then cap it so well that it probably will never leak again. And I think the technology that was here could be developed. If they can with that movie Titanic develop technology for the cameras that went down there, just for a movie, which means nothing, they can surely do this with Onondaga Lake if they really and truly want to.

And they could go back year after year, maybe the first two years after, then two years, leave a space, two years after, two years, three years. They have barriers that they put on highways when they want to work on them, they can use the same type of technology on the lake. I don't believe they can't. Thank you.

O-14 DIRECTOR LYNCH: Les Monostory.

LES MONOSTORY: I am Les Monostory, M-O-N-O-S-T-O-R-Y. I'm president of the Onondaga County Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs, and I represent about 30 clubs and several thousand members of sportsmen who are some of the primary users of the lake in

terms of fishing, boating and we have a fair number of duck hunters that also use the lake for hunting purposes.

1 And my concern is about shoreline safety issues. Many of you may not be aware that along the shorelines where Allied had the wastebeds, which really covers basically from Nine Mile Creek all the way to past Onondaga Creek to Ley Creek. There was these wastebeds that leaked calcium sediments into the lake and particularly along the shoreline by the so called white cliffs, which is the area adjacent to the, well the New York State Fair parking areas.

There are areas along the base of those cliffs where if you walk into the water you may fall through a hardened calcitic sediment which has been deposited along those shores.

On November 26th I wrote a memorandum to Honeywell and DEC Region 7 about safety concerns related to Honeywell clean up of Onondaga Lake bottom sediments. I expressed concern over safety issues along the western

shoreline related to potential hazards for fishermen or boaters who might try to either wade or land a boat along the Onondaga Lake shore.

Honeywell responded with a letter dated December 17th, in which they described proposed remedial measures specifically for the white cliffs section of Onondaga Lake, which comprise portions of SMU 3 and SMU 4.

With regards to the sediments beneath the white cliffs in SMU 3, Honeywell's letter indicates that the FS, I can't think right now, what does FS stand for? Feasibility Study recommended alternative includes dredging of near-shore sediments followed by capping along much of the shoreline.

Shoreline stabilization would be completed along the remainder of the shoreline in this area. And those areas targeted for dredging and capping, calcitic sediments would be removed. And those are these sort of glass type of sediments that I'm talking about. And the area covered

with capping materials comprised of stone, cobble and sand. The thickness and size of these materials will be determined during the design phase.

They continue. "Various techniques would be used for shoreline stabilization, and may include vegetative plantings and brush mattresses. Along those portions of the shoreline that are either exposed to wave energy or more steeply sloped, stone may be placed at the bottom of the slope to stabilize the substrate and prevent erosion of the shoreline treatments. Honeywell believes these techniques will address the potential safety concerns you raised related to calcitic sediments along 2,500 meters of shoreline."

Again, this would be the area roughly from the 690 turn-off to State Fair Grounds to Ninemile Creek. That's approximately about 2,500 meters of distance.

Shoreline Safety Recommendations: In reviewing both the Honeywell and DEC plans for dredging and capping of the shoreline

sediments in both SMU 3 and SMU 4, it is clear that specific areas along the shoreline will be dredged and capped from the lakeshore up to depths up to 9 meters. However, the reports are unclear regarding what specific stabilization measures will be completed along the shoreline sediments not specifically targeted for dredging and capping in this area.

2 In order to address the issue of physical safety concerns for anglers or boaters who may try to access the shoreline along the base of the white cliffs, I am recommending that solidified calcitic sediments along the entire 2,500 meters of shoreline at the base of the cliffs be removed to a water depth of one to two meters, and that the entire shoreline be stabilized with capping material composed of stone, cobble or sand to a minimum water depth of 1.5 meters.

The purpose of this additional shoreline stabilization is to provide safe recreational access for shoreline waders,

anglers and boaters, who are currently at risk when they try to walk the lake shores at the base of the white cliffs there, due to existing layers of unstable calcium carbonate sediment.

I also have a separate statement which I may present later with regards to a fishery goal statement for Onondaga Lake and tributaries.

0-15 DIRECTOR LYNCH: Dr. Kaczmar.

DR. KACZMAR: S-W-I-A-T-O-S-L-A-V K-A-C-Z-M-A-R. I'm adjunct professor at Syracuse University and I'm chief scientist for O'Brien & Gere engineers. I'm here tonight speaking as an independent scientist. I had the good fortune of a public education. I have been performing risk assessment investigations such as this for over 20 years and teaching others to do the same.

1 I performed an independent review of the remedial investigation in the Feasibility Study for Onondaga Lake. Having reviewed that, I place particular focus on the risk

assessment itself. Basically what a risk assessment is, it evaluates the chemicals in the system and it puts together a model of hypothetical exposures, and what's known about the toxic impact.

In reviewing this model the assumptions that were incorporated were very conservative, okay. Meaning that they had some very - assumptions that are unrealistic, but for the purposes of over-stating the risks. And the reason they're over-stated is for the purpose of protectiveness, not to try to put down, you know Honeywell caused the problem or whatever. But taking in the worst case, so that the uncertainties that might be inherit in the system, there are many, could be controlled.

Within that context there were some remedial actions taken to address those conservative risks. And it's my independent opinion that the remedies in the Feasibility Study adequately address those risks. And so I believe it's protective, and I believe it's for all practical purposes an

appropriate remedy.

2 I'm particularly encouraged by the enhancements that are present. These are the kinds of things that are not required, okay, but really are going to make our community a better place, both on the ecological part in providing an integrated potential for development of the community. I'm very happy to see that and I'm happy to be here. Thank you.

0-16 DIRECTOR LYNCH: Sharon Fulmer.

SHARON FULMER: Thank you. I'm a resident of Liverpool and have been for more than three decades. My family was raised in Liverpool. I have served on two of the Onondaga Lake committees that existed back in the 19 - I don't know '80s and '90s. I see a few people here who were part of that group for the most part. We have all figured it was going to take a long time for something to happen.

1 And to that end I sincerely hope as others have said before me that Honeywell and the DEC can come to an agreement without

requiring long drawn out processes that can see this go forth as quickly as possible.

2 I'd also ask one thing. The last slide you showed today talked about how people can view information about what's been going on at the Syracuse library and DEC and one other place I can't remember what it is. I'd ask that you remember the people who are affected the most by this, those being the people who live in Liverpool, the village and outside the village. And those people who live on this side of the lake as well, and that you provide all those written materials for the Liverpool library, which is open seven days a week and open until 9 o'clock every day. And for the library in Solvay or Camillus, Solvay and Camillus, which probably have some more hours. Thank you.

