

**Community Advisory Group (CAG)**  
**Hudson River PCBs Superfund Site**  
**Meeting Notes**  
**31 August 2005**  
**CAG Meeting, 1:00 PM – 3:45 PM**  
**Waterford, NY**

**Members and Alternates Attending:** Kenneth DeCerce, Philip Dobie, Mark Galough, Joe Gardner, Robert Goldstein, Manna Jo Greene, Harry Gutheil, George Hodgson, Oliver Holmes, John Lawler, Paul Lilac, Roland Mann, Daniel McGraw, Merrilyn Pulver, John Rieger, Rich Schiafo, Lois Squire, Julia Stokes.

**CAG Liaisons Attending:** Danielle Adams (Ecology and Environment), William Daigle (NYS DEC), Doug Garbarini (US EPA Region 2), Joan Gerhardt (Behan Communications), David King (EPA Hudson River Field Office), Gary Klawinski (Ecology and Environment), Deanna Ripstein (NYS Department of Health), Leo Rosales (EPA Region 2), Steven Sweeney (NYS Canal Corporation).

**Others Attending:** David Adams (Saratoga County EMC), Tom Brady (Saratoga County Health Department), Brian Baulsir (EPA Intern), John Callaghan (NYS Canal Corporation), John Mulligan (Malcolm Pirnie, Inc.), Paul Post (Saratogian), Chris Sgambati (Saratoga County Board of Supervisors).

**Facilitators:** Patrick Field, Ona Ferguson.

**Members Absent:** Chris Ballantyne, Jean Carlson, Dan Casey, Cecil Corbin-Mark, Theresa Egan, Mark Fitzsimmons, Richard Fuller, Gil Hawkins, Aaron Mair, Judy Schmidt-Dean, Jock Williamson.

The next CAG meeting will be held on Wednesday September 28.

**Key Action Items:**

- EPA will find out and get back to the CAG on where and when the measurement of PCB concentration will be made for disposal purposes.
- EPA will find out and get back to the CAG on how long it takes an 81-car train to cross an intersection.
- CAG members and other concerned citizens should give written comments on the Intermediate Design Report to David King at EPA, ideally by the end of September ([king.david@epa.gov](mailto:king.david@epa.gov).) EPA will respond to all comments.
- The CAG asked EPA to develop a summary of how they come to their conclusions in their assessment of GE's Intermediate Design Report so that CAG members can understand the EPA evaluation of the Report.
- CAG members should let EPA know if they want the Intermediate Design Report in hard copy or on disc (which is much easier to for EPA to reproduce). The Intermediate Design Report can also be found on the EPA website.

- Interested CAG members, with the help of the facilitator, will draft a letter stating that they would like EPA and/or GE to fund an independent analysis of economic and other impacts of Phase 1 and the creation of the dewatering facility. CAG members will have the opportunity to sign the letter.

## **Welcome and Reminder of CAG Groundrules**

The facilitators welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked John Lawler and his staff for providing lunch to the CAG at the Waterford Visitor's Center.

## **Meeting Summary, Revised Groundrules and Action Item Update**

July CAG meeting notes were approved without additional changes. Action items from July with updates and not discussed elsewhere in the meeting are as follows.

- Regarding archaeological diving and findings: diving off Rogers' Island should start in about three weeks. GE will get back to EPA with the timing of the diving. It isn't clear whether or not diving will be visible from public access points. Any found items will be shipped directly to the lab. A summary of archaeological findings will be written, and GE can present an overview to the CAG once the work is completed.
- The data monitoring website from the Commencement Bay (Tacoma) dredge site was restricted, and so could not be shared with the CAG. The facilitators provided one dredging project website that has dredging studies and information on it: Grand Calumet River, a US Steel website. Interested individuals may have to type the URL into their web browsers, as the link doesn't appear to work directly:  
[http://www.ussteel.com/corp/rcra/grand\\_calumet\\_river\\_remediation\\_index.htm](http://www.ussteel.com/corp/rcra/grand_calumet_river_remediation_index.htm)
- Fred Ellerbusch did let CAG members review his comments on the CHASP and then sent them to GE on the CAG's behalf via the facilitator.
- CBI is still working on locating New Bedford Economic Development or Chamber of Commerce representatives to come to the October CAG meeting with a project manager.

