Plainwell

(38pp, 5.5MB)

Meeting

Taken on: June 16, 2015

JENSEN LITIGATION SOLUTIONS
180 North LaSalle Street
Suite 2800
Chicago, IL 60601
312.236.6936
877.653.6736
www.jensenlitigation.com

JENSEN
Litigation Solutions

STATE OF MICHIGAN

****

EPA HEARING - PLAINWELL MILL SITE

KALAMAZOO RIVER CLEAN UP

June 16, 2015

Held at the Plainwell Community Center

Beginning at approximately 6:00 p.m.

Members on the Panel:

Coordinator: Diane Russell

Project Manager: Sheila Desai

P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. RUSSELL: It's a little after six so we'll get this started. There's some familiar faces. We've been having -- the EPA has had several meetings this summer and we have a lot of clean-up plans. Tonight is us introducing another clean-up plan for you. And this is for the former Plainwell Mill site.

That's an area that the EPA has designated as a big clean up of the Kalamazoo River Area 1 -- or I'm sorry, it's designated as Operable Unit 7. So that's what we're here for tonight.

I was going to go over the agenda quickly so you can orient yourself around the meeting for tonight. First we're going to start off with introductions, which I will do, and then I'm going to kick it off to the EPA project manager for the site, Sheila Desai, to talk to us about the proposed plan, and then we're going to have

the question and answer portion of the meeting.

So if you had any questions that you came up with during the meeting, there's some space on the back of the agenda, you can jot those down. So as you're learning about the clean-up, you can -- we'll have a portion at the end of the presentation for you to ask your questions.

Then what we'll do is take a short break before we start the formal comment period for this meeting. And if you plan on making a verbal comment tonight, what I suggest is that you pick up a numbered card at the sign-in desk up there and turn that in to me. So you'll have time to do that.

And then also if you don't feel like making a verbal comment tonight, you can always turn that in with a written comment or you can go on-line and submit that on our on-line form. And if you mail it in, we have a mail-in form attached to our fact sheet. As long as that's postmarked by July 8th, that will be

submitted into the record.

So before we begin with introductions, I would like to ask everyone -- if you haven't done so already -- to please silence your cell phones and other media devices.

Also we have enlisted the help of a court reporter who will be transcribing everything said at tonight's meeting. So we'll ask you to -- we'd ask if you do have a question or when it comes to the public comment portion, speak clearly, and then we're going to ask you to state and spell your name and any affiliation that you may want to announce as well.

So first myself, Diane Russell. I'm the Community Involvement Coordinator for the Kalamazoo Project. I'll be presiding over tonight's meeting.

We also have Sheila Desai, the EPA project manager for the site. She'll be giving tonight's presentation and is available to answer questions. And we also have other folks from the EPA, Jim Saric,

the project manager for the Kalamazoo River. We also have Michigan Department of Environmental Quality Project Manager Paul Bucholtz, who is also here tonight.

So with that, I will go ahead and kick it off and hand it over to Sheila to go over the proposed plan. Sheila?

MS. DESAI: Hi, everybody. I am Sheila Desai. I'm the project manager for the Plainwell Mill site which is Operable Unit 7 of the Allied Paper/Portage Creek/ Kalamazoo River Superfund site.

I'll discuss the clean-up plan for soil at the Plainwell Mill site, or Operable Unit 7 or OU7 as I might refer to it later on. First I will go over the site history and background and then I will discuss the clean-up alternatives, go over EPA selection criteria and then EPA recommended clean-up alternatives and I'll go over the next step and discuss a public comment period and other resource areas for other information.

So this is -- I'm trying to get the

pointer. This is the Kalamazoo River. And I just wanted to show you where the Plainwell Mill is compared to the rest of the river. And it's the green area there. And here is a zoomed-in area.

So the brown outline is the outline of the property for the Plainwell Mill site or OU7, and it is along the Kalamazoo River.

This site operated as a paper mill from 1884 to 2000 -- from at least 1884 to 2000 and it was operated by various different companies. From 1954 to 2000 there was waste water treatment treated on-site. In 1990 it was placed on the National Priorities List with the rest of the Kalamazoo River Superfund site.

In 2007 -- I mean 2005, a legal agreement called a consent decree was put in place between the EPA and Weyerhaeuser to conduct work at the site and do the clean-up.

In 2006 the City of Plainwell purchased the property and in 2011 CRA or Conestoga-Rovers & Associates purchased a

portion of the property. The site is 36.2 acres, approximately.

So for the contamination history, it was a paper mill. It manufactured paper products and recycled paper materials which did include carbonless copy paper, or the de-inking of carbonless copy paper, which had PCBs. The water was treated on-site in a wastewater treatment plant and the wastewater sludge was dewatered in lagoons.

So just to go over some of the progress we've had as far as cleaning it up, in 1996 to 2007 there was preliminary investigations looking at the site. In 2005, as I mentioned, there was a consent decree signed to conduct the work.

From 2007 to 2009 there was an Emergency Response Action along the banks of the property which is adjacent to the OU, the operable unit. And this was conducted to remove visible paper residuals and PCB contamination that was greater than 50 parts per million or milligrams per kilogram in the soils and sediments. And then the banks

were restored to minimize future release of PCBs into the river.

So this is a map of where that action occurred and it was along the banks here in four different zones. The yellow is some of the areas on-site that were cleaned up in the floodplain areas.

So to continue, from 2008 to 2011 remedial investigation field work was conducted and that was conducted to characterize the site conditions, determine the nature and extent of contamination at the site, and assess the human health risk and risk to the environment.

In 2013, the remedial investigation report was finalized and approved by the EPA. And then in 2015 the feasibility study report was finalized. And that includes -- it basically presents the various clean-up options -- it was finalized and then it was also approved by the EPA. And then in June of 2015, this month, we issued the proposed plan for clean-up. We as in the EPA.

So I'm going to briefly go over

some of the investigation results that were found during the remedial investigation.

First, the remedial investigation was subdivided based on the planned future land use at the site or the planned redevelopment areas as shown in this figure. So there's eleven different areas. The yellow over here, the red, the green and the purple are considered commercial areas or nonresidential areas as well as this little sliver in here which was a water closet which was considered nonresidential as well for clean-up purposes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is the slide available on-line?

MS. DESAI: Yes, it is. I also have -- yes, it is available on-line. It's also in the long proposed plan that's on-line.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you speak up, please?

MS. DESAI: It is also in the proposed long plan on-line.

The hashed areas that were not in

the middle area are all considered residential. There's mixed residential and commercial, as well as the orange and the blue. And so for clean-up purposes, all of those areas remaining will be considered residential.

So for soil, the sample results were compared to the Michigan Generic Residential and Nonresidential Clean-up Criteria and Screening Levels, or Part 201. So I'll be referring to them as Part 201 going forward rather than saying that really big, long name.

It's also compared to the federal Toxic Controlled Substance Act regulations for PCBs.

The main contaminants of concern at the site were metals, VOCs, SVOCs, PCBs, cyanide and phosphorus.

So this slide has a lot of information on it and I don't need -- I don't really need for you to read it all. I just want to show you a couple quick major points out of it. And this is also in the

proposed plan if you wanted to look at it closely -- more closely.

But it basically shows that in the soil, these are the highest concentrations of contaminants that were found based on Part 201 or TSCA, the Toxic Substances Controlled Act.

And these are the residential areas -- or eleven redevelopment areas, not residential, the eleven redevelopment areas that I showed you in the previous map. This is where those concentrations were found, or where they were exceeded.

So I guess the main point is to show that the majority or the main contaminant through the site was really arsenic. And unlike the rest of the river areas like OU5 and OU1 where the main contaminant was PCBs, this had VOCs, SVOCs, PCBs and metal as their main contaminant.

If you do want to know more details about the slide, you can talk to me afterwards and I can go over it with you. But that's really what I wanted to show on

this, is the difference in the contaminants that were found.

So even though this proposed plan is for soil only, I just wanted to go over a little bit about groundwater and just give a little bit of information on it for background purposes.

The groundwater was compared to Part 201 criteria as well as the Federal Drinking Water Standards Maximum Contaminant Levels, or MCLs. The drinking water is not affected by the site. The City of Plainwell provides water for Plainwell. There was some metals contamination under the property in the shallow groundwater. Arsenic, manganese, iron, lead, aluminum. And the groundwater will be re-evaluated after the soil clean-up is finished. It will be re-evaluated but a remedy will also be evaluated if it's necessary.

So to go over a little bit about the human health risk assessment, it was subdivided into the eleven redevelopment areas that I discussed. It evaluated

residents, trespassers, commercial workers, construction workers, utility workers, and recreational users for future and current use scenarios. It evaluated exposures to surface soil, soil and groundwater. And this was -- risk-based clean-up goals were established for arsenic and PCBs.

There was a baseline ecological assessment risk that was conducted for the Kalamazoo River in 2003. A screening level ecological risk assessment was conducted for the Plainwell Mill site. The majority of the area is paved or under buildings. And with the future redevelopment, it is planned to remain that way.

It did find that there was a potential risk to avian and/or mammalian wildlife in the riparian corridor, or it's the interface between land and water.

So ecological clean-up goals were developed based on the refined contaminants, but with those goals it was found that the soil at the site was already -- was already protective of those clean-up goals except

for lead, which will be addressed during the clean-up alternatives.

So there's also a lot of information on this slide and it's also located in the proposed plan. But this is basically an overview of the alternatives. And I will show the slide again later.

But what I wanted you to see on here is that it goes over the main remedy components. And the difference is that -- I just wanted you to see it -- there is three alternatives except for the non -- I mean the no action alternative, which is one, so there's two series and a three series.

And the difference between the two series and three series, the main difference is that the two series has an on-site consolidation component to it.

The other difference going through the alternatives, you'll notice is that there's a different land use. And then what varies is the arsenic clean-up goal and the PCB clean-up goal and cost.

So I'm going to go over each

alternative individually next. So the first alternative, alternative one, is the no action alternative. The EPA always includes a no action alternative just for comparison. And it is zero dollars.

So for the rest of the eight alternatives, they all have common elements. All of the items I'm going to go over right now are going to be in all of the rest of the alternatives, and that includes the pre-remedial design delineation, which would be determining the vertical and horizontal extent of the contamination.

There is pre-excavation activities. These are really detailed in the feasibility study and it includes things like erosion control measures or decommissioning activities that need to be done before they can excavate.

So then all of the alternatives will excavate areas impacted above the clean-up goals for soil. And what I mentioned earlier is that the clean-up goals is what really varies between the

alternatives.

The removal of the coal tunnel and associated materials will be done for all of the alternatives.

The excavated areas will be backfilled with clean fill. And then restoration will occur if needed.

And there will be monitoring and maintenance of the cap or cover, which would be -- for the two alternatives would have a cap or cover because there is consolidation on-site, and then there is existing concrete slabs for the majority of the alternatives.

And then institutional controls which would be based on land use restrictions or a raised garden bed or community garden.

So the two series, there's an A, B, C, and D under the two series sub alternatives. And for all of them, they'll have consolidation of metals-impacted material with concentrations between the residential and nonresidential clean-up goals.

And those materials will be consolidated on-site in a designated area that's considered nonresidential. So basically the soil between the residential and nonresidential clean-up areas will just be on-site and then there's a gravel cover that would be installed on that material.

The rest of the offsite disposal, offsite disposal of the VOCs, SVOCs and metals above the inhalation criteria in 201 and then nonresidential clean-up goals, the material that contains coal or coal debris, all of that would be taken offsite and disposed in a permanent landfill.

There is engineering controls which include a soil management plan since there will be soil remaining on-site for these activities. The engineering controls are for the gravel covering I mentioned and for concrete slabs where some arsenic contamination may remain.

The three series which also has an A, B, C and D underneath it, sub-alternatives, is off-site disposal of

the VOCs, SVOCs, metals, and material that contains coal and coal debris and PCB-impacted material above the clean-up goals. So basically everything goes outside except for a little bit of arsenic, some arsenic contamination that's under existing slabs which engineering controls are required for, except for 3-A.

