing anything
else except watch the, the plume and see what
happens downgrading it.

3B and 3C are the same type of
alternatives, that is, 3A, which is injecting in the
upper grid but adding amendments to the rest of the
plume to help accelerate the natural processes that
are occurring. And the only difference between B
and C is the amendments, the additional amendments
that we would add. One type of amendment would be
to increase the oxygen to allow the naturally
occurring bugs that like oxygen to work on the
plume. Instead of doing oxygen, then 3C would be to
inject with something that would take away oxygen.
So that would enhance the bugs that, that work well
with no oxygen. So that's 3, 3, and 3 different
parts.

And the last option that we asked Dover to
look at was a pump-and-treat option. And that's a
standard for generally what we usually do in
Superfund sites, install giant pumping wells throughout the groundwater plume. Dover would build an offsite treatment plant. The treatment plant would then discharge to Sugarcreek. So there would be a whole system devised for that.

Once we agreed, U.S. EPA and Ohio EPA agreed that these alternatives seemed like viable alternatives and ones that we should look at further, they're evaluated against nine criteria. And this is done by U.S. EPA to help evaluate what alternative might be the best.

If you look in your Fact Sheet on Page 4, you will see a list of the nine criteria that we used to evaluate the options. The first one is overall protection. We want to make sure we are protecting human health and the environment. The second is to make sure that we comply with all rules and regulations as far as the federal goals, the state goals, and any local regulations that might be occurring. We also want to make sure that any remedy we select is a permanent remedy and a long-term solution to the problem.

U.S. EPA is in favor of a treatment option. We like to see treatment. And so we want to use treatment to reduce the toxicity mobility and volume
of the contamination. We want to weigh that as a 
criteria. We also want to know how quickly the 
option is going to solve the problem that we have. 
We also want to make sure it's implementable; can we 
really do this in the real world.

We also look at cost because that is a 
factor that has to be considered. We look at state 
acceptance and then obviously community acceptance 
which is what we're here for today and kind of what 
Ginny explained earlier about you submitting 
comments and making sure the public is comfortable 
with what we're proposing to do.

This is kind of a chart that gives us the 
overall view of how each of the four remedies, 
including 3A, B, and C, meet all of those nine 
criteria. And that is also on Page 4 in your Fact 
Sheet. And you can kind of see quickly that 
Alternatives 3A, 3B, 3C, and 4 kind of meet most of 
the criteria and do what we think needs to be done. 
So we have a number of things that could work.

So we also then go to cost. Unfortunately 
I don't think you guys have this slide. But cost 
and time frame then are the last factors that we 
kind of look at. And as we mulled over all the 
options, we felt that Option 3B, which is the
treatment upstream and then the treatment to add oxygen, add oxygen to the offsite groundwater plume, would be the best option. That will cost around 7.4 million dollars and take about five years to clean up, three years to implement and then a five-year cleanup goal.

Now, I'd like to caution that these are all calculations. And until we do some real-world injections and actually see how the aquifer performs and things like this, I mean it could take a little bit longer. It could take a little bit less. Most likely a little bit longer. Usually things don't happen as quickly as we expect them to. But we do expect to see some improvement in the aquifer over time, over a shorter period of time.

And this (indicating) is just kind of another overview of the 3B option that we are interested in, that we are proposing and interested in selecting. So it is the injection in the type grid, chemical injection along with an oxygenated compound down the center of the plume. And then we will monitor that over time. And hopefully we will get the results we want which is a reduction in contamination in the offsite groundwater plume.

And just to summarize, it is Alternative 3B
that we are proposing as the cleanup for that
offsite groundwater plume associated with Dover.

We have a public comment period that
started on June 22nd and will go through July 22nd.
And that's all I have to present. So I can take
some questions that you might have about, about what
I've talked about. And hopefully I can answer them.
And then we'll take official public comments after
that.

Questions?

MR. IRELAND: Andrew Ireland. When you
talk about the B zone, are you seeing contamination
in A and C also?

