1	Page 1
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	AGENCIES' PUBLIC INFORMATION & COMMENT SESSION
7	FMC MIDDLEPORT RCRA CORRECTIVE ACTION
8	
9	MIDDLEPORT FIRE HALL
10	28 MAIN STREET
11	MIDDLEPORT, NEW YORK
12	JUNE 10, 2009 6:30 P.M.
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	REPORTED BV:

22	Doreen M. Sharick, Court Reporter
23	Edith E. Forbes Court Reporting Service
24	21 Woodcrest Drive
25	Batavia, New York 14020

ı	Page 2
2	APPEARANCES:
3	ANN HOWARD, FACILITATOR
4	
5	BRIAN McGINNIS, FMC REPRESENTATIVE
6	WAI CHIN LACHELL, AMEC GEOMATRIX, INC.,
7	FMC REPRESENTATIVE
8	
9	MATTHEW MORTEFOLIO,
10	NYS DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION
11	

12	MICHAEL INFURNA,
13	US ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
14	
15	ERIN RANKIN, ARCADIS
16	
17	TAMARA GIRARD
18	NYS DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
19	
20	DR. TERRI BOWERS
21	
22	KELLY MCINTOSH
23	
24	
25	

1 Page 3

	2	MS. HOWARD: Good evening. My
	3	name is Ann Howard and I will be the
	4	moderator/facilitator for tonight's session.
	5	My role here is to make sure we get
	6	through our agenda and that every one who
	7	wishes speak has an opportunity to present.
	8	Couple of logistical things, if you are going
	9	to deliver comments, it's going to be very
	10	important that you come to the microphone to
	11	speak and I'll go over that again as we get to
	12	that part of the agenda.
	13	The agenda for this evening is
	14	pretty simple. We'll have a presentation by
	15	representatives from FMC on the information
	16	contained in these volumes that are under
	17	discussion for this evening. There will be a
	18	short commentary from Matt Mortefolio from the
	19	New York State Department of Environmental
:	20	Conservation. There will be a short
2	21	presentation by Mike Infurna from the USEPA
2	22	and then we will open up the comments session
2	23	I'll go over this again when we get to that
:	24	part of session that.

1	Page 4
2	session. This is an opportunity for you to
3	share your comments and concerns regarding
4	this information to forward and review by the
5	agencies.
6	As I said, I'll review the process
7	as we get to that part of the agenda. So
8	first order of business is to introduce Wai
9	Chin Lachell and Brian McGinnis, the FMC
10	representatives.
11	MR. McGINNIS: Thank you, Ann.
12	Good evening and I'd like to thank everybody
13	for coming out tonight and I'd like to also
14	thank you for having us here. I'd like to

5	real briefly introduce the folks, the
6	consultants that are here from FMC. First, my
7	name is Brian McGinnis. I'm an FMC employee.
8	I'm from Philadelphia. I'm the FMC project
9	manager for Middleport Cleanup Project.
20	Wai Chin Lachell and Erin Rankin are
21	my two project managers from two different
22	consulting firms that work on the project. I
23	brought along Dr. Kelly McIntosh. Kelly,
24	raise your hand so everybody knows who you
25	are. Kelly is an expert in groundwater. We

1	Page 5
2	also brought along Dr. Terri Bowers. Terri is
3	an expert in arsenic risk and arsenic
4	background.

5	Before we get started with all this
6	material tonight, I wanted to take this
7	opportunity to congratulate a group right here
8	in Middleport, it's the Middleport Community
9	Input Group. Bill Arnold is the president of
10	that group. There is a number of other folks
11	in the room that come to those meetings on a
12	monthly basis. They just actually received
13	recognition by the USEPA last night and they
14	are the recipient of a 2009 Region 2
15	Environmental Quality Award. So on behalf of
16	that FMC, we'd like to congratulate that
17	group. We also like to thank the MCIG for all
18	their valuable input that they have provided
19	us on the project over the last two and a half
20	years for giving us and you as the community
21	not only their time but themselves. So we'd
22	like to thank you very much for that.
23	Tonight, we are going to talk about
24	three different reports that are in draft form
25	for the RCRA Facility Investigation for the

1	Page 6
2	Middleport site. The purpose of the RFI
3	report is it really presents all the
4	information that we have collected over the
5	last number of years, and it also presents our
6	evaluation of the results. What I'd like to
7	say is what it's not I think is also
8	important. What it's not going to tell
9	anybody or us right now, it's not going to
10	identify properties that either definitely
11	will or will not need to be cleaned up.
12	That's going to take place in the next step of
13	the process, which is called the Corrective
14	Measures Study. And we will talk briefly
15	about that later on in our presentation.
16	There's three reports. There's one
17	about our background and related information

18	The second one is about the suspected Air
19	Deposition Area, which is along the
20	residential homes in and around the plant site
21	and also, the third volume is about Culvert
22	105.
23	Culvert 105, if you don't know, is a
24	stormwater drainage way actually starts right
25	at the railroad tracks just north of the plant

1	Page 7
2	and it runs from there all the way up to the
3	village water treatment plant on
4	MS. LACHELL: Pearson Road.
5	MR. McGINNIS: Pearson Road.
6	It's a series of underground pipes and open
7	ditches. It's a stormwater conveyance.

8	So the purpose of this RFI that we
9	have done, it's required by the government for
10	FMC to conduct this. That's one of the
11	reasons that we did it. What it really does
12	is it evaluates and I'll come back and
13	explain this. It evaluates the nature and the
14	extent of materials that were historically
15	released from the plant site. The nature part
16	of this means what was released and the extent
17	means how far did it go and where is it.
18	As part of the process, we actually
19	analyzed for a whole host of different
20	materials that the plant handled over the
21	years back to the 1920's and one of the things
22	that we found early on in the project actually
23	was that arsenic is really the predominant
24	material that was actually released from the
25	facility. So that's actually one of the

1 Page 82 materials that we have really keyed in on to

3 look at. Although, we have looked at many

4 others, too.