Regarding media groundrules: the facilitators updated and circulated a new version of the media section of the CAG operating procedures. The changes are intended to ensure that CAG meetings can be held in a way that is open to but not disrupted by media participation. These changes were approved by the CAG, and will be available to distribute to media representatives who attend CAG meetings.

## **Intermediate Design Report Presentation**

David King of EPA presented the Intermediate Design Report (IDR) submitted by GE to EPA on August 22. EPA released the Report to the public on August 23. The Draft Final Design Report is due 120 days after EPA approves the IDR. State agencies, EPA and the public are reviewing the Report simultaneously. The IDR lays out a proposed procedure for the dredging of 265,000 cubic yards of the Hudson River in Phase 1.

The IDR shows the proposed preliminary layout of the processing facility in Fort Edward, as well as the dredge area locations in Phase 1. If CAG members want copies of the IDR and accompanying Treatability Study, EPA can provide them on CD.

The IDR proposes a schedule for Phase 1 of dredging from May 2007 to the end of October, 2007, six days a week, 24 hours a day. The seventh day would be for equipment maintenance and repair. Within Phase 1, there would be at least one month of dredging at the full rate anticipated for Phase 2. This would serve to test that all systems are able to handle that level of dredging.

The dredging is proposed to occur in five-acre increments. Once a five-acre area has been completed, 40 samples would be taken within that area to determine whether it is meeting the residuals of less than one ppm. If not, that area will be re-dredged and re-tested to see if the PCB level can be reduced to the <1ppm level. If the <1ppm level cannot be attained, there may be capping or backfilling of clean material instead of additional dredging in the same location. There may be up to seven mechanical dredges in total. Mechanical dredging is especially good for areas with significant debris on the river bottom, as in the area under consideration. There may be a need at some point for some small hydraulic dredges in shallow places in the Hudson, but this isn't expected to be necessary most of the time.

The mechanical dredges that are proposed to be used are controlled by GPS and laser, so the depth and location of dredging will be extremely precise. The Phase 1 Dredge Area Delineation report describes in detail the areas targeted for Phase 1 Dredging.

Up to 12 barges are proposed to be in operation; one tugboat or fewer per barge will also be used. 134,000-186,000 cubic yards of backfill may be needed during Phase 1. The habitat restoration section of the IDR addresses what would be used to replace habitat where needed.

Any water used in the facility or that might have come into contact with PCBs will go through a water treatment process before being released into the river. There will be one fully loaded 81-car train approximately every other day (4 per week) leaving the facility.

There is a need to maintain through-boating for recreational boats. The Canal Corporation, GE and EPA are discussing that as an important issue, but have not yet determined how they will manage this. The inference that through-traffic could be shut down could be as damaging as the reality in terms of deterring recreational boats from choosing to go through this area.

The monitoring plan is still being developed. It will describe the many types of monitoring that will be implemented. Preliminary noise and light analysis schematics have been included in the IDR.

In Phase 1, it is expected that 390,000 tons of processed material will be transported off-site. The purpose of Phase 1 is to determine the effectiveness of the remediation steps (for example: will they meet all requirements?), and to provide project managers a period in which to make systems adjustments as necessary prior to Phase 2.

Several CAG members noted that it sounded as though EPA staff were endorsing the report, whether or not that was their intention and despite the fact that even they haven't yet had time to read the entire lengthy document. Several CAG members asked that EPA be sure to evaluate the GE-prepared IDR and its conclusions critically, looking for both pros and cons. David King clarified that he, rather than a GE representative, was making the presentation to the community because under the consent agreements between EPA and GE, EPA agreed to do community outreach. Mr. King noted that his intention at this meeting was to present an overview of the contents of the IDR. Joan Gerhardt of Behan Communications stated that GE representatives are willing to discuss the report, but that they wanted citizens and interested parties to have time to read the report prior to those discussions. Ms. Gerhardt stated that GE feels that this CAG meeting and the Fort Edward meeting held on August 30 are great opportunities for EPA and the community to discuss the report, and noted that GE staff welcome alternative suggestions or ideas from the public.

