

70409

EXHIBIT SHEETS
Date: 4-2-01
Hudson River PBCs Public Meeting

10.8622

1 We were very pleased with the results of
2 the peer review.

3 Obviously, everything was not perfect.
4 It is not easy, particularly for those who wrote
5 the documents, to sit in an audience and hear
6 people tear their work apart.

7 But, for the most part, we did quite
8 well. We are pretty pleased with it.

9 For instance, at peer review, there was
10 agreement on certain factors like -- certain very
11 important things, like the fact that the fish pose
12 an unacceptable risk in the Hudson River.

13 That is a rather key finding. Also,
14 there was agreement that widespread diminution of
15 contaminated sediments was not happening.

16 Not surprisingly, they talked about the
17 river system being very dynamic, and you would not
18 expect that to happen.

19 The site itself covers 200 river miles
20 from Hudson Falls to The Battery, as you can see
21 here (indicating slide).

22 The Upper Hudson, which is really the
23 focus of our study, is about 40 miles.

24 The rest of the river, the Lower Hudson,
25 is about 160 miles.

1 the load increase over the Thompson Island Pool.

2 What it shows here on the bottom is the
3 mass coming into the Thompson Island Pool, and
4 what is here in the red is the mass leaving the
5 Thompson Island Pool.

6 What this simply shows you is that, as
7 the water goes over the sediment in the Thompson
8 Island Pool, this is the increase, this is just a
9 PCB homologue; it is just a way of looking at it.

10 So, there is a significant increase; we
11 figure in the neighborhood of three times extra
12 that the water column is picking up from the
13 sediment.

14 So, what does that say? It says that,
15 yes, the sediment is very important.

16 PCBs are coming from the sediments. It
17 is not all coming from upstream.

18 On the next slide, this just simply
19 shows you that we have been able to fingerprint
20 the sediments into the water column.

21 In other words, based upon this PCB
22 homologue pattern, the sediment in the water
23 column area is at the same pattern; so, we know it
24 is coming from there.

25 In other words, it is not coming from

1 Again, it is because it is in the
2 Thompson Island Pool that they went up, and then a
3 leveling off again. So, we get the same thing.

4 With the water and the fish, what you
5 may have heard is that the levels are going down,
6 that there is no problem, you do not have to worry
7 about it.

8 Well, that is not the case. They have
9 been basically the same for quite a long period of
10 time, and we expect them to stay that way.

11 As far as the PCBs in the sediment,
12 natural dechlorination processes are not
13 sufficient to solve the problem.

14 You have probably heard that PCBs will
15 take care of themselves, that they will
16 dechlorinate and become harmless.

17 That is not the case. We have found
18 that that results in about less than a 10 percent
19 mass loss.

20 There is also, as I mentioned before,
21 little evidence of burial in the Thompson Island
22 Pool, burial of PCB-contaminated sediments by
23 clean sediments.

24 What our coring has shown -- the
25 sediment cores, the sampling of the sediment -- is

1 It will reduce the load of PCBs over the
2 Troy Dam by 40 percent.

3 It will allow the fish consumption
4 advisories to be reduced at least a generation
5 sooner.

6 It will reduce the PCB levels in
7 wildlife.

8 I see there is a press release from the
9 State concerning just that issue. I just saw it.

10 It will reduce the risk to those who
11 consume fish for subsistence reasons.

12 We know and we have heard from plenty of
13 folks that there are a lot of people who eat fish
14 as a matter of subsistence for protein and are not
15 as worried about the fish consumption advisories
16 as they are about eating.

17 It will eliminate a significant amount
18 of PCBs from the river system in the case of
19 significant flood events.

20 And it will accomplish much in the much-
21 needed navigational dredging.

22 With that, I know Ann mentioned the web
23 site and the fact that we have gotten 20,000 e-
24 mails.

25 There's a lot of folks -- which is one

1 1980s, GE violated the Clean Water Act by
2 exceeding their discharge permit.

3 "These violations directly contradict
4 GE's claims that they have always abided by their
5 permit.

6 "In my lifetime, tremendous progress has
7 been made in cleaning up the Hudson River.

