Hudson River
PCBs SUPERFUND SITE

HUDSON RIVER PCBs SUPERFUND SITE SEDIMENT PROCESSING/ TRANSFER FACILITIES

FACILITY SITE SELECTION SUMMARY

DECEMBER 2004

Prepared for:

United States Army
Corps of Engineers

EPA
United States Environmental
Protection Agency

Prepared by:

ecology and environment, inc.
International Specialists in the Environment

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 2
290 BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10007-1866

DEC 13 2004

To All Interested Parties:

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) is pleased to release the *Facility Siting Report* and the *Facility Site Selection Summary* for the Hudson River PCBs Superfund Site.

Relative to the facility siting process, sites for the dewatering and/or transfer facilities have been selected. The Energy Park/Longe/NYSCC site in Fort Edward and the O.G. Real Estate site in Bethlehem have been selected as the dewatering and/or transfer sites for the Hudson River PCBs Superfund Project. The specific operations to be performed at each of the sites will be determined after the disposal site(s), transportation method, and routes have been selected.

The Bruno/Brickyard Associates/Alonzo site in Schaghticoke, the Old Moreau Dredge Spoils Area/NYSCC site in the Town of Moreau and the NYSCC/Allco/Leyerle site in the Town of Halfmoon will no longer be considered for use as a dewatering/ transfer facility for the project. The *Facility Site Selection Summary* and the *Facility Siting Report* provide additional details of the selection decision.

EPA plans to host public forums in the two selected site communities in early 2005. We will work with the selected site communities to schedule these meetings and will announce the date, time and locations as soon as the information is available.

The *Facility Siting Report* and the *Facility Site Selection Summary* are available online at EPA's web site for the Hudson River PCBs Site (www.epa.gov/hudson), at the site information repositories, or by calling the Hudson River Field Office at 518-747-4389 or toll-free at 866-615-6490.

Sincerely yours,

George Pavlou
Acting Deputy Regional Administrator

Hudson River PCBs Superfund Site
Sediment Processing/Transfer Facilities

Facility Site Selection Summary

December 2004

Prepared for:

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGION 2

and

UNITED STATES ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
KANSAS CITY DISTRICT

Prepared by:

ecology and environment, inc.
International Specialists in the Environment

Under contract with:

United States Army
Corps of Engineers

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

BA	Biological Assessment
CAG	Community Advisory Group
CHASP	Community Health and Safety Plan
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
FCS	Final Candidate Site
GE	General Electric Company
GIS	geographic information system
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NYSCC	New York State Canal Corporation
PCB	polychlorinated biphenyl
PCS	Preliminary Candidate Site
RD	Remedial Design
ROD	Record of Decision

Decision Summary

In February 2002, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued a Record of Decision (ROD) selecting the remedy for the Hudson River PCBs Superfund Site (Site). The ROD calls for targeted environmental dredging of approximately 2.65 million cubic yards of PCB-contaminated sediment from the Upper Hudson River, an area extending from the former Fort Edward Dam to the Federal Dam at Troy, with dredging to be done in two phases over a six-year period. In the ROD, EPA determined that sediments would be transported via rail or barge to disposal facilities outside the Upper Hudson River Valley. EPA also determined that one or more facilities would be necessary to dewater and stabilize, as needed, the dredged sediments prior to transport.

In support of the facility siting selection process, EPA is issuing this *Facility Site Selection Summary* (Site Selection Summary) to brief the public on EPA's selection of the sediment processing/transfer facility sites to be used. The selection of sites will enable General Electric (GE) to complete the remedial design (RD) and further the implementation of the remedy.

In addition to summarizing the information used to make the site selection, this document contains an overview of the two-year facility siting process, including EPA's efforts at carrying out the Agency's commitment to significant community involvement during the decision-making phases of the RD. Consistent with that commitment, EPA held nine public forums and received more than 2,350 public comment documents regarding the *Draft Facility Siting Report* during the 90-day comment period that extended from April 28, 2004 to July 30, 2004. EPA is issuing the *Summary of Public Comments and Responses*, which addresses those public comments in detail, along with this document, the Site Selection Summary. EPA is also issuing the *Facility Siting Report*, which reflects revisions to the *Draft Facility Siting Report* based on public comment, input from GE (RD Team), and the results of additional EPA site evaluations. Information obtained as a result of the public's input has been incorporated into EPA's decision-making process.

EPA has selected the Energy Park/Longe/New York State Canal Corporation (NYSCC) site in Fort Edward and the OG Real Estate site in Bethlehem as the processing/transfer sites for implementing the remedy for the Site. The specific

operations to be performed at each site have not yet been finalized. Phase I operations will be determined after the disposal site(s), transportation methods, and routes have been selected. EPA expects to have more information regarding Phase 1 operations in the spring of 2005, when the intermediate design and transport/disposal contracting have progressed further. Additional information regarding Phase 2 operations will be developed later during the design process.

The Bruno/Brickyard Associates/Alonzo site in Schaghticoke, the Old Moreau Dredge Spoils Area/NYSCC site in the Town of Moreau, and the NYSCC/Allco/Leyerle site in the Town of Halfmoon will no longer be considered for use as dewatering/transfer facilities.

Along with information obtained through public comments, EPA's siting selection relied on findings by the RD Team. GE's evaluations considered the relative benefit that the Selected Sites have as compared to the eliminated sites and the relative ease or difficulty for sites to meet the engineering and quality of life performance standards. As part of progress on the overall design, the RD Team has further analyzed the information found in the *Draft Facility Siting Report* regarding each site's characteristics. The relative impact of each of the many interdependent factors (such as rail access, topography, local traffic issues, and sensitive and cultural resources) on the safe and efficient design, construction, and operation of a sediment processing/transfer facility has been considered. The RD Team has also incorporated information regarding the logistics of the transportation methods and routes for moving material reliably and cost-effectively to disposal locations.

In addition to this Site Selection Summary and other siting documents, EPA is issuing a fact sheet, mailing individual responses to all those who submitted written comments, and conducting public forums in the Selected Site communities. EPA's outreach during the project, including public involvement regarding the design and operation of the processing/transfer facilities, will continue through such upcoming steps as the development of the Community Health and Safety Plan and the intermediate design.

