

**REVIEW OF TRANSCRIPT
FOR PHILIP SERVICES CORPORATION SITE
PUBLIC MEETING CONDUCTED MAY 3, 2022**

The South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (the “Department”) created this document to provide a complete record and to address the technical questions asked by attendees during the May 3, 2022, Philip Services Corporation Site (PSC) public meeting either during the meeting or as a follow-up after the meeting.

Responses to questions posed after the meeting by email or U.S. Mail are attached.

The following list includes outstanding responses needed after the public meeting. The page and line numbers correspond to the public meeting transcript.

1. Mr. Craig (begins on Page 14, Line 19):

- a) Mr. Craig submitted Mrs. Christi Cox’s emailed questions from March 23, 2022. The Department had already provided responses to some of these questions, and the remaining responses were completed on May 5, 2022. The questions and responses are attached (**Attachment #1**).
- b) Mr. Craig also asked several questions during the meeting that he indicated verbally were adequately addressed.

2. Dr. Norma Gray (begins Page 23, Line 18):

- a) (Page 24, Line 13) Dr. Gray expressed concerns about possible contamination beyond the PSC site and asked if the samples had been collected from the Nazareth Baptist Church. She was told that the samples had been collected and the Department was waiting on the laboratory data. (**Attachment #2** – Memo on Sample Collection, laboratory data, emails and letter related to Church property sampling).
- b) (Page 25, Line 2 and Page 27, Line 3) Dr. Gray asked if the methods used for remediation were proven methods that the community could accept. The Department sent emails on May 4, 2022, to both Dr. Gray and Ms. Connolly with attachments of Citizen Fact Sheets from the USEPA Website on the primary treatment options to be implemented at the PSC site. (**Attachment #3**).
- c) (Page 50, Line 22) Dr. Gray requested a link, provided by email, to the location of reports and data related to the site. The Department responded to this request by sending an email with a link to the PSC site webpage on the Departments website. (**Attachment #5**). Ms. Connolly was included in the email as a courtesy.
- d) (Page 29, Line 1) Ms. Connolly’s statements and questions from early in the meeting were not technical.
- e) (Page 48, Line 21) Ms. Connolly had a question about *in situ* thermal remediation. She was concerned that this treatment method involved the use

of an incinerator. The Department addressed this question at the meeting and followed up after the meeting by sending an email with the EPA Citizen Fact Sheet entitled “A Citizen’s Guide to In Situ Thermal Treatment” to both Ms. Connolly and Dr. Gray (**Attachment #3**).

- f) (Page 55, Line 13) Ms. Connolly had further questions about thermal treatment of soils and groundwater. These questions were addressed at the meeting, and the fact sheet that was sent by email (**Attachment #3**) also addressed her concerns with thermal treatment.
- g) (Page 69, Line 19) Ms. Connolly expressed concern that the actions at the site would not be made public and would not be subject to Freedom of Information requests. The Department addressed her concern during the meeting, explaining that the only limitations on public access to information are related to the Waste-In Database and the coding of hazardous waste manifests within the database. This database is the intellectual property of the PRP Group and is owned entirely by the PRP Group. The Department has access to the database under a license from the PRP Group, but it is not required for the Department’s statutory obligations. To the extent that other Records are protected by confidentiality (e.g., business confidential records or records subject to attorney-client privilege or other cognizable privilege recognized by state or federal courts or statutes), these protections are established in statute or common law. The PRP Group must demonstrate that the privilege applies should they choose to assert it. If it does not, the information is subject to FOIA. All environmental information is and will continue to be available to the public for review. The Department provided Ms. Connolly with a link to the Department’s webpage for the PSC site so that she would have quick access to reports on prior investigations and new information on environmental activities as those plans and reports become available (**Attachment #5**).
- h) (Page 87, Line 16) Ms. Connolly wanted to know whether the work required to implement the remedy at the Site would be performed by the PRPs or the Department. The Department explained that the PRPs would be hiring appropriate contractors to perform the actual work and that the Department would be overseeing all activities and would have final approval for all activities and processes performed and would also provide oversight in the field. The Department further explained that the Statement of Work in the Settlement Agreement provided ample and detailed procedural requirements for how the process would work.
- i) (Page 90, Line 13) Ms. Connolly asked about when the field work would begin. The Department explained that the Design Phase would begin immediately upon approval of the Settlement Agreement and there is no reason and no opportunity for the PRPs to move slowly in the clean-up process; rather, the PRPs will be required by the agreement to complete the work on a timely basis as provided in the Settlement Agreement and the Scope of Work.

3. Tammy Gordon (begins Page 43, Line 22)

(Page 44, Line 9) Ms. Gordon had questions regarding surface water contamination in

creeks near the PSC site. Surface water sampling was discussed during the meeting and a follow-up phone call and letter containing maps, data and a summary of surface water sampling were mailed to Ms. Gordon. **(Attachment #4).**

4. Representative Ligon (begins Page 59, Line 13):

- a) (Page 63, Line 6) Representative Ligon asked about a timeline for the project. The Department answered the question to his satisfaction during the meeting.
- b) (Page 67, Line 13) Representative Ligon asked if there were positive results from the groundwater treatment system that the Department has kept in operation since taking over the site in 2003. The Department answered the question to his satisfaction during the meeting.

5. Mr. Burris (Page 71, Line 18):

Mr. Burris had concerns about a possible impact to private wells in the area due to site contamination. He has a private well in an area that would not be impacted based on the well location and the Department's knowledge of existing groundwater conditions. Nonetheless, the Department agreed to collect a sample for volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from his well. He was satisfied with that response. The Department completed sampling on June 22, 2022. The Department will provide Mr. Burris with the results. Copies of an email and letter sent to Mr. Burris are attached **(Attachment # 6).**

6. Mr. Broome (Page 76, Line 5):

Mr. Broome stated that he had been an employee at ThermalKem (previous operational name prior to Philips Services Corporation). He wanted to have an opportunity to express his experience working at the facility and his opinions about other facilities in the area. He had no specific questions about the PSC site.

7. Mr. Galvez (Page 85, Line 6):

Mr. Galvez wanted to know how he could be kept informed of what is going on at the site. The Department informed him that he could contact the Project Manager, Carol Crooks, and provided him with a business card with Ms. Crooks' contact information. The Department also informed him that it would send a mailout or information sheet letting residents know of the start of field work for the remediation effort.