Several CAG members noted that they would be submitting the report for evaluation by independent contractors. Others stated that they would appreciate if EPA would prepare a document that gives the CAG some understanding of *why* they make their decision of approving or not approving the IDR. They want to see the reasoning of the decision EPA makes to stand behind certain decisions GE has made. EPA comments on the IDR are expected to be incorporated into the Final Design.

### **CAG Comment on the Intermediate Design Report Presentation**

The CAG stated a wide range of questions and comments<sup>1</sup>:

#### EPA ROLE AND PROCESS

- *If EPA hasn't yet evaluated the document, why does it seem as though EPA is defending the report rather than evaluating it? It seems like we should all be listening to GE (rather than EPA) present this information. If EPA is defending the work GE has presented, it should present concerns as well as supporting information.* There isn't yet an official EPA position on the draft, since EPA will be developing comments for GE over the next month. EPA's role is to evaluate and review the report to see if it will meet EPA performance standards and to answer the question "can this work?" If it can work and does meet performance standards, even if it isn't describing exactly the same procedure EPA would choose, EPA would approve it.
- *It isn't clear that the comment period is long enough.*
- *It would have been nice for GE to present this report to the CAG. The Intermediate Design Report is very different from other reports in that EPA hasn't had preparation time and so can't answer all CAG questions. GE should be defending their decisions and explaining the IDR to us. Did anyone ask GE if they would present? When we at EPA first got the report, we decided to give the public as much time to review the document as we had. As a result, we are discussing this IDR before we have had time to completely read through it. We've had time to hit the highlights. Whether EPA or the public agrees*

---

<sup>1</sup> Unless noted otherwise, in bullet lists italicized comments were made by CAG members and plain text comments were made by EPA representatives in response to CAG comments or questions.

with the conclusions drawn by GE is a premature question. EPA is just trying to get the information out to the public. Joan Gerhardt said that meeting the IDR submission deadline took a great deal of GE staff time and effort, and that those staff members involved are currently taking much deserved time off while the public reviews the IDR. GE intends to talk with the public and EPA about the IDR over the coming months.

- *What role will EPA play in Phase 1? What level of supervision will EPA have over the project? EPA should be representing the concerns of the community. That is EPA's role – you represent the people.*
- *Many people on the CAG aren't qualified to understand the IDR and determine if it is a good design or not, so beyond hiring independent professionals to review it, we are looking to EPA and trusting you to take care of us and use your good judgment. Am I right to trust EPA to look out for us? Fundamentally, you are the government and you are supposed to protect us. Will EPA do the right thing? With the first sign of re-suspension in our drinking water, will you shut this down? Yes.*
- *The quality of drinking water and the safety of the people who use the river are of paramount importance, and anything and everything else is a distant second.*

#### TYPE OF DREDGING

- *We told the public that hydraulic dredging is a one-way flow out of the water. In our comments on the ROD, we recommended hydraulic dredging, and that is what we had been hoping for. I hope we can leave the door open to that possibility.*