1 Document Overview

This Site Selection Summary identifies the sites selected for the sediment processing/transfer facilities for the Hudson River PCBs Superfund Site and provides the Agency's rationale for the selection of these locations. Further information is contained in documents that EPA is releasing in conjunction with the Site Selection Summary: the *Facility Siting Report* (USEPA December 2004a) and the *Summary of Public Comments and Responses* (USEPA December 2004b). The *Facility Siting Report* reflects additional information from the RD Team, the results of additional EPA site evaluations, and EPA's review and consideration of public comments received on the *Draft Facility Siting Report* (USEPA April 2004c).

Section 2 of this document provides a summary of EPA's community involvement efforts during the facility siting process. Section 3 of this report summarizes the process EPA used to identify locations deemed suitable for the design, construction, and operation of a sediment processing/transfer facility, including the identification of the Preliminary Candidate Sites (PCSs), the selection of the Final Candidate Sites (FCSs), the identification of the Suitable Sites, and the identification of those sites proposed as the Recommended Sites. Section 4 summarizes input since the *Draft Facility Siting Report* was issued and the basis for EPA's selection and elimination of sites. Section 5 provides information about the next steps in the project. Section 6 is a list of documents cited in this report.

2 Summary of Community Involvement Activities

In the ROD for the Hudson River PCBs Superfund Site, EPA committed to frequent and regular interaction with the communities and to providing an EPA presence in the upriver community to encourage public input and to respond to public questions and concerns (USEPA February 2002). Consistent with this commitment, EPA established a Hudson River Field Office in Fort Edward in 2002. The Field Office has provided a center for public information services and outreach. The goals and objectives of the enhanced community involvement program as well as the plan for frequent and regular interaction with the public on specific issues of concern are contained in the *Community Involvement Plan* (USEPA August 2003).

In particular, EPA committed to conducting the facility siting process in a way that would involve communities and include public input opportunities. Specifically, EPA set forth a process that would include:

- Public notification of potential facility locations that satisfied necessary engineering criteria,
- Public meetings and a public comment period on the proposed locations, and
- Issuance of a document notifying the public about EPA's final decision on the facility locations and explaining the reasons for the decision.

The first major public outreach effort for facility siting was in December 2002 and included hosting public availability sessions in Fort Edward and Albany, New York, issuing a fact sheet, and releasing the *Facility Siting Concept Document* (USEPA December 2002). The main purpose of the public meetings was to introduce the functions of a sediment processing/transfer facility, identify the facility siting study area, introduce the criteria that would be used to identify potential facility locations, and describe how the selection process would be conducted.

In June 2003, EPA hosted a second series of public sessions and issued a fact sheet and the *Technical Memorandum: Identification of Preliminary Candidate Sites* (USEPA June 2003), detailing the process of identifying the PCSs using the

criteria and process that were introduced in December 2002. The public sessions were once again held in Fort Edward and Albany.

In September 2003, EPA hosted public forums in Fort Edward and Troy, New York, and issued a fact sheet that identified the FCSs. Presentations and discussions with the public involved the evaluation and screening process that led to the elimination of some PCSs and the selection of the FCSs.

EPA released the *Draft Facility Siting Report* for public review and comment on April 28, 2004, together with the *Facility Siting Data Summary Report* (April 2004a). Public involvement activities relating to the release of this report included a press release, multiple fact sheets, and public forums throughout the Upper Hudson River area. During May, June, and July 2004, one or more public forums were held at or near each Recommended and Suitable Site, including sessions in Fort Edward, Stillwater, Bethlehem, Schaghticoke, Halfmoon, and Moreau. Copies of the document were placed in local repositories, including the Hudson River Field Office, and were made available online at the EPA website www.epa.gov/hudson. In addition, EPA answered questions related to facility siting by phone and in person at the Hudson River Field Office during the public comment period.

The public response from the Upper Hudson River community during the public comment period represents the most significant public input on any document issued by EPA during the RD phase. Public interest in facility siting was also reflected by considerable newspaper and other media coverage. EPA received more than 2,350 comments in a variety of forms, including individual comment letters, form letters, form letters with additional comments, and petitions.

EPA has carefully reviewed all written comments received during the comment period and has prepared a *Summary of Public Comments and Responses* (USEPA December 2004b), which responds to those issues of most concern to the public. These issues included the potential for community and health impacts, quality of life impacts, and the site selection process. (The *Summary of Public Comments and Responses* is included in the *Facility Siting Report* as Appendix C. It is available also as a stand-alone document.) EPA is also preparing letter responses to individual comments from those in the public who provided comments to EPA in writing. These letters will be sent after the release of this document. EPA's selection of sites and the revisions of the *Facility Siting Report* also reflect their consideration of the substantive comments that were received during the comment period.

3 Facility Siting Process

3.1 Background Information

In conjunction with the development of EPA's *Hudson River PCBs Site Phase 3 Report: Feasibility Study* ([Feasibility Study] USEPA December 2000), EPA conducted a preliminary evaluation to determine the engineering characteristics necessary to site a sediment processing/transfer facility or landfill (TAMS Consultants, Inc. December 1997). Thereafter, EPA determined in the ROD that one or more processing/transfer facilities would be needed and that transport via rail or barge would be used to dispose of dredged sediments at a location outside the Hudson River Valley. (If a beneficial use of some of the dredged material is identified, an appropriate transportation method will be determined.) The characteristics of a conceptual processing/transfer facility were set forth in the Feasibility Study (December 2000) and in the *Responsiveness Summary* for the ROD (USEPA February 2002).

3.2 Development of Siting Criteria

Following the ROD, EPA determined the need to identify and document for the public the intended process for selecting location(s) for one or more sediment processing/transfer facilities. The resulting *Facility Siting Concept Document* (Concept Document) was released to the public in December 2002 (USEPA December 2002). The Concept Document identified the parameters of the study area (the land area within approximately one-half mile inland from the edge of the river extending from the Village of Hudson Falls to the downstream end of the Port of Albany) and the siting criteria that would be used to identify, evaluate, and eventually select potential sites. Site selection criteria were defined in the Concept Document as Group 1 – Engineering Criteria, Group 2 – Additional Considerations, and Group 3 – Site-Specific Information.

- Group 1 siting criteria (i.e., engineering) were sufficient space for facility construction and operations; river access; road access; rail access; availability of utilities; and proximity to the areas that will be dredged.

- Group 2 siting criteria (i.e., additional considerations) were the presence of sensitive or cultural resources; existing and historic land uses; the presence of rare or unique ecological communities or threatened and endangered species;

ease of acquisition; wetlands, geology, or surface features; and mapped 100-year floodplain or floodway data.