So now I'm going to go over each one individually. So there's another slide. There's a lot of information on it. But what we really need to see is what changes between each sub-alternative, A, B, C and D for the clean-up goals. And I'm going to go over all of them.

So for sub-alternative A, it is cleaned up to -- and once again, 2A is off-site consolidation -- I mean onsite consolidation with some offsite disposal and then 3A is offsite disposal.

And I'm going to reiterate that going forward just to put it into your head.

So 2A is clean-up to residential. And this is regardless of land use. So

they're not taking into account the land use that I mentioned with the redevelopment areas. It is residential clean-up goals, and this is Part 201 and then residential Part 201 and residential Part 201. (Pointing.)

The difference is that the clean-up goal for PCBs will be one which is based on the Toxic Substances Control Act for all of the areas.

So alternative 2A, it cleans up to residential, it leaves no place to consolidate the soil on the site because there's no nonresidential area anymore. So that alternative was not retained and it wasn't carried through the proposed plan and the cost was not calculated. Alternative 3A costs 9.42 million.

So this -- even though this is a really small map, it's hard to read, I do have a larger copy if you want to look at it.

I'm going to go over all of the -- there's a different one for each

sub-alternative, A, B, C and D, and what you really need to see is that the areas -- you know, the areas change when I go through each one. And these are what areas are going to be excavated based on the sub-alternative.

So the code basically is the green is to zero to two feet excavation. The blue is two to five feet excavated. The pink is five to ten feet excavated. And the orange is greater than ten feet.

So the next one is the B alternatives. And once again, 2B is on-site consolidation with some off-site disposal. And 3B is off-site disposal. This is clean-up to residential and non-residential Part 201 criteria throughout the property except for PCBs.

The PCB concentrations for clean-up is based on a risk-based number which is actually lower than the Part 201 number for clean-up. And it's 2.5 and 9.1. The 2.5 is for residential and 9.1 is for nonresidential.

And then the B alternative does have engineering controls which leaves some arsenic contamination under existing concrete slabs.

Can we -- can you save the questions for after?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's not really a question. You need to show us on the map. Where are those concrete slabs?

MS. DESAI: I have a separate map I can show you after the presentation.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you show everybody during the presentation?

MS. DESAI: I can but it varies by alternative. Here, let me show you the next one.

So it's in the buildings, where the buildings are. Some of it is in historic buildings. And then where the parking lot is, where the buildings were. Where one of the buildings was. So I can show you specific locations. It's kind of hard to see on this map.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I

understand. I think it's important for us to see the answers to these questions.

MS. DESAI: So the differences now, the 2B is 4.46 million and 3B is 4.36 million.

So back to the slide once again, this is the excavation areas for the B alternative -- the sub-B alternatives. Green once again is zero to two feet, blue is two to five feet, pink is five to ten feet and orange is greater than ten feet.

Next is the C alternatives. They are very similar to the B alternatives. Once again 2C is on-site consolidation with some on-site disposal and 3C is off-site disposal.

So this C alternative, like the B alternative, is clean-up to residential Part 201 criteria and non-residential Part 201 criteria based on the future land use. PCBs are also cleaned up to the same as the B alternatives.

The difference is that the arsenic number is based on a risk-based number. So

it's slightly lower than what's in Part 201 for arsenic. And the number is 6.4 for residential and 27 for nonresidential.

And the cost is five million for 2C and 4.8 million for -- 4.88 million for 3C.

And then these are the excavation areas for the C alternatives. And I can go over it again. Green is zero to two feet, blue is two to five feet, pink is five to ten feet, and the orange is greater than ten feet.

So then there's the D alternatives. Once again 2D is off-site consolidation with some -- on-site consolidation with some off-site disposal, while 3 is off-site disposal.

Similar to the B alternatives and the C alternatives, it is cleaned up to Part 201. Residential clean-up criteria based on the residential land use and nonresidential based on the nonresidential land use.

The PCBs are cleaned up to TSCA, one for residential and then one for the

Waterfront Plaza and then ten for nonresidential. And then the arsenic was based on a risk-based number but that number was below the background so it is defaulting to background throughout the site.

And similar to that 2A alternative, the 2D alternative does not have a place to put the consolidated material on-site. So it was not retained. Since most of it would then be residential, there is no place to put the soil. So 2D was not calculated. 3D is 7.48 million. And this alternative does have some arsenic remaining under existing concrete slabs.

These are the excavated areas for the D alternatives. Once again, the green is zero to two feet, blue is two to five feet. Pink, five to ten. And orange, greater than ten.

So any alternatives are compared to the nine Superfund Remedy Selection Criteria. And these criteria, there's a threshold criteria, which is page three of the facts sheet, if you have a facts sheet,

it discusses each criteria in detail.

But the criteria are overall protection of human health and the environment. And the compliance with applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements, which are ARARs.

The balancing criteria are long-term effectiveness and permanence, reduction in toxicity, mobility or volume through treatment, short-term effectiveness, implementability and cost.

And then the modifying criteria are State acceptance and community acceptance.

Now, the EPA is required to select a criteria which meets the threshold requirement. So the next slide shows the comparison of all of the alternatives compared to these nine selection evaluation criteria. The table is also in the fact sheet if you want to follow along.

Alternative one, which is a no action alternative, doesn't meet any of the criteria and was not evaluated further.

2A and D do not meet compliance

with the regulations, or you know, the applicable relevant and appropriate requirements or ARARs which was a threshold requirement. So those weren't carried forward either.

The rest of them, 2B and 2C and the whole 3 series meet the threshold criteria and most of the balancing criteria. None of the remedies use treatment because no viable treatment is available for these materials.

So the costs are compared here. Alternative 3A is the most expensive at 9.42 million. And 3B is the least expensive at 4.36 million. The EPA preferred alternative is 3B. The State supports this alternative 3B. And then the community acceptance will be evaluated after the public comment period.

So this is a slide I showed you earlier. As I mentioned, alternative 2A and 2D are grayed out because there was no area for them to actually be implemented. And so they weren't retained through the proposed plan.

3B is the EPA preferred alternative. And it's excavation and off-site disposal with engineering controls for existing concrete slabs where some arsenic contamination remains.

The clean-up goals are Part 201 based on land use. Even the arsenic is Part 201. And then a risk-based clean-up goal for PCBs. And then the cost is 4.36 million.

So the EPA recommended alternative is 3B. It is recommended because it is protective of human health and the environment. It meets State and Federal regulations or the ARARs, which are applicable and relevant and appropriate requirements.

It is implementable. It is long-term and short-term effective. It is the least costly protective alternative. And it cleans up to residential and non-residential Part 201 standards and below Part 201 standards for PCBs.

So the next steps. We're currently

at the proposed plan where we present the preferred alternative. And it is open to a thirty-day comment period. The next step here is we would consider the public comments, which could change the remedy. So your opinion does count.

After we evaluate the comments that we received, we have a Record of Decision which contains a selected remedy for the site and it provides responses for all of the comments received during the public comment period.

Usually after the Record of Decision, there's a negotiation period to negotiate clean-up, but as I mentioned earlier, we already have a consent decree in place so we don't need to negotiate the clean-up.

So we go straight into the remedial design and then the clean-up which is the remedial action. As I mentioned earlier, this proposed clean-up does not address groundwater. But it could make it not necessary.

So therefore after the clean-up is completed for soil, we'll re-evaluate the groundwater and reassess to see if there is a risk. And if there is a risk that remains, we'll re-evaluate a groundwater remedy.

And then there's already a five-year review in place for the whole Kalamazoo River site and the next one is in 2015. So that will continue. And the Plainwell Mill or Operable Unit 7 is part of that review process.

So the public comment period started June 8th and will continue to July 8th. You can review documents at the on-line website for the Kalamazoo River project. I believe the link is located in the fact sheet. And then these local libraries also have documents, or there's the EPA regional office. And that's it.

MS. RUSSELL: Thank you, Sheila.

We're going to open it up for questions now. But before we do that, I just wanted to remind everyone, you know, we

have audio here tonight. And we do have a court reporter so what I would ask, if you do have a question, please just go ahead and raise your hand and Sheila will call on you.

But please state your name slowly and spell it for the court reporter so she can capture that and speak as loudly as you can so she can also hear your questions. So just a good reminder to speak slowly, speak clearly.

And also now is the time to ask your questions since at the comment period, we cannot respond to any questions at that point. Any questions or things put during the public comment period, the formal verbal public comment will be reflected in a document that's called the Responsiveness Summary where the EPA will then respond to those questions and comments placed during the formal comment period.

You had a question back there?

MR. HARRISON: Dayle Harrison. I just had a procedural issue. One of the concerns I had, some of the key questions we

get short answers for are at the meetings and I think it would be more preferred if those questions were put in the register and you responded to them as part of the official record for this public meeting.

Do you follow me?

MS. RUSSELL: I do. To reiterate, the questions that we have during this portion of the meeting, you would like to see submitted during the formal public comment portion?

MR. HARRISON: Responded to by EPA in the register.

MS. RUSSELL: What I would encourage you to do -- because I don't want to tie folks up who have general clarification questions.

If you do have a question that you would like EPA to respond to in the responsiveness summary, that would need to be put in the verbal comments or something you want to write down and submit to EPA that way as well.

MR. HARRISON: I don't want to be

argumentative. Why complicate matters? People raise questions here that are not answered or not answered in great detail. Why not provide the answer in the official record?

MS. RUSSELL: And I understand what you're asking. We have to follow a certain process for how we submit this. It's formal comments during the comment portion. So I think some folks who come to these meetings -- we want to divide it up in a way and the EPA likes to run meetings in a way so that folks who just wanted some quick questions answered, and it's not something that's long and lengthy, that would be appropriate for the record, that's what this time is for. This quick answer, you know, I had a clarification question.

But if you have an in depth question or statement that you want to be a part of the record, by all means put that at the formal verbal portion of the meeting or submit that written either in the mail or faxed or on the on-line comment form. So

yes, Dayle?

MR. HARRISON: Just to repeat and follow-up, are you going to bring the slides back during the official public comment period so we can respond to specific slides?

MS. RUSSELL: I think we can accommodate that. But hold on, I had a response here from someone from the EPA here.

MS. WOOD: Dayle, if you want, we can do that.

MS. RUSSELL: State who you are for the court reporter.

MS. WOOD: Nicole Wood, I'm the attorney for the site from the EPA. So what you can do is you can refer back to something during the formal comment period because we do bifurcate the process.

So the formal comment period starts after this general question session. And the purpose of the general question session is to clarify things so you can formalize your public comment.

So if you want to refer back to it,

if you have a formal question during this time and you don't want to write it, you can refer back to it because we do have a court reporter. So when we do the responsiveness summary, we can know -- you know, just state your name both times. That would be helpful.

MS. RUSSELL: That might be a good option.

MR. HARRISON: So you're not saying, as I thought you would or hoped you would, that if during my public comments that if I wanted to see specific slides for more information, you can't bring that up.

MS. RUSSELL: Yes.

MS. WOOD: During the public comment portion, sure.

MR. HARRISON: During the public comment portion, thank you.

MS. RUSSELL: It sounds like if you asked a question during the informal part, if you wanted to reference back to it and say it is to my previous question before, just reference it that way and we can tie

those together as well. So you won't have to state your question all over again if it's a long question.

So hopefully that was a little accommodating for you. But really this time, if you had some clarification questions, things that we can just, you know, informally respond to right now on the presentation on the proposed plan, now would be the time to do that and we would be happy to answer your questions.

Yes, state your name, please, for the court reporter.

MS. MARTINSON: Name is Kris Martinson, M-a-r-t-i-n-s-o-n. I live directly across from the clean-up site on the other side of the river.

And during the 2007 and 2008 clean-up, there was quite a bit of dust blowing in our direction. And we couldn't leave our windows open for two summers. And the dust infiltrated everything. It was pretty bad.