#### ECONOMIC AND OTHER IMPACTS

- *We all have known for a very long time that this day was going to come. At the end of the day, the project is being driven completely by the performance standards. The ROD talked about 4-5 dredges, and that 4/5 would be mechanical. We're getting just what we asked for. The important thing isn't whether EPA or GE makes this presentation, it is who will be bearing the impacts of the project. If everyone wants to start discussing the future impacts, lets move forward to concentrate on working together to protect the upper river communities.*
- *There are so many impacts that are all converging on Fort Edward simultaneously that it is going to be difficult for the Town to sort out how to handle each of these issues. We have a multitude of impacts we have to address – tourist impacts including the Fort Edward Yacht Basin being closed down for a whole season. Those impacts will have to be addressed, and there will have to be a contingency plan so that local people are not forced out of business because of this project. We need to have an independent impact analysis of the Intermediate Design Report site plan of how this project will impact Fort Edward, and we've asked EPA and GE to get us money to do that. This Superfund site has increased from its original 40-mile length to its current 160-mile length. A Superfund project doesn't have to meet local laws or regulations, though we want it to. The quality of life issues are huge. New issues are raised at each meeting of what effects this project will have on the whole Town of Fort Edward and the people in the region.*
- *How long does it take an 81-car train take to cross an intersection? This could affect emergency response times if police or firemen had to wait for a long time for a train to pass. EPA will get back to the CAG on this.*
- *Since 1997, we've requested that economic analysis of the impacts be conducted before a decision is made. Fort Edward will pull its business community in to find ways to*

*mitigate what is going to happen. Let's all work very hard to make Fort Edward a model community so we can come out of it as a whole community with the project as a win-win for all of us. Fort Edward will go through a lot of transition in the coming years – which depends largely on re-suspension, residual and productivity rates. The IDR is totally based on achieving those levels. This could become a 12-year project, we don't know.*

- *Many of us have decades of our careers invested in this area of New York State and on the Hudson River. It is a remarkable river. Municipalities, the state and the federal government have invested millions of dollars to bring this river back. Towns being revitalized and scenic byways being protected is evidence of this good work. EPA, GE, and the CAG must be very cognizant of the impacts we're having on peoples' lives as we undertake a project that affects the river. We need to be very careful of how we structure our review of the impact this will have on the area.*

### BACKFILL AND QUARRIES

- *Where will the backfill come from? Will it be from the Hudson Valley? Joan Gerhardt stated that the quarries being considered for backfill material are all from this region.*
- *Quarrying and mining in this area could cause local disputes. Taking this much gravel from the quarries could significantly expand some of our local quarries, so we need to determine the impact to road building costs if this much gravel were used.*
- *If quarries for backfill are local, won't trucks be used to move the fill? Joan Gerhardt stated that the quarries proposed (a) have a facility or staging area with direct access to rail or the river, and (b) have adequate material available so as not to require facility expansion to supply fill for Phase 1.*
- *If stone from local quarries goes to this project instead of to other normal building projects, other quarries will be filling a gap in the region.*
- *If the quarries deplete the natural resources in your hometown – you want a basketball court and your cement isn't there – it'll jack up prices in the region for a long time. Right now some towns in the region have moratoria on mining. What happens if the dredging project depletes the local mines?*
- *Does the report say mostly just back fill and let nature take its course?*

### SLUDGE MEASUREMENT AND DISPOSAL

- *Is there the possibility that highly contaminated sediment would be diluted with less contaminated sediment to alter where it gets disposed of? I'm concerned that dilution isn't the solution, and I want to be sure that dilution won't be considered. Right now it looks as though all Phase 1 material will be treated as TSCA.*
- *If beneficial use of the sludge sediments were found, where it would be transported? Joan Gerhardt stated that non-TSCA material could be used at non-TSCA landfills as cover, outside of this region. EPA stated that large cobbles could be put back into the river for habitat restoration once they had been washed of mud and silt. Sediment material that had been dredged would not be put back into to the Hudson River.*
- *Where and when will the measurement of PCB concentration be made for disposal purposes? Doesn't the regulation say the measurement has to be made in the river? There is a place in the IDR that says they'll do PCB testing after dewatering, but that is out of compliance with TSCA. EPA will get back to the CAG about this.*

