

**Onondaga Lake Consent Decree, ESD, and SCA Siting Report Responsiveness Summary  
Comment and Response Index**

Name/Agency	Comment Code	Comment Summary	Response
	G-2.4	<p>The data sets used to develop the plan were insufficient, disjointed, outdated, incomplete, and fail to establish comprehensive linkages over time. There was not a sufficient understanding of mercury (total) and methylmercury sources and fate.</p>	<p>Similar to Comment N-2.12, this comment relates to matters (i.e., remedy selection) outside the scope of the present comment period on the Consent Decree, draft ESD, and Siting Evaluation for the SCA. However, NYSDEC provides the following response as part of its continuing commitment to be responsive to the public regarding comments and questions regarding the remedial program for Onondaga Lake.</p> <p>As is noted in the ROD, during the RI process from 1992 through 2002, over 6,000 samples were collected and analyzed for contaminants including metals, volatile organic compounds (VOCs), semivolatile organic compounds (SVOCs), PCBs, dioxins, and pesticides. These data were assessed in the RI (TAMS, 2002c) in the context of historical data (including those presented in Effler, 1996, NYSDEC long-term fish monitoring, aerial photographs, and other technical documents dating back to the 1940s). These data and analyses resulted in the construction of a conceptual site model, quantification of the mercury loads for various sources, and a mercury mass balance for the stratified period for Onondaga Lake (see Chapter 6 of the RI and responses to Technical Comments #14 and 17 in the ROD's Responsiveness Summary* [NYSDEC, EPA, and TAMS/Earth Tech, 2005]).</p> <p>To further examine the potential changes in fish concentrations after implementation of the selected remedy, an assessment of the potential concentrations of methylmercury in the media that the fish would be exposed to (water and food) after remediation was conducted during development of the Proposed Plan and ROD (see responses to Technical Comments #15 and 16). The full responses are included in the ROD's Responsiveness Summary* and are not repeated herein.</p>

**Onondaga Lake Consent Decree, ESD, and SCA Siting Report Responsiveness Summary  
Comment and Response Index**

Name/Agency	Comment Code	Comment Summary	Response
	G-2.5	A comprehensive monitoring program, designed to identify success or failure of the program, is needed and should be conducted by an independent party.	<p>Similar to Comment N-2.12, this comment relates to matters (i.e., remedy selection) outside the scope of the present comment period on the Consent Decree, draft ESD, and Siting Evaluation for the SCA. However, NYSDEC provides the following response as part of its continuing commitment to be responsive to the public regarding comments and questions regarding the remedial program for Onondaga Lake.</p> <p>As is discussed in the response to Frequent Comment #4 in the ROD's Responsiveness Summary*, the development and implementation of a monitoring program for various site media (e.g., sediment, water, and biota) is required in the ROD and would begin as soon as practicable. The monitoring will be designed to serve as the baseline against which remedy performance can be measured. Sampling and analysis of fish will be a critical part of the monitoring program.</p> <p>As is noted in the ROD's Responsiveness Summary*, the monitoring program will be overseen by NYSDEC as part of the Superfund process. However, since NYSDEC is aware that numerous experts in the field are already conducting monitoring of the lake under various programs and exploring the development of models for Onondaga Lake, the Superfund monitoring program will consider the possibility of using the existing programs and expertise.</p>

**Onondaga Lake Consent Decree, ESD, and SCA Siting Report Responsiveness Summary  
Comment and Response Index**

Name/Agency	Comment Code	Comment Summary	Response
	G-2.6	A goal of the remedy should be the establishment of a cold-water fishery that should be edible, absent of atmospheric inputs to the system.	<p>Similar to Comment N-2.12, this comment relates to matters (i.e., remedy selection) outside the scope of the present comment period on the Consent Decree, draft ESD, and Siting Evaluation for the SCA. However, NYSDEC provides the following response as part of its continuing commitment to be responsive to the public regarding comments and questions regarding the remedial program for Onondaga Lake.</p> <p>As is discussed in the response to Frequent Comment #15 in the ROD's Responsiveness Summary*, the focus of a CERCLA-based remediation is to address releases of hazardous substances consistent with the NCP. There are programs, such as those administered by the Onondaga Lake Partnership (OLP), to improve fisheries in the lake that are unrelated to NYSDEC and EPA's program for addressing hazardous substances in the lake under CERCLA. Nonetheless, changes that may take place in the lake due to the remediation, as well as the long-term monitoring program, may provide additional information relevant to the feasibility of fishery improvements under other programs. During the remedial design, there will be coordination with the OLP, to the extent appropriate, consistent with CERCLA and the NCP. Also see response to comment G-3.3.</p>

**Onondaga Lake Consent Decree, ESD, and SCA Siting Report Responsiveness Summary  
Comment and Response Index**

Name/Agency	Comment Code	Comment Summary	Response
Les Monostory, President, Onondaga County Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs	G-3.1	The Onondaga County Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs supports the cleanup plan for the lake sediments and its goals.	Comment noted.
	G-3.2	The major problem that remains to be resolved is the cleanup of the lake bottom as well as lower Geddes Brook and Ninemile Creek, and the wastebeds/upland sites.	<p>Similar to Comment N-2.12, this comment relates to matters (i.e., remedy selection) outside the scope of the present comment period on the Consent Decree, draft ESD, and Siting Evaluation for the SCA. However, NYSDEC provides the following response as part of its continuing commitment to be responsive to the public regarding comments and questions regarding the remedial program for Onondaga Lake.</p> <p>The components of the remedy for Onondaga Lake are outlined in the Onondaga Lake ROD. Also, as is discussed in the response to Frequent Comment #5 in the ROD's Responsiveness Summary*, considerable progress has been made in addressing the historic contamination at the upland sites. NYSDEC is committed to completing remediation at these upland sites in a timely manner in order to expedite the remediation of Onondaga Lake. Geddes Brook and Ninemile Creek, will be addressed under a separate ROD(s).</p>

