

EPA Housatonic River Citizens Coordinating Council (CCC)

The Lenox Library
Sedgwick Reading Room
18 Main Street
Lenox, MA 01240

May 15, 2013
5:30 to 7:30 PM

Draft Meeting Summary

Participants: The list of participants is attached.

Introduction

Patrick Field, Facilitator from the Consensus Building Institute, opened the meeting and reviewed the agenda. CCC members introduced themselves.

The facilitator asked whether CCC members had additions to the agenda or suggested corrections for the January 2013 meeting summary. After making revisions, the January meeting summary was approved.

Upon request of a CCC member, representatives from the following media organizations identified themselves:

- Berkshire Eagle
- Berkshire Record
- WAMC
- iBerkshires

Rest of River Update

Jim Murphy, US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), provided an update on the Rest of River process and the ongoing discussions between the EPA, agencies from Massachusetts and Connecticut, and General Electric (GE). Mr. Murphy reported that the parties have been meeting for approximately the past nine months to discuss the Status Report, which is the consensus document that emerged from the discussions between EPA and agencies from Massachusetts and Connecticut before GE began participating in the discussions. GE joined the discussions to gain a clearer understanding of portions of the Status Report and EPA agreed that it would be productive to discuss the potential remediation approach sooner rather than later. While the Status Report is not the official remediation plan, EPA is optimistic that the final plan will be released by Labor Day.

Mr. Murphy explained that recent discussions between the parties have focused on capping of the river (and, particularly, on the required thickness of the cap), downstream transport (in order to monitor PCB loads after the remedy is implemented), and disposal options. Mr. Murphy also explained that, if and when the agencies come to an understanding or agreement with GE, a remediation plan will be released for public comment. The initial public comment period may be for sixty days, and members of the public may ask that the period be extended. In closing, Mr. Murphy expressed appreciation for people's patience with the length of the ongoing discussions.

CCC members' questions and comments are as follows (*replies are in italics and are from EPA personnel unless otherwise noted*):

- Is it correct that EPA will be coming to an agreement with GE before the public even has an opportunity to comment on the remediation plan? *While I would characterize it as an "understanding" with GE, the intention is to create a situation such that GE does not delay implementation of the remedy for many years. The public will have a chance to comment through the public comment process and individuals may also choose to file an appeal. EPA's hope is that, by giving GE an opportunity to discuss and provide input to the remediation strategy, the company may be less likely to object to the formal plan.*
- Will the conversations with GE focus on clarifying and elaborating on the framework that already exists or will the framework be changed in a process of negotiation? *While we do not know exactly how the discussions will conclude yet, there may be both clarification and some changes made as a result of the discussions. EPA has asked GE to make a case for the changes that the company would like to see. If GE has specific suggestions, for example on installation of a thinner cap that would still function properly, then those suggestions could be considered.*
- It seems like the public's threat to sue does not scare EPA nearly as much as GE's threat to sue. The public does not have the same deep pockets that GE does to file lawsuits. It seems like a very unfair process.
- Could you please elaborate on the dispute over capping materials and thickness? If there is some question as to the effectiveness of various alternatives, it seems obvious that you should go with the more conservative approach. On what basis could somebody argue for thinner capping materials, other than cost-effectiveness? We've seen so many shortcuts taken throughout this whole remediation process. *While I cannot comment on all of the technical details of various approaches to capping, EPA is working with GE such that the company can use modeling to demonstrate that their preferred approach would work. EPA is open to considering alternative cap thicknesses just as EPA is open to alternative technologies and approaches.*
- Although you say that you are open to considering alternative technologies, there has not been much receptivity to allowing pilot tests of promising technology. It seems like a stretch to say that EPA is open to alternative technologies. *Although I do not remember*

right now the name of the company that has made presentations about their technology, I can say that two people from EPA headquarters have spoken with the company to try to get more information. EPA has left the ball in the company's court at least twice and has not heard much back. We would not implement something just to try it. Rather, it would need to follow EPA's rigorous protocols before it could be implemented on the Housatonic.

