1	U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
2	GUTERL SPECIALTY STEEL
3	FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PLAN
4	
5	
6	Thursday, July 29th, 2021
7	7:00 PM
8	Held via Webex
9	
10	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
11	1776 Niagara Street
12	Buffalo, New York 14207
13	
14	APPEARANCES:
15	, Outreach Specialist
16	LIEUTENANT COLONEL - Commander of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Buffalo
17	District
18	, Guterl Specialty Steel Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program Site
19	Project Manager
20	- Chat Moderator
21	
22	MEETING REPORTER: , RPR
23	, KIK

1			P	U	В	L	Ι	С		С	0	M	M	E	N	T	s	
2		NAME																PAGE
3																		30
4																		33
5																		35
6																		41
7																		42
8																		42
9																		43
10																		
11																		
12																		
13																		
14																		
15																		
16																		
17																		
18																		
19																		
20																		
21																		
22																		
23																		
		—DEP.	AOL	ω-(CRO	OSI	BY	$\mathbf{R}\mathbf{E}$	PC	m RT	ΊN	G S	SEF	lVI	CE	S,	IN	g. ———

: Good evening, everyone.

Thank you for joining us tonight. This meeting is being recorded. A court reporter is also on the line to prepare an official transcript of the meeting. Please keep your phones on mute during the presentation of this meeting.

During the public comment period portion of the meeting you will be called on in the order that you signed up to speak.

To orient you a little to WebEx, some of the icons shown above will be visible on the bottom of your screen. Again, please keep your phones on mute during the presentation portion of this meeting.

If you have a question, please click on the chat icon and type in your question.

Please hit enter when you are finished typing.

The chat box will be monitored during the presentation and your questions will be addressed after the comment portion of the meeting is completed.

It's my pleasure to introduce Lieutenant Colonel , the Commander of the U.S.

Army Corps of Engineers Buffalo District.

LIEUTENANT COLONEL : Thank you,

. Can you hear me?

: Yes, sir.

EVERYONE. I regret we're not able to meet in person tonight, but I understand the current COVID-19 circumstances preclude that opportunity for many folks. Either way, we appreciate the opportunity to connect with the community on this vital project which will benefit our region.

Since 1857 the Buffalo District has served the people in the watersheds of the lower Great Lakes all the way from Massena, New York in the east to the Indiana state line in the west. We have many projects across this area of responsibility, but this one is particularly close to home.

Many of our 300 employees from the

District live in this community and we care

about serving all of our fellow citizens and

safeguarding them. The number one priority

about our decision-making process and subsequent cleanup of the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program, or FUSRAP, sites is the protection of human health and the environment. Cleanup activities are conducted in a manner that is safe for our on-site workers and the community.

Next slide please. So as you can see, this is an agenda for our meeting tonight.

Tonight's session is being recorded by a court recorder. Once we have completed the presentation we'll receive your comments.

Commentators will be called in the order that they are registered.

Questions can be placed in the chat section. Questions received tonight in the chat will be addressed after the comment portion of the meeting. The questions and answers will also be posted on the site's website.

Thank you for participating in our virtual meeting and I'd like to take this time to thank the federal, state and local elected

officials and agency representatives who are joining us tonight.

I understand Legislator , representing the 13th District of Niagara County has also joining the meeting and would like to say a few words.

LEGISLATOR : Can you hear me?

LIEUTENANT COLONEL : Absolutely.

LEGISLATOR : I'd like to thank
you for having us and for coming down here to
Lockport and taking care of this situation. My
father worked at Simonds Steel at the time for
24 years until they closed. My family lives
down the street, my mom and my sister, and I
have another sister who has a business
literally right on the corner, so we're very
pleased that the Army Corps of Engineers is
taking action to clean that site up and I'm
very appreciative as a legislator in the City
of Lockport.

