

PUBLIC MEETING OF PROPOSED PLAN FOR FORMER CAMP CROFT

PLACE: Marriott Renaissance Hotel
Spartanburg, South Carolina

DATE AND TIME: Thursday, March 24, 2016
6:30 p.m. to 7:35 p.m.

REPRESENTATIVES: Ray Livermore, Government Co-Chair
US Army Corps of Engineers
Wilmington District

Julie Hiscox
US Army Corps of Engineers
Savannah District

Brett Frazier
US Army Corps of Engineers
Huntsville District

Jason Shiflet
ZAPATA INCORPORATED
6302 Fairview Road, #600
Charlotte, North Carolina 28210

Suzy Cantor-McKinney
ZAPATA INCORPORATED
6302 Fairview Road, #600
Charlotte, North Carolina 28210

REPORTED BY: Sandra L. Satterwhite
Sandy Satterwhite Reporting
P.O. Box 742
Roebuck, South Carolina 29376
Satterwhite@Charter.net
864-706-5698

1 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

2 All right. Good evening everybody. My name is Ray Livermore. I'm the
3 project manager for the Camp Croft Formerly Used Defense Site with the US
4 Army Corps of Engineers.

5 I'd like to welcome you all to the proposed plan public meeting, and we're
6 going to have probably about 30 slides, I think, for this presentation. Primarily
7 cover some background of the project itself, some regulations that govern the
8 process that we operate under, and then a summary of the remedial
9 investigation that was conducted, feasibility study, and then where we are right
10 now for the proposed plan.

11 I'm going to be giving the initial part of the presentation, background for
12 the project; and Mr. Jason Shiflet, who is with our consultant Zapata, who
13 conducted the remedial investigation and feasibility study, is going to be
14 presenting the technical portions for those items.

15 So we'll get to the presentation. Here's the agenda. As I mentioned, to
16 give a little background on the legal framework that governs the Formerly Used
17 Defense Site Program, stakeholders that are involved with the process,
18 remedial investigation, feasibility study, proposed plan, which is where we are
19 right now, and we'll have questions afterwards. If you have any questions during
20 the presentation, you're welcome to go ahead and ask as we proceed, also.

21 The first slide here, CERCLA process. I'm not sure if any of you all are
22 familiar with it. Basically, this is an EPA regulation that governs investigation
23 and cleanup of hazardous sites, basically dealing with historical hazardous sites,
24 older hazardous sites; and, as you can see, the process here basically starts at
25 some type of historical records research, which is where the INPR, PA/SI,

1 that's a records research and initial investigation to determine whether there is
2 any contamination on the site.

3 The second stage is the RI/FS. That's what we've just completed for the
4 past couple of years, and we are currently at the proposed plan, and we will get
5 into a discussion of some of the subsequent phases later on in the presentation.

6 I guess let me back up here a little bit. Just to --- of course, working for
7 the government, we love acronyms. So we're going to have plenty of acronyms
8 through the presentation, and I may defer to using some of the acronyms. So if
9 any of you all have any questions and want to know what the term is that I'm
10 using, please don't hesitate to ask.

11 Okay. The FUDS Program, formerly used defense site program, as you
12 can see, Congress established it under the Defense Environmental Restoration
13 Program. DERP is the acronym that we use to refer to this program.

14 Basically, 1986 was when the program was established. FUDS are
15 properties where the Department of Defense owned, leased or otherwise
16 possessed that property, and the property had to have been released from the
17 Department of Defense's control prior to October 1986 for it to be eligible for
18 the Formerly Used Defense Site Program.

19 As I mentioned, the last bullet there, the FUDS Program is required to
20 follow the CERCLA process for the Military Munitions Response Program, which
21 Camp Croft is in the MMRP Program.

22 The next slide: This is identifying the primary stakeholders that are
23 involved in the Camp Croft Formerly Used Defense Site project. Obviously, the
24 first acronym is the US Army Corps of Engineers. We are basically the
25 government's agency that manages the Formerly Used Defense Site Program.

1 South Carolina DHEC is the state regulator that is involved with the project.
2 They provide oversight of the Corps and the work on Camp Croft. Sometimes if
3 there's a --- maybe a Superfund site, which is an EPA hazardous site, they may
4 be involved, but Camp Croft has not been designated Superfund site, so the
5 state is the primary regulatory agency on this project.

6 Restoration Advisory Board: Camp Croft has a Restoration Advisory
7 Board. I see several folks out in the audience that have attended the RAB
8 meetings or even RAB members. Basically, the Restoration Advisory Board is
9 made up of government officials, federal, state, local, local community members.
10 It basically acts as a vehicle that allows the Corps of Engineers to provide
11 information on the status of the project, where we are and where we're going
12 with the project and get feedback from the community on concerns, issues that
13 maybe need to be addressed.

14 Planning and reporting documents: Basically, all the documents that are
15 related to the project from the historical records research up through the
16 feasibility study that we completed eventually are in the information repository
17 and available for the public to review.

18 This meeting, the Proposed Plan Public Meeting, is required by CERCLA.
19 The proposed plan is a document that presents what our recommended action is
20 for basically any type of cleanup or dealing with any hazards that may exist at
21 the site.

22 Background of Camp Croft: It was known as Camp Croft Infantry
23 Replacement Training Center or IRTC. It was activated in 1941. It was in use
24 from '42 through '47. As you can see, there were 12 live ammunition ranges at
25 the site. The entire installation about 19,000 acres. In 1947 it was declared

1 excessed and that's when it was released from the Department of Defense
2 control. You can basically see the --- we have a wide variety type of munitions
3 that were used and have been found at the site from grenades, landmines,
4 mortars, projectiles, rockets; and since the early 1990's, we've conducted
5 numerous investigations and response actions for the site.

6 All right, and this is a figure of the boundaries of Camp Croft. It shows
7 some of the areas of concern during the initial stages of the investigation that
8 were evaluated. The range spans for some of the live fire spans that were used
9 when the site was active; and then I think that might be it, Jason.

10 We're here to the RI. So I'm going to turn it over to Jason Shiflet, who,
11 again, was our project manager at Zapata, who handled the technical portion of
12 the RI and FS.

13 BY MR. SHIFLET:

14 Okay. Thank you.

15 So some of these slides, if you've participated in these meetings before,
16 may look familiar. They have been pulled forward to this presentation. They
17 are a summary of lots of work that we've conducted here at Camp Croft, but it's
18 still valuable information and it's something that I think you'll benefit from
19 hearing, again.

20 The remedial investigation or what we affectionately call the RI, the
21 purpose and objective. The purpose of the RI is to characterize --- my catch
22 phrase is characterize the nature and extent. What is present and where,
23 where can it be found? Basically, but more importantly, it is to characterize
24 the nature and extent of the risks that are posed by that potential
25 contamination; and then the objective that we have for the RI is to gather

1 enough information to be able to make decisions going forward. Decisions of
2 the FS, decisions in the proposed plan, etcetera.