- You said something about EPA having a "position." Does that mean that EPA is open to changing its approach? Is it possible that remediation waste be disposed of locally? *Currently, EPA and the other government agencies are working from the Status Report. We will propose a plan as soon as we can, and then take public comment on the basis of that plan and amend the plan following the public comment period. Currently, the EPA position is for off-site disposal. While we cannot say definitively that on-site disposal categorically will not happen, that is not EPA's intention.*
- Commissioner Kimmel of MA DEP recently said that, definitively, there would be no landfills in Massachusetts to dispose of waste from the Housatonic cleanup. Seeing that two landfills from the Pittsfield cleanup have already been located here, it seems that GE could go to court to argue that two landfills have already been allowed in the local area and that a new landfill should also be allowed. Is MA DEP prepared to sue the PRP to stop local disposal? *Reply from MA DEP representative: While I cannot say what would happen in a lawsuit, the Commissioner made it clear that the State is vehemently opposed to additional onsite landfills.*
- We were also vehemently opposed to Hill 78. It seems like a federal judge would be likely to say that there is precedent for siting landfills from the remediation in the local area. Unfortunately, I do not think that a local landfill is off the table and that it will ever be off the table. GE is purchasing large, existing contaminated parcels of land. Somebody should keep track of GE's purchases in the land records in various town halls.
- I am very against landfills. Unfortunately, Hill 78 was formed in stone because it was included in the Consent Decree and the public did not have the money to go to court to contest it. It is unfortunate that we do not have the money to destroy these harmful substances as opposed to storing it for future generations to deal with. In addition, I am concerned about shipping, as spills and other bad things could happen during shipment.

Jim Murphy, EPA, also responded to a question from the facilitator to note that, if there are any major developments with the Rest of River process, CCC members will be informed by email and a CCC meeting would be convened.

Silver Lake Remediation Activities

Dave Dickerson, US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), provided an update on the remediation of Silver Lake. After showing maps of the areas of lakebed soil and sediment that were intended to be removed as well as those areas in which removal has been completed and

near-shore capping has been installed, Mr. Dickerson reported that soil and sediment removal and near-shore capping is almost complete, with approximately a week's worth of work remaining. The near-shore cap consists of a sand and loam cap that is placed over existing sediment, with armor-stone placed along the shoreline. The stone extends above the waterline and is covered by soil and is seeded for vegetation. In addition, sand and gravel are placed for fish habitat on the deeper portions of the armor-stone. Mr. Dickerson explained that, now that soil and sediment removal is coming to an end, GE's contractor will begin the hydraulic capping portion of the project. GE also conducted debris removal activities. The fifth in Mr. Dickerson's presentation slide shows an excavator fitted with a rake attachment that sifts through sediment to feel where debris is and picks this up and puts it into a scow for offsite removal. After all debris is removed, a spreader barge (pictured in slides) will spread capping slurry over the lakebed. The cap will be measured in-place to ensure that it has greater than 0.5% organic content.

Mr. Dickerson also explained the turbidity monitoring system for Silver Lake and recent readings and noted that there had been one brief exceedence of the "Action Level" (of 50 turbidity units) since the previous CCC meeting. This exceedence occurred on 4/15/13. As capping slurry is placed, turbidity is likely to increase and GE and EPA will keep watch of that.

Lastly, Mr. Dickerson presented information about the monitoring of airborne PCB data at Silver Lake, as well as corrective actions that are being taken to control emissions during debris removal. He said that the action level, of 0.1 micrograms per cubic meter air ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$), is lower than a level of PCBs that someone would have to breathe 24 hours per day for many years to be considered a risk to human health. The intent of the monitoring program is to monitor over time and, if EPA and GE see levels start to increase, then changes can be made so that those levels can be ratcheted down. Mr. Dickerson explained that the chart on the tenth slide of his presentation shows that an exceedence of the action level was seen in September 2012, as well as on 4/24/13 and 5/2/13. These 2013 exceedences were detected at three different locations all on the north shoreline of the lake. After each of these exceedences, work was stopped and corrective measures were taken. Mr. Dickerson explained that, after the 4/24/13 exceedence, EPA required GE to implement the following corrective measures:

- Daily PCB air sampling during debris removal operations,
- Additional PCB air sampling locations,
- Use of vapor-suppressant foam to cover removed debris,
- Minimize/eliminate holding time in debris stockpile prior to shipment,
- Covering debris stockpile with poly sheeting as needed,
- Install a second oil boom and silt curtain around removal operations,
- Use of sheen-dispersant as needed.