- Group 3 siting criteria (i.e., site-specific information) comprised information developed from further examination of the Group 1 and 2 criteria; site-specific information derived from the field investigations at the FCSs; and design-related information from the RD Team.

3.3 Identification of Preliminary Candidate Sites (PCSs)

Following release of the *Concept Document*, EPA began identifying sites that satisfied the Group 1 siting criteria by developing a geographical information system (GIS) database that could be used to map and evaluate the size and location of parcel data in relation to the shoreline, roads, railroads, utilities, and areas that will be dredged. The database was generated by combining relevant existing databases such as public property records and aerial mapping surveys.

Because EPA had stated in the ROD that siting efforts would focus on industrial and/or commercial properties, parcels within the study area classified as residential or agricultural were removed from consideration. Using property classification codes from the New York State Office of Real Property Services, EPA then identified a total of 2,410 parcels within the study area with appropriate property classification codes, including vacant, commercial, and industrial land. The database information regarding these parcels was then compared with the Group 1 engineering criteria.

After eliminating parcels that were too small in area or surrounded by parcels with dissimilar property codes, 151 parcels remained from the 'first pass' analysis. The 'second pass' analysis was a more critical look at each parcel and its agreement with the Group 1 siting criteria both as a single parcel or in combination with adjacent parcels. For example, EPA was able to evaluate the quality or complexity of the river and rail access and whether the parcels contained active industrial operations that would preclude use of the property for a sediment processing/transfer facility. Included in this analysis were other properties that had been submitted to EPA by interested landowners, by CSX Transportation, or that had been previously identified during the Feasibility Study.

EPA identified the 24 PCSs and described the evaluation process that led to the identification of those sites in the *Technical Memorandum: Identification of Preliminary Candidate Sites* (USEPA June 2003). The PCSs identified during this phase of the facility siting process are shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Preliminary Candidate Sites

River Sections/Site Name	Location (Town and County)	Approximate River Mile
Above River Section 1		
Energy Park (Champlain Canal)	Fort Edward, Washington County	195.1
Longe (Champlain Canal)	Fort Edward, Washington County	195.0
River Section 1		
Old Moreau Dredge Spoils Area	Moreau, Saratoga County	193.8
State of New York (A)	Moreau, Saratoga County	193.2
River Section 2		
Georgia Pacific	Greenwich, Washington County	183.2
River Section 3		
Bruno	Schaghticoke, Rensselaer County	166.5
Brickyard Associates	Schaghticoke, Rensselaer County	166.0
Edison Paving	Schaghticoke, Rensselaer County	164.0
NIMO Mechanicville	Halfmoon, Saratoga County	164.0
NYS Canal Corporation	Halfmoon, Saratoga County	162.4
General Electric (C)	Waterford Saratoga County	159.0
Green Island IDA	Green Island, Albany County	154.4
Below River Section 3		
Troy/Slag/Rensselaer IDA	Troy, Rensselaer County	151.4
Callanan/Rensselaer IDA/City of Troy/King Services	Troy, Rensselaer County	150.8
Town of North Greenbush	N. Greenbush, Rensselaer County	148.7
Rensselaer Tech Park (A)	Rensselaer, Rensselaer County	147.7
Rensselaer Tech Park (B)	Rensselaer, Rensselaer County	147.3
State of New York/First Rensselaer/ Marine Management	Rensselaer, Rensselaer County	146.7
Albany Rensselaer Port District/BASF	Rensselaer, Rensselaer County	144.3
Bray Energy	Rensselaer, Rensselaer County	144.0
Bray Energy/Petrol/Gorman/ Transmontaigne	Rensselaer and E. Greenbush, Rensselaer County	144.0
Norwest	E. Greenbush, Rensselaer County	143.5
OG Real Estate	Bethlehem, Albany County	142.8
P & M Brickyard	Coeymans, Albany County	134.1

3.4 Identification of Final Candidate Sites (FCSs)

After the June 2003 community outreach public sessions about identifying the PCSs, EPA performed site visits and other studies to gather more detailed information regarding the suitability of the PCSs.

Site activities included interviews with property owners and others knowledgeable about the sites and field observations of existing site activities, structures, disposal areas, potential wetland areas, shoreline conditions, road access, on-site roads, site topography, rail access, utilities, and other relevant information. Other research

included calculating areas of previously mapped wetland and floodplain locations, locating mapped prehistoric and historic resources, identifying property classifications of surrounding parcels, and determining numbers of residential parcels, educational facility parcels, recreational parcels, hospitals, and other medical care facilities within 0.5 and 1 mile of each PCS. In addition, EPA reviewed existing databases for information on past environmental contamination.

The resulting information provided a basis for making preliminary determinations regarding potential limitations or potential design issues. The evaluation process was designed to identify the locations that would meet project needs. The assessment of suitability resulted in the selection of some sites and the elimination of others. In general, sites were eliminated because development had occurred or had begun during the facility siting process; historic or current land uses posed a potential for environmental concerns; access to the river would require a relatively more complex design because of steep shoreline slopes; the density of residences and/or number of education facilities within 0.5 and 1.0 miles was higher; and there were relatively large areas of previously mapped state or national wetlands.

An important step in identifying FCSs was the modification of several PCSs by combining separate, adjacent PCSs and/or adding new parcels to create larger sites. While the acreage for the Group 1 criteria was initially set at levels to satisfy the general characteristics of the conceptual facilities described in the ROD *Responsiveness Summary*, information from the RD Team indicated that the amount of space required to accommodate rail needs for the project was greater than initially thought. After screening new parcels to ensure that they met Group 1 criteria, the following PCSs were modified:

- Energy Park and Longe PCSs were combined with the NYSCC parcel (above River Section 1);
- NYSCC property was added to the south of the Old Moreau Dredge Spoils Area PCS (River Section 1);
- NYSCC ownership of a small area along the river of the Georgia Pacific PCS (River Section 2) was acknowledged;
- The Bruno and Brickyard Associates PCSs were combined and the Alonzo property (River Section 3) was added; and
- The Allco and Leyerle properties were added to the NYSCC PCS (River Section 3).

The evaluation of the PCSs resulted in EPA identifying seven FCSs (Table 2). In September 2003, EPA hosted public forums in Fort Edward and Troy, New York, and issued a fact sheet that identified the FCSs. Presentations to the public included a discussion of the PCS evaluation process and EPA's reasons for selecting

the FCSs. The benefits and limitations of each of the PCSs and the process of identifying FCSs were documented in the *Draft Facility Siting Report* (USEPA April 2004c).