3 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

4 Jason, I just wanted to, again, acronyms, I'm trying to make sure that
5 everybody here understands the acronyms. We have a couple up here in the
6 Purpose, MEC and MC. MEC refers to munitions and explosives of concern.
7 Basically, items that may have some type of explosive hazard associated with
8 them. So some type of live item or fuse that we are concerned about. MC is
9 munitions constituents. Typically, those refer more towards the chemical
10 compounds, maybe TNT or the metal components of a shell or something like
11 that that we're concerned and maybe possibly leeching to groundwater. So
12 those are a couple of acronyms to remember as we proceed through the
13 presentation.

14 BY MR. SHIFLET:

15 Sure. Thank you. So a summary of what was found during the RI.
16 Seventy-seven percent of the investigation area, you know, all the area that we
17 looked at, contained only small arms or low quantities of MD, and low quantity
18 means maybe the tail fin of a rifle grenade or something, and there were lots of
19 places, 77 percent of the area, where we really just didn't find very much.

20 Eight areas within the total acreage contained MEC or very high
21 concentrations of MD, scrap, munitions' pieces. MD is another one of these
22 terms that you will seem, munitions debris. It means it is military munitions
23 related, but it doesn't have an explosive hazard. So it can be a practice item of
24 some sort or a piece of a projectile or fragments of a projectile.

25 Importantly, no munitions constituents risks were identified anywhere.

1 Fourteen areas were investigated, unique areas, and eight areas were
2 retained for future action, which means that following the RI, eight areas we
3 felt like needed to be addressed in the FS.

4 Okay. Munitions categories: These are basically the kind of things that
5 we found at the site, grenades and all types and forms of grenades, hand
6 grenades, illumination grenades, landmines, practice. I don't know if we found,
7 actually found any live landmines, but I believe we did. Mortar, mortars
8 different sizes, projectiles and rockets. So these are the general categories
9 that we lumped everything into based on what we found.

10 I just wanted to include a picture of the type of munitions that we're
11 finding or MD that we're finding. The projectiles are up here. The mortar, this
12 is a 60 millimeter mortar. Tail fins, these are, you know, scrap pieces of or
13 components of munitions items that we would find. A grenade, and that's a little
14 rifle grenade, and then 50 caliber shells in some places, which are not
15 considered MEC.

16 Investigation summary: So of the areas that we looked at and their
17 acreages our findings from the RI were reported, and this is a --- I will just
18 suggest to you this is a very concise summary of a whole lot of work. So the
19 RIs are available at the library, if you want to go look through them, but I've
20 tried to boil everything down for this presentation.

21 In MRS 1, which we can talk about where that is, no MEC or MD was
22 observed.

23 MRS 2, we had very minimal access to that, which was a suspected
24 grenade court, and so we weren't able to do any investigation there; and then we
25 had these areas designated.

1 The 105 millimeter area, we found 105 millimeter projectiles and on down
2 the line. It's a little difficult to see, but some of them are red and the red
3 text indicates locations, areas where we found MEC. These are actual explosive
4 items.

5 Yes?

6 BY MR. STRANGE:

7 Is there any way we can blow that up a little more?

8 BY MR. SHIFLET:

9 Well, I can make it a little bigger but not a lot, because if I push it back,
10 it goes off the screen to the top.

11 BY MR. STRANGE:

12 Okay.

13 BY MR. SHIFLET:

14 Yeah.

15 BY MR. STRANGE:

16 All right.

17 BY MR. SHIFLET:

18 Sorry.

19 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

20 Is there any specific questions you have that we might be able to help or

21 ---

22 BY MR. STRANGE:

23 Well, I just --- I just wanted to know the ---

24 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

25 Sure.

1 BY MR. STRANGE:

2 --- areas we're dealing with.

3 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

4 The presentation will be available on the project website afterwards ---

5 BY MR. STRANGE:

6 Yeah.

7 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

8 --- if you'd like to look at it at your leisure afterwards, so.

9 BY MR. STRANGE:

10 Okay.

11 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

12 Okay.

13 BY MR. SHIFLET:

14 And I am reminded of one point.

15 If you have a question, we have a transcriber who is going to need your

16 name.

17 So, if you could, just state your name before your question.

18 BY COURT REPORTER:

19 Could you tell me your name real quick?

20 BY MR. STRANGE:

21 Ronnie Strange.

22 BY COURT REPORTER:

23 Thank you.

24 BY MR. SHIFLET:

25 Thank you.

1 Continuing on the list of areas, again. The point mostly with this table is
2 to show you that there are locations where we found actual MEC items.

3 As part of the RI, we have to perform something called a MEC hazard
4 assessment. It's a tool that we use to help evaluate the risk or hazard
5 associated with a munitions site, and the key thing to keep in mind here is that
6 there are a range of scores, but a one is a high score and a low --- a four is a
7 low score. There are calculation sheets that we use to get to these scores.

8 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

9 Jason, just to stress this hazard assessment is only done for those areas
10 we actually found some type of unexploded ordnance item. So several of the
11 other areas where we did not find any explosive items, then this hazard
12 assessment was not done for those areas.

13 BY MR. SHIFLET:

14 Right. It can only be performed if you have an explosive item or an
15 explosive hazard.

16 Good point. Thank you.

17 For the locations where we found MEC those areas are indicated here.
18 Here are example Hazard Assessment Scores, and they vary from a score of
19 one in several locations, a two in a couple locations and a score of three.

20 So, area disposition: Essentially what we do is when we complete our RI
21 investigation we have to decide which areas warrant moving forward into the FS
22 where we will evaluate potential remedial options, and this table is meant to
23 summarize that. So there are some areas where we found no evidence of MEC
24 and MD. Those areas like MRS 1, for example, NFA, meaning no further action,
25 and we will address that area in the decision document. It did not require

1 evaluation in the FS or inclusion in the proposed plan. There are several areas
2 like that that you can see, and then you'll see that there are a host of areas,
3 again, in red where we found MEC and needed to move those into the FS. So we
4 needed to address the remedial options for those areas or evaluate them.

5 So the purpose and objective of the feasibility study. I will admit that
6 the feasibility study is perhaps the most complex piece of this, in my view. The
7 purpose is to develop and evaluate, those are key terms, potential response
8 alternatives, what are we going to do to clean up the site if it needs it, to
9 manage MEC and MC hazards and risks. The objective of the FS is to provide
10 decision makers, the information needed to support the appropriate response
11 alternative. So the FS is supposed to be the tool that is used to help decision
12 makers make the decision on what to do at the site.