Following the additional exceedence on 5/2/13, EPA required GE to implement the following additional mitigation measures:

- Utilize a dive team to locate and place cables/floats on debris targets (eliminated use of rake attachment to find debris and thus minimized disturbance of lake sediments),
- Minimize/eliminate use of barge anchors (“spuds”) due to dive team’s pre-placed cables/floats.

As a result of these mitigation measures, airborne PCB levels should decrease. *For additional information, please see the presentation titled “Silver Lake Cleanup Presentation” under the May 15, 2013 heading on the Public Meetings page of EPA’s website for the GE-Pittsfield/Housatonic River Site, as well as updated air monitoring data posted on the website since the 5/15/13 CCC meeting.*

CCC members’ questions and comments are as follows (*replies are in italics and are from EPA personnel unless otherwise noted*):

- Is that an oil sheen that can be seen inside the boom in the slide photo? What is the cause of that oil and will this area be capped? *An oil sheen develops when debris is removed. Yes, this area of the lakebed will be capped.*
- Why is EPA presenting about work that GE and its contractors are responsible for doing? GE used to make these presentations and the current arrangement means that EPA is bearing the brunt of public anger. There should be greater separation between EPA and GE. *Reply from GE representative: GE feels that it is best if EPA presents in these meetings. However, GE is present at the meetings.*
Reply from EPA representative: EPA does oversee GE’s work, and so the agency also has a role in the work.
- Could that be an action item, that GE present information about any work that it is performing? *Reply from facilitator: The request is noted.*
- Was any of the debris found in Silver Lake a result of GE tearing down their buildings before they officially closed up? *I do not believe that is the case. The debris has mostly been old wooden piers, a few cars, and old wooden pipes, since the lake was used for non-contact cooling water.*
- I am concerned with the methods that GE is using to collect the debris and move on. For instance, since GE is remediating Silver Lake after remediating the first ½ mile of the river, you are risking recontamination of the first ½ mile of the river since Silver Lake drains into that portion of the river. In the river itself, since GE started with remediation of the shore, and is now moving into the middle of the lake, does that risk recontamination? How has the debris removal been conducted? And what will the extent of capping be? *Although I understand your point, the cleanup is not exactly moving from the shore to the middle of the lake. Debris was located all over the lake. The lake was mapped using bathymetry and GE’s contractor removed the easiest debris first and then removed those pieces that were embedded in the bottom of the lake. The whole lake will be capped to cover any remaining PCBs, and monitoring will continue in*

the future. During the remediation itself, contractors have been using booms and other methods to minimize recontamination.

- *What is done with the turbidity and air quality monitoring data? If EPA sees a pattern of reaching notification levels, then does EPA tell GE that something needs to be done to bring down the levels? GE receives the monitoring data and is required to notify EPA in writing, after which the data is posted to EPA's website. As indicated, GE has taken corrective actions to control air emissions. Thus far, we have not seen a real problem with turbidity. The biggest problem has been algae growth on the sensors. We do expect to see turbidity going up when slurry capping is happening, however.*
- *Will turbidity impact the lake in areas where it has already been cleaned up? There is a difference between turbidity and PCB contamination. The capping material that is placed is clean sand and topsoil, without PCBs.*
Reply from GE representative: We also have stop logs that we can put into the temporary sheetpile dam at the lake outlet to hold back flow from the river for some period of time if needed.
- *Was vapor-suppressant foam only used on debris and not on lake water? That is correct.*
- *How much longer will monitoring go? GE will continue to monitor daily through the active debris removal process, which is coming to an end very soon. There is only one more large branch that needs to be removed from the lake. Monitoring will continue on a weekly basis until levels below the notification level are reported for three weeks in a row after capping has started.*
- *What amount of PCBs is being sent to the landfill? Will that landfill be tested for safety? 13,500 cubic yards have been removed to date and all will ultimately be shipped to a licensed, out of state landfill. It gets held temporarily in Building 65 for dewatering and stabilization and gets loaded onto trucks and rail for shipping to Michigan as it is ready to go. The state is responsible for inspecting the landfill. EPA checks with the state (in this case, Michigan) and the state sends a report to EPA every six months.*
- *Is the Michigan Landfill a Toxic Substance Control Act (TSCA) site? Yes, it is.*
- *Will the cap on the lakebed stay secure forever? How far into the banks will the capping material actually go? The cap is supposed to be in place forever. In many locations around the lake, sediment was removed from the lake bed so that the cap could be placed without raising the overall level of the lake bed. Then armor stone was placed on top of the cap in shoreline areas to keep waves from disturbing the cap. The stone is intended to prevent erosion from waves.*
- *The last time this happened there was great concern and a vocal outcry from CCC members. Last time, EPA had agreed that local neighborhood and stakeholder groups would be immediately notified so that they could spread the word. This is a tragedy. I am stunned by how many actionable levels you had and you stand there and give us the pat answer about how many micrograms people would need to breathe in before they're affected. People have been living there for decades and breathing these in! They*

