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(Public hearing starts at 6:02 as follows:)

MS. POPE: Hello, everybody. How are you today?

(Multiple inaudible responses.)

MS. POPE: Good. Thank you. I'd like to thank you so much for coming out for the Proposed Plan Meeting for Zone 1. You know, we're here today to, you know, give you an overview about what's going to go on with that portion of the superfund site.

So I'd like to introduce a few people today that are with us. First, I'd like to introduce Doug Mallatte, who's the acting division director of the Superfund Division; then Joan Tanaka, who's a branch chief in the Remedial Program Branch; Tim Fischer, Remedial Program Branch Section Chief; Doug Petras (phonetic), who's with the Indiana Department of Environmental Management. And those are the special people. Okay? So --

(People laughing.)

MS. POPE: So, for the press, if you're here, please see Rachel Basler in the back and
talk with Rachel. And she asks that the press
hold all questions until after the public
comment period. And then after that, if you
want to talk to one of the EPA people, you do
it at that time. Okay?

So I am not going to hold you any longer.
Michael's going to come up at this moment and
take us a little further.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Thank you. Hi,
everybody. My name is Michael Lythcott. I'm a
neutral facilitator. I'm an EPA contractor.
But as a neutral, EPA is my client, you are my
customer.

My job is to make sure that the airtime
gets shared equally and that you leave here
today fully understanding what is intended here
and that you have an opportunity to make public
comment.

Now, if you look at your agenda, there's
two kind of close activities here. After Tom
Alcamo -- by the way, is making the main
presentation -- gives his presentation, we're
going to have a questions-and-answers period
for the purpose of making sure you understand
EPA's proposed plan. "I didn't -- Tom, I
didn't understand this. Tom, are you saying
that? What about this, Tom?"

Then after that, there's a public comment
period where everybody -- anybody who cares to
make a public comment and put it on the record
will have up to five minutes each in order to
put it on the record.

By the way, we have a stenographer, a
court reporter, with us today, and we are
already on the record. So -- and I'd like
to -- I know this issue exists in your mind as
sort of one idea, but if you could try to
separate questions for clarification from
statements you'd like to make regarding EPA's
proposed plan.

And with that, I'll turn it over to
Tom Alcamo, who's going to take us to the
overview of the proposed plan.

MR. ALCAMO: One thing to keep in mind, if
you don't want to talk tonight, you have until
January 14th to submit your public comments.
We respond to those public comments, and we
eventually make a decision. We attach those
comments to the decision. We respond to all
those comments. So your comments will be
responded to in our -- the final Record of Decision. Okay?

So we're here tonight, as Janet said, to talk about the USS Lead Zone 1 Proposed Plan. And if I'm not talking loud enough, please yell at me.

Anyways, as you know, Zone 1 used to contain the West Calumet Housing Complex. You can see here's an actual aerial view of after it's been demolished.

Next slide. Just to give you a general overview of the area, here's Zone 1, Zone 2, Zone 3. This is something we call an "operable unit," or you can think of it as "phase." So this is Phase I. We're focused here to talk tonight about Zone 1.

A couple of other things to keep in mind: This is Operable Unit 2 or Phase II. This is the former USS Lead site. There's some work being done here and sampling for contamination; but also, there's an area-wide groundwater study that's underway. Actually, today they were installing some monitoring wells today.

Then finally, as some of you are aware, here's the former DuPont site, and that's being
handled not by Superfund but by another program
called the Resource Conservation Recovery Act.
Okay?

So let's talk a little bit, right out of
the gate, about future use for Zone 1. Future
use in Zone 1, or any superfund site, is really
determined by the owner. Okay? The owner
tells EPA what they want the future use --
either residential or industrial commercial.
Property owners for Zone 1 are the East Chicago
Housing Authority and the City of East Chicago.
And again, EPA cleans up that property based on
this future use.

So in most cases, an industrial commercial
cleanup would not be as stringent as a
residential cleanup. In most cases.

Right now, the current use -- future use
is residential, but you need to be made aware
of -- we received a letter from the City in
September changing that future use to
industrial commercial. And this letter, it
basically said two developers were interested
in the site in terms of developing. That's all
we know.

In any case, there were subsequent
discussions with the mayor, and the mayor
decided he was committed to keeping this
residential until there was a much more
congrete commercial proposal that's submitted.

So during this Public Comment Period, if
they come back to us and say that the future
use of this site is commercial industrial, we
could modify the remedy. But right now, as of
today, the remedy -- the future use for this
remedy in Zone 1 is residential.

Next slide, please. Just to give you a
little bit of background, in November of 2012,
we chose a remedy for Zones 1, 2, and 3. For
Zone 1, it called for the excavation to
residential standards. That would be 400 parts
per million lead, 26 parts per million arsenic,
with a visible marker institution of controls,
and these soils that will be excavated will be
disposed of off-site. In any case, no
excavation -- the time that the Record of
Decision was signed, the West Calumet Housing
Complex was occupied. So there would have been
no excavation under hardscapes; such as,
streets, sidewalks, and houses.

The cost -- back in November of 2012, the
cost for the entire cleanup of Zones 1, 2, & 3 was estimated to be about $25 million. We now, likely, are going to be in excess of $100 million.

Next slide. So just to give you a little bit of a history, in superfund, our goal is to try to get the polluter to pay. That's kind of one of the things that we like to do in superfund. We did get settlements in 2014 and 2017 with responsible parties to clean up these sites.

Kind of fast-forward to the summer of 2016, the mayor closed West Calumet Housing Complex and called for the demolition. The demolition began this last spring. The cleanup of Zones -- of homes in Zones 2 and Zones 3 began in the fall of 2016, and those are ongoing right now. Likely, all the cleanup could be done by maybe next year, or for sure, the following year.

The West Calumet Housing Complex, that demolition was completed this last fall. So because of this demolition, it's kind of forced EPA to relook at our original remedy that we determined in 2012.
Next slide. So we did revise the size of Zone 1. Essentially -- here's the former housing complex, utility corridor, Goodman Park. We excised the Carrie Gosch School because next summer the responsible parties will be dealing with a small amount of contamination under Carrie Gosch. There was contamination at 12 -- or 18 to 24 inches, and that will be excavated next summer. So in any case, this now revised Zone 1 is 50.5 acres.

Next slide. So as we moved forward and started looking at different alternatives for the cleanup of Zone 1, we did have the benefit of having over a thousand soil samples during the Investigation and Design Phase in Zone 1. Also, the East Chicago Housing Authority, they actually hired a contractor prior to the demolition and did a series of 38 borings on the site down to 12 feet.

A couple of things that came in, in focus during these borings, is that the groundwater is involved between 4 and 5 feet at this site, and there's debris at least at 11 feet in some of the locations on the site.

As part of their investigation, they also
did limited soil and groundwater sampling that we used, in our calculations of soil volumes, along with these 1,000 samples that we took on site.

Next slide. This slide gives you just a general cross section. Think of this as like taking the ground and cutting a piece of cake, where you can see ground water, where you can see debris. It's likely debris is from the former smelter that was on the property. As you remember, the housing complex was built on top of the former smelter property. So we do think there's debris at depth over a large portion of the site.

Next slide. This slide here, we took all EPA's -- all -- neutrally-only sampling data [sic] -- and this gives the statistics on it -- to try to give you an idea of what the concentrations of contaminants are on site. Here's -- the average is down to 30 inches. You can see 0 to 6 inches.

The median is -- if you're not familiar with what the median is, the median is a value that's right in the middle. So, for example, in 0 to 6 inches lead, half the samples on the
site are greater than 831 parts per million,
half the samples on the site are below 831 parts per million. So this gives you a general idea that we do have contamination on this site, essentially, over the entire 50.5 acres.

Next slide. So as we moved forward in developing this Feasibility Study, we amended the Feasibility Study. And again, future use as of now is residential. So we continued to use the same cleanup criteria of 400 parts per million lead, 26 parts per million arsenic.

One of the things that we also assumed, based on the data, that all the contaminants in those top 30 inches would be greater than our cleanup criteria. So when we looked at different alternatives, we looked at a suite of them, and they included stabilization of soils. We looked at soil washing to try to separate out the actual metals from the soil. And we looked at containment. But we came to the conclusion that, really, the only excavation was -- off-site disposal is really the only viable option.

And as I mentioned previously, there's a separate groundwater study that's underway
right now. If groundwater has to be addressed in the future, there would be another meeting like this where we would propose another remedy if it's required.

So let's go over the alternatives, that "four excavation with off-site disposal alternatives be evaluated."

We kept this Alternative 4A, which is an alternative with an industrial standard. As I mentioned previously, in many cases an industrial standard isn't quite as stringent as a residential standard because individuals are not on the property as frequently. So in any case, we kept this in just due to fact is there could be redevelopment to industrial commercial standards.

Right now, based where we're at today, this would not be protected because the current future use is residential. So we took the volume. We take 50.5 acres, and you take the volume, and you're looking at about 122,000 tons of contaminated soil that will be dug up and taken off-site.

To put that in "truck" perspective, if you have a 30-ton truck, which is the average-size
dump truck, that's in the neighborhood of about 4,000 trucks. Okay?

One of the things, too, because of the concentrations of lead on site, we made the assumption that about 50 percent of those soils would have to be treated. What that means is that lead in high concentrations, you just can't take that and dump that in a nonhazardous landfill. They would have to treat it to make sure that that material wouldn't leach over time. So we assume that about 50 percent of the soils, based on the concentrations we looked at, at the site, would require treatment. And that's, again, in the top 1 foot. The cost of that would be about $14 million, and it would be -- take about five months to complete.

So the second alternative we looked at -- and this is our preferred alternative -- would be excavation to 2 feet. Again, this is residential standard, consistent with what we're doing across the other two zones. We would excavate, we would take the soil off-site. We would have to treat some of this soil. There would also be institutional
controls put in place. Institutional controls are something like a visible marker, deed restrictions, things of that nature.

So in any case, all the -- since the Calumet Complex isn't there anymore, we would be excavating across the top 2 feet over the entire 50.5 acres.

Again, just to give you some ideas of some of the volumes, you're talking 235,000-plus tons. You're talking 5,000 like with cubic yards of concrete. We think about 50 percent of the soils would likely have to be treated. And the cost is about 26-and-a-half million dollars. Again, we think it would take about seven months to complete. And again, as I mentioned previously, this is consistent with Zones 2 and 3.

One of the things regarding the timing of the cleanup, this excavation can be done, obviously, a lot easier than what's being done currently in Zones 2 and 3. They will be able to bring in large equipment and direct load the soils for off-site disposal. Again, probably there's about 8,000 trucks that it would take. So in terms of the timing, that's in terms of
what we considered direct loading and taking that off-site.

The third excavation alternative we looked at would be excavating down to either groundwater or native sand. So in any case, again, the soils would be excavated. It would be taken off-site for disposal. Some of the soils would require treat [sic]; and again, we'd have to implement these institutional controls; such as, visible markers and things like that because below that, there is some contaminated material.

Again, we're looking at about 300 and almost 40,000 cubic yards, 11,000 trucks. Again, you can see about 45 percent of the soils we think would require treatment; again, likely by stabilization, which is mixing it usually with a material such as concrete. Cost is about $40 million, and it would take nine months to complete.

So in any case, our last alternative we looked at was excavation to native sand, off-site disposal, again, the treatment of soils, and institutional controls. This is at about 364,000 cubic -- 364,000 tons, which is
going to be in the neighborhood of 12,000 trucks.

Again, you can see what we assumed, you know, about 45 percent of the soils would require treatment. All the debris -- we would chase all the debris at the site. And as I mentioned previously, that debris is at depth, so we would have to do a number of groundwater control measures here; such as, adding sheet pile and treating groundwater because you would be digging, actually, in groundwater. The cost is about $49 million. We think it would take about 14 months to complete.

Next slide. So just to give you a general comparison of our preferred alternative, 4B, to alternative 4C. So it's a 2-feet excavation to, essentially, around a 4-foot excavation. Both alternatives would leave contamination in place and would require institutional controls. We don't view alternative 4C would provide that much additional risk reduction with the institutional controls that would be put in place for alternative 4B because we do know that there's still contamination at depth.

Alternative 4C is about $13 million more
in price. We do think Alternative 4C would be
a little bit more difficult to control because
of the fact is: With the deeper excavation,
and we have a potential to hit groundwater.

So finally, Alternative 4C, which is the
groundwater alternative, it's not consistent
with what we're actually doing in Zones 2 and
3.