13 This is a key slide here, and since we're talking about risks, and the way
14 that I envision it is if you have a receptor, which might be a person walking in
15 the state park, and you have an exposure pathway, which means that the item
16 might be laying on the surface instead of buried two-feet deep, and you actually
17 have a MEC item, when those three things come together, you have a risk.

18 So even though you might have a MEC item and an exposure pathway, if
19 there are no receptors, then there's no risk. All right. So we're talking very
20 specifically about where these three things come together.

21 The generalized process is that we use the FS and the risk assessments
22 conducted is part of the FS. We begin to establish remedial objectives: What
23 are we trying to accomplish? We look at a broad range of alternatives from no
24 action to the most aggressive kind of remediation. We screen those
25 alternatives, and then once we have a set of alternatives that pass screening,

1 we, for the retained alternatives, we evaluate them using criteria that are
2 established as part of CERCLA.

3 So these are the nine criteria which we'll briefly touch on in a bit. These
4 are established criteria that are included within the CERCLA law.

5 Okay. So range of alternatives. What did we look at? Again, we talk
6 about no action to things like land use controls or long-term management. Land
7 use controls can be things like fencing, signs, information, etcetera, community
8 awareness, training, all the way down to various technical removal alternatives
9 to what we call a digital advanced classification surface and subsurface MEC
10 removal to support unlimited use and unrestricted exposure.

11 So in our case of this range of alternatives, the bolded ones, no action,
12 land use controls, analog and digital advanced classification, these were
13 retained for the more detailed analysis against the nine criteria.

14 Just to touch on it briefly, I'm not going to read all this, but the nine
15 criteria are overall protection of human health, compliance with ARARs. Again,
16 this is a challenging subject. You can think of ARARs as rules or regulations
17 that we would need to follow if we're going to do some action at the site. Long-
18 term effectiveness and permanence; reduction of the toxicity, mobility or
19 volume through treatment; the short-term effectiveness; the implementability,
20 can we do it; the cost; state acceptance; and community acceptance.

21 So we look at a, this is a comparative analysis of the four alternatives
22 that were retained, and this is a very busy slide, and I know you won't have time
23 to digest all this, but this is a way for us to evaluate the pros and cons of each
24 one of the alternatives relative to the nine criteria in sort of a simplistic way.
25 The FS does this in a detailed way. This is a summary of that detailed

1 evaluation or analysis. Cost is a large component of it, so, again, we have the
2 cost associated with each one of the four alternatives for the areas that were
3 carried through to the FS.

4 And now we get to the proposed plan. The purpose and objective of the
5 proposed plan. Frankly, it is to facilitate the public's involvement. It's your
6 turn to shine, if you haven't already. It's to summarize the remedial
7 alternatives that we retain during the FS so that you're aware of those, and
8 then if the proposed plan does just that, it presents the preliminary
9 recommended alternative selection for addressing each of the MRSs. Not the
10 answer, but the recommendation.

11 Proposed remedial action objectives: These are essentially the way to
12 think of these are these are the objectives that we're trying to accomplish. So
13 for each of the areas that were retained in the FS, we have the depth at which
14 MEC was found, the deepest depth. We have a conservative land use depth, and
15 in a lot of cases you'll see that's residential, and then we have a, what we call, a
16 remedial action depth, and you'll notice that, just take this first one for
17 example, the deepest item we found was at two feet. The residential land use
18 is what we selected with an estimated depth of usage, land usage, if you will, is
19 two feet, and so we set our objective depth a foot beyond that at three feet.
20 In some cases where MEC was not found we use, obviously, the land use as our
21 guide.

22 And so the big slide of the night, I suppose, is our recommendation for
23 the preferred alternatives for each one of the areas, their acreages, the
24 preferred alternatives are either Alternative 2 or Alternative 4. Alternative 2
25 is land use controls, essentially, and Alternative 4 is the digital advanced

1 classification surface and subsurface MEC removal to support UU/UE, which is
2 unlimited use and unrestricted exposure.

3 So following the completion of the proposed plan, which includes a 30-day
4 public review period and feedback from the public before that document is
5 finalized, the next step in the CERCLA process is the decision document of
6 which the public is a part. This document will finalize the remedy for each
7 MRS. It's where we document what will be done at each of these MRSs. It will
8 address any public comments that we received on the proposed plan. South
9 Carolina DHEC is involved with this process, and a decision document, like all the
10 other decision or all the other documents that we have generated, will be placed
11 in the library on file.

12 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

13 Jason, I'd like to elaborate a little bit on this document. Basically, this is
14 a document that will be approved by the Department of Defense to authorize
15 the cleanup work. So once we have this prepared, as Jason had mentioned, it
16 addresses any public comments. So any comments here tonight, or during the
17 30-day public comment period, we will address in the decision document. We will
18 capture the responses to those questions, and we have to forward up through
19 the Department of Defense to gain approval for the work. So there is a little
20 bit of time involved with that process, and it's required, obviously, to get
21 approval to do any type of cleanup action at the site, so.

22 BY MR. SHIFLET:

23 Okay. Just a couple more slides. Actually, only maybe one or two.

24 Upcoming schedule, just so that you're aware of kind of where we are in
25 the process, the public comment period starts tomorrow and lasts through April

1 25th. At that point, we'll take any comments that we get and we will finalize
2 the proposed plan. As part of the decision document is the responsiveness
3 summary, which addresses, basically, the public comments that we've gotten,
4 and then we will draft the decision document, which I expect to be about May
5 of this year. That will be the draft decision document. Like all the other
6 documents, there's a draft, a draft final and a final, so there's some process to
7 get to a final decision document, but that's the general timeline.

8 And then I just want to reiterate, for those maybe that have never seen
9 this before, that safety is obviously a concern. We want to make sure that we
10 recognize that these items can be dangerous, that we definitely don't touch
11 them, that we retreat from the area and make sure that we report them.

12 And at this point, if you have any questions, we will be happy to answer
13 them.

14 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

15 You could ask the questions in front of the group if you want to, or if you
16 would rather ask questions one-on-one, we can certainly do that after the
17 meeting. Yes, sir.

18 BY MR. BOUGHMAN:

19 My name is Glenn Boughman, and I have a question. Your proposed plan
20 for item number two and item number four. Do you already have that
21 translated, and does this map show those areas? I'm trying to get an idea of
22 what areas, ---

23 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

24 It ---

25 BY MR. BOUGHMAN:

1 --- you know, visually ---

2 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

3 Yes. Uh-huh (affirmative response).

4 BY MR. BOUGHMAN:

5 --- that map translates into, so ---

6 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

7 Right.

8 BY MR. BOUGHMAN:

9 --- in all that.