And I was wondering what they were

1 going to do for the dust because there has
2 been two documented cases of cancer on that
3 bank just since 2008. There's just too much
4 stuff blowing across from the southwesterly
5 and westerly winds on that north shore
6 during these clean-ups.
7 MS. DESAI: For dust, correct me if
8 I'm wrong, Richard, but I believe that
9 during the clean-up they plan to use water
10 to minimize the dust.
11 MS. MARTINSON: It was pretty bad
12 last time. It blew all over the place. As
13 they trucked it away, there was more dust
14 being picked up and the winds were carrying
15 it right over to the other side of the river
16 where we all live. It was pretty bad. And
17 you're going to have it closer to downtown
18 now, so I worry about the people in the
19 downtown area.
20 MR. GAY: Yes, water will be used.
21 MS. DESAI: That is correct.
22 So the plan is to minimize the dust
23 as much as possible and they will be using
24 water. And I don't know, there might be

other methods too.

MS. DESAI: Yes?

MR. KORNHEISER: I have three areas. I'll just take one at a time.

MS. RUSSELL: Your name, please.

MR. KORNHEISER: Kenneth, K-e-n-n-e-t-h, Kornheiser, K-o-r-n-h-e-i-s-e-r.

So I have three question areas. Do you want me to do one?

MS. DESAI: Let's do one first.

MR. KORNHEISER: The simplest one is you said that there was wastewater sludge dewatering on-site. So I would like to know where on that map it was and where was the dry sludge disposed of, on-site or off-site.

MS. DESAI: Let's go back to the redevelopment map. Because it lists some of the buildings. So the wastewater treatment plant I believe is this area, am I right?

MS. RUSSELL: Yes.

MS. DESAI: I can't read it. And so those are the lagoons that were there where it was dewatered in the lagoons. And

then it was disposed of at -- what was it?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 12th Street landfill.

MR. KORNHEISER: Are you ready for the second question?

MS. DESAI: Yes.

MR. KORNHEISER: The second question is the concrete slabs are recommended to be left in place with engineering controls. How long do you expect those concrete slabs to remain in place?

And what happens when the redevelopment takes place and are those concrete slabs going to be required to remain in place? And what's going to guarantee that they remain in place or are they going to be allowed to be removed?

And then what will be the remediation or removal and clean-up of the arsenic that's now revealed?

MS. DESAI: Okay. So afterwards I will show you the figure because it's a smaller figure, I don't want to hold it up,

but the majority of it is under slabs in existing buildings. So they are historical buildings. The city plans to put new buildings in those places. So those will be covered.

The rest of it is under concrete slabs that were buildings or will be demoed buildings and they are planned to be a property line. So if that was changed, it would be in the deed restriction. In order to change it, they would have to get approval from the EPA.

And if they remove the slabs, they would -- and they wanted to remove the slabs and just have exposed dirt, they would have to clean it up to the commercial number, non-residential number because it's all in one area and it's a non-residential area. But they would still need permission from the EPA to do so.

MR. KORNHEISER: What is the lifetime on slabs anticipated?

MS. DESAI: The EPA does a five year review because that is considered

contamination left on-site. So every five years we have to go out and make sure the slabs are still in place and that the integrity is good and that there isn't any problems with them.

MR. KORNHEISER: Is money going to be held not only to go back and look but to remove the slabs if they are deteriorated and remove the contaminated soil underneath if necessary?

MS. DESAI: Well, at this point it would be based on if the slabs are -- we have the responsible party that's doing the clean up. So if the slabs are deteriorated, we still have -- EPA would then ask the responsible party.

MR. KORNHEISER: So you have to go back and ask for more money? It wouldn't be in the negotiated agreement in advance? Will you maintain a trust for the clean up?

MS. DESAI: They're required to keep the integrity of the slabs. So we go back and inspect them every five years. Does that make sense?

MR. KORNHEISER: Yes.
MS. DESAI: Does that make sense?
MR. KORNHEISER: It's the answer. I'm not sure I'm satisfied with it but that's the answer.
MS. DESAI: Okay.
MR. KORNHEISER: Well, I worry about trying to get more money later on. It's been, you know, like pulling teeth. I'm a veterinarian. So pulling teeth from a horse is difficult, dangerous and frustrating. And it has been a long process to get to this point.
And I won't go into any of that except to say I now have to believe that that money is going to be available to be satisfied, and your answer doesn't quite satisfy it. It's not up to you but that's my problem.
MS. DESAI: Okay.
MR. KORNHEISER: Okay. Third question.
MS. DESAI: Okay.
MR. KORNHEISER: All right. You

have said, and you know, you personally stated this and it says in the summary sheet that high levels of arsenic were present. You showed us a table of, you know, contaminants and required levels for clean up and the danger zones, the danger levels.

And it looked to me like arsenic was in all areas on the site, including possible residential areas, and had arsenic levels exceeding residential -- and you'll have to tell me what the acronym DCC stands for.

MS. DESAI: That is direct contact criteria.

MR. KORNHEISER: Okay. So all of the site, including potential residential areas, it looks like.

MS. DESAI: Except for this area. It is bolded because it's based on the risk based number.

MR. KORNHEISER: So almost the entire site has arsenic in excess of the residence DCC, the direct contact requirement, and the clean-up option which

EPA is recommending is 3B. Okay, the big difference between 3B and 3C, as I can see it, is that 3C will do a better clean up of arsenic. Is that correct?

MS. DESAI: It is, I believe, just over one part per million difference.

MR. KORNHEISER: Okay. However, it is also only a twelve percent increase to go after that higher safer level of arsenic. Why isn't the EPA saying, gee, for another $510,000 we can do a better job?

MS. DESAI: Because the 3B alternative is protective. It's long-term protective and short-term protective. So we had to evaluate all of the criteria. And all of the criteria also takes into consideration the cost. But it's not going to necessarily increase the protectiveness if your look at the risk assessment.

MR. KORNHEISER: And option 3D would get even more arsenic. And it says that arsenic clean-up criteria would be the State default background level which would require clean up to below residential

criteria.

So if I understand this correctly, the EPA is willing to be satisfied with a less adequate clean-up of arsenic than the State background level. Is that correct?

MS. DESAI: The EPA is satisfied to cleaning up to the Michigan Part 201 numbers which are the clean-up numbers for the State of Michigan which are actually to the -- it's a ten-to-the-minus-five risk level. I don't know if you are familiar with the risk levels. And the EPA risk range is actually ten-to-the-minus-four to ten-to-the-minus-six. So it is actually much more stringent than the EPAs.

MR. KORNHEISER: The State's levels are more stringent than the federal?

MS. DESAI: Yes.

MR. KORNHEISER: But neither one is up to Michigan levels?

MS. DESAI: It is almost impossible to clean up to background. So usually EPA does not require clean-up to background. It's not impossible but almost impossible.

It's pretty hard.

Yes?

MR. SURINE: My name is Jon Surine, J-o-n, S-u-r-i-n-e.

In relation to this lady's question about dust across the river and everywhere, winds can be blowing, will the EPA be willing to provide any air monitoring devices to measure trace elements and will they be available for public record?

MS. DESAI: Richard, do you recall if there was air monitoring listed?

MR. GAY: No.

MR. SURINE: I would request it.

MS. WOOD: I don't know if they are, Sheila.

MS. DESAI: We'll consider it and take it into account that it was requested. I'm not positive if it's listed in the options.

Yes?

MS. RICHARDS: There was one site -- I'm sorry. My name is Janie Richards. And I'm curious as to getting a

copy of all of these slides you have been showing.

MS. RUSSELL: We will have that on our website after the meeting.

MS. RICHARDS: I was going to ask, is it on the WWW region five?

MS. RUSSELL: Yes, that website on the fact sheet.

MS. RICHARDS: I can print them off from there?

MS. RUSSELL: Yes, you can.

MS. RICHARDS: Awesome, thank you.

MS. DESAI: Yes?

MR. HARRISON: Dayle Harrison, Kalamazoo River Protection Association. I have a whole series of questions.

Let's just begin with something that Ken brought up about the pretreatment of the paper waste back in the days when it was being discharged.

As far as I recall, having been on the river a long time, there wasn't much secondary treatment. So was there some sense that it was resolving the PCBs

entering the river? I'm not sure what you meant when you included that in your statement.

MS. DESAI: It was just mentioning that that was done on-site. And then that just could be a possible contamination towards the site because that was treated on-site and then the lagoons were where it was dewatered and then the sludge was then taken to the landfill.

MR. HARRISON: So there is no statement or no conviction on your part that all of the contamination was resolved before it entered the river and the discharge?

MS. DESAI: Yeah, I don't --

MR. HARRISON: Let me move on.

MS. DESAI: I mean there was no -- there was nothing that says it went -- I don't know what went to the river. I don't think --

MR. BUCHOLTZ: Dayle, are you just trying to get at -- I'm Paul Bucholtz.

Are you trying to ask if there's some implication in the fact that it was

treated that somehow some of the PCBs were getting in the river?

MR. HARRISON: That's where I'm going.

MR. BUCHOLTZ: And the answer to that is no. At least my understanding, they should have brought it up. It's just that we know that some of these activities happened on-site, they had the clarifiers in the lagoons. It's just another area for us to look at. But PCBs still made it in the river.

MR. HARRISON: I'm not clear and I don't know if you can -- you probably have the information, I don't know if you have it here tonight, but I can't help but wonder how many samples were taken in the residential and commercial units, the separate units that you have outlined in the pink, the green, the blue.

MS. DESAI: There's a lot. I do have a copy on my laptop but it's also on the clean-up site -- the website. Because the feasibility study is -- it is uploaded?

MS. RUSSELL: Yes.
MS. DESAI: So that's uploaded and it summarizes the sample points.
MR. HARRISON: Do you have estimates of how many samples were taken and what the depths might have been for each zone?
MR. BUCHOLTZ: Is that summarized in the proposed plan?
MS. DESAI: The depths aren't summarized. And the number of samples I don't think are summarized. Offhand I don't have that. But it is also listed in the feasibility study and I can show you that after or it's available on-line.
MR. BUCHOLTZ: And it's in the RI report.
MS. DESAI: Yeah, it's in the remediation report as well.
MR. HARRISON: Do you have any sense of the distribution of PCBs in the soil from top to bottom? Because I guess you answered that, you don't have that available.

MS. DESAI: I don't have it with me. So these are the areas. This is the highest. What I did summarize was the highest total PCBs that were found.

MR. HARRISON: The 37 in the residential area, is that the pink?

MS. DESAI: Let me go back. So it was residential area four, right?

MR. BUCHOLTZ: Yeah.

MS. DESAI: Which is the hashed orange. So it is this area.

MR. HARRISON: And then of the total 36 acres, how much of that is either building, surfaces, concrete or parking lot areas? Do you know how many acres that is?

MS. DESAI: Off hand we don't know the acreage. But it's pretty much this whole area is buildings, and I believe isn't it all the way up to this -- almost up to here. So the buildings are outlined on some of it.

MR. HARRISON: So it could be as much as seventy percent of the site?

MS. DESAI: It's probably more like

fifty or forty. I don't know exactly. Like pretty much all of this is paved in here, or it's buildings. This might be grassy, from what I'm trying to remember. We didn't tour the site this morning.

MR. HARRISON: You were talking about recovering under one of the alternatives underneath the slabs but how about under the paved areas, are you going to do remediation under the paved areas, is that in the alternatives? Did I miss that?

MS. DESAI: Yeah, the excavation areas on some of it. It is only arsenic contamination that would remain under existing slabs. Let me go back to the 3B excavations. So this area, some of this area over here is under concrete. I have a bigger version of this, so I might be able to show it to you.

MR. HARRISON: How about the parking lot areas, the paved parking areas. What is underneath that?

MS. DESAI: Right here, this one?

MR. HARRISON: There are a lot of

parking lots.

MS. DESAI: Yeah, there is a lot of parking. So I'm wondering which area. I would have to look up on this map but I don't think there's any -- it doesn't look like --

MR. WILSON: That's all clean fill.