**Onondaga Lake Consent Decree, ESD, and SCA Siting Report Responsiveness Summary  
Comment and Response Index**

Name/Agency	Comment Code	Comment Summary	Response
	G-3.3	The commentor states that, "An important feature of the cleanup plan is that the Consent Decree has in place standards to be met, rather than dollar figures, for attainment of future fish and sediment target levels."	<p>Similar to Comment N-2.12, this comment relates to matters (i.e., remedy selection) outside the scope of the present comment period on the Consent Decree, draft ESD, and Siting Evaluation for the SCA. However, NYSDEC provides the following response as part of its continuing commitment to be responsive to the public regarding comments and questions regarding the remedial program for Onondaga Lake.</p> <p>As is noted in the response to Comment N-2.10, the selected remedy addresses all areas of the lake where the surface sediments exceed a mean probable effect concentration quotient (PECQ) of 1 or a mercury PEC of 2.2 mg/kg. The selected remedy will also attain a 0.8 mg/kg BSQV for mercury on an area-wide basis. The appropriate areas, within the lake, for applying the BSQV will be determined during the remedial design. The selected remedy is also intended to achieve lakewide fish tissue mercury concentrations ranging from 0.14 mg/kg, which is for protection of ecological receptors, to 0.3 mg/kg, which is based on EPA's methylmercury National Recommended Water Quality criterion for the protection of human health for the consumption of organisms. The description of the selected remedy in the ROD is based on performance of required technical aspects of the design, implementation, and monitoring of the remedy. It is correct that Honeywell's obligation is to perform these actions to meet the remedial goals, not to spend a specific amount of money.</p>
	G-3.4	The Sportsmen's Federation supports the process of developing a monitoring plan and plans on playing an oversight role during remediation and monitoring.	Comment noted. See response to Comment G-1.2.

**Onondaga Lake Consent Decree, ESD, and SCA Siting Report Responsiveness Summary  
Comment and Response Index**

Name/Agency	Comment Code	Comment Summary	Response
Peter W. Plumley, Milton J. Rubenstein Museum of Science & Technology and Syracuse University	G-4.1	The commentor supports the plan and looks forward to the lake's healing progress.	Comment noted.
Samuel H. Sage, President, Atlantic States Legal Foundation, Inc.	G-5.1	The commentor states, "Atlantic States Legal Foundation, Inc. submitted comments on the ROD in 2005. At this point we would reiterate the points made then. We urge that the projects and procedures described in the ROD and these three documents be finalized, as appropriate, and submitted to the court forthwith. All of us deserve as expedited implementation as possible."	Comment noted. Please also see the response to Comment R-1.2.
	G-5.2	The commentor hopes that, "implementation can happen with full cooperation of the parties and full disclosure to and involvement of the public." In addition the commentor believes that ASLF "should be involved at every step and should be part of the team developing the work plan and public participation plan for carrying out this project."	Please see the response to Comments N-2.9 and R-2.2.

**Onondaga Lake Consent Decree, ESD, and SCA Siting Report Responsiveness Summary  
Comment and Response Index**

Name/Agency	Comment Code	Comment Summary	Response
	G-5.3	The commentor states that, "...the constant mention of a "price" for the implementation of this program has been interpreted in many quarters as a "penalty," rather than what it is as an estimated cost for what is thought to be the necessary amount of resources Honeywell will have to expend in implementation. The public is not being adequately made aware that under Superfund, the clean-up is performance based, i.e. to protect human health and the environment, and so the ultimate success or failure of this clean will be measured by continued monitoring of results after completion of construction and not by the expenditure of any set amount of money. If the plan envisioned by the ROD does not work, then Honeywell must do it over until it does work. The necessary expense in re-doing this clean-up falls on Honeywell's shoulders and could make the final expenditure much greater than the estimated number."	NYSDEC will generate future fact sheets and presentations, associated with the remediation of Onondaga Lake, such that the information presented is clear to the public, as well as accurate.
	G-5.4	The commentor states, "Atlantic States Legal Foundation, Inc. has pledged its cooperation both to the State and to Honeywell in making sure that correct, understandable, and adequate information flows to the public. That cooperation and involvement should start immediately - it should not have to wait for an approved work plan."	NYSDEC recognizes the importance of ASLF to the Onondaga Lake community and will continue our on-going dialogue with ASLF as the Onondaga Lake remedial design process proceeds. Please also see the responses to Comments N-2.9, R-2.2, and G-5.5.

**Onondaga Lake Consent Decree, ESD, and SCA Siting Report Responsiveness Summary  
Comment and Response Index**

Name/Agency	Comment Code	Comment Summary	Response
	G-5.5	The commentor states that, "The CO should spell out in details that all document submitted under this CO should be placed in the various document repositories or at least to the three that are the most complete. This must also include all document mentioned in the CO."	Please note that the legal agreement for implementing the remedy is a Consent Decree (not a Consent Order [CO]). Pursuant to Paragraph 84 of the Consent Decree, Honeywell will send all approved documents to six document repositories for Onondaga Lake. In addition, the various technical documents mentioned in the consent decree will be placed in the document repositories. A modification of the Consent Decree is not necessary to address this comment.
	G-5.6	The commentor states, "We realize that a detailed public participation plan is yet to be written and is one of the first tasks after completion of a work plan. We would urge that the CO be amended to include ASLF as the EPA designated TAG agency and that there is a role for ASLF in drafting this plan and in its implementation."	As part of NYSDEC's on-going dialogue with ASLF, NYSDEC will meet with ASLF to discuss the public participation plan prior to the plan being finalized. A modification of the Consent Decree is not necessary to address this comment.
	G-5.7	The commentor states, "Throughout the Onondaga Lake remediation and clean-up process there have not been any end goals except for meeting regulatory requirements." The commentor also states, "The modifications spelled out in the ESD will require changes in habitat. The goals for the direction and desirable outcomes of these changes should be set by the public under the direction of the DEC."	Please see the responses to Comments N-2.9 and R-2.2.



**Onondaga Lake Consent Decree, ESD, and SCA Siting Report Responsiveness Summary  
Comment and Response Index**

Name/Agency	Comment Code	Comment Summary	Response
	G-5.8	The remedy should be designed to ensure that the two newly found endangered plant species in the lake are protected.	<p>Similar to Comment N-2.12, this comment relates to matters (i.e., remedy selection) outside the scope of the present comment period on the Consent Decree, draft ESD, and Siting Evaluation for the SCA. However, NYSDEC provides the following response as part of its continuing commitment to be responsive to the public regarding comments and questions regarding the remedial program for Onondaga Lake.</p> <p>The ROD was based on the information available at the time it was written. It was recognized at that time that additional information on the lake habitat would be required during remedial design. This can be seen in the text from the ROD (pages 78 and 79) describing the selected remedy, which indicates that the design phase of the process will address habitat issues in sample collection, design, and construction, including the development of and adherence to a lakewide habitat restoration plan.</p> <p>Information on these newly found plant species will be reviewed by NYSDEC during the remedial design to determine if they are found in areas where dredging and/or capping will take place, and if so, what steps need to be taken to minimize impacts to these endangered plant species.</p>
	G-5.9	Are there concerns with any by products from the potential decomposition of the steel or the epoxy coating of the barrier wall?	NYSDEC is not aware of any information that would give rise to these referenced concerns. Coated sheet pile walls are not only a common technology for barrier walls but sheet piling is used extensively for bulkhead walls on fresh and sea water. These have been used throughout the United States.