MS. MARTIN: It varies depending where
you're talking about. If you're onsite, we have
contamination in the A zone and the B zone and not
the C zone.

MR. IRELAND: A little bit, not very much.

MS. MARTIN: Yeah. Very little. Offsite,
the majority in the B zone, we do have blips here
and there.

MR. IRELAND: Fluctuation.

MS. MARTIN: Yeah. I don't think -- not in
the C zone. I can't think.... No.

MR. LANTZ: I don't think so.
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MS. MARTIN: Yeah. We are still cleaning the C zone. Everything we're seeing is definitely B zone in the offsite groundwater plume.

MR. IRELAND: Thank you.

MS. MARTIN: Ginny just said that I should point out that, again, that everyone in the area is on a public water supply system. And your drinking water is clean. That drinking water is monitored on a regular basis by the state and by the city. And Dover also has a Century well in between the Dover well field and their plant. And they monitor that on a constant basis to make sure that there's no issues there.

MS. JONES: I lived -- Gloria Jones -- just a short distance from '51 to '60 up there. And they talked about all the slant drilling that they would be doing so the water didn't go to the city wells. They said that's the way they got rid of the waste. They slant drilled and pumped it in that way.

MS. MARTIN: You know, I think you're talking about the fracturing waste. Is that what you're talking about?

MS. JONES: I don't know. But that's what they talked about, the chemicals and the stuff from that, they pumped away from the city wells. And it
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was a slant drilling. And there used to be a lot of
talk about that, that different ones were really
upset about it. And I just wondered if --

MS. MARTIN: Well, I don't know of any
slant -- what were the years you're referring to,
'51 to --

MS. JONES: '51 to '62 -- or, '69.

MR. LANTZ: Who was doing the slant
drilling?

MS. JONES: Down at Dover Chemical. I
don't know who it was. But they said --

MR. LANTZ: The chemical plant was doing
the drilling?

MS. JONES: Yeah. They said it was to get
rid of the chemicals because they didn't want it to
go over to where the city drinking water was.

MR. LANTZ: We're not aware of any of that.

MS. JONES: There used to be a lot of --
well, you're not 80 years old either. Don't put
that in the Record.

MS. MARTIN: I'm not sure we're aware of
it. But we do --

MS. JONES: I was wondering, is the
chemicals that you're talking about now, are they
from back in that period when they were doing what
was supposedly -- when, when they did these wells
and this water and that got contaminated?

MS. MARTIN: Well, there's groundwater
underneath the Dover Chemical site. And that has
probably been contaminated since the '50s, '60s, and
'70s.

MS. JONES: How did it get so far away if
it just went down? I just want to know about that
drilling, you know, if that's what made them go that
way.

MR. LANTZ: Groundwater flows down; it's
like dumping in a stream. It will move down,
downstream. So that's how it gets all the way
offsite into that plume you see there.

MS. MARTIN: I'm not aware of like
slant-drilled wells.

MS. JONES: That's what they used to say.

MR. LANTZ: I think what you're talking
about is waste disposal wells. And I think if that
was going on, we have a pretty dense network of
monitoring wells. If, if any of that was going on,
I think we would have seen it.

MS. JONES: That was 50 years ago.

MR. LANTZ: I can't say anything about
that.
MS. JONES: That's why I wondered if the contamination is old or newer or when it was --

MS. MARTIN: Well, contamination on the Dover property site is pretty old. I mean it's, it's there and it's been there for a long time. And it's migrated offsite. And that's been there for a long time. We've known about the offsite groundwater plume for at least 20 or 30 years. And Dover's been doing work on the property to help alleviate further contamination. And I think that's why we're seeing some of the contamination in the offsite plume kind of shrinking, getting less and less. It's still a problem. But it's not as big of a problem as it was, say, 20 years ago when we first realized something was out there.

MS. JONES: Well, are they doing prevention?

MS. MARTIN: Uhm-huhm.