do not deserve to breathe in any more. And we also believe that your testing is inadequate. There's research that shows that health effects happen at much lower levels than EPA's actionable levels. *EPA agreed, in the September 2012 meeting, to post information about exceedences on EPA's website for the Housatonic remediation. We did this; the information was posted under the "What's new?" section. In addition, EPA has checked with other sites around the country and stands by its belief that someone would have to breathe in PCBs at the action level of 0.1 micrograms per cubic meter air ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) for 24 hours per day for many years for it to be considered a risk to human health.*

- EPA had agreed to notify the Housatonic River Initiative (HRI)! If this happens again, I request that EPA notify HRI, as HRI is the recipient of the Technical Assistance Grant from EPA. *I do not believe that EPA agreed to notify HRI, but we should go back and look at the meeting summary to see what EPA agreed to do. EPA will get back to the CCC about notification. EPA could notify HRI about exceedences, but this really overemphasizes what the purpose of the notification level actually is. It should not be a fire alarm for everybody. However, if that is what people want, EPA will consider it. Comment from facilitator: We should go back and check the meeting summary from that meeting to verify the conversation and commitment that was made.*
- Were local residents notified about the air quality exceedences? *EPA posted information about this on its website and also called the City of Pittsfield and the Pittsfield Economic Development Authority (PEDA). As far as we know, individual residents in the neighborhood were not notified.*
- Regular citizens do not routinely check EPA's website. Furthermore, the information was not posted for 7 days after the exceedence occurred, so citizens could not even close their windows in response. I find this to be wholly inadequate. We talked about this two meetings ago and said that we were really upset that action levels have been reached. The public should also know that, prior to April, air quality monitoring was conducted only on a monthly basis. So we don't know how often local residents were breathing in PCBs.
- What dispersant did GE use? Why did GE disperse the PCBs when they could collect it? *The dispersant is a product named Biosolve. The idea is to sink the PCBs to the bottom of the lake, where they will be capped.*
- What evidence do you have that the PCBs actually sink? We have seen in the Gulf of Mexico that dispersants cause damage to wildlife.
- Do you know why GE is getting algal growth on the air quality monitors? *We suspect that the lake is over-nutriented.*
- Is GE using a different method to spread the slurry cap than was used in the pilot study? *Response from GE representative: It is a similar method. Slurry is disbursed from the surface.*