My district encompasses a good portion of the city. Not that ward in particular, but, as I said, I have a long history with that

1 particular site, so thank you again for being 2 here. LIEUTENANT COLONEL 3 S: Thank you, 4 for the City Mayor 5 of Lockport. Would you like to also say a few words? Is Mayor online? 6 I did see her on the line. 7 8 She's muted right now. There we go. : 9 MAYOR It was confusing with the 10 phone. You told me to call in on the phone and 11 not on my computer, so sorry. I unmuted my phone and not my computer. Can you hear me 12 13 now? 14 LIEUTENANT COLONEL Absolutely, : 15 Mayor. 16 MAYOR Okay. I wanted to 17 reiterate what Legislator said. Ι greatly appreciate all the work that you have 18 19 put into this so far and we are looking forward 20 to the cleanup of this site so that the health and safety of everyone there, including the 21 current workers who work in the adjacent lot so 22 23 that they know that when they go to work that

they're going to be safe as well, so thank you very much.

LIEUTENANT COLONEL : Thank you,

Mayor I'll now turn this meeting over

to ______, our Guterl Site Project

Manager.

everyone hear me? All right. Let's see. Good evening, everyone. Before I get started, we tried to keep our use of acronyms on these slides to a minimum. These are some of the acronyms used in the presentation that you're going to hear tonight. These acronyms will be explained when they are used on each slide.

We are here tonight to discuss the proposed plan for the Guterl Specialty Steel Site which is being addressed under FUSRAP.

Most importantly, we are here to receive your comments on the proposed plan preferred alterative which is shown on the screen.

Our preferred alternative is the result of complex and meticulous analysis that we have performed since we last met with you to discuss

the results of our remedial investigation of the site. As we walk through the slides in this presentation, we will go into more detail about the process we followed to arrive at a preferred alternative and the other alternatives that were considered.

In our judgment, the remedial action outlined in the preferred alternative, or Alternative 3, provides the best overall long-term protection of human health and the environment.

It has been a while since we've met with you regarding the site, so I'm going to cover some background information first. The work we are doing at the Guterl Specialty Steel Site is authorized under FUSRAP. The program was initiated in 1974 to identify, investigate and, if necessary, cleanup or control sites through the United States that were contaminated as a result of the Manhattan Engineer District or the early Atomic Energy Commission activities.

The objectives for FUSRAP are identified on this slide.

Our number one priority while performing activities at the site is the protection of human health and the environment and the safety of the community and site workers.

Use of the site began in 1910 when it was owned and operated by Simonds Saw and Steel Company to manufacture steel and specialty steel alloys. Simonds owned the site through 1966. During its period of ownership, and specifically during World War II, normal plant operations were suspended and the plant conducted operations for the United States Government under various contracts.

Between 1948 and 1952 the New York State Operations Office of the Atomic Energy Commission, or AEC, managed a contract with Simonds to roll uranium steel bullets into rods.

Between 1952 and 1956 Simonds continued the rolling work under a subcontract to National Lead Company of Ohio who was under contract to the AEC. Under each contract, the uranium metal bullets were received on the site

by rail car, were rolled to contract specifications and then transported back off-site by rail car. Records indicate that Simonds processed between 25 million and 35 million pounds of natural uranium metal and approximately 30,000 to 40,000 pounds of thorium metal between 1948 and 1956.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

In 1966 the site was sold to Wallace-Murray Corporation who operated the site until 1978. In 1978 the site was sold again to Guterl Specialty Steel Corporation who operated the site until 1982. In 1982 Guterl filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy protection. Ιn 1984 Allegheny Ludlum Corporation, now ATI Specialty Materials, purchased the Guterl Steel Corporation's assets. An approximate nine-acre portion of the property, which is now known as the Excised Area, was removed from the sale. Equipment used during the time at Simonds that was conducted during the work for the Atomic Energy Commission was also excluded from the sale.

The Guterl Specialty Steel Site is

located in Lockport, New York situated north of the Erie Canal. The Guterl Site is comprised of two areas. The 60.6-acre ATI Specialty

Materials property includes four buildings that were constructed after the termination of AEC activities. ATI currently operates an active specialty steel manufacturing facility in the southwest portion of this property.

The nine-acre Excised Area, owned by

Guterl Specialty Steel, includes nine buildings

located in the southeast corner of the site

that were used by the AEC to roll uranium

metal. These buildings are currently abandoned

and a chain link security fence surrounds the

inactive buildings.

When implementing FUSRAP, the Corps of Engineers follows this Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, or CERCLA, as amended, and the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan using the process that is outlined on the screen.