MS. JONES: Like where 77 goes by, there's no protection between the highway and the chemical plant. If a truck goes off, he goes right straight into the plant. And there's no guardrails or nothing there by the, the chemicals. And I thought, well, there should be at least 10-foot guardrail. Because if a truck comes down which goes in there,
the whole north end of Dover is going to be contaminated.

MS. MARTIN: Yeah. That's not a good situation.

MS. JONES: That's what I thought. Who would be responsible for putting that in?

MS. MARTIN: Well, that would probably be the Department, D.O.T., Ohio D.O.T.

MS. JONES: The chemical company wouldn't be responsible --

MS. MARTIN: I don't --

MS. JONES: -- for prevention? That would be a super super spill.

MS. MARTIN: That could be. That's true.

Do you have any suggestions?

This is Kristy Hunt. She is with Ohio EPA. And she has a little bit more knowledge about the state activities.

MS. HUNT: I think that would just be something for us to bring up to Dover Chemical in our conversations with them.

MS. JONES: Sorry about that.

MS. MARTIN: No. No.

MS. NARSETE: No. That's okay.

MS. JONES: Nobody else is --
MS. HUNT: We are not dealing with transportation. We are dealing with the groundwater contamination that has been there. And certainly the prevention of future contamination is what we are working with Dover Chemical on. So it's definitely something that we can mention to them.

MS. MARTIN: Yeah. You know, it is something that -- I don't know that we've ever thought of it.

MS. JONES: Just leave it up to me.

MS. NARSETE: Thank you.

MS. MARTIN: Thank you.

MS. NARSETE: Okay. Any more questions?

MR. NOTZ: Alan Notz. I am not on public water. I live down there. There is a well site down -- I used to get reports from Dover Chemical. I think they ceased to do that. They put a water -- a testing well. Is there ways that you can find out what this water test...?

MS. MARTIN: Are you on 15th Street?

MR. NOTZ: I'm on a well.

MS. MARTIN: I know. Where do you live?

MR. NOTZ: West 14th.

MS. MARTIN: That's the area -- Dover probably -- was it 1990s? You were tested on a
regular basis.

MR. NOTZ: Yes.

MS. MARTIN: And then they ran --

MR. NOTZ: I believe it was three months.

MS. MARTIN: -- public water supply.

MR. NOTZ: Now, I don't receive anything now. I was wondering --

MS. MARTIN: There is a public water supply system available to you I think. I believe.

MR. NOTZ: That's true. But the cost....

I have geothermal. Now, it's my understanding. I talked to the city about that. They said either run city water or a well; I can't have both. That means I have to do away with my geothermal.

MS. MARTIN: Oh, I see. Well, I can --

MR. NOTZ: Am I at risk with my well?

MS. MARTIN: I don't believe so. Because if you, if you see the plume, I don't -- it doesn't run that --

MR. NOTZ: It does change and stuff; I understand. I want to know if I'm at risk with my well.

MS. MARTIN: I don't -- I would say at this point we don't-- I don't think you are.

MR. NOTZ: Or will this --
MS. MARTIN: Because the natural --
MR. NOTZ: -- Plan B, will that help mine, do that area there too? I don't know what areas are all involved in here.
MR. LANTZ: Well, the work that we are talking about is for offsite south of the plant.
MR. NOTZ: That's --
MR. LANTZ: So I don't think what we are talking about would affect your well. But Dover is doing monitoring up there.
MR. NOTZ: Yes, they are.
MR. LANTZ: And they are not seeing anything that --
MR. NOTZ: I could get on a site to find out what those wells monitor. I have no idea what they monitor. I've had mine tested already.
MS. MARTIN: You want to know what the monitoring wells test for?
MR. NOTZ: There's a well, there's a monitoring well right down there.
MS. MARTIN: Okay.
MR. NOTZ: Now, I used to get reports. Is it still available, these reports?
MS. MARTIN: Uhm-huhm.
MR. NOTZ: Available to me?
MS. MARTIN: Yes, they are. They're quarterly groundwater reports that are available.

MR. NOTZ: That's what I guess I need to know.

MS. MARTIN: Yeah.

MS. NARSETE: How can he get them if they're available?