**Onondaga Lake Consent Decree, ESD, and SCA Siting Report Responsiveness Summary  
Comment and Response Index**

Name/Agency	Comment Code	Comment Summary	Response
	G-5.10	A mitigation plan must be developed to address the loss of lake surface area due to the changes detailed in the ESD. The plan should be subject to public discussion before final approval.	<p>NYSDEC recognizes that the proposed change in the remedy as it pertains to the pooled NAPL removal will cause a loss of lake surface area that will need to be mitigated. The draft ESD states that "As compensatory mitigation for the loss of aquatic habitat resulting from placement of the barrier wall, existing upland area adjacent to Onondaga Lake will be converted to new aquatic habitat. The design document for remediation of SMU 2, and the adjacent area in SMU 1, will include specifications for the construction of a natural shoreline lakeward of the barrier wall that is consistent with the lakewide habitat restoration plan ('Remedial Design Elements for Habitat Restoration document'). " The location and nature of the compensatory mitigation will be determined during design.</p> <p>The mitigation plan will be available for public review and comment prior to final approval, as required by the regulatory programs implemented by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act.</p> <p>Please also see the response to Comments N-2.9 and R-2.2.</p>
	G-5.11	The commentor asks, "Do the changes enumerated in the ESD change the time line from the ROD?"	The changes reflected in the draft ESD would not influence the timeline outlined in the ROD.
	G-5.12	The commentor states, "There should be public involvement in the design phase of the project. Honeywell and NYSDEC should develop a plan for getting input before detailed design commences and then keep the public informed as the design progresses. We realize that a public participation plan is being drafted and is the second item after the overall work plan. However, we are also aware that some design work is now ongoing and so efforts are needed immediately to get this part of the public involvement plan launched."	Please see the responses to Comments N-2.9, R-2.2, and G-5.2.

**Onondaga Lake Consent Decree, ESD, and SCA Siting Report Responsiveness Summary  
Comment and Response Index**

Name/Agency	Comment Code	Comment Summary	Response
	G-5.13	Does moving the barrier wall into the lake change any of the permitting requirements? "For example, does Honeywell need to apply to the Army Corps of Engineers for dredge and fill permit (404) or a Section 10 permit?"	Although Honeywell will not need to obtain federal dredge and fill permits, the modified remedy will be performed in conformance with the substantive requirements of regulatory programs implemented by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act. The remedy will utilize best management practices to ensure the utmost protection to the aquatic resource during construction operations and as part of the proposed reestablishment of habitat.
	G-5.14	The commentator states, "Atlantic States Legal Foundation, Inc. finds nothing of concern with this SCA. We have one question that relates to the entire wastebed area. While the clean-up of the Onondaga Lake sediments is being carried out and material is being transported into wastebed 13, will this necessitate any restrictions on what is being done on the other wastebeds and on future considerations of their use?"	While this comment relates to matters (i.e., remedy selection) outside the scope of the present comment period on the Consent Decree, the scope of work (SOW), or the Explanation of Significant Difference (ESD), NYSDEC provides the following response as part of its continuing commitment to be responsive to the public regarding comments and questions regarding the remedial program for Onondaga Lake. Please see the section entitled "Summary of Public Comments" of the Responsiveness Summary for more information.  Long-term future impacts on nearby wastebeds, from the construction/operation/closure of the SCA on Wastebed 13 are not anticipated.
Carol Sweet, President, Friends of Historic Onondaga Lake	G-6.1	The Friends of Historic Onondaga Lake support the plan.	Comment noted.

**Onondaga Lake Consent Decree, ESD, and SCA Siting Report Responsiveness Summary  
Comment and Response Index**

Name/Agency	Comment Code	Comment Summary	Response
<b>Public (Individual) Comments</b>			
James V. Breuer	P-1.1	The commentor supports the plan and looks forward to continued progress.	Comment noted.
Edna Carr	P-2.1	More should be done to clean up Onondaga Lake. The current proposal from NYSDEC and Honeywell is a "quick fix" and should be refused. The lake would be more costly to fix later.	<p>Similar to Comment N-2.12, this comment relates to matters (i.e., remedy selection) outside the scope of the present comment period on the Consent Decree, draft ESD, and Siting Evaluation for the SCA. However, NYSDEC provides the following response as part of its continuing commitment to be responsive to the public regarding comments and questions regarding the remedial program for Onondaga Lake.</p> <p>As discussed in the response to Frequent Comment #6 in the ROD's Responsiveness Summary*, consistent with EPA's guidance for conducting remedial investigations and feasibility studies (RI/FSs) under CERCLA and the NCP, the time needed to implement the remedy (which relates to implementability and short-term effectiveness) and its cost must be considered as part of a nine-criteria evaluation. Based on NYSDEC's and EPA's evaluation of these criteria, the selected alternative provides the best balance of tradeoffs among the remedial alternatives with respect to the NCP's evaluation criteria. In addition, because this remedy will result in hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants remaining on-site above levels that allow for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure, a statutory five-year review will be conducted within five years after initiation of remedial action. The five-year reviews will formally evaluate the results from monitoring programs established as part of this remedy to ensure that the remedy remains protective of human health and the environment.</p>