The report actually is going to end up being 11 volumes. We have three of those tonight that are finished in draft. We have another one that's being reviewed by the agencies right now. Let me give you a little picture here. This is the plant site. If you look at this map on the right side, that's the plant site. The Air Deposition Area, which we have been talking about, is this area in green that's surrounds the plant site. The Culvert 105 is in this purple area. You can see that it starts right north of the railroad tracks, underneath the Erie Canal and then up right by Pearson Road.

The other really large volume of data or large report that we have that the

agencies are reviewing right now is for
tributary one, which is the stream that runs
through town, just on the west side and then
continues on up and that stream actually ends
up going into some other streams and ends up

1	Page 9
2	at Lyndonville. So there is actually going to
3	be 11 different volumes. Some of them are a
4	lot smaller. Some of them are a lot larger.
5	The next largest one that is coming out is
6	tributary one.
7	So Wai Chin, you'll talk about
8	Volume I for us.
9	MS. LACHELL: Yes.
10	MR. McGINNIS: Thank you.

1	MS. LACHELL: Volume I just
2	really discusses the background information.
3	It provides information that relates to all
4	the different study areas. There is nine
5	study areas. So it provides information and
6	it any kind of summarizes the study areas,
7	describes the study areas. Provides a
8	description of the history of the operations
9	at the plant site since about 1920. It also
20	identifies all the materials that were ever
21	handled at that facility. It provides other
22	information concerning land usage, climate,
23	wind directions. And you know, the other big
24	things, it describes everything that FMC has
25	evaluated in terms of environmental. So that

1 Page 10

2	it describes environmental monitoring
3	programs, all the environmental studies and
4	the remedial activities conducted to date.
5	Information in this Volume I will be
6	used in all the other subsequent volumes. So
7	one of the key information that is provided in
8	Volume I is the discussion of Middleport
9	background studies. In other words, what are
10	arsenic levels in areas that have not been
11	impacted by FMC.
12	Arsenic is a naturally occurring
13	substance. So it can be found in soils and
14	it's also a very widely used material. For
15	example, it has been used in pesticides in
16	orchards, wood treatment and a variety of
17	other materials. So you know, the background
18	studies really identify what the arsenic
19	levels are in soils that have not been
20	impacted by FMC.
21	So in this case and in the studies
22	in this RFI and subsequent studies, the
23	background data that will be used is the data

collected back in Gasport back in 2003. And
 as you can see here, this is the summarized

1	Page 11
2	data that was collected back in Gasport based
3	on land usage.
4	MR. McGINNIS: Thank you, Wai
5	Chin.
6	What we are going to do now is give
7	you a brief summary and kind of a 50,000 foot
8	overview of the results from Volume II, which
9	is the Air Deposition Area. The reports for
10	all three of these reports are actually
11	available on line if you want to go on line
12	and look at them. We have got the reports
13	here tonight. They are in the Middleport

14	Library. We also have them at 17 Vernon
15	Street. If you want to come by there, you
16	can't actually check them out from the library
17	but if you want to come by 17 Vernon Street
18	and you want to take them home for a couple
19	nights, that's fine. Just let us know and we
20	will make arrangements for you to do that if
21	you want to look at it in a lot of detail.
22	The yellow area is the area that we
23	have studied for the Air Deposition Area.
24	That's the area that we looked at. We
25	included in this volume data that we collected

1 Page 12
2 when we studied Culvert 105. And the reason
3 that we did that, it makes it a little bit

- 4 more complicated, but in the end it will be a
- 5 lot better because there are some properties
- 6 that not only did we look at their soils in
- 7 the upper 12 inches for air deposition, if the
- 8 culvert ran through their property, we took a
- 9 lot deeper samples to evaluate if there was
- any impact in the buried area from the
- 11 culvert. We actually took the data from south
- of the canal here and added that into this
- report. If one of these property owners wants
- to look at their data as a whole, they don't
- have to go look at two different reports.
- They can just go to one report and look at
- 17 that.
- Total samples, we sampled about 255
- 19 properties. There's about 30 properties in
- 20 this area that were not sampled for various
- 21 reasons. Mostly, we couldn't get access to
- them.
- This shows all the different points
- 24 at which we collected samples and we went to a
- 25 little over 2,400 different locations within

1	Page 13
2	this area to collect samples. Now, at some of
3	these locations we actually took more than one
4	sample. Some of these samples we took them
5	from zero to 3 inches, 3 to 6 inches, 6 to 9
6	inches and 6 to 12 inches and that varied from
7	location to location. So we ended up with
8	about a little over 5,600 individual sample
9	results in this area that were analyzed for
10	arsenic. There's also approximately 530 of
11	these samples in this area that were analyzed
12	for other constituents. Other materials that
13	we handled at the plant over the years.
14	Now, what we did with the results to
15	make it easier for not only us but for the
16	public most of that I think they did it for

me. I don't know. But to try to understand 17 18 what was going on, what you see here is a map where we mapped all the different sample 19 20 results. And over here on the side is a color 21 scale that tells us, you know, what the levels of arsenic were. If it's white, it's less 22 23 than 20. And then I'm not going to go through 24 these but gray is 20 to 25. And then this purple color is where we had sample results 25

EDITH E. FORBES (585) 343-8612

Page 14

	3
2	that were greater than 60 parts per million.
3	As you can see, you've got some areas that are
4	closest to the plant. You see the highest
5	results.