0-17 THE COURT: Dereth Glance.

DERETH GLANCE: My name is Dereth Glance, I'm a Central New York Program Coordinator for Citizens Campaign for the Environment. CCE is a not-for-profit,

non-partisan advocacy organization with over 80,000 members across the State of New York and in coastal Connecticut. We work for the protection of public health and natural environment.

1 CCE understands the challenges to remediate the Onondaga Lake bottom and of the toxic, persistent and bioaccumulative chemicals and metals discharged from industrial polluters are unparalleled. CCE appreciates the efforts of the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation - I'll call you the Department from now on - Honeywell International and the host of stakeholder groups dedicated to improving Onondaga Lake.

CCE plans to submit formal detailed comments for thoughtful review by the Department. Today, because of the time constraints I'll limit my comments to the following recommendations.

2 First, CCE urges the Department to hold additional public hearings in a question answer and format. We're very pleased to

hear about the question and answer that will follow this public comments process, I don't know the time that will be. And so from the turnout tonight it looks like we can really stand to have another public hearing in February. I understand there are several folks in the community that have been very involved in the process and were unable to make it today due to a variety of different conflicts.

Specifically we would like to have the additional public hearing to be held in the question and answer format so that we can inspire more and more questions from the community to thoroughly ask some good questions about the plan.

3 Secondly, we believe that CCE - we believe that the Department should provide ample opportunity for public involvement during the design phase. CCE understands that some of the most important decisions to be made regarding the Onondaga Lake bottom clean up are currently scheduled to occur during the design phase. These key

decisions currently include determining the appropriate Sediment Containment Area or the SCA, identifying the appropriate method of effluent treatment, in determining the long term monitoring requirements.

CCE believes these issues and others raised by this project will impact the local community and that the design phase needs to be transparent and accessible to the public. To this end, CCE recommends that the Department establish a Citizens Advisory Committee or CAC. The Citizens Advisory Committee should advise, provide guidance and support the Onondaga Lake remediation efforts.

CAC members would meet on a regular, perhaps monthly basis, to review plan implementation, provide input on design phase decisions, and receive reports on Onondaga Lake remediation progress and challenges. The CAC should consist of members representing the Onondaga Nation, scientists, environmentalists, local environmental officials and concerned

citizens. Such CACs are well established throughout New York State and the nation and have been beneficial to government agencies, stakeholder organizations and the general public.

4 Finally, CCE believes that the Department should require public education as part of the Onondaga Lake bottom remediation efforts. CCE is concerned that the Proposed Plan, including the three preliminary remediation goals or the PRGs do not include a public education component to inform the public about the risks of our changing local waterbody.

CCE believes Onondaga Lake remediation discussions and actions need to be part of a coordinated public education effort that will inform individuals about the safety of using the lake for common recreational activities such as fishing, consuming fish, wading, swimming and boating.

Specifically, CCE is concerned about the PRG 2 or the Biological Tissue Goal, which is to achieve pollutant concentrations, to

the extent practicable in fish tissue that are protective of humans and wildlife that consume fish.

The extensive mercury contamination in Onondaga Lake warrants aggressive public education efforts concerning fish consumption CCE understands that this is a long term goal, and that the public education and outreach efforts about the risks to human health from consuming Onondaga Lake fish needs to be a critical part of the remediation plan to protect public health. Thank you.

O-18 DIRECTOR LYNCH: Don Hughes.

DON HUGHES: Thank you, my name is Don Hughes, H-U-G-H-E-S. I've served as technical adviser to Atlantic States Legal Foundation, and I'm a resident of the city of Syracuse since 1985, I believe. I'm going to talk, going to add to Sam Sage's comments earlier, but talk more about some of the technical issues concerning the remediation.

1 First of all, people should know that the remediation depends very heavily on the

viability of the slurry wall. This is an intermediate, interim remedial measure which is to be placed along the western shore in the corner of the lake, it's a mile and-a-half long. And it will hopefully cut off the movement of non-aqueous phase liquids from entering the lake. This has got to work for this whole plan to work. If it don't work we're going to be in trouble.

It has the cap, which is to be placed over the in-lake deposit is designed on a groundwater flow of 6 centimeters per year, the existing groundwater flow is about 200. So the slurry wall has got to reduce it, has got to cut off the groundwater, and you have to pump that groundwater into a treatment system. Okay, so that's a big concern.

2 Another concern I've got it has to do with what we're doing with the sediments. The sediments are going to be pumped up to the wastebeds, wastebed number 13 has been tentatively selected and I would ask why that one? It would seem that treatment has not really been considered to any extent

except to the most cursory level.

The contamination in the sediment is concentrated in these tarry deposits which are a non-aqueous phase. And these things are dispersed throughout a matrix of calcium based waste which is the Solvay waste, which is the white, the same stuff that's the white cliffs. And it's probably a fairly easy task to separate those two things. This is, you can use mining technology to separate things which have different sizes and different densities, and it's cheap.

It's been demonstrated on contaminated sediments in Saginaw Harbor, Saginaw Bay. And I was part of that investigation and it does work. And I think that the Department and Honeywell should look extensively into that, because that's a way to take the toxicity out of the sediments. And that is a primary goal of Superfund is to significantly and permanently reduce toxicity.

3 Another big issue is once you get the sediments onto the wastebeds what about volatile emissions? The sediments contain a

whole host of volatile chemicals, including benzene, toluene, chlorobenzene, dichlorobenzenes, xylenes and so forth. These things don't only smell bad, they are toxic. And we don't want to expose either residents or workers to this stuff. So we've got to have a good control system on odors, on emissions.

4 Another issue has to do with the deep waters of the lake. Now the plan really focuses on the littoral zone, the shallow waters of the lake, the profundal zone, which is the deep waters, is - well, it's kind of left in the lurch. It's - the plan really lacks a plan other than wait and see. That's what monitored natural recovery is.

The concentration of mercury will be monitored in surface sediments over time, over 10 years. And this is somehow going to be modeled using a program called STELA. STELA is a generic program for which any number of parameters and inputs can be specified. Right now we're kind of lacking basic inputs as to what's going to go into

that.

And there is a lot of issues having to do with disturbance of the sediments and how the STELLA is going to successfully model the sediments. You've got groundwater moving upward into the sediments. There is a release of gas bubbles called ebullition, because there's been so much organic matter deposited in the bottom. And once the lake becomes more hospitable in the bottom waters, hopefully that's going to happen, now that Metro is being upgraded, we're going to see more fish and macro-invertebrates living in the bottom waters, which means more disturbance, more bioturbation of those sediments.