**Onondaga Lake Consent Decree, ESD, and SCA Siting Report Responsiveness Summary  
Comment and Response Index**

Name/Agency	Comment Code	Comment Summary	Response
Joseph Francis	P-3.1	Dredging will only spread the contamination. The commentor suggests that instead of dredging, the lake should be drained, contaminated sediments should be removed in the dry, treated and disposed, and the lake bed covered with sand.	<p>Similar to Comment N-2.12, this comment relates to matters (i.e., remedy selection) outside the scope of the present comment period on the Consent Decree, draft ESD, and Siting Evaluation for the SCA. However, NYSDEC provides the following response as part of its continuing commitment to be responsive to the public regarding comments and questions regarding the remedial program for Onondaga Lake.</p> <p>Please see the response to Comment P-2.1.</p> <p>Hydraulic dredging with proper engineering controls is expected to have relatively few problems in terms of resuspension and spreading of contamination. As is discussed in the response to Frequent Comment #7 in the ROD's Responsiveness Summary*, dredging has the potential to present short-term water quality impacts. The disturbance of bottom sediments by dredging would result in increases in the levels of some suspended solids in the lake near the area of dredging. However, modern environmental dredges are relatively precise machines that can carefully remove targeted sediments without excessive disturbance of the lake bottom. Thus, it is expected that only a small fraction of the material dredged will actually enter the water column and that much of this material will settle in the immediate work area and will, as a result, be removed by continuing dredging operations. The remaining dredged material that does not quickly settle to the bottom within the work zone will be contained with a silt curtain that will encircle the work zone.</p> <p>In addition, considerable monitoring will occur during both dredging and capping operations. Should it be determined that unacceptable levels of suspended sediments are being generated by dredging operations, there will be an opportunity to modify operations so as to reduce those levels. Possible actions that could be taken in this regard include slowing down the rate of sediment removal, changes</p>

**Onondaga Lake Consent Decree, ESD, and SCA Siting Report Responsiveness Summary  
Comment and Response Index**

Name/Agency	Comment Code	Comment Summary	Response
	P-3.1 (cont.)		<p>to the depth of the dredge cut, and modifications to the movement of the dredge equipment.</p> <p>The draining of the lake was not directly considered in the FS and ROD. However, the large impacts on the lake habitat caused by draining the lake and regulatory issues would preclude this suggested alternative. Due to improvements at the Metro plant and closure of the Honeywell facilities, a large number of fish, zooplankton, and macrophytes have returned to the lake. See also the response to Frequent Comment #2 in the ROD's Responsiveness Summary*.</p>
Wendy Harris	P-4.1	The commentor states, "Simply, I believe that the settlement and clean up plan proposed is a disgrace and a hazard to all future life in and around the lake."	Please see the responses to Comments P-2.1, N-2.3, and G-2.1.

**Onondaga Lake Consent Decree, ESD, and SCA Siting Report Responsiveness Summary  
Comment and Response Index**

Name/Agency	Comment Code	Comment Summary	Response
	P-4.2	<p>"The proposed cleanup/cover-up would leave Onondaga Lake with mercury levels 1,400 times the safe exposure level. The proposed cleanup would leave the PHH1 levels in excess of 22,000 times the safe level, 1,300 times the safe level of benzene. All of the lake pollutants post-remediation levels far exceed safe exposure and the law."</p>	<p>While this comment relates to matters (i.e., remedy selection) outside the scope of the present comment period on the Consent Decree, the draft ESD, and the SCA Siting Evaluation. However, NYSDEC provides the following response as part of its continuing commitment to be responsive to the public regarding comments and questions regarding the remedial program for Onondaga Lake.</p> <p>It appears that the cap threshold values (CTVs) presented in the Proposed Plan were misinterpreted by the commentor. The CTVs should not be confused with the derivation of the cleanup levels for sediments. As is discussed in the ROD and Responsiveness Summary*, the mean PECQ of 1 was determined to be protective and was used along with exceedances of the mercury PEC of 2.2 mg/kg as the cleanup values in five of the six action alternatives in the Proposed Plan and ROD, including the selected alternative. The CTVs for hot-spot dredging were developed by NYSDEC and are based on the isolation cap model predictions using a higher groundwater upwelling rate than what Honeywell used in the FS report. These values (described on pages 45 to 46 of the ROD) represent the maximum concentrations that could be present in the wastes/sediments and not cause failure of a cap with a 2.5-foot-thick isolation layer assuming an upwelling rate of 2.4 inches/year (6 centimeters/year). The hot spots are defined as those wastes/sediments that contain select CPOs (based on their presence at significantly elevated concentrations in the ILWD materials and/or compounds to which the cap model was most sensitive) above the threshold concentrations (CTVs). It is important to note that based on existing sediment data from the RI/FS, only chlorobenzene, dichlorobenzenes, and xylenes exceed their respective cap threshold values in the ILWD. Following removal, an isolation cap would be placed. The CTVs do not represent residual concentrations in surface sediments. The highest values to be expected at the top of the cap will be below the individual PECs for each compound evaluated in the cap modeling.</p>

**Onondaga Lake Consent Decree, ESD, and SCA Siting Report Responsiveness Summary  
Comment and Response Index**

Name/Agency	Comment Code	Comment Summary	Response
	P-4.3	The commentor states, "The proposed remediation has no milestones by which citizens could measure progress in eliminating toxic hazards, it is literally a cover-up."	See response to comment R-2.3.



**Onondaga Lake Consent Decree, ESD, and SCA Siting Report Responsiveness Summary  
Comment and Response Index**

Name/Agency	Comment Code	Comment Summary	Response
	P-4.4	<p>The commentator states that, "Our county executive rightly points out that if we dredged the lake we would only create a problem for people wherever we dumped the waste. Our county executive rightly points out that the costs would be prohibitive if we were expected to restore Onondaga Lake to the standard of the law. And, both of these realities should suggest that the rest of our environmental history is doomed if we do not take a stand here. Albert Einstein said that we can not solve the problem with the same mind that created the problem. The County executive is of the old mindset, the Onondaga Nation and their land claim lawsuit is of the new mindset. I believe we have to change the law and require every viable corporation who ever soiled this lake, share proportional responsibility it the lakes cleanup based on their share of its problem. The city and county governments must be held responsible for their failure to manage water overflow and human waste treatment problems. Citizens must also be willing to dig deep to do what is right - remediate this lake in a way that will communicate to all current and future polluters, that we no longer will tolerate such wonton exploitation of our environment. Maybe Syracuse could become the leader in environmental toxic awareness, spear heading a national debate on consequences of our lifestyle, corporate responsibility, and environmental stewardship. Maybe we could turn this in to positive for our city and region.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Please see the response to Comment P-2.1.</p>