6 Now, this is what it looked like

1

7	before we did anything, any type of clean up
8	outside the plant area. If we take away those
9	areas we have already cleaned up, you can see
0	that, one, a lot of the higher results are
1	gone now. So those are the three different
2	areas that we cleaned up, the school yard and
3	the 14 properties over here on Vernon and then
4	this area on Park and that wooded parcel
5	behind the property that's right along the
6	railroad tracks. Thank you.
7	MS. RANKIN: It's a formerly
8	wooded parcel. If you go by there now,
9	there's no trees. Thank you.
20	MR. McGINNIS: Thank you. Her job
21	is to say things correctly. Thank you.
22	This actually shows the sample
23	results from the zero to 3 inch depth and I'm
24	going to go through and show you zero to 3
25	inch 3 to 6 inch 6 to 9 inch and 9 to 12

1	Page 15
2	Here's the 3 inch to 6 inch. It
3	looks pretty similar to the zero to 3. If we
4	take out what's already been remediated,
5	that's what we have left. And then we go to
6	the 6 to 9, and you can see it's with depth
7	the concentrations start to go down. And if
8	we take out what's been remediated, it looks a
9	little better. Then if we go to the 9 to 12
10	inch, you can see there's a few spots around
11	that still have some levels above 20. If we
12	take out what we remediated, there's not a
13	whole lot. So the concentrations decrease
14	with depth. All right.
15	MS. LACHELL: So you know, we

have all that data. What did we do with that

based on the concentrations that we saw and a

data? We looked at it and what we did is

bunch of other factors including wind

16

17

18

19

20 direction, you know, historical uses on 21 properties, we identified which properties 22 would be included in the Corrective Measure 23 Study. The Corrective Measure Study is the 24 point where we identified whether or not a property warrants remediation. In the RFI all 25

EDITH E. FORBES (585) 343-8612

1	Page 16
2	we are doing is trying to figure out which
3	properties will go into the Corrective Measure
4	Study, the next step.
5	So just a quick summary of what
6	these symbols mean, the hatches, the wide
7	hatches identify properties that we had no
8	sampling data on that. We could not sample
9	during our RFI process. And these smaller

10	hatchings are properties that have both
11	impacts from stormwater from Culvert 105 and
12	impact from air deposition. So it's just a
13	few of these properties.
14	Back in 2007, the agencies had
15	reviewed some of the preliminary soil data
16	that we received and that they had determined
17	that there was no further action required for
18	46 properties. And the 46 properties are the
19	ones shown in yellow. So those 46 properties
20	will not need to be evaluated in the
21	Corrective Measure Studies. They already
22	should have received a letter from the
23	agencies saying that no further actions are
24	required.
25	The properties that will require

1 Page 17

2	further study in the Corrective Measure Study
3	are shown in green. So the study areas are
4	shown in this bluish/purplish outline. So
5	based within that study area, approximately 28
6	properties will not move onto the next step,
7	which is the Corrective Measure Studies.
8	MR. McGINNIS: So we talked about
9	two of the reports already. The third one is
10	for Culvert 105. This shows the areas that we
11	investigated. Here's the canal and here's
12	Culvert 105 and here's Sleeper Street,
13	continues on north and right up here is the
14	village's waste water treatment plan.
15	We sampled approximately 25
16	properties through here. There were 299
17	points at which we collected samples and we
18	did this a little bit differently. This is
19	typically the way when we investigate some
20	type of a waterway, instead of taking just,
21	you know, a pattern of dots or a series of
22	equally spaced sample points, we go across the

stream. So you will see in the report they
are referred to as transects. That is the
sampling that we did across the streambed to

1	Page 18
2	try and get an idea of what was there. So a
3	total of about 1,300 samples for arsenic in
4	here and about 82 samples for other
5	constituents.
6	MS. LACHELL: Just going back a
7	little bit. As with the Air Deposition Area,
8	in the Culvert 105 area, arsenic was
9	determined and defined the extent of FMC's
10	impact even though we looked at all the
11	constitutents that were ever handled at the
12	facility, we determined or concluded in the

13	RFI that arsenic really defines what the
14	limits are. So that's why we are only kind of
15	focusing on arsenic in our presentation.
16	MR. McGINNIS: Right, right.
17	MS. RANKIN: FMC hired us as
18	consultants to collect the samples and submit
19	them to the laboratory for analysis. In
20	addition to that, the agencies also collected
21	samples and they independently sent those
22	samples to a laboratory for analysis.
23	MR. McGINNIS: Right. Those are
24	included in the report.
25	MS. RANKIN: Right.

1 Page 192 MR. McGINNIS: All the sampling

- data whether FMC collected and analyzed the
- 4 data or the agencies collected and analyzed
- 5 the data, all of that information is in the
- 6 reports.
- We mapped some other results for you
- 8 just to show you. This is Sleeper Street and
- 9 down here is the canal. The solid lines are
- the buried portions of Culvert 105 and the
- dashed lines are the open ditch. So here's
- the results that we found for the depth
- between zero and 12 inches along Culvert 105
- 14 just north of the canal. After we did our
- 15 remediation --
- 16 MS. LACHELL: 2007.
- 17 MR. McGINNIS: -- Two years ago,
- two summers ago, this is what's left. If we
- 19 look at the deeper results because we did take
- deeper samples here, greater than 12 inches,
- 21 here's the results. After we did our
- remediation, that's what was left.
- The next slide shows the results
- from Sleeper Street down at the bottom on up
- 25 to the waste treatment plant up here at the

1	Page 20
2	top and this is zero to 12 inches.
3	MS. LACHELL: Yes.
4	A JUROR: And if we look at
5	deeper than 12, there's not a lot left there.
6	That kind of tells us in the big picture is
7	that the majority contamination is in the
8	upper 12 inches of soil.
9	MS. LACHELL: Where there is some
10	higher levels of arsenic, they were typically
11	found near the bottom of the pipe, the buried
12	pipe.
13	MR. McGINNIS: Right, right.
14	MS. LACHELL: So we did a little
15	bit different approach for identifying what