8 "Both the New York and the Federal
9 Government have made substantial investments in
10 bringing the Hudson back to life.

11 "GE should now take responsibility for
12 its share.

13 "EPA's plan to dredge PCBs from the
14 Hudson should go forward so that future
15 generations are not left with the legacy of
16 pollution, and the residents of the Hudson Valley
17 can fully enjoy the benefits of a clean Hudson.

18 "Thank you very much."

19 (Applause.)

20 MR. MC CABE: Thank you.

21 Ms. Hudson?

22 MS. HUDSON: My name is Katherine
23 Hudson. I am an Assistant Attorney General in the
24 Environmental Protection Bureau, and I welcome
25 this opportunity to present the statement of the

1 of Hispanics consumed the contaminated fish.

2 Further, this study showed that
3 approximately 50 percent of downstate anglers
4 reported sharing Hudson River fish with the most
5 at-risk population, women and children.

6 3. The Hudson River is not cleaning
7 itself of PCBs.

8 While the river is cleaner now than it
9 was 30 years ago, that is largely because the
10 State has expended tremendous resources to reduce
11 sewage and other industrial discharges.

12 The PCBs that remain in the river,
13 however, are invisible.

14 The PCB levels in the fish have decreased
15 only marginally in the over 20 years since GE
16 stopped using PCBs at its Hudson Falls and Fort
17 Edward plants.

18 Over the last seven years, PCB levels
19 have remained essentially stable.

20 Unless the PCBs are removed from the
21 river, the fish will remain contaminated.

22 4. Dredging the hot spots in the Hudson
23 River will remove large quantities of PCBs and, in
24 conjunction with control of the continuing
25 discharges from the Hudson Falls plant, will lead

1 to major improvements in the river.

2 This remedy will dramatically decrease
3 human health risks, particularly in the Upper
4 Hudson River Valley.

5 It will also cut almost in half the flow
6 of PCBs over the Troy Dam, significantly assisting
7 the recovery of the 150 miles of the Lower Hudson
8 River.

9 These long-term benefits far outweigh
10 the limited short-term impacts that may result.

11 In addition to these scientific findings
12 by EPA, a well-established body of law supports
13 requiring GE to clean up its PCBs from the Hudson
14 River.

15 For 20 years, companies big and small,
16 regardless of the legalities of the discharges,
17 have cleaned up their toxic discharges under the
18 Federal Superfund Program and its state
19 equivalents.

20 There is no reason to treat GE
21 differently.

22 Moreover, contrary to the common
23 misperception, GE's discharges were not always
24 permitted or legal.

25 Indeed, GE had no permit for most of its

1 I am, therefore, making a formal request
2 that, before the EPA issues a Record of Decision,
3 that it conduct a comprehensive health study of
4 those residents who live and work along this 40-
5 mile corridor.

6 It is the only way that you can truly
7 learn what the effect of PCBs contaminating the
8 fish has had and will have on the human
9 population.

10 MR. MC CABE: Thank you, Judy.

11 Marion, would you like to respond?

12 MS. OLSEN: There is currently a study
13 being conducted by the New York State Department
14 of Health, including Hudson Falls and Glens Falls
15 as a control population.

16 And they are looking at the effects on
17 the nervous systems of adults between, I
18 believe, the ages of 40 to 70.

19 The first study was done last year;
20 there were about 100 people involved, and they
21 will be doing another hundred folks this year.

22 They will evaluate the data and then
23 develop a report and analysis of the data.

24 MS. SCHMIDT-DEAN: Well, I know about
25 the report, too, Marion.

1 But when you consider that there are
2 hundreds of thousands of people, not just 100 --
3 and especially in Glens Falls, not even where I
4 live, right on the river -- that is just not
5 enough. It is just not enough.

6 MS. OLSEN: This is a design that was
7 developed by the New York State Department of
8 Health.

9 It was reviewed by the Agency for Toxic
10 Substances and Disease Registry.

11 And, usually -- this is the type of
12 study that will be done. We are looking at
13 representative people in that community to look at
14 the effects.

