

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION AGENCY
-----X
Public Hearing in the Matter of:
HUDSON RIVER PCBs SITE, NEW YORK
-----X
DATED: February 20, 2002
Poughkeepsie, New York

TIME: 7:15 p.m. - 8:30 p.m.

Michael P. McAliney, Reporter

MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING

Mary T. Babiarz
Court Reporting Service, Inc.
11 Market Street, Poughkeepsie, N.Y. 12601
(845) 471-2511

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

SPEAKERS:

Jane Kenny,
Regional Administrator Region 2

Bonnie Bellow,
Communications Director

William McCabe,
Deputy Director of Superfund Division

* * * *

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

BY MS. KENNY:

Good evening. Can you hear me? Well, thank you for coming tonight. My name is Jane Kenny. I'm the Regional Administrator for the United States Environmental Protection Agency Region Two. And, as you know, on February 1st Administrator Whitman and I signed the Record of Decision finalizing our plan to remove PCBs contaminated sediment from the Hudson River.

This is the second public meeting that we've held to explain the Record of Decision. The first one took place last week in Saratoga Springs.

As Regional Administrator I'll have chief responsibility for the Hudson River cleanup. It's a huge task, it's probably the most important single aspect of my work over the next several years. I take this responsibility very seriously and that's why I'm turning to you.

At the Saratoga Springs meeting last week a few people expressed concern that EPA may only pay attention to the up-river communities that will be most directly effected by

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

dredging. I want to assure you that the river's health affects everyone, I understand that, including down-river communities. I'm absolutely committed to an all inclusive public participation.

I know that long before I came to EPA the agency was working to involve the community in our ten-year reassessment of river conditions. The fact that seventy thousand people throughout the region sent written comments last year in response to our proposed cleanup is remarkable. And now we need to do even more. Governor Whitman and I are committed to involving the public and I believe there is unfortunately still a residue of distrust about this process and we are going to make every effort to overcome it.

Tonight's meeting is an opportunity for EPA to explain this decision and for you to ask questions about the plan. With me are Bill McCabe, the Deputy Director of our Superfund Division, and Bonny Bellow, our Communications Director who will talk in more detail about our plan.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

But let me start with some of the basics. EPA has been studying the problem of PCB contamination in the Hudson for over a decade after first declaring the Hudson Superfund site in 1984. During all this time the New York State Department of Health has posted fish advisories warning people to severely limit the amount of fish they eat that come from the river.

During all this time commercial fishing in the Hudson has been outlawed. And during all this time concerned citizens with many different points of view have made their voices heard. Citizens like you have come to town meetings and public hearings, more than seventy-five altogether. Citizens wrote letters, signed petitions and sent e-mail by the tens of thousands.

To verify the work of EPA's own scientists we brought in experts. During the ten-year reassessment EPA arranged for five different independent peer reviews of our findings. The agency wanted to get this right and with careful study and public input we did.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I want to reiterate just why we're undertaking this cleanup. PCBs, plain and simple are toxic. They enter the food chain through tiny organisms that fish eat and they can find their way into people who eat those fish.

PCBs cause cancer in laboratory animals and they are considered a probable cause of cancer in humans. PCBs can also trigger other serious health effects. And as is so often the case with environmental hazards, the most vulnerable, the people who are the most vulnerable to this are children and pregnant women.

These are serious life altering and potentially life threatening problems. And while the level of PCBs in fish is lower than it was twenty-five years ago, it's still dangerously high. Nature alone can't take care of the problem. This is not something we should leave for our children to deal with. That's why we've made the decision to target areas of the river for dredging.

As I announced last week, EPA will be

1

7

2 setting up a field office near the upper
3 Hudson area where dredging will take place.
4 That field office will be staffed by N.G.
5 Kaul, who was the Director of the New York
6 State Department of Environmental
7 Conservation's Water Program. With his help,
8 EPA will work closely with all the communities
9 that are effected by this cleanup, including
10 communities along the lower Hudson.

