

70401

ERRATA SHEETS

Date: 2-6-01

Hudson River PBCs Public Meeting

10.7770

1 just want to call your attention to that.

2 Up here with me, Doug Tomchuk,
3 Alison Hess, both project managers for the
4 Hudson River team, and Rich Caspe. Rich is
5 the head of Superfund for Region II. He's the
6 division director. And over there also is
7 Marian Olsen. Marian, say hi. She does all
8 our human health risk assessment, and she
9 is invaluable to us. And Doug Fischer, who is
10 our counsel. I think that's about it.

11 I'm going to turn this over to
12 Rich. He'll give you a presentation. Then
13 we're going to acknowledge some public
14 officials and then we'll go to the mikes.

15 MR. CASPE: Thank you. I'd like
16 to start off by apologizing to those of you
17 that are standing. I guess we got more people
18 than we expected. I thank the hotel staff for
19 opening up as much as they could open up.
20 Please make yourself as comfortable as you
21 can.

22 This is the second, we're now into
23 the second round of meetings concerning EPA's
24 proposal for remediation of the Hudson River

25

1 Next thing I'd like to talk about
2 is PCB levels in fish. You can always, if you
3 look hard enough, you can always find an
4 example to prove something that you want to
5 show. For that reason, you have to look at
6 all the data. You have to look at all the
7 data, you have to look at all the fish, and you
8 have to look at all the locations. I'd like
9 to give you four -- and you have to recognize
10 what you've got, because, if you only have
11 five fish from an area on one given year or
12 eight fish from an area, you don't know
13 whether you're really capturing everything
14 properly. There are error bars involved in
15 that. You don't know whether it's plus 50
16 percent, minus 50 percent, and so on and so
17 forth. These are the graphs I'd like to show
18 for the different species of fish as far as
19 what's happened in the last 20 years.

20 If you look at them -- now, this
21 one here is Black Bass at Stillwater. You can
22 see largely -- if you look at the dots, which
23 are in the middle of those, you can see that
24 they're almost level. And then, when you take
25

1 I would just remind you that PCBs
2 are not visible, you don't see PCBs in fish
3 and you don't see PCBs in the water.

4 Next thing I'd like to talk about
5 is source control. Is it a part of the
6 solution? Absolutely, it's part of the
7 solution, but it's not the whole solution.
8 It's part of the solution. The Hudson Falls
9 facility has to be controlled. It is
10 releasing PCBs to the environment. And we
11 anxiously await General Electric Company's
12 submittal to New York State DEC in March to
13 see their proposal on how they're going to do
14 that and when they're going to do it. But I'd
15 like to just remind you that that's roughly
16 three ounces per day of PCBs that are being
17 discharged into the river. Our estimate
18 through the Thompson Island Pool is that the
19 sediments are releasing one to one and a half
20 pounds of PCBs a day. So you're comparing
21 three ounces from that source to one to one
22 and a half pounds from the sediments.

23 And how do we know this? We know
24 this through what we call fingerprinting.

25

1 Spanish Armada, and it doesn't quite look
2 Like back-to-back dredges and barges for the entire
3 area. Far from it. This is what it looks
4 like. And, again, this is a worse case
5 scenario that we put together.

6 I would then also add that, for
7 those of you that look and envision that a
8 dredge would be there outside of your property
9 for months and years, I would just tell you
10 that we wouldn't expect that basically for
11 anybody's property. A dredge would be there for
12 more than weeks. There maybe an exceptions
13 someplace along the way, which we believe
14 we'll look at and try to work out. But we
15 don't expect dredges to be in front of
16 people's properties for a long period of time.
17 We expect to do this, do it efficiently, and
18 move on.

19 The last thing I would just say is
20 examples of dredging, where it does work. We
21 obviously have to do a better job in showing
22 you all our video and our pictures of what
23 dredges look like and how they work. And we
24 will do that as the weeks and the months go
25

1 well, how many hours are you going to work,
2 what kind of noise is it going to be. Noise
3 travels over a river. We've heard all this.
4 We think we can accommodate this. We're
5 working on this. I would just remind
6 everybody here that, as we work on this and we
7 come to a conclusion in August, whatever that
8 conclusion may be, if the conclusion is to go
9 forward with this project, we then have three
10 years to design. We're not going away. And
11 dredging doesn't occur the day, you know,
12 after August, on September 1st. We're talking
13 about three years to design, to go through all
14 the details that you all have so many
15 questions about, and a time period when we
16 would continue to have a public, you know
17 public comment, certainly, and advisory-type
18 group available.

19 With that, I'm going to stop for a
20 little bit and let Alison pick up and address
21 the environmental results of dredging.

22 Thank you.

23 ALISON HESS: Thank you, Rich. I
24 would like to talk about the environmental
25

1 the proposed plan that with EPA's proposed
2 alternative. But what happens next? And I
3 wanted to discuss that for a short while here.
4 Obviously, we want to receive all the public
5 comment. We will review that comment, and we
6 will determine what needs to be addressed from
7 that comment, and then we will make up our
8 minds on what the proper course of action is
9 to address the sediments in the river. Okay.

10 Our decision is put into a document
11 called the Record of Decision which
12 memorializes our decision, and it includes a
13 Responsiveness Summary in which we respond to
14 all the public comments. All substantive
15 comments will be responded to in that
16 document. So that should be done by the end
17 of August.

18 After that process we start our
19 remedial design. Before I talk about that,
20 though, I want to talk about something that
21 will be happening in parallel. That's the
22 Source Control Action that will be ongoing at
23 the GE/Hudson Falls plant site. New York has
24 an order with GE, and GE will be implementing
25

1 materials be taken to a federally approved
2 toxic waste site and that no new toxic waste
3 landfill will be built on the shores of the
4 Hudson or anywhere else.

5 I look forward to meeting with EPA
6 Administrator Whitman in the near future to
7 work on fine tuning the details of the EPA's
8 plan.

9 Finally, I want to emphasize this:
10 If the clean up of the Hudson is derailed now,
11 it will be a long time before we again see
12 this opportunity to restore the Hudson River
13 to its former status, as a premier fishery, a
14 grand recreational expanse, and a safe and
15 reliable source of drinking water.

16 Sierra Club, Environmental
17 Advocates, Scenic Hudson, NYPIRG, and Arbor
18 Hill Environmental Justice Corporation thank
19 Congressman McNulty for this statement.

20 If I may make a statement as the
21 elected Assemblyman from the 104th District in
22 Albany County. First I would ask the people
23 in the audience to look around at yourselves.
24 I cannot think of a more heated or difficult
25

1 think you're going well over your time.

2 ROBERT PRENTISS: I will finish
3 in a moment. You took your sweet time talking
4 to us, now hear us. You talked to us for a
5 whole hour.