15 MS. SCHMIDT-DEAN: Then I have to
16 ask, why did they go to Glens Falls? Why didn't
17 they just stay on the river?

18 MS. OLSEN: Because that is their
19 control population that is being evaluated. They
20 need a control that has not been impacted to
21 compare with those individuals that are actually
22 exposed.

23 MS. PULVER: Good evening. My name is
24 Marilyn Pulver, P-u-l-v-e-r. I am the Town
25 Supervisor of Fort Edward.

1 I understand that there was an
2 announcement that the village of Fort Edward
3 supports dredging because of the economic loss to
4 the community of boat traffic.

5 If today was April Fool's Day, I would
6 consider it a joke. But today is April 2nd, and
7 it is a bold-faced lie.

8 This is just one more prime example of
9 paid environmentalists misrepresenting the facts.

10 The village of Fort Edward passed a
11 resolution regarding navigational dredging of the
12 yacht basin; not a part of this project, not
13 environmental dredging of the Hudson River. The
14 village is opposed to EPA's proposal.

15 Fort Edward's Mayor, Ed Ryan, and Fort
16 Edward Town Supervisor, Marilyn Pulver, announced
17 on December 19, 2000, that the village and the
18 town of Fort Edward remain steadfastly opposed to
19 the EPA's proposed decision to dredge the Hudson
20 River.

21 Any articles that have questioned the
22 unity of Fort Edward concerning this are
23 absolutely incorrect.

24 Our community, for a quarter of a
25 century, has battled all dredge and dump proposals

1 due to the devastating economic impact of such a
2 project, and this one is no exception.

3 We adamantly support our December
4 resolution, and call upon EPA to heed the voice of
5 the upriver communities.

6 Sixty-five upriver communities are
7 united in opposition to EPA's proposed plan, and
8 we ask that EPA consider in its process of
9 decision-making the level of impact to the upriver
10 communities and the consequences of this dredge
11 proposal.

12 Thank you.

13 (Applause.)

14 MS. RUGGI: Good evening. My name is
15 Sharon Ruggi, R-u-g-g-i.

16 I am a councilwoman in the town of Fort
17 Edward.

18 And I do have a question. But, first, I
19 want to express my appreciation for the fact that
20 you have changed your resuspension numbers, though
21 we have really no idea how this number has been
22 derived.

23 And my question is very simple: Are you
24 committed to revising the numerical predictions
25 that you initially had regarding resuspension?

1 women of child-bearing age and children under the
2 age of 15 should not eat any fish from the Hudson
3 River.

4 Everyone I interviewed intended to eat
5 the fish they caught, warnings or not.

6 I continued to ask these questions,
7 going down the river's edge and, through the
8 years, more and more people are not aware of the
9 advisory.

10 We have a large number of low- to
11 middle-income families that have recently made
12 Newburgh their home, and many of them can be found
13 along the river shore fishing for eels, catfish
14 and stripers.

15 For some, this is recreation but, for
16 others, it is a part of their culture and,
17 realistically, food on the table.

18 No amount of signs or orders are going
19 to stop them from feeding the youngsters, the
20 pregnant mothers and wives and older people that
21 fish the bounty of the Hudson River.

22 The only solution is for the river to be
23 cleaned ASAP.

24 The bottom of the river, where the eels,
25 catfish and crabs live is called "The Benthic

1 Level" or "The Benthic Line".

2 For me, the bottom line is that PCBs
3 have to be removed from there, and it must be done
4 immediately.

5 (Applause.)

6 MR. BALLANTINE: My name is Chris
7 Ballantine. I am here tonight representing the
8 Sierra Club.

9 The Sierra Club fully supports your
10 Preferred Alternative Number 4.

11 I believe that, in some instances, we
12 ought to be looking at recovering more PCBs from
13 the toxic hot spots.

14 I have two specific questions tonight
15 for EPA.

16 I understand, through newspaper
17 articles, that the group CEASE is trying to
18 arrange a meeting with Administrator Whitman of
19 the EPA.

20 And my call to you is, if that meeting
21 happens, I would hope we would be given the
22 courtesy of the environmental community meeting
23 with the EPA Administrator as well.