**Onondaga Lake Consent Decree, ESD, and SCA Siting Report Responsiveness Summary  
Comment and Response Index**

Name/Agency	Comment Code	Comment Summary	Response
	P-4.4 (cont.)	<p>We as a people have become complacent and hopeless about anything but money and big business speaking. Please consider the voice of Mother Earth, please do the right thing for your grandchildren seven generations out and beyond.</p> <p>I am simply a citizen, with no particular affiliations, that believes that this is a tragically inadequate plan of a so-called clean up. It provides near term political cover for our "leaders" to have appeared to have done something, when in reality all they did was place a 'band aide' on a festering ill with the hope that it stays contained. Shame on all of us for considering this a real solution. Shame on us for passing the true burden to our children and ignoring any real call to responsible action."</p>	
Donald Lovejoy	P-5.1	The commentor states, "Personally I would like to see the lake cleaned and put to good use. However, according to the article I read on the WTVH.com site, the proposed method of cleaning the lake is not the solution to keeping it clean. In fact the article suggested that in 50 years we will have the same problem and I for one will still be around to deal with that issue."	Please see the responses to Comments P-2.1, N-2.3, and G-2.1.
	P-5.2	The commentor states, "The other reason I would be against the project is the \$451 million. That just seems like an awful lot of money that could be put to a use that is guaranteed to raise our standard of living in the Syracuse area."	Please see the response to Comment P-2.1. NYSDEC is responsible for investigating and, as appropriate, remediating hazardous waste sites located throughout New York State. Onondaga Lake, although a hazardous waste site, is also a valuable natural resource that is and will continue to be utilized by the people of New York State. By remediating Onondaga Lake, NYSDEC will be improving this valuable resource.

**Onondaga Lake Consent Decree, ESD, and SCA Siting Report Responsiveness Summary  
Comment and Response Index**

Name/Agency	Comment Code	Comment Summary	Response
Verne N. Rockcastle	P-6.1	The commentor supports the oral comments by Lindsay Speer.	See the responses to Comments O-13.1 through O-13.3, below.
Bob Walker	P-7.1	The commentor provides suggestions to NYSDEC for restoring the lake environment, including cleaning up debris along the shoreline, planting of native trees and shrubs, and allowing easier access for non-powered boats, among others.	<p>The improvement of the lake and shoreline habitat is an important aspect of the remediation of Onondaga Lake. As is noted in the ROD on page 42, because of the importance of Onondaga Lake as a natural resource, and to ensure that the remedy complies with NYSDEC regulations, the protection of habitat through remediation and restoration was an important consideration in the development of the various capping and dredging alternatives. Throughout the analysis of the various alternatives, the goal of reestablishing productive aquatic habitat in the lake was considered along with the need to provide an effective and permanent remedy to the adverse impacts of contamination on the fish and wildlife resources of the lake. Accordingly, a lakewide habitat restoration plan will be required as part of the remedial design.</p> <p>The commentor's suggestions will be considered during the development of the lakewide habitat restoration plan during design.</p>
<b>Oral Comments</b> (NOTE: These oral comments were given at the October 19, 2006 public meeting. They have been summarized from the meeting's transcript, and are presented in the order they were received.)			
Bob Czaplicki, Supervisor, Town of Geddes	O-1.1	The commentor supports the plan.	Comment noted.
Jim Farrell, Onondaga County Legislator	O-2.1	The commentor supports the plan.	Comment noted.
Jeff Freedman, Onondaga Yacht Club	O-3.1	The commentor supports the plan.	Comment noted.
	O-3.2	The commentor is pleased with the interactions with the NYSDEC.	Comment noted.
	O-3.3	This critical phase of removing toxins should begin as expeditiously as possible.	See the response to Comment R-1.2, above.

**Onondaga Lake Consent Decree, ESD, and SCA Siting Report Responsiveness Summary  
Comment and Response Index**

Name/Agency	Comment Code	Comment Summary	Response
	O-3.4	The remediation should provide for plant-free zones to promote access for boating, especially near the marina.	The area near the marina is not currently proposed for direct remediation for CERCLA-defined hazardous substances. However, this issue will be considered during the development of the lakewide habitat restoration plan, as was discussed in response to Comment O-10.3 in the ROD's Responsiveness Summary*.
	O-3.5	Underwater obstructions to navigation should be removed or marked.	Although it is not envisioned that the remediation of Onondaga Lake will result in the creation of any underwater obstructions, if such obstructions are created or encountered in areas of the lake that are remediated, such obstructions will be addressed. With respect to underwater obstructions that exist in areas that will not be remediated, NYSDEC does not have the authority to require Honeywell to remove or mark such obstructions.
	O-3.6	"Third, regarding the newly proposed containment wall, to be constructed on the lake, we support the idea that a natural shoreline appearance be restored after the work is completed, rather than leaving a bulkheaded structure. The natural appearance of Onondaga Lake, in our view, as surrounded by the county park, is one of the lake's greatest assets, and is well worthy of preservation and restoration."	Comment noted.
	O-3.7	The commentator supports the plan and urges that the remediation begin as expeditiously as possible.	Comment noted. See also the response to Comment R-1.2, above.
Bill Pease, Onondaga Yacht Club	O-4.1	The commentator supports the plan.	Comment noted.

**Onondaga Lake Consent Decree, ESD, and SCA Siting Report Responsiveness Summary  
Comment and Response Index**

Name/Agency	Comment Code	Comment Summary	Response
Thane Joyal, Onondaga Nation	O-5.1	<p>"The three documents that New York State Department of Environmental Conservation has presented for public comment are very important and they represent separate steps in the process, required by CERCLA. At the outset, we are deeply concerned that the draft consent decree incorporates, by reference, the as yet unfinalized E.S.D. This is yet another reminder that public comment, from NYSDEC's perspective is a meaningless waiting period that must pass before they can move forward with the plan.</p> <p>As the Nation has repeated on countless occasions, meaningful comment and meaningful consultation requires an exchange of ideas before a final decision is made. We deeply regret the NYSDEC's continued efforts to steamroll this project forward."</p>	<p>NYSDEC relies on public input to ensure that the concerns of the community are considered in making important decisions at sites requiring remediation. That is why the draft ESD (along with the proposed Consent Decree and other related documents) were issued for public comment in October.</p> <p>Please also see the responses to Comments N-1.5, N-2.9, and R-2.2.</p>