6 MR. CASPE: Go ahead.

7 ROBERT PRENTISS: Now when it
8 comes to, if you get a minute, if you give a
9 penny for your thoughts, make sure you give
10 them change. That's all I'm going to say
11 about that.

12 Let me just wrap up my two minutes.
13 By the way, don't worry that we have never
14 attempted a project anywhere near this size,
15 or in a river like the Hudson which EPA has
16 called for, it's swift current, and all of
17 that, destruction. EPA's plan won't reduce
18 the level of PCBs enough to allow unrestricted
19 consumption of fish during most of our life
20 times. Let me be clear, the EPA project will
21 not accomplish the goal of lowering PCBs in
22 fish any faster than a cleanup that is now
23 taking place for that reason -- don't dredge
24 the Hudson River!

25

1 MR. CASPE: A lot of people are here.
2 The next speaker is Assemblyman Brodski. I
3 just would ask all the speakers to try to keep
4 it down to something reasonable. There is a
5 lot of people here who want to speak. I don't
6 have any place to go, but a lot of you
7 probably do.

8 ASSEMBLYMAN BRODSKY: In the
9 interest of brevity I will submit written
10 copies of my statement. The written statement
11 includes the reasoning behind the -- what up
12 to here, in a moment, we have submitted,
13 Senator McEneny and I, a copy of the letter of
14 the Pataki administration to the EPA
15 administration supporting the dredging.

16 Thank you for this opportunity to
17 address the EPA. I accept at the outset the
18 good faith of the EPA, the persons who believe
19 both sides of the issue. Here we are each
20 entitled to our own sets of opinions. We are
21 not entitled to our own sets of the facts.
22 PCBs are poisonous. They were put in the
23 river by General Electric. In order to get
24 rid of the PCBs they must be removed, and
25

1 counter-offensive to the distortions brought
2 forward by General Electric these public
3 hearings remain the only source of information
4 by the community. It is hard to watch. It is
5 hard to watch a paid propaganda campaign
6 showing a mule deer on the bank of the Hudson;
7 that praises a corporation that's going beyond
8 it's allegiance to the bottom line. They have
9 distorted the truth. It's up to the media and
10 the EPA to clear that up, to protect the long
11 and short term interests of this community,
12 and dredging the PCBs out of the bottom of the
13 river.

14 MR. CASPE: Thank you. The next
15 speaker is Lis Grisaru on behalf of Elliot
16 Spitzer, the Attorney General of the State of
17 New York.

18 LIZ GRISARU: My name is Liz
19 Grisaru, and I am an Assistant Attorney
20 General in the Office of Attorney General
21 Elliot Spitzer, the Environmental Protection
22 Bureau. And I have a statement for the EPA.

23 The Attorney General's office
24 strongly supports the U.S. EPA's decision to
25

1 dredge contaminants that are in fish
2 throughout the Hudson River. From Hudson
3 Falls to the Battery life along the Hudson
4 River the wildlife is contaminated. Humans
5 are exposed and are also contaminated with
6 PCBs. It is high time to address those
7 problems. We applaud EPA, Region 2, for the
8 thoroughness you have exhibited in reaching
9 this decision.

10 Congress made a decision over 20
11 years ago and has repeatedly reaffirmed it
12 since that time that there is a compelling
13 national need to clean up toxic waste sites.
14 Companies responsible for it should clean them
15 up preferably by removing them. The Hudson
16 River after decades is long overdue for a
17 cleanup.

18 Based on the extensive evidence in the
19 record, EPA has gathered technical and
20 scientific review of that evidence. Four
21 points are clear and should be indisputable.

22 First, PCBs cause harm to humans
23 and wild life.

24 Second, PCBs are available to fish
25

1 have to pay for the cleanup if G.E. doesn't,
2 to those towns and villages who have done
3 their share, and to New Yorkers who long for a
4 cleaner Hudson, remove the toxic waste from
5 the Hudson. We save the river by cleaning it
6 not by leaving it polluted. Thank you.

7 MR. CASPE: The next speaker is
8 Legislator Marlene Prentiss.

9 LEGISLATOR PRENTISS: I'll tell
10 you right off, I'm opposed to dredging. Too
11 many tons will be taken out and it's mud that
12 you're going to be putting on other people's
13 property and destroying that property. That's
14 45,000 tons, 45,000 tons of mud a day, 45 rail
15 cars to move that out, plus you're harming the
16 people that live around there, on the river,
17 and the fish.

18 I do have a statement. I will hand
19 this in later.

20 But government gets involved just
21 like NL Industry, and it's 20 years and that's
22 not cleaned up. Now we're going to start
23 another project of government and this isn't
24 going to be cleaned up in five years or ninety
25

1 Florida Everglade, what did they do? They
2 raped it. They ruined it. Now they want to
3 put it back where it was. Clearcut forest,
4 the government built roads so that those
5 timber people would have an access to go in
6 there and clearcut the forests. They have
7 done all kinds of bad things. They don't
8 listen. They don't listen. They don't pay
9 attention to you.

10 In the 50s, I don't know how many
11 people remember it, every day in the newspaper
12 they would tell you what the radiation count
13 was in New York because of the atomic bombs
14 they were setting off out in Oregon and
15 Washington. The United States government
16 spread germs to see how many people, not
17 deadly germs, to see how many people would be
18 infected. They spent a million dollars,
19 million dollars, to study the sex life of a
20 tree frog. Since then they spend millions of
21 dollars to study flatulence of a cow, I'm
22 telling you the EPA and the Corp of Engineers,
23 they had their feet right in there in the
24 Everglades. They stunk it up and ruined it,
25

1 people about what's going on.

2 And I would like to thank the EPA
3 for its exhaustive study. Also for engaging
4 in public comment. Thank you.

5 Next I would just say that what you
6 do is right on the money. This isn't about
7 you. It's about the PCBs in the river and
8 what you do with them. It's not about G.E.
9 and the EPA. It's the PCBs.

10 JOHN C. TOBIN: My name is John
11 C. Tobin my comments are on maritime tankers
12 on the Hudson River and on the Champlain
13 Section of the canal --

14 MR. CASPE: Just get a little
15 closer.

16 JOHN C. TOBIN: Now my comments
17 are focused on strictly the negative economic
18 impact that has happened to our industry
19 because of the channel being impeded with the
20 lack of the depth. Judge Taradino(sic), in the
21 State of New York against General Electric in
22 which he sums it up in this statement: If the
23 sediment is allowed to settle and accumulate,
24 the body of water will be squeezed until it's
25

1 use is strictly limited.

2 That has happened in the Champlain
3 section. We can no longer get a barge up, the
4 commercial tour boats they have operated,
5 commercial boats have been grounded. I feel
6 that the communities have lost out because
7 industry and business will not take advantage
8 of the long term lease they can now get from
9 the canal. The jurisdiction of this canal
10 section is with the Canal Corporation of the
11 State of New York, who is directed to get
12 permits so that they can continue. They have
13 to work in conjunction with you.