This is the CERCLA process again with

the years entered for the activities that have been taking place at the Guterl Site. In 2000 the site was referred to the Corps of Engineers by the U.S. Department of Energy, or DOE, as potentially eligible for FUSRAP. The Corps completed the preliminary assessment and site inspection in 2001.

During 2010 the remedial investigation report for the site was released. The Guterl Site is currently in the feasibility study and proposed plan phase. The reason we are together virtually tonight is to receive your comments on the proposed plan for the Guterl Site.

Once we have considered your comments, our next step will be to reach a record of decision which will outline the selected remedy for the site. We estimate that due to the priorities for sites already in remediation within the FUSRAP national program, it will be several years before we can begin remediating the Guterl Site.

I am now going to provide you with a

recap of the remedial investigation findings for the site. The conceptual site model in this slide indicates the potential exposure pathways from contamination in site soil, surface water, sewer or storm water, groundwater and in the buildings.

When we performed the remedial investigation a baseline risk assessment was conducted. The risk assessment included a human health risk assessment and screening level ecological risk assessment. The text bubbles inside the dotted box focus on the potential receptors in the human health risk assessment.

The human health risk assessment indicated that some increased risk existed for persons within the project area when long term exposure is assumed, if the buildings in the excised portion of the site were to be reoccupied for industrial or commercial use.

The greatest potential human health risks at the site are posed by exposure to building materials and contaminated soils

underneath Building 8 and a localized area of elevated activity in surface soil within the railroad right-of-way. Uranium in groundwater below some areas of the site could pose unacceptable risks if the site groundwater was used as a source of potable drinking water. The Erie Canal is not a medium of concern for human health because uranium concentrations are not elevated in the Canal.

The text bubbles inside the dotted boxes on this slide focus on the potential receptors in the screening level ecological risk assessment. The Erie Canal is not a medium of concern for ecological receptors because uranium concentrations are not elevated in the canal.

Some potential risks to terrestrial ecological receptors at the Guterl Site were identified based on this risk evaluation.

Since the radiological standards or dose rate limits for protection of human health are generally more conservative than recommended dose rate standards for protection of

ecological populations, it is generally assumed that the environment is protected when remedial actions are taken to protect people from exposure to FUSRAP-related materials.

Based on the results of the human health risk assessment and screening level ecological risk assessment, response actions are necessary to protect public health from unacceptable risk posed by FUSRAP-related constituents in buildings, site soils and groundwater.

When developing alternatives in the feasibility study, we considered the potential exposure pathways to humans and the environment of the FUSRAP-related contaminants based on the reasonably anticipated future land use.

These figures show current conditions for uranium contamination in the groundwater at the site. Groundwater is underground water. It resides within cracks, crevices and spaces in soil, sand and rock. Groundwater within the shallow bedrock aquifer is observed within a few feet of the ground surface and extends to an approximate depth of 20 to 30 feet.

The deep water-bearing zone encountered is encountered at approximately 35 to 40 feet below the ground surface. The Environmental Protection Agency's maximum contaminant level for community drinking water resources is 30 micrograms for uranium.

Groundwater monitoring is performed at the site to determine potential for movement of FUSRAP-related radiological contaminants associated with historical Atomic Energy Commission activities, developing baseline data for monitoring groundwater for use in assessing effectiveness for remedial alternatives once implemented and to develop and evaluate alternatives to address unacceptable risk.

Uranium concentrations in groundwater at the Guterl Site remain consistent with historical results and exemplify seasonal fluctuations derived from variations in groundwater recharge through contaminated site soils.

Groundwater under the site is currently not utilized as a source of drinking water.

Niagara County's drinking water comes from the Upper Niagara River. As indicated by groundwater monitoring, contaminated groundwater is not degrading surface water in the Erie Canal. Therefore, there is no unacceptable risk to human health or the environment from uranium in site groundwater.

Site soil is impacted with

FUSRAP-related materials. The purple areas in
this figure show the impact of the soil
contamination using a preliminary cleanup goal
based on risk. This figure shows approximately
5000 cubic yards of soil that would need to be
removed in order to protect a construction
worker from direct contact exposure; to just
the soil via ingestion, inhalation or external
gamma.

