

70403

Date: 2-7-01
Hudson River PBCs Public Meeting

10-8085

1 may cause long-term public health and
2 ecosystem risks.

3 We're very pleased with that. That
4 is actually a direct quote in what EPA's view
5 of the matter is as well.

6 We are concerned, on the other
7 hand, by recent statements by people in the
8 public venue, which seem to indicate that PCBs
9 do not have a health impact and they're safe
10 to eat the fish. We strongly advise everybody
11 here and all within the listening area not to eat
12 fish, and, you know, eat the fish from the
13 Hudson River, PCBs are a real health problem,
14 and you should observe the State Health
15 advisory, which say eat none between Troy and
16 Fort Edward or Hudson Falls.

17 The next issue I'd like to talk
18 about is fish consumption advisory as a
19 long-term management plan. The discussion
20 has been, you know, we've heard comment to the
21 effect of, well, so we'll have nobody eat the
22 fish and, therefore, there will be no risk,
23 and that's all there is to it. Number one,
24 that's not in the public interest for a

MARTIN COURT REPORTING ASSOCIATES
(518) 587-6832

1 locations, and you have to understand the data
2 sets from which that information, you know, is
3 developed. The error bars, you try to
4 understand, well, I only collected a half a
5 dozen fish or eight fish in one particular
6 year. Well, how sure am I that -- one of the
7 fish the level was here. One of the fish the
8 level was here. Well, was the average, was
9 that the correct average. Maybe if I would
10 have taken more samples, the average would
11 have been a little bit higher or a little bit
12 lower. And you develop error bars, you try to
13 understand just what the confidence of your
14 data is.

15 If you look at the next four charts of
16 data that has not been collected by EPA. This
17 is State data. And if you look at the error
18 bars and again you look at the last 10, you
19 look at the last 10 years, certainly, with the
20 exception of some -- well, if you look at --
21 I'll try it again.

22 AUDIENCE: Turn the lights off so
23 we can see it.

24 MR. CASPE: If you look at it

MARTIN COURT REPORTING ASSOCIATES
(518) 587-6832

1 get a much better match, if you look at it.
2 That's a fingerprint. That tells us that the
3 PCBs that are flowing over that dam that are
4 getting into the water column in that area,
5 they're not coming from upstream, they're, for
6 the most part -- some of them are coming from
7 upstream. I should take that back. But the
8 majority of them are coming from the sediment
9 within the Thompson Island Pool.

10 So, with all this, this is why EPA
11 believes that we cannot leave the river to
12 take care of itself. We think the fish will
13 be safer to eat almost immediately and that
14 fish advisories can be relaxed one to two
15 generations sooner, at the minimum.

16 And so we get to the big question.
17 Is the cure, which is dredging, obviously,
18 worse than the disease?

19 AUDIENCE: Yes.

20 AUDIENCE: No.

21 MR. CASPE: Right.

22 I would point, please, I would
23 point first at one of the statements that have
24 been made about the Spanish Armada. Spanish

MARTIN COURT REPORTING ASSOCIATES
(518) 587-6832

1 of a residence for a matter of weeks, not
2 months and, certainly, not years.

3 The next thing I would just like to
4 talk about, the next thing I'd just talk about
5 examples of where dredging works. We believe
6 dredging does work. He believe it's worked in
7 the lower Fox River in Wisconsin, where the
8 material -- where, in that case, the
9 concentrations of PCBs in the sediment have
10 gone from 50 parts per million to two parts
11 per million. We believe it worked at the
12 General Motors facility in Messina, New York,
13 where, according to GM's numbers, they removed
14 99.8 percent of the PCBs that were in the
15 river. And we believe it's worked up in
16 Queensbury, in Niagara Mohawk dredging, where,
17 as a result of the dredging there are
18 significant reductions in the bass and the
19 perch resulted in DEC actually lifting the
20 fishing bands.

21 AUDIENCE: How much did you take
22 out up there?

23 MR. CASPE: We believe that
24 dredging -- please, if you don't mind, let me

MARTIN COURT REPORTING ASSOCIATES
(518) 587-6832

1 year design period. First part we have to
2 keep up the monitoring that we have been doing
3 to monitor the fish levels and the water
4 levels and understand what's going on in the
5 system. We also will be doing site -- design
6 sampling to determine the depth in detailed
7 areas where we will have to conduct the
8 dredging, pre-construction sampling.