10 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

11 And the items you were talking about, those are the alternatives that
12 were evaluated in the ---

13 BY MR. BOUGHMAN:

14 Right.

15 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

16 --- feasibility study. Basically, Alternative 2 is land use controls, which is
17 some type of education or community awareness, brochures, training to make
18 the public aware.

19 We didn't find anything, but there's potential to encounter these type of
20 items, and I guess those are identified by yellow, Jason?

21 BY MR. SHIFLET:

22 Yes.

23 BY MR. BOUGHMAN:

24 By yellow?

25 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

1 So, basically, the majority of the site we did not find unexploded
2 ordnance items, so we are recommending some type of public awareness for
3 those areas. Again, I guess some of the specifics, probably brochures, I would
4 imagine, public education, those type of things will be a part of that alternative.

5 Alternative 4, which was the advanced classification, that involves
6 actually going out surveying the area with these advanced classification
7 technologies, and basically clearing it to the depths that we identified for those
8 specific areas based on either the depth that items were found historically or
9 what the typical use is for that area, and those are identified in the orange
10 areas, and those, basically, it's based off we did find some type of unexploded
11 ordnance items in those areas.

12 BY MR. BOUGHMAN:

13 But in any one of those areas is part of the proposed plan to restrict
14 deeds or ---

15 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

16 No, that was something that we had discussed in one of our previous
17 Restoration Advisory Board meetings. It basically was a suggestion or question
18 to the community: Would they be open to implementing some type of land use
19 controls?

20 I guess I'll back up a little bit. The Army doesn't own the property, so we
21 can't force any type of restrictions on the property. It has to be something
22 that is done with the consent of the property owner, the community. So that is
23 not something that we are considering at this time. If the community wanted
24 to see that implemented as part of the cleanup action, then, obviously, we would
25 want to gain concurrence from the community to go forward with that route,

1 but that is not something that we are considering as part of that alternative at
2 this time.

3 BY MR. SHIFLET:

4 If I could just add something to that: This is a large and complex site
5 and lots of different areas, and so there are some sort of logistical difficulties
6 developing a feasibility study for a site like this. I can't, as the author of that
7 document or one of the authors, I can't treat every parcel and property
8 individually. I sort of have to lump them together in areas. So this is where it
9 becomes really important for the public to give us feedback. If, for instance,
10 you look at the proposed plan and look at some of the documents, and you think
11 the idea of fencing off any of these areas, whether they're public or private or
12 otherwise, is ludicrous and you would prefer not to see fencing, that's a
13 comment. You could make it, and we could incorporate that in the documents
14 going forward as one of the wishes of the public. That's just a small idea of
15 what we're looking at, but another, you know, idea would be, if you know of an
16 area in particular that you feel is maybe particularly dangerous for some
17 reason, you could say, "That we don't feel," --- you know, you don't feel like
18 we're addressing it enough. This is where we really are asking for your
19 feedback, because if no feedback comes, there are very few decision makers
20 who are weighing in.

21 In the back. Yes, sir.

22 BY MR. STRANGE:

23 Ronnie Strange, again. I might have missed this, but is there a scaled
24 down version of this that's going to be available of the map showing, you know,
25 what we found and what we didn't find?

1 BY MR. SHIFLET:

2 There are maps in the FS and in the RI that are a little bit bigger, paper
3 maps that you can open up and look at for sure. I have our web-based GIS, so
4 we could talk after this meeting, and I can drill down to your property
5 specifically.

6 BY MR. STRANGE:

7 Right.

8 BY MR. SHIFLET:

9 And answer questions related to your properties.

10 I haven't talked about it with the Corps, but this data could,
11 theoretically, be posted on the internet, you know, for folks to look at and be
12 able to look at it themselves visually. That's just not something that's been
13 done, but ---

14 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

15 And we can certainly make this particular figure, if you would like to look
16 at this, we can certainly put this on the website so you can look at it.

17 BY MR. STRANGE:

18 Yeah, that'd be good.

19 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

20 Okay.

21 BY MR. STRANGE:

22 And I just wondered in the past, you know, like when the remediation was
23 done on my property and surrounding areas, it seems like I might have gotten
24 some kind of a report, you know, stating whether it was, you know, and the
25 condition.

1 BY MR. SHIFLET:

2 Right. It's possible.

3 BY MR. STRANGE:

4 Would that be right?

5 BY MR. SHIFLET:

6 You've had work done on your property?

7 BY MR. STRANGE:

8 Yes.

9 BY MR. SHIFLET:

10 Yeah. It depends on what was done and where.

11 BY MR. STRANGE:

12 Well, I mean, I say I had work done. I had the investigation.

13 BY MR. SHIFLET:

14 Oh, okay. Yeah. Yeah.

15 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

16 It was part of the investigation, sir?

17 BY MR. STRANGE:

18 Yes.

19 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

20 Okay. So, and that would obviously be included in the remedial
21 investigation report if that was part of that work, so.

22 BY MR. SHIFLET:

23 Yeah, but, I mean, in a minute we can --- I can pull your property up and
24 we can look at it.

25 BY MR. STRANGE:

1 And I'm going to ask one other thing, and I hope this is all I have. In
2 relation to MC, or I take it to mean chemical compounds?

3 BY MR. SHIFLET:

4 Correct.

5 BY MR. STRANGE:

6 Was the Corps involved in any way or anticipate in any groundwater
7 monitoring or anything in that respect?

8 BY MR. SHIFLET:

9 Not in association with our work, and, typically, that's the reason that
10 that doesn't happen in a case like this is we won't blindly collect groundwater
11 samples without having some reason to suspect that there's contamination. So
12 we start by collecting soil samples, and if those evidenced leads us to believe
13 that we have a larger problem, then we would continue to explore that, and we
14 didn't have that issue.

15 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

16 And I think that's the line of evidence that we look for. Obviously,
17 impact areas, we have known areas where we have seen unexploded ordnance
18 items, you would expect to see contamination in the soil. If it is in the soil, then
19 the second part of that sequence is we would look at the groundwater if we saw
20 contamination in the soil, then we would subsequently sample wells.

21 BY MR. STRANGE:

22 We don't have any record of any, let's just say, gas containers being
23 found anywhere during your all's remediation?

24 BY MR. SHIFLET:

25 No, I don't recall anything like that.

1 Gas by, you mean, petroleum gas?

2 BY MR. STRANGE:

3 Right, mustard gas.

4 BY MR. SHIFLET:

5 Oh, no, no. Huh-huh (negative response).

6 BY MR. STRANGE:

7 Gases.

8 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

9 Yeah, there's no --- there's no project documentation that indicates ---

10 BY MR. STRANGE:

11 Project ---

12 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

13 Yeah, there's no project documentation that indicates that chemical
14 warfare was used at this site. So, typically, when we do these investigations,
15 obviously, we do have sites across the country that were used for chemical
16 warfare practice, and we have the documentation that indicates that it was
17 used at those sites. So that would entail some different steps as far as
18 implementing that investigation, but none of the historical information indicates
19 that chemical warfare was --- items were used at the site.