11 I'm new to this job and I know you have
12 all lived with this issue for a long time. I
13 want to help start a new chapter, one in which
14 we find ways to work together. And I look
15 forward to working with you, the people who
16 live here and who love the Hudson River.

17 This hasn't been an easy process and there
18 are a lot of hard decisions ahead of us. But
19 I think it can be a productive dialogue and
20 successful project that will be a proud legacy
21 for our children, grandchildren and
22 generations to come.

23 Before I turn things over to Bill McCabe
24 and Bonny Bellow, I want to introduce the EPA
25 staff who are with me tonight. There is a

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

tremendous commitment on our part, including this presence of our staff. From our Superfund Program, Mel Hauptman, I want you to stand, Doug Tomchuk, Alison Hess and Marian Olsen. From the Office of Regional Counsel, Paul Simon and Doug Fischer. From our communications office, Mary Mears and Dave Kluesner. We also have representatives from contractors, including E&E, our primary design contractor, as well as TAMS, Malcolm Pirnie and Morasco Newton. Please stand now.

Now, I'm going to ask Bill to briefly describe the Record of Decision and Bonny Bellow will then outline the process we envision for developing a new community involvement program. And then we'll be happy to take your questions when the presentations are done. Thank you.

BY MR. McCABE:

Thanks, Jane. What I would like to do is discuss with you the selected remedy and also how we responded to all the comments that we've received over the years.

The selected remedy calls for targeted

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

dredging of over two-point-six-five million cubic yards of PCB contaminated sediments. And on the next slide you will be able see, on the next few slides actually, those areas in red, I don't know if you can see it back there, they're entitled remediation areas. Those are the areas that we're talking about remediating.

And as you can also see from this in the top eleven miles we're talking about the upper Hudson as being forty miles, in the upper eleven miles of that we're talking about over eighty percent of the dredging. So, that's why we're talking about this as being a targeted dredging project.

We'll also be backfilling that with about one foot of clean backfill. That will be both for the purpose of habitat restoration and also to isolate any residual PCBs. The goal for the cleanup is one part per million.

The area that we're talking about here again with respect to the targeted dredging is about five hundred out of thirteen hundred -- out of thirty-nine hundred acres, I'm sorry.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

So, you're talking about less than thirteen percent of the area. So, again, that's where we're coming up with the target dredging, basically a hot spot type of dredging.

Historically, we've all heard about the forty hot spots that were in the upper Hudson River, twenty of those were in River Section One, which was the first six miles down to the Thompson Island Dam. Fifteen of those hot spots were in the next five miles down to the Northumberland Dam. And, again, that's where I said we're doing over eighty percent of the dredging. And then the last five hot spots were in the remaining twenty-nine miles.

The dredging will remove about one hundred fifty thousand pounds of PCBs. That's about sixty-five percent of what remains in the upper Hudson River. The dredging will be done in two phases, and we will be developing performance standards for the dredging project.

These performance standards included in the ROD, right now we have air quality and noise performance standards. And there will

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

be performance standards for other things that we'll develop in the design, such as, dredging production rates, the resuspension of PCB residuals. And the purpose of the two phase dredging is that in phase one, as we come up with these performance standards, we will be testing our dredging job versus how we accomplish those performance standards. That's in the first year.

Phase two is the remaining five years of dredging. So, after we do phase one we'll test it against those performance criteria. We'll also have the performance criteria peer reviewed. We'll also peer review the results of the first phase of dredging versus those performance criteria, and only then will we move on to phase two the following year.

The ROD also includes the siting of sediment processing and transfer facilities. We expect that there will be a good deal of public controversy over these facilities and we will be working with the public on the siting of the facilities. We'll also include a public comment period on those facilities.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

We have also stated in the ROD that we'll be using rail or barges for transportation of both the backfill material and the processed sediment. And, of course, we're going to be doing extensive monitoring during this entire operation, both during the design and during the construction. That will be in order to deal with or address the performance criteria and also to protect water supplies. And, finally, we will be doing a, developing a new community involvement plan.