16 properties would be included in the CMS for 17 the culvert area. What we decided to do was 18 that all properties that are traversed by the 19 Culvert 105 would be included into the next 20 phase of the study, will be included in the 21 Corrective Measure study. So those properties 22 will be studied further, but that does not 23 necessarily mean just because you're an 24 agreeing property and included in the CMS, it doesn't mean that you'll be remediated. That 25

1	Page 21
2	will be determined as part of that Corrective
3	Measure Study.
4	Conclusions, just a summary of the
5	findings of the two volumes. We looked at all

6	the constituents that the facility has
7	handled. We think that we have adequately
8	evaluated any impacts that FMC may have had to
9	the areas. We have enough data to complete
10	the Corrective Measure Studies. And we have
11	identified what properties will be further
12	evaluated in the Corrective Measure Study. So
13	with conclusion of this report and the
14	approval of the reports, we will hopefully be
15	moving onto the next phase.
16	MR. McGINNIS: What's next is
17	this kind of just gives a summary of different
18	activities that are going to be going on over
19	the next probably year or so, maybe a little
20	bit longer. The public comment period for the
21	first three volumes of the RFI, it will be
22	over on July 2. And once the agencies gets
23	all those comments, they will evaluate them,
24	and based on the comments, they may ask FMC to
25	revise our document or not based on the

1	Page 22
2	comments so comments are very important. We
3	are looking to finalize those first three
4	volumes either this summer or early fall and
5	get them on the shelf.
6	The next step as we talked about is
7	a Corrective Measure Study. We have a
8	Corrective Measure Study work plan. The work
9	plan kind of outlines how we are going to go
10	about conducting the Corrective Measure Study
11	That was submitted oh, I don't know.
12	Anyway it was submitted to the agencies and
13	the agencies are currently reviewing that.
14	I have to stop myself and I
15	apologize. I keep saying the agencies and
16	it's actually the three folks sitting over
17	here. It's the United States Environmental
18	Protection Agency. It's the New York State

Department of Environmental Conservation and the New York State Department of Health. So when we say agencies, that's a bad habit of ours. When we say agencies, we mean those three governmental agencies, who provide us guidance and comments on the project.

Once we get approval to do the

EDITH E. FORBES (585) 343-8612

Page 23

2	Corrective Measure Study and that's for
3	Culvert 105 and the Air Deposition Areas, for
4	both of those areas, once we get approval, we
5	will go ahead and start that. Right now, we
6	are targeting we think we will probably be
7	done early next year, depending on when we get
8	approval or agreement about how it should be

9	conducted. I mean we are looking at is it
10	nine months?
11	MS. LACHELL: Yes, less than that
12	I think.
13	MR. McGINNIS: Between six and
14	nine?
15	MS. LACHELL: Yes.
16	MR. McGINNIS: Between six and
17	nine for us to actually sit down and do the
18	study, put everything together.
19	MS. LACHELL: Once that study is
20	completed, we will go through this same
21	process
22	MR. McGINNIS: Yes, yes, right.
23	MS. LACHELL: Public meeting,
24	public comment.
25	MR. McGINNIS: Right. So I think

1	Page 24
2	that should wrap it up for us I think. Ann.
3	MS. HOWARD: The next portion of
4	the agenda will include comments by Matt
5	Mortefolio from the New York State Department
6	of Environmental Conservation.
7	MR. MORTEFOLIO: My name is Matt
8	Mortefolio, project manager for New York State
9	DEC. I come from Albany and I've been working
10	on the project since '86. Most of you know
11	me, of course. I'm going to raffle through
12	these slides because we did our presentation
13	separately. I just found out that those guys
14	have covered alot of what I did. So I'm going
15	to raffle through as much as we can.
16	First of all, FMC's covered under a
17	thing called RCRA, which stands for the
18	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, a
19	Federal law. FMC's covered under it because
20	they once managed hazardous waste at the site
21	and that law basically governs facilities that

did that in the past. And that we also have
authority over releases. It's a federal law
and the states also have jurisdiction over it
in New York State's case. That's what that's

1	Page 25
2	all about.
3	Just quickly, the presentation
4	topics, the purpose of the RFI like Brian said
5	is to determine the nature of the
6	contamination and its extent away from the
7	facility. That's about all I can say about
8	that. I'm going to go overall site area one,
9	Culvert 105, like they did, a little more
10	detail on certain things. Again, the nature
11	of the releases, the extent and then going to

12	go in a little more detail about property
13	categories, their effected properties that we
14	believe the properties been effected by
15	releases, unaffected and places where we have
16	no data and different other nuances to that.
17	I'll go over the public
18	opportunities for comment, which Brian touched
19	upon. I'll give you some addresses and things
20	you can provide comments. And again, next
21	steps like Brian just highlighted.
22	Again, past chemical releases from
23	the FMC facility migrated from the plant site,
24	that's what this is all about, finding out
25	what they are and where they went. The

- chemical constituents concerned in Area #1 and
 Culvert 105 that we looked for when samples
 are basically arsenic, lead, chlorinated
 pesticides, DDT is one of those chlorinated
 pesticides. It's a group of chemicals.

 In general, after that sampling was
 done, we basically concluded and agree with
- 8 9 FMC that the primary constituent and concern 10 was arsenic like they said. And the reason 11 for that is arsenic, unlike the other ones, 12 appeared in the highest concentrations, higher 13 than these other two right here, and also, was 14 the most wide spread. In other words, we 15 found many locations where we found arsenic to 16 be elevated but not the other constituents. 17 We agree with FMC that that's a good chemical 18 to use to find out what the extent of the
 - to use to find out what the extent of the contamination was. Arsenic, which I won't go into any detail, is a toxic element and it's also a Class A carcinogen, which means it's a confirmed carcinogen by EPA's research in the past.