The purple areas in this figure show that approximately 58,000 cubic yards of soil, the majority of which is within 18 inches of the surface, needs to be removed to protect the underlying groundwater from the impact of uranium leaching from the soil to the

groundwater.

It assumes that the underlying contaminated groundwater would then be used as a potable water source of drinking water, which it currently is not.

As you can see while comparing the two figures, the volume of soil that needs to be removed to be protective of groundwater is much greater than would be needed to be removed to be protective for the construction worker.

In the figure on your left as you look at the screen, you can see that most of the impacted buildings are within the boundary of the Excised Area, the light blue outlined area. The figure on your right is enlarged and shows the sample locations for samples taken in the buildings. Note, these are the building material samples that are different than soil samples.

Before we developed a proposed plan, we developed potential alternatives to address FUSRAP-related contamination on the Guterl Site.

A feasibility study is performed to identify, develop and evaluate remedial alternatives, analyzing in detail each remedial alternative. Reading from the left to right as you look at the screen, a potential remedial alternative is evaluated for its overall protection of human health and the environment, compliance with applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements, and if these first two criteria are not met an alternative cannot be considered.

Balancing criteria are considered next.

They are the primary criteria used for a detailed analysis of the developed alternatives and are used to select the preferred alternative based on the best balance among the criteria; long-term effectiveness and permanence, reduction of toxicity, mobility or volume through treatment, short-term effectiveness, implementability and cost.

The last two criteria, or modifying criteria, are considered based on the comments received on the proposed plan.

Applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements, or ARARs, are the standards for cleanup of contaminants used in conjunction with risk-based levels developed in the risk assessments. These are used to direct response actions at CERCLA sites.

Another one of our acronyms on this site, Code of Federal Regulations, or CFR. The District identified these federal regulations as relevant and appropriate requirements for the Guterl Site. The second regulation listed above is relevant and appropriate for sight groundwater since the aquifer below the site could be used for drinking water in the future, although it currently is not being used for drinking water.

The alternatives outlined in the feasibility study are listed on this slide.

Site-Wide Alternative 1 is No Action. This alternative is developed for comparison purposes only. The alternative is not protective of human health and the environment and does not meet applicable or relevant and

appropriate requirements, so we will not be discussing it further tonight. It is not considered a viable option.

We will be discussing Site-Wide

Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 in the upcoming slides.

Site-Wide Alternative 3 which is boxed in green is our preferred alternative.

Site-Wide Alternative 2 includes dismantlement and off-site disposal of buildings that were involved in AEC activities, soil removal to meet the soil preliminary remediation for groundwater protection for approximately 58,000 cubic yards of soil and off-site disposal; and monitored natural attenuation of groundwater with environmental monitoring. Monitored natural attenuation is a systematic approach of modeling, predicting, monitoring and measuring the rate at which natural attenuation of contaminants occurs in a groundwater system.

For this alternative, it is expected to take approximately 120 years for the uranium concentrations in groundwater to achieve the

EPA's maximum contaminant level for community drinking water sources which is necessary to be fully protective of human health and the environment.

The buildings where AEC activities took place which are highlighted with blue numbers on this slide would be dismantled and disposed of off-site under Site-Wide Alternative 2.

This slide shows the estimated extent of soil, approximately 58,000 cubic yards, that would be removed and disposed of off-site during the preliminary remediation needed for groundwater protection. The vast majority of this soil is located within 12 to 18 inches of the surface with select areas of deeper soil in the northern portion of the site.

Site-Wide Alternative 3 is the Corps'

preferred alternative for the site. The

alternative includes dismantlement and off-site

disposal of buildings that were involved in AEC

activities, soil removal to meet the soil

preliminary remediation goal for groundwater

protection and off-site disposal and

groundwater recovery using extraction wells and a rubblized trench with ex situ treatment and environmental monitoring.

2.1

Building dismantlement and soil remediation actions will take approximately two years. This alternative is estimated to take approximately 30 years for the uranium concentrations in groundwater to achieve the EPA's maximum contaminant level for community drinking water sources. This alternative will be explained further in the next set of slides.

In Site-Wide Alternative 3 the buildings where AEC activities took place would be dismantled and disposed of off-site.

This slide shows that the estimated extent of soil, again approximately 58,000 cubic yards, that will be removed and disposed of off-site using the preliminary remediation goal for groundwater protection.