MS. MARTIN: Well, we send them to the library in bunches on disc. Or you can, you can e-mail me and I can send you a copy or e-mail you a copy. And, yeah, or I can send you a disc with a copy on it.

MS. NARSETE: Her name is on the Fact Sheet.

MR. NOTZ: Now, I don't know how many people are on the well down there or not. I think I did sign up for city water. So I don't know who is down there now or not.

MS. MARTIN: Yeah. Didn't Dover offer, though, to continue testing your well on a -- I thought maybe. No?

MR. NOTZ: No. My personal well, no. It's never -- I haven't had it tested for years. They used to come and test it. But then I think they put a well or monitoring well down at the end. And I
think they monitor it down there now. But I don't
know what the depth is of that either.

MS. MARTIN: Okay. Yeah, we can get you
that information if you'd like.

MR. NOTZ: Definitely like.

MS. NARSETE: Okay. Thanks. All right.

Anybody else?

MS. MIZER: Louise Mizer. I live on West
13th Street. And I am with the Dover Chemical CAC.
That's for the citizens advisory. I live at 523
West 13th. How long did the Ohio EPA know about
this plume?

MS. MARTIN: I --

MS. MIZER: You guys.

MS. MARTIN: Well, we've known about it,
you know, since we started probably in the 1990s,
was when we started installing monitoring wells in
the offsite area downgrade of the Dover facility,
Dover Chemical facility.

MS. MIZER: Why now to look, to clean it
up? And why not then clean it up?

MS. MARTIN: Well, you know, it's kind of a
process to figure, to figure out where we go and
what we do. And we've continued to monitor,
continued to install monitoring wells in that
offsite groundwater plume and then continued to take
care of some of the more severe contaminated areas
onsite. So it's just kind of been a long process
of, of taking care of different things at different
times and working with Dover Chemical to get things
cleaned up. And, you know, we've done a lot of work
on the Dover Chemical site to, to make sure that
we're not going to recontaminate anything that we
might require Dover Chemical to clean up in the
offsite groundwater plume.

So, you know, all of those kind of factors
kind of weigh into it. And it just takes time. And
all of this work is being paid for by Dover
Chemical. So they've been very cooperative with
U.S. EPA, and they've been very willing to do
whatever we ask them to do.

And so, you know, it takes, it takes time
to work with a chemical manufacturing company. And
we have to get agreements signed. We all have to be
on the same page, you know, and that kind of thing.
And unfortunately it, it takes time for that stuff
to work.

But, you know, we were active; we've been
active all along. It's just kind of now culminated
to where we're ready to, to find a remedy to take
care of this offsite groundwater plume.

MS. MIZER: And, of course, that time period, the plume got bigger and more contamination.

MS. MARTIN: It has. But the interesting thing is is that with some of the work that we've done on onsite property the contamination in that offsite groundwater plume is shrinking. It is becoming less over time.

MS. MIZER: Are we getting any more contamination off onsite to go into our groundwater?

MS. MARTIN: We believe that the pump-and-treat system that is currently operating onsite captures all the groundwater, contaminated groundwater that is underneath the Dover Chemical property itself.

MS. MIZER: And they treated it themselves there?

MS. MARTIN: Yeah. That goes through a treatment process. And they discharge that to a -- through an NPDES permit through the State of Ohio in Sugar Creek.

MS. NARSETE: Ma'am, if you look on Page 2 and 3, it gives you the site history --

MS. MIZER: Okay.
started --

MS. MIZER: Uhm-huhm.

MS. NARSETE: -- the time period. It goes all the way back to the early '80s.

MS. MIZER: I know.

MS. NARSETE: I gave most, several of this (indicating) out on it. This is the Dover Chemical Superfund site proposed plan background information. The Fact Sheet is basically a summary of what's in here. But this one has maps. I've got I think three or four left. So if you didn't get one, I'll make sure I get you a copy.

You didn't get one either?

MS. JONES: (Ms. Jones moved her head from side to side).