9 I want to point out here that last
10 night we had a question about the design
11 sampling, confirmatory sampling, and I want to
12 clarify that I said that we would probably do
13 a pass of the dredge, and then do confirmatory
14 sampling, and then, you know, do another pass
15 of the dredge to make sure we got everything.
16 Actually our plan really calls for going out,
17 getting detailed information so we can catch
18 everything in the first cuts of the dredge. It is
19 the intention to go down to clean material so
20 that we will not have to go back for
21 additional passes. We believe that this will
22 save us time in implementing the remedy.

23 During the design period we also
24 need to get access agreements, we will need to

MARTIN COURT REPORTING ASSOCIATES
(518) 587-6832

1 you will be even using hydraulic dredges. Have
2 we heard any specifics from you, the EPA,
3 about which dredges you're going to be using?

4 And, you know, in fact, this is
5 just another issue that you have deflected
6 until the design phase. We haven't received,
7 we haven't heard specifics. And probably most
8 important, you haven't told the public where
9 this sludge will ultimately go. You only get
10 it to these temporary dewatering facilities.
11 Well, unless you locate a place willing to
12 accept this much material -- and keep in mind
13 that not only must they want the stuff but
14 they also have to be permitted to accept this
15 much material in this time period of five
16 years --

17 MR. CASPE: Would you please wrap
18 up?

19 ASSEMBLYMAN PRENTISS: Yes, I
20 will.

21 MR. CASPE: Thank you.

22 ASSEMBLYMAN PRENTISS: -- then
23 this hazardous waste is going to be sitting at
24 these dewatering facilities for an unspecified

MARTIN COURT REPORTING ASSOCIATES
(518) 587-6832

1 amount of time, maybe even forever.

2 To wrap up, my point is that you
3 have left the public completely in the dark about
4 the most critical aspects of this proposal,
5 the blueprint designs, and yet you are
6 expecting the public to give the EPA
7 meaningful, thoughtful, substantive comments
8 on this plan. Well, you know, that's like
9 asking a professor to grade papers his
10 students haven't even written yet. We're
11 completely in the dark here.

12 MR. CASPE: Thank you.

13 The next speaker is Assemblyman
14 Faso.

15 DAN FARRELL: I would like to
16 start off by saying thank you to the EPA for
17 finally making its way to Washington County.
18 My name is Dan Farrell. I am going to be
19 reading a statement on behalf of the
20 Republican Leader in the New York State
21 Assembly, John Faso.

22 The question of whether or not to
23 dredge the Hudson to remove PCBs not only
24 raises a number of technical challenges, it

MARTIN COURT REPORTING ASSOCIATES
(518) 587-6832

1 1997, during hearings convened by Congressman
2 Solomon, EPA officials assured us that the
3 public would be informed every step of the way
4 in this process. I was at that meeting, too.

5 As you recall, at the time, it was
6 discovered EPA had conducted a secret study to
7 find a possible location for PCB dumps, all
8 the while saying it had no predisposition to
9 dredging.

10 Let me quote William Bazinsky's
11 Deputy Regional Administration for Region II
12 during the hearing. If you don't believe
13 these quotes, I can get you a copy of the
14 transcript. "I'd like to begin my remarks
15 first by apologizing to you, to the public,
16 and its communities up here for our handling
17 of this siting survey."

18 Mr. Bazinsky also stated,
19 "Regarding this landfill siting survey,
20 mistakes were clearly made to undertake this
21 type of study, to not inform the public was
22 wrong, regardless of the reason. Jeannie Fox
23 has asked me to assure you that she is
24 personally assessing the facts behind this

MARTIN COURT REPORTING ASSOCIATES
(518) 587-6832

1 move the contaminated soil, which is really
2 encapsulated beneath the river, move it to
3 another area and only take the project and
4 move it from one place to another. It will
5 disrupt the shoreline, disrupt the river,
6 disrupt the economy of our area for many
7 years.

8 I really and truly believe that all
9 of us want to see this project and see this
10 river cleaned up. And it has been, it has been
11 cleaned up, everything we see, all of the
12 reports, we are finding the river in better
13 condition than it was in several years ago. I
14 think we should continue that way, continue to
15 look at other ways of continuing our
16 monitoring and testing of the water and just
17 wait.

18 I encourage the EPA to have more
19 hearings and to continue to have hearings in
20 the areas that are going to be impacted by
21 this project. And that's up in this area.