And based on the comments of Mr. Freedman we might see some boat anchors to worry about as well. So the profundal zone is a big big question mark. I would tend to characterize this whole remedial action as Part 1, the littoral zone. And Part 2 is the profundal zone, that will come later.

Finally I've got a generic comment

5 how the decision-making process goes. All three of the preliminary remediation goals and all five remedial action objectives are qualified by the phrase "to the extent practical." This type of language is typical in the Feasibility Study. But who decides what is practical and how will the public learn of and participate in these decisions?

How useful is the public -- how useful to the public is a goal that is achieved based on an undefined assessment of practicability? Is a qualified goal a real goal? Shouldn't goals and objectives be transparent, achievable and measurable?

Why not define what clean up levels are technically practicable given the very best model cutting edge remediation technologies fully justifying and documenting the determination to the public, and make those the achievable and measurable goals. Thanks.

0-19 DIRECTOR LYNCH: Sara Eckel. Sara Eckel here?

SARAH ECKEL: E-C-K-E-L, S-A-R-A-H. I

1 have seen the proposed plan to use existing wastebeds to contain the various sediment. And my concern evolves around the fact it will not include a comprehensive clean up of these existing wastebeds. While I understand the cost-effectiveness of the already contaminated areas I do not believe the plan should ignore the future problems that could result from leaving these areas untreated. I also understand the need to move this plan forward and I believe it should be done with future generations in mind.

O-20 DIRECTOR LYNCH: Steve Effler.

STEVE EFFLER: E-F-F-L-E-R. I am director of research of the Upstate Freshwater Institute, a not-for-profit research organization, and it's involved in the research study of a number of fresh water systems throughout New York State.

I've spent the larger part of my professional life studying Onondaga Lake. Some people do Lake Tahoe, some people do Lake Erie -- well someone had to do it I guess.

Anyway, the Institute over the last 20 some odd years has published more than 200 articles in the peer reviewed literature, and we're quite proud of the fact that one of those articles entitled The Impact of the Chlor-alkali Plan in Onondaga Lake and Adjoining Systems was actually the primary technical basis for the provisional lawsuit that has led to this cleanup.

As I said, we're involved in the research of a number of systems and have in the last decade led the development of water quality models for the New York City reservoir system.

Let's get down to where we stand based upon our review of much of the available documents with regards to cleanup of the Honeywell site. We enthusiastically endorse the proposed rehabilitation efforts for the site that include removal of toxic sediments, capping of sediments, and improvement of degraded habitat. We endorse proceeding without undue delay. Let's get on with it, we have all waited a long time. With the

following caveats, of course.

2 There is a continuing review process. EPA will be involved in continuing technical review. There are portions of these documents that frankly fall outside of our expertise. And also we understand the way this process works, if indeed we find new sources of contaminant problems in the future during clean up those items would also be addressed.

3 All those nice things said, and by the way all the hard work that I know has gone into this, those efforts certainly should be applauded. All that said however, we have great concern with the lack of understanding of the behavior of contaminants from the Honeywell site within the lake itself. This is - we don't fault any of the agencies or organizations involved, to our way of thinking this is largely attributable to the constraints embedded in the Superfund process. It's simply a very difficult arena to get some of the basic scientific information that I think we still need.

Why should the community care about this esoteric stuff? Well, because neither Honeywell or the state can really tell us how much better the lake will be following execution of these rehabilitation programs. Meaning, they cannot answer the question quantitatively at least, how much lower will fish mercury concentrations be following these programs? Think about that. And that's not just mercury, the other contaminants also.

We have every reason to expect, as they have argued, things will be better. But at this point don't you think we ought to know how much better? And basically this comes down to the what's lacking is a credible scientific mathematical model that can predict responses in the lake to these and other management actions. There was originally a mathematical modeling element in the Superfund work, particularly related to mercury. But these efforts had to be dropped.

While we support moving ahead with clean

up actions without a model - I'll say that again. We do support moving ahead with clean up actions without a model, this limitation should be eliminated in the future. We need those tools, we need that level of understanding. As Charlie Driscoll from Syracuse University was recently quoted, "If you understand the system you can model it."

So where we are is, while we expect things to get better and indeed so do I, I think we want to know it a little better than that.

Further, UFI recommends that this model be developed and tested outside of the Superfund process. Simply put, the process by the way it is set up it is simply not the arena to get this level of understanding. The kinds of questions or information such a tool gives is, it allows us to evaluate the feasibility of reaching various goals, certain levels of contamination in fish flesh, it will help us establish reasonable expectations for the lake in response to

rehabilitation efforts. How much better will it get? And allow and support quantitative evaluation of management alternatives. And could contribute to future parts of a management program.

4 Lastly, we support the comments of a number of previous speakers with regards to the monitoring program. The monitoring program is extremely important, particularly for the adopted build and measure approach that relies primarily upon monitoring information before and after implementation.

This needs to start ASAP. We really don't have, from what's been done so far, adequate monitoring data to be able to assess how much better things are going to be following implementation. This needs to be designed and implemented so that it can also support the modeling program. It needs to be flexible to allow changes in response to observations, it needs to be flexible, right.

In other words when we see certain behavior we need to make changes. And

that's very difficult within the Superfund process. And we believe that this data needs to be available to the public soon after collection as well as other experts. Thank you very much for your time.

O-21 DIRECTOR LYNCH: Nancy Ciampi.

NANCY CIAMPI: Thanks, Ken. Nancy C-I-A-M-P-I. I'm a town of Geddes resident. And I just want to say thank you, express my appreciation to the DEC, to Honeywell, Earth Tech, for the sessions that were held in the Town of Geddes December 9th, and the two sessions in January, as well as tonight. And hope that they continue.

1 My comment is that I feel these sessions are very important to the success of the plan and that the public needs to know that there will be well publicized open and honest public meetings to get frequent status updates and share their concern.

O-22 DIRECTOR LYNCH: Peter Pedemonti.

PETER PEDEMONTI: P-E-D-E-M-O-N-T-I. I

1 just like to say I would like to see the most thorough and complete clean up of the

lake regardless of time or cost. Just because when put into the context of our responsibility to future generations, the Onondaga Nation, wildlife and the lake itself, it means a little less. So thank you for the opportunity to comment.

O-23 DIRECTOR LYNCH: David Arnold.

