

Community Advisory Group (CAG) Meeting
Hudson River PCBs Superfund Site
Meeting Summary
Thursday April 23, 2015
1:00 PM – 4:00 PM

Saratoga Town Hall, 12 Spring St, Schuylerville, NY 12871

CAG Members and Alternates Attending: David Adams, Rich Elder, Manna Jo Greene, Peter Goutas, Abigail Jones, Richard Kidwell, William Koebbeman, Roland Mann, David Mathis, Althea Mullarkey, Julie Stokes, Andrew Squire, Lois Squire.

CAG Liaisons Attending: Michael Cheplowitz (USEPA – Region 2), John Davis (NYS Office of the Attorney General), Kevin Farrar (NYS DEC), John Fazzolari (Ecology & Environment, Inc.), Joe Finan (National Parks Service), Joan Gerhardt (Behan Communications), Gary Klawinski (USEPA – Region 2), David Kluesner (USEPA – Region 2), Tim Kruppenbacher (GE), Deepali McCloe (Ecology & Environment, Inc.), Joe Moloughney (NYS Canal Corporation), Larisa Romanowski (USEPA – Region 2)

Others Attending: Sander Bonvell (Citizen Observer), Terrie Boguski (Skeo Solutions), Margaret Byrne (USFWS), Robert Duncan, Pam Doody (Anchor QEA), Justin Donnely (NYSDOA), Audrey Van Genechten (NYS DOH), Brittany Haner (NYS OAG), Nick Hartman (Skidmore College), Sarah Hoenig (Skidmore College), Timothy Holmes (Schuylerville), David King, George Lukert (Ecology & Environment, Inc.), Cullen O'Brien (DA Collins), Paul Post (Saratogian), Bill Richmond (Behan Communications), Christina Scanlon (Post - Star), Dan Shaw (Town of Easton Super) John Sherman (Mayor, Schuylerville), Nandini Srinivasan (Skidmore College), Stephen Williams (Daily Gazette), Kirby Webster (Skeo Solutions), Tom Wood (Town of Saratoga, Supervisor), James Woods (NYSOAG)

Facilitators: Ona Ferguson and Eric J. Roberts

Members Absent: Cecil Corbin-Mark, Chris DeBolt, Laura De Gaetano, Darlene DeVoe, Richard Fuller, Brian Gilchrist, Robert Goldman, Robert Goldstein, Timothy Havens, Gil Hawkins, Jeffrey Kellogg, Edward Kinowski, Aaron Mair, Merrilyn Pulver-Moulthrop, Thomas Richardson.

Action Items:

- CBI to distribute the NRD Trustee factsheets.
- EPA to provide Julie Stokes and other interested CAG members with copies of the nearly complete cultural resource Memorandum of Agreement (MOA).
- EPA to provide copies of the 2015 design and remedial action work plans to the CAG when they are finalized.
- EPA to provide the CAG with examples of the letters to property owners and the information they are provided regarding data collected and proposed actions.
- CAG members to send CBI any additional topics for Skeo Solution's independent review of the Floodplains RI/FS within one week.
- Althea Mullarkey to share with Julie Stokes the map of the 136 acres.

Welcome, Introductions, Review December 2014 Meeting Summary

The facilitators welcomed the group and reviewed the agenda, noting that the CAG assessment was postponed until the fall so that the CAG could focus on the RI/FS work plan earlier. The CAG approved the draft December 2014 meeting summary. CAG handouts and presentations are available on the project website: <http://www.hudsoncag.ene.com/documents.htm>

2015 Dredging Season Overview

Tim Kruppenbacher, General Electric (GE), presented the 2015 dredging season overview. His points are summarized below.