22 Thank you.

23 MR. CASPE: Thank you. The next
24 speaker is Supervisor Chiamano from Warren

MARTIN COURT REPORTING ASSOCIATES
(518) 587-6832

1 prevail.

2 Thank you.

3 MR. CASPE: The next speaker is
4 Larry Bowman, Councilman for the Town of
5 Moreau.

6 LARRY BOWMAN: First of all I
7 want to thank everybody for coming out
8 tonight. This is a very important issue
9 pertaining to all of us.

10 I am a little upset with the EPA.
11 I'm from Moreau, as stated earlier, Councilman
12 of the Town of Moreau, and this dewatering
13 facility has been looked at being located in
14 Moreau, and I am upset by the fact that we
15 have to base our decisions for our
16 constituents and our families on knowledge.
17 The EPA never made any attempt to come to our
18 Town Board to speak with us so we could be
19 advised of the exact plans that were going to
20 take place.

21 However, as a Councilman who has
22 dealt with General Electric on contamination
23 with our compost-dump(sic) site, I want to let
24 everyone know that in my opinion G.E. is

MARTIN COURT REPORTING ASSOCIATES
(518) 587-6832

1 recognize that these PCBs are a serious human
2 health risk. And regardless of the GE
3 multi-million dollar ad campaign, you need to
4 move forward with an expedited proposal.
5 Three years may be too long to do the design
6 and remediation phases. You may need to move
7 faster, rather than slower, and you need to
8 consider about all of the hype of these
9 communities that are allegedly against it.
10 The town that I live in never debated this.
11 You folks never came to my town. We never had
12 an open and honest forum. It was contrived in
13 a back room deal in Saratoga, and it's not
14 fair to those of us that suffer with these
15 poisons.

16 I would urge you to work with our
17 elected officials, including all of those
18 tonight that were talking about blueprints,
19 and I would urge them to come up with a
20 blueprint for political leadership, because
21 this is an issue that divides us north and
22 south, east and west. And it is high time
23 that the political leaders and the residents
24 and our neighbors work to resolve this

MARTIN COURT REPORTING ASSOCIATES
(518) 587-6832

1 river front property on the Hudson due to PCB
2 pollution. No one wants to buy land next to a
3 highly polluted river.

4 AUDIENCE: I just bought three
5 acres.

6 PATRICK SHANNON: Congrat-
7 ulations.

8 MR. CASPE: Folks. There's going
9 to be both sides, and we can scream and holler
10 at each other and people won't be heard. Go
11 ahead.

12 PATRICK SHANNON: Instead of
13 fighting the EPA's clean-up proposal, people
14 should look at the possible benefits it would
15 bring. With the project under way, there
16 would be added income to towns from the jobs
17 that would be created. People should be aware
18 of the high-paying opportunities that are
19 possible. Also, local businesses would
20 benefit with workers bringing their income to
21 spend in town. Tourism could be a major
22 source of income to the river town, but can
23 only be possible if boat traffic is allowed up
24 river. Currently, the touring boats cannot

MARTIN COURT REPORTING ASSOCIATES
(518) 587-6832

1 which is about a fifth of what they're talking
2 about taking out of the Hudson. During the
3 dredging, there were two swimming beaches that
4 were open in a stone's throw of this dredging.
5 They stayed open for the entire time because
6 the turbidity was so low. There was an intake
7 pipe for Georgia Pacific Paper Company, and
8 they have very low thresholds for turbidity
9 for the stuff that they take in to use. That
10 stayed open the entire time. So if this was
11 throwing up a lot of resuspension, that would
12 have had to shut down.

13 The motels and the hotels up there,
14 didn't close down. The economy didn't fall
15 apart. And we've gone up and we've
16 interviewed people in the area. They don't
17 have any major complaints about the noise.
18 They hardly knew the folks were out there
19 doing this work. And they used to end up
20 waving to them in the morning and offering
21 them coffee in the morning.

22 Their property values are going up,
23 their economy didn't fall apart, and Lake
24 Champlain is a healthier body of water now and

MARTIN COURT REPORTING ASSOCIATES
(518) 587-6832

1 Rensselaer County and Columbia County
2 residents will be positively impacted by this
3 proposal. Therefore, the NUCC voted to
4 endorse the U.S. EPA PCB clean up plan for the
5 Hudson River and to forward this letter of
6 support to the U.S. EPA.

