

70393

ERRATA SHEETS

Date: 12-12-00

Hudson River PCBs Public Meeting

10.6820

1 bit about how we're going to do things here
2 tonight.

3 The purpose of this meeting is to
4 present our proposed plan, to take public
5 comment. So how we're going to do that is by
6 having people come up to the microphones here.

7 Now, those of you who want to give
8 verbal comment can do that by filling out
9 small index card like this, some of you already
10 have. If some of you have not, please do so.
11 That's the only way you're going to get up
12 here. We're going to call you up by fives and
13 sixes to come up to the microphones and give
14 your comments or questions.

15 There is some EPA people here.
16 Would you please identify yourselves, those on
17 the floor? Raise your hands. Okay. We've
18 got Bonnie Bellow over here and we've got Nina
19 back there. If you want, what you can do is
20 you can fill out a card as the meeting
21 progresses and get it to them, and they can
22 get it to me so that you can come up here and
23 give your comment.

24 Now, everybody's going to be

1 Hudson Valley after this one and the one at
2 Poughkeepsie this Thursday night. We will be
3 back up in this area and other areas of the
4 Hudson Valley in January to speak with you
5 again and to take more comment.

6 Before we turn this over to Rich
7 and he starts talking about the proposed plan,
8 I do want to acknowledge that there are some
9 people here who are representatives, elected
10 representatives, who do want to come up and
11 share their thoughts with us. And we will
12 acknowledge them and have them come up to the
13 microphones before we open the public portion.

14 I want to recognize Congressman
15 Maurice Hinchey, who will be coming up to the
16 mic.; also Peter Lehner, who is representing
17 the Attorney General, Eliot Spitzer; and also
18 Assemblyman Robert G. Prentiss is also here.

19 I guess that's about it. So I'm
20 going to turn this over to Rich Caspe.

21 And have a good evening.

22 MR. CASPE: Good evening.

23 As Ann said, we're here tonight to
24 present EPA's remedy for dealing with the

1 as an example, is 4,000 pages. It will be on
2 the website this week. The proposed plan is
3 only 31 pages. It's a boiled-down version. I
4 strongly recommend you read that one first.

5 But, again, this is a time to share
6 opinions, understand the facts, and for all
7 parties here to try to listen to each other
8 and understand where they're coming from.

9 So after a 10-year study, where are
10 we? I'd like to recap what we know, what the
11 study has given us.

12 We know that PCB is a serious
13 health threat. We know that over one million
14 pounds of PCBs were discharged into the Hudson
15 River. We know that PCBs don't go away in the
16 environment, that they're long lived. We know
17 that there's unacceptable fish contamination
18 in the Hudson River, and we know that when we
19 look into Thompson Island Pool that the fish
20 numbers are over a hundred times what we
21 believe would be an acceptable number. We
22 know that people are eating the fish, despite
23 the eat-none advisories. The latest 1996
24 study that was done by the Department of

1 stretch, you see a lot less red, only around a
2 half a million cubic yards, and large
3 stretches of the river that would not be
4 disturbed at all.

5 If you look at the next slides, moving
6 on, the next two, moving to the last 29 miles
7 of the river, you see that there is very, very
8 little dredging actually that's occurring,
9 roughly a half a million cubic yards and only
10 a few hot spots.

11 We did the dredging for different
12 reasons. In the first, in the first stretch,
13 we looked at the Thompson Island Pool. What
14 really was governing what we were looking at
15 was the impact on fish. You know, that area
16 certainly had the greatest impact, and that's
17 what governed largely where we were dredging.

18 When we moved, looked into the
19 second section, it was a combination of
20 factors. We had some large masses of PCBs
21 there as well as we had considerable impact on
22 fish as well.

23 When we moved into the third area,
24 in fact, we did look - the fish issues

1 weren't that great. What the issues were here
2 is we had hot spots that clearly showed that
3 there was some scour, we saw signs of scour,
4 erosion, in some of those hot spots, so the
5 selected areas there for removal that we
6 believed otherwise were continuing to erode
7 and continuing to move with the river
8 downstream, downstream and sideways, I guess,
9 as it mixes around.

10 So we looked at those different
11 things.

12 And what all of this really shows,
13 if you to go the last slide, I guess, what it
14 really shows is that the impacted area, the
15 river, 40 miles of river, and it's a pretty
16 big river, so there's 3900 acres of river
17 bottom within this 40-mile stretch. Of those
18 3900 acres, we are recommending that we would
19 dredge around five, a little under 500 acres
20 of it. That's around 13 percent of the area.
21 That's why we call it targeted. It's far from
22 what some people characterize as bank-to-bank
23 dredging. Certainly not for 40 miles, not for
24 six miles, and not for five miles referring to

1 targeted that's why the remedy is referred to
2 as what it is.

3 We are proposing no local landfill.
4 And that is largely as a result of community
5 opposition. We've heard you, we've tried to
6 accommodate that. All of the, all of the
7 dredge material would be water, which I'll
8 come back to, and then shipped by rail to
9 facilities outside of the Hudson Valley.

10 Now, people say, "Well, where is
11 that going?" For costing purposes, we used
12 Texas for the hazardous material and Buffalo
13 for the non-hazardous material. I just
14 would underline that that's for costing
15 purposes. And you have to understand
16 something, that when you're dealing with rail
17 transport, once you put something in a rail
18 car, it doesn't cost that much more to go a
19 little bit further. So just so you understand
20 that. And, certainly, we're not looking at
21 anything in the Hudson Valley.