14 My other point is that what has
15 G.E. been doing about this one? They moved
16 1100 jobs from Fort Edward to Mexico. They
17 also (inaudible) the federal lawsuit in
18 Washington, D.C. due to lack of due process.
19 In addition over in Pittsfield, Massachusetts
20 they entered a consent decree with the state
21 of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and G.E. What
22 about the PCBs here? Is there greater health
23 risk there than here?

24 In conclusion I can only say, what
25

1 can decide whether dredging is right for
2 human beings or not and the only proper
3 morality is one based on humanity,
4 self-preservation, not on self-sacrifice for
5 animals, fish, rivers, rats, or the ambitions
6 of politicians.

7 The real issue at hand is whether
8 the state has the right to prematurely end our
9 lives to restore nature. I argue no, the
10 state has no such right.

11 If GE is forced to waste half a
12 billion dollars on moving mud, then it cannot
13 invest that money in new medical technology.
14 If it can't do that, if it can't invest in new
15 medical technologies, human beings will die as
16 a consequence. That is the real choice: To
17 move mud and kill our fellow man or to respect
18 GE's absolute right to keep all of its profits
19 some that we benefit from life-saving
20 technology.

21 Taxes and regulations destroy human
22 progress. If there were no taxes or
23 regulations, our standard of living would be
24 that of the year 2020. Maybe you don't care
25

1 Pete Sheehan, Heba Mair, David Viale, Marjana
2 Mair, Steve Cowan, Tim Havens, Maryann Mair --
3 a lot of Mairs -- Darwin Brudos.

4 Okay. Next speaker is Andrew
5 Williamson.

6 ANDREW WILLIAMSON: Good evening.
7 My name is Andrew Williamson. I'm a dairy
8 farmer from Washington County. I also have the
9 privilege of representing the County Farm
10 Bureaus of Albany, Rensselaer, Saratoga,
11 Washington, Fulton, Montgomery, and
12 Schenectady Counties.

13 We have some concern with the plan
14 or the remediation plan.

15 First off, I also have read the
16 executive summary from the NAS thing, and
17 you're right, you quoted, they said may, may
18 be, may not also. That's open to
19 interpretation. The things we have are also
20 out of the National Academy of Sciences review
21 was the resuspension levels of PCBs during the
22 dredging process, the silt screen would be
23 during the process but they won't be there for
24 the whole time of settling out the PCBs.

25

1 What's the danger to the surrounding
2 communities and to the flood plain of the
3 river?

4 The second issue is the science
5 (inaudible) and concerns of other pollutants,
6 such as heavy metals. We know they're there,
7 why not deal with them in this plan? I mean,
8 they're going to be part of this whole
9 package.

10 Another issue is the safety of our
11 roads due to the extra truck traffic. There's
12 already numerous hazardous situations for
13 farmers using our local roads. The backfill
14 operation in itself is going to be a massive
15 project, let alone where all this is going to
16 come from.

17 I think this plan just spreads PCBs
18 around. Right now we know they're under the
19 ground. This plan's going to make at least
20 two dewatering facilities and a temporary
21 storage site, where you're going to go, or
22 permanent site, whichever, and any possible
23 contamination that happens in the process of
24 cleaning up.

25

1 Basically, we're also worried about
2 our property rights. We own the majority of
3 the land within two miles of each side of the
4 river. We want to be addressed. We want to
5 know what's going on. We don't want you
6 coming and going as you please.

7 Basically, I'm opposed, we are
8 opposed vehemently to dewatering facilities on
9 or adjacent to agricultural land. And there
10 will be -- I know you stated it, but we
11 will -- there will be no landfill, temporary
12 storage, or whatever you want to call it in
13 our agricultural area.

14 Thank you.

15 MR. CASPE: Thank you. I think
16 there were a couple of questions in there that
17 I'd like to just respond to a little bit.

18 First, there was a question of how
19 do we know what releases would be during an active
20 dredging? We will certainly have the silt
21 screens in place, we'll have environmental
22 dredging techniques, but we'll also have
23 monitoring in place. We'll be monitoring very
24 carefully, is how we plan doing it, and if we
25

1 found any problem, we obviously would modify
2 the operation and shut the operation down
3 temporarily if we had to do that as well.

4 With regard to the issue of heavy
5 metals and things like that, those are
6 generally co-located in the same locations as
7 the PCBs.

8 You talked about trucks. And, you
9 know, I've heard numbers, people talking about
10 thousands of trucks. We don't plan on using
11 any. We don't really see -- I mean,
12 certainly, there will be crews coming to work,
13 although, they're not in the 30,000 people
14 from the Spanish Armada, you know, only about
15 a hundred. But there will be people coming to
16 work that will drive. But beyond that, we
17 plan on using rail and barge.

18 ANDREW WILLIAMSON: Even for
19 the -- I'm talking about the backfill.

20 MR. CASPE: Even for the
21 backfill, that's right. We do not plan on
22 using any trucking operation, you know, as part
23 of this.

24 And I guess the last thing, the
25

1 are and where access points are. We need to
2 know how much truck traffic and where backfill
3 materials are to come from and how they get to
4 the river. And, finally, we need a realistic
5 estimate on how long this disruption will
6 really last. Even a DEC official was recently
7 quoted as saying that the EPA has grossly
8 underestimated timeframe and cost. And the
9 recently quoted National Academy of Sciences
10 also agrees that regulatory agencies do not
11 give sufficient attention to risks as
12 ecological impacts on the local economy. The
13 so-called risks and remedy have not even been
14 considered.

15 New York Farm Bureau opposes this
16 dredging project and plans to submit detailed
17 written comments for the rest of these and
18 other concerns.

19 MR. CASPE: Thank you.

20 I would just respond that I heard
21 that 15 times, that 15 times number actually
22 on a radio station this afternoon driving up,
23 or this morning driving up. I don't know
24 where it really comes from. I mean,
25

1 the Hudson, who value and cherish the Hudson.

2 Thank you.

3 GRACE LeFEBVRE: Hi, my name is
4 Grace LeFebvre. I will let you know that I
5 really don't think this is a good time to
6 dredge the Hudson. I know the PCBs have to
7 come out. I don't think you have the
8 technology to do so. Years ago we all trusted
9 the government. We basically lived by blind
10 faith, but as the years have gone by we have
11 found what the government has done for our
12 children; to the Vietnam veterans exposed to
13 Agent Orange; GIs asked to watch nuclear
14 explosions above ground, no help for them.
15 Along the Hudson there are thousands of young
16 children today who will probably have been and
17 will continue to be exposed to neurotoxins.
18 We know it with their disabilities, learning
19 problems, things of that nature. I don't
20 think you have the technology to safely remove
21 those PCBs at this time. I think a lot more
22 research must go into it. You must not expose
23 the children. We are already contaminated,
24 most of us are in one way or another. You all
25

1 probable human carcinogen.

