ERRATA SHEETS
Date: 4-4-01
Hudson River PBCs Public Meeting

10.8844

70 411

are not harmful. They are known to cause cancer in lab animals and they probably cause cancer in humans. They are known to cause serious non-cancer effects as well which have been measured, actually measured in people exposed to PCBs, and in babies and children whose mothers ate contaminated fish while they were pregnant. One example of this is that researchers have continued to study exposed children as they grew up, and have found that even at the age of 12 years old these children had lower IQs, lower reading comprehension, attention deficits, and memory problems. So EPA strongly advises people to follow the state advisories: eat no fish between Troy and Hudson Falls, and follow the lesser advisories below Troy; and women of child bearing age and children under the age of 15 should eat none for the entire 200 mile stretch of the river.

But simply not eating fish is not an answer to the PCB problem. It's

Based upon information and assumptions the EPA makes from the feasibility studies, and the new PCB suspension rate information from the U.S.P.S. relative to the Fox River project, actual PCB resuspension rates resulting from dredging the Hudson River may be as much as 32 times higher than those projected by EPA and FS.

Saratoga County is still quite concerned about the impact this increased PCB resuspension may have upon downstream drinking water supplies.

EPA spokeswoman, Ann Rychlenski stated a 4/3/01 Post Star news release, yesterday's news release, that, "Her agency has completed at least seven reports that have estimated how PCBs may affect water supplies, in Half Moon and Waterford.

At this time Saratoga County requests copies of the Saratoga County water supply PCB impact reports from EPA. Saratoga County is not familiar with these

environmental review process is clearly unacceptable.

One can hardly make this an immediacy case for the Hudson River PCB site because it's been studied for over 25 years and poses no imminent public health environmental threat. Doesn't the largest site in U.S. history, a site whose preferred dredging --

MR. CASPE: Please wrap up.

GEORGE HODSON: -- widespread negative community impacts for many years deserve a comprehensive review?

MR. CASPE: Please wrap up.

GEORGE HODSON: In summary, Saratoga County asks EPA to respond to its 3/14/01 correspondence, sent to Administrator Whitman, which requests EPA to comply with Federal NEPA environmental review requirements.

MR. CASPE: Thank you.

GEORGE HODSON: And lastly, the U. S. EPA needs to get its head out of the Hudson River and its tunnel vision

places the river bottom material on the land, I would like to know if the EPA has given any thought as to how they will make sure that all the people, farms, and businesses located near the sites, should their wells, and I'm echoing this last gentleman, become contaminated, what, if anything, would EPA do? Will EPA install public water supplies throughout the Hudson River area to towns, villages that do not have them, and/or if so who will pay for them? Will our crops be marketable. Will the farms milking cows in the area lose their markets? You, the EPA, have you addressed these issues? Will our land values be effected? Will we be able to sell if we ever decide later on to sell at a fair price if the dredging starts? Will our taxes be lowered to match our land values, and if so who will pick up the lost taxes to the towns and villages in the Hudson River area? Who will be responsible for maintaining our roads from all the extra truck traffic?

EPA has used the media for scare tactics, precluding information, keeping secrets, untold truths, making one believe the EPA has already made up their minds, disregarding the citizens most affected by this dredging.

EPA says they will resuspend more PCBs than they said in the beginning. That means, at least, there will be more traveling downriver, over the Troy dam and endangering not only upstate, but downstate, primary water supplies and the shorelines of them.

EPA, can you guarantee our community won't be totally devastated that dredging will add -- at least that hasn't happened or that every animal or aquatic habitat will not be exterminated.

Where are the filtration plants going to be located? On somebody's land where you can take 2 miles away?

EPA has no positive proof PCBs cause cancer. The National Cancer Institute and the American Council of

we have checked those numbers and rechecked them. And the numbers are based upon historical loss rates at sites that we have looked at, and looked at in great detail.

I think in your calculations the 38 pounds should be being compared to 20,000 pounds a year of PCBs that are roughly being removed from the river. It's not the volume of the total sediment. If we are removing 100,000 pounds of PCBs over five years, then you are removing 20,000 pounds a year. If you look at 20,000 pounds, and then -- or if you take the number you are looking at, which is the 38 pounds, and divide it by 20,000, you wind up with .19 percent --

MR. SHAW: Don't you have to use the 2.6 million cubic yards?

MR. CASPE: No, because the amount of -- a lot of that is clean sediment. A lot of the rest of the material left to be cleaned is clean sediment. We are not talking about clean

sediment, we are talking about just PCBs.

MR. SHAW: Right, but out of that 2.65 million cubic yards you are going to remove with it, a 100 pounds of that is going to be PCBs, is that right?

MR. CASPE: Yes.

MR. SHAW: Well that figures out to a ratio of 8,000:1 poundage wise. If you're using a calculation of 3,000 pounds per yard, which is a standard calculation for dirt.

MR. CASPE: Right.

MR. SHAW: Now is that ratio 8,000:1 -- I don't care if you want to do it over five years or one year, you are using 38 pounds per year so I'm using ratios, and it's coming up .004 of 1 percent.

MR. CASPE: We would be glad to sit with you after the meeting if you would like or at a different time, and run the numbers with you and show you how we come up with the numbers we come up with. Thank you.

water outside that, they saw that the resuspension, or the stirring up of the PCBs was very low. It was so low to the point that one day it was non-detect, you could not detect PCBs coming downstream from this dredging project.

So I would encourage anyone to think about that and think about the possibilities that GE has the technology. They know how to do this. They have done a pilot project already. Now is the time to clean up these PCBs forever, and I applaud the EPA and encourage you to go ahead with the full plan.

Thank you.

MR. CASPE: Next speaker is Baret Pinyoun.