**Onondaga Lake Consent Decree, ESD, and SCA Siting Report Responsiveness Summary  
Comment and Response Index**

Name/Agency	Comment Code	Comment Summary	Response
	O-5.2	The selected plan will leave contaminants at levels significantly higher than NYSDEC's own safe levels and the lake will remain a Superfund site.	<p>Similar to Comment N-2.12, this comment relates to matters (i.e., remedy selection) outside the scope of the present comment period on the Consent Decree, draft ESD, and Siting Evaluation for the SCA. However, NYSDEC provides the following response as part of its continuing commitment to be responsive to the public regarding comments and questions regarding the remedial program for Onondaga Lake.</p> <p>While the selected plan will leave concentrations of contaminants in deep sediments of the lake, these residual contaminants would not be exposed to the environment. As is discussed in responses to Comments G-3.3 and P-4.2 above, the cleanup values of a mean PECQ of 1, the mercury PEC of 2.2 mg/kg, and the mercury BSQV of 0.8 mg/kg (applied on an area-wide basis) are the maximum concentrations of CPOIs that will be left exposed in the surface sediments. Any areas exceeding these values will be remediated.</p> <p>In those areas in the littoral zone to be remediated (through a combination of dredging and capping), an engineered cap using clean material will be applied. Modeling of the cap effectiveness is expected to determine how thick the cap must be to preclude exceedances of the cleanup values for the lake. As is discussed in response to Comment P-4.2, above, cap threshold values were calculated on more conservative criteria and represent the maximum concentrations that would be allowed to remain under the cap, without additional remedial actions. Monitoring will be implemented to ensure that the contaminants under the cap will be isolated from the lake environment. The contaminants (primarily mercury) in the majority of the profundal zone sediments are predicted to be naturally isolated from the environment due to on-going sedimentation burying the more contaminated sediments with cleaner sediment.</p>

**Onondaga Lake Consent Decree, ESD, and SCA Siting Report Responsiveness Summary  
Comment and Response Index**

Name/Agency	Comment Code	Comment Summary	Response
	O-5.2 (cont.)		<p>As is noted in the ROD on page 81, because this remedy would result in contaminants remaining on-site above levels that allow for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure to site media, CERCLA requires that the site be reviewed at least once every five years. The five-year review will formally evaluate the results from monitoring programs established as part of this remedy to ensure that the remedy remains protective of human health and the environment.</p>
	O-5.3	<p>What is the benefit of this plan? The selected plan means that the lake will be contaminated into the future.</p>	<p>Similar to Comment N-2.12, this comment relates to matters (i.e., remedy selection) outside the scope of the present comment period on the Consent Decree, draft ESD, and Siting Evaluation for the SCA. However, NYSDEC provides the following response as part of its continuing commitment to be responsive to the public regarding comments and questions regarding the remedial program for Onondaga Lake.</p> <p>As is discussed in the ROD, the selected remedy addresses all areas of the lake where the surface sediments exceed a mean PECQ of 1 or a mercury PEC of 2.2 mg/kg. The selected remedy will also attain a 0.8 mg/kg BSQV for mercury on an area-wide basis. The appropriate areas, within the lake, for applying the BSQV will be determined during the remedial design. The selected remedy is also intended to achieve lakewide fish tissue mercury concentrations ranging from 0.14 mg/kg, which is for protection of ecological receptors, to 0.3 mg/kg, which is based on EPA's methylmercury National Recommended Water Quality criterion for the protection of human health for the consumption of organisms.</p> <p>The intended benefits or outcome of the selected plan is that the contamination currently in the lake sediments or flowing into the lake would be removed or isolated and no longer interact with the environment. In order to demonstrate this result, a long-term monitoring program will be instituted, and a formal evaluation of the data will be conducted every five years (based on annual reviews of the data). See also the response to Comment O-5.2, above.</p>

**Onondaga Lake Consent Decree, ESD, and SCA Siting Report Responsiveness Summary  
Comment and Response Index**

Name/Agency	Comment Code	Comment Summary	Response
	O-5.4	The revision to the remedy is a fundamental change to the ROD.	<p>NYSDEC and EPA determined that the revision to the selected remedy in the July 1, 2005 Lake Bottom ROD is a significant, rather than a fundamental change for the following two reasons.</p> <p>First, the principal components of the remedy (i.e., dredging and isolation capping in the littoral zone to prevent loss of lake surface area, for erosion protection and to reestablish habitat, and to remove sediments and/or wastes from the portion of the in-lake-waste-deposit ["ILWD"], and thin-layer capping and the performance of an oxygenation pilot in the profundal zone to reduce contaminant concentrations in the upper layer of sediments and to reduce the formation of methylmercury in the water column) have not been fundamentally changed. As remedies progress from the selection of the remedy in a ROD to the design of the remedy, changes are often made to reflect additional information obtained as part of the design process. Here, the remedy as proposed to be modified by the ESD still focuses on dredging and isolation capping in the littoral zone, but also responds to pre-design data indicating that the extent of pooled NAPL is significantly less than had been estimated in the ROD. While, as contemplated in the draft ESD, there would be the loss of approximately two acres of aquatic habitat in the lake in the Sediment Management Unit ("SMU") 2 causeway area and a small adjacent area of SMU 1 due to the isolation of contamination behind a barrier wall coupled with NAPL removal by extraction wells, as opposed to the dredging in this area as was envisioned in the ROD; under the draft ESD, replacement of the lost aquatic habitat would be implemented in an upland area adjacent to the lake to mitigate for the loss. The remedy, as proposed to be modified with the draft ESD would still require the capture and treatment of the pooled NAPLs as a significant component of the remedy. Pursuant to the draft ESD, pooled NAPLs would be collected by extraction wells as opposed to dredging. The treatment of collected NAPLs off-site would not change under the draft ESD.</p>



**Onondaga Lake Consent Decree, ESD, and SCA Siting Report Responsiveness Summary  
Comment and Response Index**

Name/Agency	Comment Code	Comment Summary	Response
	O-5.4 (cont.)		Secondly, based on information obtained during the preliminary design investigation on the extent of pooled NAPLs present in the lake, the change in the volume of sediments to be dredged from the lake is a small percentage relative to the total volume (i.e., approximately 6 percent <sup>1</sup> ). It should also be noted that while the change to the remedy would be addressed via an ESD rather than an amended ROD, the principal administrative and public participation requirements associated with the issuance of an amended ROD (e.g., 30-day public comment period following the release of the notice of the change, the holding of a public meeting, and the generation of a Responsiveness Summary following receipt and review of public comments) are being conducted.
Susan Hammond	O-6.1	With respect to background information, site history, extent of contamination, health effects, and the inclusion of seven alternatives, the ROD was a wonderful document.	Comment noted.