DAVID ARNOLD: My name is Dave Arnold, A-R-N-O-L-D. I'm a life long resident of Onondaga County, Town of Clay. And I am a farmer. My farm is located on Route 57, just north of Moyers Corners almost to Three Rivers.

1 Two years ago on January 15th, 2003, I stood in front of you and spoke against issuing Evergreen Recycling a permit to operate in the Town of Clay. Along with 500 others we spoke our minds and collectively convinced you this was not a good idea, even though the Clay officials did. During this meeting I spoke about illegal acts committed by our elected officials. Since that time our representatives have rewarded those acts by issuing more than $2.5 million in grants

on projects involving a fraudulent contract at Three Rivers Point.

The Onondaga Lake Cleanup Project is much larger than the projects involved in Clay. The Clay Brownfield clean up project at Three Rivers could easily surpass $50 million if the land is cleaned up the way it should be.

If we can't even start a project in Clay without corruption and fraud at the $50 million level, how in the world can Onondaga Lake Cleanup Project succeed? A half a billion dollars in this town is a big chunk of change. We need someone at the county level that we can trust to take charge and appoint public committees of oversight that will independently scrutinize all phases of these projects. We must all take responsibility for neglecting Onondaga Lake and Three Rivers Point. Yes, the perpetrators will pay a large price, but we will pay an even higher one if we don't succeed.

On September 10, 2004, I contacted the Attorney General's office. It is my hope

that Mr. Spitzer will investigate and prosecute all those involved in corruption and fraud in Onondaga County, so we can then proceed with confidence on these extremely important environmental projects.

We are fortunate in this country to be able to criticize those who represent us. What is unfortunate is when they refuse to listen. Thank you.

0-24 DIRECTOR LYNCH: Sherry Mossotti.

SHERRY MOSSOTTI: Thank you. Hello, Ken. Sherry M-O-S-S-O-T-T-I. I'm here to speak
1 as a citizen and a taxpayer of Onondaga County. I am a life long resident of this county. For over 23 years I have driven by Onondaga Lake and thought what a shame. I've traveled all over the world, and it doesn't take someone to travel to know the importance of a lake on a community. This is an opportunity, folks.

In my position as executive director of the Premier Community Leadership Program in this community that trains and educates our community's leaders which include 600 adults

and 300 youth leaders, we have had the opportunity to hear about the history of the lake from a historian, what's in the lake from the scientists and biologists, the engineers, the methodologies for clean up, and also the economic potential of Onondaga Lake. Onondaga Lake clean up is a topic that continually comes up among our community leaders that we train every single year.

We have met with Honeywell, we have met with the DEC, and we have reviewed all of the proposed plans. I have discussed this with Ken Lynch, Neil Murphy, who is the head of SUNY ESF, numerous scientists, engineers and residents both adult and youth. And it was great to see some young people come up and speak this evening.

On behalf of Leadership Greater Syracuse we applaud Honeywell, the DEC, the county, the city, O'Brien and Gere, and all the interested parties for coming together to the table. And we ask you, no, we implore you, on behalf of our community, our

wildlife, our children and our grandchildren, to continue to come together and work at the table and move this project forward to find a resolution that we can all be proud of for years to come for our children and our grandchildren. Thank you.

O-25 DIRECTOR LYNCH: Terry Brown.

TERRY BROWN: Thank you. I have to be honest I'm a little conflicted here this evening, didn't know whether I was going to say anything. But I'll get unconflicted at the end of my comments here. My name is Terry Brown, I'm am chairman/CEO of O'Brien & Gere, it's an engineering and construction firm headquartered in Syracuse, New York. And I have lived in Syracuse all my life. I raised my family, and I've been with O'Brien & Gere nearly 30 years.

I spent my first six years of my career with O'Brien & Gere making or building the third Metro wastewater treatment facility. It's now in its fourth construction. In 1974 that was supposed to clean up the lake, if people go back and look at the newspaper

articles.

I really have a passion for the community, a passion for this lake. And I have really more so a passion of the opportunity we have as a community in front of us.

As an organization, O'Brien & Gere, we're in our 60th year. Our founder, Earl O'Brien, graduated from Solvay high school in 1913. So we have a presence in this community. We pride ourselves in offering cost effective environmental solutions for our clients and municipalities we serve. Solutions which on sites, environmentally impacted, they protect the environment for future generations. That's kind of the background.

1 As I started listening to some of this thing, I've attended these information hearings and I have spent a lot of time in the last, I spent 18 months looking at the sites and what they could be, trying to develop a vision with a couple of my colleagues on our own time. And the vision

that we can create as community for the sites and the lake is just unbelievable.

We really are at a crossroads in this community as to what we can do. And the thing we talk about, and I'm an engineer, which is much different from a scientist, I'm a doer. And I was trained, some of my training was in military. The one thing I was trained to get was the information, as much as you can, in your gut, you know what's ahead and there is tough times ahead of you but you manage the situation and go.

And we can talk about modeling, and all this other thing that we've talked about but there is a point in time where we have to go. And I'm sorry, we have made this so confusing for the public, modeling and the science. This is not. And I beg forgiveness from some of my scientific colleagues, this is not rocket science. We don't need to make it difficult for this community to understand.

We have enough information and to go with the information we have, to have an

effective clean up in this community and create a vision. But we have to have a sense of urgency. That's what I want to stress, this is not necessarily the DEC but the people that are commenting and running comments in the future.

We have, I have worked on sites for 25 years. We've had numerous corporations, we'll buy out a site, different philosophy, different management team come in. We have an organization willing to invest in this community now and take action. That could change tomorrow. We can't let this slip by us.

And when I say acting, take the information that we have, I could give you a resume of hundreds and thousands of environmental sites. And we just had some information, we knew what the science was, we didn't have all the answers but we went out there and cleaned it up. And to my knowledge O'Brien & Gere was never cited for any environmental citation, our reputation is flawless in the nation. We have worked

with DEC and some of the gentlemen sitting here on numerous occasions. We didn't have a lot of information, but we had enough science, we knew what the conditions were and we managed it.

2 So my comment really to this group here is we have to have a sense of urgency. We have to make the science simpler. We can do the modeling as we go along. We'll learn more by doing and addressing the issues as we take on the environmental remediation than we will ever learn in the modeling process. And we'll have better models in the future. But we have to move on.

A very wise gentleman said to me this afternoon, who we all respect in this community, he said, we have an opportunity and we've got to make it right. But we also have to move and we have to move with urgency so we don't lose this opportunity. Thank you.