24 Obviously, politics have changed, but
25 the fact that we need to clean up and restore this

1 pesticides, dioxins and PCBs.

2 I do not believe that the river will
3 clean itself up. I believe that it is pure
4 propaganda that General Electric has spent endless
5 dollars advertising.

6 I see countless dollars wasted on
7 advertising when we have a public health issue at
8 hand.

9 Cost should not be a deterrent to public
10 health initiatives, and we are failing to protect
11 the children from industrial poisons.

12 And I would like to say that I agree
13 with Rachel Mann who said that, to some, our
14 current regulatory system is like a trial in which
15 the criminal defendants get to serve on the jury.

16 If we want to have children who can
17 play, who can think and who can learn normally, we
18 will have to change our corporations and our
19 government so that protecting brain development
20 comes ahead of protecting profits.

21 Please, actively remove the PCBs from
22 the targeted hot spots along the Upper Hudson.

23 It is time to start the clean-up.

24 Thank you.

25 (Applause.)

1 MS. ROWAN: I am Kathy Rowan, R-o-w-a-n,
2 head of corporate responsibility for the
3 Maryknoll Sisters, and international Catholic
4 religious organization serving in over 30
5 countries.

6 The Sisters' headquarters is in Ossining
7 on a hill overlooking the beauty of the Hudson
8 River.

9 The Sisters are members of a religious
10 organization along the river, LORE.

11 In our mission statement, LORE believes
12 that we share a kinship with all creation and that
13 ecologically sound care of the land is a key part
14 of our mission.

15 We come together to address the
16 interrelated issues of poverty, justice, and
17 ecology in this vital region.

18 For us, the presence of PCBs in the
19 Hudson River is a moral issue and is related to
20 poverty, justice and ecology.

21 Because of the presence of PCBs, the
22 government considers eating even one fish a danger
23 to children and women of child-bearing age.

24 PCBs pose a serious health risk to the
25 residents of the Hudson Valley.

1 We are especially concerned for those
2 who may rely on Hudson River fish for their
3 nutrition.

4 We are concerned about justice; that
5 those who pollute be held accountable for their
6 actions.

7 As institutional shareholders, the
8 Maryknoll Sisters have drafted a resolution
9 calling on companies to clean up the river.

10 We are concerned about ecology and the
11 health and safety of the web of life linked so
12 closely with the Hudson River.

13 We support Christie Whitman's statement
14 on the EPA's web site, her commitment to leave
15 America's environment cleaner when we are done
16 than when we started.

17 And we urge the EPA to act as quickly as
18 possible to reduce the risks to health and the
19 environment which the PCBs in the river have posed
20 for so many years.

21 Thank you.

22 (Applause.)

23 MR. SULLIVAN: My name is Ned Sullivan,
24 Executive Director of Scenic Hudson.

25 I previously served in the New York

1 levels in fish occurred years ago when GE was
2 ordered to stop discharging PCBs into the Hudson,
3 and they have leveled off at levels that exceed
4 the safe threshold for consumption.

5 I want to address the effectiveness of
6 remedial technology to address this problem.

7 Scenic Hudson conducted a study
8 nationwide, and found that dredging technologies
9 are effective, that sediment clean-ups in -- we
10 looked at 90 different sites and we found that 70
11 clean-ups reduced average contamination
12 concentrations in sediments by 82 to 99 percent.

13 And the average reduction in fish
14 concentrations ranged from 56 to more than 99
15 percent.

16 So, the technology is there, and it is
17 effective.

18 And we urge the Bush Administration to
19 follow its three bad decisions for the environment
20 in its first 70 days in office with a good
21 decision to clean up the PCBs in the Hudson.

22 Thank you.

23 (Applause.)

24 MS. SYLCON: My name is Carol Sylcon,
25 S-y-l-c-o-n.

1 1977.

2 And recently they spent millions more
3 telling us about those clean-ups.

4 So, what about this clean-up? GE seems
5 to commend itself for the fact that they now have
6 only three ounces of PCBs leaking into the Hudson
7 River every day.