22 Dewatering facilities. We will
23 need dewatering facilities. There will be
24 probably two of them. We need one in the north

1 and we need one in the south. The operation,
2 while the operation is going on, these
3 facilities will have to be operated. There are
4 around 15 acres. We would expect them to be
5 each, up to 15 acres, depending on what type
6 of dredges we used and how we set the
7 operation up. And would be cited on
8 commercial property. We have looked, we
9 believe there are commercial sites that would
10 not require taking of any farmland or anything
11 else for putting this. We can put one,
12 basically, in the area of the Port of Albany.
13 And the other was somewhere slightly north of
14 the Moreau Landfills.

15 And rail transport, I mentioned
16 that.

17 Five-year construction. We've
18 heard a lot of different things about how long
19 it takes to do something. We believe we can
20 do this job in five years. We can get in, we
21 can get the job done, we can get it out.
22 People refer to previous dredging jobs. They
23 take a 50,000 cubic yard dredging job and they
24 say, "Well, if that took a year and this is 10

1 times or 20 times, whatever, bigger, then this
2 is going to take 20 times longer." That's not
3 the way things are. And I think you all know
4 that, when somebody builds, builds a housing
5 development or something like that, doesn't
6 take them 20 times longer to build 20 houses
7 as it takes them to build one house. This
8 would be scaled up. We would be operating
9 with multiple dredges. They would be
10 environmental dredges. And I underline that,
11 environmental dredges. They will not be your
12 children's Tonka toys. They won't look like
13 that. They won't be the dredges that you've
14 seen pulling mud out, dripping things from all
15 different sides. These are dredges that have,
16 they have positioning systems built into them,
17 they have video cameras built into them. We
18 would have real-time monitoring going on at
19 the same time the dredging will go on to
20 insure that we didn't have sediment
21 contamination of any significance leaving the
22 site. So we think this can get going and it can
23 be done readily.

24 So where are we going from here?

1 Well, we have a public comment
2 period, and we're expecting that by June, our
3 hope is that by June we would finalize the
4 remedy. We would then have a three-year
5 design, where a lot of the details, exactly
6 how all of this would be done, would be then
7 laid out, you know, in great detail, the way
8 you normally do in an engineering design. And
9 then after that three-year design, we would
10 expect to have a five-year construction
11 schedule, where we would be in and out within
12 five years.

13 That's largely the remedy that I'd
14 like to cover. I'd now like to turn it over
15 for a little bit more detail to two RPM's for
16 the site. RPM's being remedial project
17 managers.

18 And first Doug is going to talk
19 about the remedial remedy and go a little bit more
20 into why remediation is necessary. And then
21 Alison will go into a few more details on what
22 the actual remediation will be.

23 Thank you.

24 DOUG TOMCHUK: Thank you.

1 water Hudson which is all the way, at least,
2 down to Kingston for a 100 river miles.
3 That's the primary source of PCBs to the
4 river.

5 This graphic shows the PCBs coming
6 in at Roger's Island. That's in the yellow
7 part. It's split up by the type of PCBs called
8 homologues there and it shows a pattern which is
9 used to identify the sources in certain
10 aspects of this. And then the light blue bars
11 are the PCBs as they come out at the Thompson
12 Island Dam. Basically you see an increase in
13 concentration. You also see a shift in
14 pattern which enables us to identify them as
15 similar to the ones that are in the sediments
16 and make the statement that they do come from
17 the sediments as well. There are no other
18 sources in this region. They have to come
19 from the sediments.

20 So we have PCBs that come out of
21 the sediments. Well there are different
22 processes that occur and -- that could help
23 deplete this over time. So that if the river
24 was to clean itself there are certain

1 processes. I will cover two of them tonight
2 which are two of the ones we have heard about
3 the most. The first one is PCB
4 dechlorination, the natural break down of
5 PCBs, if you would, or stripping off of
6 chlorine molecules making less of them and
7 some people claim less toxic. That's not
8 EPA's position. Okay. Sediment PCB
9 inventories will not be naturally remediated
10 by dechlorination. Our investigation showed
11 us that we got less than a 10% mass loss over
12 time, and basically that is controlled by the
13 concentration, not the amount of time. It's
14 not just a matter of waiting another 10, 20 or
15 30 years. That the concentration in the
16 sediment controls it. So it's not -- the
17 dechlorination occurs quickly, and then the
18 rates drop down to negligible rates. Another
19 way that PCBs could be naturally -- the system
20 could be naturally remediated as burial so the
21 PCBs would be isolated from the water column
22 and from the biota. We have found that the
23 upper Hudson River is a dynamic system and
24 natural sedimentation will not solve the

1 the primary -- as I said eating fish is the
2 primary exposure pathway and we have found
3 that cancer is a thousand times greater than
4 our goal for protection. To people that are
5 involved in this it's 1×10 to the 3rd.
6 That's where the combined consumption, whether for
7 a young child, adolescent and adult. For
8 non-cancer hazards we are over hundred times
9 the acceptable level for a young child and
10 sixty five times the acceptable level for an
11 adult. Non-cancer health effects can be
12 things such as low birth weight, learning
13 problems and immune system problems, inability
14 to fight infection.

15 We have also done ecological risk
16 assessments and found unacceptable levels to
17 animals that eat fish, and that would be
18 animals such as the river otter, mink and bald
19 eagle.