20 BY MR. STRANGE:

21 Just trying to get a warm fuzzy feeling about this thing.

22 BY DR. KEITH:

23 John Keith.

24 So, to reiterate, the yellow portion, it's my understanding that you don't
25 plan any deed restrictions, fencing or any restrictions on that portion that

1 would devalue the property or otherwise hinder that portion of the yellow
2 portion?

3 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

4 I think, as Jason mentioned earlier, we don't plan any deed restrictions at
5 all. If that's --- again, that's feedback from the community. If the community
6 felt for certain areas they would like to see some type of deed restrictions,
7 then we could implement them, but, again, we do not own the property. So we
8 cannot enforce or implement any type of deed restrictions on the property.

9 So, basically, what we are recommending for the areas in yellow are some
10 type of education, basically brochures, community awareness to let them know
11 that these are areas that we didn't find any unexploded ordnance items. We
12 may have found some munitions debris, again, fragments that inert type items,
13 but, basically, this is education to let you know this is what the procedure is to
14 implement in case you do see something that looks suspicious. So it's more of an
15 educational awareness type program is what we would be implementing for those
16 areas in the yellow.

17 BY DR. KEITH:

18 This is more of a yes or no answer. Do you plan to the parts in yellow to
19 do anything devalue the property?

20 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

21 No.

22 BY DR. KEITH:

23 Okay. Thank you.

24 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

25 Julie, do you have something to ask or answer?

1 BY MS. HISCOX:

2 Julie Hiscox, Corps of Engineers, and I just wanted to clarify that point
3 from a professional with the Corps. We can't do it. The federal government
4 has no ability to do that. That would be a community action. If folks in your
5 community decided for some reason they wanted restrictions on the property,
6 that would have to be done at the community level. We have no authority
7 whatsoever to do that.

8 BY DR. KEITH:

9 Right. I'm just trying to know whether you plan to make
10 recommendations in that to pursue that or not.

11 BY MS. HISCOX:

12 No. No, we do not.

13 BY DR. KEITH:

14 Do not. Okay.

15 BY MS. HISCOX:

16 We have no authority to do so.

17 BY DR. KEITH:

18 Thank you.

19 BY MS. HISCOX:

20 You're welcome.

21 BY DR. MCCLURE:

22 Don McClure. Why isn't this presentation made at the RAB, you know,
23 the quarterly RAB meeting? I mean why did you all have a special meeting
24 tonight?

25 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

1 This meeting is required. The CERCLA process on one side that we had
2 there, ---

3 BY DR. MCCLURE:

4 Right.

5 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

6 --- this is a required public meeting when the proposed plan is issued.

7 BY DR. MCCLURE:

8 How did you notify the public of this meeting tonight?

9 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

10 I guess we had newspaper announcements, flyers ---

11 BY MR. SHIFLET:

12 Newspaper, flyers to ---

13 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

14 --- that went out to the mailing list.

15 BY MR. SHIFLET:

16 Went out to the mailing list that we have.

17 BY DR. MCCLURE:

18 And your mailing went out two days ago for the meeting tonight. Where's
19 your card, John? Here's the, you know, card right here, and it's, you know,
20 postmarked the 21st of March. That's not a lot of advance notice. My card
21 hasn't even come yet. John happened to call me. That's the reason I'm here, so
22 you wonder why you have no attendance. I mean to me it's something that we've
23 been waiting for a couple years to have to hear, but, yet, no public awareness or
24 notification to the people involved.

25 BY MR. MOON:

1 Yeah.

2 BY DR. MCCLURE:

3 I guess my card will come tomorrow.

4 BY MR. MOON:

5 And that was --- you know, that's kind of I found the same way. I mean I
6 just happened --- if it hadn't been for the Corps team the other day and I
7 happened to see it on --- we have a way we do mail at the park, but I had no
8 idea. Usually I get an email, and I calendar, you know, I then put it on my
9 calendar. If I hadn't seen that card, I wouldn't have never known it, and I'm on
10 the RAB board, and I would have never known tonight was that, was the public
11 meeting.

12 BY DR. MCCLURE:

13 I'm certain there are RAB board members aren't here and a lot of people
14 that come to the RAB meetings aren't here, so, obviously, it wouldn't get
15 disseminated to the public.

16 BY MR. SHIFLET:

17 Did you --- did anyone see it in the newspaper, just out of curiosity?

18 BY MR. BOUGHMAN:

19 I haven't read a newspaper in years.

20 BY MS. HISCOX:

21 That is a problem, isn't it?

22 BY MR. SHIFLET:

23 No, I agree. I don't take the paper, either, but, you know, ---

24 BY DR. MCCLURE:

25 I read it every day and I didn't see it.

1 BY DR. KEITH:

2 You may want to reschedule the meeting to let other people. I mean
3 we're fortunate to attend, but it seems like a pretty sparse attendance.

4 BY DR. MCCLURE:

5 On your GIS data, ---

6 BY MR. SHIFLET:

7 Uh-huh (affirmative response).

8 BY DR. MCCLURE:

9 --- would you ever put that on a website?

10 BY MR. SHIFLET:

11 Would I?

12 BY DR. MCCLURE:

13 Yeah.

14 BY MR. SHIFLET:

15 Well, the Corps owns the data. If they want to put it on the website, we
16 can facilitate that for sure.

17 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

18 And I think it's something we can certainly look into.

19 BY DR. MCCLURE:

20 Well, I know for individual property owners it would be a, you know, a big
21 help.

22 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

23 Uh-huh (affirmative response).

24 BY DR. MCCLURE:

25 Because when you look at these almost generic kind of maps, you know.

1 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

2 Right.

3 BY DR. MCCLURE:

4 They're sort of broad brush strokes, and ---

5 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

6 Sure.

7 BY DR. MCCLURE:

8 --- unless you know a particular squiggle in a road, you don't know quite
9 where you are.

10 BY MR. SHIFLET:

11 I would say there is a little good and bad to that.

12 BY DR. MCCLURE:

13 I know.

14 BY MR. SHIFLET:

15 The bad being potentially that if that information is out there on the
16 web, then it's accessible, and, unfortunately, there are treasure hunters and
17 things like that, folks like that that like to snoop around and go to these orange
18 areas and see what they can find. So, just to make that point.

19 Yes.

20 BY DR. KEITH:

21 And could we get a copy of this big map? Is that possible to get a copy
22 of that?

23 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

24 We can certainly put it on the project website.

25 BY MR. SHIFLET:

1 We can post it there for sure, and you can down --- it's just a pdf file you
2 can download and print it just as big as you want it.