- What side of the dam is Monitor 2 (for turbidity monitoring) on? *It is on the downstream side of the dam. Monitor 1 is in the lake and Monitor 2 is in the discharge channel.*
- PEDDA still has not done anything about the PCBs coming out of their stormwater system. It seems clear from their letter to EPA that they do not know what to do. One of the comments from PEDDA is that they do not have maps of storm sewer pipes from before they took ownership of the property. Could GE provide PEDDA with this information? Has PEDDA asked GE for help? *Response from GE representative: We could provide PEDDA with that information. They have not approached us for help.*
- Jane Winn said that she would send a letter to CBI [the facilitators] for distribution to CCC list about PEDDA's property. *[These documents were provided by Ms. Winn and were distributed to the CCC list by CBI on May 20, 2012.]*
- Is the air quality testing only for PCBs? Is GE also testing for solvents or other volatilized organic compounds (VOCs)? Monitoring for harmful substances other than just PCBs should be conducted also. *The air quality monitoring is only for PCBs. Monitors for dust have not indicated any problems.*
- Is the lakebed cap permeable? *Yes the cap is designed to be permeable.*
- It is important for members of the public to know: there is a little pond that is now owned by PEDDA that is filled with PCBs and is draining into Silver Lake.
- If the boom had contained the sheen, then why did not GE and its contractor scoop up the sheen out of the water to dispose of it offsite? Why use dispersant and put another chemical into the lake? Nobody else in the world would run their business the way that this cleanup is being run. It seems like complete common sense to the rest of us that you would remove the pollutant. The shore areas of the lake have already been capped and any additional pollutants and chemicals that are stirred up can recontaminate those areas. *Response from GE representative: During debris removal, in addition to the boom, a silt curtain is in place that goes down to the lakebed. The boom is oil absorbent and we use absorbent pads to soak up some of the oil. In addition, the lakebed has not yet been capped and the oil that sinks down to the surface would be covered by the cap. In using dispersant, we are attempting to remove the sheen from the surface of the lake as quickly as possible and sinking it so that it ends up under the cap.*
Response from Facilitator: It also sounds like GE may have been trying to reduce the potential for volatilization as quickly as possible.
 - If the concern was around volatilization, could GE have covered the site of the sheen with plastic to prevent volatilization and scooped up the material? *GE made a judgment call that they could more quickly get rid of the sheen using dispersant, but yes, another option would have been to try to soak up the sheen using pads over the course of hours. It was a judgment call about the correct course of action.*

- Another interpretation of why GE did what they did is because GE wanted to get rid of the sheen quickly to avoid raising public concern about an oil sheen on the lake. Did GE check with EPA about the wisdom of its dispersant strategy? *Yes, EPA was consulted and we thought that it would be an effective strategy.*
- The reason that CCC members volunteer our time for these meetings is because we want a clean environment for ourselves and future generations. I am devastated every time I come to these meetings. Please keep the health and safety of the public foremost, not the easiest or cheapest way to sweep the pollution under the rug.

Residential Floodplain Properties Downstream of the Confluence

Susan Svirsky, US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), explained that the Consent Decree identifies a GE-lead Removal Action Area (RAA) to address contaminated floodplain areas of current residential properties below the confluence of the East and West Branches with PCB concentrations over 2 parts-per-million (ppm). The RAA is limited to the portion of the property that is defined as “actual or potential lawn” in the Consent Decree. “Actual or potential lawn” is an area that is currently lawn or could be converted to a lawn, excluding river banks and wet areas and steep slopes where potential exposures are inconsistent with residential use. Ms. Svirsky explained that GE submitted a document called *Revised Pre-Design Work Plan for the Floodplain Residential Properties Downstream of the Confluence* in March 2013, which identified 41 parcels with actual or potential lawn areas potentially greater than 2 ppm in PCB concentration. The parcels were combined into 22 property groups located between the Confluence and Rising Pond, and group 20 was then further divided into Group 20 and 20a. Ms. Svirsky showed the locations of each of these 20 groups, and provided a detailed description of one sample parcel, in which the purple dots indicate points that are being investigated by GE and the symbols of other colors show the existing data [see slide #7]. GE will sample properties in the summer and fall of 2013. Sampling requires securing access permission from the property owner. 2,055 soil samples will be collected from 662 sample locations. If PCB concentrations in a property are elevated, GE will evaluate the need and extent for non-PCB sampling and if data suggest that adjacent parcels could also be contaminated, then GE will also report to EPA on those. Results of the sampling will be presented in GE’s *Pre-Design Investigation Report*. After sampling is completed, remediation will be conducted according to the following criteria:

- Remove/replace soil as necessary to achieve a spatial average PCB concentration of 2 ppm or less for 0 to 1 foot depth interval and 1 foot to the depth at which PCBs have been detected (up to a maximum of 15 feet).
- Remove/replace all soil in the top foot of unpaved areas with PCB concentrations that exceed 10 ppm.