20 So basically we have a problem with
21 the sediment. We do not see that going away.
22 PCBs remain available to the biota of the fish
23 and can be consumed by humans and other
24 receptors. So Alison will now discuss some of

1 the -- basically that's the reason that we
2 believe in remediation, active remediation is
3 appropriate, and Alison will now discuss how
4 we -- the process that we use to try to
5 determine the right remediation process to
6 select.

7 ALISON HESS: Thank you, Doug.

8 I would like to share with you the
9 process the EPA went through in order to
10 arrive at our preferred alternative. We did
11 what's known as a feasibility study. As Rich
12 mentioned, this is summarized in our proposed
13 plan. It's a six volume study. It is
14 available in the information repositories and
15 should be available on our website shortly.
16 In the feasibility study we evaluate options
17 for PCB contaminated sediment in the upper
18 Hudson River in order to protect human health
19 and the environment for the entire nearly 200
20 miles of this superfund site.

21 Next slide, please. The objectives
22 of our study included reducing cancer risks
23 and non-cancer hazards for people eating fish
24 by reducing concentrations of PCBs in fish.

1 another. We looked at different treatment
2 technologies, we looked at in situ treatment
3 technologies, which are treatment technologies
4 whereby the PCB contaminated sediment would be
5 treated in place. We did not find any
6 technologies that were capable of doing this
7 in the Hudson River. We also looked at two
8 extra treatment technologies where the PCB
9 contaminated sediments would be removed from
10 the river and then treated. We looked at some
11 beneficial use options. These are options
12 where PCB contaminated sediments might be
13 treated in order to create some commercially
14 viable product such as cement or architectural
15 tiles. We looked at different modes of
16 transportation that would be available, and
17 finally we considered various disposal
18 options.

19 The criteria for evaluation are
20 standard criteria that are used at all
21 superfund sites. We have nine criteria that
22 we use and the two most important are called
23 the threshold factors. And these are overall
24 protection of human health and the environment

1 additional dredging in the channels to
2 implement our alternative and also to allow
3 the normal flow of river traffic. It included
4 monitored natural attenuation until acceptable
5 levels are obtained, and also assumed the
6 source control at the GE Hudson Falls plant.
7 This remedy -- these remedies are protective
8 of human health and the environment because
9 they involve the permanent removal of PCB
10 contaminated sediments from the river and
11 thereby result in reductions in concentrations
12 of PCBs in fish.

13 The next slide shows a comparison
14 of the two dredging alternatives that we
15 considered. Number 1 is the preferred
16 alternative that EPA has identified and Number
17 2 is a more extensive dredging alternative
18 that we considered. You can see that there --
19 our preferred alternative has just under
20 500 acres of area that would be targeted while
21 the more extensive remedy is significantly
22 larger at just under a thousand acres.

23 Similarly the total volume removed
24 in EPA's preferred alternative is

1 My question goes to the
2 implementation of this program.

3 It's clear that you've proposed a
4 dredging program unprecedented in scope and
5 are predicting that it will be done in five
6 years. Can you tell us how many dredges at a
7 time will be operating?

8 Let me just ask several parts.

9 How many dredges at a time will be
10 operating?

11 What production rates have you
12 assumed?

13 And how many shifts a day do you
14 plan to operate the dredges?

15 And then the related question is
16 what is the split you've assumed between
17 hazardous and non-hazardous waste? In other
18 words, TOSCA and non-TOSCA waste?

19 Thank you.

20 MR. CASPE: Can you just give me
21 that third part again?

22 I got dredges, production rates.
23 The last one is --

24 BRAD CUSHING: How many shifts a

1 of different places on a regular basis.

2 KEN FISH: There is already
3 community opposition in Western New York.
4 It's obvious.

5 MR. CASPE: Wherever it goes it
6 will go to a licensed facility where there
7 will be bids placed, where people -- there
8 will be opportunity for people -- there's
9 money, quite frankly, involved in this. This
10 is an issue of trade. This is an issue of
11 putting this material some place where
12 somebody is looking to make a profit on it.
13 So that's largely where it ends up going.

14 Thank you.

15 The next speaker is Fred Stein.

16 The next five speakers are Manna Jo
17 Greene, Pete Sheehan, Bob Gibson, Stephen
18 Davis, and Robert Henrickson. Fred Stein?

19 FRED STEIN: Yes, good evening.
20 PCBs are a long term threat to human beings.
21 The organization I represent, Rensselaer
22 County Environmental Action, has been spending
23 the last several years trying to determine
24 what the facts are about PCBs and health. We

1 Source control gets you halfway
2 there. Dredging gets you the other half of
3 the way, from our perspective.

4 Second item is speed. You asked
5 whether we've looked to do it faster. We may
6 have, but the truth of the matter is there is
7 no need to look to do it faster. We know we
8 can do it in five years. You know, this job
9 can be done in five years and the ideas that,
10 again, that we said people have put out about,
11 well, look at what you've done here on a much
12 smaller site and say, well, let's scale it up
13 and multiply it by factors. You know, well,
14 again, if it's 10 times as much, it's 10 times
15 as long. That's not the case, we know that's
16 not the case, and we're convinced we can do
17 it.

18 Thank you, John.

19 JOHN CONNOLLY: Just to respond.

20 Source control doesn't get you
21 halfway there and dredging doesn't get you the
22 other half. They both get you to the same
23 place, which is what the chart shows. It's
24 just a matter of time.

1 who I did not elect.