Dredging to Date – Since the project began, 2.5 million cubic yards (cy) have been removed from 92 Certification Units (CUs) resulting in the removal of 90% of the target sediments. 2.9 million tons of dewatered sediment have been shipped to off-site disposal locations. 2.6 million tons of backfill/cap have been placed. Dredging is complete in the following areas: Fort Edward to Thompson Island Pool (except for CU 60), Lock 6 in Fort Miller to Lock 3 in Mechanicville, and Lock 2 in Mechanicville to Green Island (except for CU 99). Thirty-five acres (92% of program) of Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (SAV) and 15 acres (75% of the program) of Riverine Fringing Wetland (RFW) have been planted.

Offseason Activities – GE completed maintenance and repair of the processing facility and the tugs and hopper barges during winter 2015. GE also submitted 2014 close out plans and 2015 Design and Remedial Action Work Plans (RAWPs) for final EPA review. EPA said they will make them available to the CAG members in response to a CAG request.

2015 Dredging Season – Dredging in 2015 will remove an estimated 250,000 cy of sediment. The same contractors will be used as before, although Shaw was renamed CB&I. Dredging will start in early May in CU 99 and then proceed to CUs 94 and 96. As river conditions permit, dredging will proceed through CU 60, portions of CU 64-65, and CU 66 in the landlocked area. Dredging will conclude with CU 95 near Quack Island. None of the dredging in 2015 is located in the navigational channel. More detail about each of the planned dredge locations is below:

CU 99: 2015 dredging will start in subunits 6 and 7 of CU 99 south of Lock 1 in Waterford. One subunit is located on the east shoreline and the other on the west shoreline. Completion of these subunits will complete all of the work below Lock 2.

CUs 94, 95, and 96: Dredging here will commence with CU 94 and move to CU 96. CU 95, which contains three sub units, will be completed at the end of the season. Access to CU 95 is complicated by a shallow rock ledge to the northeast of Quack Island, lack of access from the south due to proximity to the dam, limited access from adjacent steep sloping river banks, and presence of an eagle nest. To dredge CU 95, GE will set up a land-based staging area and build a temporary causeway to the mudflat in the dredge area. GE will then create finger piers to extend the reach of the excavator from the land to dredge approximately 3,500 cy. Backfill for CU 95-2 will be deposited from the finger piers. To dredge the remaining approximately 30,000 cy, platforms will be emptied and floated into the area between the mudflat and Quack Island. The excavators will be loaded onto the platforms from the mudflat for dredging into mini-hoppers. A water propulsion boat will push loaded mini-hoppers, since boat propellers would be damaged on the rock ledge. Material from the mini-hoppers will be loaded into larger barges north of Quack

Island for shipping to the processing facility. Backfill will be placed using a reverse process from the barges to the mini-hoppers. Eagle activity will influence the work schedule in CU 95.

CU 60: Located north of Thompson Island Dam, CU 60 consists of subunits CU 60-1 and CU 60-2. Subunit CU 60-2 poses challenges due to its location below the Canal Corps safety cable, the velocity of the river, currents, and proximity to the dam. The Champlain Canal land-cut also limits access to the area. Since no vessels will be in the water in this area, the dredging will be limited to the material that can be accessed from soon-to-be-constructed finger piers on the New York State Canal Corps (NYSCC) owned peninsula between the land-cut and the river.

CU 60-1, located on the west side of the river, poses challenges because it is also located below the safety cable and contains a culvert and extremely shallow, swampy land that impedes floating in equipment. Smaller equipment that works in shallow water will be used instead. GE will dredge into mini-hoppers. The material will then be transported to the safety cable, where it will be transloaded into larger hopper barges that will transport the material to the processing facility. Backfill and capping material will be transported into CU 60-1 using a reverse process. The safety cable will remain in place during the operation. Due to safety concerns about having divers in the water this close to the dam, SAV will not be planted in this area. However, additional SAV was planted north of Thompson Island dam to meet the project requirements. Waders tethered to the land will plant RFW in CU 60-1.