Table 2 Final Candidate Sites

River Sections/Site Name	Location (Town and County)	Approximate River Mile
Above River Section 1		
Energy Park/Longe/NYSCC	Fort Edward, Washington County	195.1
River Section 1		
Old Moreau Dredge Spoils Area	Moreau, Saratoga County	193.8
River Section 2		
Georgia Pacific	Greenwich, Washington County	183.2
River Section 3		
Bruno/Brickyard Associates/Alonzo	Schaghticoke, Rensselaer County	166.5
NYSCC/Allco/Leyerle	Halfmoon, Saratoga County	162.4
Below River Section 3		
State of New York/First Rensselaer/ Marine Management	Rensselaer, Rensselaer County	146.7
OG Real Estate	Bethlehem, Albany County	142.8

3.5 Identification of Suitable Sites

Following EPA's public forums and presentations to and discussions with the public about the FCSs, site-specific field investigations were conducted in fall 2003 at each FCS. These investigations were designed to gather more detailed information about various environmental and physical features within each of the FCSs (USEPA April 2004a). The field studies involved a series of both intrusive and non-intrusive sampling activities that included soil sampling, surface water sampling, groundwater sampling, Phase IA and Phase IB cultural resource investigations, determination and delineation of wetlands, and other investigations.

Following the field investigations, the relative benefits, potential limitations, and additional design considerations for each FCS were identified based on the Group 1 (engineering) criteria, Group 2 (other considerations) criteria, and Group 3 (site-specific) criteria evaluations. Based on this review, five of the seven FCSs were identified as Suitable Sites (i.e., sites that exhibited characteristics that would satisfy the minimum requirements to feasibly design, construct, and operate a sediment processing/transfer facility to the standards established by the project).

EPA's determination of suitability was particularly influenced by discussions with the RD Team about evolving design needs. Whereas RD Team input during the PCS evaluation focused on a site's total acreage, useable acreage—particularly with regard to rail yard configuration—was determined to be a critical concern. In particular, the RD Team provided input on the acreage required for the processing facility (5 acres for mechanical processing and 15 acres for hydraulic processing)

and rail yard facility (15 to 25 acres). Additionally, the RD Team agreed that some sites (based on the importance of their location) might be able to be used even though rail appeared to have some limitations and additional design considerations. It was expected that rail limitations could be addressed in design, for example, by transporting sediment off-site by barge.

During this phase of the siting process, EPA also evaluated each FCS to determine whether the construction and operation of a facility could result in disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority populations and low-income populations at any of the FCS locations. This evaluation was conducted under EPA Region 2's *Interim Policy on Environmental Justice* (USEPA 2000), consistent with *Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations.*

A demographic analysis of the area within a 1-mile and 10-mile radius of each of the FCSs, compared with similar rural or urban areas within New York State, indicated that construction and operation of a facility would not result in disproportionately high or adverse human health or environmental effects on minority populations and low-income populations at any of the FCS locations. Further, EPA compared the human health or environmental effects associated with existing industrial, municipal, or commercial facilities within a 1-mile and 10-mile radius of each of the FCSs to determine whether any of the sites were subject to a disproportionately high and adverse environmental burden. Based on this analysis of existing facilities and health rankings, EPA was able to conclude that there was a minimal to low human health risk at all of the FCSs and that further investigation was not warranted.

EPA also looked at local roadway and traffic characteristics at the three FCSs that contain public roads within site boundaries—the Georgia Pacific/NYSCC (County Road 113), Bruno/Brickyard Associates/Alonzo (Knickerbocker Road), and NYSCC/Allco/Leyerle (U.S. Highway 4/State Route 32) sites. Although it was noted that these sites differed from the other FCSs in that facility design would have to appropriately address potential impacts associated with roadways (i.e., traffic safety issues, possible transfer of materials, equipment, or workers across public roads, etc.), it was thought at that time that conditions could be successfully addressed during design. The presence of public roads was not considered a factor for elimination of a site when considered on its own.

All of this site-specific information was used to identify the Suitable Sites from the list of FCSs. The five Suitable Sites are shown in Table 3.

Table 3 Suitable Sites

River Sections/Site Name	Location (Town and County)	Approximate River Mile
Above River Section 1		
Energy Park/Longe/NYSCC	Fort Edward, Washington County	195.1
River Section 1		
Old Moreau Dredge Spoils Area	Moreau, Saratoga County	193.8
River Section 3		
Bruno/Brickyard Associates/Alonzo	Schaghticoke, Rensselaer County	166.5
NYSCC/Allco/Leyerle	Halfmoon, Saratoga County	162.4
Below River Section 3		
OG Real Estate	Bethlehem, Albany County	142.8

Two of the FCSs, the Georgia Pacific/NYSCC and the State of New York/First Rensselaer/Marine Management sites, had potential limitations and additional design considerations that outweighed their benefits. Issues relating to the development and operation of a rail yard facility on the Georgia Pacific/NYSCC site (to meet the production demands associated this project) were considered site limitations.

Other factors that limited the suitability of the Georgia Pacific/NYSCC site were the location and potential extent of a historic archaeological area, geotechnical concerns about roadways and structures (associated with potential fill areas), and the potential need to cross County Road 113. Moreover, hilly topography and the presence of a closed landfill on the eastern parcel of the site (east of County Road 113) significantly restricted useable acreage, and the proximity of the Northumberland Dam would require specific safety measures to be implemented.

The potential conflict of the State of New York/First Rensselaer/Marine Management site with the City of Rensselaer's Local Waterfront Revitalization Plan and associated plans to develop the site for recreation were significant site limitations. This site is located below River Section 3 and is not near the dredge areas, and the useable acreage for construction of the sediment processing or rail transfer facility is marginal. It was determined that the site would have to rely on off-site rail yard space in order to fulfill the operational needs of the project because the site did not appear to meet the rail yard footprint requirements.

3.6 Identification of Recommended Sites

In conjunction with the site suitability evaluation process discussed above, and with input from the RD Team, EPA also determined that three of the five Suitable Sites appeared to exhibit those characteristics that would best optimize design and satisfy the project requirements, including the performance standards. The Recommended Sites are listed in Table 4 below.