8 They think this is a good thing: "We
9 are down to three ounces."

10 Well, you know, this chemical was banned
11 in 1977, the plant was closed in 1984, and there
12 are still three ounces a day coming into the
13 river. I think that is pathetic.

14 GE should have never -- if they were a
15 responsible company, they would have never buried
16 what they knew to be a toxic chemical in bedrock
17 that any geologist in the world could tell you was
18 unstable at best; never mind the fact that this
19 whole clean-up was part of a settlement with the
20 State and that GE was required by the State to do
21 this.

22 What is even more pathetic and
23 disgusting about General Electric though is the
24 fact that they completely disregard the EPA's
25 accepted decade-long peer-reviewed scientific

1 follow through on the requirements to clean up
2 their plant site, and they need to get rid of the
3 main source of contamination, which is the
4 sediment.

5 And if GE does not want to dredge, then
6 it better come to the table with a better
7 alternative that they can do.

8 And instead of coming to the table, they
9 are out there telling us lies, that PCBs do not
10 harm humans.

11 And what this is exactly what the
12 tobacco industry did. It is tobacco science:
13 Don't buy it. GE lies. GE deceives us, and then
14 spends millions of dollars trying to avoid a
15 clean-up for a river that they single-handedly
16 devastated.

17 (Applause.)

18 MR. MC CABE: There is a question from a
19 Hubert Boyd here: "Is it true that PCBs in the
20 Hudson were legally disposed of under existing
21 laws, regulations and permits?"

22 I think they would say partially so. I
23 think you heard quite well before from the
24 Attorney General's Office exactly what was legal,
25 what was not legal, what was in gray areas or

1 health effects.

2 And we looked at young children, we
3 looked at adolescents, and we looked at adults.

4 And those levels in the Upper Hudson,
5 for the young children, they were about a hundred
6 times the level that is considered basically safe.

7 This is what is called a "reference
8 curve", and it is a level that is set to be
9 protective of children and other populations that
10 are exposed.

11 For the adolescents, it was 71 times
12 higher, and for the adults it was 65 times higher.

13 We did a separate human health risk
14 assessment for the Mid-Hudson, and the risks were
15 about half of that level.

16 And this looked into the future. And,
17 again, as Bill mentioned, we are looking at risks
18 to recently exposed individuals.

19 The toxicity information that is used in
20 this is very much from analyses that were
21 conducted by EPA.

22 In 1996, EPA conducted a reassessment of
23 the cancer data, and concluded, again, that PCBs
24 are a probable human carcinogen.

25 And we also made specific

1 the flesh of striped bass.

2 And I have a question: Why was that
3 changed, going from whole-carcass analysis to
4 filets?

5 Canadians used filets for a long time in
6 Lake Ontario studies, and we have always used in
7 New York whole-carcass analysis.

8 And it does not apply directly to our
9 problem, but it was a question that New Jersey was
10 asking. And I associate with some respondents
11 down there.

12 We all live downstream, and thank you
13 for coming downstream and looking at the potential
14 problems that people have brought to you.

15 I certainly support a health study on
16 the downstream effects, and would like you to look
17 at that.

18 I would also ask you to consider a pilot
19 program of what flotation in the water column of
20 PCBs might be if you did what you are planning to
21 do, instead of going full-scale.

22 We have waited approximately 30 years to
23 accomplish what we have at this point; another
24 year or two with pilot studies below the Troy Dam
25 and down in our area is not going to keep us from

1 accomplishing our goals.

2 I think we are all after the same thing.

3 It is just that I would hate to see our water
4 supplies and PCBs in the striped bass rise.

5 Thirdly, commercial fishing of striped
6 bass is highly recommended at this point by
7 commercial fishermen.

8 How come they can use that high level of
9 toxic chemicals in their products is kind of iffy,
10 and we cannot look at it.

11 MR. MC CABE: Okay. The pilot study
12 effort has been raised by a number of people, and
13 it is something we are looking into.