The ROD also recognizes the need for source control. What you see here is the GE Hudson Falls facility. New York State is handling this with under an enforcement order with GE and we expect that this remediation will be completed prior to our initiating our dredging. Incidentally, the State is also working with GE at the Fort Edward facility.

Now, how do we address community concerns or how did we address community concerns. We did it in two ways. One way was in the proposed plan of December of 2000 and the second way was in the ROD itself after we

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

received all the public comments and developed a responsive summary.

In the proposed plan we included items such as there will be no local landfilling. For a good part of the project, particularly the end part of the project, this was the major concern of the community, that there will be no local landfill. Well, we included that in the proposed plan.

We said we would use rail or barge for the processed dredged sediments. This was to avoid truck traffic. People, rightly so, believe that the trucks would be a disruption to the community, at least that kind of volume of trucks would be a disruption. So, we said we would use rail or barge.

We've also stated that navigational dredging will occur such that we won't impede navigation in the river. People said that the dredging equipment is going to tie up the river, we said we'll make sure it doesn't. We'll do any navigation dredging that's necessary to accomplish that.

And of course we said the public

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

involvement program will continue through design and construction, and of course we can even change the program and Bonny is going to get into that.

After the proposed plan we opened up the public comment period. I think it was pretty successful, obviously we had some ninety thousand individuals in the form of over seventy-three thousand comments submitted to the agency. That resulted in a three volume responsiveness summary in the neighborhood of a thousand pages. For those of you who aren't interested in a thousand pages, we also have a slightly abridged version and executive summary, that's about thirteen pages, has all the results, all the answers.

And all this is available as you can see on the web site here, EPA.GOV/HUDSON. All of our information, the ROD responsive summary, executive summary, everything. The other changes were made in the ROD itself. As I mentioned before we've come up with this phasing approach. People ask this, well, what do you base your decision on, how do you know

2 that this is going to work, what other success
3 have you had that you can prove to us that you
4 can do this job, that you can get these
5 dredging production rates, that you can
6 minimize the resuspension and a whole variety
7 of other concerns.

8 So, we said, well, the only way we can
9 think of doing that is doing it in a phased
10 approach where we develop all those criteria
11 in the public forum, we have them peer
12 reviewed, and then we conduct the first phase
13 of dredging and see how it works. We, of
14 course, are confident that it will work and
15 that's why we proposed it, and only then will
16 we go on to phase two.

17 In the ROD we've added the railing, the
18 rail or barging of the backfill material. As
19 I mentioned in the proposed plan we already
20 said that we've used that for the process
21 sediment, now we're adding it for the backfill
22 material.

23 We said we would develop performance
24 standards. Again, I mentioned those, the
25 resuspension, the production rates and

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

residuals. Already in the ROD we have the air quality and noise standards and other quality of life factors may be developed such as odor, lights, et cetera.

Similar to what we did during the reassessment we're going to do a peer review, as I mentioned already. I assume that that will be a very similar process to the one we've already conducted and was quite successful.

As Jane has mentioned, we'll be opening up a field office, we're hoping to have that opened in March some time. And we've already got it staffed by a senior person, as Jane has also mentioned. And we'll also be analyzing water-based processing and transfer facilities.

People said, well, it's going to be difficult to get one on the land, so why don't we look at other options. Of course, another option is in the water. Of course, once you have it in the water it still has to get to the land. We have to go from there, so that wouldn't end it, the need for any land

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

transfer facility.

Once we've dealt with all these public comments, and obviously we have developed a Record of Decision, the responsiveness summary, the next step is the remedial design, and that's the phase that we're in right now.