A member asked about why a ‘hole’ in CU 60-1 that is surrounded by areas to be dredged (forming a donut-like area) is not slated for dredging. EPA responded that coring data created the CU shape; in this case, two nodes did not meet the criteria for dredging. As in other areas with similar situations, samples are only retaken in areas where dredging occurs; additional samples will not be taken in the area of the donut hole since the EPA reviewed downstream deposition of contaminants during earlier dredging and determined it was not problematic.

CUs 64-65 and CU 66: Approximately 60,000 cy remain in the area between Thompson Island Dam and Fort Miller Dam (a.k.a “the landlocked area”). The same approach used last year will be used to dredge the remaining sediment.

Support Properties – Crews will continue to use the Saratoga Barge and Load Area for maintenance and the office, and the Rensselaer Barge Loading Area (RBLA) for storage and distribution of backfill and capping material. The Isthmus Transload Area and the Land-Locked Barge Loading area will also continue to be used this season.

Cultural Resources – The team evaluated cribs as a cultural resource in CU 96 and developed plans to remove them. Remnants of foundations were identified as cultural resources in CU 60-2 and were excluded from the work area. Cultural resources were evaluated in CU 99 and a plan was developed to address what appears to be a sunken canal boat. A CAG member said she would like to see where cultural mitigation is occurring, and EPA representatives said the mitigation is wrapped into the Memorandum of Agreement, which is nearly final. EPA said they can provide the reports to the CAG.

2015 Habitat Planting – Approximately three acres of RFW will be planted in 13 CUs. Approximately three acres of SAV will be planted in 5+ acres. Planting will start in late May, depending on water temperatures and the size and condition of in-river plants.

Facility Decommissioning – EPA is reviewing GE’s proposed decommissioning plan, which may be revised based on EPA feedback. EPA will approve the plan before decommissioning begins. Decommissioning was proposed as a phased approach to begin as dredging activities diminish and the full capacity of the facility is no longer needed. The remaining decommissioning will occur in 2016 and the completion date is not yet known.

The CAG discussed the decommissioning plan:

- A member suggested that decommissioning of the processing facility should occur only after remediation of the floodplains and backwaters is complete. An EPA representative said he anticipates that any sediment removed as part of the floodplain work could be processed with smaller scale, localized processing machines instead of the existing processing facility.
- CAG members requested 30 days to review and comment on the draft decommissioning plan prior to EPA approval. In response, EPA said they would share the decommissioning plan after some issues are clarified and they are comfortable with it. EPA will not hold an official public comment period on this document, but they will accept comments as they are received.
- A CAG member suggested that Washington and Saratoga County economic development agencies be included in discussions about decommissioning the processing facility and other support facilities because these areas could provide project development opportunities. EPA noted that the conversations are ongoing and that the property owners will ultimately decide what to do with their properties.
- A member noted that many people, including the 59 municipalities that urged the EPA and GE to complete a more robust cleanup of the river prior to closing the processing facility, perceive a rush to close the processing facility when it could be used for additional clean up that would help the river recover more quickly and be completed more cost effectively. She urged EPA to consider this before approving the decommissioning plan and GE to consider mutually beneficial settlement agreement options with the Trustees, the NYSCC, and other state agencies before the facility is decommissioned. Another member added that local communities are not seeking bank to bank clean up; instead, they are asking for reasonable actions that will impact the future of the Hudson River and surrounding communities and are seeking partnership opportunities instead of imposing additional penalties.

CAG member discussion also focused on the following topics:

- A couple of members said GE has done a lot of great work on a massive undertaking and that they have been good at problem solving to remove hard to reach sediment. One member commented that GE should dredge the navigational channel, as their expertise would enable them to dredge the navigational channel more efficiently than the state.
- The group discussed the length of time that CUs are open and smaller production rates anticipated in 2015. Mr. Kruppenbacher said CUs should not be open any longer than

normal and that the production rates are only smaller because smaller machines are being used to access the difficult to reach areas.