7 I should add, I'm also going to
8 forward to you a letter from Rebecca Caters, a
9 resident of Green Bay, Wisconsin, and she
10 wrote about the success of a dredging proposal
11 that started out as a disaster when done by
12 the polluter's contractor and was a success
13 after the EPA took it over.

14 Thank you.

15 KRISTI PLUNKETT: Hello, my name
16 is Kristi Plunkett and I'm from the Hudson
17 Falls area. I'm speaking tonight on behalf of
18 my little girl, Lila(sic). I'm a breast
19 feeding mother. I live every day with the
20 knowledge and the stress of poisoning my own
21 child through the breast milk. I hope that
22 when she has her offsprings and her offsprings
23 have offsprings as well, I hope that they
24 won't have to deal with the knowledge of

MARTIN COURT REPORTING ASSOCIATES
(518) 587-6832

1 programs, which I have been very deeply
2 involved with. I feel their benefits are hard
3 to beat. General Electric along with the
4 employees donate large sums of money to many
5 charities.

6 I would hope that everyone would
7 take into consideration.

8 One of the laboratory facts from
9 the National Academy of Health Science on
10 blood in rats. How many other PCBs found in
11 the river? Dredging could cause economic
12 hardship. How many types of PCBs have been
13 found in the Hudson River below and above?

14 Thank you.

15 RICHARD KIDWELL: My name is
16 Richard Kidwell. I am a 19 year resident of
17 Washington County. I reside in the Hamlet of
18 Fort Miller. I look out my front door onto
19 the Hudson River. I have seen it in worse
20 times. I have seen it in better times, better
21 times are now. I do not think what is being
22 proposed is the right thing to do at this
23 time, and so I am, therefore, very strongly
24 opposed to what you have in my mind.

MARTIN COURT REPORTING ASSOCIATES
(518) 587-6832

1 March 7, 2001

2 profession. I've been doing it for twenty
3 years since Superfund started. I worked on
4 about thirty-five Superfund sites. I'm
5 currently working on the RIFS study for
6 what was once the largest transforming
7 plant in the world and my meeting on the
8 proposed plan for that study was yesterday,
9 in another EPA region.

10 The other reason, and that's
11 why I have a strong professional interest,
12 what's happening at the Hudson River has
13 affected remedy selection at sites
14 involving contaminated sediment all over
15 the United States, including a site off the
16 coast of California, a site I've been
17 working on, also, so I have a strong
18 interest in what's going on up there.

19 The second interest I have is
20 that I live three miles from a landfill
21 that takes a lot of waste from New York and
22 New Jersey and western Pennsylvania, 355
23 miles from here. Honestly, the remedy
24 selection process that has been gone
25 through for this particular Superfund site

1 party were to propose a sludge processing
2 plant that was only a fraction of the size of
3 the plant you are proposing, an environmental
4 impact statement would be required.

5 My first question is: Do you plan
6 on filing an environmental impact statement
7 prior to construction of your sludge
8 processing plant?

9 MR. CASPE: It's not a sludge
10 processing plant. It would be a plant for
11 dealing with dredge material. And I just
12 would clarify, we're not talking about --

13 BERT HEUCKEROTH: Please just
14 answer the question.

15 MR. CASPE: I'm going to answer
16 the question, if you give me a minute.

17 We've done a study, we've looked
18 at -- we have -- we said in the feasibility
19 study that, yes, it is feasible to site
20 facilities, to site a facility in the north
21 end of the site and the south end that would
22 be able to dewater the dredged material. We
23 didn't say where, because we didn't know
24 where, and we don't know where. What we -- in

MARTIN COURT REPORTING ASSOCIATES
(518) 587-6832

1 downstream and we're going to have continuous,
2 same problem downstream.

3 Also, we're picking on GE. Yeah,
4 okay, they're a big corporation, but they did
5 it legally when they were depositing it.

6 At the same time that they were
7 depositing it in the river, I live in the town
8 of Queensbury, where they were spreading PCBs
9 on the roads as dust control. Nobody got
10 upset over that and suggest they clean up the
11 roads. It's right in my backyard.

12 I have one question to ask the EPA,
13 in hearing that they were going to use trucks
14 to hall the backfill and now I just heard that
15 they're not going to use trucks, you're going
16 to probably use barges.

17 Where are you going to get the
18 barge, or how are you going to get the barge
19 to that excavation pit that's going to hall
20 those many hundred --

21 MR. CASPE: I didn't say -- I
22 said we would use barges or rail cars or
23 combination of the two, that we would not have
24 trucks within this area.