MS. DESAI: Yeah, I don't think there's anything under there that needs be to excavated. I don't think there's any contamination. Go ahead and state your name.

MR. WILSON: Sorry, it's Erik, E-r-i-k, Wilson, W-i-l-s-o-n. I'm the city manager of Plainwell.

MS. DESAI: But if you see these little squares, I think those are all sample points. So that might help you a little bit on your numbers.

MR. HARRISON: Well, in the alternative, let me just quickly get that up. Alternative 3A, does that include all of the contamination underneath the paved portion of the site?

MS. DESAI: Yes, 3A does.

MR. HARRISON: Okay. One of the questions I have on the ground water, one of the fundamentals of ecology is that water flows down to the flow of the river. So I'm wondering how extensive you've studied that.

It sounds like it's a little premature to say we're going to look at that a little bit later.

MS. DESAI: So --

MR. HARRISON: Let me finish, please. It seems like it's a little premature to say we're going to look at that as a remedy. It sounds like we should look at it now as a proposed alternative. Did I miss something here? How much work has been done on that area?

MS. DESAI: How much work on what?

MR. HARRISON: Groundwater movement.

MS. DESAI: The remedial investigation report looked at the groundwater thoroughly. I do have a slide I can show you.

MR. HARRISON: Okay.

MS. DESAI: I will have to bring it up. It's the groundwater contamination and then when you see it, you can maybe see why we are waiting until the soil clean-up is complete to re-evaluate it because they are barely above the drinking water standards. The exceedances. So I can bring it up for you now. Hold on.

MS. RUSSELL: So to clarify while you're doing that. Is it safe to say that what we do for the soil clean-up could impact and actually improve conditions for the groundwater, is that a fair statement?

MS. DESAI: Correct.

MS. RUSSELL: So by doing this first thing, doing the soil clean-up, that might improve conditions for the groundwater.

MR. HARRISON: I understand. Whether it's going to do it successfully or not, that's another question.

Is there some concern that part of the redevelopment in Plainwell is centered

on the proposition that they want some of these buildings left in place and intact? Is that an issue for the EPA?

MS. DESAI: That they want to keep the buildings intact?

MR. HARRISON: A lot of them, you know.

MS. DESAI: No, that is not an issue.

MR. HARRISON: Do they want them torn down?

MS. DESAI: Does the EPA want them torn town?

MR. HARRISON: No, the city.

MS. DESAI: Do you want to answer that?

MR. WILSON: What is the question?

MR. HARRISON: We just wondered if the buildings are going to be maintained as they are today on the cement pads.

MR. WILSON: The Plainwell Paper Mill is on the National Register of Historic Places. So we leave buildings intact. If you go to Plainwell.org, we have a concept

plan that shows the buildings that are -- they call it significantly contributing to the historical value. Those buildings will stay in place.

MR. HARRISON: So it's possible that if we're going to look at preserving those areas and not removing the slabs -- I guess you can't preserve them without preserving the slabs, but has the EPA looked at doing some underground reinforcement to preserve the integrity of the buildings and yet being able to remediate the underground contamination -- the under-the-slab contamination?

MS. DESAI: The EPA has not looked into that. The slabs are considered protective. That's one reason, is that it is a protective barrier. So we do clean-ups based on risk. And then leaving a slab in place eliminates the risk for exposure to those contaminants.

MR. HARRISON: If you were to select a total clean-up option, how would you do that?

MS. DESAI: I'm not --

MR. HARRISON: How would you remove the contaminated soil underneath the buildings and in the parking lot if you chose the preferred alternative of complete removal of the contamination down to Part 201 standards?

MS. DESAI: It was costed out for alternative A. It was not costed out for the rest of them. So they would have to do it with the National Historic Preservation Act in compliance with that for the historical buildings.

MR. HARRISON: What's your ten-to-the-minus-six risk assessment, one hundred thousand?

MS. DESAI: One million.

MR. HARRISON: And maybe this is a question for Paul. I'm wondering where the DEQ on this.

MR. BUCHOLTZ: We're in support of the 3B alternative. We think it's protective.

MR. HARRISON: Thank you.

MS. DESAI: Did you want to see the groundwater slide?

MR. HARRISON: So tell me about that. How many wells, how many --

MS. DESAI: You probably can't read it. I have a copy of it up here. But it mainly tells you -- these are the contaminants. It's iron and manganese, most of them. All of these are iron and manganese. Manganese. Manganese. (Pointing) And then these with the yellow are the two areas where there was arsenic. So this goes down to this one. And this one goes to that one.

So iron and manganese are actually drinking water standards. Federal drinking water standards. They are secondary. And for 201 they are considered -- I think they are what? I know you can't read it. I can read it closer. I think it was non-drinking water standards or non-potable.

MR. BUCHOLTZ: Well, we have the drinking water protection in the GSI.

MR. SARIC: I'm Jim Saric with the

USEPA.

Sheila, can you clarify for Dayle that every one of those dots, those are all wells, okay? And all of them were sampled for everything, including arsenic, correct?

MS. DESAI: Yeah, they were sampled for a whole suite of chemicals.

MR. SARIC: So the ones you see in the yellow, like the arsenic was identified, these exceeded the drinking water. So what you see is that you don't have a plume of contamination, what you have is a couple of isolated wells that are here and then there (pointing) that have had the detections of arsenic above that. And it's over time. You haven't had -- like you don't have this increase or decrease of arsenic. It was let's remove the soil and then see if that soil removal is going to make it better.

MR. HARRISON: So how about the wells along the edge of the river?

MR. SARIC: They sampled them and they did not identify arsenic.

MR. HARRISON: How about PCBs?

MR. SARIC: No, they were not detected.

MS. DESAI: The only detection is what you see.

MR. HARRISON: It's hard to read.

MS. DESAI: I have it up here if you want to see it closer.

MR. SARIC: So really what you're seeing, Dayle, is that there is iron and manganese, arsenic, there is lead that was detected. Those were detected. And only the ones that were highlighted in yellow exceeded the standards.

MR. HARRISON: What I'm wondering is that it seems like in the residential area four where the levels were 37 parts per million, at least one sample showed that. I'm just wondering, is there any removal from that site at all?

MR. SARIC: I think that was a soil sample.

MR. HARRISON: Right.

MS. DESAI: So that might be this area.

MR. HARRISON: I didn't see any wells there specifically.

MR. SARIC: Those dots there.

MS. DESAI: Dots there, dots there, dots there.

MR. HARRISON: 300 feet apart, maybe?

MR. BUCHOLTZ: Around that, yeah.

MS. DESAI: Does that answer your other questions too?

MR. HARRISON: That's good for now, thanks.

MS. DESAI: Okay.

MS. RUSSELL: Any other questions? Otherwise we can take a break here.

Go ahead and state your name, please.

MS. MCCARTHY: Jamie McCarthy, M-c-C-a-r-t-h-y. I just had a question about where you delineated residential and non-residential. Was that based on city zoning and how they plan to reuse the property?

MS. DESAI: Yes.

MS. MCCARTHY: Thanks.

MR. WILSON: Erik Wilson, City Manager. I just wanted to stress, the city has a concept plan. We do not have a site plan for the Mill site. So obviously in 2007 -- we acquired the mill in 2006, trying to seek developers, we wanted to get some idea of where we thought the development would go. So it is certainly not a site plan, it's a concept plan. I just wanted the record to state that.

MS. DESAI: And then if that changes, and the redevelopment areas need to change, we would have to -- we would have to reassess that area. Yes?

MR. HARRISON: Dayle Harrison. I understand the ideas and issues that the city has concerning the restoration. I respect that. But I also am concerned that we have sites that are kind of vague about what is actually going to happen with them. Some residential, some commercial.

So I'm confused by what they look like side by side and overlapping one zone

to the other.

If it's an entire residential development, then would you be bound to clean up to the complete removal?

MS. DESAI: If the whole place was --

MR. HARRISON: If it was all residential hypothetically.

MS. DESAI: If it was going to be residential, then they would clean up to residential.

MR. HARRISON: Would you have to select remedy -- I believe it's 3A, complete removal?

MS. DESAI: I don't think we'd be required to do that. I think it would be somewhere in between one that wasn't selected. But since it was based on future land use, the exact remedy, I don't think would actually -- or straight residential was considered in there. It would be similar to 3A but it might not exactly be 3A. Yes?

MR. KORNHEISER: Ken Kornheiser.

Something to follow-up on that question, if the actual land use is not known, future land use is not known, and there is some desire to put in residential where it's not cleaned up to residential standards, is there going to be some legal restriction preventing the city or developers -- is there going to be a way to prevent them in the future from putting residential development in a place where the soil is not cleaned up to a residential standard?

MS. DESAI: Yes. There will be deed restrictions and a restrictive covenant in place.

MR. WILSON: I don't think the city would allow building on a piece of property that has contamination on it.

MR. KORNHEISER: That's one man's opinion.

MS. RUSSELL: Okay. Dayle?

MR. HARRISON: This is not a question but a point raised. I'm wondering how soon do you get a transcript of the meeting? Is this something that we can

review and check back before we make our formal comment? Would that be available in let's say a week or ten days?

MS. RUSSELL: You want to check the verbal comments you submit tonight to make sure it clarifies what you want within the timeframe of public comment to slip anything else in that you want in?

MR. HARRISON: Yes.

MS. RUSSELL: We can arrange to have that posted. It depends on how quickly I can get a turn-around on that. But it should be within the comment period.

MR. HARRISON: I was pleased to see that you had a longer comment period than you had before. It seemed like you had a meeting and then comments were due within a week. Did anything ever happen with that with the Area 1?

MS. RUSSELL: So we're talking about Area 1 of the Kalamazoo River clean-up, OU5. So there is an extension in place now for that comment period. So you should have gotten an e-mail from me.

MR. HARRISON: When does it expire?
MR. SARIC: July 3rd. We sent you an e-mail.
MS. RUSSELL: Maybe I'm going to your junk mail. You need to check that.
MR. HARRISON: Thanks.
MS. RUSSELL: This public comment goes to July 8th. July 8th. And for public comments, if you don't want to come and submit a verbal comment tonight, again, you can submit that, there is a form within the fact sheet and you can mail that to me, that would be recorded.
There is also a form on our website that you can link to and that will come to us.
You can also -- if you would like to fax, you can fax it to me. The fax number is also on the front of this fact sheet as well. So there are a number of ways you can submit your comments.
And for the transcript for tonight's meeting, we'll try to get that turned around fairly quickly so you can

reference that.

Okay, is there any other questions before we take a quick break so we can get re-oriented to start the formal comment period?

Again, we want to reiterate that we cannot respond to those, if you have questions during that portion, we can't respond to that tonight. But we will respond to comments and questions submitted during the -- not just tonight but over the comment period for this site, we'll respond to those in a document called a responsive summary that will be included with the Record of Decision.

So any last questions? Yes?

MR. KORNHEISER: Can you restore the slide which shows the future potential development so that when we're having a break I can have somebody look at it for me?

MS. RUSSELL: Absolutely. She's working on that. So a short four or five minute break and then we'll come back and do verbal comments. Thank you.

(There was a short break.)

MS. RUSSELL: We're going to go ahead and get started with the formal comment portion. So before we get started, a few instructions and reminders. Thank you.

So please remember this is your opportunity to provide comments which will be recorded as part of the official record for this project. The EPA will not be responding to questions or comments during this portion of the meeting. But EPA will follow-up to those responses in our responsiveness summary.

If you turned in a card, I will call your name to come up. And actually I would like to have you stand as close as you can to the court reporter so she can remember you as you give your comments.

That would be the best thing. And please speak clearly and note that only spoken words and not gestures will be recorded. And so that everyone might have a chance to speak, let's try to keep comments

brief. And we have this space reserved, but not all night.

So with that I'm going to call the first person up who is Ken Kornheiser.

Go ahead.

MR. KORNHEISER: Do you have my name? Okay.