Next slide. Okay. Thank you. You're
ahead of me. So in any case, Alternative 4D,
which is down to native sand, we would view
this as having a large amount of contingency.
We view this alternative as difficult to
implement. It can be done, but we view this as
difficult to implement just because of the
groundwater at depth.

We also know that we expect to find a
large amount of debris at depth on the site,
and we'd probably have to do some additional
predesign work to deal with that debris at
depth. And you're about -- 4DA -- 4D is nearly
$22 million more expensive than 4B -- for the
alternative.

Next. Okay. So when EPA goes and looks
at evaluations, we look at nine criteria when
comparing alternatives. These first two
criteria are called "threshold criteria." We
have to meet those criteria. So, for example,
Alternative 4A, the excavation of 1 foot for
industrial standards, that would not meet this
overall protection of human health and
environment because the current future use is
residential. The compliance with ANR [sic] --
ANR is a fancy word for regulation.

Okay. So then we have five balancing
criteria. Long-term effectiveness and
permanence, reduction of toxicity mobility for
volume through treatment.

Short-term effectiveness. What you can
think of as short-term effectiveness is the
risk associated with the remediation activities
to the nearby neighborhood or to construction
workers.

Implementability is another one, and then
finally cost. We use these five to balance
against each other when we look at the
alternatives. And we have -- the final two
alternatives we look at is state acceptance and
community acceptance. State acceptance -- IDEM
has told us verbally that the agreed -- that
preferred alternative, which is 4B -- we've not
received anything in writing on that, but right
now, they have indicated that they support the
preferred alternatives [sic]. This is why
we're here tonight, okay, for community
acceptance.

And let me repeat: You'll get a chance to
submit public comments. There's a court
reporter. We will respond to all of your
comments, and they'll all be attached to our
final remedy decision.

One thing to keep in mind is: If you
don't want to talk and you feel shy, and you
don't want to talk, there's comment pages back
there. You have till July 14th --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: January.

MR. ALCAMO: January. Sorry. To get your
comments in to us, being postmarked by then.

Next one. We put this table together just
to get a general overview. You want a detailed
discussion in regards to how we compared the
alternatives, you can look at the Feasibility
Study Addendum. It's in the Administrative
Record. There's also a long version of the
Proposed Plan that's in the Administrative
Record. You have a fact sheet version.

There's a much longer version that goes into a little bit more detail if you want to look more into that.

But in regard to what we view -- EPA views 4B, our preferred alternative, 4C, and 4D to be protective with institutional controls, engineering controls -- and don't forget, these remedies are not walkaway remedies. There's going to need to be maintenance and inspections on the site whatever remedy we implement. They will all be compliant with regulations. As you can see here, 4A would not meet these this, so we would not choose that remedy as of today. Okay?

Long-term effectiveness and permanence, we view that all three of these would meet that criteria.

Reduction in toxicity mobility and volume through treatment. They all have some form of treatment in it, in terms of stabilization.

Short-term effectiveness, now, this is -- this is something that we have to take into consideration. If you remember when the demolition occurred, there was a series of air
monitors surrounding the site. That will
likely be required for this excavation to make
sure that we don't transfer contaminants --
everybody -- you know, I get it. Everybody
here is concerned about: When we dig this
stuff up, how are we going to move it? We're
also doing, for example, air monitoring during
our Zones 2 and Zone 3 excavations, and so this
will obviously be a big component of any remedy
that we implement.

    All these alternatives can be implemented;
some more difficult than others, but they can
be implemented. And comparison of the costs,
you can see the cost difference.

    The State, once we get the official letter
from them, we'll let everyone be aware of if
they concur with our preferred alternative or
not. As I said previously, verbally, they have
concurred with it. And again, we will respond
to all public comments and evaluate those
comments to determine if we need to modify our
preferred remedy.

    Okay. Next slide. So I think there's --
this chart was in the back. So I just put this
together to kind of give you just a general
summary of the comparisons of the alternatives.

Alternative 4B --

(Coughing heard.)

MR. ALCAMO: -- 2C area [sic], 1 foot, groundwater, native sand. Native sand, difference in cubic yards. Again, kind of multiply by that by 1.5 to get the amount of tons. This material is pretty heavy because of the metals and everything.

The -- (unintelligible) -- plant, you can see the comparison, cost comparisons. The institutional controls, all these will require a barrier demarcation, likely not 4D, but we do think there will be institutional controls likely because of the groundwater.

And then, of course, just some of the concerns that we have in relation to each alternative. And so you have that table in the back kind of to help you when you put forth your public comments.

Just to give you a final slide, a final summary, our preferred alternative is similar to the previous alternative we chose, which is excavation to 2 feet, off-site disposal, treatment of about 50 percent of the soils, and
then institutional controls; such as, a visible
marker, deed restrictions, maintenance
activities, and inspection activities.

One of the things to keep in mind, it gets
more controlled -- as you go deeper, the more
difficult it gets to implement.

Redevelopment could influence the final
remedy, and we're kind of in a no man's land
here because of the fact -- right now it's
commercial industrial. We could get something
that says, prior to the signing of Record of
Decision, to change it to -- I mean -- back up.
Sorry.

If the -- Redevelopment, as I said, will
influence our final remedy decision. Right now
it's residential, but we could get something
prior to the signature of the Record of
Decision Amendment that could say, industrial
commercial. So I want you, when you submit
comments, to make sure you submit comments
that -- if you like that, if you don't like
that. You should assume that possibly this
could change.

I do not have any inside information on
that. I am telling you that, right now, it's
residential. Again, the State supports the
preferred alternative.

So with that, I'll take some questions
after I get some water.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Okay. We want to take
questions for clarification, to make sure that
everybody understands the presentation. We
asked you to take a number if you had a
question for clarification, and so we're going
to go through those. If you have a question
and didn't take a number, you can still get a
number.

Who has No. 1? Little white square with
No. 1.

(No response.)

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: No. 2?

(No response.)

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Does anybody have
No. 3?

Yes, sir.

REMONSTRATOR TURPIN: Yeah.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Can you introduce
yourself? And then ask your question.

REMONSTRATOR TURPIN: David Turpin. On
the summary of the alternatives, you say, under
4D, that's described, it says -- (inaudible)
controls likely -- (inaudible) -- groundwater.
Can you expound on that a little?

MR. ALCAMO: The groundwater -- we have --
there's -- monitor wells are being installed on
the site as we speak. I think there's -- the
last ones to be installed. There are four
groundwater monitoring wells on the site down
to 12 feet.

The concentrations in those wells for
lead -- I'll take lead for example -- was
non-detect, 26, 48, and 160, if I remember off
the top of my head. So the drinking water
standard is 15 parts billion. Okay?

So there needs to be a lot more study on
groundwater, and that's why there's additional
wells being put on the site. And then that
data will be looked at, and there may be
actually more wells put on site. We're going
to be doing this groundwater study in a phased
approach.

So groundwater could be a -- have to be
treated on the Zone 1. We don't know yet. And
not just Zone 1. It could be in the whole
general area. So that -- as I said, that would
be a separate decision that would be done in a
public meeting just like we're doing now.
Okay?

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Thank you.

MR. ALCAMO: And another thing to add,
that's also assuming that we can find all the
debris. Okay. We're going to be taking in
groundwater. We're at depth. We think that
this smelter -- a lot of this was just
demolished in place and buried, and us trying
to find that -- we think groundwater and
dealing with that also could require -- that we
could miss something [sic].

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Thank you, Tom.
Question No. 4.

REMONSTRATOR FRANK: Right here.
MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Tom.
REMONSTRATOR FRANK: Yeah, Thomas Frank
with Calumet Lives Matter.

I have a question. One of the things that
we did get to with the mayor, we got him to
commit to HUD a letter that we videotaped, that
actually Mr. Cunningham actually read out loud.
That --

MR. ALCAMO: This was in 2016?
REMONSTRATOR FRANK: Yeah -- or 2017.

MR. ALCAMO: Okay. Okay.

REMONSTRATOR FRANK: For recilitating to housing in West Calumet. We're hearing, with the new letter to HUD -- or EPA in September, that he's opening, you know, the discussion to industrial commercial. We want to ensure that it stays residential, not something that Calumet Lives Matter can -- advocating for [sic].

One of the things we're also really concerned about is when you described getting down to clean soil, what is the standard for what is clean sand?

And also, right to the south of this parcel, West Calumet, is a -- is a area between the Operating Unit 1 and Operating Unit 2, which we don't know of any testing that had been done previously. All right? So right here --

MR. ALCAMO: (Unintelligible) -- now back up.

REMONSTRATOR FRANK: So right between here -- these two --

MR. ALCAMO: Can you put -- next one.
REMONSTRATOR FRANK: These two, this triangle there.

MR. ALCAMO: No. Keep going.

REMONSTRATOR FRANK: No, that was the map.

MR. ALCAMO: No.

REMONSTRATOR FRANK: Go back.

MR. ALCAMO: Well, that 1.21 is Zone 1, though.

REMONSTRATOR FRANK: No, the -- no. Go back. Go back to the -- (inaudible).

MR. ALCAMO: Sorry.

REMONSTRATOR FRANK: Go back.

(Multiple people speaking in unison.)

REMONSTRATOR FRANK: There.

REMONSTRATOR: Right there.

REMONSTRATOR FRANK: We don't have any testing describing what had happened there, and that's going to affect what's going on in West Calumet. And that's not even a part of the superfund site, does make any sense. And so we also are looking for -- asking what you're going to do to make sure things are done in a compatible use.

You described what was maybe under Zone 1,
which also includes Carrie Gosch. And we don't
have any records of any real proper cleanup by
the EPA having occurred there. We have IDEM
coming on site when the construction was
saying -- happening, saying that, "Hey, look
out, it's contaminated," but we don't have any
records of any proper cleanup, and we'd like to
get some records.

MR. ALCAMO: Okay. Let's start first --

REMONSTRATOR FRANK: Yes.

MR. ALCAMO: -- with the HUD question.

REMONSTRATOR FRANK: Lot of questions.

MR. ALCAMO: Actually, Jim Cunningham sent
me an email basically stating that he's not
aware of any proposal as of now for
residential.

REMONSTRATOR FRANK: But we have that on
videotape and sent it back to him.

MR. ALCAMO: Okay. That's --

REMONSTRATOR FRANK: He read out the
letter.

MR. ALCAMO: I'm not -- I'm not debating
you. I mean, we basically -- if it's
residential, we're going to clean it up to
residential, where we're at now.
This area here, I'll talk to IDEM in regards to getting some sampling done in there if we need to. I'm not -- honestly, I'm not sure, but this is -- we'll take a look at that. IDEM's been going in the general area and doing additional sampling to determine what contamination is where. So we'll take a look an that. That a was long --

REMONSTRATOR FRANK: Yeah, sorry.

MR. ALCAMO: Sorry, Tom.

REMONSTRATOR FRANK: If you could just go to the last one where -- about Carrie Gosch and getting records of cleanup.

MR. ALCAMO: Okay. Carrie Gosch -- there was actually samples, detailed sampling done all around Carrie Gosch. Okay? There's one area of about 1,000 cubic yards at 18 to 24 inches that basically will require excavation.

REMONSTRATOR FRANK: Right. We recognize that you've done some sampling that tested pos-- or negative -- or --

MR. ALCAMO: Not negative, but not above the cleanup criteria.

REMONSTRATOR FRANK: Not negative, but not
at eye level. But we don't have a record of a
proper cleanup having occurred there, and
that's what we're looking for.

MR. ALCAMO: Do you mean a cleanup when
they built the school?

REMONSTRATOR FRANK: Before they built the
school.

MR. ALCAMO: Okay.

REMONSTRATOR FRANK: I know they probably
piled a lot of soil on top of it --

MR. ALCAMO: I'll give you, for example
here -- you're right -- you're -- you know --
and that's why we did the sampling. I'll give
you an example: The Goodman Park, where they
dug the pool out, there's a big mound of soil.
You guys probably slid down it if you lived
there.

REMONSTRATOR: Yeah.

MR. ALCAMO: You know?

REMONSTRATOR: We call it "the mountain."

MR. ALCAMO: Yeah, there you go. That
essentially will get excavated. So in terms
of -- that was easy, but, you know, we did have
sampling around here, Tom. So --

REMONSTRATOR FRANK: Yeah, I recognize
they had sampled it, but we don't have a Record
of Decision --

MR. ALCAMO: Okay.

REMONSTRATOR FRANK: -- for actually

Mr. ALCAMO: All right.

REMONSTRATOR FRANK: -- prior to the
construction of Carrie Gosch.