### DEWATERING FACILITY

- *The IDR says there will be seven miles of rail in Fort Edward? 38,000' total is what the IDR says. It is because there will be a lot of railroad track at the dewatering facility.*
- *Does the report still say the dewatering facility will sit on 100 acres of land? Yes.*
- *Is there enough room on-site to put backfill materials there? How do you manage 89 trucks per 24-hour period? The report proposes taking the backfill to the different locations, not to the dewatering facility. The clean fill will be barged in per the ROD, as specified in the IDR. Trucks will not be used for backfill materials.*

#### TRANSPORTATION: RAIL

- *Is the community ready to handle seven miles of rail? This isn't clear. The people who live nearest to the tracks will have many concerns. At some point we need to know: how many at-grade crossings are we dealing with for the 81-car train so we can know what to expect for impact. The scheduling of train trips can be very important. Concerns about trains running in the middle of the night are different from those about trains running during the day.*
- *A passenger train is light compared with these full trains we're talking about. The full trains will be leaving from the center of Fort Edward (within one mile of downtown). We need to be concerned about the four trains –both coming in and going out per week.*

#### TRANSPORTATION: ROADS

- *Roads are also a huge issue. In Fort Edward, we're going to be building a dewatering facility in the middle of our community. We're doing a study right now trying to evaluate our roads. Route 4 is going to be completely reconstructed in the next two years, and the bridge from 197 will be in construction in 2007-2009. We don't even know how we'll get buses into the village of Fort Edward to pick up people to take them to their destination.*
- *In the Record of Decision, we said that trucks couldn't remove reusable or resalable material, but there is a grey area in the IDR that makes it seem that reusable/resalable material could be transported by truck.*

#### CANAL USE/YACHT BASIN

- *Rail, roads and waterways are huge areas of concern to Fort Edward. The ability for pleasure boats to get through lock 7 to Lake Champlain is non-existent. The upper river will be closed off to the rest of the world if pleasure boats can't come through. This will be a big concern to people in the region.*
- *We are talking about shutting down the Champlain Canal. The Canal ends here, in Waterford. We have ships from all over the world that like coming here because it is the joining of the two canals. The place that served lunch today relies on boat traffic to stay in business. Closing the river will seriously impact people literally across the street who have staked their living on canal traffic. This CAG is the only recourse that exists for communities, to present a case for the tremendous economic damage that this project is going to cause businesses (entirely aside from other general quality of life issues). These are real businesses, small businesses, and communities that are trying to pull themselves up by the bootstraps, all based on the promise that the canal will bring in business. This means businesses closing and laying people off. At some point, someone running this project will have to stand up here and say "tough luck" because that is what this is going to come down to. All the platitudes people say at the CAG won't help. We need an*

*economic analysis of what this will do to our communities including those to the north and to the south of Fort Edward.*

- *The proposal being presented calls for the Fort Edward Yacht Basin to be closed for a year. Has anyone even talked with the Yacht Basin about this?*
- *In the New Bedford dredging project, hydraulic dredges were being used instead of barges. They had pipes and there was little disruption of traffic, so maybe we could use hydraulic dredging in the area by the Yacht Basin so it could remain open.*
- *Perception will shape whether people on pleasure boats continue north or decide to go towards Erie.*
- *26 trips a day – 13 in and 13 out? Yes 13 round trips.*
- *How wide is the lock? The barges are 35'. Steven Sweeney stated that there won't be room for more than one tugboat and one barge at a time.*
- *What does this mean in terms of timing? Steven Sweeney said that estimating a 30 minute passage, the locks will have to stay open 15 hours or more, which exceeds their current rate and will cause labor and budget concerns. This is given that 26 trips per day will require over 12 hours of lock time per 24 hour period.*
- *Currently, 10 craft per day on average pass through the locks. Of the 10, three to four are pleasure craft.*
- *Would hydraulic dredging mean that the Yacht Basin could be left open? Joan Gerhardt responded that there were several reasons for recommending the closure of the Fort Edward Yacht Basin, among which are that GE believes sheet piling is needed in order to meet the resuspension standard, and that extensive dredging has to occur in that one very narrow channel, with nearly bank-to-bank dredging. Because so much equipment (project barges, tugs and dredges) will need access to that channel, from a safety perspective GE staff didn't see a way that the channel could also accommodate recreational vehicles. The recommendation for closing the Yacht Basin wasn't made lightly, but GE couldn't see any other way to get the work done.*