<sup>1</sup> The total volume of sediment originally to be dredged, pursuant to the ROD, was an estimated 2,653,000 cubic yards (cy). The volume behind the proposed barrier wall location, which would no longer be dredged pursuant to the proposed ESD, is an estimated 157,000 cy or approximately 6 percent of the total ROD volume.

**Onondaga Lake Consent Decree, ESD, and SCA Siting Report Responsiveness Summary  
Comment and Response Index**

Name/Agency	Comment Code	Comment Summary	Response
	O-6.2	Was there a change in the selected remedy that was in the Proposed Plan after the public comments?	<p>Similar to Comment N-2.12, this comment relates to matters (i.e., remedy selection) outside the scope of the present comment period on the Consent Decree, draft ESD, and Siting Evaluation for the SCA. However, NYSDEC provides the following response as part of its continuing commitment to be responsive to the public regarding comments and questions regarding the remedial program for Onondaga Lake.</p> <p>The alternative selected in the ROD (Alternative 4) was the same alternative that was proposed in the November 2004 Proposed Plan. NYSDEC reviewed and responded to all public comments, and documented these in the formal Responsiveness Summary* attached to the ROD. During that process, NYSDEC and EPA reassessed numerous aspects of the information presented in the Proposed Plan. The ROD and Responsiveness Summary* provided additional information and analyses beyond what was contained in the Proposed Plan as well as clarification of many points on why Alternative 4 was selected and how that alternative would be implemented. Thus, in the final consideration, the same basic plan (with added clarifications) as was originally proposed in November 2004 was selected as the cleanup plan in the ROD (July 2005).</p>

**Onondaga Lake Consent Decree, ESD, and SCA Siting Report Responsiveness Summary  
Comment and Response Index**

Name/Agency	Comment Code	Comment Summary	Response
	O-6.3	Why was Alternative 7, which was described as providing greater long-term effectiveness, not selected? How is the selected alternative more "cost effective?"	<p>Similar to Comment N-2.12, this comment relates to matters (i.e., remedy selection) outside the scope of the present comment period on the Consent Decree, draft ESD, and Siting Evaluation for the SCA. However, NYSDEC provides the following response as part of its continuing commitment to be responsive to the public regarding comments and questions regarding the remedial program for Onondaga Lake.</p> <p>NYSDEC and EPA determined that the selected alternative provided the best balance of positive benefits for the lake and potential negative impacts on the community. The benefits of this alternative include the removal of up to an estimated 2.65 million cubic yards of contaminated sediments and waste from the lake, isolation of the remaining material from the lake environment, reduction or elimination of the methylation of mercury in the lake, utilization of a barrier wall to prevent contaminated groundwater from entering the lake, and improvement of the habitat throughout large areas of the lake. These actions are predicted to reduce CPOI concentrations in the sediments to levels where toxicity would not be detected and reduce contamination in fish to levels comparable to other waters in the State.</p> <p>Consistent with EPA's guidance for conducting RI/FSs under CERCLA and the NCP, the time needed to implement the remedy (which relates to implementability and short-term effectiveness) and its cost must be considered as part of a nine-criteria evaluation. The considerations included whether the increase in removal for the more costly alternatives would lead to a disruption of the aquatic community in the lake, restrictions on the use of certain areas of the lake, and potential community impacts due to noise, traffic (truck, barge, and train), as well as the span of time in which these potential impacts would occur. In addition, the use of additional land for contaminated sediment disposal must also be considered and evaluated. Balancing the public's desires to see as extensive and permanent a cleanup as possible, along with the public's concerns about the potential impacts, was factored into NYSDEC and EPA's selection of Alternative 4. The</p>

**Onondaga Lake Consent Decree, ESD, and SCA Siting Report Responsiveness Summary  
Comment and Response Index**

<b>Name/Agency</b>	<b>Comment Code</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
	O-6.3 (cont.)		increased demonstrable benefits of Alternatives 6 and 7 were marginal, while the increased environmental costs (impacts) were large. It was this balancing of benefits versus environmental costs (impacts), as well as the construction and operational costs, that was the basis of the selected remedy being "cost effective." .  See also the response to Comment P-2.1 (above) and the response to Frequent Comment #6 in the ROD's Responsiveness Summary*
Sherri Mossotti	O-7.1	The commentor supports the plan.	Comment noted.
Bryan Campbell	O-8.1	The commentor would like to see the continuation of the cleanup.	Comment noted. See also the response to Comment R-1.2, above.
	O-8.2	The Central NY Wild Fowlers is committed to helping with habitat restoration.	Comment noted.
Erin Cunningham	O-9.1	The commentor supports the plan.	Comment noted.
Ms. Furlong	O-10.1	The commentor supports the plan.	Comment noted.
Russ Andrews	O-11.1	The commentor supports the plan.	Comment noted.
Terry Brown, O'Brien & Gere Engineers	O-12.1	NYSDEC and Honeywell should be congratulated on this agreement (consent decree). The commitment of resources for the lake and upland sites is unprecedented.	Comment noted.
	O-12.2	The commentor supports the plan.	Comment noted.
Lindsay Speer	O-13.1	The commentor would like to see Onondaga Lake cleaned up so that it can be an asset to our community.	Comment noted.

**Onondaga Lake Consent Decree, ESD, and SCA Siting Report Responsiveness Summary  
Comment and Response Index**

Name/Agency	Comment Code	Comment Summary	Response
	O-13.2	The plan does not look far enough into the future. There is a time when the engineered constructs will fail.	<p>Similar to Comment N-2.12, this comment relates to matters (i.e., remedy selection) outside the scope of the present comment period on the Consent Decree, draft ESD, and Siting Evaluation for the SCA. However, NYSDEC provides the following response as part of its continuing commitment to be responsive to the public regarding comments and questions regarding the remedial program for Onondaga Lake.</p> <p>As was discussed above in the responses to Comments R-2.6 and P-2.1, the selected plan is intended to remove or isolate the contamination in the lake. The effectiveness of the remedy will be monitored, and the monitoring data will be formally evaluated every five years with respect to the goals identified in the ROD (as dictated by law), and if necessary, changes will be implemented to the remedial plan.</p>
	O-13.3	Hopes that the public is guaranteed a role in commenting on the design phase.	See response to Comment G-5.2.
Bob O'Leary	O-14.1	The commentator wanted to "...thank people for the reference in cleaning up Onondaga Lake."	Comment noted.
Bob O'Leary	O-14.2	The Chargers rowing group will, within the next three months, be coming to the NYSDEC to discuss the number of permits we have to get. We hope NYSDEC will be able to assist us.	Comment noted.