For additional information, please see the presentation titled “Downstream Floodplain Residential Properties Presentation” under the May 15, 2013 heading on the Public Meetings page of EPA’s website for the GE-Pittsfield/Housatonic River Site.

CCC members' questions and comments are as follows (*replies are in italics and are from EPA personnel unless otherwise noted*):

- How much oversight will there be of GE's testing of these properties? When they tested [the speaker's] property, they skewed the whole sampling. I requested that MA DEP come out and retest. I request that EPA provide significant oversight of testing and, specifically, verify that tests occurred in the locations that EPA specified. *EPA is already providing oversight and will continue to do so. Thank you for the suggestion.*
- Sampling of a property on the Housatonic River that is owned by one of the CCC members found some areas with higher PCB concentrations and other areas with lower concentrations. However, those areas that had higher were not the areas that one would intuitively think would have higher concentrations. How much ability will landowners have to provide input on where sampling should take place? Could there be some sort of protocol for making sure that areas of high concentration be sampled? *A GE representative responded: GE spoke with property owners about relevant information such as the level and locations to which water reaches. Some of the properties have pretty dense sampling grids and all sampling locations have been submitted to EPA for approval. If EPA makes any requests to sample differently, GE would take care of that.*
- If, under initial sampling, any areas are found to be in the double digits in terms of PCB concentration, would those areas automatically be resampled? *Yes, if the area is an actual or potential lawn area. Other areas would fall under the Rest of River remediation protocol.*
- How does the spatial averaging under the cleanup criteria work? *First, any area within the actual/potential lawn that is greater than 10 mg/kg in the top foot will be cleaned up. Then the data in the top foot of soil are averaged, and soil is removed to result in an average concentration of less than 2 mg/kg. Samples are also averaged for the soil of 1 to the maximum depth at which PCBs are detected and soil will also be removed to achieve the 2 mg/kg average in this depth interval.*
- Municipalities along the river have concerns about property values. For example, if someone is forced to sell their property after it has been found to have elevated PCB levels, then that person faces a personal economic impact. For example, if an elderly homeowner needs to sell his or her property but it no longer has any value, then that person may not have any assets left. *There was certainly a history of issues of that sort arising in Pittsfield around the remediation. Unfortunately, I cannot provide further input on how to handle that sort of situation.*
- Could GE share a blow-up map for the areas where this program is taking place with the local municipalities? *EPA will coordinate with GE to provide maps of the areas to be sampled to the Berkshire Regional Planning Commission and municipalities.*

- Why are these properties under EPA’s jurisdiction while Pittsfield properties were under MA DEP’s jurisdiction? We were told that residential areas are not included in the Consent Decree. And, specifically, properties that were built with fill material from GE would fall under MA DEP’s jurisdiction. *When the Consent Decree was written, it placed properties into two categories, those subject to the terms of the CD and those outside the CD. One key factor was the source of the PCBs. For example, if the source was “fill material” provided by GE to homeowners, then the property was likely to be addressed by DEP. If the source of PCBs that migrated from GE property, such as this RAA, then the property was included in the Consent Decree.*
- Are the MA DEP or the EPA standards more stringent? *Response from EPA and MA DEP representatives: The standards are the same for the two agencies.*
- What differentiates pasture from lawn? *Any flat surface that could be mowed (in other words, any land that could be lawn in the future) is covered under this program.*

General Updates and Issues from CCC Members

CCC members made the following comments and asked the following questions (replies are in italics and are from EPA personnel unless otherwise noted):