The EPA has demonstrated that there is arsenic in all areas on the site. And the recommended clean-up level may be adequate, but I remain very concerned about that.

And I understand that it's a cost benefit decision that has to be made, and so potentially the double cost to remove all of the arsenic from all areas at the residential level will be considered and unlikely to be negotiated adequately. However, the difference between 3B and 3C is twelve percent. It is $510,000. And so I would urge that 3C be chosen in preference to 3B.

Secondly, I remain concerned about the perpetuity and protection of those

concrete slabs. And so I would urge a remedy that actually removes the arsenic from below those concrete slabs or that negotiates so that money remains so that if those concrete slabs do deteriorate, the money is already there, negotiated in advance, and not have to be negotiated in the future. Thank you.

MS. RUSSELL: Thank you, Ken.

Our next commenter is Dayle Harrison. If you wouldn't mind stepping up over here next to our court reporter, you may make your comment. Thank you.

MR. HARRISON: I'm Dayle Harrison, D-a-y-l-e. Harrison, normal spelling.

I'm the president of a group called the Kalamazoo River Protection Association. And I think this proposal that the EPA has come up with is simply not adequate.

I think the only remedy that I would advise the members of our board of directors to support is option 3A which is complete removal with removal of soil down to 201 standards.

I think the vagueness of the residential and commercial overlaps and overlays creates unsolvable problems. I think those designations are quite arbitrary. And I think to avoid problems for the city in their redevelopment plans, residential versus commercial, I think we should move to have the complete residential standards met.

So we're supporting option 3A. It takes a lot of the guesswork out of the groundwater modeling and groundwater remedy, if there is one.

The zoning issues, it leaves that open. If the city wants to grant a variance for commercial zones, they can do that. If it's all residential, I think that would be a good place for the zoning to start or begin again anew.

We'll take the time to review in more detail the remedial investigation and the RIFS and look at some of the data. I'm not satisfied at this point that there's been an adequate study of this site for the

36 acres. It doesn't seem like a lot of samples.

If you look at the Operable Unit 1 in Plainwell -- or not Plainwell but the Allied site, there are literally tens of thousands of samples that were taken. That may be an issue. I will have to look at the data and see if it is.

In my questions earlier, I'll refer to them in my comments later on, we'll address those individual concerns and review those, review the transcript hopefully within ten days and add further comments to you.

But at this point I think unequivocally I think we need to look at option 3A as a solution not just for the Kalamazoo River but for Plainwell as a whole, a community that wants to rebuild and restore their waterfront without issues of contamination and deed restrictions, et cetera. That's just not the way I think the city should go on this.

I'm sure they are still talking

with you about what they want to do and hopefully they will lend an ear to my comments. Thank you very much.

MS. RUSSELL: Thank you, Dayle.

I'm out of cards but I would open it up to anyone else if they feel like they wanted to get a comment on the record verbally now, they can do so.

Otherwise again you could -- there's a sheet within the fact sheet and you can mail that in to me. You can -- there's a form on our website, you can submit that comment there. And you can also fax it if you would like to fax your comment as well. And that comment period again is open until July 8th.

So is there anyone else who wanted to make a verbal comment tonight? Dayle, do you want to append?

MR. HARRISON: I can speak up. I have a very short point.

But I'm going to ask as part of the remediation process, whatever you have to do, before any soil is removed, that you

water it down so there is no dust leaving the site. There's a lot of water available. It shouldn't be a hardship. It may be a little heavier, but I think it is important to protect the people across the river as well. Thank you.

MS. RUSSELL: Thank you, Dayle. If there is any other comments? Okay. I'm going to go ahead and close the comment period now and go ahead and close the meeting.

Again, thank you for taking the time to come out tonight and showing your interest in the project and what we're doing here. And again, that comment period is open, if you send things by mail, as long as they're postmarked by July 8th they will be accepted.

Otherwise, have a good evening and drive home safely. Thank you very much.

(Meeting concluded at 7:42 p.m.)

****

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COUNTY OF CALHOUN

I, Marilyn J. Hubbard, Certified Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of Michigan, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the EPA hearing on June 16, 2015, is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 24th day of June, 2015.

Marilyn J. Hubbard

My commission expires: 07-25-18

$

$510,000 43:11 69:20

1

1 2:14 65:19,21 72:3
12th 38:2
1884 6:10
1954 6:12
1990 6:14
1996 7:13

2

2.5 20:22
2000 6:10,11,12
2003 13:10
2005 6:17 7:15
2006 6:22 62:6
2007 6:17 7:13,17 35:18 62:6
2008 8:8 35:18 36:3
2009 7:17
201 10:10,11 11:6 12:9 17:10 19:4,5 20:17,21 22:19,20 23:1,19 27:6,8,22, 23 44:7 57:7 58:18 70:24
2011 6:23 8:8
2013 8:15
2015 8:17,22 29:10
27 23:3
2A 18:17,23 19:11 24:6 25:24 26:20
2B 20:13 22:4 26:6
2C 22:14 23:4 26:6
2D 23:13 24:7,11 26:21

3

3 23:15 26:7
3-A 18:8
300 61:6
36 50:13 72:1
36.2 7:1
37 50:5 60:16
3A 18:20 19:17 26:12 52:22 53:1 63:13,22,23 70:22 71:10 72:17
3B 20:15 22:4 26:13,15,16 27:1, 12 43:1,2,12 51:15 57:22 69:19,22
3C 22:15 23:5 43:2,3 69:19,21
3D 24:11 43:20
3rd 66:2

4

4.36 22:4 26:14 27:9
4.46 22:4
4.8 23:5
4.88 23:5

5

50 7:22

6

6.4 23:2

7

7 2:15 5:11,15 29:11
7.48 24:12
7:42 74:21

8

8th 3:24 29:14,15 66:8 73:16 74:17

9

9.1 20:22,23
9.42 19:18 26:13

A

Absolutely 67:21
acceptance 25:13 26:17
accepted 74:18
accommodate 33:7
accommodating 35:5
account 19:1 45:18
acquired 62:6
acreage 50:17
acres 7:2 50:13,15 72:1
acronym 42:11
Act 10:15 11:7 19:9 57:12
action 7:18 8:4 14:13 15:3,4 25:22 28:21
activities 15:14, 18 17:18 48:8
actual 64:2
add 72:13
address 28:22 72:11
addressed 14:1
adequate 44:4 69:11 70:19 71:24
adequately 69:18
adjacent 7:19
advance 40:19 70:7
advise 70:21
affected 12:12
affiliation 4:14
agenda 2:17 3:5
agreement 6:18 40:19
ahead 5:5 30:3 52:11 61:16 68:3 69:5 74:9,10
air 45:8,12
Allied 5:11 72:5
allowed 38:18
alternative 14:13 15:1,2,3,4 19:11, 15,17 21:1,15 22:8,17,18 24:6,7, 12 25:21,22 26:12, 15,16,20 27:2,11, 20 28:2 43:13 52:21,22 53:15 57:5,9,22
alternatives 5:18, 20 14:2,6,12,20 15:7,10,20 16:1,4, 10,13,20 20:13 22:8,12,13,22 23:7,12,17,18 24:16,20 25:17 51:8,11
aluminum 12:16
and/or 13:17
anew 71:19
announce 4:15
answers 22:2 31:1
anticipated 39:22
anymore 19:14
append 73:19
applicable 25:5 26:2 27:16
approval 39:12
approved 8:16,21
approximately 7:2
ARARS 25:6 26:3 27:15
arbitrary 71:5
area 2:12,14 6:4,5 10:1 13:13 17:2 19:14 26:21 36:19 37:20 39:18 42:18 48:10 50:6,8,11,18 51:16,17 52:3 53:17 60:16,24 62:15 65:19,21
areas 5:22 8:6,7 9:6,7,9,10,24 10:5 11:9,10,18 12:24 15:21 16:5 17:5 19:3,10 20:2,3,4 22:7 23:7 24:15 37:4,9 42:8,9,17 50:2,15 51:9,10, 13,21 56:7 58:12 62:13 69:9,16
argumentative 32:1
arrange 65:10
arsenic 11:17 12:15 13:7 14:22 17:20 18:5,6 21:3 22:23 23:2 24:2,13 27:5,7 38:21 42:3, 7,9,22 43:4,9,21, 22 44:4 51:13 58:12 59:5,9,15, 17,23 60:10 69:9, 16 70:2
assess 8:13
assessment 12:22 13:9,11 43:19 57:15
Associates 6:24
Association 46:15 70:17
attached 3:22
attorney 33:15
audio 30:1
avian 13:17
avoid 71:5

Awesome 46:12

B

back 3:5 22:6 30:21 33:4,16,24 34:3,22 37:17 40:7,18,23 46:19 50:7 51:15 65:1 67:23

backfilled 16:6

background 5:17 12:7 24:4,5 43:23 44:5,22,23

bad 35:23 36:11, 16

balancing 25:7 26:8

bank 36:3

banks 7:18,24 8:4

barely 54:7

barrier 56:18

based 9:4 11:5 13:21 16:15 19:8 20:5,20 22:20,24 23:20,21 24:3 27:7 40:12 42:19,20 56:19 61:21 63:18

baseline 13:8

basically 8:19 11:3 14:6 17:4 18:4 20:7

bed 16:16

begin 4:2 46:17 71:19

benefit 69:14

bifurcate 33:18

big 2:13 10:13 43:1

bigger 51:18

bit 12:5,6,21 18:5 35:19 52:18 53:9

blew 36:12

blowing 35:20 36:4 45:7

blue 10:4 20:8 22:9 23:9 24:17 48:20

board 70:21

bolded 42:19

bottom 49:22

bound 63:3

break 3:11 61:15 67:3,20,23 68:1

briefly 8:24

bring 33:3 34:14 54:2,8

brought 46:18 48:7

brown 6:6

Bucholtz 5:4 47:21,22 48:5 49:8,16 50:9 57:21 58:22 61:8

building 50:14 64:16

buildings 13:13 21:17,18,19,20,21 37:19 39:2,3,4,7,8 50:18,20 51:3 55:2,5,19,23 56:1, 3,11 57:4,13

C

calculated 19:17 24:11

call 30:4 56:2 68:16 69:3

called 6:18 30:17 67:13 70:16

cancer 36:2

cap 16:9,11

capture 30:7

carbonless 7:6,7

card 3:14 68:15

cards 73:5

carried 19:16 26:4

carrying 36:14

cases 36:2

cell 4:5

cement 55:20

centered 54:24

cetera 72:22

chance 68:24

change 20:3 28:5 39:11 62:14

changed 39:9

characterize 8:11

check 65:1,4 66:5

chemicals 59:7

chose 57:5

chosen 69:21

city 6:22 12:12 39:3 52:14 55:14 61:21 62:2,3,18 64:7,15 71:6,15 72:23

clarification 31:17 32:18 35:6

clarifiers 48:9

clarifies 65:6

clarify 33:22 54:10 59:2

clean 2:13 16:6 39:16 40:14,20 42:5 43:3,24 44:22 52:7 63:4,10

clean-up 2:8,9 3:7 5:13,18,20 6:21 8:19,23 9:13 10:4, 9 12:18 13:6,20,24 14:2,22,23 15:22, 23 16:23 17:5,11 18:3,14,23 19:3,7 20:16,19,22 22:18 23:19 27:6,8 28:15,18,20,22 29:1 35:16,19 36:9 38:20 42:24 43:22 44:4,8,23 48:23 54:5,12,17 56:23 65:22 69:10

clean-ups 36:6 56:18

cleaned 8:6 18:17 22:21 23:18,23 64:5,11

cleaning 7:12 44:7

cleans 19:11 27:21

clear 48:13

close 68:17 74:9, 10

closely 11:2

closer 36:17 58:20 60:7

closet 9:11

coal 16:2 17:12 18:2

code 20:7

comment 3:11,13, 18,20 4:12 5:22 26:18 28:3,12 29:13 30:12,15,16, 20 31:11 32:9,24 33:4,17,19,23 34:17,19 65:2,7, 13,15,23 66:7,10 67:4,12 68:4 70:13 73:7,13,14,15,18 74:9,15