MR. ALCAMO: Okay. I -- let's -- maybe we
can try to dig something up in some records.

REMONSTRATOR FRANK: Yeah.

MR. ALCAMO: I don't know.

REMONSTRATOR FRANK: All right.

MR. ALCAMO: But I --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, the 2012
Record of Decision covered Carrie Gosch.

(Multiple people speaking in
unison.)

MR. ALCAMO: I don't know. He's looking
for the prior. I don't know.

MS. MORGAN: So 20 years ago when they
rebuilt Carrie Gosch, that --

REMONSTRATOR: That wasn't built 20 years
ago.

MS. MORGAN: When it was rebuilt --
REMONSTRATOR: It wasn't 20 years ago.

MS. MORGAN: How many years ago?

(Multiple people speaking.)

REMONSTRATOR: It was before the superfund site --

(Multiple people speaking.)

MS. MORGAN: Okay. Can I finish my point?

REMONSTRATOR: And that went to the old Carrie Gosch --

MS. MORGAN: Right. And so --

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Okay. Let's try to speak one at a time, please.

MS. MORGAN: And so, again, Carla Morgan for the City of East Chicago. When Carrie Gosch -- the school was rebuilt by the school city, there wasn't a Record of Decision because it was not a superfund zone yet. So that would be a question for the school and whoever their developer was then. Remember, they were rebuilding all the schools in the '90s.

REMONSTRATOR: Why would that be a question for the schools if the City okayed the rebuilding of the school? So why would that be a question of the school officials when the
city officials and the project [sic] is the
ones that rebuilt the school?

MS. MORGAN: That property's always been
owned by the school city. The school city paid
for that rebuilding. They would have
contracted for it. So that was the school
city's decision.

MR. ALCAMO: What we'll do is I'll contact
Paige McNulty, who's head of the school board,
and see if --

REMONSTRATOR: We should have more city
officials here.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Sir, I think you have
a number already.

REMONSTRATOR: I do.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: So, if you could,
just --

MR. ALCAMO: But anyways, I'll get ahold
of Paige McNulty and see if she has any type of
records and see if we can get that and get that
information to you guys. I'm not aware of any.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Question No. 5? Yes,
Sherry.

REMONSTRATOR S. HUNTER: I'd like to know
what happened to our Moving Forward Program
that the governor signed off and said it's specifically going to be used in the hardest hit area of East Chicago. He said, "Zone 1."
That's what he said. So why -- where is it?
Why is nothing being done in Zone 1?

MR. ALCAMO: Well, I think we're going to try to do something in Zone 1 in terms of cleanup.

REMONSTRATOR S. HUNTER: No. I'm talking about where's our Moving Forward Program funding?

MR. ALCAMO: That's outside the scope of the EPA.

REMONSTRATOR S. HUNTER: Yeah.

MR. ALCAMO: We -- we are going to try to get the company to come in here and clean this stuff up. Okay? If we choose our preferred remedy, it's going to be something in the neighborhood of $27 million. That's what we're going to do. I can't -- I don't know about that program.

REMONSTRATOR S. HUNTER: Well, I know where it went. It went over in the Harbor. The mayor's using it in the other areas of East Chicago instead of over here where they
need it.

(Applause.)

REMONSTRATOR S. HUNTER: He does nothing over here. Nothing. And we -- Calumet Lives has tried for a month to have a sit-down with this guy. He won't answer -- the last thing I did was the certified thing to -- he don't talk to us at all. I'm just saying.

MR. ALCAMO: Well, I hope --

REMONSTRATOR S. HUNTER: The Moving Forward Program, someone needs to check it out. I was at Carrie Gosch when the governor signed off on that, and he said it's only to be used in Zone 1, the hardest hit area in East Chicago.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Thank you.

MR. ALCAMO: It's called Moving Forward?

REMONSTRATOR S. HUNTER: Moving Forward.

MR. ALCAMO: Okay.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Thank you. Question No. 6?

REMONSTRATOR 6: That's me.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Yes, sir.

REMONSTRATOR 6: I'm Joe from Zone 3. I want to ask, that one soil, the top was cleaned
MR. ALCAMO: The top is cleaned to -- all the way to 18 inches.

REMONSTRATOR 6: Okay. Why did you have to excavate that? That top part is clean. Why did you have to go --

MR. ALCAMO: We're not excavating that. We're basically going down to 18 to 24. And that's, obviously --

REMONSTRATOR 6: The top layer's clean, right, to 18?

MR. ALCAMO: To 18.

REMONSTRATOR 6: Right now. The bottom part is --

MR. ALCAMO: 18 to 24 is --

REMONSTRATOR 6: Now, why do you have to clean it if the top is okay? If the top part is okay --

MR. ALCAMO: Because it's within 2 feet.

REMONSTRATOR 6: Okay. So if the -- anything below 2 feet of soil is dirty, it will come up and soil -- and dirty the top of the soil?

MR. ALCAMO: I don't have that data in front of me, in terms of what's at depth. I
don't think there's any contamination below 2 feet. I would have to -- I would recommend you talk to --

REMONSTRATOR 6: What I'm saying, if the top is okay for 2 feet, okay --

MR. ALCAMO: No, the top isn't okay for 2 feet. The top is okay for 18 inches.

REMONSTRATOR 6: All right. Okay. 18 inches. All right? Okay? And you're saying you're excavating it because below that is where the contamination is.

MR. ALCAMO: Yes.

REMONSTRATOR 6: Okay. So you're telling me eventually that contamination below it, at 18 inches, will eventually come up to the surface of the soil?

MR. ALCAMO: We're going to remove it. We're going to dig it up and take it out.

REMONSTRATOR 6: Will that contamination that's under 18 inches eventually come up to the ground level?

MR. ALCAMO: No, because --

(Multiple people speaking in unison.)

REMONSTRATOR: Will it stay in place?
Will it come up?

MR. ALCAMO: Oh, no, no. Will it stay in place? Will it come up? Likely not. But we're going to take that 18 inches. Okay? And I'm not involved in that. I mean, I would really recommend you talk to Sarah Rolfes. I'm just kind of talking in regards to what I know.

REMONSTRATOR 6: It's bizarre that the top would be okay, and then you have to go below and cut it because the bottom half is bad. I'm thinking that stuff is driving up.

MR. ALCAMO: No.

MS. TANAKA: No, we don't think it's rising up. And when we take out that -- between 18 and 24, then we'll put clean stuff there and then put the clean stuff on top. So it was probably --

REMONSTRATOR 6: The reason why you're going below 18 -- how come you're not worried about it coming up? It's just standard, it has to be cleaned down?


REMONSTRATOR 6: All right. Thank you.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Thank you.

MR. ALCAMO: Thank you.
MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Question No. 7.

REMONSTRATOR 7: My name is Carl Wolf.

The owners of the property, the Housing Authority and the City, could switch the intent for use. And if they do that, according to your presentation, then that's that. Is there no recourse that the public would have if they disagreed with the City's decision, you know, in terms of EPA?

(Applause.)

REMONSTRATOR 7: You know, where would the community go to say -- I don't know.

MR. ALCAMO: We're kind of in -- stuck in a pickle here because of the fact is we don't make the determination of future use. We have nothing to do with that. They tell us what it is.

Now, let's say we move forward, and they did say, okay, it's going to be commercial industrial, we could have -- still have the ability to say, okay, you can excavate 1 foot where buildings are; but maybe where there's not buildings, we want you to go to 2 feet. So we have a little bit, but this isn't our -- our decision. You know? And so I -- you know, I
can only say that -- that if it changes -- if
it changes, before we sign the Record of
Decision, we could choose a less-stringent
remedy than we're choosing now.

REMONSTRATOR 7: So -- but regardless, if
the vast majority of the public that lived in
that area or lives in Zones 2 and Zone 3, we're
saying, this isn't what we want, you guys would
have to ignore their pleas?

MR. ALCAMO: I think you should submit
comments and state very clearly --

REMONSTRATOR 7: Not holding back, yeah.

MR. ALCAMO: -- state clearly in terms of
put it in the record in regards to what your
opinions are. Okay? I -- I can't predict the
future. This development may not go through,
it may go through. But, you know, we don't
make the decision on that.

REMONSTRATOR 7: But there's no recourse
that -- otherwise, as far as the EPA is
concerned?

MR. ALCAMO: I think if -- if we -- I -- I
don't know. Rachel, is there any --

MS. ZANDER: Yeah, I mean -- so hi. I'm
Rachel Zander. I'm the attorney working with
Tom at the site. And he's absolutely right, whether -- whether this property becomes residential, whether it becomes an industrial commercial facility, that is up to the owners of the property. So we're here to hear all of your comments and concerns about the remedy selected for the contamination at the site, but -- and we understand that there's a lot of concern about what ultimately happens with Zone 1. But the use of it is not what we're involved in. We're involved in making sure whatever use that is, that the property gets cleaned up appropriately for that use.

REMONSTRATOR: Well, let me ask you this: How come they change the use?

MR. ALCAMO: 'Cause they own it.

REMONSTRATOR: But what is -- it's a residential. That's -- that was the reason why we -- it was demolished with the knowledge that -- and the acceptance of the community, knowing it was going to be returned to residential. Why is it suddenly under discussion, that it's no longer going to be about residential?

MS. ZANDER: The way that -- the way that
EPA selects preferred remedies relies on a designation of future use of the property, and the owner of the property gets to tell us what the anticipated future use is.

REMONSTRATOR: But what if their anticipated use was contrary to the health of the public? What if their preferred use was contrary to the people that live in that area?

MR. ALCAMO: We would have to clean it up so it's overall protective of human health and the environment. So we would not support that. So that's --

MS. ZANDER: Maybe back to those first two criteria, Tom.

MR. ALCAMO: Right. So I know. I mean, right now it's residential and -- it's residential, and we're moving forward that it's residential. I can't tell you what the City's going to do.

(Multiple people speaking in unison.)

REMONSTRATOR: The City is the owner.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Okay. Let's try to speak --

MR. ALCAMO: The Housing Authority owns
the Calumet property, and the City owns

Goodman Park.

(Multiple people speaking in
unison.)

REMONSTRATOR: It's not the City --

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Let's try to speak one

at a time, please. Now, if we only let

everybody get a chance to speak tonight

[sic] -- we have to try to all agree to keep

some kind of order. You're going to have -- we

have a time period for you to make general

comments.

MR. ALCAMO: Please, and I'm -- please,

make -- I think it's important that you make

those comments for the record.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Yes.

Who has Question 8, clarification of the

presentation? Question 8? To better

understand the presentation.

(No response.)

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Question 9?

REMONSTRATOR: You have nine.

REMONSTRATOR: Oh, presentation only.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: I'm sorry?

MS. ZANDER: Maybe you can clarify this
question session is for clarifications about
the presentation and --

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Yes. So I'll say it
again: This period here is for clarification
of what Tom presented, the proposed plan,
anything you want to know or ask about the
proposed plan. When that's finished, we're
going to have a general comment period where
you can make any comment that you care to make,
within five minutes, regarding the situation or
the plan.

Nine?

REMONSTRATOR LOPEZ: On the presentation?

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Yes, it's on the
presentation, on the proposed plan.

REMONSTRATOR: Oh, I'll do it now because
I've had surgery, so I might as well do this
now. May I?

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Yes.

MR. ALCAMO: Sure.

REMONSTRATOR LOPEZ: Thank you. My
question is, will the removal of the highly
contaminated soil lead to further contamination
in the neighborhood surrounding the remediation
area? What steps will be taken to protect the
nearby residents and the people working and
ing playing in Carrie Gosch?

And the question is this: Because Zone 1
encompassed, originally in the Consent Decree,
Carrie Gosch. We did not know the who, what,
why, where, when, and how this became, all of a
sudden, separated.

REMONSTRATOR: Right.

(Multiple people speaking in
unison.)

REMONSTRATOR LOPEZ: Neither the
residents -- that decision was made behind
closed doors. Again. Again. Again. I repeat
this three times. Closed doors. All right?

MR. ALCAMO: Uh-huh.

REMONSTRATOR LOPEZ: All of a sudden,
Zone 1 became separated. Carrie Gosch no
longer is part of Zone 1, apparently. That's
separated because now it's being made for
profit, profit over people's lives.

REMONSTRATOR: Yes, yes, yes.

REMONSTRATOR LOPEZ: So let me finish
what's my question.

MR. ALCAMO: I'm sorry.

REMONSTRATOR LOPEZ: Because now
children's lives are at risk neurologically because there's a church in there.