MS. NARSETE: Okay. Is there any more questions? I'll take one more. And then we'll go to the comment period. Then we'll go back to questions and answers.

MR. BALDWIN: My name is Bruce Baldwin. Why would you not recommend the, the plan 3C that would use the aerobic and the anaerobic treatment of the contaminated groundwater? Why just the aerobic?

MS. MARTIN: Well, right now we believe that the aquifer will respond better to an aerobic
condition. And that will also clean up in a faster
time frame than if we were to use an anaerobic.
That's what we're working with, the information that
we have right now.

MS. JONES: Thank you.

MS. NARSETE: Okay. All right. We're
going to go ahead and start the public comment
period. Now, this is -- I don't know if you've ever
been to one of these before. But this is kind of
interesting. Basically you can stand up, you can
sit down, you can dance if you want, whatever is
easier for you, say a poem like I said earlier. And
you make your comment. We can't comment back. If
your comment is a question, we can't answer that
question. All this is is basically a comment that
you're giving to us on what you think about what
you'd like to see done. If you want to select an
alternative, different alternative, say that now.

So I'm going to go ahead and start the
public comment period. So let's -- I'm going to go
row by row. I don't want to put anybody on the
stand, but I figured I'd go row by row. If you have
a comment, you can, you can say that now. Or you
can send it in. You can mail it in. Or you can
text me. Here's my cell phone number; I'll give it
to you. It's (312)919-0126. That's my cell phone
where can you text me. Or you can send me an e-mail
too.

So I'm going to go ahead and start public
comment. We'll go with Row 1. Any comments?

MS. JONES: (In Row 2.) Gloria Jones. Are
they producing a different type of chemical than
they did back in, say, the '50s and '60s? Or is it
more hazardous? Is it more dangerous to our water
supply? That's all I want to know. Is there a
difference in the chemicals they produce.

MS. NARSETE: Thank you. Row 3.

MS. MIZER: Louise Mizer. I know you guys
went to 3B. But this has been going on so many
years. And I guess I don't really think about the
cost. I'm thinking about the health. I'm thinking
about all the stuff that we have to do in order to
get this plume taken care of. And it does come from
Dover Chemical. I do think Alternative 4.

MS. NARSETE: Okay. Sir?

MR. MIZER: I'm okay.

MS. NARSETE: Okay. Next row.

MR. IRELAND: Andrew Ireland. I'm going to
take you up on your liberty. I'm not going to sing
a song or dance. I know we are talking about the
offsite contamination. And I'm glad something is being done. I realize it takes time. I know that at least one representative of Dover Chemical is here. I'm not naive; I know I don't purchase things from Dover Chemical. But things I purchase, you know, in some way downstream I'm a consumer. So I realize plants like Dover Chemical have to exist.

I'm just concerned over the years that I've lived there. I've lived in Dover pretty much my entire life, three decades now. There's been incidents. And as I get older, I pay attention. And some of the more recent incidents, there's almost been a reluctance to admit problems exist from Dover Chemical. Sounds like Dover Chemical and EPA are working well together. And that's good. As a resident, that's what I want to hear. I just want to say I hope that continues. Because, you know, and as I've been watching and I've been wondering, it sounds like there is one citizens group -- you know, some of these, not coverups, but just hush-hush....

I remember there was a fish kill or something a couple years ago where, you know, we just read in the paper "It's not us. It's not us. It's not us," even if it starts at the output pipe.
And then a couple months later, "Oh, yes, it was us." Or the last major incident in 2012 where there was that cloud of vapor making people sick from the highway for almost a half hour where they said, literally said there's no problem. They told the Ohio patrol there's no problem. But there was. And actually I think it was the Water Department that ended up calling the Fire Department; you know, they called 911 -- they (indicating) didn't call 911 -- they called the Fire Department. And by the time Dover Chemical finally admitted a problem and called 911, the fire trucks were actually rolling up on the scene.

So my comment is I just hope this partnership, whatever this working together, continues. Because I've seen some things in the past that concern me about Dover Chemical. And I just want them to be a good neighbor of the residents which I think they're well poised to do and capable of doing. I just hope that happens.