DIRECTOR LYNCH: Those are all the people that signed up to speak. Is there anyone else who wants to speak for the

record other than a question and answer period? Les?

O-26 **LES MONOSTORY:** I'm speaking now on behalf, well as a co-chair of the Fisheries Subcommittee of the Onondaga Lake Partnership, also vice-president of the Central New York Chapter of the Izaak Walton League. And I'm going to talk about a fishery goal statement for Onondaga Lake and tributaries.

1 "It is difficult to evaluate the restoration plan for Onondaga Lake without first reaching a community consensus on the restoration goals and objectives for Onondaga Lake and it's major tributaries." This is a memo that I wrote to the Outreach Committee on October 27th, and also addressed to the committee chairman, who is Seth Ausubel with the US EPA.

"On November 10, the Fisheries Subcommittee meetings included a discussion on fisheries goals and objectives for Onondaga Lake. Comments include the following:

MONOSTORY

Participants at the first Onondaga Lake Fisheries Roundtable agreed that we want to improve what fisheries we already have.

Onondaga Lake and it's principal tributaries can be promoted as a combination cold-water and warm-water fishery.

The Fisheries Subcommittee members agreed that as a future fisheries goal, Onondaga Lake should be clean enough to support both warm-water and cold-water fish species, including trout and Atlantic salmon.

On November 17th I received an e-mail from Dave Lemon, an aquatic biologist with DEC in Cortland. Lemon is a member of the subcommittee but was not able to attend the November 10th meeting. He had the following comments:

Reading over the November 10 meeting minutes I just wanted to provide some comments regarding the desire for creating a cold-water fishery on Onondaga Lake." We're getting a little technical here but this is - Lemon makes some interesting points.

MONOSTORY

"We in the Region 7 Fisheries Office do not feel that reestablishing a self-sustaining population of trout and Atlantic salmon in Onondaga Lake is a realistic goal. I'm not sure if this is the objective of the group or not." Referring to our fisheries subcommittee.

2 "I've attached a draft position statement to EPA, which provides some facts on the life histories of the Cisco," the former white fish "and Atlantic salmon as well as current and expected conditions in the lake. Based on this we don't believe that self-sustaining salmonid population are a realistic objective in the foreseeable future.

As such we feel that the realistic objective for the lake's fish community is a combination of cool-water walleye, perch, pike, and warm-water bass, bluegill, etcetera, species. We certainly would be happy if lake conditions improve enough so that year-round habitat for trout survival exists, but for the foreseeable future that

scenario is unlikely.

3 The Region 7 Fisheries Office has prepared a draft position statement to EPA entitled 'Coldwater Fisheries Rehabilitation and Management in the Onondaga Lake Watershed,' also known as the Fishery White Paper, which was prepared in July of last year. In addition to providing background information on lake water conditions and environmental requirements for various fish species, the White Paper recommends adoption of a fishery goal statement for Onondaga Lake."

A specific Goal Statement for the lake is presented as follows. "In the long term the Onondaga Lake Partnership supports the achievement of a suitable year-round habitat for a sustainable warm-water and cool-water fishery in the lake and conditions conducive for transient cold-water species in the lake and resident cold-water species in the lake tributaries."

As co-chairman of the Partnership's Outreach Committee's Fishery Subcommittee I

endorse the fisheries goal statement contained in the DEC's Fishery White Paper and recommend adoption of this goal by the Onondaga Lake Partnership and its member agencies. This I think will help us at least in terms of what we would like to achieve as a fisheries goal and as a lifetime fisherman and, you know, as president of the Sportsmen's Federation I think - I happen to agree with the DEC's Fisheries goal for the lake.

0-27 DIRECTOR LYNCH: Anyone else like to speak? Bob?

BOB NUNES. My name is Bob Nunes, N-U-N-E-S, I'm the EPA project manager for the Onondaga Lake NPL site and I just wanted to briefly elaborate on what Ken said

1 briefly in the presentation about EPA's role and what process it's following now with regards to this Proposed Plan.

EPA's role for the Onondaga Lake Superfund site has been to act as a support agency to DEC. In this capacity EPA has provided approximately $18.7 million to the

State of New York under a cooperative agreement. And this funding has supported the performance of investigation activities, coordination and tracking of site-wide remediation activities, development of a comprehensive enforcement program, implementation of a site-wide citizen participation program, creation and maintenance of a site-wide database and project management activities.

EPA has also provided technical supports to DEC related to the investigation and clean up of the Onondaga Lake subsites. For the Onondaga Lake bottom subsite EPA provided technical support during the rewrite of the remedial investigation and review of the Feasibility Study report.

2 EPA will offer a position on the preferred remedy after the Proposed Plan and other project documents have been reviewed by EPA's National Remedy Review Board and EPA's Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation Sediments Team. (Microphone emitting noises) I thought it

was the acronyms that were causing the problem.

The National Remedy Review Board is an EPA peer review group composed of technical and policy experts that review all proposed Superfund clean up decisions that meet certain cost-based or other review criteria to ensure that the proposed decisions are consistent with the Superfund law, regulations and guidance.

EPA Sediment Team offers consultation to assist risk managers in making scientifically sound and nationally consistent risk management decisions at contaminated sediment sites. The Board and Sediment Team will provide feedback to EPA Region 2 and a summary of the Review Boards and Sediment Teams comments and responses from the Region will be included in the responsiveness summary in the Record of Decision. Thank you.

DIRECTOR LYNCH: Anyone else? I want to thank everyone for some great comments. What we're going to do right now is take a

very short five minute break, allow our stenographer (court reporter) to rest his hands and everyone to stretch a little bit. But we're going to try to start again real quickly with a question and answer period in about five minutes.

(Brief recess then Q&A period).

DIRECTOR LYNCH: Please don't be afraid to move up closer to us. Okay we're going to reconvene with the question and answer session. I apologize to all of you out there that have been sitting, dying to ask questions. As you can see we had a lot of people sign up for official public comments so we had to take those first. And hopefully we can answer all your questions tonight that you've been waiting to ask.

I will be attempting to answer some of those questions but not being an engineer or scientist myself I'm going to rely on my experts which are in the first two rows here. So please be patient with us so that we can identify the appropriate person amongst us to answer your particular question.

I will ask a couple things. Try to ask only one or two questions at a time so I can get around the room and at least give everybody an opportunity to ask questions. We're going to try to go as long as possible. We'll also likely stick around to talk one-on-one with you if you want to ask your questions in that form.