Table 4 Recommended Sites

River Sections/Site Name	Location (Town and County)	Approximate River Mile
Above River Section 1		
Energy Park/Longe/NYSCC	Fort Edward, Washington County	195.1
River Section 3		
Bruno/Brickyard Associates/Alonzo	Schaghticoke, Rensselaer County	166.5
Below River Section 3		
OG Real Estate	Bethlehem, Albany County	142.8

The major factors and relative attributes used to select the Recommended Sites include the following:

- **Useable Acreage.** Energy Park/Longe/NYSCC, Bruno/Brickyard Associates/Alonzo, and OG Real Estate contain large, relatively level topographic areas of useable acreage that could allow the development of waterfront offloading/berthing/bulkhead areas, a processing (dewatering) facility, and a rail yard facility. However, the uneven terrain at the Old Moreau Dredge Spoils Area/NYSCC site and on the eastern portion of the NYSCC/Allco/Leyerle site could affect useable acreage.

- **Rail Yard Suitability.** Four of the sites have long, relatively level rail frontages. In contrast, the areas that parallel rail on the Old Moreau Dredge Spoils Area/NYSCC site are characterized by uneven topography, the area/frontage near the rail is much shorter, and additional track would need to be constructed to access the Fort Edward rail yard. No potential limitations or additional design considerations (i.e., wetlands, drainages, cultural resources concerns, etc.) have been identified for the Energy Park/Longe/NYSCC, Bruno/Brickyard Associates/Alonzo, and OG Real Estate sites in the vicinity and along the rail frontages. However, on the NYSCC/Allco/Leyerle site there are a series of wetlands perpendicular to the existing rail line, creating an additional design consideration.

- **Waterfront Suitability.** With the exception of the OG Real Estate site, which has a long river frontage that parallels a deeper navigational channel that can be accessed by larger freight ships, each of the other Suitable Sites have issues relative to waterfront suitability. While these sites have adequate frontage, the Energy Park/Longe/NYSCC site will require designing berthing and turning basin facilities along the Champlain Canal; the Old Moreau/NYSCC site would require construction of an in-river channel and would be expected to require extensive navigational dredging; and the Bruno/Brickyard Associates/Alonzo and NYSCC/Allco/Leyerle sites are located along shallow areas of the river and would require extensive dredging in order to obtain shoreline access and would likely require periodic navigational dredging.

- **Environmental Conditions.** The known environmental conditions on the Old Moreau Dredge Spoils Area/NYSCC site are considered a potential limitation to the extent that development could be limited because of historic dredge spoils disposal and the uncontrolled dumping that has occurred. In contrast, sampling at the other four sites does not indicate significant environmental concerns.

- **Proximity to Dredge Areas.** The Energy Park/Longe/NYSCC and Old Moreau Dredge Spoils Area/NYSCC sites are located in River Section 1, where approximately 59% of the dredged material is located. The Bruno/Brickyard Associates/Alonzo and NYSCC/Allco/Leyerle sites are located in River Section 3, where approximately 19% of the dredged material is located. OG Real Estate is the only Suitable Site below River Section 3. The relatively more distant location of OG Real Estate is offset by its access to ocean-going barge and multiple rail lines.

EPA documented the basis for selecting the Suitable, Recommended, and Eliminated sites in the *Draft Facility Siting Report* and included information collected during the siting process. The *Draft Facility Siting Report* was released for public review and comment on April 28, 2004. The *Facility Siting Data Summary Report* was also made available for review at that time.

4 Basis for Site Selection

EPA's site selection is based on the siting documents (the *Facility Siting Report*, the *Summary of Public Comments and Responses*, and this *Facility Site Selection Summary*) being released by EPA, which incorporate the results of design evaluations from the RD Team, additional EPA site evaluations (such as cultural resources work), and input from the public. As noted, together with this *Facility Site Selection Summary*, EPA is issuing the *Summary of Public Comments and Responses* that addresses those public comments in detail. EPA is also issuing the *Facility Siting Report*, which reflects revisions to the *Draft Facility Siting Report*. The information regarding the Selected Sites is also presented in Section 6 of the *Facility Siting Report*.

As described in Section 2, the 90-day public comment period began on April 28, 2004, and ended July 30, 2004. EPA received more than 2,350 comments from members of Upper Hudson River communities in the form of individual letters, emails, form letters, and petitions. The public forwarded comments to EPA that involved quality of life concerns, issues of potential community impacts, specific characteristics of the Recommended Sites, and questions regarding the facility siting process. Some of the specific issues raised included existing traffic congestion conditions, safety concerns regarding the use of local roads by emergency vehicles and school buses, the identification of potentially historic resources, and additional information on recreational areas.

Since the release of the *Draft Facility Siting Report*, the RD Team has also continued its intermediate design phase evaluations of the Recommended Sites, including further analyses of the potential limitations and additional design considerations and the logistics of moving processed material from each given facility to various potential disposal sites. Remedial design evaluations are ongoing and some logistical considerations of transportation and disposal have not yet been finalized. However, the RD Team has obtained enough information to make recommendations to EPA on site selection.

Section 4.1 describes the primary information that resulted in the selection of the Energy Park/Longe/NYSCC and OG Real Estate sites. Section 4.2 describes the information that led to the elimination of Bruno/Brickyard Associates/Alonzo.

4.1 Selected Sites

Comparison of the Recommended Sites indicates that the Energy Park/Longe/ NYSCC and OG Real Estate sites have the key characteristics needed for the project while having relatively few limitations. Importantly, these two sites appear to have the best set of options for developing efficient and reliable transportation from the processing and/or transfer facilities to the disposal sites. Further intermediate design evaluations have indicated that factors previously identified as potential limitations or additional design considerations on these sites have been determined to be manageable. Both locations will facilitate optimal design for the safe and successful completion of the project. This Site Selection Summary is not intended to define the facility boundaries for purposes of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act's (CERCLA) "on-site" definition.

4.1.1 Energy Park/Longe/NYSCC

The Energy Park/Longe/NYSCC site exhibits many of the key factors for optimizing design and is a particularly good site for this project because it is relatively close to River Section 1, where a large percentage (approximately 59%) of the total volume of sediments that are targeted for dredging are located. In addition, the site is within 12 miles of approximately 80% of the dredged material. Proximity to dredge areas is interrelated with a number of key design and project productivity factors, including duration of transport time from dredge areas to the processing facility, efficiencies of transport and the effect on the number of barges needed (at least in River Section 1), and increased flexibility of dredging approach, given that both mechanical and hydraulic dredging can be used.