14 We have not made a particular decision
15 on that, but it has been suggested by a number of
16 folks.

17 Commercial fishing is different from our
18 proposal or our exposure scenario in that --
19 they use what is considered a market basket
20 approach in that they obtain their fish from a
21 variety of sources and you have a variety of fish
22 that you are eating.

23 We have assumed that you would all be
24 eating fish from the Hudson River, so the
25 exposures are very, very different.

1 But that is for the future. For right
2 now, our concern is what the right decision is for
3 the River.

4 And that is really what we are trying to
5 focus on.

6 I know everyone likes to talk about the
7 other side, but that is for another day.

8 MS. KATAM: Good evening. My name is
9 Sandra Katam, and I am the President of the
10 Stewart Park and Preserve Coalition.

11 Those of you who live in our area know
12 that our focus has been saving open land adjacent
13 to Stewart Airport.

14 And we are still working on this. We
15 have some land left to go.

16 Our organization passed a resolution to
17 support the dredging.

18 And I would like to comment personally
19 this evening on the issues that appear to be
20 emerging.

21 I am extremely saddened to see that a
22 company such as General Electric, which has
23 substantial culpability by not taking
24 responsibility, and is conducting those activities
25 that will prevent them from assuming their

1 responsibility, has actually made some headway
2 with the public.

3 I have to tell you that there are
4 similarities here with what we deal with the
5 Stewart issue.

6 When it serves the opposition, they do
7 not tell the truth. They confuse the figures.
8 They step aside from responsibility.

9 And I would be willing to assume and
10 suspect that, if GE were not liable for these
11 costs, the dredging would go forward without any
12 opposition whatsoever and they would not be
13 fighting the project.

14 I am reminded of a project that occurred
15 at Cold Spring that was a cadmium clean-up.

16 I do not remember any problem with that
17 whatsoever.

18 But you know what? My understanding is
19 that it was entirely paid for by public funds.

20 Whenever there are clean-ups to be done
21 and it is going to be paid for with public funds,
22 nobody gets upset.

23 What was that big power plant that
24 closed on Long Island; Shoreham? The public not
25 only had to construct the plant, but they had to

1 I have a couple of questions for you.

2 First, in your proposed plan, you talk
3 about the time for fish to reach the safe level was
4 34 to 37 years, and I was wondering how you
5 arrived at that figure.

6 I looked at the plot graph that you
7 have, and you could pick a time frame anywhere you
8 want.

9 Where were you actually calculating that
10 time frame from? Where do you start and where do
11 you stop?

12 MR. TOMCHUK: The time frame would be
13 from the time of the completion of the project to
14 the --

15 MR. TORLEY: In the NMA, when I looked
16 at your graph, you explained the various PCB
17 levels in the fish over time.

18 Depending on where you started and where
19 you stopped the curve, you can generate a time to
20 zero effect anywhere you want.

21 So, what did you actually use as your
22 generated time limits?

23 MR. TOMCHUK: There was a model that we
24 used --

25 MR. TORLEY: But how well does that fit

1 river animals and people.

2 And I point to the incident that
3 happened at the SUNY New Paltz campus, where PCBs
4 found their way in, and just had a devastating
5 effect on people and the buildings and to all of
6 us, the taxpayers.

7 My position is that I am 100 percent in
8 favor of the removal of PCBs from the river.

9 I believe that PCBs residing at the
10 bottom of the river do not get better with time,
11 as has been pointed out.

12 I believe this would be a public health
13 issue potentially affecting a large geographic
14 area.

15 And with about 500 pounds of PCBs
16 flowing over the Troy Dam, that points out that
17 this is not a static situation, but that very
18 likely the contamination is building.

19 I would say that, in this instance, we
20 are roughly talking about \$5000 per pound of PCB
21 in your projected costs.

22 In strange events as we have seen in New
23 Paltz, I am sure that the cost was much higher per
24 pound. And the events that caused that to happen
25 were very odd and strange.

1 And odd things do happen, including a
2 barge going down the river dragging its anchor for
3 many miles in the Poughkeepsie area last year.