Okay. Factors FMC used and we

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	Page 27
2	an arsenic background concentration and we
3	basically determined that 20 parts per million
4	or milligrams per kilogram, milligrams of
5	chemical to kilograms of soil, would be a good
6	number to use to delineate the extent of the
7	arsenic and the reason for that is that number
8	basically, FMC performed a background sampling
9	in nearby Gasport where we didn't believe any
0	affect from FMC on the soils was happening to
1	determine what the amount was normally in the
2	soil if FMC's releases had never occurred.
3	They took over 100 samples. They
4	were taken from different land uses, farms,

15 residential, commercial, orchards, the kind of 16 land uses you see right around Middleport and 17 then we synthesized that data. We came up 18 with two things; one is the 95th percentile of 19 that data turned out to be about 20 parts per 20 million for residential soils. 95th 21 percentile simply means that 95 percent of the 22 data that we collected gave us results of 20 23 parts per million or less. It's like an upper 24 bound of what would be a non-FMC related soil. 25 We also calculated what's called the

EDITH E. FORBES (585) 343-8612

Page 28

weighted 95th percentile of all the data and

that includes farm, residential, orchards and

everything. It's weighted because each of the

5	land uses has a different area and it wasn't
6	appropriate to have orchards be governing the
7	data more than residential or visa versa and
8	that turned out to be also 20 parts her
9	million. That's where that came from.
10	Other factors that are used, just a
11	concentration of arsenic alone found in the
12	soil doesn't mean it's related to FMC. So
13	other factors were used in area one. We
14	looked at the historic wind patterns since the
15	release was by air, which way does the wind
16	normally blow so we could correlate that with
17	the data, ground features that might influence
18	where the air emissions went. In Culvert
19	105's case, we looked at where the ditch runs
20	and what the flood limits are, and the idea is
21	that the flooding that occurred along that
22	waterway would be kind of an ultimate limit of
23	where the FMC related contamination would be
24	Using that, again, these two figures
25	appear at the back of the facts sheet which I

1 Page 29

2 handed out. I'll probably go over a lot of

3 those. Those are kind of most the two most

4 important figures out of the two volumes,

5 Volume II and Volume IV out of all of them

6 because basically, they sum up what the

7 results of the investigation are in terms of

8 what properties and areas will have to be

evaluated further and which ones won't, which

10 I think is critical.

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

Again, FMC pointed out the blue line is the culvert. The green area in both of the figures is an approximation of the extent of the involved effected properties for the releases. That doesn't mean every inch of property may be affected. If a part of it is, it appears all in green. It doesn't mean the

18 whole thing is. Also, it's approximate 19 because if a property wasn't sampled, it also 20 doesn't mean that, you know, there's nothing 21 there. So it's an approximate area which we 22 feel is adequate to move onto the CMS. 23 Couple features of this, along this 24 line here, which is the northern boundary of 25 the Air Deposition Area #1, and this line here

EDITH E. FORBES (585) 343-8612

Page 30

which is basically the county line, Niagara

and Orleans County, is basically the end of

sampling for Area #1. However, we basically

don't consider it as maybe being the end of

the contamination because of the 20 parts per

million is still elevated here. So additional

7

8	sampling has been done north of the canal by
9	FMC and east of this line, which we are
10	waiting on. FMC has the results of and we are
11	going to be having them soon. That should
12	basically close out the book we think on maybe
13	the extent.
14	This will be a separate area. We
15	will call it area two if it materializes that
16	there's actually elevated levels there. It
17	will be addressed at a later time. So what
18	we're going to do is prioritize everything in
19	green area to move forward into the CMS.
20	We're not going to wait to see and what
21	happens out here and delay this area's further
22	study.
23	I'm going to focus on some property
24	categories. So we are very clear on,
25	especially if you are a property owner, who's

1 Page 31

2	affected and who's not affected and where you
3	might fall. And this is basically the same
4	figure 9.1, but it's the west area of it. The
5	green property, again, has been determined to
6	be effected. They generally have in some
7	realm or another soil greater than 20 parts
8	per million, again, maybe not the whole
9	property. In some cases it is. It's also
10	considered related to the FMC and they will be
11	included in the CMS as FMC said.
12	Yellow properties are the properties
13	where we sampled. The agencies, like Brian
14	said, gave the homeowners letters saying we
15	don't believe you are affected by the FMC
16	releases. All of these properties have levels
17	of arsenic primarily or predominantly below
18	20. So those will not be included as Brian
19	said in the CMS. Those properties are done.

If you are in a yellow property, your

20

21	property's part in this process is over once
22	this report is approved. That's the gist of
23	that.
24	We have white site properties inside
25	this blue line, which is this thin line where

1	Page 32
2	we sampled. We haven't given them no further
3	actions. An example, these two white
4	properties here, this report basically would
5	indicate that the extent of the FMC related
6	contamination doesn't extend to these
7	properties. In some cases, it means that
8	these properties are unaffected by any sort of
9	arsenic contamination. In other cases, there
10	may be some elevated arsenics in spots related

11	to non-FMC reasons that we don't know why.
12	Outside the property, all the white
13	out here, everything here is outside the
14	sampling area. We didn't collect samples, but
15	based on what we found inside the area, the
16	sampling we did there plus the wind patterns
17	and everything else, we don't believe these
18	properties are affected either. They weren't
19	sampled, but they will not be looked at any
20	further. So anything out here is basically
21	done.
22	This is the northern part of that
23	same figure. Again, Brian went over this
24	stuff that's basically in these purple areas
25	is previously remediated properties or areas,