2 MR. CASPE: Thank you, Marian.

3 LAURA HAIGHT: Yes, I'm Laura

4 Haight, Senior Environmentalist with NYPIRG.

5 The Hudson River dates back roughly 75 million

6 years. Humans settled in the Hudson Valley

7 around 6,000 years ago. Up until the past 100

8 years the Hudson River safely provided

9 sustenance to humans and wildlife who turned

10 to it as a source for food. Now through the

11 unnatural intervention of the General Electric

12 Company many fish from the Hudson River are

13 too contaminated to eat. This is the natural

14 and unnatural history of the Hudson River.

15 These days we hear the word natural a lot.

16 G.E. is trying to convince the public that the

17 river is cleaning itself up naturally. What

18 does that mean exactly? There is nothing

19 natural about PCBs. They are a class of

20 manmade chemicals noted for their ability to

21 not degrade. The only natural process that is

22 taking place is gravity. The PCB contaminated

23 sediment sinks to the bottom of the river.

24 That these sediments are routinely disturbed

25

1 SHEILA POWERS: My name is Sheila
2 Powers. I'm president of Albany County Farm
3 Bureau, and I have had to edit this three or
4 four times, so.

5 I represent -- am president of and
6 represent a 385 member organization, which
7 night not sound very impressive until I tell
8 that 65% of those are farmers. Our
9 organization has passed policy year after year
10 after year opposed to dredging in the Hudson
11 River since 1980, as a matter of fact.
12 Because we haven't seen enough to convince us
13 that the farming areas won't be used as they
14 have been for everything else, to dump into.
15 The impact, the economic impact, the spirit to
16 impact, if you will, to the people who do that
17 work is also at risk here. We are very
18 disappointed at the announcement that you have
19 just decided to dredge. We can't understand
20 why you are unwilling to listen to the voices
21 of those who reside and do business in the
22 area which you are going to do a lot of harm
23 to. We have been told that studies on 7000
24 workers exposed to PCBs don't show health
25

1 problems caused by them. I know from
2 attending enough committee meetings myself
3 during the years that many, many G.E. people
4 were also present at that meeting who were
5 apparently bathed in PCB oils and certainly
6 didn't look unwell to me. You have already
7 said the water is safe to drink and swim in.
8 And you said, and nobody disagreed, that PCB
9 levels are lower than they were in 1984 when
10 EPA handed out a no action decision. You
11 won't tell us where you are going to dump the
12 sediment, but we know it probably won't be in
13 Niagara Falls now, and we don't want it
14 either. We are concerned about impact to
15 agriculture land located near this proposed
16 dredging site. These lands shouldn't be
17 considered dump sites for PCBs or other
18 contaminants. They are producing food which
19 people eat.

20 MR. CASPE: Thank you.

21 SHEILA POWERS: I'm not quite
22 finished, sir.

23 MR. CASPE: I had that suspicion.

24 SHEILA POWERS: Yeah, okay. I
25

1 those who grow on big pieces of land --

2 MR. CASPE: We are looking to
3 take this material to facilities that are
4 aimed at taking it -- where they take this --
5 they make money by taking this stuff. It will
6 be put out to bid and they will be taking it
7 to commercial facilities that would take this
8 material, not farm land, not new land fills,
9 old existing facilities.

10 SHEILA POWERS: And I think I
11 heard you say tonight that you would be taking
12 it through the rail lines only and to be removing
13 it by rail, is that right? Is that what I
14 heard?

15 MR. CASPE: Right. That's
16 correct.

17 SHEILA POWERS: So there are not
18 going to be trucks driving back and forth over
19 #144, for example?

20 MR. CASPE: No, no trucks.

21 SHEILA POWERS: Thank you.

22 MR. CASPE: Barges, yes, rail
23 cars yes. Trucks, no.

24 SHEILA POWERS: Well we intend to
25

1 reuses tires. We slice off the side walls,
2 grind down the worn tread, and bond the them
3 treads together in a non-toxic process.

4 I will be in the lobby for 20
5 minutes after I am done here at the
6 microphone. I am willing, ready, and able to
7 speak with anyone about this product and how
8 it can help the Hudson.

9 I thank you for your time.

10 MR. CASPE: Thank you.

11 JERRY SAGLIOCCA: Good evening.

12 My name is Jerry Sagliocca, and I'm against
13 the EPA's secret dredging plans.

14 The blundering EPA appears to have
15 changed its mind since the 1980s and today it is
16 getting ready to shove down our throats this
17 secret plan that we still don't know the facts
18 and details of.

19 What disturbs me tonight, is that
20 the EPA does not seem ready to be swayed to
21 forego this massive un-thought out plan.
22 Dredging is not going to be a walk through the
23 tubes, as the EPA alleges it will be for the
24 next five years.

25

1 action that you plan to take in order to
2 insure that PCBs are actually taken out and
3 they're not remaining in the sediment and
4 stirring up PCBs instead?

5 MR. CASPE: Actually, the dredges
6 we're looking at are dredges that are made
7 specifically for environmental dredging. They
8 are shaped differently. They have a whole
9 different design, aimed at not, trying not to
10 resuspend material as you bring it up, kick
11 the material up, try to get a clean cut. Some
12 of them are designed for shallow cuts, some
13 are them are designed for deeper cuts,
14 depending on what, how deep the
15 contamination is in that area. They're
16 designed for different types of materials.
17 They have a whole different set of designs.
18 These are not your old-fashioned type
19 navigational dredges. These dredges are
20 specifically designed to remove material in an
21 environmental way.

22 LISA DWYER: Thank you for
23 providing additional information. I'm sure
24 the students at Shaker High will take this
25

1 the damn and the stoppage of navigational
2 dredging. So when we looked in 1984-85, the
3 river was at that stage. We then made a
4 decision that did not make sense to go forward
5 at that time. Five years later we were
6 requested by the State of New York to
7 relook(sic) at the area, take another look at
8 it, see what's going on and we did. And it's
9 also part of the law that we operate under
10 that. We look at things five years after the
11 fact. So we started a re-investigation in 1990,
12 and it's taken this long because we started
13 off thinking we wouldn't need additional data,
14 that we would be able to look at it simply.
15 Then we find out we needed more data, then we
16 find out we needed a new model. We wound up
17 spending around \$25 million on this study,
18 believe it or not. This study was not an
19 inconsequential thing. Even we take a while
20 to spend that kind of money. So it took us a
21 long time, you know, and actually now 10 years
22 later we come out with this conclusion that
23 some people argue that we have rushed to make.
24 So that's why it took as long as it did.
25

1 problem there, as we looked at -- we looked
2 there at how much of the bottom we were going
3 to be disturbing and how much benefit we would
4 get. And, as we did that, we came to a
5 conclusion that this, this alternative that we
6 selected was what we considered to be the most
7 cost beneficial. We looked at the benefits,
8 we looked at the costs -- costs in terms not
9 just of dollars, but what it costs as far as
10 disruption of the environment, disruption of
11 people's lives, and so on and so forth. And
12 that's how we came up with this alternative.
13 It was a balancing technique.