MS. PINYOUN: Thank you. My name is Baret Pinyoun, and I work for the Sierra Club. We are one of those environmental groups that everyone has been talking about.

I just feel the need to clear something up. People keep saying that

million, and elevated human cancer rates. And I have read your brochures, and I have seen a lot of the words "probable cause", "may cause", but what evidence do you have that shows unambiguous causality between specific concentration levels. I really don't care how many parts per million are retained in fish. What you have to show is does it cause cancer and can you prove that. And PCB exposure and elevated human cancer rates. And I don't want to hear something about 1996. This has been going on long before that. I don't want to hear anything about TOSCA(sic) and CIRCLA(sic) or rats studied from 15 years ago.

So do you want to take the second one first?

MR. CASPE: That's it, right?

MR. CRAIG WILLIAMS: Yes, the second one is for you.

MR. CASPE: We figured that.

MS. OLSEN: To address your question there have been a number of occupational studies that have evaluated

Ramsey. I'm Vice President of Corporate Environmental Programs for the General Electric Company. That includes responsibility for the Hudson River project, and the work that we have done. I have attended almost all of these public meetings and before I get started I would like to commend everybody who has participated whether you agree with us, agree with EPA or have no opinion. I want to particularly commend the folks from CEASE and the upper river and their officials who had the courage to stand up three times in the last 25 years and now a fourth time to oppose a massive dredging project in their communities.

I think I would just like to summarize what I think we know at this point, and then talk a little bit about what we don't know. First off we know that dredging and source control will achieve all of the targets that EPA says it will meet in the upper river so they will achieve the same benefit

regardless of whether it's source control or dredging that comes from the EPA report. We know that if you dredge there will be resuspension. With all due respect to Doug, the United States Geological Survey found that resuspension of PCBs can be expected to occur in a range of 2.2 to 10 percent. The National Academy of Sciences report says that you can expect PCB resuspension to occur in dredging projects from .5 to 9 percent. You have assumed zero on this project. It's simply unsupportable. I would point out that your 1999 decision not to take interim action in the Thompson Island Pool you assumed there would be 2 percent resuspension. I think you should explain at some point tonight or on the record about that difference.

The point here is what's right for the river. The river is going to achieve cleanup through source control and natural recovery. We know that. The EPA even agrees with that. We know that if source

MR. CASPE: I think it's important to understand that of the -- we don't have a good estimate of exactly what was released. You used a number of a million pounds, or 1.3 million pounds.

A lot of that was tied up in the upper river. A good portion of that was dredged out during navigational dredging for the Fort Edward dam.

There's approximately 200,000 pounds of PCBs left in the upper Hudson. We're targeting at least half of those. How you calculate that number, it could be up to 67 percent.

Although the rest of it is in very low concentrations, relatively low concentration.

The area we're targeting are the areas that really are leaching the PCBs from the sediment and contributing to the water and getting into the fish.

We're targeting areas where the fish reside and feed, and areas where the fish concentration the

friends and neighbors, their history, family. I traveled approximately seven miles on each side of the river and questioned every resident.

I interviewed 20 households. Many were long time residents. I was given health information on 127 people in these and other households. I knew of 27 people who were dead or cancer victims. Not everyone afflicted with cancer had the same type of cancer. Not everyone who had died of cancers had cancer listed as the cause of death.

Six people had brain cancer. My conclusions, number one, PCBs are known to be harmful.

Two, PCBs flow down the river and get into the fishing.

Three, most people along the river drink (inaudible).

There was an amazingly high rate of cancer, including rare cancers among river residents. Even on my short trail down the river I encountered this tale of

either.

GE is arguing that their source control plan would be an effective remedy for dealing with the PCB problem. It seems to me if they hadn't put PCBs into the river -- well if they hadn't dumped them in 25 years and they are still leaking in, that if they are claiming to be standing up for the environment, they would have done something about that source a long time ago. And clearly the amount leaking in has gone down, but there is still some going in, and that's not good.

That's it. Thanks.

MR. CRONKHITE: My name is John Cronkhite C-R-O-N-K-H-I-T-E, and I am up here to dispel a few myths.

I was born on the banks of the Hudson River about the time Mr. Solomon was four-years-old. I swam in that river. I grew up on that river. I've eaten fish out of that river since I was old enough to chew. I still have all my hair. I'm

not a very nice sight. I am very glad to see that the river has cleaned itself. Even my father remarked that it had cleaned itself up.

As I say, have been eating fish, and I love bullheads and guess where they hang around, in the mud. Right in the middle of all them PCBs. So I say, go check these records from General Electric, people who worked there, exposed more directly to these PCBs than even I ever would by eating the fish. I think you will find that they are not really that harmful. Especially dispelled (dispersed) in the trillions of sections that they are. Thank you.

MR. DAVIS: My name is Stephen Davis - S-T-E-P-H-E-N D-A-V-I-S. I am from Fort Edward.

I have a couple of questions. A lot of people have been very concerned about kind of like this all or nothing type of do-it-type project. And I was wondering if it would be possible to

mouth bass that are three, four pounds.

So I think there is many reasons we should move ahead and dredge as soon as possible. I would encourage your Proposal #5 to remove as much as possible.

Thank you.

MR. EGAN: Hi, I'm Tobias. This issue is pretty bad. We have got the media, local news media, and everything. It sickens me. I have been in Stillwater. I have been in the river. I don't really know what we should do, and that's why I'm not for dredging or against it. So I'm on the fence about this issue. But I do think that as far as economic revival(sic), recovery in this area, we have an interstate called 87, and I think if we direct our attention to businesses, high tech businesses that the State of New York has talked about, I think that could be our new source of economic income. And as far as the issue with the river, I think we need more studies, and I think General Electric needs to stop dissuading