There are four pathways people are being contaminated. Airborne: There is not an invisible wall going all the way to the atmosphere or going down to the core of the earth that's protecting the groundwater. That's still contaminating, coming into our homes by seepage that you still have not tested. And we know it's contaminating our homes that way, airborne, coming in through our windows, every which way possible. And those of us that live in the superfund site know that because we're dealing with it daily.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: And so the question is: How --

REMONSTRATOR LOPEZ: So now the question is: When will the Statement of Work be completed? Will it be shared with the community before the work starts?

How are the control measures reflected in the cost of different alternatives?

Do you have metrics of how the Pollution Control Plan worked to control air emissions and soil tracking during the demolition of West
Calumet Housing Complex?

Did you learn anything that convinced you of the need to make changes of this remediation plan?

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Thank you.

MR. ALCAMO: Okay. That's a lot of questions. I'll try to remember.

First, regarding the controls, essentially, there will be air monitoring surrounding the facility. We don't want to transfer this stuff off-site. We've excavated these projects using engineering controls safely and effectively. We're doing it at Zones 2 and Zones 3 as we speak. During the demolition, there was no issues associated with air monitoring. The data is all there. They sampled, basically, for lead and arsenic, dust. We had dust monitors. We set the levels of the dust monitors extremely low. And if the alarms went off, then there would be a requirement for additional controls. The demolition did not spread contamination into the surrounding area.

Carrie Gosch was not included in this proposed plan because the responsible parties have already agreed to deal with it. There's
no use for me to do a remedy decision on -- for
Carrie Gosch when they've already said they're
going to do it. So that's the only reason why
they basically -- that's taken out. That's the
reason.

MS. ZANDER: And Tom, if I can, too --
sorry to jump in. I don't mean to steal the
limelight.

The separation of Carrie Gosch and the
rest of Zone 1 here -- I mean, the reason we're
looking at this part of Zone 1 again is because
of the demolition, because the remedy provided
that we weren't going to dig under hardscapes,
and those hardscapes are gone. So what do we
do with those spaces now? That's why we're
looking at this again.

Carrie Gosch is the same layout. You
know, there are still buildings in place where
there were buildings in 2016.

REMONSTRATOR: Who are the responsible
parties that you --

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Yes. Part of the
answer?

MS. MORGAN: I can maybe clarify a little
bit of what Moritza addressed.
There’s always been, in Zone 1, three
property owners. The northern part is
Carrie Gosch. When you vote for the school
board, that is the separate taxing entity, the
governing entity, that controls what happens to
Carrie Gosch. They are not going to change the
use of that, in that they're not going to, you
know, knock it down and do anything different.

And plus, the environmental testing there
only revealed that that one corner of the
parking lot is contaminated. And as far as
records of, you know, what happened when they
remodeled it, rebuilt it, that is not a
question for the City. It's a question for the
school city.

So the strip between that and West Calumet
is Goodman Park. The City owns that portion.
And again, when we're waiting for the cleanup,
the City has closed off that park, and it's not
currently being used. We -- the Park
Department is making sure that those gates stay
closed so that whatever the school city has
decided, which apparently was to lease, in the
short term, to the Cross Church --

REMONSTRATOR: It is in use.
MS. MORGAN: Okay. That's fine.

REMONSTRATOR: (Unintelligible).

MS. MORGAN: I'm not arguing that -- I'm not arguing that point. I'm just trying to give you some useful information, which is that the City is ensuring that whomever the Cross Church has in that school, which is between them and the school city, will not be able to access the city property, which hasn't been remediated yet, which is Goodman Park.

So then you have West Calumet, which has been owned for the last 40 or so years by the Housing Authority. And, obviously, the use there is -- there will be some sort of change, whether it's -- the old residential will be demolished, the new residential, or as time is, you know, discussed over and over again, they could change use.

But I just wanted to break down that there was not some nefarious change and why Carrie Gosch is not being discussed today. It's up to who owns each segment, what they're going to do with it. And again, if you have -- if you have issues with what the school city's doing with Carrie Gosch property, you've got to
take that to the school city.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: So I just want to --

REMONSTRATOR: That's not true --

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: -- really. I really

want to --

REMONSTRATOR: -- because the school
didn't make a decision for a church to be
there.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: We have 20 --

REMONSTRATOR: (Inaudible) -- where the
church gonna be. So what she said is not true.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: We have 28 questions
out. I need to ask you to please ask one or
two questions, and let our answers be pithy,
because all of you -- there are 28 of you now
who still have questions to ask. And so

Moritza, I'm going to let you come back in
another round. You asked about six questions.

And so I'd like to go to No. 9.

REMONSTRATOR 9: I was nine.

REMONSTRATOR: That was nine.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: No. 10.

REMONSTRATOR 10: No. 10.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Yes.

REMONSTRATOR 10: My question's about
the -- you were discussing the implement of the
groundwater survey was ongoing. Your preferred
remedy, as you said, leaves quite a bit of
debris, like a buried lead plant that is
sitting there, and it's just sitting in the
groundwater. And then you're going to cover
over 2 feet, at which point you may have to
re-excavate. Did you mention that -- that's
still leaching into the groundwater; correct?

MR. ALCAMO: Well, we wouldn't
re-excavate. We would actually do some type of
groundwater treatment, where you capture the
contaminated groundwater and treat it.

REMONSTRATOR 10: So is that -- that
long-term, forever groundwater treatment, has
that been looked at as a cheaper remedy than
simply removing the whole lead plant now?

MR. ALCAMO: We have not compared that.
But in any case, the likelihood is, it would
be, based on our experience in terms of what we
see in the groundwater. We don't see these
screaming -- at least from the four monitoring
wells that we see on site, we don't see huge
concentrations of lead in the groundwater.
There's low-level arsenic and a few other
metals. But overall, we don't see this major problem.

Now, that's what we're basically just looking at right now, and that's why these new wells are being put in. And I don't see -- there may be more wells get put in. But we do think that with 2 feet, putting institutional controls in, doing maintenance, inspections, and all the things that need to be done would be protective. And then if groundwater needs to be addressed -- no one is drinking groundwater, but we usually have to clean up aquifers to the drinking water standard -- then that would be done separately.

REMONSTRATOR 10: Through a pumping treatment type thing.

MR. ALCAMO: Groundwater collection trench or whatever. You know, who knows?

REMONSTRATOR S. HUNTER: US Lead is not gone. I live by -- (unintelligible) -- Street. US Lead is up under that mountain. They only put it down so for. US Lead is still there. And all that water you see draining around the side of that mountain is coming from US Lead, coming up.
MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Thank you, Sherry.

Question 11? Yes, sir.

REMONSTRATOR 11: I have a question about the soil and it's contaminated [sic]. Three parts to this: First off, you said the toxicity and volume are part of the -- reduction of those are part of the criteria used to determine cleanup, except the toxicity of these metals won't be reduced; they're elements. And the volume is actually going to increase because you're gonna mix stuff with it. So that seems like you're going away from your required goals under the law and under the superfund. That's Part A.

Part B is: I'm confused because you said there was no contamination below 2 feet, but then you said there was smelter waste 11 feet below the ground. So how can that be right?

And Question C, the third part is: What community is this gonna -- 122,000 tons of toxic waste gonna be dumped on?

MR. ALCAMO: Let's start with your last one first. That's unknown right now. The land -- under CERCLA -- under CERCLA, we have to take material that's contaminated off-site.
It has to meet compliance standard. So we look at where it goes. That's not been determined yet.

Regarding the toxicity, it would reduce the toxicity because of the fact is, is the TCLP test would show that the lead would essentially leach from the soil. That's why prior to being disposed of in a landfill, it would have to be put in something like concrete or lime or something like that. But you're absolutely correct, it would increase the volume at the landfill, but at a loss --

REMONSTRATOR 11: It does not reduce the toxicity of the metal.

MR. ALCAMO: Well, it would be -- it would not be leachable. It would stay in place.

REMONSTRATOR 11: The toxicity is the same overall, though.

MR. ALCAMO: Well --

REMONSTRATOR 11: Let's tell the truth.

MEDIATOR LYTCHOTT: Lead is lead.

MR. ALCAMO: But the truth is, is that material would not leach from that.

REMONSTRATOR 11: Do you have any studies to prove that?
MR. ALCAMO: Well, yes, we do. I mean, in terms of stabilization.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Okay. Thank you.

Question --

MR. ALCAMO: Hold on. There was another one that -- I hear another part about -- then I misspoke -- you said about -- I didn't understand --

REMONSTRATOR 11: I didn't say you misspoke. I said, I'm confused because you said there was no contamination under 2 feet, yet you said there was --

MR. ALCAMO: (Inaudible).

REMONSTRATOR 11: -- debris and contamination underground, so those two statements don't --

MR. ALCAMO: I -- then I misspoke, but there is contamination under 2 feet. Because I misspoke. If I said that.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's why you need institutional --

MR. ALCAMO: Right.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Thank you. Question 12.

REMONSTRATOR 12: Will EPA open the
Consent Decree as part of amending the Record of Decision?

MR. ALCAMO: I'm assuming we'd have to do a Consent Decree amendment, but I'm not a lawyer.

REMONSTRATOR 12: Well, let the lawyer talk. So how about we hear from her?

MS. ZANDER: Right. So I don't think it's quite right to characterize it as "reopening" the Consent Decree. But yes, since we're talking about an amended remedy, a slightly different remedy at the site, then yes, we would be looking at a -- not a new, but an amended supplement document, as well.

REMONSTRATOR 12: And would that go back before the judge then?

MS. ZANDER: Yes, consent decree amendments go back before the judge.

REMONSTRATOR 12: Thank you.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Thank you.

Question 13. Yes, ma'am.

REMONSTRATOR 13: My question is about contingencies. The EPA stated that the -- MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Can you all hear her back there?
REMONSTRATOR: No.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: A little louder, please.

REMONSTRATOR 13: I'm sorry. My question is about contingencies. The EPA has stated that the amendment could include a contingent plan that would set out certain conditions that have triggered with -- change the cleanup to the commercial or industrial level. Can you explain a little about how that would work?

MR. ALCAMO: Well, if we get something from the owners that say, all of a sudden, this is a commercial facility, prior to assigning the Record of Decision, then I think we could change that. And that's why we want you to comment that -- on that possible contingency.

REMONSTRATOR: We have the owner right here. Is he -- (unintelligible) -- speak on that right now?

MS. ZANDER: I'm sorry, Thomas. I just want to add a little bit more detail to Tom's answer. So there -- we -- based on further information about the -- any redevelopment that might happen, we have a couple options. So we can -- we can carry forward with the current
preferred alternative. If more information
comes in, we can select a different alternative
that's been examined here. Or there could be
an alternative -- a ROD finalized that contains
a contingency.

So it would say, we're going with the
current preferred alternative; but if before a
certain date, a certain level of
concrete-enough information comes in about a
redevelopment proposal, we still have enough
flexibility to change course. Because we want
to be out there doing -- doing work at the site
to deal with the contamination as soon as
possible. So we don't want to have to start
back all over at scratch again if it means that
we still have enough flexibility to pivot and
work with documents that we've already
addressed and have public comment about.

MR. ALCAMO: I would expect, in the Record
of Decision, that that would be signed sometime
early summer. Obviously, we're expecting a lot
of comments that we need to respond to and
evaluate. So what happens between that time
frame, I'm just not sure.

REMONSTRATOR 13: But that's exactly what
my question is, is that contingent plan --

    MS. ZANDER: Yes.

REMONSTRATOR 13: So once that occurs, after the decision's already been finalized and you change the course, will there be -- will everyone be able to comment, or will that specific plan be laid out ahead of time? What will the process be?

    MS. ZANDER: So we're dealing with options that are on the table right now in these series of alternatives. And while EPA has marked which is our preferred alternative, all of them remain on the table throughout the public comment period. So if the public has opinions about alternatives other than EPA's preferred alternative, we want to hear your comments on those other alternatives, as well, because they could become part of the overall remedy at the site. So this is -- this is your opportunity.

You know, our preferred alternative is 4B. But if you have a lot to say about one of the others, you know, say it now, tonight, written, email Janet, you know, use all of those ways to get your feedback to us.

    MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Thank you.
Question 14. Yes, ma'am.

REMONSTRATOR 14: I don't understand why we're having this public hearing when the City has yet to put in writing what they want, if they want it into commercial or industrial. This seems that the community can't win on this one because you're saying the City is here, which really, the City is the community.

REMONSTRATOR: Right.