#### RESUSPENSION

- *I'm not sold any longer on the fact that there isn't going to be re-suspension, which will affect peoples' water intakes down the river. I don't believe we aren't going to see re-suspension. When that happens, the communities downstream will wake up and start caring about the dredging. Why isn't this question of re-suspension being addressed? The travel time of re-suspended sediments is approximately one and a half days from the Phase 1 dredge areas to Waterford. We believe our monitoring will provide adequate notice of potential problems.*

#### OTHER IDR DETAILS

- *Dredging 24/6 is better than dredging 24/7, but that is still a lot to ask of one community.*
- *I think this report is designed to fail. It isn't designed to meet performance standards. GE is setting up a design for failure, for example: hydraulic dredging. In the preliminary design report, GE stated in several places that hydraulic dredging would be suitable. There is a need for a very critical review of the IDR by EPA, especially of the choice of mechanical dredges, the impact of how the lock is used, navigation of the river and shutting the Yacht Basin. I think there are potentially better ways to design this. GE "refined" or changed the conclusions from the DAD, and the changes are inconsistent with the ROD. This is not surprising, since the people designing the project are the ones*

*who have said for years that the dredging won't work. I'm concerned this is set up to be the worst-case scenario and to fail. I see an attempt to move some of the inventory and then cap (which was rejected in the ROD), rather than to remove it all.*

- *To understand the report, you need to understand all the other documents and supplementary documents that have been released prior to today.*
- *Is someone looking at hydrological impacts of shifting water flow to the west channel of Roger's Island? Yes. And, sheet piling is recommended to help mitigate re-suspension in order to meet the resuspension standard.*

## **Next Steps for the Intermediate Design Report**

EPA is planning to assemble and submit to GE all its own internal comments by the end of September, and encourages communities community groups and other stakeholders to do the same. Comments David King receives will be reviewed and passed along in both original and summary form to GE. David will also pass along comments he hears at the CAG to GE. EPA noted that this is not a formal comment period, but comments submitted now should be incorporated into the Final Design document, which is due from GE 120 days after EPA approves the Intermediate Design Report.

EPA noted the following. (a) Sediment sampling and analysis were completed about two weeks ago. (b) Some in-river activity will be starting in the next few weeks on the cultural and archaeological findings. (c) Discussions between GE and landowners are ongoing regarding access. (d) Design work is ongoing. (e) GE is continuing discussion with railroads and landfills. (f) The CHASP is still being developed.

There is a meeting on September 8 at 7:00 pm at the Ft Edward Firehouse. GE and EPA will be there.

## **Role of CAG in the Intermediate Design Report Review**

The facilitator asked what role the CAG wanted to have regarding the IDR going forward.

Responses from the CAG to this question included:

- *The CAG has met many times, but it needs a win or an accomplishment, and it doesn't feel like we've had any. I need to want to come to this meeting to express my feelings and then be able to go back to my constituents and feel like we've accomplished something. Today more than other times I feel that we haven't accomplished much. I credit the facilitators and EPA for their work, but if the CAG isn't going to accomplish something, it doesn't make sense for us to keep coming to the CAG – we can have an engineering company come here and represent us.*

Ideas for “wins” from CAG members:

- *For local communities to receive some sort of financial accommodation for problems that we have – it is criminal to take peoples' livelihood away, even though things like running a Yacht Basin or local restaurant aren't high revenue livelihoods.*
- *Establishing a contingency fund to compensate local families living closest to the site who will bear the brunt of the noise and other disturbances.*
- *Receiving funding for the completion of an independent review and review of positive and negative economic and other impact analysis of the facility construction and Phase 1 as stated in the IDR.*
- *Receiving total support from the CAG for the request for this economic and impact analysis. While the federal government may not think this is important, most of us at the table think it is. (Many CAG members stated their support for such analysis being funded and completed. One stated that Fort Edward has the support of people in other towns and from other interest groups.)*
- *For a contingency fund to be set aside so local peoples' losses can be taken care of and to help keep local economies alive and growing.*
- *A dispute mechanism needs to be in place to address quality of life concerns.*