3 BY MR. MOON:

4 Did you say that we could get that like just for Croft State Park on that
5 map instead of the whole thing?

6 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

7 Yeah.

8 BY MR. MOON:

9 Like for myself and ---

10 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

11 Again, it will be a pdf. We can post it on the website, and you can crop it
12 down to just to the park if you want to. I mean I could do that for you and
13 email it to you, if you want. That's not a problem.

14 BY MR. SHIFLET:

15 Yeah. I mean, you know, yeah.

16 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

17 Uh-huh (affirmative response). Yes, sir.

18 BY MR. BOUGHMAN:

19 Glenn Boughman, again. Now the orange, just to clarify, what is the
20 action for the orange?

21 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

22 That would be the alternative for the advanced classification surface and
23 subsurface clearance. Basically, it's a --- it's a clearance, transects will be set
24 up on those areas where they will basically walk those areas with these
25 technology items that will give them an indication of what it is in the subsurface

1 and whether it is a potential unexploded item, and then they will actually
2 excavate those items. So, actually some type of intrusive excavation will be
3 conducted in those areas.

4 BY MR. BOUGHMAN:

5 And there will be a decision made on that, as well? That decision could be
6 that hasn't been moved yet?

7 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

8 Well, that will be in the decision document. So, that --- we are
9 recommending that be the cleanup or the action, response action be taken for
10 those areas right now.

11 BY MR. BOUGHMAN:

12 Okay.

13 BY MR. MOON:

14 John Moon. So do you know when will that actually be? Is there any
15 timeline on when that might actually happen?

16 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

17 On the actual response, actual cleanup?

18 BY MR. MOON:

19 Right. You know, I know you've got ---

20 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

21 Yeah. I mean we're really talking, you know, crystal ball here, I think, as
22 far as long term. Jason had on the slides as far as the decision document, the
23 draft decision document, May. We have to forward it up through the
24 Department of Defense, you know, up at headquarters level to get it approved,
25 you know, so it's a long process where there are a lot of folks that have to sign

1 off on it through that process. So, you know, it could probably take at least six
2 months for that process to happen before it's signed. Once it's signed, so if
3 we're talking probably late this calendar year, at that point we would have to
4 include it in our funding request for --- you know, you may be familiar, I'm not
5 sure if everybody is, but how the federal government works. Obviously, we have
6 a fiscal year that starts October 1st. So as far as a funding mechanism to be
7 able to do that, we have to request those funds to do the work for subsequent
8 years. That has to be done. Long range, you know, I'm looking at all the small
9 steps right now. Long range we're probably looking at least a couple of years
10 probably before we even get to the point where we would do some type of
11 intrusive work. We would have to look at contractors, as far as get proposals,
12 award a contract to actually do this work, and even back it up before that.
13 Typically, what the Corps of Engineers is doing for all of these sites, all of
14 these FUD sites across the country, what they've done is try to prioritize them
15 based on risks.

16 We talked a lot tonight about risks and that's really the mechanism that
17 allows us to do any type of cleanup. There has to be some type of risks before
18 we can do any cleanup at these sites.

19 So, typically, what the Corps of Engineers is doing is prioritizing these
20 sites. So they may come back, as far as they, headquarters, Corps of Engineers
21 may say, "Well, this site," you know, "fits in here from the priority, so we would
22 not get to it, say, for a couple of years because these other sites may be a
23 chemical warfare site or something like that." It has a higher priority, so that
24 would get some of the funding to address that site before this. So there's a lot
25 of sort of different steps that we would have to go through prior to actually

1 getting to that phase where we would award a contractor to get out and do
2 some intrusive work.

3 So the best guess we're probably looking at probably at least a couple of
4 years before we would actually do some type of intrusive work, and probably
5 more of a longer term, probably more like, you know, five years or something
6 like that, I don't know.

7 Julie, do you have any better ideas as far as a broad idea what we're
8 looking at from actually seeing some type of cleanup action happening at Camp
9 Croft?

10 BY MS. HISCOX:

11 No, but I assume we get the decision document signed, but it could ---
12 the first one, and certainly we would go to the highest priority site. It could be
13 in the plan for next year.

14 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

15 Okay.

16 BY MS. HISCOX:

17 If the stars all align, but that's possible.

18 BY MR. MOON:

19 So, where do you go from here?

20 You know, I mean now this, the public put some input into it and gives
21 their opinions on what they feel should be done and how it should be dealt with,
22 you guys utilize that for it to be complete public involvement and what not, as
23 far as RAB meetings and all that kind of stuff, I mean, is it pretty much just
24 that's it? There's nothing, I mean ---

25 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

1 Well, as long as there is interest from the community to have a RAB, we
2 will continue holding the RAB. It does serve as, you know, a valuable resource.
3 I think we've seen as far as getting feedback from the community on concerns
4 and things of that nature, that, obviously, the Corps of Engineers being able to
5 apply information on where we are in the project. So as long as I think that
6 there is some interest from the community to continue the RAB, then we will
7 continue to move forward with that, so.

8 Now, you know, there may not be in the interim, you know, we get the
9 decision document signed, there may be a delay of, you know, a year before
10 some type of intrusive cleanup action is done. You know, there may not be a lot
11 to present at some of these RAB meetings, so, you know, there may be meetings
12 where we say we all agree let's postpone it for this quarter until we've got some
13 concrete information to provide or things of that nature; but, again, you know,
14 in that interim we may continuing to stress, you know, education awareness,
15 things like that, implementing those type of alternatives, brochures, things like
16 that continuing to try to provide that information to the community to make
17 sure that they're aware of potential hazards that are out there.

18 BY MS. HISCOX:

19 And I think we would also look for community input on to which one, which
20 property or which MRS we address first. There may be factors that we're not
21 aware of that might elevate one over one we think is the worst. So, you know,
22 that's another area where the RAB can help us out.

23 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

24 Yes, sir.

25 BY DR. MCCLURE:

1 Don McClure, again. When I look at your map over here and look at the
2 orange area, it looks like a lot of it are in the park.

3 BY MR. MOON:

4 I see that, too.

5 BY DR. MCCLURE:

6 And ---

7 BY COURT REPORTER:

8 I'm sorry?

9 BY DR. MCCLURE:

10 A lot of the orange areas are within the park boundaries. You know, just
11 sitting here looking at it here.

12 BY MR. MOON:

13 At least those two down there. Yeah, there you go.

14 BY DR. MCCLURE:

15 Yeah. You know, it looks like, you know, retrospect, if you could, it shows
16 the worst places to put the park, you know, when you look at the whole Croft
17 area, and, you know, the park is for public use, but that public use is being --- is
18 fairly restrictive, isn't it?

19 BY MR. SHIFLET:

20 You are exactly right, and this is where public response becomes
21 important. It's up to the public to make that a priority.