1 Page 33

2	school property, the football fields we are
3	all familiar with. The reason they are in
4	green is that the remediations were performed
5	and we believe performed satisfactorily, but
6	the regulations require they must first go
7	through the Corrective Measure Study process
8	to do a last evaluation to determine that
9	those remediations were adequate, which we
10	believe that will be happening and then these
11	things will be finalized. That's why they are
12	in green and they will be part of the CMS.
13	Properties with the close diagonal
14	lines, as Wai talked earlier, these here are
15	basically properties that share effects from
16	air deposition and from where the culvert
17	passes through, Culvert 105.
18	Another set of property categories.
19	Wai went through this a little bit.
20	Properties with wide space diagonal lines. If
21	they are green and both of these cases mean we
22	have no sample on the property. If they are
23	in the green area, they are appearing in the

- 24 CMS because the samples around them suggest
- 25 the possibility of contamination. So we will

1	Page 34
2	be evaluating them as if they were sampled.
3	If they are white with diagonal lines, it
4	means no sampling was performed. But again,
5	white means that the data around them suggests
6	that they are not affected by the FMC releases
7	and that, again, white means it will not be
8	apart of the CMS.
9	Moving onto Culvert 105, this is
10	south of the barge canal. That's the barge
11	canal right there. Pretty much same thing
12	what green indicates. These properties will
13	be in the CMS because they are impacted from

14	releases from the culvert. And again, the
15	diagonal lines, again, mean where properties
16	share impacts from both air deposition and
17	from the culvert that goes through here. And
18	that's a different category there. So this is
19	the same thing that Brian showed you earlier
20	This is, again, Culvert 105 continued. This
21	is the barge canal. Now, we are north of the
22	barge canal as we look through here.
23	Again, plain green properties are
24	the properties that we believe are affected
25	from culvert releases through flooding and

EDITH E. FORBES (585) 343-8612

Page 35 various other means. Again, it doesn't mean whole properties are affected, like an example

- 4 maybe this property right here. The affects
- 5 maybe limited to near the culvert, which they
- 6 probably are. But since there's part of the
- 7 property been affected, everything is kind of
- 8 shown in green.
- 9 This wide brown line here, that is
- 10 basically signifying that we would have no
- samples here, but what happens here is that we
- 12 have elevated levels of arsenic along this
- property boundary indicating that we need to
- 14 have further samples because probably it's
- 15 further out in this direction. So it's not
- really clear where the eastern extent of the
- 17 contamination is along that line. That's what
- the line signifies.
- 19 As I said before, public
- 20 opportunities for providing input. That's
- 21 what we are here for is to get the public's
- 22 opinion on these reports before the agencies
- take final action. Various ways to do it
- tonight, when I get done, we will have people
- coming up and you can give your oral comments

1	Page 36
2	on the report and they will be transcribed.
3	Also, in the back if you haven't gotten one
4	already, there's comment forms which you car
5	write your comments on, leave them here or
6	mail them in. After tonight, you can mail
7	your comments to me. There's my address at
8	New York State DEC up until July 2, which is
9	the end of the comment period.
10	And that address is also on the
11	facts sheet if you need take a look at that.
12	One other thing before I go on here, I should
13	have put it on the slide, but Brian said
14	earlier that these reports are available on
15	line for the public to review.
16	MR. McGINNIS: Can you tell them

17	where?
18	MR. McGINNIS: Thank you because
19	I didn't put it on the slide either. If you'd
20	like to look at all three volumes, they are
21	put online separately thanks to the Middleport
22	Input Group. I believe I got that right.
23	MR. McGINNIS: No, Community
24	Input Group.
25	MR. MORTEFOLIO: Middleport

1	Page 37
2	Community Input Group has a web site and they
3	have been gracious enough to put these online
4	for us. And the web site is
5	www.Middleport-future.com/RFI and that is in
6	the fact sheet. If you didn't hear me, nick

7	up a facts sheet and that way you can access
8	the reports and look at them at home at your
9	leisure.
10	Next step, as Brian went through, we
11	will review all the public comments after July
12	2nd including the transcript from tonight.
13	The agencies will review all those. We will
14	prepare and present to the public what's
15	called a responsive summary. That means we
16	would take all the comments, we will reprint
17	them in some fashion, even the ones in the
18	transcript and the agency will issue some
19	responses to them.
20	And we will probably also depending
21	on the size of the comments either mail them
22	out to the commenters at least mail out a
23	notification that we have done this, and this,
24	again, hopefully, will be available online.
25	The responsive summary will be in the library

1	Page 38
2	so people can come and look at it.
3	Once we've done that, probably
4	immediately when we've done that, we will make
5	a final determination on these three volumes
6	of the RFI report which their choice is to
7	approve them or basically have FMC modify them
8	as Brian said based on the comments.
9	And then as they went through
10	before, we move on to conducting the
11	Corrective Measure Study, which will be
12	basically a fall/winter, maybe even spring of
13	2010 endeavor by both FMC and the agencies and
14	there will be a lot more opportunities during
15	that time and after that time for public input
16	on that part of it.
17	Finally, I'm done. I'd like to
18	acknowledge a couple of things first before I
19	send off here. The Middleport Public

20	Involvement Group, which I got that wrong. I
21	got that wrong on the slide. Middleport
22	Community Involvement Input Group. I totally
23	messed that up. I'll give you a lot of
24	credit. Like I said before, they have been
25	instrumental in getting things online so

1	Page 39
2	people can get them easily. It's not easy for
3	the agencies to do that for various reasons.
4	And they came to our rescue there sort of and
5	also helped FMC out. So I'd like to
6	acknowledge that they have been a big help in
7	this endeavor.
8	Other New York State DEC staff, way
9	back there is Mike Kitten and he works out of

10	Region 9 Buffalo. From New York State
11	Department of Health in the back desk doing
12	the duty tonight is Nate Freeman and Tamara
13	Girard from the New York State DOH, has been
14	project manager for DOH on this site for quite
15	a while and the last person I'll introduce and
16	say a few things that Brian already kind of
17	let out of the bag but that's okay, Mike
18	Infurna, who is representing USEPA. He works
19	out of New York City. He's been on this
20	project almost as long as I have and has a
21	couple words to say with regards to the
22	Middleport Community Input Group. Got it
23	right there. Thank you.
24	MR. INFURNA: Brian kind of stole
25	my thunder