Everything that I've mentioned already, and a whole lot more that's in the ROD is what we're dealing with in the remedial design. Some of the more prominent elements that we're going to be dealing with and some of the more time consuming ones I suspect will be our sampling and monitoring program. We're going to be taking a tremendous number of samples, I don't, probably thousands, ten of thousands samples. It's just a tremendous effort.

The purpose of that will not only be for the performance standards but also to develop the cut lines. You've seen on the charts there, we've got those nice red areas that show where we're going to be dredging. Obviously, we've got to get that a little bit more refined. Actually, we have to get that a whole lot more refined. So, we have to go in

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

there and figure out exactly where we're going to be dredging.

We have to select a type of equipment that we're going to be using. We didn't select hydraulic or mechanical dredging in the Record of Decision. We're going to have to make that decision in the design phase. And perhaps a combination of those types of equipment.

We'll be developing performance standards, of course, the peer review, we'll be siting the processing and transfer facilities. As I mentioned before, I expect that to be rather controversial. We will have that open to public comment and we expect that we'll be able to site a facility successfully. And we'll be developing a community health and safety plan, and that would include things like protecting the water supplies.

And, finally, we'll be defining the phase one and phase two areas. We did not define that in the Record of Decision, that is for phase one, this first phase, we're going to develop the performance standards and test them out. Where's that going to be? Is that

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

going to be all the way north or is it going to be some other location. Obviously partly that depends on any kind of a processing or transfer facility where we can locate that.

And, finally, the next steps, what do we need to do in the immediate future. Well, first of all, we have selected our consultants, and Jane mentioned who those were. That was on February 7th. We have started the enforcement process with General Electric. We issued a special notice letter on February 4th. They have a couple months to respond to what's a good faith offer.

We will be establishing the field office, we expect somewhere around March 17th. And we'll be out in the field, we expect to be out in the field doing or sampling somewhere around May 1st. That doesn't mean we won't be out in the field prior to that doing some preliminary work. For instance, we need to do some work for on the siting of the transfer facilities. Just getting some information, not doing any sampling work, any sampling work we'll be letting the public know about it

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

ahead of time. We'll be developing work plans for sampling, things like that.

So, a good deal of work will be going on while were in the process of developing the community involvement plan, which is the last item up here. And which Bonny Bellow is now going to describe to you.

BY MS. BELLOW:

Good evening. It seems like a very serious room tonight. We've got a few smiles out there.

As you just heard from Jane Kenny we are very committed to an open public process that will give all the effected communities, interested organizations and the individuals who come forth during this process an opportunity to provide input on really critical issues.

Our goal is to develop a new community process that will encourage real dialogue. And I think that's the operative word here. I know we've had a lot of words spoken, but we're talking about real conversations where we hear you, you hear us, we talk, we listen,

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

we exchange ideas, and hopefully we come to some sort of consensus on some of the critical issues before us. And I hope this is one of the few times as we move forward in this process that we're in this format, you're sitting out there and we're providing information to you. I envision this more of us sitting around a table as we move forward, although we might need the largest table ever made in the history of humankind, but we'll cross that bridge. We've got bigger obstacles than that.

I want to take a few minutes just to go over how we're going to proceed. We have enlisted the assistance of Morasco Newton, an employee owned consulting firm with expertise in dispute resolution. They're going to serve as the neutral facilitators who will guide us through the process of developing a community involvement program.

The first step will be for them to reach out to you. Their public involvement specialists will conduct a series of interviews that will take place in your

1
2 communities. They will reach out to the key
3 stakeholders. There are many of you who have
4 been involved in this process for many years.
5 There is also new people and new organizations
6 that have come forward during this public
7 process of commenting on our proposed plan,
8 and there are actually some new groups that
9 have formed along the way. So, we want to
10 hear from everybody. We want to get
11 information from you. And, again, we really
12 want to listen and we emphasize that we also
13 hope that through this you will listen to us,
14 you will listen to the technical side, you
15 will listen to the community side. And that,
16 again, we'll be able to reach some consensus.