14 SUSAN BRANDER: With your
15 dredging technique, doesn't that include
16 dredging part of the bottom of the river, like
17 the bed of the river, where bed dwellers live?
18 And not only the animals will leave but the
19 bed dwellers of the river will not leave
20 because that's just not their action is to
21 move. So what are you going to do about that when
22 you take the sludge out and these bed dwellers
23 are still in the sludge, destroying their
24

1 group with that, and I also have residency in
2 Schuylerville. I want to briefly thank you,
3 the agency, for presenting a very well
4 balanced feasibility study. I think it was
5 interesting reading for someone of my nature.
6 I'm not a technical person, but I got through
7 most parts of it that are important, and I
8 appreciate that you had four panels of experts
9 peer reviewing that document, which really
10 assures me, as a citizen, that it has been
11 well studied and that the final review of the
12 Hudson River Reassessment has been seriously
13 taken into account over the ten years with
14 well documented information. I applaud the
15 agency for taking the necessary steps to
16 address the clean-up of 200 pounds of PCBs
17 that still remain in the 40 identified hot
18 spots in the upper Hudson River. What I would
19 like to do is just talk about a little more
20 than what the plan is suggesting. The
21 residential exposures to upriver shore lines
22 contaminated with PCBs really need to be
23 considered. As the river is cleaned and more
24 and more recreational uses of the beaches and
25

1 boat launches can be anticipated, we really
2 need to consider those exposures routes. For
3 example, New York State soil standard for PCBs
4 is one part per million, and there are areas
5 along the upper Hudson that show PCB soil
6 levels well above those standards. For
7 example, I recently discovered that soils
8 along the shore line of Schuylerville have PCB
9 concentrations as high as 3.5 parts per
10 million, and it's just really important that
11 we address this, and work with the state
12 agency on this.

13 I just want to say overall for the
14 past decade I have worked with citizens
15 involved with super fund sites across the
16 nation, and a common positive outcome will
17 only result when the stakeholders work
18 collectively on these clean ups, and I'm
19 talking federal, state agencies, and most
20 importantly we need cooperation from the
21 principal parties who polluted those areas in
22 order for the benefits to be resolved, and the
23 residents have obtained those benefits. I
24 really urge a partnership in this clean up
25

1 work hard to see through the misinformation
2 fed to us by those who refuse to accept the
3 responsibility for poisoning our community.
4 We too have had to join our voices struggling
5 and demanding to be heard above the roar of
6 corporate money and political influence. We
7 too want our river cleaned up for our families
8 and for our future. Our rivers are tied
9 together by more than just circumstances.
10 They are also tied together by the efforts of
11 polluters. The paper mills that polluted our
12 Fox River with PCBs are working together with
13 General Electric to say that dredging is not
14 safe, to buy ads that feed misinformation to
15 the public, and to lobby public officials so
16 that anything planned might be quashed. They
17 are working and conspiring to do, as G.E. so
18 eloquently puts it, as I saw in a quote, "Make
19 sure that projects like this don't ever
20 happen."

21 I do have good news to bring to you
22 from my state of Wisconsin. On our river we
23 have had two pilot dredging projects that have
24 gone on down on the river both of which were
25

1 version? That's the difference between them
2 is one in a thousand?

3 MR. CASPE: The difference is the
4 increased risk from someone ingesting into the
5 future would be one in a thousand.

6 KEN WELLES: Of that reduced
7 rate, not of a steady rate, right?

8 MR. CASPE: Right. We looked at
9 reduction and the models. The non-cancer
10 health risk was a 100 times higher than our
11 safe (inaudible).

12 KEN WELLES: Okay.

13 MR. CASPE: Thank you.

14 KRISTIN KOLBER: My name is
15 Kristin Kolber. I came to make my mind up
16 about this. I have some questions and
17 comments.

18 Why not do the MNA, which is the
19 Alternative 2? It will get the same result,
20 according to your chart, just not immediately,
21 like the active remediations.

22 The sediment, according to --
23 referring, that is, to page 24, the sediment
24 is expected to be transferred to two
25

1 facilities along the river and then expected
2 to be removed after completion. Where is this
3 going to go? I would like, I would like not
4 to see another Love Canal.

5 You also said, with trucking, that
6 trucks won't be used, that barges to rail.
7 But according to page 23, increased traffic
8 will also present an incremental risk to the
9 community. The potential for traffic
10 accidents may be increased marginally as
11 additional vehicles are on the road. These
12 effects are likely to be minimal because most
13 transportation of sediments for disposal will
14 be accomplished by rail. In addition to
15 vehicle traffic, there will be increased river
16 traffic.

17 The only other thing I wanted to
18 say is that I do have a problem with should
19 be, likely, probably and not sure. As a
20 person who doesn't know which way she's
21 going, I now don't feel I can make an informed
22 decision, and I'm very sorry about it for both
23 sides.

24 Thank you.

25

1 their money.

2 What we would do is we would bid
3 the job. This is something that people,
4 there's people all over the country who will
5 make a lot of money by taking this material to
6 a licensed facility. Now, the material that
7 might go, for example, to the Buffalo area,
8 it's not a really hazardous waste. It's
9 not -- it cannot go to just a regular plain
10 ordinary landfill, but it can go to certain
11 types of landfills. And when it goes to those
12 landfills, it may, in fact -- they would
13 charge us, potentially, as if it were a waste
14 and, then, when they got it there, they would
15 have a productive use for it. They could
16 actually use it as cover material at that
17 landfill for different lifts between material.
18 So they would be using this as a resource,
19 even though they're charging, even though
20 they're kind of getting paid to take it away
21 as a waste.

22 And we're also still looking -- all
23 of this, we're still also looking at recycling
24 and reusing some of this material, where some of
25

1 this material might be turned into different
2 types of product, whether it's tile or things
3 like that. So there's a variety of different
4 things we're looking at. But that will all
5 come out in the design, really, and then it
6 will be bid.

7 Okay.

8 Burr Deitz, Frank Berlin. None of
9 these people were here? Joe Mahon, Warren
10 Wielt, Mildred Gittinger, Dorothy Matthews,
11 Richard McGrath.

12 Okay. Next group. The next group
13 is David Luck, Brian Smith, Mary Fitzsimmons,
14 Chris White, Chris Bowser, Edward Vanover,
15 David Page, Susan McCormick, Charles Noll, and
16 John Washburn.