2 In someone who spends time on and
3 in the river, studying its plants and animals,
4 I've been disheartened by the numerous impacts
5 we've imposed on the river, including
6 alterations of flows coming out of Indian Lake
7 and Sacandaga Lake, impoundments in the
8 Adirondacks, the barrier to anadromous fish
9 posed by the Troy Dam, prevention of natural
10 floods in the Poplar and Silver Maple flood
11 plane forests with hard banks along Menands
12 and Watervliet, the large declines in three
13 native mollusks species by factors such as
14 zebra mussels, which have been brought in by
15 boat traffic, the scraping of the river
16 sediments over tens of miles for navigational
17 dredging and, lastly, the poisoning of native
18 animals of the Thompson Island Pool by PCBs.

19 The tidal portion of the Hudson
20 River is essentially unique in this state and
21 probably has a good chance to being restored
22 to one of the few best examples of this river
23 type along the east coast in the U.S. if we
24 reduce some of these major disturbances that

1 JAMES KUDLACK: I'm James Kudlack
2 a former agriculture advisor to Congressman
3 Solomon, retired, at last. We have heard time
4 after time --

5 MR. CASPE: Excuse me, Mr.
6 Kudlack. Could you stand a little closer?

7 JAMES KUDLACK: We have heard
8 time after time to dredge, not to dredge. We
9 listen to very elaborate discussions on how
10 hazardous PCBs are on fish and humans, and
11 discussions that there is no proof of PCBs
12 being a hazard. I have heard nothing of
13 alternatives to dredging. The ideal method
14 would be the solar crystal refractory system
15 which can break PCBs down by subjecting PCBs
16 to very high temperatures. To explain the
17 solar crystal refractory system mechanics
18 briefly, it will consist of refractory tubes,
19 the hot spots would be coffered, sludge would
20 be constantly stirred and circulated through
21 the system by pipe line. No mess, no fuss.

22 To supplement and to defray some of
23 the PCB clean up costs I highly advise for the
24 Hudson River Research Institute to be

1 know? Choosing PCBs in their system or being
2 thrown back, they'll take being thrown back.

3 (Applause.)

4 Now, according to one study I've
5 read, a human being would have to eat pounds
6 of Hudson River fish every day for decades to
7 endanger his or her health to a cancerous
8 level.

9 Now, one thing I'd like to read.
10 In an EPA's legal announcement of it's
11 remedial alternative, this was in today's
12 Saratogian. This was in the legal advertising
13 section. Here's what they say. Here's what
14 they printed so you can be sure they chose
15 their words carefully.

16 (Applause.)

17 JEFF KELLY: Wait a minute.

18 MR. CASPE: Hold it. Hold it.

19 Hold it. Come on.

20 JEFF KELLY: I'll be done in a
21 minute. In one minute, literally.

22 "Some of the dredged areas will be
23 backfilled and approximately one foot of clean
24 material to isolate -- isolate residual PCB

1 powered lobbyists who ignore this public health
2 threat. No other superfund site has endured
3 the technical and political scrutiny that the
4 Hudson River PCB site has endured, and we
5 strongly encourage the EPA to keep this
6 process moving forward, stay on track, and
7 issue it's final record of decision by
8 June 2001. We encourage the EPA to hold
9 public meetings along the entire stretch of
10 the Hudson River, this 200 mile superfund
11 site, including meetings in New York City so
12 that all effected communities have the
13 opportunity to make public comments before the
14 agency. Scenic Hudson will thoroughly review
15 the proposed plan and feasibility study and
16 submit more extensive comments. While on face
17 value the removal of 2.6 million cubic yards
18 and 100,000 pounds of PCBs sounds fairly
19 extensive, we are concerned whether this goes
20 far enough.

21 Our -- just real quickly our three
22 concerns is that to keep the 2000 deadline; we
23 are concerned about the three year design
24 phase, that we need to accelerate that; and

1 listed the Hudson as one of the ten most
2 endangered rivers for the past four years, and
3 PCB impacts were one of the major reasons. I
4 also note that this week a U.N. treaty was
5 enacted by 122 countries banning the "dirty
6 dozen". They are the twelve most highly toxic
7 chemicals they consider. The press indicated
8 that this was because they break down slowly,
9 the travel easily in the environment and they
10 have been linked to cancer and birth defects.

11 I have been working on the Hudson
12 recently for practically all my summers. I see
13 the need. I urge you to move ahead with this
14 program.

15 Thank you.

16 MR. CASPE: Thank you.

17 The next five speakers are going to
18 be Maureen Ferraro-Davis, Neal Herr, Charles
19 Hanehan, Andy Esperti and Susan Lawrence.

20 MARSHALL SECUNDA: Excuse me.

21 You called my name, Marshall Secunda.

22 MR. CASPE: Yeah, I'm getting up
23 to you. That's -- I'm getting there, I'm
24 getting there. Those are the next five.

1 is Maureen Ferraro-Davis. I'm a resident of
2 the Hudson River Valley. I live on the banks
3 of the upper Hudson River, in the Town of
4 Schaghticoke, at approximately river mile 158
5 from looking at your map, just below Campbell
6 Island.