**Onondaga Lake Consent Decree, ESD, and SCA Siting Report Responsiveness Summary  
Comment and Response Index**

Name/Agency	Comment Code	Comment Summary	Response
Casey Cleary-Hammarstedt	O-15.1	To cap what cannot be capped does not make sense. Capping is just hiding the problem.	<p>Similar to Comment N-2.12, this comment relates to matters (i.e., remedy selection) outside the scope of the present comment period on the Consent Decree, draft ESD, and Siting Evaluation for the SCA. However, NYSDEC provides the following response as part of its continuing commitment to be responsive to the public regarding comments and questions regarding the remedial program for Onondaga Lake.</p> <p>See the responses to Comments P-2.1, P-4.2, and O-5.2 above. See also the response to Frequent Comment #6 in the ROD's Responsiveness Summary*.</p>
	O-15.2	What is the outcome of this plan? The selected plan means that the lake will be contaminated into the future.	<p>Similar to Comment N-2.12, this comment relates to matters (i.e., remedy selection) outside the scope of the present comment period on the Consent Decree, draft ESD, and Siting Evaluation for the SCA. However, NYSDEC provides the following response as part of its continuing commitment to be responsive to the public regarding comments and questions regarding the remedial program for Onondaga Lake.</p> <p>See the response to Comment O-5.3 above. The remedy was developed to be protective of the environment and human health, by removing or isolating the contamination currently in the lake, and was determined to be implementable. The remediation of the upland sites under other legal orders will prevent new contamination from entering the lake. As is discussed in the responses to Comments R-2.6, L-2.2, and G-2.5, above, the success of this plan in addressing risks due to hazardous substances will be measured in a long-term monitoring program and the data will be compared to the RAOs and PRGs specified in the ROD, as required by law.</p>

**Onondaga Lake Consent Decree, ESD, and SCA Siting Report Responsiveness Summary  
Comment and Response Index**

Name/Agency	Comment Code	Comment Summary	Response
	O-15.3	A goal of the remediation should be to have fish that are safe to eat.	<p>Similar to Comment N-2.12, this comment relates to matters (i.e., remedy selection) outside the scope of the present comment period on the Consent Decree, draft ESD, and Siting Evaluation for the SCA. However, NYSDEC provides the following response as part of its continuing commitment to be responsive to the public regarding comments and questions regarding the remedial program for Onondaga Lake.</p> <p>The reduction of contamination levels in fish to levels that are protective for human health and fish and wildlife is a major goal of the selected remedy, and is included in the RAOs and PRGs presented in the ROD. As is discussed in the ROD and ROD's Responsiveness Summary* and in the response to Comment G-3.3, above, the selected remedy is intended to achieve lakewide fish tissue mercury concentrations ranging from 0.14 mg/kg, which is for protection of ecological receptors, to 0.3 mg/kg, which is based on EPA's methylmercury National Recommended Water Quality criterion for the protection of human health for the consumption of organisms.</p>
	O-15.4	How can natural recovery be effective with these artificial man-made compounds?	As is discussed in the ROD and response to Technical Comment #10 in the ROD's Responsiveness Summary*, natural recovery can occur through a variety of physical, chemical, and biological processes that act singly or in combination to reduce contaminant concentrations, exposure, or mobility. This process can occur in various media at a site (e.g., water and sediments). In most of the Onondaga Lake profundal zone (SMU 8), the ongoing burial of contaminated sediments with cleaner sediments is the process that will be utilized to isolate contamination (especially mercury) from the rest of the lake habitat.
	O-15.5	What is the endpoint against which to measure the success of the remedial program?	As is discussed in the ROD and in the responses to Comments L-2.2, O-5.3, and O-15.3, above, NYSDEC and EPA have determined that this remedy is protective and will satisfy the goals (RAOs and PRGs) presented in the ROD. An evaluation of the success of the remedy with respect to these goals will be measured in a long-term monitoring program and reassessed every five years.

\* The Responsiveness Summary is available on the internet at <http://www.dec.state.ny.us/website/der/projects/ondlake/responsiveness.pdf> and also at the following document repositories:

Atlantic States Legal Foundation\*  
658 West Onondaga Street  
Syracuse, NY 13204  
Phone: (315) 475-1170  
Please call for hours of availability

Liverpool Public Library  
310 Tulip Street  
Liverpool, NY 13088  
Phone: (315) 457-0310  
Hours: M - Th, 9:00 a.m. - 9:00 p.m.;  
Fri, 9:00 a.m. - 6:00 p.m.;  
Sat, 10:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.;  
Sun, 12:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.

NYSDEC, Region 7\*  
615 Erie Blvd. West  
Syracuse, NY 13204  
Phone: (315) 426-7400  
Hours: M - Fri, 8:30 a.m. - 4:45 p.m.  
Please call for an appointment

Onondaga County Public Library  
Syracuse Branch at the Galleries  
447 South Salina Street  
Syracuse, NY 13204-2400  
Phone: (315) 435-1800  
Hours: M, Th, Fri, Sat, 9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.; Tu, W, 9:00 a.m. - 8:30 p.m.

Moon Library  
SUNY ESF  
1 Forestry Drive  
Syracuse, NY 13210  
Phone: (315) 470-6712  
Hours: check <http://www.esf.edu/moonlib/>

Camillus Town Hall  
4600 West Genesee Street, Room 100  
Syracuse, NY 13219  
Hours: M-Fri, 8:30 a.m. - 4:30 p.m.  
Phone: (315) 488-1234

NYSDEC\*  
625 Broadway  
Albany, NY 12233-7016  
Phone: (518) 402-9767  
Hours: M - Fri, 8:30 a.m. - 4:45 p.m.  
Please call for an appointment

Detailed information on the Record of Decision, the proposed Consent Decree, the draft ESD, and the siting of the SCA and other aspects of the Onondaga Lake cleanup is also available online at <http://www.dec.state.ny.us/website/der/projects/ondlake/> on the NYSDEC website.



**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.**