4 If that had been over a capped area, I
5 am sure that would have created a disturbance.

6 Thank you.

7 MR. MC CABE: Thank you.

8 MR. LEBEAUX: My name is John Lebeaux.
9 I am originally from France but, as I kayak along
10 the Hudson River, I realize that this is truly a
11 very beautiful area.

12 I, for one, would like to be able to eat
13 fish from the river.

14 It would help us if you could reassure
15 and educate more fully the residents along the
16 river about the dredging process.

17 I think that very little has been said
18 in terms of describing the dredging itself. I
19 have seen in the newspapers, however, different
20 types of scoopers for dredging the river.

21 So, I think it would help if you would
22 give some reference as to perhaps where we could
23 view such a dredging situation going on right now.

24 So, two questions to you -- or, two
25 requests, if you wish: One, give us some

1 We know you can dredge; I mean, it is
2 done all over the place.

3 But can you dredge at that rate? That
4 is what some people have questioned.

5 We have said we are going to do it in
6 five years. That, of course, means we are going
7 to do it at a certain rate per year. And some
8 have questioned that rate.

9 A pilot project could show that you
10 could scale it up to that level.

11 But like any kind of project in any kind
12 of construction field, we do not see any
13 impediments to scaling it up.

14 It is not innovative technology; it is
15 all proven technology. You use more of it.

16 We do not really anticipate that being a
17 problem.

18 MR. MELLE: I am Andy Melle from
19 Hudson River Sloop Clearwater.

20 Would it be safe to say that, whereas GE
21 is deriving a great deal of energy -- putting a
22 great deal of energy into saying that you cannot
23 do a project this size, a project this size has
24 never been done.

25 Would it be safe to say then that this

1 I assume they -- they probably used
2 different assumptions than we used.

3 And I do not know if you have anything
4 else to say, Doug --

5 MR. TOMCHUK: Well, I do not know what
6 their assumptions -- assuming that they would all
7 be the same, there could still be something else
8 in someone else's model that --

9 MR. MELLE: Well, before the public, I
10 can say that I have run your model, and it shows
11 that -- Clearwater runs the EPA model, and it
12 conclusively proves that there will be zero
13 resuspension, and it would have equal validity
14 before the public --

15 MR. TOMCHUK: We will check and get back
16 to you.

17 (Laughter.)

18 MR. MELLE: Thanks very much for
19 coming.

20 (Applause.)

21 MR. MC CABE: Our model was peer-
22 reviewed. There was a debate there for quite some
23 time about which model was better; we should have
24 a contest of models, you know, run one against the
25 other; which one would be acceptable.

1 We said, "Look, it is a tool." If the
2 tool is proven to be sound and acceptable, which
3 the peer review has found it to be, then it works
4 and it is fine.

5 As you have heard before, also, you can
6 calibrate a model a lot of different ways.

7 That does not mean that, in the forecast
8 mode, that is going to exactly work that way. It
9 depends on all those assumptions you made, all
10 those coefficients that you fill in to make it
11 work.

12 So, our's worked. We are happy with it.
13 GE, I guess, is happy with theirs.

14 MS. METAXAS: I am Emily Metaxas, and I
15 am a resident of the City of Newburgh. I am a
16 transplant from Connecticut to the Hudson Valley.

17 I am here representing a group known as
18 the Newburgh Neighbors Network.

19 We are a grassroots organization here in
20 the City of Newburgh, comprising about 200
21 homeowners here in your district.

22 We are mainly preservationists and
23 environmentalists, and we are deeply concerned
24 with our quality of life here in the City of
25 Newburgh.

1 really a credit in the international community to
2 the United States; they are indicative of what is
3 possible for a corporation given the free range to
4 pursue capitalist goals.

5 I studied GE in a very good business
6 college where I went to school, all the way to
7 advanced management.

8 Jack Welsh is probably one of the most
9 quoted and lauded CEOs in existence.

10 And I thought, I see, now wrongly that
11 GE had corporate spirit and a patriotism that
12 demonstrated above the almighty dollar or the
13 return on investment or the return -- or, earnings
14 on stock prices, that the health of our children
15 and the quality of our environment where we live
16 and work is much more important than that.