7 I've always supported the EPA's
8 decision to actively remediate the upper
9 Hudson with environmental dredging. I do,
10 however, have a concern, the Arbor Hill
11 Environmental Justice Center recently
12 initiated the testing of soil samples in my
13 neighborhood. Samples taken from my yard, not
14 river sediment, came back 380 parts per
15 million and another 780 parts per million.
16 Both samples identified the type of PCB as
17 Aroclor 1242, which, I believe, is used by
18 GE. It's my understanding that anything over
19 50 parts per million is considered toxic. But
20 I see in your report that the EPA has just
21 determined that my family's exposure to these
22 elevated levels through daily living
23 activities represent an acceptable risk. I'm
24 sorry, but I have a problem hearing that

1 adverse health effects to my family are
2 acceptable risks.

3 Nonetheless, I believe it is time
4 to send GE a message that social
5 responsibility is as important as a bottom line.

6 MR. CASPE: I would just like to
7 say in response to that that this remedy that
8 we're dealing with here is dealing with the
9 river bottom really and the contaminated
10 sediments there. If you're having a problem
11 on your property as well, you can contact the
12 Department of Health or you can contact us
13 directly as well and we'd be glad to look into
14 it with you and with the State.

15 Next speaker is Neal Herr. Is
16 there a Neal Herr here?

17 Charles Hanehan.

18 CHARLES HANEHAN: Good evening.
19 My name is Charlie Hanehan.

20 My two brothers -- that's
21 H-A-N-E-H-A-N.

22 My two brothers and myself own
23 Hanehan Family Dairy, milking 650 cows in the
24 Town of Saratoga. Okay. We milk -- There you

1 can hear that -- 650 cows in the Town of
2 Saratoga. Part of our farm consists of 110
3 acres of the finest and most productive soil
4 in New York State. This land is mostly in the
5 flood plane of the Hudson River just south of
6 Schuylerville in Coville. It's a beautiful
7 and historic area. In fact, this very tract
8 of land was pictured in the National
9 Geographic March 1996 article entitled "Herr
10 of the Hudson." There's the picture. That's
11 my land.

12 And I am extremely concerned about
13 increased PCB sedimentation on my land due to
14 EPA's ill-advised proposed dredging project in
15 the Hudson, just up river from my land.

16 I have neighbors who irrigate the
17 land throughout the growing season who are
18 also very concerned about this problem. We
19 are in the process of hiring an environmental
20 engineering firm to do baseline testing of the
21 soil and to monitor PCB levels as the dredging
22 proceeds. We will hold EPA, Scenic Hudson,
23 and the Sierra Club responsible if these
24 levels increase, as I believe they will.

1 I support the plan to dredge PCBs
2 from the Hudson River.

3 This is obviously a very
4 controversial issue. Some on both sides have
5 good points. I think to find a workable
6 solution we need to cooperate with -- from
7 both sides. And I would like to suggest a
8 small step in that direction.

9 I think reasonable people on both
10 sides would agree that both the river and the
11 fish in the river would be better if they
12 didn't contain PCBs. Even GE agrees that some
13 clean up is necessary, since they are
14 currently cleaning up along the shoreline in
15 some areas.

16 To dredge or not to dredge, that is
17 the question.

18 One side says a lot of dredging is
19 required. The another side says none. Who is
20 right?

21 How about a third alternative? A
22 closely monitored pilot project to prove the
23 concept out, a pilot project large enough
24 to prove the proposed technology is safe and

1 cancer. And my father died from a very rare
2 kind of leukemia, called stem cell leukemia.
3 The incidence of cancers, especially breast
4 and lymphomas, is extremely high in the Hudson
5 estuary. PCBs affect all parts of the body,
6 the nervous system, the blood system, the
7 immunological system, the endocrine system,
8 just about everything.

9 I've researched as much as I can on PCBs
10 and dredging and listened to GE's point of
11 view. This year, they were dredging in the
12 Mohawk River where I fish, between Lock 8 and
13 9, with a cutter head. This was navigational
14 dredging, but they dredged five days a week.
15 On the Saturday morning we were there
16 catching, within 15 feet of this dredge, an
17 unbelievable number of bass. They were not
18 affected by it at all, up to four pounds. And
19 I saw no serious environmental problems or
20 damage being done by this dredging.

21 I believe it is imperative that
22 dredging to remove as much of the
23 contamination as possible be started as soon
24 as possible.

1 Responsibility.

2 My family and I live on the river
3 in Selkirk, New York, in the Town of
4 Bethlehem. We've been there 18 years. My
5 family and I also boat and fish the river, so
6 I have many reasons to be here.

7 As a member of Physicians for
8 Social Responsibility, for the past 10 years
9 I've been involved in educating local
10 communities on the dangers of waste
11 incineration, a process that produces dioxins.

12 Therefore, I'm aware of the health
13 effects and environmental effects of PCBs, and
14 the EPA's proposed remedy is the best way to deal
15 with this issue at this time.

16 Ideally, pollution should be
17 prevented in the first place. And given this
18 lesson, we should be shutting down waste
19 incinerators across the country.

20 I live on the shore of the Hudson
21 River in Bethlehem. Almost in my backyard is
22 a water treatment plant, a water recovery
23 plant from an aquifer on the side of the river,
24 which goes primarily to feed GE's plastics

1 Stillwater, New York and declared the upper
2 Hudson, from Fort Edward south to Federal Dam
3 in Troy, open for cash-and-release fishing.
4 In doing so, Governor Pataki stated that the
5 Hudson River has never been so clean and that
6 the fish have never been so healthy.

7 It was obvious then, and it is more
8 obvious now, to dredge this river would be a
9 mistake that would have a major, negative
10 impact on the communities which are dependent
11 on the Hudson River as not only a source of
12 recreation but also as an important source
13 that enhances the economic development of
14 these communities.