REMONSTRATOR 14: They work for the community. They work for residents. The residents pay their salary. But there's this division, which I don't understand. The City is going to take their time and do what they want and come to a decision after the public hearing.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Is there a question?

REMONSTRATOR 14: The question is: Why is this backward, in my opinion, that until the City makes -- when the City makes its decision, that is when the public hearing should be, because that would require, I would think, the City to come to these meetings and defend their position, which they're not doing, with the public.
MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Thank you.

MR. ALCAMO: You should assume that this is residential for now. We have no information that it's --

REMONSTRATOR 14: No. You're saying -- I can't assume that because you said, I can also assume they will change their position. They can. So that's -- that's, you know, a no-win for the community, if it's -- because of the way it's being addressed.

Now, the other thing I wanted to say is: Where is the clean soil coming from? You have this clean soil.

MR. ALCAMO: Well, there will be -- there will be -- I -- it's not been determined yet, but there will have to be a series of testing of that soil. We do that, actually, in Zones 2 and 3, where the soil was actually tested prior to us bringing it in as either fill or topsoil. So there would be all the requirement [sic] -- the soil, as it comes in, would be tested so it isn't contaminated.

REMONSTRATOR 14: So you're using -- you know, you're sifting through the contaminants and getting clean soil that -- you're not
bringing it from somewhere else?

MR. ALCAMO: Yes.

REMONSTRATOR 14: It's the same soil --

MR. ALCAMO: No, no, no, no. We're clean --

REMONSTRATOR: That's clean?

MR. ALCAMO: That's clean. It is a registered soil area that is clean. And then we go in there and do a series of samples to make sure it doesn't contain pesticides and things like that prior to bringing it on the site. So there will be clean soils brought in. And that's a requirement. They're even -- as I said, they're doing that in Zones 2 and 3.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Thank you.

(Multiple people speaking in unison.)

REMONSTRATOR 14: We have hazardous and nonhazardous landfills. You've said you don't know where it's going to. I don't understand that either. It seems to me you should know where this -- where the landfill is that that soil --

MR. ALCAMO: Well, we --

REMONSTRATOR: -- (unintelligible) --
contamination go to, but does the City have --

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: And then we've got to
move to Question 15, ma'am.

REMONSTRATOR 14: -- (unintelligible) --

how many hazardous landfills do they have?
Because you're talking about going to a
nonhazardous landfill --

REMONSTRATOR: Yeah, let her get her
question out.

MR. ALCAMO: They -- they basically -- I
don't know yet because we're going to go in
discussions with the responsible parties. They
will have the option. If they agree to do it,
they will have the option. We have to look at
that landfill, wherever it goes, and make sure
it can accept that material. We're not going
to let it go to some landfill that isn't
basically approved to accept it.

If they have a bunch of violations and
things like that, they, essentially -- we don't
allow it to go there. So there's something
called the CERCLA Off-site Policy.

So I can't tell you right now -- I know --
I think they're going to Newton -- Newton
County, I think -- right now, I think. But
they're going to have their option to go, and
then they're going to tell us, Hey, we're going
to go to XYZ landfill. What is the compliance
status of it? And we go and look at that, and
when was it last inspected? All of that. And
if they have violations, we don't allow it to
go there.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Thank you.

Question 15.

REMONSTRATOR 15: What steps, beyond this
meeting and the public comment period, will you
be taking to determine if you've met this
community acceptance session? And what's the
evaluation criteria for deciding that you've
met community acceptance?

MR. ALCAMO: We will take all the
comments. We will evaluate all those comments.
We respond to all those individual comments,
and then we make our final decision based on
that. So we take the comments as one of the
nine criteria. It's not the only criteria. So
that's essentially why we're here tonight, for
you to submit your comments to us.

So after that, there's certainly going to
be some legal things that will be public
comment and things like that. But otherwise, based on the superfund law, there's no additional requirement after we respond to comments and choose our final remedy.

Of course, we -- we're here. We've been coming on Saturday meetings and things like that and certainly more than willing to talk about it and discuss how we responded to your comments.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Thank you.

MS. MORGAN: Kind of a point of order.

REMONSTRATOR: Why don't she take a number like everybody else, wait her turn to talk?

REMONSTRATOR: She's a resource person.

MS. MORGAN: I'm from the City.

REMONSTRATOR: I can talk, too. I'm from the city, too.

MS. MORGAN: Okay.

REMONSTRATOR: I'm from the city, too.

You talk; I can talk.

MS. MORGAN: So point of order --

REMONSTRATOR: You be -- (unintelligible) like everybody else. Wait your turn.

MS. MORGAN: People -- people have kind of ceased giving us their names.
REMONSTRATOR: (Unintelligible) -- so why
she got to talk?

MS. MORGAN: So if people want --

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Yes. Let me -- let me
just run -- let me run the meeting.

MS. MORGAN: -- resume --

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Thank you. So

Question No. 15, please introduce yourself
before you start.

REMONSTRATOR PARTS: 16.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: 16?

REMONSTRATOR PARTS: Yes.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Thank you.

REMONSTRATOR PARTS: She was 15.

Hi, there. I'm Colin Parts. I'm from the
Abrams Clinic, U of Chicago.

I just wanted to make sure I understand
correctly your soil -- soil removal decision,
your evaluation of risk. That's on the basis
of -- you're going down to 2 feet. You said
that. 4C, which would go down further, you
said, wasn't that much better at eliminating
the risk. And you're making that decision on
the basis of the monitoring wells that you
currently have in place.
MR. ALCAMO: No. There's soil -- there's
38 soil boring datas. There's also data at
30 inches. And so we view that even though you
would be removing more material, underneath
that, there still would be contamination.

We think with 4B, at 2 feet, with the
proper visible markers, with the proper
inspections, with the proper engineering
controls, that it can be as -- protected. Now,
it's -- slightly more soil would be removed.
But from an overall protective standpoint, we
think it would be pretty similar to 4 -- 4C and
4B. It would be pretty similar.

REMONSTRATOR PARTS: Sorry. I wanted to
be clear. I'm actually concerned about
leaching of lead through the soil. I know that
you're going to be taking -- monitoring wells
throughout OU -- or rather, OU2 is looking at
the groundwater throughout Zones 1, 2, and 3;
right? These wells will be pulling
groundwater. And if for some reason these
wells find that from Zone 1 there is lead
leaching, that you hadn't originally found,
would you stay the course of this current soil
removal rather than going further if you, all
of a sudden, found out that there's a lot more lead leaching from the soil?

MR. ALCAMO: I think we'd make us look at something. We may have to relook at the remedy. I don't know. You know, you're asking me to make a decision on something that -- I don't know what would happen. Right now we don't think that's going to happen. But certainly, if there's new information that becomes available, we have -- every five years, we have to relook at these remedies in terms of are they protective or not. So there's inspections that are done. There's sampling that is done during this five-year review.

So as I said previously, this isn't just like a walkaway remedy. You know, we have procedures in place that could require us to do additional work. And we have done that based on five-year reviews at other sites. I don't think your conceptual site model is accurate; but, you know, we'll see in the future.

REMONSTRATOR PARTS: Right. But to be clear, you're going with a risk assessment that doesn't fully understand the groundwater that's going through these other sites. And it's
possible that that would change, like you said.

MR. ALCAMO: I mean, we don't think that
the groundwater is going to recontaminate the
top 2 feet of the site. We think the visible
markers that are in place --

REMONSTRATOR PARTS: The top 2 feet of
Zone 1, or all of the other zones, as well?

MR. ALCAMO: Well, you're talking --
you -- all, this whole area. I don't know.
You know? That's why. We don't think, at
depth [sic] -- you know, some of the wells are
going into Calumet. Okay? Around 25 to 30
feet in depth. So in any case, I don't think
there's going to be -- at least the preliminary
data of what I've seen, is there a huge
groundwater problem leaving USS Lead? That's
to be determined with this addition of wells
and possibly more wells.

So I don't think that leaching of lead is
going to be an issue. I just don't.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Thank you.

Question 18.

REMONSTRATOR OLIVER: Me?

(Multiple people speaking in
unison.)
MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: 17?

REMONSTRATOR OLIVER: I have 17.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Oh, I'm sorry. 17 and then 18. Sorry.

REMONSTRATOR OLIVER: Sheryl Oliver in Zone 2.

My questions are about your presentation. The term --

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Can you all hear in the back?

REMONSTRATOR: No.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Ma'am, could you --

(inaudible).

REMONSTRATOR OLIVER: Again, my name is Sheryl Oliver. I'm in Zone 2.

My question's about your presentation. You mentioned, "short-term effectiveness."

That's definitely a concern. From what you were saying, because that has to do with the impact that's -- what's happening in Zone 1 is going to happen to us in Zone 2, and that was the one area that's cleaned. I notice you didn't have a totally black dot there. It's kind of fuzzy. (Unintelligible) -- more clarification on what that "short-term
effectiveness" is.

And you also mentioned, "deed restrictions." Please clarify that. Does that have to do with my property deed? Or what are you talking about when you start --

(inaudible) --

MR. ALCAMO: Sorry -- (inaudible).

REMONSTRATOR OLIVER: We are --

( unintelligible) -- concerned about property values and what's happening with our homes.

MR. ALCAMO: So --

REMONSTRATOR OLIVER: And the other two is -- the last one is: What is that "OU"?

MR. ALCAMO: Okay. That -- just you can think of that as Phase II.

REMONSTRATOR OLIVER: Okay.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: My bad. I was going to the other one.

MR. ALCAMO: Keep -- up. Up.

REMONSTRATOR: You're fired.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: I am fired.

MR. ALCAMO: Okay.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: There you go.

MR. ALCAMO: You can think of this OU --

we call it an "Operable Unit." You can think
of it as a phase. Okay? This is the first phase, and then -- we like to break these sites into different phases to get the risk reduction sooner. Okay? So instead of just dealing with everybody all at once -- we do this all the time at superfund sites -- we break it up so we can deal with a portion of it quicker. All right?

So let's talk about deed restrictions.

And I apologize. I should have explained that. These deed restrictions would be associated with Zone 1. For example, we would not allow them to install drinking water wells on this property. We would not -- if it stays -- probably shouldn't say this, but let's say it went commercial. Okay? We would not allow them to build residential on that. Okay? So that would be a restriction on this actual Zone 1 property, that -- just not anywhere. Not your property or anywhere else. Just on Zone 1. And we do that a lot in all these superfund sites.

REMONSTRATOR: So the term "deed" --

MR. ALCAMO: Well, it's -- actually, it's put right on the actual deed that it -- it's an
enforceable agreement that we put forth. It can be enforced. It says, Owner of property, you will not do A, B, C, and D. Okay? Those are developed and used quite commonly in superfunds. Okay?

And your final question --

MS. ZANDER: I've got one more clarification on deed restrictions.

So Tom's right, it goes right on the deed. But what we're talking about for this part of Zone 1 is that it will be attached to the property description and legal property documents for that Zone 1 property.

So say it does go residential, and it gets subdivided, and there are residences on it, each residence -- each deed for the residential property would have notes on it saying, You can't have a well. You -- if you dig below 2 feet, you need to have these -- you call us, and we'll get some protections involved. You know, it's a remedy-specific requirement to make sure that everything we do stays -- (inaudible) -- into the future. So it is restrictions on the deed, but it's not -- when we're talking about this remedy, we're not
talking about your deed. We're talking about
the deed for that property.

MR. ALCAMO: And I'm completely in
agreement with you regarding if it's a --
short-term effectiveness deals with the risk to
the nearby community and the workers during
these excavation activities. And certainly, we
talked about this in the demolition. Remember?
I mean, all the demolition -- we had them put
all these additional air monitors surrounding.
I would expect to do the same thing.

We are doing -- we are doing the same
things in Zones 2 and 3. If you know that --
if your house has been excavated, there's been
air monitors by -- at your house to make
sure -- and dust monitors to make sure that
we're not stirring up these soils, it gets
spread into the surrounding community [sic].

We also will use engineering controls to
control any dust leaving. So there are a
number of things that we would put in place to
make sure that Zone 2 doesn't get impacted by
Zone 1, including a large amount of monitoring.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Thank you, both.

Yes, 18?
REMONSTRATOR 18: Yeah, I'm 18.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Thank you.

REMONSTRATOR 18: My question is regarding the excavation of only 2 feet when you're going to excavate 8 feet deep on the DuPont North site, and that's zoned as commercial use. But you're only going to excavate 2 feet deep on a possible residential site. Can you explain what the conditions are, why they're different, and why you've only chosen 2 feet versus 8 feet?