commenter 70:10

comments 28:5, 7,11 30:19 31:21 32:9 34:12 65:5,17 66:9,21 67:10,24 68:8,11,19,24 72:10,13 73:3 74:8

commercial 9:9 10:3 13:1 39:16 48:18 62:22 71:2, 7,16

common 15:7

community 4:17 16:17 25:13 26:16 72:19

companies 6:12

compared 6:3 10:8,14 12:8 24:20 25:18 26:11

comparison 15:4 25:17

complete 54:6 57:5 63:4,13 70:23 71:8

completed 29:2

compliance 25:4, 24 57:12

complicate 32:1

component 14:18

components 14:10

concentrations 11:4,12 16:22 20:19

concept 55:24 62:4,10

concern 10:17 54:23

concerned 62:19 69:11,23

concerns 30:24 72:11

concluded 74:21

concrete 16:12 17:20 21:4,9 24:14 27:4 38:8,11,15 39:6 50:14 51:17 70:1,3,5

conditions 8:11 54:13,18

conduct 6:20 7:16

conducted 7:20 8:10 13:9,11

Conestoga-rovers 6:24

confused 62:23

consent 6:18 7:15 28:16

consideration 43:17

considered 9:9, 12 10:1,5 17:3 39:24 56:16 58:18 63:21 69:17

consolidate 19:13
consolidated 17:2 24:8
consolidation 14:18 16:11,21 18:18,19 20:14 22:14 23:13,14
construction 13:2
contact 42:13,23
contaminant 11:16,19,20 12:10
contaminants 10:17 11:5 12:1 13:21 42:5 56:21 58:8
contaminated 40:9 57:3
contamination 7:3,22 8:12 12:14 15:13 17:21 18:6 21:3 27:5 40:1 47:6,13 51:14 52:11,23 54:3 56:13,14 57:6 59:12 64:17 72:21
continue 8:8 29:10,14
contributing 56:2
control 15:17 19:9
Controlled 10:15 11:7
controls 16:14 17:15,18 18:7 21:2 27:3 38:10
conviction 47:12
Coordinator 4:17
copy 7:6,7 19:21 46:1 48:22 58:6
correct 36:7,21 43:4 44:5 54:15 59:5
correctly 44:2
corridor 13:18
cost 14:23 19:17 23:4 25:11 27:9 43:17 69:13,15
costed 57:8,9
costly 27:20
costs 19:18 26:11
count 28:6
couple 10:23 59:12
court 4:8 30:2,6 33:13 34:3 35:13 68:18 70:12
covenant 64:13
cover 16:9,11 17:6
covered 39:5
covering 17:19
CRA 6:23
creates 71:3
Creek 5:11
criteria 5:19 10:10 12:9 17:10 20:17 22:19,20 23:19 24:22,23 25:1,2,7, 12,15,19,23 26:7,8 42:14 43:15,16,22 44:1
curious 45:24
current 13:3
cyanide 10:19

D

D-a-y-l-e 70:15
danger 42:6
dangerous 41:11
data 71:22 72:8
Dayle 30:22 33:1, 10 46:14 47:21 59:2 60:9 62:16 64:20 70:10,14 73:4,19 74:7
days 46:19 65:3 72:13
DCC 42:11,23
de-inking 7:7
debris 17:12 18:2
decision 28:8,14 67:15 69:14
decommissioning 15:17
decrease 59:17
decree 6:18 7:16 28:16
deed 39:10 64:13 72:21
default 43:23
defaulting 24:4
delineated 61:20
delineation 15:11
demoed 39:7
demonstrated 69:8
Department 5:2
depends 65:11
depth 32:19
depths 49:6,10
DEQ 57:20
Desai 2:23 4:20 5:8,9 9:16,22 21:10,14 22:3 36:7,21 37:2,11, 17,22 38:6,22 39:23 40:11,21 41:2,6,20,23 42:13,18 43:5,12 44:6,18,21 45:11, 17 46:13 47:4,15, 17 48:21 49:2,10, 18 50:1,7,10,16,24 51:12,23 52:2,8,16 53:1,10,18,21 54:2,15 55:4,8,12, 15 56:15 57:1,8,17 58:1,5 59:6 60:3,6, 23 61:4,9,13,24 62:12 63:5,9,15 64:12
design 15:11 28:20
designated 2:13, 15 17:2
designations 71:4
desire 64:4
desk 3:15
detail 25:1 32:3 71:21
detailed 15:15
details 11:21
detected 60:2,11
detection 60:3
detections 59:14
deteriorate 70:5
deteriorated 40:8,14
determine 8:11
determining 15:12
developed 13:21
developers 62:7 64:7
development 62:8 63:3 64:10 67:19
devices 4:6 45:9
dewatered 7:10 37:24 47:9
dewatering 37:14
Diane 4:16
difference 12:1 14:10,15,16,19 19:7 22:23 43:2,6 69:19
differences 22:3
difficult 41:11
direct 42:13,23
direction 35:20
directly 35:16
directors 70:22
dirt 39:15
discharge 47:14
discharged 46:20
discuss 5:13,18, 21
discussed 12:24
discusses 25:1
disposal 17:8,9, 24 18:19,20 20:14, 15 22:15,16 23:15, 16 27:3
disposed 17:14 37:16 38:1
distribution 49:21
divide 32:11
document 30:17 67:13
documented 36:2
documents 29:15,19
dollars 15:5
dots 59:3 61:3,4,5
double 69:15
downtown 36:17, 19
drinking 12:10,11 54:7 58:16,23 59:10
drive 74:20
dry 37:16
due 65:17
dust 35:19,22 36:1,7,10,13,22 45:6 74:1

E

e-mail 65:24 66:3
E-r-i-k 52:14
ear 73:2
earlier 15:23 26:20 28:16,21 72:9
ecological 13:8, 11,20

ecology 53:4
edge 59:21
effective 27:19
effectiveness 25:8,10
elements 15:7 45:9
eleven 9:7 11:9,10 12:23
eliminates 56:20
Emergency 7:18
encourage 31:15
end 3:8
engineering 17:15,18 18:7 21:2 27:3 38:10
enlisted 4:7
entered 47:14
entering 47:1
entire 42:22 63:2
environment 8:14 25:4 27:14
Environmental 5:3
EPA 2:7,12,22 4:20,24 5:19 6:19 8:17,21,23 15:3 25:14 26:14 27:1, 11 29:20 30:18 31:12,19,22 32:12 33:8,15 39:12,20, 23 40:15 43:1,10 44:3,6,12,22 45:7 55:3,12 56:9,15 68:10,12 69:8 70:18
EPAS 44:15
Erik 52:13 62:2
erosion 15:16
established 13:7
estimates 49:5
evaluate 28:7 43:15
evaluated 12:20, 24 13:4 25:23 26:17
evaluation 25:18
evening 74:19
exact 63:19
excavate 15:19,21
excavated 16:5 20:5,9,10 24:15 52:10
excavation 20:8 22:7 23:6 27:2 51:12
excavations 51:16
exceedances 54:8
exceeded 11:13 59:10 60:13
exceeding 42:10
excess 42:22
existing 16:12 18:6 21:3 24:13 27:4 39:2 51:15
expect 38:11
expensive 26:12, 13
expire 66:1
exposed 39:15
exposure 56:20
exposures 13:4
extension 65:22
extensive 53:6
extent 8:12 15:13

F

faces 2:6
fact 3:23 25:19 29:18 46:8 47:24 66:12,19 73:10
facts 24:24
fair 54:14
fairly 66:24
familiar 2:6 44:11
fax 66:18 73:14
faxed 32:24
feasibility 8:17 15:15 48:24 49:14
federal 10:14 12:9 27:14 44:17 58:16
feel 3:17 73:6
feet 20:8,9,10,11 22:9,10,11 23:8,9, 10,11 24:17,18 61:6
field 8:9
fifty 51:1
figure 9:6 38:23, 24
fill 16:6 52:7
finalized 8:16,18, 20
find 13:16
finish 53:11
finished 12:18
five-year 29:8
floodplain 8:7
flow 53:5
flows 53:5
folks 4:24 31:16 32:10,13
follow 25:20 31:6 32:7
follow-up 33:3 64:1 68:13
form 3:21,22 32:24 66:11,14 73:12
formal 3:11 30:15, 20 31:10 32:8,22 33:17,19 34:1 65:2 67:4 68:3
formalize 33:22
forty 51:1
forward 10:12 18:22 26:5
found 9:2 11:5,12 12:2 13:22 50:4
front 66:19
frustrating 41:12
fundamentals 53:4
future 8:1 9:4 13:3,14 22:20 63:18 64:2,9 67:18 70:8

G

garden 16:16,17
GAY 36:20 45:13
gee 43:10
general 31:16 33:20,21
Generic 10:8
gestures 68:22
give 12:5 68:19
giving 4:22
goal 14:22,23 19:8 27:9
goals 13:6,20,22, 24 15:22,23 16:24 17:11 18:4,14 19:3 27:6
good 30:9 34:8 40:4 61:11 71:18 74:19
grant 71:15
grassy 51:3
gravel 17:6,19
grayed 26:21
great 32:3
greater 7:22 20:11 22:11 23:10 24:19
green 6:4 9:8 20:7 22:9 23:8 24:16 48:20
ground 53:3
groundwater 12:5,8,15,17 13:5 28:23 29:3,5 53:19,23 54:3,14, 19 58:2 71:12
group 70:16
GSI 58:23
guarantee 38:17
guess 11:14 49:22 56:8
guesswork 71:11

H

hand 5:6 30:4 50:16
happen 62:21 65:18
happened 48:9
happy 35:10
hard 19:20 21:22 45:1 60:5
hardship 74:3
Harrison 30:22 31:12,24 33:2 34:10,18 46:14 47:11,16 48:3,13 49:4,20 50:5,12,22 51:6,20,24 52:20 53:2,11,19 54:1,20 55:6,10,14,18 56:5,22 57:2,14, 18,24 58:3 59:20, 24 60:5,14,22 61:1,6,11 62:16 63:7,12 64:21 65:9,14 66:1,6 70:11,14,15 73:20
hashed 9:24 50:10
head 18:22
health 8:13 12:22 25:3 27:13
hear 30:8
heavier 74:4
held 40:7
helpful 34:7

high 42:3
higher 43:9
highest 11:4 50:3, 4
highlighted 60:12
historic 21:18 55:22 57:11
historical 39:2 56:3 57:13
history 5:17 7:3
hold 33:7 38:24 54:9
home 74:20
hoped 34:11
horizontal 15:12
horse 41:11
human 8:13 12:22 25:3 27:13
hundred 57:16
hypothetically 63:8

I

idea 62:8
ideas 62:17
identified 59:9
identify 59:23
impact 54:13
impacted 15:21
implementability 25:11
implementable 27:18
implemented 26:22
implication 47:24
important 22:1 74:4
impossible 44:21, 24
improve 54:13,18
include 7:6 17:16 52:22
included 47:2 67:14
includes 8:18 15:3,10,16
including 42:8,16 59:5
increase 43:8,18 59:17
individual 72:11
individually 15:1 18:10
infiltrated 35:22
informal 34:21
informally 35:8
information 5:23 10:21 12:6 14:4 18:11 34:14 48:15
inhalation 17:10
inspect 40:23
installed 17:7
institutional 16:14
instructions 68:5
intact 55:2,5,23
integrity 40:4,22 56:11
interest 74:14
interface 13:19
introducing 2:9
introductions 2:20 4:3
investigation 8:9, 15 9:1,2,3 53:22 71:21
investigations 7:14
Involvement 4:17
iron 12:16 58:8,9, 15 60:9
isolated 59:13
issue 30:23 55:3,9 72:7
issued 8:22
issues 62:17 71:14 72:20
items 15:8