- Why was the cover removed from the building currently undergoing demolition? *Response from GE representative: The cover was an asbestos containment cover and, since the asbestos-removal phase is complete, GE removed the cover. The material that was removed has also shipped to the landfill in Michigan for disposal.*
- Under the proposed revisions to Massachusetts’ Wetlands Protection Act, I have heard that landfills would be allowed in Areas of Critical Environmental Concern. Is that correct? *Response from MA DEP representative: That is not correct and there was a misunderstanding reported by some media outlets. There was a misunderstanding that landfills would be allowed in dam removal areas, but that is not what is being proposed in the revisions to the Act. This statement from the Department of Environmental Protection (MA DEP) clarifies that misunderstanding [a DEP representative provides a copy of a written statement to the facilitator. The statement is attached to this meeting summary].*

Public Comments

Members of the general public made the following comments and asked the following questions *(replies are in italics and are from EPA personnel unless otherwise noted)*:

- How long did the process take for removing debris from Silver Lake? Why did not GE remove the debris first, before the near-shore areas were already remediated and fish habitat laid down? *Response from GE representative: The process has taken three to four weeks. If GE had known how the remediation would evolve, in retrospect we would have done it differently.*

- Communities downriver should be able to know that the river has been properly cleaned so that they never have to worry about this issue in the future.
- My understanding of dispersant is that it scatters the substance in question. What EPA described today seems to be designed to sink the substance down to bottom of the lake, however. Also, my understanding is that dispersants are content-specific. Could you provide more information about this? *Response from GE representative: GE's contractor recommended that the dispersant in question, Biosolve, would be appropriate for the situation. We would need to look at the data sheet for Biosolve to comment further. The thought process is that it would be an effective way to deal with oil. We will get more information about the dispersant and report back to the CCC.*
- When an individual does something wrong, he or she is monitored by the state. But when GE does something wrong, the company is left to manage themselves. *This is one way to manage a difficult public process. Monitoring data goes to GE's contractor and to GE first, and then the notifications come to EPA.*
- A Harvard scientist came to a recent CCC meeting and said that current agricultural projects are safe but that new projects should carefully evaluate which lands they start on. Do you know anything more about this? *EPA performed a risk assessment a few years ago and found that different types of agriculture have different exposure scenarios (for example, agriculture involving animals may be more susceptible to contamination than agriculture only involving plants, due to the interaction of PCBs and fat molecules). EPA has a risk assessment into which different exposure scenarios could be plugged in. EPA built this risk assessment as a tool that could be forward looking. EPA would be happy to sit down with you and explore your concerns and use the risk assessment tool so that you could communicate relevant information to your agricultural constituency.*

Next Meeting

The next meeting will tentatively be planned for September.

Action Items

(with results of action items included in italics)

1. Next CCC meeting will be scheduled for September. **(CBI)**
 - a. *Response to Action Item: CBI is coordinating with the Agencies and GE to schedule a CCC meeting in September.*
2. Request for GE to present information at future CCC meetings about any work that it is performing. **(GE)**
3. EPA to respond to some CCC members' request that it directly inform the Housatonic River Initiative when either air emissions or turbidity monitors on Silver Lake exceed

either the respective notification levels or action levels. **(EPA)**

4. Review the January 2013 meeting summary to verify the conversation and commitment that was made by EPA regarding informing the CCC about exceedences of notification and action levels by air emissions or turbidity monitors on Silver Lake. **(CBI)**
 - a. *Response to Action Item: CBI reviewed the January 2013 meeting summary and sent the following text from the meeting summary to the CCC on May 20, 2013:*
 - “• Could EPA put out a press release informing the public about what has happened and that testing results indicate that dangerous levels of PCBs have been detected in one-third of tests? *EPA generally informs the public through its website, but this is an issue that we could discuss further.*
 - The people of this community deserve to know what is going on and what health risks they are bearing. They deserve to know that PCBs are volatilizing and that they are breathing in contaminants. *EPA has control over its website and can provide information about test results through its website.*
 - Once CCC members see reports on the website, we can write letters to the newspapers and inform other media outlets about the dangers posed to the public. It is unfortunate that we cannot have a system of flags on the lake, indicating when harmful conditions are present. *EPA views this incident as an indication that we need to rethink engineering controls and methods of operation to ensure that an incident of this sort does not occur again. Unfortunately, in areas of high contamination, some volatilization is likely to occur.”*
5. CCC member Jane Winn to send a letter to CBI for distribution to the CCC list about contamination of PEDA’s property. **(Jane Winn and CBI)**
 - a. *Response to Action Item: These documents were provided to CBI by Ms. Winn and were distributed to the CCC list by CBI on May 20, 2012.*
6. GE to coordinate with EPA to generate town-specific maps of the areas being sampled. EPA to send these maps to the Mayors and Boards of Selectmen of target municipalities and to the Berkshire Regional planning Commission. **(GE and EPA)**
7. GE to report back to the CCC with more information about the dispersant used in Silver Lake, Biosolve. **(GE)**