22 BY MR. MOON:

23 So what is --- I mean I keep hearing your opinion on what needs to be
24 done first and what areas need to be done first. Do you guys know that
25 standing here today where you think need to be or it's in this and you feel like it

1 can be done first? Is it the park and the fact that it's a public used area or is
2 it more to some other areas that I don't know anything about that need --- you
3 know, maybe they have a need greater than that of the park?

4 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

5 Right.

6 BY MR. SHIFLET:

7 My opinion. I can give you my opinion. The park has a risk and huge
8 exposure potential. A lot of the people in the place where we don't necessarily
9 maybe don't want them to be with respect to what's there. There are other
10 areas that have potentially more, more dangerous explosives but less public
11 exposure. That's my opinion. There are several areas that are in orange. Of
12 those areas that are in orange there are several that they need to be cleaned
13 up. There is no doubt about it.

14 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

15 I think we didn't necessarily delve into some of the specifics as far as
16 the MEC hazard assessment, but, you know, that's basically a risk assessment
17 that looks at some of these items that we're talking about, how much exposure
18 is happening to folks out there. Jason showed me one slide that had the three
19 different circles and how they interlap. I mean that's the risk in that center
20 area. So certainly if we have an area where we have known unexploded
21 ordnance items and a lot of potential receptors, folks that are there, you know,
22 the risk is much greater for those areas. So, I can't recall exactly what our
23 number was. I presume it was probably a one for the park area, so, obviously,
24 that's the highest risk number that we have using that tool, so.

25 BY MR. SHIFLET:

1 As a matter of fact, it was.

2 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

3 It was, yeah.

4 BY MR. SHIFLET:

5 It was the maximum score.

6 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

7 So it's the highest score. So, you know, based on if we strictly went off
8 these numbers, obviously, it's --- you know, it is the highest score, highest
9 hazard and would obviously probably be recommended. If not, the initial site,
10 obviously, in that group, if we had multiple sites that were approved to go
11 forward first.

12 Yes, ma'am. Yes.

13 BY MS. PORTER:

14 Okay. I would like to say this has been going on since this whole time.
15 My father got killed in '45 by a hand grenade, but they swept it under the rug,
16 swept it under the rug, and swept it under the rug. The two ladies on the front
17 row, they know what I'm talking about, but I'm saying you all are standing there
18 and you all are talking about this and that and the other, and you really don't
19 know what's really going on and what's really out there, because if this has been
20 going on since '45, and this is '16, somebody ain't doing their work.

21 BY MS. HISCOX:

22 Well, so the DoD ---

23 BY MS. PORTER:

24 Uh-huh (affirmative response).

25 BY MS. HISCOX:

1 Let's back up a little bit. In '45, we didn't have the technology we have
2 now.

3 BY MS. PORTER:

4 I'm sure you didn't.

5 BY MS. HISCOX:

6 And we didn't have environmental programs back then.

7 BY MS. PORTER:

8 I'm sure you didn't.

9 BY MS. HISCOX:

10 You know, the CERCLA and all this environmental rules didn't start until
11 the eighties, and so, you know, it's like anything else. We learn as we go over
12 time.

13 BY MS. PORTER:

14 Right.

15 BY MS. HISCOX:

16 If you ever were in the drycleaners, you know they threw stuff out the
17 back door back in the day. They don't do that anymore. So we're learning as we
18 go, and we're at the point now where the technology is good enough that we can
19 go out there and find new things under the surface, which is something we
20 couldn't do back then.

21 BY MS. PORTER:

22 Well, this wasn't under the surface. This was on top of the ground.

23 BY MS. HISCOX:

24 Well, but ---

25 BY MS. PORTER:

1 And then ---

2 BY MS. HISCOX:

3 --- you understand what I'm saying?

4 BY MS. PORTER:

5 Yeah, I understand what you're saying. I understand what you said, but
6 I'm saying he brought up the subject if anybody ever got, you know, hurt, killed,
7 whatever, because of it, and that's why I'm speaking the way I'm speaking
8 because ---

9 BY MS. HISCOX:

10 That's good.

11 BY MS. PORTER:

12 --- something did happen, but it was covered up, still covered up.

13 BY MR. STRANGE:

14 Some of us are aware of that incident.

15 BY MS. PORTER:

16 You're aware?

17 BY MR. STRANGE:

18 Yes, ma'am.

19 BY MS. PORTER:

20 Yes, sir. You're not the only one. You know, they don't won't talk about it.
21 They want me to tough it up and push it back, and we'll talk with different ones.
22 We even went to Atlanta to the archives and tried to get some information on
23 it, but we still got it, but they wouldn't let us have it, and they brought us out
24 some papers that wasn't even worth reading, but we wasn't --- you know, we just
25 acted like we knew what --- we didn't know what they was doing, and we were

1 going along with whatever was going on, because this thing had been pushed
2 back and covered up for years, so, hey, you all --- you all has got you all's job to
3 do if you all are going --- think you all are going to clean up this. It's more than
4 you think it is; and from '45 until today, until today, and you all are still finding
5 the stuff in Camp Croft, now you think about it.

6 BY MR. SHIFLET:

7 Well, I will add something very important to what you're saying, which is
8 we --- the government, I will say, not we. The government doesn't have the
9 money to investigate every acre at Camp Croft. So we have to approach that
10 investigation in the most appropriate way that we can use funds available to
11 accomplish as much as possible. My point is we didn't investigate every acre of
12 the former Camp Croft. We didn't. We investigated. We investigated in a sort
13 of a broad brush, if you will, or we essentially used transects across the site,
14 and we spaced those out in a certain way so that we could collect data across
15 the site, and then we have to make some conclusion based on that data.

16 What's important is that folks that are in the community that have a
17 specific need has to bring it to the attention of the Corps, not necessarily
18 Zapata. You can tell me and I'm going to tell the Corps, but the Corps has to
19 understand where that emergency need is, even if it means taking them out in
20 the field and pointing and saying, "Right there." It has to be --- sometimes it
21 has to be that way. We have done, at this site at Camp Croft, we have done
22 what's called a time critical removal action during our investigation because we
23 found enough explosive items on the surface it warranted an immediate
24 response, but that's only because we found it.

25 BY MS. PORTER:

1 It was already there. It wasn't hidden. You know, all we wanted to do, all
2 my family wanted to do was the government, somebody in the government to
3 talk to us. Oh, no, they wouldn't talk to us. They pushed us back, pushed us
4 back and pushed us back until today. They still haven't talked to us. That's all
5 we wanted was the government to talk to us, but huh-huh (negative response).