1	Page 40
2	MR. McGINNIS: I'm sorry. I
3	didn't mean to say anything.
4	MR. INFURNA: Last night I
5	presented the MCIG with a plaque for an
6	Environmental Quality Award, pretty much
7	rewarding their work in getting comments and
8	concerns from the community to the agencies.
9	They work very hard at it. It goes
10	unappreciated except in this instance where we
11	gave them a plaque and we appreciate their
12	work.
13	And if anyone would like to get
14	involved with this, I know it's kind of hard
15	sometimes to come to these types of forums
16	because if maybe somebody doesn't want to
17	speak in public, but if you're interested and
18	you have some concerns and you'd like to relay
19	them to the agenciess, maybe you can speak
20	with Bill Arnold after this meeting. They
21	meet once a month and it's an excellent way of
22	getting your concerns and maybe your neighbors

and whoever else's to the agencies and it's a
really good way of addressing things before
it's maybe too late or whatever, but they did

I	Page 41
2	a great job with this and we look forward to
3	working with them in the future.
4	MS. HOWARD: Thanks, Mike. Now,
5	here's your portion of the meeting. I just
6	want to follow-up, again, with more specifics
7	about how this portion of the meeting will
8	run. This is at the bottom of your agenda.
9	Just please note that this is not a question
10	and answer session. This is your opportunity
11	provide comments as you had reflected on the
12	information you received tonight or if you've

13	taken the time to read these multi-page
14	volumes of information. The purpose is to get
15	your comments. This is not the only way you
16	can provide your comments. There were
17	handouts that would allow you to provide
18	written comments. You can leave those tonight
19	or as Matt said earlier, you can mail them to
20	him. And the final day for submitting
21	comments, again, is July 2nd.
22	If you wish to speak tonight at this
23	meeting, there are a couple of things we are
24	going to ask you to do and this is mainly
25	because this meeting is being transcribed.

1 Page 42

2 The final written transcription will be

3	provided to the agencies to assure accuracy of
4	your comments and to assure that all the
5	information you provide is included. We are
6	asking if you want to provide oral comments
7	this evening, please come to the microphone.
8	Please state your name, your address and then
9	provide your comment. We are only going to
10	have one person at time obviously and we will
11	try to move this as smoothly as possible.
12	There is no particular order of this so I will
13	just ask people just by show of hands if you'd
14	like to speak.
15	Because this is not a question and
16	answer format, it is recognized that you may,
17	in fact, have questions and so representatives
18	from FMC as well as from the agencies will be
19	here after this formal session to answer your
20	specific questions if you think that's
21	appropriate in that one on one opportunity.
22	So we are ready to take your comments.
23	Okay. Please state your name,
24	address and then give your comment, please?
25	MR. WESTCOTT: My name is Dick

1	Page 43
2	Westcott. I live at 13 Mechanic Street in the
3	village. I'm a village trustee and I'm also a
4	member of CIG. My comment for the agencies
5	and to FMC, is it my understanding that the
6	approximately 28 properties that will be
7	excluded from the CMS study will receive a
8	letter indicating a reason as to why they were
9	excluded, either because they were below the
10	20 parts per million or it was a parking lot
11	or whatever, but those 28 properties roughly
12	will receive a letter at the end of this? Is
13	that what is my understanding here?
14	MS. HOWARD: Do you have a
15	comment about that or are you suggesting a

16	letter should be sent? Do you have a specific
17	comment?
18	MR. WESTCOTT: As a
19	representative of the village and
20	particularly, I stress that it should be done
21	at the conclusion of this so these people can
22	attach it to their property and personal
23	paperwork and whatever so they are not hanging
24	because some people will be tested then they
25	are excluded. They deserve a reason and

1	Page 44
2	that's my comment. I just hope it's going to
3	be followed through and it will be right.
4	Thank you.
5	MS. HOWARD: Thank you. Anyone

6	else?
7	MR. ARNOLD: I'm Bill Arnold.
8	I'm a resident at 10160 State Road. That's
9	east of the Middleport Schools. I'm also
10	chairman of the Middleport Community Input
11	Group. I'd like to thank the agencies and FMC
12	for their comments that they made regarding
13	the group. We have a table in the back over
14	here where there's some information that you
15	can pick up that explains our group and other
16	information such as that.
17	We do meet once a month. We'd like
18	people to come to our meetings if they can.
19	You don't have to say anything. You can just
20	sit there and learn what's going on,
21	understand what the topics are that we are
22	discussing and join in if you'd like.
23	I have several comments and I'll
24	just make a couple right now and let someone
25	else speak. We, as a group, discussed last

1 Page 45

night after our regular meeting with the agencies and FMC, our concern over the conclusion of the corrective action objectives and the way that that one paragraph was spelled out with the range of cancer risk, we are still not happy with the way that turned out and we'd like to go on the record in this transcript saying that we are not happy with

the situation.