EPA Housatonic Remediation, Citizens Coordinating Council
May 15, 2013

Name	Organization	Present
Valerie Andersen	Housatonic Clean River Coalition	X
Thelma Barzottini	Citizens for PCB Removal	X
Gene Chague	Berkshire League of Sportsmen	X
Barbara Cianfarini	Citizens for PCB Removal	X
Jeff Cook	Downtown Pittsfield	
Dave Dickerson	EPA	X
Shep Evans	Housatonic Valley Association	X
Sarah Flynn	Housatonic Clean River Coalition	
Lynn Fowler	Housatonic River Commission	X
Benno Friedman	Sheffield	X
Dave Gibbs	Citizens for PCB Removal	X
Tim Gray	Housatonic River Initiative	
Judy Herkimer	Housatonic Environmental Action League	X
Nat Karns	Berkshire Regional Planning Commission	X
Charles Kilson	Schaghticoke Tribal Nation	
René Laubach	MA Audubon	X
Andrew Madden	MA Dept. for Fish & Wildlife	X
Dan McGuinness	NW CT Council of Governments	
James McGrath	City of Pittsfield	
Karen Pelto	MA Natural Resources Trustees	X
Susan Peterson	CT Department of Energy and Environmental Protection	
Dennis Regan	Housatonic Valley Association	
Andy Silfer	General Electric	X
Mike Supranowicz	Berkshire Chamber of Commerce	
Susan Svirsky	U.S. EPA	X
Dean Tagliaferro	U.S. EPA	X
Cory Thurston	Pittsfield Economic Development Agency (PEDA)	
Eleanor Tillinghast	Green Berkshire	
Eva Tor	MA Department of Environmental Protection	X
Sherry White	Mohican Nation	
Jane Winn	Berkshire Environmental Action Team	X
John Ziegler	MA Department of Environmental Protection	X
<i>Alternates</i>		
Jerry Burke	Berkshire Chamber of Commerce	
Audrey Cole	HEAL	
Tim Conway	U.S. EPA	
Alison Dixon	HVA	X
Lauren L. Gaherty	Berkshire Regional Planning Commission	

Richard Gates	General Electric	X
Mark Jester	Berkshire County League of Sportsmen	
Dave Martindale	HRI	
Kevin Mooney	General Electric	X
Jim Murphy	U.S. EPA	
Tom Potter	MA Natural Resources Trustees	
Gayle Tardif-Raser	Mass Audubon	
Bruce Winn	Berkshire Environmental Action Team	X
George S. Wislocki	Green Berkshire	

Additional Attendees

Name	Organization / Affiliation
Dan Johnson	Congressman Richard Neal
Traci Iott	CT Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Anthony Ayers	Resident of Great Barrington
Charlie Cainfarini	Citizens for PCB Removal
Mike Argue	Weston Solutions
Al Bertelli	HRI
George Valli	Resident of Pittsfield
Clarence Fanto	Berkshire Eagle
Jan Chague	Resident of Lenox
Mark Shapp	Resident of Lenox
Sharon Hawkes	Lenox Library
Bruce Garlow	Resident of Beckett
Hope DuBois	
Matt Calacone	GE
Luke Pryjma	Resident of Great Barrington
Scott Campbell	Weston Solutions
Dick McGrath	The Isosceles Group, Inc.
Richard DiNitto	The Isosceles Group, Inc.
Ken Munney	US FWS
Tom Casey	Berkshire Record
Lucas Willard	WAMC
Joe Durwin	iBerkshires
Tom Czekanski	Weston Solutions
Rod McLaren	GE