6 BY DR. MCCLURE:

7 How much money has been spent to date on Croft?

8 BY MS. HISCOX:

9 I would have to look that up. I don't know off the top of my head, sir.

10 BY MR. SHIFLET:

11 Since the early nineties.

12 BY DR. MCCLURE:

13 Somewhere over a million dollars?

14 BY MS. HISCOX:

15 Yes, easily over a million.

16 BY DR. MCCLURE:

17 Many million dollars?

18 BY MS. HISCOX:

19 Yes.

20 BY DR. MCCLURE:

21 But, yet, we still have the public park. A lot of it is not useable or
22 accessible.

23 BY MS. HISCOX:

24 That is the CERCLA process. We have to follow the regulations.

25 BY DR. MCCLURE:

1 Well, I know.

2 BY MS. HISCOX:

3 And then they tell us how to go about this work.

4 BY DR. MCCLURE:

5 Well, understandable.

6 BY MS. HISCOX:

7 Yes.

8 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

9 I will say that we have had several type of cleanup actions that have
10 occurred on the park property. They occurred before I was involved with the
11 project, but I'm aware that we've had several cleanup actions, so --- and they
12 may be small in scale compared to the size of the park, but typically those type
13 of cleanup actions are reserved for areas where we have, you know, items that
14 are on the surface. You know, if we know we've got and we see something on the
15 surface and it's in such great volume that we have so much risk, then there are
16 tools that we can use where we can get out in the field immediately and try to
17 address some of those areas with some type of cleanup action immediately.

18 Yes, ma'am.

19 BY MS. MOORE:

20 Jeanette Moore. Going back to Mr. Strange's concern about chemical
21 disposal and whatever. I grew up in White Stone Community and have lived in
22 the Camp Croft area, and we heard rumors for years that chemical disposal,
23 chemicals were dumped in wells and whatever. My concern is the amount, the
24 number of people in White Stone that have been diagnosed with cancer, myself
25 included. It seems like there is a cancer cluster there for that small community

1 and every family has been touched with this, and I'm wondering about chemical
2 disposal in the wells and whatever in the water table.

3 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

4 Again, I would go back I guess to at least the information that we have.
5 There's no documentation that indicates chemical rounds were found at this
6 site. So, we have sampled for many chemicals in the soil as part of the
7 investigation, items that would be associated with traditional ordnance, metals,
8 some of the explosive compounds, things of that nature, but to trigger, I guess,
9 or to be --- to have the need to sample for chemical rounds or chemical
10 components we would need some type of justification to go forward with
11 sampling for that, and none of the historical documentation for the camp
12 indicates that there were chemical items that were used here at the site.

13 And I don't know what else to say about the cancer cluster. I mean I
14 know we all have family members that have contracted cancer. My father
15 passed away a couple years ago from cancer, and we lived in such an
16 industrialized society nowadays, there are probably many constituents that
17 we're exposed to nowadays that we don't even know if it's cancer causing and
18 probably won't know until, you know, five to ten years down the road. So it's
19 tough to--- I guess to pinpoint what is --- you know, what is causing the cancer.
20 All I can tell you is the information that we have from all the project
21 documentation is that chemical items weren't used at the site.

22 BY MS. MOORE:

23 Well, I mean multiple members and families. My father and three of his
24 brothers died of cancer. I can just list families in White Stone that --- you
25 know, several members of the family.

1 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

2 Uh-huh (affirmative response).

3 BY MS. MOORE:

4 It was just an inordinate amount that it seems unlikely in such a small
5 community.

6 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

7 Right.

8 BY DR. KEITH:

9 She could get her water tested, could she not?

10 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

11 Oh, certainly.

12 BY DR. KEITH:

13 I mean if she's concerned about that.

14 BY MS. MOORE:

15 Well, now we're on city water, but this was years ago down in White
16 Stone that I drank well water.

17 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

18 Yeah, there are certainly --- you know, if you want to get your water
19 tested, I'm sure there are plenty of private companies that would test it.

20 BY MS. MOORE:

21 Well, I don't live there now.

22 I live ---

23 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

24 Okay.

25 BY MS. MOORE:

1 --- two miles up the road, but all my --- you know, until like I was 25 I
2 lived there and drank that water.

3 BY MR. MOON:

4 I don't know whether, you know, how much it helps your situation,
5 obviously, but I mean I know the park, obviously, we have all of our wells are
6 tested because of public wells, public use wells, and none of them have ever, at
7 least while I've been there ---

8 BY MS. MOORE:

9 Right.

10 BY MR. MOON:

11 --- have never come up for anything of concern, bacteria from a, you
12 know, a fly or anything else that can get in on a spigot or what have you. So
13 they come out yearly and do that every single year. So, I mean, I'm in an area
14 where it's, you know, obviously, a lot of heavy usage. Now, granted, I don't think
15 anything like that was used in the Croft area. I know a lot more of it was some
16 of the stuff that, you know, your hearsay about chemicals and things like that
17 could have been used more in the White Stone area, but I do know that the
18 park is publicly tested by DHEC every year.

19 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

20 Yes, ma'am.

21 BY MS. PORTER:

22 I had two sisters to die from cancer, and they lived in White Stone, and
23 then there was nobody back then testing our water. You drew your water from
24 a well and that's what you drank. That's what you washed with. That's what you
25 cooked with. So, I would say, you all are saying, I don't know. I mean she know

1 what I'm talking about. She knows what I'm talking about it. You know, so now
2 you all stand before us and you all tell us all this stuff you got on the board and
3 all that kind of stuff, but if you didn't live in White Stone, you just don't know
4 what we're saying.

5 BY MS. MOORE:

6 Yeah, everybody there has had cancer.

7 BY MR. PORTER:

8 Right.

9 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

10 Any other questions?

11 (NO RESPONSE)

12 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

13 And like I said, after we're done here, you're welcome to talk with myself
14 or Jason or any of the other government officials that are here tonight.

15 BY MR. SHIFLET:

16 And I'd add two things. If you haven't signed in, in the back of the room
17 there is a sign-in sheet, and there are also spare comment forms. You can take
18 a form with you if you want to leave a comment for us or mail it in later. It has
19 the address on the form. You can pick one of those up on the way out, as well.

20 BY MR. LIVERMORE:

21 Okay. All right. Thank you.

22 (MEETING CONCLUDED AT 7:35)

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
) CERTIFICATE
COUNTY OF SPARTANBURG)

This is to certify that the within meeting was taken on
the 24th day of March, 2016;

That the foregoing is an accurate transcript of the
meeting;

That the undersigned court reporter, a Notary Public for
the State of South Carolina, is not an employee or relative of
any of the parties, counsel or witness and is in no manner
interested in the outcome of this action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my Hand and Seal
on this copy at Spartanburg, South Carolina, this 29th day of
April, 2016.

Sandra Satterwhite (Original signed)

Sandra Satterwhite

Notary Public for South Carolina

My Commission Expires: 3/14/17

(SEAL)