Other key factors associated with the Energy Park/Longe/NYSCC site that have been discussed in earlier phases of the facility siting evaluation process and that optimize the design of the facility include available space, level land surface across most of the site, and rail access. Available space includes 104 acres of flat, relatively open land that would provide suitable space for the processing facility and a rail yard as well as sufficient space to develop a buffer between facility operations and the surrounding community.

One of the most important engineering characteristics of the site—sufficient space for a rail yard—supports the transportation needs and productivity standard of the project. An existing rail line runs adjacent to the northern boundary of the site for approximately 2,350 feet. This area provides sufficient space to create a rail yard capable of handling the volume of material that will be generated from this project. The rail yard requires a large enough area to:

- Support the transportation of processed dredged sediments to disposal areas by rail;

- Support the import of clean backfill materials for loading onto barges for final placement in the Hudson River;

- Accommodate sufficient numbers of rail cars at the desired intervals so that processed materials may be removed, loaded, and delivered to the final destination upon demand;

- Allow rail cars to be sorted by material type or destination before being made up into blocks of cars or whole trains for movement to the final destination; and

- Store spare cars to ensure that there is uninterrupted rail car supply to meet the demands of the dewatering facility.

All the above-listed factors require a large area for the rail operation, and the Energy Park/Longe/NYSCC site provides a suitable area and layout for the construction of this type of facility. The physical layout and the rail frontage characteristics of the Energy Park/Longe/NYSCC site support the optimization of the design for a rail yard.

Additionally, the site exhibits fewer environmental characteristics that could complicate the design and construction process. For example, no archaeological sites were discovered, the site is outside the mapped 100- and 500-year floodplains, and there are no significant environmental contamination issues.

Because the property owners of the Energy Park and Longe parcels submitted the properties to EPA for consideration during the PCS identification process, EPA anticipates that acquisition/leasing can be successfully negotiated. Because the owners plan to develop this site for industrial use, this project could create an infrastructure for the planned future use.

There are some considerations associated with the Energy Park/Longe/NYSCC site that increase the complexity of design and operation of a processing and/or transfer facility:

- The location of the site on the Champlain Canal, approximately 1.4 miles from the Hudson River, will require lockage through Lock 7.

- The development of a waterfront facility will require a land cut in order to create a berthing area or turning basin, given that the current width of the canal is approximately 150 feet wide, which limits the number of barges that can be present in the canal without affecting other navigational traffic.

- The Lock 8 access road will have to be relocated or access will have to be modified during the course of the project.

- Constructing the waterfront facility could impact wetlands.

The intermediate design evaluations indicate that these issues can be sufficiently managed through design. Additionally, these issues are not considered impediments that will limit the viability and reliability of the site because the combination of the other site features allow optimization of project design and will support the demands and objectives of the project.

4.1.2 OG Real Estate

The OG Real Estate site also exhibits characteristics that are essential to design and to logistical considerations. OG Real Estate is a vacant industrial site that has ample, relatively flat space for siting, designing, constructing, and operating a sediment processing and rail yard transfer facility. It contains suitable waterfront along the Hudson River, does not have existing conditions that are problematic to facility design or layout, and has road access.

As many in the public have pointed out, this site is more than 40 miles downstream of some of the dredge areas located in River Section 1. Despite this, the RD Team has indicated that moving materials downriver would not adversely affect the project. In addition, because the site is located south of the Federal Dam, the navigation channel is deeper at that point along the river. The deeper navigation channel could facilitate using large, ocean-going ships to transport the processed sediments. Two rail companies service the rail lines adjacent to the OG Real Estate site. This situation, in addition to the possibility of using large ships, provides more options and greater flexibility that could increase efficiency of transporting the processed sediments and reduce overall costs. Additionally, because this site is situated in an industrial/commercial corridor near the Port of Albany, impacts on nearby residents would be minimal.

The OG Real Estate site also has direct rail access with relatively long rail frontage (3,370 feet). As noted above, this project requires extensive rail frontage directly adjacent to the processing facility. The OG Real Estate site has sufficient available space and suitable topography that allow optimal design of a rail yard facility. There are also two rail access points: an un-maintained rail spur on-site and the rail line running adjacent to the western boundary of the site. An additional benefit of the site includes the existing road access. State Highway 144 is adjacent and to the west of the site. This highway already serves the Port of Albany area and other commercial and industrial traffic. Direct access to a major highway will limit the potential for disruptions of local community-based traffic.

Additional optimization characteristics at this site include available space for the creation of a buffer between on-site operations and surrounding areas, no cultural resource issues, and future-use possibilities. The landowner has proposed constructing a waterfront marina on-site, and the development of the site for this project could provide some of the infrastructure necessary for the planned future use.

There are some considerations associated with the OG Real Estate site that increase the complexity of design and operation of a dewatering and/or transfer facility:

- The site is located more than 40 miles downstream from a majority of the dredge areas, which means that barges traveling downriver will have to travel through as many as seven locks. The initial investigations by the RD Team during the evaluation of the FCSs suggested that, although proximity of a dewatering facility to dredge areas would influence a number of important design components (e.g., hydraulic versus mechanical dredging), distance between dredge areas and facility locations was a factor that could be addressed in project design. Further intermediate design phase evaluations show that the transportation benefits of the site (i.e., serviced by two rail companies, option for use of large ships) compare favorably so that downriver barging of materials to the site will allow for design optimization.

- Most of the site is located within the 100-year floodplain. Per Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management (40 FR 6030), EPA will ensure that measures will be taken to minimize the impacts of floods on human safety, health, and welfare and to restore and preserve the natural and beneficial values served by floodplains. Further evaluations by the RD Team indicate that the design of a sediment processing and/or transfer facility can be accomplished while ensuring that floodplain capacity and function will be maintained. The facility will be designed to accommodate flood flows and ensure that adverse impacts do not occur.

- The Hudson River from the Federal Dam to beyond the river frontage at the OG Real Estate site is a known spawning area for the shortnose sturgeon, a federally listed endangered species. EPA has been consulting with appropriate federal and state agencies regarding the shortnose sturgeon and the bald eagle, the only other identified endangered or threatened species existing in the project area. EPA is developing a Biological Assessment (BA) to evaluate any potential impacts the project may have on threatened or endangered species in the project area. Conservation measures will be developed in the BA to address impacts that may be of concern to the resource agencies.

