

Hudson River PCBs Superfund Site

Community Advisory Group Meeting

December 8, 2005

IDR Comment Steps

- EPA, the public, and other involved agencies have reviewed the IDR and provided comments.
- Public review period extended to October 7.
- 14 letters and 175 comments received.
- EPA has categorized and compiled agency and public comments and submitted them to GE (November 1, 2005; 228 comments).
- Copies of all public comments have been provided to GE.

Comment Categories (as noted in comment matrix)

- **Category A - Corrections or Clarifications To IDR**
 - Addresses inconsistencies in the IDR and questions regarding assumptions made or design values selected. These comments should be taken into account in preparation of the final design documents.
- **Category B – Supplemental Information Required**
 - Requests that GE provide more information so that EPA can more fully understand and evaluate the intent of the design or procedures used in its development.

Comment Categories (cont.) (as noted in comment matrix)

- **Category C - General Comments on Text or Statements in IDR**
 - Covers EPA concerns about the content of the IDR or defines EPA's understanding of what has been presented.
- **Category D – Information For GE**
 - Covers comments made by EPA to make GE aware of certain project information or EPA's perspective on design items or issues.
- **Category E – Community Concerns Not Already Addressed by Other EPA Comments**
 - Includes concerns raised by the public to EPA that have not been included in EPA's comments. GE to provide response to EPA.

Overview of IDR Comments

- **Dredging selection**
 - Additional details on pros and cons of dredging methods.
- **Dewatering facility**
 - Design detail questions on site development, process and material handling.
- **Navigation (maintaining vessel movement)**
 - Vessel staging, traffic control.
 - EPA and GE working closely with NYSCC.

Overview of IDR Comments (cont.)

- **Closure of yacht basin**
 - Ongoing discussion to allow some use and/or alternate docking.
- **Canal system use**
 - Ongoing discussion to identify potential limitations and contingencies.
- **Controlling resuspension**
- **Air and noise modeling**
 - GE is providing additional data prior to Final Design.

Overview of IDR Comments (cont.)

- **Capping / backfilling**
 - Dredging project, not a capping project.
 - 50% capping estimate for material quantity estimating.

IDR Comments (cont.)

- **EPA Region 2 Interagency Agreement with NOAA**
 - For technical reviews on Region 2 projects
 - Reviews performed at EPA's request
 - Reviews intended to be technical in nature not policy or legal reviews
 - EPA determines how to incorporate comments or perspective

IDR Comments (cont.)

- **EPA strongly disagrees that the IDR:**
 - Represents a significant change to the ROD
 - Compromises the effectiveness or protectiveness of the remedy
 - Will decrease the likelihood that Phase 2 will be implemented
- **EPA believes the approved IDR:**
 - Reflects a significantly greater understanding of the physical and chemical nature of the river
 - Integrates and addresses many items that have come to light during the design that had not been fully comprehended, or in some instances even thought of during the reassessment
 - Provides latitude and flexibility to those who will be responsible for implementing and overseeing the construction in the field

IDR Comments (cont.)

- **Regarding dredge prism development**
 - **Current estimates indicate that a greater mass of PCBs will be removed than envisioned in the ROD.**
 - **Approximately 50 percent more surface area will be dredged in areas delineated in the Phase 1 DAD than was envisioned in the ROD.**
 - **Sampling for the residuals standard will determine when backfill can be placed and when caps can be used. The shoreline approach may, under certain circumstances, allow GE to cap sooner (i.e., after fewer dredging attempts) than required by the standard. EPA does not believe this will result in significant contamination being left behind.**

IDR Comments (cont.)

- **Shoreline approach: (cut 2 feet at shoreline proceed on a stable slope (assumed 3:1) away from the shoreline until estimated DoC is intersected)**
 - **ROD did not contemplate removal of all PCBs from upper Hudson but focused on most contaminated areas.**
 - **EPA estimates that minimal contamination will be left behind and believes that there may be some confusion with interpretation of the shoreline language in existing documents.**
 - **GE has agreed with EPA that this concept needs to be better detailed in future documents.**
 - **EPA believes that the cost of constructing and maintaining caps will be a strong disincentive to GE to cap in these areas.**

IDR Comments (cont.)

- **Shoreline approach continued**
 - **Allows for greater flexibility for personnel to make field decisions**
 - **Reduce quality of life impacts associated with noise (driving sheet piling); access roads, time that construction is active in a particular location**
 - **Will improve ability to achieve the productivity standard**

IDR Comments (cont.)

- **Regarding extent of habitat restoration**
 - The EPA-GE RD agreement, requires detailed restoration design details to be provided in the Final Design Report, not the IDR.
 - GE has agreed that the goal will be to replace wetlands on a 1 for 1 functional basis. The ROD does not require 1 for 1 replacement of SAV; in fact the ROD states “...acre for acre replacement of SAV beds may not be desirable or feasible...”
 - EPA estimate that the 15% backfill requirement (above and beyond the 1 foot of backfill envisioned in the ROD) will result in a similar number of acres of dredged river being within the photic zone as before dredging.

IDR Comments Next Steps

- **GE will respond to EPA comments, expected in next several weeks.**
- **EPA is developing responses to public comments (individual letters will be sent out).**
- **Draft Final Design and Draft CHASP due March 17, 2006.**

Discussion