We would also ask that if you have an especially technical question, and being a complex cleanup there are a lot of technical issues and questions, we will try to briefly respond to that. But we may ask that you stick around or talk to one of our experts outside on that particular interest so we don't consume everybody else's time and take up the opportunity for some other questions. So what I'm going to do is kind of open up to raise your hand and I'm going to ask Dawn, we'll start in the front and Dawn kind of work back with the microphone so she's not jumping all over the place.

Questions. You're going to have to start in the back Dawn. Also state your

name for the record because this is also going to be recorded. This question and answer will be part of our response and summary as well as a response to all the comments that were made earlier .

BARRY RAICHLIN: Has there been any other searches all over the world with any other ways to do this than what we have, just plain on dredging like your swimming pool? Has there been any other things? With all the engineering we have in the world why haven't we looked into somewhere else that might have a better idea than we have? We're looking for Number 4, not Number 1. Get this done. Either you do it all, do it right or don't even bother because mother nature is doing a great job so far.

DIRECTOR LYNCH: The Feasibility Study that was an assessment of all the alternatives requires Honeywell to go and look at other technology out there other than just dredging. And although the Feasibility Study concentrates on dredging

and capping alternatives Honeywell wasn't required to look at some other technical expertise around the country and around the world. And I'm not aware of any specific one that they looked at or one that they found would address a mercury and a sediments issue.

But they did look at, one of the things they looked at, as you said, leave it alone. They did look at the option of leaving it alone. And it was simply as a Department we didn't feel that that lake would heal itself in an acceptable time frame. It would leave open the environment, the fish, humans accessible to contaminants for a very long period of time before it was covered up.

BARRY RAICHLIN: Well, this is the fox in the hen house deal. As long as the little dinky fox is there we're going to have the same problem. I won't live long enough but the problem is going to be there unless we get *everything* out of there. We stop all the pollution and, you know, all the arteries going into the lake, it's never

going to stop. This is just providing jobs for everybody, engineering, everything else. It's not the solution. You've got to cut the BS, you've got to get it all out of there or don't do anything.

You can damn it or whatever, you get right down to the bottom all the way around the lake, you won't have to worry about it anymore once you got them in jail, the crook, right? If you don't do that it's just going to keep going on and on.

I've been here 60 some years, if you don't straighten it out now it's never - if you don't do it completely it's never going to stop.

DIRECTOR LYNCH: We understand it's very important to address it now and we think we have a pretty good plan to do that.

BARRY RAICHLIN: Thank you very much.

DIRECTOR LYNCH: Thank you. In the back.

TOM RHOADS: My name is Tom Rhoads, R-H-O-A-D-S, and I was wondering about the sediment containment areas. I'm sorry I missed the first part but it seems like

there is an awful lot of dredge spoils that are going to be moved in this project and I was wondering if there were going to be further public hearings or further discussion on the transport of those sediments, the dredge spoils and the containment system for the Sediment Containment Area and the capping enclosure of that so the sediments are not remobilized later on into the lake.

And I was wondering if there would be future public hearings on sort of that portion of the cleanup. This was primarily about the lake itself. Thank you.

DIRECTOR LYNCH: Excellent question. First the sediments have two options, two routes. They could go to a permitted facility or the less contaminated sediments right now are proposed to go somewhere on the wastebeds. That is a pretty general proposal in the plan. It is not defined and we admittedly will say that there is a lot of design work that needs to go into any sediment containment area on the wastebeds or anywhere else before it's built.

We do have the very basic requirements that a liner be placed for such a structure that thereby a leachate collection system and that leachate be treated. We will not permit or allow any sediment containment area unless we are convinced that it's stable and can adequately withhold the sediments that are put in that area.

We will be reviewing any proposals during the design phase. I will expect and I have had a meeting with the Town of Camillus, some of the residents that live near that area, that we will be coming back to the public to discuss any specific proposals that are made for disposal on those wastebeds. And that will likely also involve a public meeting for anyone interested in the specifics of that proposal.

Other questions?

JIM RHEA: Jim Rhea, R-H-E-A, life-long resident of Onondaga County. And I just have a clarifying question hopefully. In your presentation earlier you talked about the two different options, the one that

Honeywell had advanced and then the one that the state advanced in their plan. And there is a big difference there in terms of total volume that is going to be removed as well as total cost.

We heard some comments earlier about urgency and the need to work together and cooperatively. I wonder if you can comment, maybe clarify for everyone here what is the difference between those two in terms of actual volume and then maybe actual risk reduction. Because I assume that those differences need to be related to risk.

DIRECTOR LYNCH: You hit the major difference. Conceptually the two plans are very similar in that they both divide the lake into eight specific sections and develop a cap and dredge proposal for each of those sections.

The biggest difference in the - between the two plans is the amount to be dredged and the amount of capping that's placed. And the Department's position is, we took a very much more conservative view as the

amount of material that needs to come out, the contaminated material that needs to come out, partially based on a risk assessment.

And also a little more conservative view of the depth of a cap that actually needs to be placed in the water to be protective. There are some other differences and these guys can probably add to that if you want to hear more about the differences between the two plans.

But the significant differences is the amount to be dredged. I think it was a half a million cubic yards in the Honeywell proposal and 2.7 for the DEC proposal.

DAVE ARNOLD: Dave Arnold, I spoke earlier. I guess what I'd like to do is just clarify, Mr. Lynch. In the beginning I said that I attended a hearing on Evergreen Recycling in the Town of Clay. And I would just like to I guess have some reassuring that you're not going to dump the bottom of Onondaga Lake on top of the Town of Clay on Woodward Industrial Park.

DIRECTOR LYNCH: There is no proposal to

do that, Mr. Arnold.

BARRY RAICHLIN: Why not?

DIRECTOR LYNCH: Any other questions?

RALPH MARTONE: I live over here in the city. I would like them to just expand on the toxic mercury methane and what is the possibility of, you know, health, once they start to dredge.

DIRECTOR LYNCH: During the dredging activities itself? You mean the extent to which mercury will be stirred up?

Q. (Martone) Right. I heard a new term to me, mercury methane?

A. (Lynch) Mercury methylation.

Q. Yes, what type of threat is that to the public health?

DIRECTOR LYNCH: I'm going to draw on one of my experts on this one to answer. Who can answer in very general terms. If we can explain mercury methylation and the potential impact from mercury during the dredging activities.