17 But what they are going to do is they are
18 going to listen to your concerns and solicit
19 suggestions for the format of a new process.
20 So, this first stage is actually the process
21 of developing a process. I know this sounds a
22 little convoluted, but we want to get to a
23 point several months from now where we are in
24 agreement about what a community involvement
25 program is going to look like that will guide

1

2 us into the future.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The interviews that they conduct are going to be confidential, because we want you to feel comfortable voicing your concerns without us sitting in the room. They'll convey that information to us but it won't have your name on it. So, we'll get a summary of the ideas and information that have come forth, but it won't be as difficult because you don't have to worry about voicing a strong opinion to them.

The consultants will then convene a series of facilitative workshops that will be attended by representatives of a cross-section of groups and individuals. Those people, groups and organizations that are representative of all of the stakeholders that care about the Hudson River. And, again, I want to emphasize that we're talking about the up river who have their concerns about the direct impacts on their lives as well as those people who live down here and all along the Hudson River who may have the same concerns and a variety of different concerns. We view

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

this as a very inconclusive process. And I personally feel very confident with the neutral facilitators we're going to be able to build a plan that is built on consensus.

The final step will be to submit the plan that comes out of this consensus building process for public comment. And we made a commitment that we would do that. We'll go out for public comment, we'll take comments, and then we will finalize the plan. At that point, which we hope will be early in the summer, we will have a new community involvement program in place that will guide us as we move forward into the design phase of the project and further along as we begin to dredge the river.

And as many of you know we are on a very, very tight time frame, so we're going to really need help from you. We've got milestones, we've got deadlines to reach, so we're going to ask for you to help us in moving this process along. And I just want to assure you that while we are developing this plan, which will be over the next few months,

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

it's not that we're going go away, we're going to keep in regular contact with you. Through our field office we will hold a series of public availability sessions, we'll get written materials out, we will get information out on our EPA website. And we have set up a free list serve. You go onto the site, on our website, you subscribe and that gets you regular updates and information about events related to our activities in this phase of the work.

So, this is something new. We've never done this exactly this way and we're really going to need you, all of you, to work with us. I personally feel very exited by the process. I think we have a tremendous opportunity here and I think we're really ready to just roll up our sleeves and get started.

So, we are now going to actually give this by taking questions from you. I would ask if people could or would mind to come over maybe to these two mikes just so you're directing your questions up here. That mike is on.

1

2 That's fine.

3 SPEAKER FROM PUBLIC:

4 This addresses the issue of equipment
5 selection. There are groups in New York
6 Environmental Business Association and others
7 who are in a position to aggregate equipment
8 that would meet all your criteria and
9 specifications levels a lot better than your
10 ROD currently indicates in terms of noise and
11 resuspension and et cetera.

12 However, your ROD does not seem to address
13 any of this state of the art equipment and I'm
14 wondering if the EPA is in a position to
15 extend financial support with Congressional
16 approval and with New York State approval, to
17 engineering firms along the Hudson who have
18 lived with this issue for their entire lives
19 to submit independent designs to your
20 consultant engineers, yes or no?

21 BY MR. McCABE:

22 If I'm limited to that, it would be no.
23 If I could explain a little bit, perhaps it
24 might help. Financial -- the way we -- the
25 way the process works is, as you've heard, we

1

2 have a consulting firm doing the design. That
3 is done through the Corps of Engineers, we
4 have contracts through the Corps of Engineers
5 with this firm. The firm was selected on a
6 national basis by the Corps as well as some
7 other firm, but that's how we access them.
8 So, they competed for and got that work.

9 There's a variety of ways that the
10 construction work could be done. Obviously,
11 open bidding is one of those ways. That's the
12 way that we access consultants and contractors
13 and, obviously, the way the money flows. If
14 there is any information or technology or
15 anything of that nature that you think we
16 would benefit by, certainly you can speak to
17 our project managers who are here, and they
18 then could put you in touch with our
19 consultants.