15 I serve on the Saratoga County
16 Board of Supervisors, and that legislative
17 body passed a unanimous resolution opposing
18 dredging. That Board represents nearly
19 200,000 people, and those voices need to be
20 heard.

21 I also served as vice-chairman of
22 the United States Environmental Protection
23 Agency's Governmental Liaison Committee, and
24 that Committee opposes dredging.

1 to treat or remove 100,000 pounds of that.
2 That's 7% of the material originally removed.
3 The difference is 1.2 million pounds. My
4 question is how much of that 1.2 million
5 pounds will be in the sediments of the upper
6 Hudson River after dredging, and how much of
7 that material is in the sediments of the lower
8 Hudson River which will not be treated at all?

9 MR. CASPE: We believe our remedy
10 will remove approximately 50% of the PCBs in
11 the upper Hudson River sediment. Thank you.

12 MARK HARKNESS: And how much is
13 in the lower Hudson?

14 MR. CASPE: The rest of it.

15 MARK HARKNESS: So you're saying
16 that your remedy is going to treat, like, 10%
17 of the PCBs in the river?

18 MR. CASPE: The estimate of 1.3
19 million pounds is just that, it is an
20 estimate. There are no real records of what
21 GE discharged into the river. Estimates
22 actually range from 209,000 to 1.3 million not
23 including any releases from the Hudson Falls
24 plant site, you know, that are seeping out

1 agency's position so I have it clear. Are you
2 planning to start dredging before the source
3 control work at the Hudson Falls GE plant is
4 completed and evaluated?

5 MR. CASPE: You asked two
6 questions. There's two parts to that question
7 (Someone in the audience said to answer it yes
8 or no.) The answer(sic) is do we plan on
9 dredging before the work is done?

10 MARK BEHAN: And evaluated.

11 MR. CASPE: No. Well I have
12 heard proposals that we might evaluate for 5,
13 10, 20, 50 years and then we'll decide. No,
14 we certainly would believe that source control
15 is something that should be taking place
16 before we dredge, as we dredge the source will have
17 been handled.

18 MARK BEHAN: You have a dredging
19 start date of 2004 in the plan.

20 MR. CASPE: Right.

21 MARK BEHAN: And as I read the
22 plan, you expect source control to be in place
23 by 2005.

24 MR. CASPE: We expect them both

1 whether it's completed, the answer is yes.
2 Evaluated? I don't know what that means. Is
3 that a five year program, a ten year program?

4 MARK BEHAN: The benefits, I
5 mean. What are the benefits of it? Were they
6 evaluated?

7 MR. CASPE: What are you
8 proposing?

9 MARK BEHAN: I'm proposing that
10 you look at the benefits of reducing the
11 source before you begin dredging.

12 MR. CASPE: And could you
13 explain -- could you just explain to me what
14 you would propose as far as how long we would
15 study those benefits?

16 MARK BEHAN: You ought to take a
17 look at the monitoring data for a period of
18 time before you begin dredging.

19 MR. CASPE: What period of time
20 do you want me to look at? (Audience getting
21 loud.)

22 MARK BEHAN: I'm sorry?

23 MR. CASPE: What period of time?

24 MARK BEHAN: What period of time?

1 family have worked for GE. That doesn't mean
2 we don't acknowledge the negative health
3 impact of PCBs and the obvious fact that PCBs
4 do not belong in the river bed of the Hudson.

5 I'm about to start my family, and
6 that's my motivation for speaking to you
7 tonight. I want my child to grow up in a
8 healthy environment. I want my child to be
9 able to enjoy the Hudson River.

10 It's past time to remove the PCBs.

11 Thanks.

12 MR. CASPE: Thank you.

13 Next speaker is Margaret Stein.

14 MARGARET STEIN: Thanks for the
15 opportunity.

16 Margaret Stein, S-T-E-I-N. I am a
17 member of Rensselaer County Environmental
18 Management Council.

19 I support the EPA recommendation to
20 dredge the Hudson River of PCBs. The river
21 will not cleanse itself, only push PCBs
22 throughout the food web and disburse it
23 throughout the environment.

24 I have major concerns about the

1 level of pollution which will be deposited,
2 say, in a 50- or a hundred-year flood event.
3 Also, the river must be dredged for
4 navigational purposes. There needs to be a
5 repository for this pollution.

6 The river suffers from a poor image
7 when recreation and fish consumption is
8 regulated due to pollution, PCB or otherwise.

9 If the state's emphasis is for
10 economic development and expansion, cleaning
11 the river is an acceptable way to accomplish
12 this. Fishing could become a major economic
13 and recreational activity. Currently, there
14 are people potentially catching and eating
15 fish containing high levels of PCBs. This is
16 unacceptable.

17 My enthusiasm about the Hudson
18 River is directly affected by the pollution
19 levels. I wish for the dredging to take place
20 so that fish advisories can be lifted sooner,
21 within a possible 10-year timeframe or 20-year
22 timeframe, as opposed to 50, without dredging.

23 I would like to utilize the river
24 to its fullest within my generation, not my

1 Wrong.

2 We have never, ever remotely
3 suggested that this is an issue. More to the
4 point, EPA has obviously only heard what it
5 wanted to hear. It forgot the rest of that
6 resolution passed by 60-plus upper river
7 communities. We opposed river dredging.