A. **(Bob Edwards)** I think I'm loud enough. I volunteered to answer your question. I

work with the DEC and I've been involved in many or several anyway, dredging projects across the state. I was project manager of one big one up in Lake Champlain. And there are a number of controls, engineering controls that take place in the lake while we're dredging that would not expose any of the public to any mercury or any other contaminants that's in the soil or in the sediments.

Once that material is pumped up to the treatment system and the containment cell there will be controls up there to minimize odors, and there won't be any opportunity for this material to spill outside of the work zone. I mean that's one of the reasons these designs are so long is we have to cross every t and dot every i on the engineering aspects of it before we do start.

I know many people spoke to me today about how I remember they dredged down in Jamaica Bay or when they dredged the canal out and they just sprayed the stuff every-

where. That's a different type of dredging than environmental dredging. And actually the days of just spraying it up and the odors being uncontrolled are long gone. The public will not allow that to happen and we will not allow it to happen as DEC.

So I don't know if you were here for the availability section, but there is a lot of different things we can do to control odors and prevent releases of chemicals and exposures to the public and to workers.

One thing - at any of these jobs all workers are required to be trained in health and safety. There is many courses we have to take, there is many different protective clothing and respirators and stuff that we wear. So human safety, public safety, worker safety, those are paramount to any of these jobs. And all those controls and all those provisions are taken up in the design so that before any of this work starts we've addressed all these concerns.

Q. My question really is the hazard of mercury, this mercury evaporating, can that

get into the atmosphere and surrounding areas or not? Is that possible or not?

A. Not during the dredging process because it will all be under water. It won't come up. How environmental dredging - or how hydraulic dredging works is a large amount of water is moved with the sediment. It's a giant pump on a boat, is essentially what it is.

Q. Slurry dredger?

A. It will slurry the material and pump it so there is no opportunity during the dredging process for that material to come to the surface, to the air. First time that material will be in the atmosphere would be at the treatment facility. And at that point there is other controls that can be taken to prevent exposure there.

RALPH MARTONE: Thank you.

HENRI HAMEL: I can probably be loud enough too. My name is Henri Hamel, I work for the State Health Department in Syracuse, and fairly familiar with the Onondaga Lake problems because I was a SUNY ESF student a

long long time ago. I don't want to say how long.

Under current conditions the only risk or the primary risk that we've seen from the lake would be to people who are consuming fish. And as far as mercury getting into the atmosphere from the lake, that's not quite the way it works here. The mercury that we're worried about is mostly tied up in the sediments in the bottom of the lake where it was deposited. So you're not taking any hazards or any exposure from mercury just under the current conditions by living near the lake or walking around the perimeter or anything like that.

Now when we do start dredging, as Bob said, the dredging operation is under water, so we're not expecting that we're going to have any mercury exposure coming up. The sediments will be transported by pipe to the containment facility, and at that point we'll be trying to design systems then that will prevent anyone from being exposed to any volatilization of mercury or any of the

other chemicals that we're going to be removing.

Now part of our operations at the lake front and also at the containment facility will be some health and safety monitoring for the workers. But we also mandate, the State Health Department requires that these projects have community monitoring programs. And we have instruments that can detect volatile organic chemicals, we also have instruments that can detect mercury.

So there will be monitoring to prevent any exposure to the public. And provisions that -- of what we would call action levels. And if we detect something with our instruments that is approaching a level that, it's a conservative level that means that somebody is going to be exposed then we have contingencies to shut down the project, do something differently, design a different system.

So we are very concerned about exposures to the public. We want to do this project to minimize that. And that's part of the

design too. And we will be back talking about the design.

JEFFREY FREEDMAN: I just wonder if the folks from Honeywell would care to comment on their basis for believing that their Proposed Plan would bring the Onondaga Lake into compliance with the Clean Water Act. We've heard from the DEC and I think the public would like to hear from Honeywell if they would care to comment as well.

DIRECTOR LYNCH: This is a DEC meeting and I don't want to turn it into a Honeywell/DEC debate. I know the Honeywell people very well and if they're willing to speak they can or if they're willing to talk to you later, which I'm sure they would, outside to talk about this.

I know Honeywell has obligations and requirements under the Superfund process so I respect their position. If they want to maybe talk outside with you to explain the difference and their thoughts on their plan. And I see them shaking their head out there. So I think they would like to meet you after

the meeting and talk to you.

BARRY RAICHLIN: You know, I was wondering she says they're going to develop means to process the waste. What do you mean they're going to develop it? Don't they know how to do it yet? Does all that water that's going to be pumped over there - what are they going to do with that, is that going to go back into Onondaga Lake like Skaneateles Lake water? Is it going to be sitting there and have to dry out for ten or fifteen years like the rest of that mess over there had to do? Why aren't we taking it to Wyoming or Buffalo or some other place. Why do we have to put it in our own back yard? That doesn't make any sense. Are there any other alternatives like railroads that we still have? You know, why can't we do that, why do we have to put it in our own back yard? Come on.

DIRECTOR LYNCH: Again, part of the Feasibility Study looked at those, specifically railroad, truck, transportation to facilities not only in New York State but

out of state. This is one, another thing that they looked at was the feasibility of putting it nearby on the wastebeds where deposits have been placed before.

BARRY RAICHLIN: And it stunk.

DIRECTOR LYNCH: And the Department has agreed to assess that proposal. And if they can specifically design it, we know that they can dredge and place it in an area and contain the water and treat the water before it is discharged back to the lake.

They can dredge an environmentally safe manner and control the dredge spoils. It's been done before. We're very familiar with the basics of that operation. However, this is specific to Onondaga Lake. We have more contaminants, we have a lot of different contaminants, we have a unique area in the wastebeds.

So that's why we have to look at the details that Henri talked about and design something that will be safe to the environment. And if they can demonstrate that it will be safe to the environment it's

something that we will consider in this area.

Q. (Raichlin) How do they take the water out of all those sediments and not ruin the whole area? She said they have to design something. Don't they know how to do it yet? That's scary.

A. (Lynch) I think they know how to dewater sediments. But specifically up on the wastebeds for this amount of sediment and the type of water that you're going to be taking out of those sediments you have to design specific parameters to demonstrate that it will be an effective ratio.

Q. So you're going to put it on top of the pads we already have there?

A. The wastebeds you're saying?

Q. Right.

A. That is one of the proposals. And one of the most likely or the wastebed that they're looking at first is Wastebed 13. And part of that reason is because that's one that was not entirely filled up. And there is some area that needs to be filled.