MS. NARSETE: Okay. Thank you. Okay.

Okay. All right. That concludes -- that's the end of our public comment period. Now you can go back to asking more questions. So do we have any more questions?

MR. IRELAND: I know about the offsite contamination. But you mentioned a couple times the onsite pumping. Is that like a maintenance thing or actually remedying the problem onsite?

MS. MARTIN: That onsite groundwater pumping system started -- it's actually Dover's noncontact cooling water system that works as part of their plant operations. However, they've, over the course of the years that we've been working with Dover Chemical, they have installed additional pumping wells. They have adjusted pumping rates. You know, we have worked with Dover to come up with an optimal pumping scheme so that we get capture of the onsite groundwater. And they're still able to operate and get the water that they need to operate their systems.

MR. IRELAND: I mean is it actually in the long run, 50 years from now, is that going to result in a better situation down there in the soil contamination --

MS. MARTIN: Yes.
MR. IRELAND: -- or just preventing more contamination?

MS. MARTIN: No. It actually goes -- I mean it's actually pulling groundwater from -- you know, and treating it. So it is pulling contamination out. They also have -- Dover also has -- Chemical has installed soil vapor extraction systems in a couple areas onsite, areas where we know that they -- that we have some VOC contamination left from some of the removal actions that were taking place. That's also helping to eliminate the mass of contamination that's still in the soils at the facility.

MR. IRELAND: So eventually the onsite stuff will be cleaner too?

MS. MARTIN: Yes, eventually.

MS. JONES: Where they've always brought these trains in, the tank cars, and they used to clean them down there and everything, is that -- along the railroad track and all those chemical cars, is that contaminated too?

MS. MARTIN: Well, there's been some soil removal work done in those areas on the property itself. And as part of that, there will be kind of a maintenance program that Dover will implement.
where they'll continue to maintain caps and things like that that they put on the property to keep continued contamination from -- any new contamination from getting into the ground.

MS. JONES: Because I remember they used to clean the chem -- those railroad cars down there. And I just wondered if, where they cleaned them, if that drained into the soil.

MS. MARTIN: In the past, it probably did.

MS. JONES: I guess I wondered if the railroad tracks were, you know....

MS. MARTIN: Some of that was remediated as part of the removal that was conducted on the property. They actually dug soil up and then replaced it with clean soil. And, and most of the site is covered with some kind of a permeable/nonpermeable cover.

MS. NARSETE: Any more?

MR. MIZER: John Mizer. The pumps they use, how much backup do they have there in case electric goes out? And how long does it -- how much of this stuff they're pumping now will go into these plumes and stuff? You know what I'm saying? If electric goes off for half an hour, an hour.

MR. LANTZ: This is Rik Lantz. I know that
Dover does routine maintenance where they shut down the wells.

And, Ken, you correct me if I'm wrong.

But I think they have had them down for as long as a week. And they test what they call the Century well which is between the chemical plant and the municipal wells. And during these one-week periods, they haven't seen contamination getting drawn toward the plant. So if the power went out for a couple hours, I wouldn't imagine it would be a problem.

MR. MIZER: Now, do they have maps of the monitoring wells somewhere that we can -- that you can...? Because this shows pumps, but they're not showing anything about monitoring.

MS. MARTIN: Well, in the proposed plan, the actual proposed plan, there is a map that has all of the monitoring wells and the pumping wells identified that Dover monitors. And then the pumping wells are identified as pumping wells that are used to capture the onsite groundwater contamination.

MR. LANTZ: You can see it, Figure 5, in the proposed plan. These, all of these wells are the monitoring wells.
MR. MIZER: Do you have a page number?

MS. MARTIN: It's in the figure section in the back.

MR. LANTZ: Yeah. In the back.

MS. MARTIN: The figures are in order.

MS. MIZER: What figure is that?

MR. LANTZ: Figure 5.

MS. MARTIN: 5.

MR. LANTZ: Actually this doesn't even -- no, it doesn't. Doesn't. Sorry. This is all of them. There is a lot.