1 breaking PCBs down by using concentrated
2 ultraviolet light by its inventor Gerard
3 Beckman.

4 Simply put, this process would mean
5 containing the PCBs in place in the river,
6 stirring the PCBs, PCB-bearing silt into a
7 sewage, then pumping the sewage through the
8 solar crystal refractory tubes, returning the
9 sewage through a closed loop back to the
10 contained area to be recycled again as many
11 times as necessary to lower the PCBs to the
12 desired level. Then you can proceed to
13 another area and continue the process.

14 Thank you.

15 MR. CASPE: I'd like to just call
16 the next group. Paulette Foote, Lee Ann
17 Armitage, William McQueen, Kevin Armitage,
18 Mark Bailey, Bruce Curtis, Rose Henderson,
19 Mac Sanders, and Jennifer Feyerherm.

20 Yes.

21 NEAL ORSINI: My name is Neal
22 Orsini. I run the Anvil Restaurant in Fort
23 Edward. I'm also a Hudson River land owner.
24 I am a recreational boater. I swim and boat

MARTIN COURT REPORTING ASSOCIATES
(518) 587-6832

1 documents that I reviewed -- this is basically
2 your record over the past 10 years -- Miss
3 Hess talked about the peer review. We're
4 talking about the risk assessment, which I
5 think is really the bottom line of what we're
6 talking about here. We don't live in a
7 perfect world. There's a risk to everything
8 that we do. The issue is the risk
9 reasonable.

10 In looking at the peer review
11 section, which was done last June, and which
12 has a November date, what you failed to tell
13 everyone is that -- I would give you at most a
14 C grade, probably a failing grade with respect
15 to the peer review. Four of the peer
16 reviewers said your report and your approach
17 was acceptable with anywhere from major to
18 minor revisions, two said that your approach
19 was not acceptable, and one went so far as to
20 say that the ecological risk assessment as
21 written should be used to make remedial
22 decisions. He said you should not use that.

23 The question I have is that, this
24 document obviously is close to a year old, did

1 material is held, there will be the potential
2 for environmental exposure, whether through
3 spillage, leakage, runoffs, or accidents. And
4 that point's been made tonight.

5 This project poses great challenges
6 because it covers such a large territory. And
7 as the clean up moves downstream, so does the
8 potential for contact between the
9 contamination and the public. It's hard to
10 foresee every possible exposure scenario, but
11 logic states that the more material that is
12 removed and the longer it goes on, the greater
13 the chances for contact become.

14 I am concerned about the
15 resuspension of contaminated sediment and
16 about increased pollutant concentrations being
17 picked up by the river current. And also the
18 point was made about the dredging being done
19 in the lake areas of -- the river has a lot
20 different hydrodynamics than the lake, and
21 would appreciate some presentation from you
22 folks about how specifically with the river
23 current you are going to address that
24 resuspension problem. I have similar concerns

MARTIN COURT REPORTING ASSOCIATES
(518) 587-6832

1 Thank you for letting me speak. I
2 would like to see more research before this
3 decision is reached.

4 Thank you for your time.

5 MR. CASPE: Thank you.

6 The next group, Dan Bianchi, Robert
7 T. Gray, John Stouffer, Kristin Gordon, Alli
8 Liss, Greg Dangelico, Rudy Gerardi, Steve
9 Gilman, Edna Woodcock.

10 DAN BIANCHI: Hi. My name is Dan
11 Bianchi, and I've waited here all night to
12 tell you that I support EPA dredging, but I'd
13 also like to say that I'm sympathetic to the,
14 to all of the complaints that came out.
15 Let me just say, I live in Saratoga Springs.
16 The people in the immediate community, I feel
17 it's important to address their insecurities
18 about not having everything, all the
19 information concerning the EPA's plans for the
20 dredging be revealed to them, and because it's
21 happening in their community it's of
22 incredible importance that they know
23 everything because, clearly, information is
24 lacking and, clearly, there's a lot of people

MARTIN COURT REPORTING ASSOCIATES
(518) 587-6832

1 public relations problem. You also could
2 benefit from a more beautiful Hudson.

3 Thank you.

4 MR. CASPE: Thank you.

5 GEORGE HODGSON: Yeah, George
6 Hodgson. I'm with the Saratoga County
7 Environmental Council. I would like to take
8 this opportunity to ask EPA to respond to a
9 few questions tonight.