But again, there is a lot of detail to

be worked out regarding stability, controlling the water and the runoff, treating the water and containing the sediments. And --

Q. Why couldn't you go over across on the Thruway across from the service area over there. There is a big area over there that they're trying to ruin right now.

A. There is a lot of different areas you can look at but there is ownership issues, there is accessibility issues and there is a whole host of other things. But they did look at a wide range of disposal of sediments from the dredging activities and this is the one that we're going to focus on first in the Proposed Plan.

Q. They ought to have more public input than they have had so far. Make a lot more people have input.

A. As that plan is developed we will.

DORIE KRAEBEL: My name is Dorie Kraebel. K-R-A-E-B-E-L. I was just wondering, I was looking at the charts earlier and it looked like you were doing the option four or

around there. And I was wondering how you decided to stop there. I was looking at the other charts, it seemed maybe that wasn't quite deep enough or far enough into the lake to get everything. So I mean I was wondering if it was like financial or just physically unable to do it or what the reason was for stopping there?

DIRECTOR LYNCH: The short answer is that the number one factor that we considered in any of the remedies is that it has to be protective of human health and the environment. And there are a number of remedies that had the potential of being protective of human health and the environment. But as you went up to different levels you would see that others are much more protective and less risky.

We basically did a risk assessment and determination that our proposed remedy, which is kind of a mix of the 14 outlined in the Feasibility Study. But our proposed remedy was the adequate remedy for both a feasibility standpoint, whether it actually

can and will be implemented and most importantly from an environmentally sound standpoint.

DORIE KRAEBEL: Thank you.

DAVE CHAPMAN: I was just curious in the design phase if there is going to be any room for pilot projects to look at proprietary technology that could assist. One of our lab tests showed that we were able to stop wastebed B permeability by 99.88 percent within 600 hours. And as he mentioned binding it up or making sure it doesn't release back into the environment, that they'll be looking at technologies or be a forum for discussing and looking at it and still at the same time still protecting proprietary technology and so forth.

DIRECTOR LYNCH: There is always a potential to pilot projects as part of one of the remedial projects. As a matter of fact one of the pilots in this project is the oxygenation. I would suggest that since it is likely that Honeywell will be the responsible party implementing this plan

that's where you could take your interest.

And that is the potential of the state or federal government doing other work but the way we address is usually through existing state contracts as far as who we hire to do the work. But I think you really should talk to Honeywell about the potential of looking at your pilot study or technology. And certainly if it was proposed to us we do take a look at it and see if it was appropriate.

Other questions? Dave way in the back. Could you just go over to the microphone so everybody can hear your question.

DAVE ARNOLD: There is a similar project that's happening, I don't know if it's completed yet or not down in Albany that G.E. or you're probably familiar with it, could you go over some of the problems that they ran into that might be similar to the ones that we're going to run into and you know, kind of give us an idea what we're looking forward to here.

DIRECTOR LYNCH: Yep, you're probably

referring to the Hudson River dredging project for the PCBs from the G.E. facility. And they've run into many questions much like we're hearing tonight. But they are not much further along than we are in this process. They have selected a remedial design but they haven't started. They probably started specific design but they haven't started any actual dredging work at this point.

So if you're asking what problems they ran into during the dredging that hasn't been done yet so I really can't answer those. But I would suggest if you have specific questions about the G.E. project, I think we have a number of people that have been involved or very familiar with that project and you can talk off line with them after the meeting. Anymore questions? One more.

RALPH MARTONE: I'd just like to know the resources that are available to this project. Is it just the one company that's Honeywell. Are they the only resource in

this to draw on basically? Just one corporation's problem? Or is it -- how does the Superfund and the resources of the US government play into, you know, the clean up?

DIRECTOR LYNCH: Any environmental clean up for hazardous waste pollution, whether at the state level or federal level is first approached by attempting to have the responsible parties, those who cause the problem clean up the problem to avoid using public monies to do so.

And in this case we have one responsible party in Honeywell who contributed to the majority of the contamination in the lake. Not all of it. We do know that there are other companies and other operations that have impacted the lake. But the Superfund does hold Honeywell responsible for addressing the entire clean up although they have certain remedies against other responsible parties.

So from a state perspective we can take the primary responsible party like Honeywell and have them do the clean up. They can

then seek contribution from other responsible parties to pay their collective share towards that clean up. There are state and federal resources involved, reviewing the project and oversight of the project which is also very important.

There is also the cases where you don't have a responsible party stepping forward and doing the work that it can be done with federal or state funds. But the first resort is the responsible parties, then we go from there.

Q. (Martone) Just to extend that same point I heard two billion dollars for the wish list on this project. What about that? What type of clean up would that involve? And I don't know if Honeywell has got two billion but if we needed to go that far would that be possible if that was necessary?

A. (Lynch) I think my presentation gave the real basics and I don't remember off the top of my head but it was the $2.1 billion proposal was the most expensive alternative

looked at in the Feasibility Study. And help me quick with the numbers, dredging - there you go, dredging over 2,300 acres of the land, 20 million cubic yards, which is almost seven times, probably six times what we're doing now.

Q. Wouldn't we like that?

A. It's a seventeen year process. Would involve much disruption to the lake in the area, much more challenging. The dredging plan proposed now is very challenging but this would be very challenging. And you have the practicality of that amount of money. Whether in fact you could get Honeywell or a combination of responsible parties to actually implement that plan. So it certainly was considered as part of the feasibility plan but we determined that our plan would be more suitable, practical and still be protective of the environment.

BY BARRY RAICHLIN:

Q. 240 million is a hell of a discrepancy between that and 2.1 billion. What's wrong with that picture?

A. It's six times.

Q. I think they're a little short?

A. They may be. That is not necessarily taking every piece of contaminant out of the bottom of the lake.

Q. Here's a government saying this is what we need. They're saying, okay we'll take this. We have 40 degrees, a new coach, why can't we have this too?

A. I wish it was as simple as getting a new coach.

JO ELLEN RAICHLIN: Trying to get money out of them.

DIRECTOR LYNCH: Any other questions? We will have people sticking around for a few moments if you want to come up one-on-one, we have a lot of charts that we have from our previous availability session.

I want to thank everyone for your great comments, great questions and your input on the Onondaga Lake cleanup. Have a good night.

* * * *

C E R T I F I C A T E

This is to certify that I am a Certified Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of New York, that I attended and reported the above entitled proceedings, that I have compared the foregoing with my original minutes taken therein and that it is a true and correct transcript thereof and all of the proceedings had therein.

John F. Drury, CSR, RPR

Dated: January 18, 2005