MR. ALCAMO: I can't talk in terms of -- I don't know anything about DuPont, but I can talk about why we're going to 2 feet here, because it's normally what we do. We think EPA has done a number of studies regarding risk, in terms of we view 2 feet as protective.

Of course, it does take into consideration that we have to have a visible marker. You have to have maintenance. You have to have all these things in place to ensure that that 2 feet and that clean material stays clean.

Again, we also do five-year reviews throughout the period of time. So every five-year review, we look -- we look at the protectiveness. So we're going to look at that
site and say, including -- could include
samples, it could include a number of things --
is this remaining protective? Is the remedy
that we've put in place still working?

So again, this isn't a walkaway in terms
of a remedy. So that's why we view 2 feet, in
terms of managing risk, but also managing the
long-term risk through maintenance, through
continuing review, through monitoring, and
things of that nature.

REMONSTRATOR 18: I have one more
question: So you don't think that leaving all
of that debris in place from the smelter is
going to be leaching out for years to come into
the soil, into the water that you just cleaned?

MR. ALCAMO: Not -- not at 2 feet, we
don't. I mean, I think that if there needs to
be a groundwater portion there, in terms of a
collection trench or a pump, a monitoring -- or
a pumping system there, that that would deal
with any type of leaching. And that needs to
be, basically, determined yet.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Thank you. Thank you.

19.

REMONSTRATOR 19: I have 19, and I was
having a question along the lines of the
leaching, but I think it's just going to go
sideways. It's been already [sic], so...

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Thank you.

20?

REMONSTRATOR EMERSON: Bill Emerson,

Lake County Surveyor.

My question does have to do with leaching.
To get back to your comments, I think, to me,
the only responsible thing to do is to remove
the lead from the soil. I mean, allowing it to
leach, continue to leach -- I have some
experience with aquifers. I'm also a
professional engineer. And, you know, being
this close to a waterway and the area that we
are, by the lake with the dune swale, aquifers
are -- they're tricky. I mean, even the best,
I think, groundwater specialists will tell you,
you know, that the aquifers can be tricky to
control and pumping them out and everything
else. I think you should do both. I think you
should remove it, remove everything you can,
and also --

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Sir, is there a
question? Because the comment period is going
to come right after this.

REMONSTRATOR EMERSON: Well, I got to run.

I'm sorry.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Question for clarification of the presentation of the proposed plan.

REMONSTRATOR EMERSON: Sure. Do you agree that --

(Laughing and applause.)

(Multiple people speaking in unison.)

REMONSTRATOR EMERSON: It's a yes or no. Do you agree --

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Jeopardy in the form of a question.

REMONSTRATOR EMERSON: -- you should remove and pump? I think pumping groundwater will have a good effect on the neighboring community, as well -- to remove and pump, as well.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Well, we can take that as a comment.

REMONSTRATOR EMERSON: You don't have to say yes or no.

MR. ALCAMO: Okay.
MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: All right. Thank you.

21.

REMONSTRATOR BROWDER: Right here.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Yes, sir.

REMONSTRATOR BROWDER: Joseph Browder (phonetic).

I have two questions. Who and they in my book has never had an address [sic]?

REMONSTRATOR: Right.

REMONSTRATOR BROWDER: You all are telling us, as a public -- this young man here asked about Carrie Gosch. You have not yet gave him a name of who the public has to contact with. You guys are in contact with these people because you say, "They tell us what to do."

They -- in West Calumet, we, as a public, don't have a name and address who we are concerned with that we need to voice our opinion with.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: So who is it at the school board that you direct Carrie Gosch questions to?

REMONSTRATOR BROWDER: And the -- (unintelligible) -- complex. Who are the names that we, as the public, need to address?

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Anybody know?
REMONSTRATOR BROWDER: We all should know.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Your city people --
(Multiple people speaking in unison.)

REMONSTRATOR: Yeah, we've been here alone. We've been here alone in the middle.

MS. CAULEY: Hi. My name is Tia Cauley --

REMONSTRATOR: (Inaudible).

MS. CAULEY: -- Executive Director of East Chicago Housing.
(Multiple people speaking in unison.)

REMONSTRATOR BROWDER: I mean -- okay. You're telling me your name, but are you in control of the situation, or do you have a boss?

MS. CAULEY: I have a lot of bosses.

REMONSTRATOR BROWDER: Okay. So you're not answering my question. Do we contact you, or do we contact your bosses?

MS. CAULEY: (Inaudible) --

REMONSTRATOR BROWDER: Why isn't there any information about who to contact here tonight at the public meeting?

REMONSTRATOR: (Inaudible) -- who is the
boss?

REMONSTRATOR BROWDER: Who's the bosses?

REMONSTRATOR: That's what we want to know.

REMONSTRATOR BROWDER: You're talking about all this lead stuff and all this, but we, as a community, don't have a voice if we don't know who to voice our opinion to.

REMONSTRATOR: That's right. We can never get in to talk to the mayor.

(Multiple people speaking in unison.)

REMONSTRATOR: Who are the bosses?

REMONSTRATOR BROWDER: Who are the bosses?

REMONSTRATOR: He haven't been out here since --

REMONSTRATOR: If we don't have anyone to contact with, our concerns are not met.

REMONSTRATOR: That's right.

REMONSTRATOR: (Unintelligible) -- in two years.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Okay. So I think that that's outside of the scope of the EPA, so --

REMONSTRATOR BROWDER: How can it be outside the scope of the EPA if he says, they
do -- "We do what they tell us to do"? They
have to know who's telling them what to do.
Come on, man. That's not how that goes.

(Multiple people speaking in
unison.)

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: He cited the mayor's
letter.

REMONSTRATOR: You got to get back with
them and --

REMONSTRATOR BROWDER: You just said the
mayor was not involved. You just said the
mayor was not involved, so now we going back to
saying the mayor is involved?

REMONSTRATOR: (Inaudible) --

MR. ALCAMO: Let me tell you what we
received. Okay?

REMONSTRATOR BROWDER: Okay. Well, I --
(inaudible) -- the public. Who we need to talk
to --

MR. ALCAMO: We received a letter from
Mayor Copeland. It's in the record. You can
read that letter. You can go online and read
that --

REMONSTRATOR BROWDER: The letter should
be here. You guys should have information.
You just said, "They tell us what to do."

REMONSTRATOR: That's right.

REMONSTRATOR BROWDER: Then they have the name. They have a name. Who are they?

REMONSTRATOR: That's all we want to know.

REMONSTRATOR: Any written correspondence, we need copies of.

REMONSTRATOR BROWDER: Who are they?

MR. ALCAMO: It's in the record. You can go online.

REMONSTRATOR: You're here to help us. You're not here to help the mayor. You're here to help us, Zone 1 and 2.

REMONSTRATOR: That's right.

REMONSTRATOR: You're not here to help the mayor. It's obvious you should know by now, the mayor don't give a damn about us.

REMONSTRATOR: That's right.

REMONSTRATOR: He's never given us a bottle of water. All the water we done had for the last two years has come from Munster, Schererville, Highland, all these places.

REMONSTRATOR: The boys got their Muslims.

REMONSTRATOR: And everything is in the Calumet water.
REMONSTRATOR: That's right. He ain't never gave us a bottle of water.

REMONSTRATOR: We still need to know who we have to contact --

REMONSTRATOR: (Unintelligible) -- he has never given Calumet or --

(Multiple people speaking in unison.)

REMONSTRATOR: Calumet is the one first historical black area or New Addition, the second historical black area in East Chicago. We have never gotten anything from this mayor.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: So the question on the floor is: Who should you direct your comments to?

REMONSTRATOR: Yes, yes, yes. Uh-huh.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: And the executive director --

REMONSTRATOR BROWDER: Who do we turn it in to?

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: The executive director of the Housing Authority has said to you that in terms of this area, you can direct your questions to her.

In terms of the Carrie Gosch School, from
what was said, that goes to the Board of Education.

REMONSTRATOR: December 3rd at the Administration Building and talk to the school board members. There's a meeting Monday for the school board at 6:00 o'clock. And if you are so concerned about Carrie Gosch and what's going on, that's where you can go to have your representative and the school superintendent there.

MS. ZANDER: And I'll just pipe in quickly about availability of correspondence that we've received. So Tom's talking about the record. The Administrative Record is available on the web page. It's at the bottom of the agenda. There are also copies at the -- there are copies at the public library. Tom, is that right?

MR. ALCAMO: Yes.

MS. ZANDER: So there are hard copies available upstairs, and at the other public library, as well as online.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Okay. We have to keep --

REMONSTRATOR: (Inaudible).
MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: I'm sorry. We've got
to keep moving forward. We've got 12 people
signed up to give public comment, and we still
have questions out. I'm going to ask you,
please, one question, no statements, and
quick -- and answers. And so we're on 22.

MS. POPE: Wait a minute. Is this for
questions?

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: This is -- we're still
doing questions. There are 28 questions out.

MS. POPE: Yeah, but the library closes at
a certain time. So we have to have a public
comment period. I would say, most -- if you
have questions, please write them down, give
them to us in writing.

MR. ALCAMO: Se Debbie first. It's --

MS. POPE: We have to do public -- we have
to do that. So this is like the last one.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Okay. So we'll do
Debbie, and then go to public comment --
(inaudible).

(Multiple people speaking in
unison.)

REMONSTRATOR: There's one more question.

REMONSTRATOR ADAMS: I'm Tara Adams; some
of you know. I just -- my question is: From the beginning, we've been asking for residents to be involved in all of these decisions; right? And I enjoy the meeting. I'm glad that everyone is here, but I don't -- I still don't see where our concerns are really being addressed the way that we would see fit because, you know, you make the decision. You don't -- you don't think this is going to happen. You don't think it's going to leach. You don't think this. But we need to feel comfortable in this place; right? So I don't see where we are still -- we are involved.

To me, we are still requesting the same things that we were requesting in 2016, and that's to be involved in your decision making. I don't agree with this, and I guess that will go to my next complaint, the other period.

Where does this clean soil come from? You said it's clean soil. Clean to what standard? Is it zero lead, or what is the --

MR. ALCAMO: It will be -- it will be -- most of it's farm fields, at least from my experience. I don't know where -- that's why a lot of times we sample for pesticides --
REMONSTRATOR ADAMS: Uh-huh.

MR. ALCAMO: -- and things like that,

for -- and there's actually approved soil areas

that basically have not been affected by

industry that are in the area. And so

that's -- we will clearly demonstrate to you

that we're bringing in clean soil. I don't

want to bring in contaminated soil.

(Unintelligible) -- I'm paying for it --

REMONSTRATOR ADAMS: Yeah, but you guys

consider clean 400 parts; right?

MR. ALCAMO: No. Well, it will be --

REMONSTRATOR ADAMS: So that's not clean
to me when I'm having kids out there playing in

the dirt.

MR. ALCAMO: It would be -- it would be a

very low --

REMONSTRATOR ADAMS: No, no. No, no. But

that's what they said "clean" is. That they
don't remediate if it's below 400. That's

considered okay, though.

MR. ALCAMO: But we would bring in -- we

would bring in --

(Multiple people speaking in

unison.)
MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Let's not have --
please --

MR. ALCAMO: Usually it's farm fields.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: We can't have --

(inaudible) -- conversations.

REMONSTRATOR: You're buying it from
farmers and taking their soil?

MR. ALCAMO: They're approved -- they're
approved fields, where people all the time go
and get material. And we have -- our bid
specifications will have a list of compounds
that can't exceed those numbers, and lead will
be very low. Okay? That's what we normally do
in our bid specifications.

We certainly will make sure that if the
responsible parties do that, that they do that.
And I'm more than happy to share. We can get
the data from Zones 2 and 3 for you, if you
need that, to show that we're not bringing in
contaminated material. I don't want to bring
in contaminated material.

REMONSTRATOR ADAMS: One more thing: If
we could just do this one more time, where
we -- because doing this as a big group like
this, people still have questions, and we've
been rushed; right? And which we shouldn't be rushed because you wasn't rushed from 2009; right?

REMONSTRATOR: Right.

REMONSTRATOR ADAMS: We've been on here for how long? So I'm going to ask that we do this again, that we make sure that people are educated in this process, because we -- even those it's been two years, it's still a lack of knowledge; right? It's still questions that we have. And rushing us for two hours is not good; right? Because we have to live -- well, I don't live here anymore, but, you know, we have to be. You understand? So I'm just gonna say that, and then I'm just gonna sit.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Thank you.

And so we're going to go to our sign-up sheet for public comment. This is to make your comment on the proposed plan. And our first one is Clamay (phonetic) Bullock.

