

36672

Mr. Stephen D. Ramsey
Vice President
Corporate Environmental Programs
General Electric Company
3135 Easton Turnpike
Fairfield, Connecticut 06431

Re: Hudson River PCBs Superfund Site

Dear Mr. Ramsey:

I would like to thank General Electric (G.E.) for participating in the March 12, 1990 meeting with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. The presentation on the research G.E. has initiated with respect to in-situ bioremediation of PCB-contaminated sediment was very educational. However, G.E.'s presentation served to heighten fundamental concerns on our part.

EPA and indeed the law encourage pursuing innovative technologies for the permanent destruction of hazardous wastes, where appropriate. Currently, there are few available proven technologies for the treatment of PCB-contaminated sediments. In-situ bioremediation is a possibility and will be reviewed in the Reassessment Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study (RRI/FS), but sufficient information does not exist today to demonstrate its effectiveness. As G.E. indicated, we may be years away from such a determination. EPA is anxious to proceed with the RRI/FS on a fast-track basis. However, G.E.'s projected schedule, with a target demonstration date of September, 1993, is substantially beyond EPA's target date of October, 1991 for completion of the RRI/FS.

We have therefore come to the conclusion that the most appropriate course of action would be for EPA to conduct the RRI/FS itself. We have reached this conclusion in light of both the aforementioned time considerations and our concern that G.E.'s obvious commitment to develop in-situ bioremediation technology would preclude or appear to preclude an objective study of, among other things, the need for and appropriateness of dredging of the PCB-contaminated river sediments. G.E. has on many occasions stated publicly that dredging the river is not appropriate and has suggested that, at most, in-river biodegradation might be appropriate. As we have stated, we are

HRP 001 0108 F

approaching the RRI/FS with an open mind and have, by no means, "pre-selected" the ultimate remedial action, if any. Dredging alternatives, bioremediation, and other alternatives (including no action) need to be considered. We have simply determined at this time that the public interest would best be served by EPA, rather than G.E., performing the RRI/FS.

Of course, as a responsible party with respect to the Hudson River PCBs site, G.E. may be held liable for the costs of our RRI/FS, pursuant to Section 107(a) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act. Accordingly, we request that G.E. agree to advance to EPA the funds needed to perform the RRI/FS. Our current estimate of the cost of our study is \$2 million.

To the extent that G.E. is able to expedite its bioremediation pilot study so that results are available in time for EPA to consider them before it completes the RRI/FS, we urge G.E. to submit those results to us. In addition, EPA will seek input from G.E. during development of the work plan for the RRI/FS.

We are anxious to proceed with this study and make a determination of the effects of PCBs on this very important natural resource and the need for and appropriateness of remedial measures.

If you have any questions, please contact Paul Simon of the Office of Regional Counsel at (212) 264-4710.

Sincerely,

/s/

Constantine Sidamon-Eristoff
Regional Administrator

cc: Thomas Jorling, Commissioner NYSDEC
Langdon Marsh, NYSDEC
Michael O'Toole, NYSDEC
Frank Csulak, NOAA
Bill Patterson, DOI
John Claussen, GE

bcc: Paul Simon, ORC-NYCSUP

HRP 001 0109