As a personal question or comment not related to the CIG, is I would like to understand what the improvement in human health would be, measureable improvement to lower landscaped properties, residential properties from say 30 to 40 parts per million to 20. Taking into account to do that you have to rip out everything, every living thing

19	that's on that property probably in an
20	excavation effort to do it. I'll let whoever
21	else would like to speak.
22	MS. HOWARD: Anyone else? Please
23	state your name and address?
24	MS. BARTHOLOMIEU: Hello, my name
25	is Rhonda Bartholomieu. I am here along with

1	Page 46
2	my husband, David Bartholomieu. Our address
3	is 84 North Hartland Street. My biggest
4	concern is Middleport is considered an arbor
5	town. We have beautiful trees and we'd like
6	to keep it that way. We also have a shallow
7	ditch in our backyard that is a habitat to a
8	lot of deer, opossums, animals, my dog. My

9	children love to play in there. And we would
10	just hate to see everything ripped to shreds.
11	From what was seen on North Vernon Street, it
12	was a descent action that was taken, but those
13	trees will never come back and the trees that
14	were put in its place, I don't think does
15	justice to what was there prior to that. So I
16	hate to see that happen to all of our
17	properties here and I just don't see how we
18	are helping nature by taking trees that have
19	taken hundreds of years to grow to be ripped
20	out just to see if there was a problem with
21	the arsenic. I mean if it's held within the
22	trees I understand taking out the soil
23	around it, but to just rip out the trees, I
24	think it's pointless and it's a crime. Thank
25	you.

1	Page 47
2	MS. HOWARD: Thank you. Any
3	other comments? Your name and address,
4	please?
5	MS. STORCH: I'm Elizabeth
6	Storch. I live at 59 State Street,
7	Middleport. I'm in the Air Deposition Area.
8	My house is in one of those green areas. I've
9	lived here for 30 years this August. I've
10	been a member of the MCIG for two years.
11	I'm a retired librarian. I have
12	researched this topic extensively. My average
13	parts per million of arsenic in my soil is
14	somewhere in the mid twenties. I feel
15	absolutely zero percent danger to my health.
16	I see no need to remediate my soil. And I
17	just wanted to go on the record for that.
18	Matt and Mike came over, Matt from
19	the DEC and Mike came over. They are well
20	aware. I told them and they came and they
21	know my feelings, but for any of you out there

that are afraid, I feel that the remaining air
deposition properties, myself, from the
research that I've done and from Dr. Bowers'
research and others that the bioavailability

1	Page 48
2	of the arsenic in the soil is very low,
3	meaning that you can be on the soil, you can
4	even grow vegetables, wash them. You can do
5	your normal activities and not be in any
6	danger of cancer from that. I want to go on
7	the record that I feel safe in the community
8	of Middleport. And I plan to continue to live
9	here for another 30 years.
10	MS. HOWARD: Thank you. Anyone
11	else? Your name and address, please?

2	MR. OWEN: My name is Dick Owen.
3	I live on 12 Locus Drive in the Village. I'm
4	a member of CIG. I'm optimistic that the
5	agencies FMC and CIG are communicating well
6	and I just hope that an agreement can be
7	reached and the process can be made faster
8	than what we have had and that the agreement
9	will be that remediation is done on a risk
20	basis rather than sticking hard to a
21	background due to the fact that I feel through
22	the research I've done that the background
23	levels are somewhat unreasonable and risk
24	based and probably bring the numbers up higher
5	and everybody will be content because I think

- then we will save alot of our foliage and
- 3 trees. That's all I have.
- 4 MS. HOWARD: Thank you. Anyone
- 5 else? Just state your name again, Bill?
- 6 MR. ARNOLD: It's Bill Arnold.
- 7 As Dick alluded to and just spoke, this
- 8 process has been going on for quite a long
- 9 time. Matt referenced that he's been doing
- this since 1986. That's over 20 years that
- this village has been going through this
- 12 situation. I would like to emphasis that we
- should try to proceed with this as quickly as
- 14 possible. I think the dates that FMC
- presented to evaluate the CMS is too long. I
- think that needs to be expedited a little
- 17 better than the scheduling that you have right
- 18 now.
- 19 20 years of this situation is more
- than any community should have to bear. And
- 21 we need to get this project moving along and
- we need to get it done quicker than what some
- of the schedules are calling for right now.
- The MCIG is not interested in hearing why we

1	Page 50
2	ideas on how it can be done.
3	On a second item, Matt referenced
4	the Gasport study. We feel that that study
5	has certain flaws in it. It's nothing but a
6	bunch of assumptions, mathematical
7	approximations and statistical calculations
8	and there's no reason to believe that if
9	somebody else did that same analysis, that
10	they would come up with the same ending. And
11	so we are not sure that 20 parts per million
12	is the true background.
13	On the chart that Wai showed, I
14	believe that she had the highest range of the

15	agricultural contamination at 56. I believe
16	there were numbers as high as 122 parts per
17	million found in the agricultural areas. So
18	the data is much higher than what was shown on
19	those charts.
20	Matt, the chart you showed for area
21	one in the upper left-hand corner, I think
22	there were properties included in there in the
23	white that you said would not be studied
24	further that are on the tributary north of
25	Frances Street and that really will be in

1	Page 51
2	Volume 5. So you may want to check that.
3	don't want anybody to go away thinking that
4	their property is going to be clear when it

5	really isn't.
6	MS. HOWARD: Thank you. Anyone
7	else? Silence is really loud, isn't it?
8	Okay. It appears as though we have heard the
9	extent of the oral comments. Just to remind
10	you, you are welcome to provide written
11	comments. You can leave them this evening or
12	mail them in prior to July 2nd. As stated
13	earlier, FMC representatives and the agency
14	representatives will be here following this
15	formal session to answer any specific
16	questions you have or to receive your comments
17	in person. Thank you for coming.
18	(Proceedings concluded.)
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	Page 52
2	
3	CERTIFICATE
4	
5	
6	I, DOREEN M. SHARICK, do hereby certify that I
7	have reported in stenotype shorthand the proceedings
8	in the public hearing of the Agencie's Public
9	Information & Comment Session, FMC Middleport RCRA
10	Corrective Action, held at the Middleport Fire Hall,
11	28 Main Street, Middleport, New York, on June 10,
12	2009.
13	That the transcript herewith is a true,
14	accurate and complete record of my stenotype notes.
15	
16	
17	

18	DOREEN M. SHARICK
19	Notary Public.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	