- A member stated that GE should dredge portions of the 136 acres (an area not included in the ROD) that are located near areas being dredged in 2015. She suggested the CAG review the locations of the 136 acres and the planned dredge areas in 2015 at the next CAG meeting.
- The group discussed an area above CU-1 near the yacht basin. NYSCC provided additional sample data to EPA and requested review of the original delineation. EPA will meet with the NYSCC soon to discuss it. The top few feet of sediment is not highly contaminated, but deeper samples exhibited higher concentration levels. Sample recovery in this area has been difficult, making the decision of how to proceed less clear.
- The group briefly discussed sampling and dredging north of the Northumberland Dam. Mr. Klawinski said all the targeted sediment had been dredged, and agreed to talk with the CAG member about concentration levels detected in the material and the dredging that was completed.
- A member requested that EPA complete a policy review earlier than scheduled, prior to GE's departure and decommissioning of the dewatering plant, to better understand what river conditions are expected when GE leaves the river and what will happen to in-river dredging once GE is gone and the NRD Trustees take over. A request was also made for more information on a statement made in the last Five Year Review that the expected outcomes of the remedy might take longer than originally thought. Mr. Klawinski said that the next five-year review is due in April 2017, and that EPA will likely start on it before then.
- A member commented that many people are fishing at the City of Poughkeepsie waterfront and that some of them think all the PCBs have been removed from the river and that the fish is safe to eat. Kevin Farrar said that fish consumption warning signs are institutional controls and that communities or landowners are not required to erect the signs. Another participant said Poughkeepsie has ordered but had yet erected these signs.

Floodplains RI/FS Work Plan Presentation

Gary Klawinski, EPA, presented on the floodplains Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) work plan, which is focused on the evaluation of PCB contamination in naturally deposited sediments. Key points from his presentation are below:

EPA and GE reached an agreement last year to complete the RI/FS study. The agreement culminated in a work plan. If human use areas with PCB concentrations greater than 10 ppm are found while completing the RI/FS, the agreement allows for completion removal actions, such as the placement of covers or warning signs.

The RI/FS process consists of several steps. Initially, the RI will identify the location of PCBs in the floodplain. Next, a Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) and an Ecological Risk Assessment (ERA) will be completed to assess whether or not the PCB concentrations found in the floodplain pose a risk to humans or the environment. After identifying the location of and risk associated with PCBs in the floodplains, a feasibility study will determine cleanup options to protect public and environmental health. EPA will then draft a proposed plan outlining a selected

cleanup option and issue it for public review and comment. After collecting public comments and amending the plan as necessary, the EPA will issue a formal Record of Decision (ROD).

Mr. Klawinski presented the organization of the groups participating in the project. As the lead agency, EPA oversees GE and retains decision-making authority. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) provides EPA with contractor and consultant support. General Electric will complete the RI/FS with their consultants and contractors. Other state and federal agencies that will review and provide recommendations include the NYSDEC, NYDOH, NYSCC, NOAA, USFW, and the NPS. Property owners will also be engaged throughout the RI/FS. Most of the floodplains properties are privately owned, and NYSCC also owns a significant portion of the floodplains land.

The study area consists of approximately 3,000 properties over approximately 6,200 acres along 40 miles of river from Bakers Falls (north of Fort Edward) to Troy. For purposes of the RI/FS, the river was divided into eight reaches based on the locks and dams and the unique flooding conditions created in each of the pools between the locks and dams:

- Reach 1: from the Troy Dam to Lock 1.
- Reach 2: from Lock 1 to Lock 2
- Reach 3: from Lock 2 to Lock 3
- Reach 4: from Lock 3 to Lock 4
- Reach 5: from Lock 4 to Lock 5 (this is the longest reach)
- Reach 6: from Lock 5 to Lock 6
- Reach 7: from Lock 6 to Thompson Island Dam
- Reach 8: from Thompson Island Dam to Bakers Falls (north of Fort Edward).