J

J-o-n 45:4
Jamie 61:18
Janie 45:23
Jim 4:24 58:24
job 43:11
Jon 45:3
jot 3:6
July 3:24 29:15 66:2,8 73:16 74:17
June 8:21 29:14
junk 66:5

K

K-e-n-n-e-t-h 37:7
K-o-r-n-h-e-i-s-e-r 37:8
Kalamazoo 2:14 4:18 5:1,12 6:1,8, 16 13:10 29:9,16 46:15 65:21 70:17 72:18
Ken 46:18 63:24 69:4 70:9
Kenneth 37:6
key 30:24
kick 2:21 5:6
kilogram 7:23
kind 21:22 62:20
Kornheiser 37:3, 6,7,12 38:4,7 39:21 40:6,17 41:1,3,7,21,24 42:15,21 43:7,20 44:16,19 63:24 64:18 67:17 69:4,6
Kris 35:14

L

lady's 45:5
lagoons 7:10 37:23,24 47:8 48:10
land 9:5 13:19 14:21 16:15 18:24 19:1 22:20 23:20, 22 27:7 63:19 64:2,3
landfill 17:14 38:3 47:10
laptop 48:22
larger 19:21
lead 12:16 14:1 60:10
learning 3:6
leave 35:21 55:23
leaves 19:12 21:2 71:14
leaving 56:19 74:1
left 38:9 40:1 55:2
legal 6:17 64:6
lend 73:2
lengthy 32:15
level 13:10 43:9,23 44:5,10 69:10,17
levels 10:10 12:11 42:3,5,6,10 44:12, 16,20 60:16
libraries 29:19
lifetime 39:22
likes 32:12
link 29:17 66:15
List 6:15
listed 45:12,19 49:13
lists 37:18
literally 72:5
live 35:15 36:16
local 29:18
located 14:5 29:17
locations 21:22
long 3:23 9:18,23 10:13 32:15 35:3 38:10 41:12 46:22 74:16
long-term 25:8 27:19 43:13
longer 65:15
looked 42:7 53:22 56:9,15
lot 2:8 10:20 14:3 18:11 21:19 48:21 50:14 51:21,24 52:2 55:6 57:4 71:11 72:1 74:2
lots 52:1
loudly 30:7
lower 20:21 23:1

M

M-a-r-t-i-n-s-o-n 35:15
M-c-c-a-r-t-h-y 61:19
made 48:11 69:14
mail 3:21 32:23 66:5,12 73:11 74:16
mail-in 3:22
main 10:17 11:14, 15,18,20 14:9,16
maintain 40:20
maintained 55:19
maintenance 16:9
major 10:23
majority 11:15 13:12 16:13 39:1

make 28:23 40:2, 24 41:2 59:19 65:1,5 70:13 73:18
making 3:13,18
mammalian 13:17
man's 64:18
management 17:16
manager 2:22 4:21 5:1,3,9 52:15 62:3
manganese 12:16 58:8,10,15 60:10
manufactured 7:4
map 8:3 11:11 19:20 21:9,10,23 37:15,18 52:4
Martinson 35:14, 15 36:11
material 16:22 17:7,12 18:1,3 24:8
materials 7:5 16:3 17:1 26:10
matters 32:1
Maximum 12:10
Mccarthy 61:18 62:1
MCLS 12:11
means 32:21
meant 47:2
measure 45:9
measures 15:17
media 4:6
meet 25:22,24 26:7
meeting 2:19 3:2, 4,12 4:9,19 31:5,9 32:22 46:4 64:24 65:17 66:23 68:12 74:11,21
meetings 2:7 31:1 32:11,12
meets 25:15 27:14
members 70:21
mentioned 7:15 15:23 17:19 19:2 26:20 28:15,21
mentioning 47:4
met 71:9
metal 11:20
metals 10:18 12:14 17:10 18:1
metals-impacted 16:21
methods 37:1
Michigan 5:2 10:8 44:7,9,20
middle 10:1
mill 2:11 5:10,14 6:3,7,9 7:4 13:12 29:11 55:22 62:5,6
milligrams 7:23
million 7:23 19:18 22:4,5 23:4,5 24:12 26:13,14 27:10 43:6 57:17 60:17
mind 70:11
minimize 8:1 36:10,22
minute 67:23
mixed 10:2
mobility 25:9
modeling 71:12
modifying 25:12
money 40:6,18 41:8,16 70:4,6
monitoring 16:8 45:8,12
month 8:22
morning 51:5
move 47:16 71:8
movement 53:20

N

National 6:15 55:22 57:11
nature 8:12
necessarily 43:18
needed 16:7
negotiate 28:15, 17
negotiated 40:19 69:18 70:6,7
negotiates 70:4
negotiation 28:14
Nicole 33:14
night 69:2
non-drinking 58:20
non-potable 58:21
non-residential 20:16 22:19 27:22 39:17,18 61:21
nonresidential 9:10,12 10:9 16:23 17:3,5,11 19:14 20:24 23:3,21 24:2
normal 70:15
north 36:5
note 68:21
notice 14:20
number 20:20,21 22:24 23:2 24:3 39:16,17 42:20 49:11 66:19,20
numbered 3:14
numbers 44:7,8 52:19

O

occur 16:7
occurred 8:4
off-site 17:24 18:18 20:14,15 22:15 23:13,15 27:3 37:16
Offhand 49:12
office 29:20
official 31:5 32:4 33:4 68:9
offsite 17:8,9,13 18:19,20
on-line 3:20,21 9:15,17,19,23 29:16 32:24 49:15
on-site 6:14 7:8 8:6 14:17 16:12 17:2,6,17 20:13 22:14,15 23:14 24:8 37:14,16 40:1 47:5,8 48:9
onsite 18:18
open 28:2 29:22 35:21 71:15 73:5, 16 74:16
operable 2:15 5:10,15 7:20 29:11 72:3
operated 6:9,11
opinion 28:6 64:19
opportunity 68:8
option 34:9 42:24 43:20 56:23 70:22 71:10 72:17
options 8:20 45:20
orange 10:3 20:10 22:11 23:10 24:18 50:11
order 39:10
orient 2:18
OU 7:19
OU1 11:18
OU5 11:18 65:22
OU7 5:15 6:8
outline 6:6
outlined 48:19 50:20
overlapping 62:24
overlaps 71:2
overlays 71:3
overview 14:6

P

p.m. 74:21
pads 55:20
paper 6:9 7:4,5,6, 7,21 46:19 55:21
Paper/portage 5:11
parking 21:19 50:14 51:21 52:1,3 57:4
part 10:10,11 11:6 12:9 19:4,5 20:17, 21 22:19 23:1,19 27:6,8,22,23 29:11 31:4 32:21 34:21 43:6 44:7 47:12 54:23 57:6 68:9 73:22
parts 7:22 60:16
party 40:13,16
Paul 5:3 47:22 57:19
paved 13:13 51:2, 9,10,21 52:23
PCB 7:21 14:23 20:19
PCB-IMPACTED 18:3
PCBS 7:8 8:2 10:16,18 11:19,20 13:7 19:8 20:18 22:21 23:23 27:9, 23 46:24 48:1,11 49:21 50:4 59:24
people 32:2 36:18 74:5
percent 43:8

50:23 69:20

period 3:12 5:22 26:18 28:3,12,14 29:13 30:12,15,20 33:5,17,19 65:13, 15,23 67:5,12 73:15 74:10,15

permanence 25:8

permanent 17:14

permission 39:19

perpetuity 69:24

person 69:4

personally 42:1

phones 4:6

phosphorus 10:19

pick 3:14

picked 36:14

piece 64:16

pink 20:9 22:10 23:9 24:18 48:20 50:6

place 6:19 19:12 24:7,10 28:17 29:8 36:12 38:9,12,14, 16,17 40:3 55:2 56:4,20 63:5 64:10,14 65:23 71:18

places 39:4 55:23

Plainwell 2:10 5:10,14 6:3,7,22 12:12,13 13:12 29:11 52:15 54:24 55:21 72:4,18

Plainwell.org 55:24

plan 2:9,24 3:12 5:7,13 8:23 9:18, 23 11:1 12:3 14:5 17:16 19:16 26:24 28:1 35:9 36:9,22 49:9 56:1 61:22 62:4,5,10

planned 9:4,5 13:14 39:8

plans 2:8 39:3 71:6

plant 7:9 37:20

Plaza 24:1

pleased 65:14

plume 59:11

point 11:14 30:14 40:11 41:13 64:22 71:23 72:15 73:21

pointer 6:1

pointing 19:6 58:11 59:14

points 10:24 49:3 52:18

portion 3:1,8 4:12 7:1 31:9,11 32:9, 22 34:17,19 52:24 67:8 68:4,12

positive 45:19

posted 65:11

postmarked 3:24 74:17

potential 13:17 42:16 67:18

potentially 69:15

pre-excavation 15:14

pre-remedial 15:11

preference 69:21

preferred 26:14 27:1 28:2 31:2 57:5

preliminary 7:13

premature 53:8, 13

present 28:1 42:3

presentation 3:8 4:22 21:11,13 35:9

presents 8:19

Preservation 57:11

preserve 56:8,11

preserving 56:6,9

president 70:16

presiding 4:19

pretreatment 46:18

pretty 35:23 36:11,16 45:1 50:17 51:2

prevent 64:8

preventing 64:7

previous 11:11 34:23

print 46:9

Priorities 6:15

problem 41:19

problems 40:5 71:3,5

procedural 30:23

process 29:12 32:8 33:18 41:12 73:23

products 7:5

progress 7:12

project 2:22 4:18, 21 5:1,3,9 29:17 68:10 74:14

property 6:7,23 7:1,19 12:14 20:17 39:9 61:23 64:16

proposal 70:18

proposed 2:24 5:7 8:22 9:18,23 11:1 12:3 14:5 19:16 26:23 28:1, 22 35:9 49:9 53:15

proposition 55:1

protect 74:5

protection 25:3 46:15 58:23 69:24 70:17

protective 13:24 27:13,20 43:13,14 56:17,18 57:23

protectiveness 43:18

provide 32:4 45:8 68:8

public 4:11 5:21 26:18 28:4,11 29:13 30:15,16 31:5,10 33:4,23 34:12,16,18 45:10 65:7 66:7,9

pulling 41:9,10

purchased 6:23, 24

purple 9:9

purpose 33:21

purposes 9:13 10:4 12:7

put 6:18 18:22 24:8,11 30:14 31:3,21 32:21 39:3 64:4

putting 64:9

Q

Quality 5:3

question 3:1 4:11 21:8 30:3,21 31:18 32:18,20 33:20,21 34:1,21,23 35:2,3 37:9 38:5,8 41:22 45:5 54:22 55:17 57:19 61:19 64:1, 22

questions 3:3,9 4:23 21:6 22:2 29:23 30:8,12,13, 14,19,24 31:3,8,17 32:2,14 35:7,11 46:16 53:3 61:10, 14 67:2,8,10,16 68:11 72:9