- Because the OG Real Estate site is within the New York State-designated coastal zone, EPA must assess the impacts from the construction and operation of the sediment processing/transfer facilities for consistency with the policies of the New York State Coastal Management Program in accordance with the Coastal Zone Management Act.

The intermediate design evaluations indicate that these issues can be sufficiently managed through design. These issues are not considered impediments that will limit the viability and reliability of the site because the combination of the other

site features will allow optimization of project design and will support the demands and objectives of the project.

4.2 Eliminated Sites

The Bruno/Brickyard Associates/Alonzo site in Schaghticoke, the Old Moreau Dredge Spoils Area/NYSCC site in the Town of Moreau, and the NYSCC/Allco/Leyerle site in the Town of Halfmoon will no longer be considered for use as dewatering/transfer facilities.

4.2.1 Bruno/Brickyard Associates/Alonzo

The evaluations of the Recommended Sites identified several design concerns, and the Bruno/Brickyard Associates/Alonzo site has therefore been eliminated from further consideration for a sediment processing/transfer facility.

Generally, this site did not compare favorably with the Selected Sites because the site characteristics would have resulted in a more complex design that could complicate site layout and facility operations and could make it more difficult to meet project requirements, including the quality of life and engineering performance standards. Potential limitations and additional design considerations leading to the elimination of the Bruno/Brickyard Associates/Alonzo site are described below. As noted above, some of this information was identified in previous phases of the facility siting process. Now that the intermediate design evaluations are occurring, the relative complexity of these issues suggests that these factors would restrict design optimization and could constrain site operations.

Potential Limitations of the Bruno/Brickyard Associates/Alonzo Site:

- **Traffic Congestion in the Area of the Site.** There are some complexities associated with road design at the Bruno/Brickyard Associates/Alonzo site. Maintaining current free flow conditions for use by local traffic would be challenging at the site. Traffic congestion occurs along NY State Route 67 when rail-crossing barriers close for a passing train. Moreover, the intersection of Route 67 and Main Street in Mechanicville is already congested during peak traffic times. The ability of local roads to handle the increased use and weight loads that would arise from project-related traffic and the potential need for upgrades and repair of those roads were additional considerations.

- **Traffic and Transportation Issues Associated with Knickerbocker Road.** Knickerbocker Road bisects the Bruno/Brickyard Associates/Alonzo site. The road is used as an alternate route for emergency vehicles when trains cross Route 67, and the road is also a school bus route. It is expected that project materials, personnel, and equipment would have to cross Knickerbocker Road during the course of normal facility operations. It is anticipated that such movements of equipment and materials could lead to temporary interferences with local traffic. The need to avoid even temporary closures of Knicker-

bocker Road is an additional element of complexity for the design of a facility at this site and an impediment to site operations.

There are also safety concerns regarding the use of Knickerbocker Road for local pedestrian and recreational traffic from the Mechanicville Golf Club. Facility design would have to provide safe travel for pedestrians through this area and would have to account for methods of protecting the safety of people crossing the road in golf carts and on foot because course play does cross the road. These conditions would be additional impediments to site operations and schedules and would increase the complexity of facility design.

- **Cultural Resources Concerns.** Phase IB and Phase II investigations have been completed on the site. The results of the cultural resource investigations indicate that the location and extent of archaeological resources on-site would require extensive mitigation and possibly the need to avoid some areas. The findings of the fieldwork suggest that the potential exists for further investigation and curation, which could impact the project schedule. The locations of the discovered cultural resources make complete avoidance of these areas difficult, affecting the facility design and layout. Concerns regarding the presence of cultural resources on-site and the associated impacts to the project schedule are limiting factors associated with this site.

  In addition, the Mechanicville Golf Club, the work of Devereaux Emmet, a prominent and prolific American golf course architect during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, may be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The qualities that may make the golf course historic include the design and workmanship of the individual holes as well as the overall historic setting and player experience.

- **Topography.** The Bruno/Brickyard Associates/Alonzo site's hilly topography is less desirable for facility design and construction. While the slope from the waterfront to east of Knickerbocker Road and from the Bruno and Brickyard Associates properties to the existing rail line could be achieved through appropriate grading design, the elevation difference is an additional design consideration. On-site topographic characteristics increase the complexity for designing rail access, the rail yard, and the transfer of material across the site.

- **Rail Service.** The Guilford Rail System provides service to the site. The RD Team has evaluated the transportation methods and routes for each of the Recommended Sites. The results of the evaluation indicated that the rail company providing service to the site has limited track and infrastructure in the project area and that the short-line track may need upgrading for heavier loads for this project. The rail infrastructure and transportation options for the Bruno/Brickyard Associates/Alonzo site do not compare favorably with the rail infrastructure and transportation options of the selected sites.

- **Waterfront River Depth.** The area along the waterfront would require initial navigational dredging and, very likely, routine maintenance dredging to provide suitable depths for barge access. An in-river channel might have to be established for barges and tugs to access the site waterfront. These are both additional design considerations that increase the complexity of the design.

- **Pool Management Relative to River Depths and Low Clearance Under Nearby Rail Bridge.** The rail bridge located upstream and near the site has a low vertical clearance. Proper clearance under the bridge and depth of the navigation channel depends on the water level adjustment within the river pool, which is made at the Upper Mechanicville Dam and is controlled by New York State Electric and Gas Corporation. Achieving clearance under the bridge for project vessels and the fluctuation of the pool (i.e., water navigation depth) along the waterfront at the site are additional design considerations that increase the complexity of the design. Although the bridge clearance will be a factor regardless of where the dewatering site is located, this issue would be magnified if the Bruno site were to be selected because it is closer to the bridge than the other two sites.

- **Lock Adjacent to the Site.** Possible vessel congestion along the frontage of the site because it is close to Lock 3 would have to be considered in barging material to and from the site.

- **Proximity to Dredge Material.** The Bruno/Brickyard Associates/Alonzo is in River Section 3, where about 19% of the material to be dredged is located. The majority of the material (80%) is in the upper part of the River (River Sections 1 and 2). Proximity of a sediment processing/transfer facility to dredge areas would influence a number of important design components, including which dredging method could be used (i.e., hydraulic versus mechanical dredging). The distance between dredge areas and facility locations is a consideration that could complicate transportation logistics and achievement of the engineering productivity performance standards. Unlike the Energy Park/Longe/NYSCC site, this site is too far away from River Section 1 to allow for the possibility of hydraulic dredging. Also, although the site is located in River Section 3, where approximately 19% of the dredging will occur, the Energy Park/Longe/NYSCC site is within 12 miles of approximately 80% of the dredged material.