20 But as far as any direct financial
21 remuneration to the engineering firms along
22 the Hudson, I know of no program. And I'll
23 ask very quickly the people here if they know
24 of any program that exists for that. I don't
25 believe so.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

SPEAKER FROM PUBLIC:

Sir, you very effectively identified the problem of your community involvement program. As long as the design process of the actual dredging technology, dewatering technology, separation of PCBs from sediments and all of that, as well as noise abatement, is under control of a single engineering firm that you have selected on a national competition basis. Their particular pre-elections as to what equipment to choose and how to use it locks out any innovative solutions that might be coming from engineering firms who live and work and attempt to prosper here in the Hudson Valley.

BY MR. McCABE:

I don't believe we're excluding anything. We did an extensive technology search during the reassessment, which was different, at least one of the consultants that led that was a different consultant than the one we have. They had dredging experts on their staff or a subconsultant as well as E&E, Ecology and Environment, has dredging consultants on their

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

staff.

And as I stated, if you have any information or any technologies, we are very open to anything that's out there. We think, of course, that we know what the state of the art is. But that's not to say that we're perfect or we do know it all. If you have anything else, if there are any other types of technology, we're more than willing to listen.

One of the items in the Record of Decision that I didn't mention is beneficial reuse. If there's anyway we can reuse the sediments beneficially, we'll do that, but we need the information. And we're certainly willing to accept it and to evaluate it. We've had a lot of suggestions in the past in all our public meetings, or I should say in the eleven public meetings that led up to the Record of Decision, a lot of information was passed and was gladly accepted.

SPEAKER FROM PUBLIC:

Does it go to Jane?

BY MR. McCABE:

I'm sorry?

1

2

SPEAKER FROM PUBLIC:

3

Does it go to the Administrator?

4

BY MR. McCABE:

5

You can send it to Jane, but obviously she

6

will give it to the technical staff.

7

SPEAKER FROM PUBLIC:

8

Okay. Thank you.

9

BY MS. BELLOW:

10

One of the things we should emphasize is

11

that we have the ability and have along the

12

way changed decisions that we've made around

13

things that have a direct impact on people.

14

Bill laid out a variety of things along the

15

way where we have looked at those things that

16

communities are concerned about. So that the

17

public involvement process is designed to

18

specifically look at issues like noise that

19

have direct impacts. Community involvement

20

process will also address the development of

21

the performance standards.

22

So, the community involvement process is

23

very broad scale and there is a very heart

24

felt desire to go forward with details of this

25

program that people feel comfortable with and

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

to do everything we can to minimize impacts.

BY MR. McCABE:

Yes.

SPEAKER FROM PUBLIC:

Good evening. I'm Jane Shellinbaum
(proper noun subject to correction). And I do
a radio program locally called Pet Talk. I
produce and I'm host of this, and it's on
wildlife on pets and on the environment
locally and worldwide. And through my
contacts and research I found something that
has the potential to be quite beneficial and
innovative with the dredging of the Hudson
River. You know, the Hudson Valley used to be
known for the wonderful bricks, and beautiful
bricks, decorative bricks, bricks for
buildings, housing, hospitals, streets, et
cetera.

And just like the Hudson River, there are
many rivers in Germany around the ports that
are filled with toxic slime, poisonous
contaminated sediments, heavy metals and the
like.

Now, there is a brick company in Hamburg

1
2 by the name of Honcion (phonetic) Brick
3 Factory. They have developed a new way to
4 dredge this waste, this slime, without any
5 environmental damage. They filter and they
6 burn it and encapsulate the bricks so that
7 nothing ever goes back out into the
8 environment. They're making eco-bricks. And
9 this is, again, without any environmental
10 damage.

11 It seems to be that the bricks are totally
12 free of contaminants, bricks usable for
13 business, homes, hospitals and schools. Which
14 you mentioned reuse, that's exactly what is
15 going on. This factory is getting their
16 materials, their raw materials free. They are
17 selling the eco-bricks like hot cakes. Money
18 back into the Hudson Valley.