8 So the upper river communities are
9 going to give EPA yet another opportunity.
10 Last night the Town of Fort Edward passed a
11 new resolution, simply titled "We Oppose
12 Dredging of the Upper Hudson River." Tonight
13 other communities are already meeting to pass
14 this resolution.

15 Now, because we, in this room,
16 heard the statement out of your mouth,
17 Mr. Caspe, the EPA listened to the upper river
18 communities regarding landfill.

19 Will someone at the head table tell
20 me why you can't hear our crystal, clear
21 message, upper river communities
22 oppose dredging. Let me repeat. Yes, we, all
23 60-plus communities and many inner-county
24 boards oppose dredging of the upper river.

1 strongly support the removal of PCB
2 contaminated sediment from the upper Hudson
3 River, and commend the EPA for it's progress
4 toward cleaning up the Hudson River. NOAA and
5 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Trustees on behalf of
6 the public wish to restore natural resources that
7 have been injured by hazardous substances such
8 as PCBs. The Trustees seek permanent
9 protective remedies at superfund sites such as
10 the Hudson River. Sediment removal is the
11 only clean up action that will unequivocally
12 reduce future adverse impact to the Hudson
13 River resources.

14 The Hudson River is a national
15 historical, cultural and environmental
16 resource. Between the late 1940's and 1977
17 somewhere between 209,000 and 1.33 million
18 pounds of PCBs were discharged into the river
19 by GE. Today PCBs continue to be released
20 from contaminated sediments as well as through
21 the fractured bedrocks below Hudson Falls.
22 Many of the natural resources of the Hudson
23 River ecosystem have been exposed to PCBs and
24 many remain grossly contaminated. Current

1 As a reminder, we've been a group
2 of citizens, an unpaid group of volunteers
3 that have been actively opposed to dredging of
4 the Hudson River and encapsulation of PCBs and
5 sediments for 20 years.

6 The Hudson River is part of my
7 past, and today I've brought another part of
8 my past with me here, because at the EPA
9 meeting that you had in Albany today, a press
10 conference, the EPA came clean and stated that
11 two miles below the Rogers Island, in Fort
12 Edward, they were dredging bank to bank. And
13 utilizing both hydraulic dredging and clam
14 shell dredging. It's kind of funny that a
15 week ago today Administrator Carol Browner, of
16 the EPA, very sarcastically, in her press
17 conference announcing her plans for the river,
18 said, "Absolutely would there be no use of
19 Tonka toy type dredging as depicted in the GE
20 ads. It's funny that today, a week late,
21 you're letting out a little more information
22 and that you are going to be using mechanical
23 dredging.

24 We're very, very concerned about

1 this proposal and we're vehemently opposing it
2 and we intend to for a long, long time. We're
3 going to ask you to reconsider it. We feel
4 that dredging of the upper Hudson River will
5 be extremely invasive and definitely is going
6 to cause a lot of harm, there's going to be a
7 lot of risk to the local private land, the
8 farm land, the small business community, and
9 tourism.

10 They say that it won't be shutting
11 down the river and it won't be making it so
12 people can't use it for recreational purposes
13 while dredging's going on. In this world of
14 lawyers, I'm sure that there's no dredging
15 contractor that's going to allow children on
16 jet skis and old men in fishing boats to be
17 out there fishing on the river in the
18 proximity of dredging.

19 I see my time is almost up, and
20 I've got a list of unanswered questions which
21 you probably won't be able to address right
22 here in the next 10 seconds.

23 But in closing I would like to say
24 that dredging 2.65 million cubic yards of

1 river sediment to recover a hundred thousand
2 pounds of PCBs is like buying a 747 to get
3 free peanuts.

4 MR. CASPE: Thank you.

5 Next speaker is Shannon Belt.

6 Next speaker is Robert Goldman.

7 ROBERT GOLDMAN: Good evening.

8 I'm Rob Goldman. I am a owner/operator of a
9 small marine transportation and tow and
10 salvage company located in Troy, New York.

11 And I'd like to tell you first hand
12 that we're running out of water draft and we
13 really do need navigational dredging on the
14 north canal to the summit level. And the
15 question comes up is why, you know, why don't
16 we wait. Well, we can't wait. We're the
17 people that move the equipment that takes care
18 of your infrastructure, your bridges, your
19 dams. We're running out of water draft. It
20 doesn't exist up there.

21 And I noticed on your charts, many
22 of the areas you show as hot spots are areas
23 where we have a really big problem with water
24 draft. So we do support your efforts.

1 had previously reported in his journal
2 polychlorinated byfemales.

3 Education is critical. Hudson
4 Basin River Watch supports the EPA proposal to
5 dredge PCB contaminated sediments from the
6 upper Hudson River from Fort Edward to
7 Waterford and is opposed to siting any
8 hazardous waste in the neighboring river
9 communities.

10 Thank you.

11 MR. CASPE: Thank you.

12 Speaker is Nina Evans.

13 Mary Song.

14 Harrison Downs.

15 Terry Middleton.

16 Next speaker is Dan Colomb.

17 DAN COLOMB: Hi. My name is

18 Dan Colomb and I live in Hudson Falls.

19 And I've seen all of the
20 information that GE has put out about the
21 situation, and I came here tonight to try to
22 learn some more on this subject from your
23 point of view. And just going through the
24 publication that you put out a couple things

1 Solomon and now Sweeney. They have been
2 taking orders for GE. GE if they understood
3 the problem from the beginning, we wouldn't be
4 here now. GE is not a good corporate
5 neighbor. They started in 1983. They had a
6 going-out-of-business sale on America. They
7 were given tax breaks to set up all over the
8 country. The only thing that they left behind to
9 us was their waste product because not
10 controlling it properly increased their
11 budget. Today they announce a \$12.7 billion
12 profit. You would think that they would spend
13 some of that in cleaning up the mess.