The outer boundaries of the study area will be determined by joint EPA-GE review of the FEMA flood maps and the boundaries of a 2011 flood (100-year flood) event. The inner boundaries of the study area generally will be located at the water line of the average river flow (5,000 cubic feet per second [cfs]); however, near-shore sediments below this level will be investigated in areas people might access if the river is flowing below 5,000cf per second. The area between Baker Falls and Ft. Edward will be assessed using the RI/FS or another approach approved by EPA. Other sites will be addressed under different studies in collaboration with the NYSDEC. Areas that have already been remediated will not be included in the RI/FS.

GE and EPA have already collected many samples and completed some removal actions. GE accessed more than 500 properties to collect approximately 3,000 sediment core samples, which resulted in about 7,000 analyses for PCBs. Removal actions is a term used to describe management actions; it does not necessarily mean anything has been removed. Thus far, GE has completed 41 removal actions (placement of soil covers) and placed warning signs on 23 properties. The data collected to date shows that PCBs are concentrated closer to the river edge and that PCBs are encountered less frequently and at lower concentration levels as distance from the source of the PCBs increases.

Additional samples will be collected to improve the data set used in the Floodplain Characterization Report and the risk assessment. Samples are generally collected between zero to 12 inches below the ground surface because the greatest potential for direct contact with contaminated soils occurs in this range. Deeper samples are completed if deemed appropriate—

for example, deeper sediment may be sampled if there is reasonable expectation that the PCBs are located deeper and it is likely that a utility worker might be exposed to those soils. The top 12 inches of soil would also be tested in agricultural settings. Kevin Farrar, NYSDEC, added that the sampling depth is driven by risk of exposure (as analyzed in the HHRA and ERA). Sampling will occur in stages, with results from prior years helping determine future sampling locations.

GE will submit a sampling plan for EPA review to jointly determine the location of additional sampling. Samples will be taken in areas of standing water, flowing water, and flooded areas that retain water for part of the year. Additional sampling will occur in the old Champlain Canal. Field verification of existing map data will occur while sampling to verify map accuracy and to delineate the locations of the floodplains. Sampling is expected to be conducted over a two to three year period. A member noted that deep sediment samples would be needed in the old canal due to the amount of sediment accretion and the quantity of sediment that must be removed to restore stormwater management functions and reduce flooding in Hardy Park.

A member commented that the river deposits 4-6 inches of sediment each year in areas near Lock 5 that are accessed by many fishermen and asked how well the concentrations in the sediment layers are understood. Mr. Farrar commented that the majority of the deposited sediment washes back into the river each year. Mr. Klawinski said EPA and NYSDEC have studied flood deposition for several years, including after the big flood in 2011, and it appears that concentrations in the deposited sediment are generally low, though high concentrations are occasionally found. EPA continues to investigate flood sediment deposition and could present the details of this research at a future meeting.

The HHRA consists of several steps including the Screening Level Risk Assessment (SLA), a pathway analysis, the Phase 1 Baseline Human Health Risk Assessment (Phase 1 BHHRA) and Phase 2 Baseline Human Health Risk Assessment (Phase 2 BHHRA), evaluation using Flood Frequency Units (FFU), and a Unique Areas evaluation. Each of these is described in more detail below:

- *Flood Frequency Intervals & Flood Frequency Units* – The HHRA revolves around Flood Frequency Intervals (FFIs), the underlying concept being that the more frequently an area is inundated with floodwaters, the more likely there will be PCBs in that area. Areas of similar concentrations and flow patterns are further subdivided into FFUs. The investigators will consolidate the eight river reaches into approximately 20 FFUs to help predict how PCBs will behave in the different portions of the river system.
- *Unique Areas Evaluation* – PCBs behave differently in areas of tributary banks and islands than they do in other portions of the river. Tributary banks are usually not contaminated because of the tributary contributing clean water into the Hudson. Most of the islands will likely be sampled since island contamination is highly variable.
- *Screening Level Risk Assessment* – This is a parcel-by-parcel decision-making process based on an initial screening with stringent criteria. Decisions to exclude properties from the next phase will be based on a comparison to the residential default value of 0.24 mg/kg and consideration of geographic location, topography, land cover, land use, etc. Any parcels registering concentration levels above 0.24 mg/kg will be carried into the Phase 1 BHHRA.