REMONSTRATOR: Can we add more names to that? I think a lot of people didn't see -- we didn't know we had to do that.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Rachel, can you guys start a second sign-up for public comment so I
can keep this in my hand?

Yes.

REMONSTRATOR C. BULLOCK: If I could get everyone that is --

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: And there's -- by the way, there's going to be a clock behind you. So every now and again, take a glance.

REMONSTRATOR C. BULLOCK: Okay. Can I get everyone that is in support of Calumet Lives Matter to please stand up and make yourselves known?

(Remonstrators complying.)

REMONSTRATOR C. BULLOCK: Thank you very much.

Good evening. I'm Clamay Bullock from Calumet Lives Matter and a life-long, active member of the Calumet community.

Although we have been most deeply fragmented by the devastating effects of industry and continue to be overlooked by many, we continue to operate on love and in unity. We are the rose that grows from concrete, on water [sic], the ones everyone tries to bury, not recognizing that we are seeds and we will indeed grow.
We, the resilient people of this community, have been left devastated, wondering if not for the already existing and the past industry, would our loved ones still be with us here today and healthy; would we, ourselves, not suffer from the afflictions we struggle with daily. And you're proposing that we consider bringing in more industry.

This city, just now, on today, is trying to decide how to clean up after the industry that hasn't even been standing in over 30 years. And it is proposed that instead of cleaning the mess up in totality, we consider just halfway cleaning it and throwing another piece of industry with possibly unknown harmful and yet-to-discover pollutants in its place. We're still attempting to pick up the pieces from the last wave of industry. We don't need to be asked to take another potentially life-threatening and possibly fatal risk at providing jobs that won't cover the medical costs of the ailments it will leave us with.

We have a vision for our community, and it doesn't include poisoning ourselves and our families to provide better lives for ourselves.
We will not sacrifice the hope for prosperity of our already forcibly fractured community. We will not allow our sure-to-be-prosperous future to be sacrificed to industry.

We want you to clean the land to rebuild homes. We refuse to be a sacrifice. Clean that land to rebuild homes. We want Alternative 4D. Clean the land to rebuild homes.

Thank you for your attention.

(Applause.)

MEDIATOR LYTCHOTT: I think I'm going to move this over so that the projector light is not in the speaker's face, if that's all right. It will be -- right here would be good. And we have too, Thomas Frank. Can you still --

REMONSTRATOR FARNK: Yeah, I can see that. Hello. I'm Thomas Frank with Calumet Lives Matter.

I'm really encouraged by the community coming out and recognize that there -- when it comes to the unity of the community, we know that there's been a lot of division, but one of the things that we're all united on, we no longer want to be a sacrifice. So...
East Chicago and the neighbors have been
sacrificed. So...

Universally, through all the groups, we
are all in general consensus for Alternate 4D
with other [sic] additional controls. We want
full cleanup. We want no institutional
controls. We want this land to go forward in a
full, clean way.

This is -- West Calumet is the third
neighborhood in the last 20 years that has been
sacrificed to industrial waste and pollution in
the last two decades. We had the brickyard up
on Kennedy Avenue in 1996. We had Marktown.
Now we have West Calumet that's been destroyed.
Perhaps the next one is New Addition. Maybe it
is -- it looks like even Calumet might be
sacrificed. We're really worried.

Only 17 percent of our land use is
dedicated to residential use. We're
contracting very, very quickly.

We also have the highest infant mortality
rate in the city -- or in the state of Indiana
and, perhaps, many years in the country.

Unless we fight for complete control and
complete cleanup, all we are getting again and
again are these cap projects or cap and trade,
which benefits the interests of industries that
may use it.

This whole institutional controls, where
there are restrictions placed on the deeds, are
going to restrict what we can do in the future
uses, and we're obligating our children to a
lot of pollution.

We need to come back to clean land. We
want to go back to homes in that neighborhood.
The City had dedicated -- the mayor had
dedicated West Calumet to be a housing project
when -- before the HUD -- before the
demolition. We know that HUD or East Chicago
Housing Authority has no experience doing
industrial development. Why hand this off to
industrial development?

What we have and what we need is
community-focused development to knit our
communities together, like we're going to be
seen tonight in terms of the universal voices
that are for a full cleanup without institution
controls, and that is 4D, Alternative 4D. And
that's what Calumet Lives Matter is for.

If you've gotten one of these pages,
please sign it, hand it back to me or one of
the EPA officials. Make your comments. We
need as many comments as possible out there.
Thank you.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Thank you, Tom.

(Applause.)

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Mr. David Turpin, Jr.

REMONSTRATOR TURPIN: Briefly, I used to
live in Marktown. One of the reasons my family
moved out is because of the poisonous
environment. And really, it's sad to see
what's happening to East Chicago.

I currently reside in Hammond, sister city
to East Chicago, and I think solidarity between
cities is -- (inaudible) -- one of the things
we need to be doing in the Region. It's sad
when we ignore each other's problems, so that's
the capacity in which I speak.

I also -- I think it's -- it's not my
place, because I'm not a member of the city of
East Chicago, but it does disturb me to see
what looks to be like a shell game, where we
look for where the will of the people is to be
found, whether it's with the Housing Authority
or the City or the school district. And, in
fact, it's quite clear the community wants complete cleanup, as Mr. Thomas Frank said. And they want answers, and they want direct accountability.

And I don't think, even, it's correct to say that you're meeting the criteria of community acceptance of the proposal if you haven't actually made sure that the people are able to get full input and all of the answers. I mean, as the young lady here in the front said, we need to slow this process down and to make sure that the community has a chance to really weigh in and get all the answers.

(Applause.)

REMONSTRATOR TURPIN: And that's entirely appropriate and the very concept of sovereignty of the people and democracy. Housing Authorities, municipal governments, parks, none of the institutions were set up to deprive the people of their ability to govern and to be sovereign. In fact, they're supposed to facilitate that. So that purpose is defeated if it becomes a shell game.

And then the question of whether or not -- you keep referring to the fact that, Well, the
EPA won't walk away. Well, that's not sufficient. I can see why that wouldn't be satisfying to people. It's not that they want you to hold their hands. We want -- people living in these areas want to know that the land that they're living on is clean.

And you keep saying, "Well, I don't think, I don't think, I don't believe that there will be leaching, and the preliminary studies suggest." That's just not sufficient. That really isn't sufficient, and it's inadequate.

You should go with 4D, and you should be thorough about it and clean the mess up. And yes, go with people who put it there.

REMONSTRATOR: That's right.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Mr. S. Henry Hunter?

(No response.)

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Oh, Sherry. Sherry Hunter.

REMONSTRATOR S. HUNTER: No, I already spoke.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Ha?

REMONSTRATOR S. HUNTER: I spoke already.
MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Oh, okay. Thank you.

We're going down to Joe Dragovich.

REMONSTRATOR: I'll speak. I'll speak.

REMONSTRATOR DRAGOVICE: I pass.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: You passing?

REMONSTRATOR: I'll speak. I'm going to say the same thing I said before.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Come -- please come up.

REMONSTRATOR: People don't understand, their lives is not -- that's why we want --

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: There's a microphone up here.

REMONSTRATOR: You guys don't realize what Zone 2 people are going through. The mayor -- I haven't seen the mayor. He don't come out here and do anything for us. He don't give us water. I can't even get in to have a sit-down with this man. You know what I'm saying? He doesn't care about us, and I don't know why. We didn't ask for what we going through. These people didn't ask for this lead. So why not -- and then he took our Moving Forward money and using it somewhere else. That's -- the governor signed off. That's what you need
to be checking out, because believe me -- I'm
going to tell you something else: He buying
the property out here in Zone 2.

REMONSTRATOR: Uh-huh.

REMONSTRATOR: In his name. Not the
City's name. And I got the paperwork to prove
it.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Thank you. And our
next speaker is Joe. Did you --

REMONSTRATOR DRAGOVICE: I passed on it.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Okay. Thank you.
Then it looks like we have Larry, Gary,
and Hebron. Is that all you?

REMONSTRATOR DAVIS: That's me.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Man. Davis.

REMONSTRATOR DAVIS: Larry Davis,
Community Adviser.

So let's review a little bit here: 1985,
we discovered the State, Ted Hunter -- or
excuse me, Ted Warner discovered lead in the
soil, over 500,000 parts per million off site.
That's over half lead in the soil. That soil's
half lead. Think about that.

And the sampling went towards the
neighborhood. And EPA came in and did sampling
in '85. And then they stopped right before
they got to the neighborhood. Now, why is
that? If EPA's actually out here protecting
the public health, why weren't we looking at
what the impact of the public health was?

In 1989 the responsible party agreed to an
agreed order with the State, "define the entire
contamination." "The full extent" is what the
language says. "Identify the full extent of
the contamination" and clean it up. Didn't say
clean it up to 400 parts per million. It said,
"Clean it up and remove it from the community."
That's not being done. We're going to 400
parts per million. And, in fact, we already
have a landfill full of toxic waste in the
community called a "Confined Management," an
"OU2." Okay?

So in 1986, EPA was required by Congress
to emphasize permanent cleanups with innovative
technology. This is not a permanent cleanup.
It should be restored to the highest use and
best use for this property.

East Chicago used to be the onion capital
of the world. Would anybody want to eat any
onions growing in the soil here now?
REMONSTRATORS: No.

REMONSTRATOR DAVIS: Why not? Why shouldn't it be the same? If it was a full, permanent cleanup, people should have had the right to raise food or their property. People should have the right to use clean water under their house if they want to irrigate their crops to grow food. That's a basic human right that's being denied here.

So EPA is going to haul it off and dump it on our community. In 1981 the EPA, in the Federal Register, said that "All landfills will leak." They said, "Even with the best application of available land disposal technology, it will eventually occur." Leaching will migrate out of the facility. Contaminated liquid will leak out. Okay? And it's not technologically and institutionally possible to contain waste and constituents forever or for the long time periods that may be necessary. "Migration of hazardous waste and their constituents and by-products from a land disposal facility will inevitably occur."

In '81, EPA told us that.

So the superfund amendments require EPA to
use permanent solutions and alternative
treatment technologies to reduce the volume of
mobility and toxicity. And we already covered
that. We're actually making the volume larger.
We're doing nothing to reduce the toxicity.

And most importantly, certain kinds of
action are inconsistent with permanence,
including any form of land disposal or
containment, any use of engineering or
institutional controls, including long-term
monitoring for releases. All of these mean the
site hazardous material remains hazardous.

There's uncertainty about releases of
hazardous material; and therefore, there's risk
to health and the environment. And there's a
host of uncontrollable, possible future events
which might compromise the effectiveness of
protection.

This is the decision we've been left here
in this community. We want a full cleanup.
The technology is available. Don't let them
tell you it's not. In fact, the technology is
available, and it's been presented to them in
countless comments. I will continue to present
written comments that provide an alternative
that's feasible, that's been proven, with technology that's already in use in Northwest Indiana at steel mills; and with an innovative treatment technology, it's far better than soil washing. It actually recovers permanent, pure forms of metals that can be marketed directly at the highest value, which will further offset the cleanup costs.

So we're literally spending millions of dollars to throw away millions of dollars of valuable material. But when it's in the environment, poison people -- and don't -- anybody in here in this room that's lived in this community can tell you how many people they know that have been poisoned by this toxic waste.

We need a permanent cleanup. We need to recover these valuable metals. And we need to stop poisoning this community and dumping on another community. Thank you.

MEDIATOR LYTCHCOTT: Thank you, Larry.

(Applause.)

MEDIATOR LYTCHCOTT: And our next speaker, commenter, is Debbie Chizewer.

REMONSTRATOR CHIZEWER: Debbie Chizewer,
Environmental Advocacy Clinic, Northwestern Law School, on behalf of the Community Advisory Group.

First, I want to repeat, in my official comments, that Tara called for another public meeting to make sure that everyone’s comments are heard and you really understand whether you have community acceptance. And I call on EPA to urge the mayor to attend the meeting.

(Applause.)

REMONSTRATOR CHIZEWER: Second, considering the extreme contamination of the site and EPA’s obligation to protect human health and the environment, EPA should use its authority to complete the most protective cleanup of the site regardless of the planned use. We urge you to do more to evaluate the leaching of arsenic from the soil into the groundwater, and we reject the exclusion of Carrie Gosch from this plan.

(Applause.)

REMONSTRATOR CHIZEWER: And finally, we call for stronger protections of the surrounding community during the excavation and a true accounting of those necessary
protections in your evaluation of the alternatives.