And this is an expanded view of the rubblized trench and the pump and treat portion of the alternative. A rubblized trench is an extraction technology process option installed

in the area to extract groundwater for treatment.

Small explosives placed underground are used to fracture the bedrock into highly permeable material to enhance the extraction of groundwater. A sump and extraction wells are then placed into the trenches to collect water inflow. The groundwater is pumped into a treatment plant, treated and then discharged into surface water after treatment. Wells would monitor the level of contamination in the groundwater.

Site-Wide Alternative 4 includes the dismantlement and off-site disposal of some of the buildings that were involved in AEC activities. This will be explained further on the next slide.

Contaminated soil will be removed to the soil preliminary remediation goal for the protection of the construction worker and disposed of off-site. Groundwater will be monitored for natural attenuation with environmental monitoring, and it is estimated

that this would take almost 660 years for uranium concentrations in groundwater to achieve the EPA's maximum contaminant level.

In Site-Wide Alternative 4, Building 1, pointed to in light blue, is decontaminated using scarification. Building 35, pointed to in black, is not addressed because the soils beneath the building are not above the remediation goal for the construction worker.

The remaining buildings indicated with dark blue and blue buildings numbers are dismantled and disposed of off-site.

In Site-Wide Alternative 4 contaminated soiled is removed to the soil preliminary remediation goal for protection of the construction worker and disposed of off-site.

In this alternative only approximately

5000 cubic yards of soil are estimated to be excavated and disposed of off-site. You can see that the purple area indicating soil to be remediated is much less than in Site-Wide Alternative 2 and 3.

This and the next slide show our

analysis of each alternative in the feasibility study against the balancing criteria. High represents a favorable rating, whereas low represents the least favorable rating. The ranking for our preferred alternative is highlighted with the green box. Alternative 3 is our preferred alternative because of its higher rankings in long-term effectiveness and reduction of toxicity through treatment of the groundwater.

This slide covers the cost comparison and the amount of time each alternative would take to completed if implemented. Our preferred alternative costs more, but takes much less time to complete. Building dismantlement and soil remediation actions will take approximately two years.

The time difference is mostly attributed to the inclusion of active groundwater treatment in Alternative 3. It will take approximately 30 years for the uranium concentrations in groundwater to achieve the EPA's maximum contaminant level for community

drinking water sources.

And this is just a review. Alternative 3 again is the preferred alternative for the proposed plan. Under this alternative, Buildings 1, 2, 3, 4/9, 5, 6, 8, 24 and 35 are dismantled and disposed of off-site.

Approximately 58,000 cubic yards of soil would be excavated and disposed of off-site.

extraction wells and a rubblized trench treated in the above-ground treatment plant.

Environmental monitoring would be performed.

An approximate total timeframe for the preferred alternative is 33 years which includes dismantlement, excavation and groundwater remediation.

Once the comment period closes, we will consider the comments received and develop a record of decision. The preferred alternative may be modified based on any new information acquired during the designated public comment period. Responses to comments received will be provided in the record of decision, which will

identify the selected remedy to be implemented. The record of decision is scheduled to be released in 2023.

That concludes the main portion of our presentation. We will now begin the public comment portion of the meeting.

: Thank you, . The following operating principles will be in place during the comment portion of this meeting. To receive your comments on the proposed plan we will be calling one person at a time in the order that you signed up to comment.

Please state your name and affiliation or town of residence before you make your comment. Please keep your phone line muted until your name has been called. Please keep the subject of your comments to the proposed plan and limit your comments to under three minutes. Please indicate when you are finished with your comment.

Questions placed in the chat box will be responded to either tonight or on the project website. If you did not sign up early to

provide comments tonight and you would like to 1 2 provide a comment, please use the chat feature when asked to do so to type in your name and 3 indicate that you would like to comment. 4 5 We will be leaving the meeting open for 15 minutes after the closing comments for those 6 that want to chat in questions or additional 7 8 comments. 9 I have two people that have signed up to provide comments. The first one is 10 11 are you on the If you are, you need to unmute your 12 line? 13 We will go to the next person and that phone. 14 Will you state your name for was 15 the court reporter and your location of residence. 16 17 Certainly. My name is 18 I reside at 19 City of Lockport. 20 Thank you. You can go 21 ahead give us your comments now. 22 Well, a wee bit of my 23 background. My father was the eye physician

for Simonds Saw and Steel during the period of time when they were working with the uranium and as a small child I recall them coming into the waiting room absolutely covered with dust and whatever the material was that they were working with and, of course, his project was to remove the steel from their eyes.