MS. NARSETE: Any other question? Yes.

MR. HOMRIGHAUSEN: Rick Homrighausen. H O M R I G H A U S E N. Every time they mention Dover, they're talking about Dover Chemical, not the City of Dover. I want to make that point clear.

MS. NARSETE: Thank you so much.

MS. MIZER: I notice that when we got notice in the mail about this, about the plume and all that, that we did get a, a literature from the City of Dover that our water was excellent, was in good shape. I appreciate that.

MS. NARSETE: Good. Okay. I think we're done.

MR. MIZER: Do they have property to put
these wells in and inject that in there now? Or is this something they have -- they are going to have to do down the road?

MS. MARTIN: Yeah. That will all be -- most of it will be on, located on private property probably. So if this remedy is selected and this is what's to be implemented, there will be a lot of access agreements and a lot of things like that that will have to take place before you can actually go out and do the work.

MR. MIZER: We are talking two years, three years?

MS. MARTIN: Well, there's a period of time to negotiate with Dover Chemical to implement the remedy. And then that all has to be lodged with D.O.J. I don't know how to say it more. But that could take a year. It could take longer, a little bit longer. And then there will be a design period and some pretesting that will take place before the actual implementation of a full remedy goes in. So, you know, three years maybe.

MR. LANTZ: Three.


MR. LANTZ: But I think to be fair to Dover
Chemical, we are asking them to spend 7 million dollars. Let's make sure they're spending it right, you know.

MR. MIZER: I'm just wondering how long this is going to take. Because we've already known for like 20 years we have a plume. Now we are going to talk another three years, ten years, or whatever down the road? Do we have an idea?

MR. LANTZ: Linda, can you pull up the one that shows the time frames?

Because I think the response to the comment that you made during the public comment, which I couldn't say anything because I was sworn to silence..., but if you look here, this groundwater pump and treat...

Which is the one that you (indicating) were suggesting --

MS. MIZER: Yes. Right.

MR. LANTZ: -- might be the best one even though it's most expensive.

...it actually takes the longest of all these.

By choosing the less expensive alternative, it will actually be quicker. So I just want to point that out to you. If you look at this -- you
can't read this thing -- but it says 4B, over 30
years to fix if they just pump it all out and treat
it.

MS. MIZER: And that's because they have to
build a treatment plant?

MR. LANTZ: No. That's because it takes
that long for the stuff to actually get sucked out
of the ground and desorbed from the aquifer.

MS. MIZER: Okay.

MR. LANTZ: As opposed to these other, 3A,
B, and C, where they're going to go in and inject
some stuff in the ground, actually attack that stuff
and degrade it in the aquifer itself. It's actually
more cost effective to do that. And it happens
quicker.

MS. NARSETE: The graph here, I think it's
in the plan.

MR. LANTZ: I couldn't find it in the plan.

MR. MIZER: The stuff you're going to
inject in there, what kind of a chemical is this?
Down the road, what I'm looking at is you inject
this in there and ten years, 20 years down the road
are we going to be --

MR. LANTZ: A new problem?

MR. MIZER: -- going to be having the same
thing?

MR. LANTZ: I don't think so. Of course, I don't know.

Ken, maybe you can speak to this more than I can.

MR. CORMIER: It will be, it will be determined through the pilot testing phase. We haven't selected the amendment.

MR. LANTZ: I mean it shouldn't be. It's typically pretty simple stuff. And the idea is it degrades, breaks down the contamination that's already in there and should go away pretty quickly. It's got a lot of oxygen. Stuff that has a lot of oxygen gets consumed by the microbes quickly.

MS. JONES: We don't need any of those earthquakes.

MS. NARSETE: Okay. Well, thank you very much for coming out. We'll stick around. We have the room until 8:00. If you want to talk with any of us, we'll be here. So that concludes our meeting. Thanks to everyone.

I want to thank the library for letting us use the room. And the city for letting us come in your town. So thank you so much.

(The meeting concluded at 7:00 p.m.)
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