- *Pathway Analysis* – The pathway analysis is a determination of how people or wildlife might be exposed to the PCBs through various land uses. To complete this analysis, EPA will consider current and reasonably anticipated future uses; current ownership, zoning and land use, topography, and planning documents; general trends in residential development; agricultural practices, and; recreational activities. The map provided by the Hudson Hoosic Partnership will be included in this analysis.
- *Phase 1 BHHRA* – This is another screening process to determine whether or not a parcel should be carried forward to the Phase 2 BHHRA. It is still in development. General use categories (e.g. residential, agricultural, recreational, etc.) will be assigned to parcels. Concentration levels on each parcel will be compared to appropriate exposure factors for each general use category. Statistical analysis will be used to calculate Exposure Point Concentrations (EPC) for each Exposure Area (EA), which will help people focus on areas of high importance. The FFU and the statistical approach will be used in combination to determine what PCB concentrations would be expected at different flood frequency intervals. CAG members asked for more information about this element of the HHRA.
- *Phase 2 BHHRA* – The Phase 2 BHHRA is a second round of analysis to refine the Phase 1 risk estimates using site specific data (from additional samples, if necessary) for EA specific EPCs. Near shore sediment areas will be assessed during this phase. These are areas that are revealed if the river drops down below 5,000 cfs and that could potentially be accessed by people. Identification and assessment will include existing and additional sampling and factors such as bank height and slope, substrate, vegetation, land use, etc.

The Ecological Risk Assessment (ERA) began with a problem formulation workshop in 2013 with representatives from GE, EPA, NOAA, NYSDEC, and other agencies. Participants established a decision making process for the assessment, identified steps and tools to be used in the ERA, types of data to collect, and species of greatest concern. GE is beginning the Screening Level Ecological Risk Assessment; EPA will coordinate closely with them to complete it.

Mr. Klawinski reviewed next steps for the RI/FS. EPA is currently reviewing the floodplains characterization report and the cultural resources work plan, which will also be reviewed by partner agencies and the consulting parties. An NPS participant at the meeting said that the western floodplain is sandwiched between two properties on the national registry, which should be highlighted as a concern in the programmatic review, that an adaptive management approach continues to be used on the floodplains work, and that a pre-assessment process should be used to allow consulting parties to respond in a timely manner and get ahead of some of the work. CAG members highlighted that this 40-mile stretch of river has a great deal of historical significance. EPA will also be working with GE to prepare the data gap sampling plan, to establish a data management system, to identify opportunities to speed up the 5-year RI/FS timeframe, and to develop the community involvement plan.

CAG questions, comments and discussion focused on the following topics:

The group discussed the general use categories that will be assigned during the Phase 1 BHHRA. EPA will set acceptable standards for general use categories. For example, a specific concentration of PCBs may be acceptable at an industry site but not at a residential site. Mr. Klawinski commented that property owners could dig cellars in the residentially designated

category, and that considerations for construction workers will occur during the pathway analysis. Mr. Farrar added that the risk and associated use categories ultimately depend on how much PCB a human body might intake in a given year on a particular land use—for example, a construction worker might briefly be exposed to PCBs while digging the foundation of a house, but a child living in the home may frequently roll around in the dirt, which could be a greater risk.

A member asked if deed restrictions could be applied to properties. Initial responses to the question were as follows. Mr. Klawinski said it is too early to talk about that but they hope this does not happen. Deed restrictions would surface if EPA thinks there is an issue on the property but the property owner will not allow EPA on the property. If a property receives a cap, a deed restriction will not be needed because the property owner will be provided the information about the cap. Mr. Farrar added that if the final remedy is not removal, then long term institutional control of the property could be required.