quick 10:23 32:13, 17 67:3

quickly 2:18 52:21 65:11 66:24

R

raise 30:4 32:2

raised 16:16 64:22

range 44:12

re-evaluate 29:2, 5 54:6

re-evaluated 12:17,19

re-oriented 67:4

read 10:22 19:20 37:22 58:5,19,20 60:5

ready 38:4

reason 56:17

reassess 29:3 62:15

rebuild 72:19

recall 45:11 46:21

received 28:8,11

recommended 5:20 27:11,12 38:9 69:10

recommending 43:1

record 4:1 28:8,13 31:5 32:5,16,21 45:10 62:11 67:15 68:9 73:7

recorded 66:13 68:9,23

recovering 51:7

recreational 13:3

recycled 7:5

red 9:8

redevelopment 9:6 11:9,10 12:23 13:14 19:2 37:18 38:14 54:24 62:13 71:6

reduction 25:9

refer 5:15 33:16,24 34:3 72:9

reference 34:22, 24 67:1
referring 10:11
refined 13:21
reflected 30:16
region 46:6
regional 29:20
register 31:3,13 55:22
regulations 10:15 26:1 27:15
reinforcement 56:10
reiterate 18:21 31:7 67:6
relation 45:5
release 8:1
relevant 25:5 26:2 27:16
remain 13:15 17:21 38:11,16,17 51:14 69:11,23
remaining 10:5 17:17 24:13
remains 27:5 29:5 70:4
remedial 8:9,15 9:2,3 28:19,21 53:21 71:21
remediate 56:12
remediation 38:20 49:19 51:10 73:23
remedies 26:9
remedy 12:19 14:9 24:21 28:5,9 29:6 53:14 63:13, 19 70:2,20 71:12
remember 51:4 68:7,19
remind 29:24
reminder 30:9
reminders 68:5
removal 16:2 38:20 57:6 59:19 60:18 63:4,14 70:23
remove 7:21 39:13,14 40:8,9 57:2 59:18 69:15
removed 38:18 73:24
removes 70:2
removing 56:7
repeat 33:2
report 8:16,18 49:17,19 53:22
reporter 4:8 30:2, 6 33:13 34:4 35:13 68:18 70:12
request 45:14
requested 45:18
require 43:24 44:23
required 18:8 25:14 38:15 40:21 42:5 63:16
requirement 25:16 26:4 42:24
requirements 25:6 26:3 27:17
reserved 69:1
residence 42:23
residential 10:2, 6,9 11:8,10 16:23 17:4 18:23 19:3,4, 5,12 20:16,23 22:18 23:3,19,20, 24 24:10 27:21 42:9,10,16 43:24 48:18 50:6,8 60:15 61:20 62:22 63:2, 8,10,11,20 64:4,5, 9,11 69:17 71:2,7, 8,17
residents 13:1
residuals 7:21
resolved 47:13
resolving 46:24
resource 5:22
respect 62:19
respond 30:13,18 31:19 33:5 35:8 67:7,9,10,12
responded 31:4, 12
responding 68:11
response 7:18 33:8
responses 28:10 68:13
responsible 40:13,16
responsive 67:13
responsiveness 30:17 31:20 34:4 68:14
rest 6:3,15 11:17 15:6,9 17:8 26:6 39:6 57:10
restoration 16:7 62:18
restore 67:17 72:20
restored 8:1
restriction 39:10 64:6
restrictions 16:16 64:13 72:21
restrictive 64:13
results 9:1 10:7
retained 19:15 24:9 26:23
reuse 61:22
revealed 38:21
review 29:8,12,15 39:24 65:1 71:20 72:11,12
RI 49:16
Richard 36:8 45:11
Richards 45:22, 24 46:5,9,12
RIFS 71:22
riparian 13:18
risk 8:13,14 12:22 13:9,11,17 29:4 42:19 43:19 44:10, 12 56:19,20 57:15
risk-based 13:6 20:20 22:24 24:3 27:8
river 2:14 5:1,12 6:1,4,8,16 8:2 11:17 13:10 29:9, 16 35:17 36:15 45:6 46:15,22 47:1,14,19 48:2,12 53:5 59:21 65:21 70:17 72:18 74:5
run 32:12
Russell 2:4 4:16 29:21 31:7,14 32:6 33:6,12 34:8,15,20 37:5,21 46:3,7,11 49:1 54:10,16 61:14 64:20 65:4, 10,20 66:4,7 67:21 68:2 70:9 73:4 74:7

S

S-u-r-i-n-e 45:4
safe 54:11
safely 74:20
safer 43:9
sample 10:7 49:3 52:17 60:17,21
sampled 59:4,6, 22
samples 48:17 49:5,11 72:2,6
Saric 4:24 58:24 59:8,22 60:1,8,20 61:3 66:2
satisfied 41:4,17 44:3,6 71:23
satisfy 41:18
save 21:5
scenarios 13:4
screening 10:10 13:10
secondary 46:23 58:17
sediments 7:24
seek 62:7
select 25:14 56:23 63:13
selected 28:9 63:18
selection 5:19 24:21 25:18
send 74:16
sense 40:24 41:2 46:24 49:21
separate 21:10 48:19
series 14:14,16,17 16:18,19 17:22 26:7 46:16
session 33:20,21
seventy 50:23
shallow 12:15
She'll 4:21
sheet 3:23 24:24 25:20 29:18 42:2 46:8 66:12,20 73:10
Sheila 2:23 4:20 5:6,7,9 29:21 30:4 45:16 59:2
shore 36:5
short 3:10 31:1 67:22 68:1 73:21
short-term 25:10 27:19 43:14
show 6:2 10:23 11:15,24 14:7 21:8,11,12,15,21 38:23 49:14 51:19 53:24
showed 11:11 26:19 42:4 60:17

showing 46:2 74:13
shown 9:6
shows 11:3 25:16 56:1 67:18
side 35:17 36:15 62:24
sign-in 3:15
signed 7:16
significantly 56:2
silence 4:5
similar 22:13 23:17 24:6 63:22
simplest 37:12
simply 70:19
site 2:11,22 4:21 5:10,12,14,16 6:7, 9,16,20 7:1,14 8:11,13 9:5 10:18 11:16 12:12 13:12, 23 19:13 24:5 28:10 29:9 33:15 35:16 42:8,16,22 45:23 47:7 48:23 50:23 51:5 52:24 60:19 62:4,5,9 67:12 69:9 71:24 72:5 74:2
sites 62:20
slab 56:19
slabs 16:13 17:20 18:7 21:4,9 24:14 27:4 38:8,11,15 39:1,7,13,14,22 40:3,8,12,14,22 51:8,15 56:7,9,16 70:1,3,5
slide 9:14 10:20 11:22 14:4,7 18:10 22:6 25:16 26:19 53:23 58:2 67:18
slides 33:3,5 34:13 46:1
slightly 23:1
slip 65:7
sliver 9:11
slowly 30:5,9
sludge 7:10 37:13, 16 47:9
small 19:20
smaller 38:24
soil 5:14 10:7 11:4 12:4,18 13:5,23 15:22 17:4,16,17 19:13 24:11 29:2 40:9 49:22 54:5, 12,17 57:3 59:18, 19 60:20 64:10 70:23 73:24
soils 7:24
solution 72:17
sounds 34:20 53:7,14
southwesterly 36:4
space 3:5 69:1
speak 4:12 9:21 30:7,9 68:21,24 73:20
SPEAKER 9:14, 20 21:7,12,24 38:2
specific 21:22 33:5 34:13
specifically 61:2
spell 4:13 30:6
spelling 70:15
spoken 68:22
squares 52:17
stand 68:17
standard 64:11
standards 12:10 27:22,23 54:7 57:7 58:16,17,21 60:13 64:5 70:24 71:9
stands 42:11
start 2:20 3:11 67:4 71:18
started 2:5 29:14 68:3,4
starts 33:19
state 4:13 25:13 26:15 27:14 30:5 33:12 34:5 35:2,12 43:23 44:5,8 52:11 61:16 62:11
State's 44:16
stated 42:2
statement 32:20 47:3,12 54:14
stay 56:4
step 5:21 28:3
stepping 70:11
steps 27:24
straight 28:19 63:20
Street 38:2
stress 62:3
stringent 44:15, 17
studied 53:6
study 8:17 15:16 48:24 49:14 71:24
stuff 36:4
sub-alternative 18:13,16 20:1,6
sub-alternatives 17:24
sub-b 22:8
subdivided 9:4 12:23
submit 3:20 31:22 32:8,23 65:5 66:10,11,21 73:13
submitted 4:1 31:10 67:10
Substance 10:15
Substances 11:6 19:9
successfully 54:21
suggest 3:14
suite 59:7
summarize 50:3
summarized 49:8,11,12
summarizes 49:3
summary 30:18 31:20 34:5 42:2 67:14 68:14
summer 2:7
summers 35:21
Superfund 5:12 6:16 24:21
support 57:21 70:22
supporting 71:10
supports 26:15
surface 13:5
surfaces 50:14
Surine 45:3,14
SVOCS 10:18 11:19 17:9 18:1

T

table 25:19 42:4
takes 38:14 43:16 71:11
taking 19:1 74:12
talk 2:23 11:22
talking 51:6 65:20 72:24
teeth 41:9,10
tells 58:7
ten 20:10,11 22:10,11 23:10 24:1,18,19 65:3 72:13
ten-to-the-minus-five 44:10
ten-to-the-minus-four 44:13
ten-to-the-minus-six 44:14 57:15
tens 72:5
thing 54:17 68:20
things 15:16 30:14 33:22 35:7 74:16
thirty-day 28:3
thought 34:11 62:8
thousand 57:16
thousands 72:6
threshold 24:23 25:15 26:3,7
tie 31:16 34:24
time 3:16 30:11 32:17 34:2 35:6,10 36:12 37:4 46:22 59:15 71:20 74:13
timeframe 65:7
times 34:6
today 55:20
tonight 2:8,16,19 3:13,18 5:4 30:1 48:16 65:5 66:10 67:9,11 73:18 74:13
tonight's 4:9,19, 22 66:23
top 49:22
torn 55:11,13
total 50:4,13 56:23
tour 51:4
town 55:13
Toxic 10:15 11:6 19:9
toxicity 25:9
trace 45:9
transcribing 4:8
transcript 64:23 66:22 72:12
treated 6:13 7:8 47:7 48:1
treatment 6:13 7:9 25:10 26:9,10 37:19 46:23
trespassers 13:1

trucked 36:13
trust 40:20
TSCA 11:6 23:23
tunnel 16:2
turn 3:15,19
turn-around 65:12
turned 66:24 68:15
twelve 43:8 69:20

U

under-the-slab 56:13
underground 56:10,12
underneath 17:23 40:9 51:8,22 52:23 57:3
understand 22:1 32:6 44:2 54:20 62:17 69:13
understanding 48:6
unequivocally 72:16
UNIDENTIFIED 9:14,20 21:7,12,24 38:2
unit 2:15 5:11,15 7:20 29:11 72:3
units 48:18,19
unlike 11:17
unsolvable 71:3
uploaded 48:24 49:2
urge 69:21 70:1
USEPA 59:1
users 13:3
utility 13:2

V

vague 62:20
vagueness 71:1
variance 71:15
varies 14:22 15:24 21:14
verbal 3:13,18 30:15 31:21 32:22 65:5 66:10 67:24 73:18
verbally 73:8
version 51:18
versus 71:7
vertical 15:12
veterinarian 41:10
viable 26:9
visible 7:21
VOCS 10:18 11:19 17:9 18:1
volume 25:9

W

W-i-l-s-o-n 52:14
waiting 54:5
wanted 6:2 11:1, 24 12:4 14:8,11 29:24 32:13 34:13, 22 39:14 62:3,7,10 73:7,18
waste 6:13 46:19
wastewater 7:9, 10 37:13,19
water 6:13 7:8 9:11 12:10,11,13 13:19 36:9,20,24 53:3,4 54:7 58:16, 17,21,23 59:10 74:1,2
waterfront 24:1 72:20
ways 66:21
website 29:16 46:4,7 48:23 66:14 73:12
week 65:3,18
wells 58:4 59:4,13, 21 61:2
westerly 36:5
Weyerhaeuser 6:19
wildlife 13:18
Wilson 52:7,13,14 55:17,21 62:2 64:15
windows 35:21
winds 36:5,14 45:7
wondered 55:18
wondering 35:24 52:3 53:6 57:19 60:14,18 64:22
Wood 33:10,14 34:16 45:15
words 68:22
work 6:20 7:16 8:9 53:16,18
workers 13:1,2
working 67:22
worry 36:18 41:7
write 31:22 34:2
written 3:19 32:23
wrong 36:8
WWW 46:6

Y

year 39:24
years 40:2,23
yellow 8:5 9:8 58:11 59:9 60:12

Z

zone 49:7 62:24
zones 8:5 42:6 71:16
zoning 61:22 71:14,18
zoomed-in 6:5