17 BRIAN SMITH: Let me first say I
18 am for --

19 MR. CASPE: Could you first say
20 who you are?

21 BRIAN SMITH: My name is Brian
22 Smith. I'm from Albany.

23 And I implore the EPA to go ahead
24 with dredging. I think it's the best idea and

25

1 line here as well and use our economic power.

2 Otherwise, I just think that having
3 the river being polluted is horrendous. I
4 mean, I'm not sure -- I have a question,
5 actually.

6 Has there been any studies of
7 ducks, like other wildlife that people will
8 eat, like ducks, you know?

9 ALISON HESS: There is a New York
10 State health department consumption advisory
11 about ducks because of the PCBs.

12 BRIAN SMITH: Because I think
13 it's horrendous that migratory water fowl come
14 here, they depend on the bottom of the river.
15 And I think it's just horrendous and we've got to
16 draw the line here.

17 Thanks.

18 CHRIS WHITE: My name is Chris
19 White and I'm with Hudson River Sloop
20 Clearwater. We're a small environmental group
21 with 10,000 members throughout the Hudson
22 Valley, from the Adirondacks down to New York
23 Bay.

24 I'd like to reiterate my support
25

1 we know people continue to eat those fish.
2 They're a threat to the upper river
3 communities, the mid Hudson and all the way
4 down to New York.

5 I'd like to just end up by reading
6 couple of quotes just to highlight the health
7 concern that we have.

8 The first is by Dr. David
9 Carpenter, who is a professor of Environmental
10 Health and Toxicology at the University of
11 Albany school of Public Health. And
12 Dr. Carpenter says, "PCBs are identified as
13 being probable human carcinogens on the basis
14 of definitive evidence that they can cause
15 cancer in animals and strongly suggestive
16 evidence for cancer in humans. PCBs suppress
17 the immune system and alter normal human
18 development by interfering with intelligence,
19 attention span, thyroid function, and sexual
20 development and function."

21 Another of the speakers, Kathleen
22 Carl, also a Ph.D. says, "PCBs, along with
23 other contaminants, are thought to play a role
24 in the incidences of breast cancer and
25

1 to ask you, sir, is it's happened across the
2 United States, and you wonder why these
3 businesses are leaving the United States.

4 AUDIENCE: Profit.

5 MR. CASPE: Well, there's a
6 Superfund Law -- you want to explain?

7 DOUG FISCHER: Yeah. I'd like to
8 clarify the point about GE's permits for the
9 discharge.

10 The company received a permit for
11 PCB discharges in 1974. It had been
12 discharging without a permit for almost 30
13 years prior to its receiving a permit. There
14 have also been a number of releases from the
15 GE Hudson Falls plant that occur to this day
16 pursuant to a permit. The company was also
17 cited for permit violations by the state in
18 the mid-1970s and there also were some
19 additional violations in the mid-1980s. So it's
20 not true really only a very, very small
21 percentage of the company's discharge
22 (inaudible) to the Hudson River occurred
23 pursuant to a permit, but the overwhelming
24 majority did not.

25

1 as the Volga of Russia. Over in Russia there
2 is no money for clean up, and a lot less will-
3 power than we have in America for this. But
4 at least here we can do something about it
5 regardless of whether General Electric pays
6 for it, or the taxpayer pays, we can afford
7 it. This is an economic boom time for us. We
8 all know PCB effects are deadly, and it can be
9 passed on from mother to child. I support
10 EPA's Alternative 5, the strongest possible
11 method for removing PCBs.

12 MR. CASPE: Thank you. The

13 other
14 people I called are not here? That's David
15 Luck, Mary Fitzsimmons, Chris Bowser, Edward
16 Vanover and Charles Noll.

17 Okay. Next group are Nancy
18 Grieseau, Dr. N. Sukumar, Fred Pocnisch, Barry
19 Finley, Peter Will, Lois Gundrum, Jennifer
20 Hanson, Kathy Ophardt, William Lysgorski, and
21 Christine Wickman.

22 Yes.

23 NANCY GRIESEAUE: My name is Nancy
24 Grieseau. I'm a geologist and hydrogeologist,
25 and I am an environmentalist in favor of
26

1 we will exceed that level because of the upstream
2 sources of residual contamination from
3 years and years of PCBs discharges that we
4 will have levels exceeding those
5 concentrations in the Hudson --

6 CHARLES MOHR: That's an
7 assumption.

8 MR. CASPE: Hopefully over the --
9 the processes will help lessen that over the
10 years, but it's going to be very difficult to
11 achieve one part per quadrillion.

12 DOUG TOMCHUK: So while we dredge
13 that number -- it will be above that number,
14 but it's above that number today, and it will
15 be above that number --

16 CHRIS MOHR: By your dredging it
17 will be above what it is now?

18 MR. CASPE: While we are dredging
19 it will be localized -- in a very localized
20 area it might be above it. Overall what we
21 calculated as far as the amount of material
22 that will release versus the amount that we
23 will gain by taking the PCBs out will show
24 every year a net reduction in the PCBs levels
25

1 the ossification sediment they leave behind.
2 A hundred-year-old wagon wheel ruts frozen in
3 time on the bottom of the Reo Grand also
4 testified to compression solidification
5 process.

6 Simple sample cores taken from
7 beneath the Hudson River show the compact,
8 well-defined strata of pre-existing river
9 beds. This process of nature is not
10 haphazard. In this process, PBCs go away by
11 getting themselves interlocked and compressed
12 within the sediment. That we want to
13 interfere with this process at this late stage
14 doesn't seem to be astute stewardship.
15 Containment should have been number one
16 priority 15 years ago. These curtains sound
17 nice now, they would have been very easy then.

18 Dredging will average a diminishing
19 one and a half percent a year. By no means,
20 can anyone call that cleaning the river. It
21 is no longer about quantity, it's about
22 keeping the membrane of the sediment intact.
23 The latest data suggests our river has been
24 quietly improving. Dredging will release
25

1 toxins that reach and linger in Poughkeepsie.

2 EPA studies try to say a mouthful
3 of PCBs is that it takes for the fish to
4 develop malignancies, so why let open-mouth
5 kids swim downstream during dredging. We all
6 know that dredging releases contaminants. We
7 can only guess to what extent.

8 At this stage, the only real
9 benefit from dredging, excuse me, is to handle
10 money. And that is not enough of a reason to
11 jeopardize people's health.

12 BRAD CUSHING: I'm Brad Cushing.

13 I have a question about
14 confirmation sampling.

15 In reviewing the feasibility study,
16 it's difficult to determine if the
17 confirmation sampling occurs after each target
18 area is dredged and after the dredge is moved
19 on, or will it be an iterative process during
20 the dredging, whereby you're testing to see if
21 you reached the clean up level, and, if not,
22 will you continue to dredge in a particular
23 target area?