19 They are eager to get other areas to use
20 their process, take their patents, and they're
21 talking to New York City, why not here. Why
22 transport the dredgings off to Buffalo,
23 Timbuktu or wherever it is designated. Why
24 not restart the brick business in the Hudson
25 Valley? Why not reuse this waste effectively,

1
2 efficiently, and with an economically
3 profitable manner for the Hudson Valley.

4 Have you looked into the eco-brick from
5 that German factory?

6 BY MR. McCABE:

7 I can't say that I personally have. I'll
8 ask the staff if they have heard of that one
9 in particular. I know that we have, for
10 instance, had a, we do look overseas for
11 technologies. I know we had a dredging
12 demonstration by a Dutch firm recently, the
13 largest firm in the world, that kind of thing.
14 We've also had demonstrations, and I don't
15 know if Doug wants to add anything on this.
16 But we do also have a demonstration, sediment
17 demonstration projects, and we've used some
18 sediment from the Passaic River, for instance,
19 beneficial reuse. But we would be happy to
20 take any information you have and pass it on.
21 And that's exactly what we're looking for.
22 This gentleman right here actually, you can
23 give it to him.

24 SPEAKER FROM PUBLIC:

25 Something I stumbled on, but it is very

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

special, that is not hydraulic, it's not pressure, they filter it and they burn it with no pollution whatsoever. And then they can use these bricks for every type of business, school, hospital, et cetera. It seemed to be something that we've lost in the Hudson Valley, those beautiful bricks that we used to have. And we have all the toxic sediments, why not go for it.

BY MR. McCABE:

We're always looking for a better answer.

SPEAKER FROM PUBLIC:

Thank you.

BY MR. McCABE:

Thanks. Yes, sir.

SPEAKER FROM PUBLIC:

Good evening. Are we supposed to identify ourselves?

BY MR. McCABE:

Yes, please, please do.

SPEAKER FROM PUBLIC:

Excuse me. I'm Erwin Spergerym (proper noun subject to correction). I'm at SUNY New Paltz, I'm mostly interested in environmental

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

health, public health issues, and I do
teaching and research on these areas.

I wanted first of all to express my
deepest appreciation for the very good faith
effort on the part of the EPA to reach out to
the community, really all the way up and down
the Hudson River by this arrangement of having
an independent organization serve as a kind of
a mediating mechanism. And I think that is an
excellent step toward the kind of dialogue
needed to hold down the level of fear that
people seem to have about errors or foul ups
that might happen in the course of dredging.
I think this is a very thoughtful and positive
step.

And it's in that connection that I wanted
to follow up with some questions that are
partly having to do with public health and
partly having to do with what GE's response
is. I mean, if we see on the one hand that,
you know, EPA, and I think by implication
other federal and state agencies that will
have some degree of involvement or
consultative role in how the procedure goes

1

2 forward are making all of these remarkably
3 extensive efforts to reach out to the public.

4 What really concerns me is that, on the
5 other hand, GE does not seem to be responding
6 in kind with any dialogue on its part. For
7 example, what I have in mind is, that for
8 several decades now there have been all of
9 these organizations, mostly they're up river
10 from us, that have represented GE to one
11 degree or another as being an exemplary
12 corporate citizen.

13 Many of these same organizations, and
14 sometimes they're candidates for public
15 office, and they have denounced the EPA, the
16 DEC, and any other agency that talks
17 causatively for the need of dredging. And
18 they've gone on to say how dredging is too
19 radical and destructive of the American way of
20 life and all that kind of nonsense. And I
21 don't see any sign that GE has, simply put,
22 called off the dogs. I mean, it seems that GE
23 has continued to go on its merry way actively
24 encouraging or at least condoning these kinds
25 of irresponsible and often ill-informed