Other comments from the CAG:

- *It isn't totally GE's fault that this dredging is happening – government entities let GE pollute and let the dam break. Can we trust EPA to look after us? We can't just keep beating up GE, they're already working on the situation and on the project.*
- *GE is the most responsible, and even if they aren't the only responsible party, they are many times more responsible than taxpayers, who will have to bear the brunt of paying for this project if GE doesn't step up to do so. GE should be stepping forward to fund economic studies the community is calling for. GE should be in the forefront of this – where are the customers of GE?*
- *The question of human and economic impacts has come up repeatedly over the last 8 years! I take issue with the delays and postponing of the dredging. Superfund legislation doesn't require an economic impact study, but the request for one comes up every year. GE only does what they are going to agree to with EPA based on requirements of Superfund legislation. GE is obligated to do what is in the legislation and no more.*
- *When will negotiations between EPA and GE be done? Joan Gerhardt stated they would be completed in the near term.*
- *This is a quality of life, standard of living issue. Every one of our residents will be affected differently. Our farm people, business people, and people who live along the river's lives will be affected. Anything CAG members can do – they need to do it now – the message has to be loud and clear – but please contact the right people. We each need to get involved in the process.*
- *CAG members present do recognize this clearly even as they have other issues they also care about – they want to know how to help Fort Edward minimize impacts and get the river cleaned up.*

There will be more time for discussion of the IDR at the September CAG meeting.

**Letter in Support of Independent IDR Analysis**

Individual CAG members proposed crafting a letter with the help of the facilitator that could be signed by any willing CAG members as individuals or representing their organization(s), stating that they would like EPA to provide for an independent economic analysis of Phase 1 dredging and operations of the dewatering plant on Fort Edward and the surrounding region. They would like mechanisms to fund the analysis and a contingency fund to address standard of living/quality of life impacts that can't be mitigated. This analysis would happen simultaneous with other engineering reviews, and would not slow the process. The goal would be to understand ways to compensate affected businesses and people. It should also include some mention of the jobs issue raised over the past few CAG meetings.

Next steps on this letter will be for the facilitators to work on the language and on the mailing list, and then on getting CAG signatures. Individual CAG members will have the opportunity to sign on behalf of their individual organizations. This will not be a CAG letter or a statement of the CAG, since the CAG does not offer collective advice.

The letter should be sent to: congressional representatives and senators, the EPA administrator, GE CEO Jeffrey Imelt, Governor Pataki, state representatives (Bruno, McDonald, Reily, Betty Little, Podesco), and the Lakes to Locks/Quebec Corridor Initiative. One CAG member noted that individuals should also feel free to send their own letters to these same people on behalf of their own organization.

## **Brief Updates**

Due to extensive conversation on the Intermediate Design Report, the facilitator stated that brief updates would be covered in the meeting notes rather than in the meeting itself. They are:

### Community Health and Safety Plan

EPA received comments from Fred Ellerbusch on behalf of the CAG. CHASP review and development are ongoing. EPA welcomes additional comments from the CAG or community members on the CHASP.

### Habitat Delineation Report

The Habitat Delineation Report will be discussed at a later CAG meeting.

### Cultural Resources

A presentation on Cultural Resources will be given at a later CAG meeting.

### Remaining meeting dates check-in:

Remaining 2005 CAG meeting dates are: Wednesday September 28, Thursday October 27, no November meeting (due to Thanksgiving), and Thursday December 15.

## **CAG Issues, Concerns, General Discussion**

This was postponed until September's CAG meeting due to time constraints.

**Public Comment**

This was postponed until September's CAG meeting due to time constraints.

**Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00pm.