  The Bruno/Brickyard Associates/Alonzo site does not provide the same level and diversity of transportation options (two rail companies and the options of deep-water vessels) as the OG Real Estate site. The barge in/barge out option does not compare favorably with the OG Real Estate site because deep-water vessels are able to transport greater volumes of material per vessel.

4.2.2 Other Suitable Sites

During the identification of the Recommended Sites, the potential limitations and additional design considerations of the Old Moreau Dredge Spoils Area/NYSCC and NYSCC/Allco/Leyerle sites led to the conclusion that, although suitable, these locations were not best suited for optimizing the design of the project. The site evaluations supporting that conclusion are presented in Section 3.4 and Section 4 of the *Facility Siting Report* (USEPA 2004a). As noted in the *Facility Siting Report*, these sites exhibited a number of potential limitations and additional design considerations that outweighed their potential benefits. The limitations and design considerations included (but were not limited to) concerns about environmental conditions (e.g., site contamination issues), waterfront suitability, rail yard suitability, geotechnical characteristics, dredge material transfer issues, cultural resources, and wetlands.

Because of these factors and because further evaluations of the Selected Sites indicated that they will allow project design optimization, it has been determined that the Old Moreau Dredge Spoils Area/NYSCC and NYSCC/Allco/Leyerle sites will be eliminated from further consideration as sites for a sediment processing/transfer facility.

4.3 Host Communities, Facilities, and Potential for Project Benefits

Members of the public have questions regarding host community benefits as they may relate to those communities in which the Selected Sites are located. While EPA is not authorized under the Superfund law (i.e., CERCLA, as amended) to provide host-community benefits, EPA is committed to working with the Hudson River PCBs Superfund Site communities that may be impacted by dredging activities to help identify opportunities outside of Superfund. This includes encouraging communities to develop reuse and revitalization plans for areas along the river, identifying and facilitating contact with agencies that may be able to provide technical assistance through grants, programs, or loans, and working with groups such as the Community Advisory Group (CAG) to identify other appropriate opportunities.

In addition, EPA has also committed in the *Record of Decision* to restoring the sediment processing/transfer facility sites in a manner that takes into account their anticipated future land use. While the outcome of this effort will depend in part on whether EPA leases or acquires a given facility, this process also has the potential to produce a tangible benefit for the community.

The potential for economic benefits to be realized by communities within the Upper Hudson River Valley is addressed in the white paper, *Socioeconomics*, which is in the *Responsiveness Summary* (Part 3 of the Record of Decision). The white paper estimates that more than $262 million would be spent on direct expenditures associated with dredging in the Upper Hudson River region (Albany, Rens-

selaer, Washington, Saratoga, and Warren counties), which in turn is expected to produce an additional $314 million of "indirect" or "secondary" economic activity as labor and materials circulate in the local economy, thereby creating increased demand in other industries. This increased economic activity is expected to generate new jobs in various industries, including construction, business services, rail and marine transportation, and service industries such as banking, retail, food services, lodging, and recreation. It is also expected that industries such as tourism and recreational fishing will grow after the project is complete, providing further economic benefits for the local communities.

5 Next Steps

The selection of sites for sediment processing and/or transfer facilities marks the end of the facility siting process. In addition to issuing this report, EPA is also issuing the following:

- The *Facility Siting Report*;
- The *Summary of Public Comments and Responses*; and
- A Facility Siting Process Update, Selected Sites Fact Sheet.

In January 2005, EPA will host public forums in each of the selected site communities to explain the site selection process and answer questions. EPA will listen carefully to community concerns and make every effort to minimize facility-related impacts throughout the design, construction, and operation of the facilities.

Project/Facility Design

The selection of sites as sediment processing and/or transfer facilities will allow the intermediate and final design of the facilities to be completed. EPA fully intends to continue involving the community throughout the remainder of the RD process and the rest of the project. Once the intermediate design is completed, EPA will provide the public with details of the design for the sediment processing and/or transfer facilities and the dredge operations. Project design will take into account the engineering and quality of life performance standards.

Community Health and Safety Plan (CHASP)

The development of the Community Health and Safety Plans (CHASP) is another step in the process of developing intermediate and final design for the project. EPA committed in the ROD to establish the CHASP to protect the community, including persons in residences and businesses, from potential exposures as a direct result of remedial project activities. The CHASP will provide for community notification regarding health and safety issues and will include a complaint-management program to address public concerns associated with the project. GE will develop, with EPA's oversight, a CHASP for the sediment processing and/or transfer facility locations and the in-river dredging operations. Once the

plans have been drafted, EPA will hold public forums to present the details of the CHASPs, and the public will have an opportunity to comment on the draft documents. Public comments will be incorporated into the final document.

6 References

TAMS Consultants, Inc. December 1997. *Hudson River PCBs Reassessment RI/FS Landfill/Treatment Facility Siting Survey*.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). December 2000. *Hudson River PCBs Phase 3 Report: Feasibility Study*. New York, New York.

_____. 2000. Interim Policy on Environmental Justice. http://www.epa.gov/region02/community/ej/

_____. February 2002. *Record of Decision, Hudson River PCBs Site*. New York, New York.

_____. December 2002. *Hudson River PCBs Superfund Site Facility Siting Concept Document.* New York, New York.

_____. June 2003. *Hudson River PCBs Superfund Site Technical Memorandum: Identification of Preliminary Candidate Sites*. New York, New York.

_____. August 2003. *Hudson River PCBs Superfund Site Community Involvement Plan.* New York, New York.

_____. April 2004a. *Facility Siting Data Summary Report.* New York, New York.

_____. April 2004b. *Final Engineering Performance Standards, Hudson River PCBs Superfund Site.* Vols. 1-5. New York, New York.

_____. April 2004c. *Hudson River PCBs Superfund Site Draft Facility Siting Report*. New York, New York.

_____. May 2004. *Final Quality of Life Performance Standards, Hudson River PCBs Superfund Site.* New York, New York.

_____. December 2004a. *Hudson River PCBs Superfund Site Facility Siting Report*. New York, New York.

_____. December 2004b. *Summary of Public Comments and Responses*. New York, New York.