The group made the following points about data and record accessibility and communication with landowners where contamination is found. Future generations (including future property buyers) will need access to data to know about existing contamination on properties. Some current property owners prefer to keep private the data about their property. Public vs. private data issues aside, the data must be organized in a database in an easily accessible format. Mr. Klawinski said it would be up to the property seller to disclose the information. An audience member commented that properties in New York cannot be sold without completing a known conditions disclosure form. EPA informs property owners of what was found on the property, what will be done, and the expected outcome. EPA agreed to share examples of the communication a property owner receives. The Record of Decision will include a publicly available report but it is unclear what that information will be included at this time.

A member said that ensuring all shorelines are safe for future development is critical because waterfront property in Saratoga County is highly valued, and will remain so in the future. He said that only considering current or anticipated uses in the next year or two is insufficient, considering that people will continue to use the shorelines for the next 300 or more years. Mr. Klawinski said they would work with property owners on a case-by-case basis but they cannot make wholesale commitments. The member said if contamination problems persist after the current strategy, communities and individuals will seek settlements for private property remediation.

Finally, a CAG member recounted his experience with GE doing floodplains remediation work in his yard. He said it was well done and that every year since it was completed he has received a report describing any changes that needed to be made.

Floodplains RI/FS Work Plan Technical Support

Following the presentation on the Floodplains RI/FS Work Plan, CAG members discussed their request for technical assistance to better understand the Work Plan. This was the continuation of a discussion begun at an earlier CAG meeting to identify topics the CAG wanted to know more about. CAG members initially requested support through EPA's Technical Assistance Services for Communities (TASC) program, and as their list of questions was compiled it became clear

that some of their questions would be best answered by EPA, while others could be answered with TASC support. EPA's TASC program provides independent technical support for community advisory groups. Skeo Solutions will be providing the CAG's TASC support.

CAG members brainstormed questions they still wanted answered or topics they wanted addressed, as follows:

- What are the potential permanent actions that could be taken as part of the removal actions or interim remedial actions (IRMs)? How do these potential remedial actions relate to the different types of properties (commercial, public, private, public access, etc.) and how do they fit into long-term community plans?
- A lot of land is undeveloped and many towns do not have comprehensive development plans. How will EPA forecast development 25, 50, 75 years into the future to determine the requisite level of sampling needed now, so that vacant properties are investigated and can be developed in the future?
- Describe how exposure points concentrations are developed.
- Describe whether stormwater management is taken into consideration in risk assessments and potential remediation work.
- Describe mechanisms for including site-specific concerns.
- Describe what has been done at other superfund sites to provide data and information about contamination to future private property owners.

The facilitation team outlined the next steps on this as follows: (1) CAG members could send in additional topics or questions after the CAG meeting to add to this list, (2) CBI committed to compiling the various requested items and circulating the list to the CAG for final input, then (3) CBI promised to incorporate that input from the CAG and to submit a formal request for TASC and EPA support.

Brief Updates and CAG Business

The following updates and business announcements were made:

- The EPA field office is moving to Wolf Road in Albany to be closer to the GE floodplain team, the state offices, and contractors. Field staff and oversight teams will continue to operate in the field.
- Mike Cheplowitz joined the EPA team.
- Peter Groutas joined the CAG as the Saratoga County Chamber of Commerce representative. Julie Stokes will now represent the Schuylerville Chamber of Commerce and Tim Holmes will replace Dave Roberts as the alternate.
- The NRD Trustees produced a fact sheet describing the responsibilities, actions, and goals of EPA and the Trustees with respect to the NRDA. They also released an injury determination report, which will be used in the restoration planning process.
- The Admin Team was asked to consider adding an agenda item to the next CAG meeting agenda: discussion of the 136 acres in relation to planned 2015 dredging.