That's it. Thank you very much.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Thank you, Debbie.

(Applause.)

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Our next commenter is Joshua Posner? Did I say that right?

REMONSTRATOR PERTNER: Pertner (phonetic).

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Pertner?

REMONSTRATOR PERTNER: Yeah.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Thank you.

REMONSTRATOR PERTNER: Joshua Pertner, also Northwestern Environmental Advocacy Clinic.

We've heard a lot tonight about the disjunction between the people and the city government, and I think EPA needs to take into account that institutional controls that they're talking about and other things may work much worse here than they would in the standard run of cases.

You have, for example, people apparently moving into the church, seemingly without EPA knowing it at the time. Perhaps they did. It seems sort of a blindsiding. Perhaps in the
final remedy we need to hear some explanation of worries about spin [sic] -- (unintelligible) construction?

    Deed restrictions are fine; but if stuff is going on that people can't control, that the city government's not watching, it doesn't matter at all. That needs to be addressed in the final remedy decision. Thank you.

    MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Thank you.

    (Applause.)

    MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Next commenter is Carolyn Marsh.

    REMONSTRATOR MARSH: I have a cold, but I just want to ask this question. I'm Carolyn Marsh from Whiting, and I consider all this pollution a regional issue. And I'm very concerned about East Chicago, Hammond, Whiting, Gary, all of these cities that are so compounded with environmental issues. Running from one, you know, meeting on permits to another, our whole lives are being spent on trying to get an understanding of why we can't get our environment cleaned up.

    Now, my question is that the blue area on the map --
MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: That's the mic for
the --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Public radio. Keep
it down there.

REMONSTRATOR MARSH: Oh, sorry.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Just speak up then.

REMONSTRATOR MARSH: I have a cold, and
I'm sorry.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Do you want to move
forward some?

REMONSTRATOR MARSH: Okay. All right. I
just have this question of -- on the map, there
was the blue, which is outside the red, and it
says, Oh, that's Phase II. And in attending
all of these meetings and many more meetings in
the Region; Federated Metals, BP,
ArcelorMittal -- the list goes on and on --
it's the way the process is, that there's
Zone 1, 2, 3, and there's Phase I, II, and III.
There's all this process going on. My question
is: Why is the cleanup or the water studies
being done in Phase II later? I mean, why
couldn't that be done first? Then at least you
could say, well, we know what's going on in
that wetland area and how the water is
migrating and if it's stagnant or going or not
going.

So who made the decision that there's this
Phase I, you know, zone this, that, and the
other? And then there's a zone -- Phase I and
then a Phase II. Because I think that all this
is really backward. You know, you can't make a
decision about the quality of life here; the
air quality, the water quality, unless you're
going to solve some of the other areas which
are pushed off after final decisions will be
made about the cleanup of the residential area.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Thank you, Carolyn.

Our next commenter is Sheryl Oliver.

REMONSTRATOR OLIVER: I'll comment again.
I came here not knowing what to expect or what
decisions were being made and all. But having
sat here for a while, I think I've come to some
conclusion. And the conclusion I've come to:
Let's not repeat the mistakes of the past.

At one point smelter, whatever it was, was
torn down, it was buried. And then now it
seems that we're going to come in again and
going to bury something again or just leave it.
You talked about leaving debris there. It
seems like we're going to do the same thing;
and years from now, people will come back and
say, why didn't they get rid of it this time,
when it was already there from before, and now
we're going to do something, and then the
conditions are gonna be there.

So I did like Plan D. From what I have
gathered it's the one that would at least get
rid of what's been there from way back when so
that our next couple generations won't have to
go through the same thing that we're going
through right now.

And also, my other comment that I'd like
to make has to do with the plan for what's
going to happen with the Zone 1. East Chicago
has always been known as the "Twin Cities,"
whether it's the Harbor and East Chicago. It
was the Twin Cities.

REMONSTRATOR: That's right. Always been
separated.

REMONSTRATOR OLIVER: And I don't see why
now we have -- and now we drop the Twin Cities,
and it just became East Chicago. It wasn't the
Harbor and East Chicago, as I remember it being
called.
REMONSTRATOR: And New Addition.

REMONSTRATOR OLIVER: Well, the dividing line was somewhere. But this -- I mean, it was the idea of having two cities in one. Well, if we're going -- if I'm -- I'm not begrudging what's happening in the Harbor. (Inaudible) -- (Multiple people speaking in unison.)

REMONSTRATOR OLIVER: You go there, see all these beautiful apartments and all really nice. I read through all the stuff that comes from the mayor, and I look every time: What's in there? What's the plan for Calumet? Industrial's gonna happen in Calumet on this side of the Twin Cities. What's gonna happen over here? Nothing's happened yet. So whatever plan we come up with, I say Zone 1 should be as good as what we see over on Main Street and Broadway in the Harbor. (Applause.)

REMONSTRATOR: Thank you.

REMONSTRATOR OLIVER: Just as good because we are one city. It's no longer two cities. But one side is looking really good, and then we are like the stepchildren or the forgotten
side of the city. So let's start it with
Calumet. Let's make Calumet beautiful again,
so that now the entire city is something that
we can be proud of.

(Applause.)

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Thank you, Ms. Oliver.
Now or next commenter is Joseph Broaden?
REMONSTRATOR BROADEN: Broaden.
I have a real simple question I want to
ask. We're gonna clean up -- let's say we're
gonna clean up Zone 1 and get everything in
order. So if they -- which we don't know their
names -- get their way, now we're gonna bring,
instead of homes, industry. So what we're
doing is we're trading one pollution for
another one. So therefore, most industries I
know give off pollution. So now we're gonna
clean up the ground, but then we're gonna
pollute our air.

REMONSTRATOR: Right. Don't make sense.
MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Thank you. Very well
said [sic].

Our next commenter is Rob Gibson.

(Multiple people speaking in
unison.)
MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Did you say that out loud?

REMONSTRATOR GIBSON: How you all doing today?

REMONSTRATOR: Hey, Ron.

REMONSTRATOR GIBSON: I have eight written points, so I don't know how long -- I got eight points.

First of all, I wanted to say that this -- and these are some things that people never think about. First of all, when you sign the sign-in sheet -- we sign these sign-up sheets, these people are getting millions of dollars just because you signed your name. So if we giving the EPA millions of dollars, we should get millions of dollars, too. Something to think about.

The next thing is when they host the meetings, when you have meetings, and these meetings are videotaped, these people are getting millions of dollars just because you attend the meeting. These things that they'll never tell you. So I want this into the record, that we -- the residents should be getting millions of dollars by our -- by
creating entrepreneurship, incubatorships, mentorships, and, you know, then enforcing or promoting the Indiana Plan.

You know, I've been a union guy for about 42 years. I'm a life-long union electrician, made good money all the time when I went to work. You know, but we didn't have a pathway for all of the residents to make money. We don't have that. Ever since Copeland was mayor, he's never provided that path with -- according to the city ordinance -- look it up, it's a fact.

And anyway, the next thing is filing a lawsuit. The residents need to know that you can file a lawsuit. You know, I know we have attorneys here, but you can file your own lawsuit. You know, we -- our babies are going to prison because they have no opportunities for entrepreneurship or jobs, and we need to file a lawsuit. And nothing against Tia. I love Tia, but housing -- there's a federal ordinance that deal with housing across the country. Okay. Whenever housing has one penny, they're supposed to provide entrepreneurshipships and jobs for the poorest of
residents, and they don't. I know it's not
your fault. I'm not blaming it on you, Tia,
but it's happening.

No. 6, have an agenda for the meeting that
you can email to the residents who don't
attend. I talked to the chairman of my deacon
board today about this meeting. You know, the
churches need to know what's going on. Mail
the agendas.

And by the way, the reason that the mayor
put me out that meeting, they didn't have an
agenda. I was trying to get an agenda so I
could speak about money, about dollars for the
residents. He didn't have an agenda; okay? So
have an agenda so that the residents can see,
especially those who don't attend, what the
meetings are about and what the conclusions
are.

And also, send all the information --
request that the persons listed on the sign-in
sheets -- there were a lot of good comments
made today, and whoever sign that sign-in sheet
should get all correspondence that HUD is
getting in an email. It only makes sense. So
we can know what you guys know; okay?
And then the last thing is: Have some of these meetings at the area centers around East Chicago, like churches or other places. You know, the meetings should not be just at the library because we got to leave. We had one meeting at my church. We need to have more meetings at area churches.

And that's it. Thank you very much.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: The next speaker is Joseph Conn or Conn?

REMONSTRATOR CONN: Conn.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: Conn.

REMONSTRATOR CONN: Thank you.

I want to kind of first try and present my standing for being here. My name is Joseph Conn. I'm a life-long Northwest Indiana resident. I worked here in East Chicago at the old CITGO City Server Refinery [sic] years back when I was in college. My father worked there for about 20 years and then did another 20 years at LTV, which is now a part of ArcelorMittal.

But I want to know -- and this -- I'm here
supporting Calumet Lives Matter, and the word "Calumet," of course, is an old Indian phrase.
And the Calumet River actually starts in LaPorte County, winds its way all the way over to Blue Island, then bounces off against the rock wall there, and then came back this way and became the Grand Calumet.

And it actually, back in the olden days, went out where the lagoon is at Marquette Park into Lake Michigan. And since then, it's been tampered with and all that sort of stuff. And it flows in two directions at once now, if anybody's studied the river.

So what we have done here in Northwest Indiana is we have messed around with nature to an enormous degree. We have some of the largest concentrations of industry in an area that was once swampland, and I think most of the folks who've lived here know that.

So we have a proposal here that we're going to dig down and remediate 2 feet. You don't have to be a soil engineer, if you've lived at any time, any length of time, in Northwest Indiana to know that going down to 2 feet is going to get you, around here, into a
lot of sand, and sand is going to have things moving through it and across it.

  We've had some presentations earlier that the aquifer here rises and falls, sort of like a heart pumping up and down. And that water comes up and down, not only going horizontally. Things go in the water here, they get into the sand, and they run out into Lake Michigan into our drinking water. This is not any -- it's not rocket science.

  When I grew up, I lived over in Brunswick, which is not far from here, and the soil profile is the same. And I remember, distinctly, a fellow going out and taking a sledgehammer and driving a pipe into the ground. And he put a well point in that thing, and he watered his lawn from 8 feet.

  So we have a plan that we're going to clean up to 2 feet. Well, if you build a house on a crawl space, you have to get your footing down to 4 feet. It's got to be down 48 inches because the ground will heave up and freeze, and that house will be going like this (demonstrating).

  If you put a basement in the house -- I
mean, some of the older houses, the basements are kind of small, but a modern house has got an 8-foot basement in it, with a footing down underneath it. So you go maybe 2 feet above ground level, you go down 6 and go down 2 more for the footing. You're going down 8 feet.

If you're going to have this area, any reasonable expectation to build single-family homes there, the only way you could build one is on a concrete slab. So you're limiting the ability of any developer to come in here and sell a house because people don't want to buy slab homes here in the North. Down South it's okay, where it's warm all the time and you don't have that cold-cold on your feet. Up here, up North, slab homes won't sell. And I know this because I had a real estate broker's license for a number of years, and I did real estate appraisals. You know? And I know what the market is for this stuff.

Also, if you have what we're -- we're talking about these deed restrictions that they're going to put on this. That's another impediment to being able to sell. Without getting too legal about it, but when you --
when you sell and convey a piece of property, you convey a bundle of rights. Just think of a bunch of sticks. And you have this bunch of rights here, and one of them is going to be like: You can quietly enjoy it and all that other stuff, you can build a garage in the back. But you typically have that encumbered. You'll have an easement for NIPSCO over here; right? So what they're talking about is another encumbrance on these property rights, and that's going to make those properties less valuable.

This real estate needs to be cleaned up to the highest and best possibilities, using the very best technology available. Otherwise, we're just -- as other folks had said, we're just basically kicking the can down the road.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: And we've reached the time limit that -- for which we have to leave the building. There are three speakers remaining. I'm going to call their names and encourage you to write your comments in. Tara Adams, Greta Eaton, and Maritza Lopez. I'm
sorry that we ran out of time.

REMONSTRATOR: How about another hearing or another date?

REMONSTRATOR: Yeah, another hearing.

REMONSTRATOR: Yeah. You haven't met your legal responsibility to let these people speak.

REMONSTRATOR: Another hearing.

MEDIATOR LYTHCOTT: All right. Thank you all very much for coming.

(Public hearing concluded at 8:02 p.m.)
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