10 On January 10th Saratoga County
11 Board of Supervisors sent correspondence to
12 EPA requesting extension of the 60 day feasibility
13 study review period which provided the county
14 of Saratoga with detailed environmental impact
15 information necessary to evaluate and comment
16 on the proposed plan for PCB remediation.

17 The river: I would like to thank
18 EPA for granting the comment period extension
19 but must ask them when they are going to
20 provide Saratoga County with the information
21 they requested. I think that was a four page
22 letter. I have a copy of it with me today.
23 Would you care to comment -- are you going to
24 respond to that letter with some detailed

MARTIN COURT REPORTING ASSOCIATES
(518) 587-6832

1 done. Thank you. Next.

2 GEORGE HODGSON: I'm also a --

3 KERIM ODEKON: Hi, my name is
4 Kerim Odekon.

5 GEORGE HODGSON: From
6 Northumberland -- I'm a councilman from the
7 Town of Northumberland.

8 MR. CASPE: If you let us answer
9 the question, we'll answer it, but if you are
10 going to keep on asking the same question over
11 and over again, then we're not going to answer
12 it.

13 GEORGE HODGSON: I asked when did
14 the change was made. In '81 you went through
15 NEPA. I just asked when that change was made.

16 DOUG FISCHER: On this project?

17 GEORGE HODGSON: Right.

18 DOUG FISCHER: Earlier into the
19 project it was being handled under NEPA, but
20 after Superfund was passed the agency
21 determined that it would better be handled
22 under Superfund. It was converted to a
23 Superfund process.

24 GEORGE HODGSON: Is there a year

MARTIN COURT REPORTING ASSOCIATES
(518) 587-6832

1 MR. CASPE: Thank you.

2 THOMAS NEWTON: I'm Tom Newton
3 from Hudson Falls.

4 I think there, everybody who was in
5 this room tonight feels the same way. The
6 river should be cleaned. Okay. Clean.
7 Define it. You know, like define is.

8 Are we talking 1600, 400 years ago?
9 Are we talking something more currently?

10 If we're talking currently, both
11 parties have played the game. Figures lie and
12 liars make figures. And GE is just as guilty
13 as the EPA. You've lied from get go. You
14 haven't told the truth. You haven't given
15 people information. You haven't answered
16 people's questions.

17 You come here from the other
18 places and you sit and you take testimony.
19 Now, you know and I know what you're going to
20 do with that testimony. You're going to go
21 back down to your city office and you're going
22 to look at the pile of paper and then you're
23 going to say to yourselves, "Gee, it's CYA and
24 we can drop it right in the basket," because

MARTIN COURT REPORTING ASSOCIATES
(518) 587-6832

1 dredge the Hudson. They get paid for dreaming
2 up these hair-brain schemes, unless forced.
3 They won't listen to us now either. They
4 didn't listen to us when the trash plant was
5 being built either.

6 And to the few visiting red brigade
7 members that are still around, it sounds to me
8 like you're more interested in destroying a
9 major company and the local jobs than you are
10 in saving the river.

11 I have a couple -- one question,
12 really. Which of Senator Clinton's friends
13 lobbied to get the clean up contract for this?

14 And if PCBs can't or PCBs can't
15 really be that toxic. Downstaters still keep
16 coming up here to tell us what to do.

17 I'm opposed to dredging.

18 MR. CASPE: Thank you.

19 PATRICK VEAL: Hi. My name is
20 Patrick Veal. I'm a citizen of Stillwater. I
21 keep a boat at Dennis's Coval Marina, just
22 south of Schuylerville. I've been boating in
23 the river for years.

24 I've got a couple of questions and

MARTIN COURT REPORTING ASSOCIATES
(518) 587-6832

1 conclusive or are they inconclusive?

2 MARIAN OLSEN: Again, as part of
3 the EPA's reassessment in 1996, EPA evaluated
4 a number of rat toxicity studies. These are
5 chronic studies and the rat species were
6 evaluated. There were a number of studies
7 that were conducted, and EPA's conclusions
8 from these studies are that PCBs are a known
9 animal carcinogen. And, again, this study
10 that I mentioned to you, I can give you all
11 the details of it.