17 They are a company that can readily
18 afford this clean-up. And it is insultingly
19 disingenuous for them to have undergone this
20 massive marketing misinformation campaign, as far
21 as going to put logos on websites that look like
22 environmental groups'.

23 I clicked on one thinking it was yet
24 another environmental group for the dredging, and
25 it was GE's arguments against it. And there it

1 lot to revitalize its waterfront in the last
2 several years.

3 We had a garbage dump, and we turned it
4 into a park.

5 We had a sludge incinerator. We shut it
6 down. We ship our sludge out now.

7 We had an empty box plant on our river
8 for 15 years and, rather than putting another
9 factory in, we are putting in the largest modern
10 art museum in the region.

11 We have junkyards torn down and we are
12 doing redevelopment there.

13 The things that we are doing in Beacon
14 will benefit greatly from having a river that is
15 clean, that encourages people back to the river
16 for recreational, commercial and residential uses.

17 So, for that, I think limited dredging
18 helps our communities.

19 My second comment is one of how to
20 decide whether to dredge.

21 The decision of whether to dredge is one
22 that is really quite simple: Rely on the experts.

23 And that means you do not rely on people
24 like me. I am not an expert.

25 It is a highly technical decision; that

1 for the clean-up; whereas, GE is looking to save
2 money, and some of the opponents to this are
3 out to get money.

4 God knows, GE probably paid half the
5 guys who came up here just to say what they said.

6 And I think you guys are doing a great
7 job. I am proud of you, and thanks for all your
8 hard work.

9 MR. MC CABE: Thank you, Steven.

10 (Applause.)

11 MR. MARTIN: My name is Craig Martin.
12 First of all, I would like to thank you for coming
13 here tonight.

14 However, I would also like to express
15 some dissatisfaction at the length of time it has
16 taken to get to this point since there were
17 presentations that were held in '86 or '87 on the
18 same topic, although I believe they were held by
19 the Department of Environmental Conservation.

20 The preferred alternative at that time
21 was 50 percent or more -- actually, it was very
22 similar to the preferred alternative presented
23 tonight, in that the preferred alternative was to
24 dredge the hot spots.

25 However, the landfill, at that time,

1 I also want to say that we are up here
2 in the Hudson Valley -- I am sorry to tell you
3 that my father, who had lived here in the Hudson
4 Valley for many years, just died a few months ago
5 of cancer.

6 My wife just had two miscarriages. So,
7 one of the other things I would ask you is to
8 advocate studies as to the long-term effects of
9 Hudson River PCBs on communities, endocrine and
10 carcinogenic effects.

11 Thirdly, as a manufacturing engineer who
12 works in industry, I can tell you that, sure,
13 industry wants to minimize cost; sure, certain
14 assignments will be given to people and told,
15 "Well, if you do not take this assignment,
16 somebody else will, so you might as well take it."

17 But industry must have a responsibility
18 towards the communities in which they operate.

19 And you and the United States Government
20 must not allow there to be any confusion or
21 exceptions on that point.

22 In fact, I can tell you that I would
23 suspect that the representatives of General
24 Electric or any other corporation publicly
25 fighting this -- I very strongly suspect that

1 responsible for damages that might come up?

2 We cannot tell who is going to sue in
3 this society. What if? Just think about it.

4 In summary, A, is the EPA dealing with
5 the shipping industry? There has been no dredging
6 since 1979.

7 The EPA says the Hudson should be safe
8 for recreators, but the EPA has no dredging
9 standards.

10 The peer review is equivocal. I am a
11 taxpayer. I am a householder. I am a small
12 businessperson.

13 We will pay all the bills, ladies and
14 gentlemen.

15 The Government does not create money; we
16 pay it.

17 If something happens, it ends up being
18 up to us. Is it worth \$460 million to babysit
19 intelligent New York citizens who are fish-eaters?

20 To me, that is the point. The issue is
21 not the PCBs. It is that we have to protect
22 people who cannot make decisions for themselves.

23 We have to remove the PCBs and spend
24 hundreds of millions of dollars to relieve these
25 poor people while if they read -- I am dyslexic,