24 Can you clarify?

25

1 DOUG TOMCHUK: I don't recall
2 the exact language in the feasibility study.

3 In order to proceed down to the
4 next location, though, I believe that
5 confirmation sampling will have to be done at
6 the location before you move that dredge away.
7 So, basically, you would take the samples
8 prior to moving on to see if there's
9 additional passes that might be necessary, you
10 know, additional passes would be necessary.

11 RAD CUSHING: It seemed to be
12 the opposite, because it looked like just one
13 round of samples is assumed. There's 36
14 samples per five acres, and it looked like the
15 dredging would be done, the dredge would move
16 on, and then a confirmation round would be
17 taken to determine what was left. But it
18 wasn't clear if there would be a response if
19 you were above a clean up level.

20 DOUG TOMCHUK: I don't recall the
21 exact sampling outlined, that was, you know,
22 outlined in the feasibility study. Of course,
23 a detailed sampling plan and confirmation plan
24 to see what levels you achieved would have to
25

1 someone tried to ignore it, well the sediments
2 stick, so I am implore it. Clean up the
3 Hudson River -- you know the words, come on --
4 whoa the Hudson River, whoa the hazard levels
5 till their gone, gone, gone, whoa whoa oh.

6 Baby, baby, the Hudson is not what
7 it --

8 MR. CASPE: Thank you.

9 BRIAN AGOSTA: All right.

10 MR. CASPE: Okay. We're down to
11 the final two dozen. Maybe they'll all be
12 singers. I don't think so.

13 Are you one of the people I called
14 already? I'm sorry. You are?

15 TOM DAVIN: My name is Tom Davin.
16 I came in here and sat down -- I live up in
17 Mechanicville -- I sat down, I heard you
18 saying the harmful effects of PCBs. In fact,
19 I come in a little late. I thought you were
20 talking about cigarettes and you were getting
21 ready to go down and dredge North Carolina.
22 That might be an easier solution for
23 everybody.

24 But I don't work for GE and I'm not
25

1 residuals that's done to landowners like me.

2 You know, I haven't seen anything
3 on that. I walked in here, The Times Union
4 said \$460 million. Fifteen minutes ago you
5 said 500 million. It went up 40 million.
6 When I bid work, if I say a thousand dollars,
7 it's a thousand dollars. It's not a thousand
8 dollars, but we got these contingencies, we
9 got this, we got that. Just what is going to
10 be the final price tag?

11 You know all about this stuff
12 coming out of the fish and all that other
13 stuff, do you know about the nuts-and-bolts
14 numbers and how it's going to affect,
15 including all the infrastructure, the roads in
16 front of my house and so forth?

17 MR. CASPE: Sure. Let me start
18 off with trucks. What do we have to do -- I
19 mean, fine, take up, you know, our guarantee
20 on that. We're not talking truck traffic. If
21 that's the issue, then your issue goes away.

22 TOM DAVIN: There won't be a
23 single truck going up there?

24 MR. CASPE: There won't be a
25

1 MR. CASPE: Well, I would presume
2 there will be some, but I don't know for sure.

3 TOM DAVIN: In other words, the
4 last project that you did, there wasn't any
5 truck traffic?

6 MR. CASPE: The last project I
7 built, I did, was not on the Hudson River.

8 TOM DAVIN: Okay. Everybody
9 here, sitting here, all you esteemed people,
10 you're going to tell me that you're going to
11 do this job without using --

12 MR. CASPE: No, I'm not.

13 TOM DAVIN: That's what you've
14 been doing a number of times tonight.

15 MR. CASPE: Well, we're --
16 maybe --

17 TOM DAVIN: And that's where good
18 faith lies.

19 MR. CASPE: Well, let me clarify
20 that. What I'm saying is that, as far as the
21 dredging, we've been talking about dredge
22 material and fill material, that material is
23 not going to be moving by truck. That I can
24 clarify. But as far as whether material for
25

1 when you ask me to do that.

2 MR. CASPE: I hear what you're
3 saying, but perhaps you also have something to
4 gain.

5 TOM DAVIN: What?

6 MR. CASPE: What? Will the value
7 of your property increase if the river is
8 clean in front of it?

9 TOM DAVIN: I've seen government
10 projects before and I hardly doubt it.

11 If you're going to do this without
12 trucks, a, if you can do it without trucks,
13 you wouldn't have to dredge. You'd be a
14 magician.

15 MR. CASPE: Thank you.

16 ANDREW McPHERSON: My name is
17 Andrew McPherson. You may have said it
18 differently.

19 MR. CASPE: Go ahead. You're
20 there already. Go ahead.

21 Let me just call the next speakers,
22 please, first. James Murphy, Michael Carlow,
23 Eugene Rowland, R. Blake Kessler, M.D.,
24 Timothy Wolfe, Glenn Reish, J. Edward Kautz,
25

1 Dennis Karius, Lisa Palansky, Rich Chiaffo,
2 Lou Ismay, and Alan Feffer.

3 I'm sorry. Go on.

4 ANDREW McPHERSON: My name is
5 Andrew McPherson. I live on Galway Lake in
6 Saratoga County. I am a member of the water
7 quality committee for that lake and I'm also a
8 part of a water quality committee for Saratoga
9 County. But I come here as an individual and
10 as a fisherman and a person who is very
11 concerned about the environment and our own
12 health.

13 Though I'm a social worker by
14 training, I've done a lot of reading of your
15 humongous six-volume report and a lot of GE's
16 material. I've talked to Dr. Brown of the GE
17 research program. He was kind enough to spend
18 over three-quarters of an hour on the phone
19 with me talking about what my major concern
20 was, how long would it take for PCBs to break
21 down. And his reply was, well, we can do that
22 in the lab and we can predict that it will
23 take a number of weeks or months under ideal
24 circumstances, with certain microbes,

25

1 anaerobic, aerobic. But when it comes to the
2 real world, you can't always predict that.
3 And what I'm getting from GE is that it will
4 take a very long, long time for PCBs to break
5 down in place.

6 The bottom line seems to be that we
7 all agree that we have soiled ourselves. And
8 we don't know how badly. I think it's
9 important for us to recognize that there's a
10 certain amount of secrecy and politics
11 involved, emotions and passions, but the
12 bottom line is responsibility. Yes, there's
13 going to be a certain amount of ignorance.
14 Our own humanity has caused us to soil
15 ourselves. I think we all, as a people, need
16 to take responsibility for cleaning ourselves
17 up, including our river. And I think it's
18 important for all of us to share that
19 responsibility.