12 In the latest study, it was a study
13 of four Aroclors, was conducted by Batell
14 Laboratories for General Electric, was
15 evaluated, and, basically, that study
16 concluded that PCBs caused cancer in female
17 rats at various dose levels across all of the
18 different Aroclors that were evaluated and
19 each of these were statistically significant.

20 PATRICK VEAL: Let's see. Now --

21 MR. CASPE: Last question.

22 PATRICK VEAL: Okay. I would
23 like to make a statement after the last
24 question, if that's possible.

MARTIN COURT REPORTING ASSOCIATES
(518) 587-6832

1 Now, are the results of that
2 study -- let's see, the conclusions reached of
3 that study, I read that EPA's reasons to dredge
4 were based on that study of the rats and he
5 estimates that, if a thousand people ate one
6 half pound of fish per week for 40 years, that
7 one person out of that thousand would get
8 cancer.

9 Is that what the reasons to dredge
10 are based upon?

11 MARIAN OLSEN: As part of our
12 risk assessment, we evaluated ingestion of
13 PCBs over a 40-year period, and we did find
14 that the cancer risks associated with that are
15 one in a thousand. But I would also mention,
16 in addition to that, we also looked at
17 non-cancer health effects, and for children
18 they were a hundred times the safe level.
19 That was for young children. For adolescents,
20 65 times the safe level. I'm sorry, it's 71
21 times the safe level. And for adults, it's 65
22 times the safe level. Again, these are all
23 indicating that they are outside of EPA's
24 acceptable risk range and pose an unacceptable

MARTIN COURT REPORTING ASSOCIATES
(518) 587-6832

1 coming down from Canada, that we're going to
2 have a lot of that zebra muscle coming in. I
3 think the environment is going to be very
4 susceptible to intrusion by that species
5 that's not Hudson River specific, and that
6 could really devastate the wildlife or any
7 kind of introduction of any kind of aquatic or
8 wildlife in the area.

9 MR. CASPE: Thank you.

10 PATRICK VEAL: Thank you.

11 ACEY MOFFITT: My name is a Acey
12 Moffitt. I lived here in the Adirondacks all
13 my life from Warrensburg on down to
14 Gansevoort. I have an eight-month-old son
15 here, and I want to know how safe is he going
16 to be during his growing up during the
17 dredging? And the water supply that is going to
18 some of these towns that take it from the
19 Hudson, how safe is that water going to be
20 during the time of dredging?

21 DOUG TOMCHUK: The water supplies
22 we will be working to insure that that would
23 be protected by doing monitoring in the
24 vicinity of the dredging activities, you know,

MARTIN COURT REPORTING ASSOCIATES
(518) 587-6832

1 a real time monitoring program for turbidity
2 to see if there's any type of escape. Then
3 you can shut down operations if there is a
4 problem during monitoring at the treatment
5 facilities. Generally PCBs are removed fairly
6 easy from conventional treatment. But we
7 would be working with the water suppliers to
8 insure that they have the monitoring in place
9 to -- and contingency plans in case there are
10 any releases. We don't expect that overall
11 the dredging operation will cause unacceptable
12 levels.

13 MR. CASPE: And I think just to
14 clarify, when Doug said he would shut down the
15 operation, not the operation of a water
16 treatment facility, but the operation of the
17 dredging. Dredging would shut down in the
18 event that we saw extrusions in the water
19 column that might ultimately, potentially
20 influence a water supply. So we are going to
21 put multiple -- what we call multiple barriers
22 to make sure that those water supplies are
23 absolutely protected.

24 ACEY MOFFITT: Right, but didn't

1 clarification from both the EPA and G.E. about
2 their respective proposals. From the EPA we
3 are looking for more specific details about
4 their plans, specifically what is the risk of
5 potential resuspension. Perhaps some of these
6 questions you already answered within the
7 context of this presentation. Where are the
8 proposed storage sites and how safe are they?
9 Do the transport vehicles you intend to use
10 meet federal standards for hazardous waste
11 transport? In other words, what safety
12 precautions is the EPA going to take to
13 prevent spills, and what are they going to do
14 if a spill happens? I would imagine you would
15 use normal HAZ-MAT standards to clean up any
16 spills that might happen, is that true?

17 MR. CASPE: Yes, they would. The
18 material would all be moved and obviously by
19 licensed-type operations with proper
20 contingencies plans behind that for cleanups,
21 yeah.

22 PATRICK SORSBY: Similar to the
23 vehicles that would be used for chemicals of
24 that grade, in other words? In other words,