14 I'm telling you that tourism can be
15 and will be a number one business. How can
16 you tell a fisherman that comes up to Hudson
17 Falls or to Fort Edward and says, you can
18 touch it for one-minute-and-a-half, and then
19 get rid of it. If you happen to be a pregnant
20 woman or someone with a respiratory problems
21 don't touch it at all.

22 We shouldn't be proud to pollute.
23 We should clean it up.

24 Thank you for the opportunity.

1 The second question you asked was
2 about biological decontamination. I believe
3 Doug can address that.

4 MR. TOMCHUK: With respect to
5 disarming, as you refer to it, generally that
6 has been looked at as dechlorination. Earlier
7 I spoke about that a little bit, and it was
8 describing that. We really investigated that,
9 you know, the natural processes that occur.
10 At this point we don't know of any way to
11 increase those processes to make that the
12 remediation process, but what we really found
13 was there is a theoretical maximum to the
14 extent that that could occur within the
15 system, any how, of 26% of PCB mass lost. So
16 that it wouldn't go all the way. It wouldn't
17 solve the problem. In addition, the statement
18 that dechlorination would produce less toxic
19 varieties of PCBs is not necessarily true.
20 There are studies that have shown that, or at
21 least suggest that, some of the non-cancer
22 effects, such as reduced IQ points are
23 probably due to smaller PCBs with less
24 chlorines on them. So you may increase one

1 or is that too complex, or could the
2 technology be there in the future to be able
3 to do that?

4 MR. CASPE: We haven't been able
5 to find that technology. Nobody has at this
6 stage.

7 GEORGE GOODWIN: Thank you.

8 MR. CASPE: You are welcome.
9 Next speaker -- actually the last scheduled
10 speaker is Vincent Paul Vallone.

11 VINCENT PAUL VALLONE: Good
12 evening and thank you for having us. This is
13 probably one of the best approaches towards
14 finding a decent resolution to a problem
15 involving the communities that are most
16 concerned with it.

17 My name is Vincent Paul Vallone,
18 former resident of Northumberland, Harris
19 Road, West River Road. The river very much
20 was in my past and is still in my future and
21 my children's future. We swam, and did a lot
22 of good activities in there. We did a lot of
23 fishing, a lot of duck hunting. We are also
24 abided by laws and regulations. Something

1 that you are supposed to be taught, if it
2 states "do not eat fish, "do not take fish",
3 then don't do it. We need to address the
4 problem with the PCBs. It is a concern. It's
5 there. I don't know all the facts that some
6 of these people know and that you know about
7 if it causes cancer in people, and how many
8 pounds of fish we need to eat. I do know that
9 if we set up a system of dredging consisting
10 of what you spoke of hydraulic clam shell,
11 whatever, operating three shifts a day, you
12 addressed you may look into that, okay. Three
13 shifts a day, some of these communities now
14 have days set up where they don't even allow
15 noise, you know, at a certain time. You are
16 just going to step in here because you feel
17 that this is the best thing, and you are going
18 to do this, and you are going to make us do
19 it. We use cell phones that cause cancer and
20 everything. Are we going to stop that? It's
21 all our country. Why do we want to take it
22 out of the river and then figure out a way to
23 haul it off and put it somewhere else? The
24 river is not cleaning itself. No, maybe it's

1 hard to say. Did some of it come out from
2 other sources beyond legal discharges,
3 perhaps. Okay. It's probably not quite that
4 simple of an answer.

5 VINCENT PAUL VELLONE: All right.
6 So then to say prior to the 70's when we
7 stopped it, to say that it was illegally
8 done -- (Someone in the audience talking over
9 speaker.)

10 MR. CASPE: Do you want to speak?
11 Let him finish.

12 VINCENT PAUL VELLONE: Step right
13 up here when I'm done, please. To say that it
14 was illegally done, like we used to see in
15 movies and things when EPA did get this going,
16 and I'm glad they did because it's needed, it
17 needs to be investigated, but we used to see
18 trucks backing up to ponds and pools dumping
19 and things like that and then they would
20 research it and then they would find the guy
21 was illegally doing this and they would go and
22 they would get him if they could. Was that
23 done to the extent of what we want to dredge?
24 That it was not a legal process? I mean I do

1 transporting sludge and then have rail heads
2 at the facilities themselves. We don't see a
3 lot of truck traffic, no.

4 MIKE ELDER: So your plan calls
5 for the barging of material to the rail head
6 and removal through some sort of machinery
7 directly onto the railcar. And that's supported
8 in the feasibility study, that's supported in the
9 plan?

10 MR. CASPE: Yeah, remember it's
11 not a full design, obviously, but, yes, it's
12 set forth, yeah.

13 MIKE ELDER: And there will be no
14 truck traffic to remove the material from the
15 point on the shore to the rail head?

16 MR. CASPE: Will there be none?

17 MIKE ELDER: Yes.

18 MR. CASPE: There may be some
19 truck traffic involved. I mean there won't be
20 anything of any major significance. That
21 doesn't mean there won't be some truck traffic
22 involved in some of the operation. You are
23 asking the question as a very -- as an
24 absolute. I don't know whether I can give you