20 I would urge that, when it comes
21 down to the bottom line, that we perhaps go
22 more like 50/50 with GE, and as a community
23 and as a humanity to carry the other 50
24 percent. That might help with the
25

1 MR. CASPE: Do you have a third?

2 TIMOTHY WOLFE: No.

3 MR. CASPE: Let me go back the
4 Second, first and then we'll come back to the
5 first. I thought I showed beginning with
6 graphs that this concept that the river --
7 that everything is just going away by itself
8 and the river is healing itself, that that
9 isn't happening. The PCBs have largely
10 leveled off. They are in the environment.
11 They are in sediment. They are available in
12 the sediment. They are moving around in the
13 sediment. They are getting into the water
14 column, and getting into the fish, and those
15 were the numbers I showed you. We didn't make
16 those numbers up.

17 TIMOTHY WOLFE: I'm not disputing
18 the numbers. How toxic are PCBs? Assuming
19 that that is happening, then how toxic really
20 are PCBs as a material, and how relative are
21 they, as a related question, to other known
22 carcinogens such as lead and mercury, which we
23 know causes damage in humans?

24 MR. CASPE: That's a number of
25

1 not conduct pharmaceutical studies similar to
2 what you mentioned. You are looking for a
3 toxic dose which is a different type of
4 (inaudible). And for the relative potency of
5 the PCBs, it's cancer exposing potency of the
6 PCBs is 2 milligrams per kilogram per day.
7 For a comparison arsenic is about 1:5. That's
8 a known carcinogen. We do (inaudible) that
9 type of information. So you can do the
10 comparison.

11 TIMOTHY WOLFE: So in simple
12 terms that would mean that PCBs are almost 50
13 percent more carcinogenic than arsonic?

14 MR. CASPE: Yes.

15 TIMOTHY WOLFE: Okay. Thank you.

16 MR. CASPE: Okay. Next? Thank
17 you.

18 LISA POLANSKY: Good evening. My
19 name is Lisa Polansky. I have no affiliation
20 with the EPA or G.E.

21 I would like to start by saying, of
22 course, I want a clean Hudson River as I'm
23 sure all of us do. I mean, that's not the
24 question here. However, I am skeptical about
25

1 MR. CASPE: Where you could eat
2 the fish?

3 DENNIS KARIUS: Yes.

4 MR. CASPE: Never. Never from
5 the Thompson Island Pool until we get down
6 to -- it's a very complicated question because
7 you are looking at three different sections of
8 the river, and you are looking at different
9 values and different things. You are looking
10 at .2 parts per million which allows you to
11 eat the fish .04 is (inaudible), less .5 is
12 (inaudible), you are looking at .05. You will
13 never get there. You may get to some of the
14 others eventually. Generally we estimate to
15 .2, generations longer than we estimate would
16 happen with dredging. On the record we also
17 believe that the model may, in fact,
18 underestimate what that gap may be. It may be
19 even larger.

20 DENNIS KARIUS: It seems to me
21 the dredging that you do, you would want to
22 extend the program and clean up the river, and
23 more if the first phase were successful. So,
24 basically, I'm in favor of dredging, and I'm
25

1 LYNN JACKSON: Hi. My name is
2 Lynn Jackson. I live at 223 South Swan
3 Street, which is nine-tenths of a mile from
4 the Hudson River. Oh, that's in Albany.
5 Excuse me. Nine-tenths of a mile from the
6 Hudson River.

7 First off, I want to say thank you
8 very much for inviting us here tonight. There
9 was an awful lot of people here. I didn't
10 hear the first part because I couldn't fit in
11 the room. But I'd like to say, for the last
12 20 years, I've lived within a mile of the
13 river and every week, in the good weather, I
14 go bicycling up the river and I have often
15 seen many years the river overflow its banks
16 all the time on the bicycle path and you can
17 see all the sediment from the river. And I
18 don't understand why people think that this
19 sediment is compressing its little self at the
20 bottom of the river when you can see it
21 overflows the banks every, every year.

22 Now, when I go bicycling along the
23 river, I see people fishing in the river.
24 There is no signs in the City of Albany that
25

1 lately in order to find out more about this
2 business of dredging and your agency, I came
3 across an article written by a couple of
4 professors, one from Duke and one from
5 Harvard, who seem to indicate that scare
6 tactics is basically what your agency lives
7 on. And to back it up they wrote a book on
8 the study they did on 150 Superfund studies
9 that your agency which was involved in. Their
10 conclusion was, basically, that they cost as
11 much as \$7.2 billion to avert a single case of
12 cancer. Now, maybe you think this is a great
13 idea, but I'm not so sure.

14 That's not the only reason I'm here
15 today. I'm here because I also found out what
16 happened in Love Canal. Love Canal, as you
17 remember, was what caused your agency to be
18 born. I find out from reading the web sites
19 that Love Canal is not cleaned up. You guys
20 spent I don't know how many hundreds of
21 millions of dollars on the most important
22 thing that caused you to be there in the first
23 place, and it's not done. The same pollutants
24 are still there. The only thing you did was
25

1 not. I'm trying to form an opinion about the
2 proposals and I'm -- I find it remarkable that
3 according to your numbers, in option number 3
4 you will remove 0.52 kilograms of PCBs per
5 cubic yards, for cubic yard of sediment;
6 option 4 it's .57, and option 5 it's .59.
7 Even though, you're -- in between 4 and 5,
8 supposedly, you would be removing less densely
9 polluted sediments, to explain the difference
10 between options 4 and 5. It seems to me that
11 that number in option 5 should have a much
12 more diminishing return, unless the overhead
13 to get started is so large that most of the
14 sediment removed does not contain any PCBs at
15 all. That's been suggested in some of the
16 comments in option number 3.

17 My concern is that you will find
18 that, after you get into this project or you
19 choose one of these projects and you proceed
20 and you don't take note of what you're doing,
21 that you will ignore information that would be
22 important to inform you as to how to continue
23 or whether to continue in that plan. The
24 Soviets had a lot of five-year plans and some
25

1 MR. CASPE: Just say who you are
2 again.

3 LYNN JACKSON: I'm Lynn Jackson.

4 And I wanted to know, I know one
5 person who had his PCB levels tested and he
6 would be illegal to, you know, like if he were
7 dead he'd be illegal to eat because he had so
8 much PCBs in his body. And I guess I'm
9 wondering if -- I'm worried, I'm worried about
10 the amount of PCBs that -- well, I mean, they
11 found PCBs in Indian people. PCBs are all
12 over the world. Right? Am I correct? Right?
13 And I want to know like how can I get tested
14 to see how many PCBs I have and what can I do
15 to like get rid of them?

16 I mean, I don't think you can get
17 rid of them. Right?

18 And how dangerous is this going to
19 be if cancer runs in my family or if I lose
20 weight, Heaven forbid? If I should get thin
21 all of a sudden, do the PCBs come into my
22 bloodstream?

23 I mean what happens with those
24 kinds of things?

25