One of my questions, and I'm cognizant of the fact that payouts of \$150,000 have been made to a number of people who consequently died as a result of being subjected to the material at that particular plant.

Do you by any chance happen to know how many people died and the families were reimbursed for that amount of money? You may not know that, but that's a question, you know, that I myself am very much interested in.

My second, most important to me, is the thought of the water actually being allowed to seep through and enter into the canal. I do have a lot of written material here from a number of years by and all kinds of other people that have been interested in

this.

How often have you actually sampled the water that may be going into the canal? I know you did it in 2007 and then it said in the report here that 2011 that there would be more sampling events.

How often do you actually monitor that?

That's the question that I think is important.

And it's important, too, to be noted that at one time our city actually had to use the canal water as our drinking water, so it is exceedingly important and a concern that this is taken into consideration.

We just recently had a gigantic flood in this community and interesting to see how much of the water -- the groundwater from over there ran off into the canal.

So I thank you very much for listening to me and I look forward to a response.

: All right. Well, thank you

. Well, I can take the first

response. With regard to the payouts and the

people who have passed, honestly we do not --

we're not a party to that program. That is actually a Department of Labor program and we don't have any data with regard to the people who have been paid out or anything like that, so that's a completely different agency that runs that program so, unfortunately, we don't have a lot of information with regard to that.

I think you're on mute, ma'am.

: I just wanted to say thank you for your response.

: Sure. No problem. And I will pass the second response on to our hydro geologist, ______, with regard to the groundwater.

een monitoring the groundwater actively every year for probably the last 10 years and we sample anywhere between 20 and 30 wells as well as we sample groundwater seeping out of the cliff and at the barge canal, so we actually float a boat and collect water down coming into the canal, as well as we sample the canal water both near the seeps as well as the water near

the emergency intake for the city that is the intake that you're referring to that is for the town and the samples for groundwater and seep water generally are pretty consistent and so it does show contamination entering into the canal, but the canal is large so the amount of water in the canal relative to the amount of water that is seeping into the canal, the amount of water in the canal is so great that it essentially dilutes that uranium discharge down to background levels immediately.

We do not see any elevated samples in the canal water indicating that there would be a large scale release from the site. It's very small scale seeping.

: Well, I'm well aware of the fact that the canal water and the water from different areas in the city. To me it's still a concern.

What is the answer to the fact that we had the flood this week and all that rainwater? Would that have had any effect? I mean, could that not have washed a great deal of materials

into the canal?

where the soil contamination is is very much contained to the site. There is no gross movement of material from rainwater on and off the site and then anything that could get into the groundwater just during a heavy rain would have residence time in the groundwater for a few years before it gets to the canal, so it would be attenuated so you would not see that big flux of uranium in the groundwater because the groundwater has the ability to dilute it as well.

So no, I don't believe you're going to see any impacts off the site from that rain event.

: Thank you.

Environmental Toxicologist and Risk Assessor for the Army Corps of Engineers in Buffalo and I also just want to point out that we did try to evaluate that kind of like a worst case catastrophic event.

We did what is called a mass balance calculation to look at what if all the uranium in the soil was going to leach into the groundwater at once and then how much would needs to get into the canal in order for us to see an exceedance of that EPA maximum contaminant level for drinking water that Natalie mentioned earlier, that 30 micrograms per liter that the EPA indicates is a level that uranium should not exceed in groundwater to maintain protection of human health, so we did that.

We went through that exercise and we determined that we don't have enough uranium on the site to impact the canal at a level exceeding the maximum contaminant level for drinking water, so we do share your concerns and we did try to evaluate what that potential was and we still don't see the uranium on the site could have a negative adverse impact on the canal water, even if the canal water were to be used for drinking water in an emergency situation.

comment that was made by a friend of mine who wrote her thesis on this situation over at Simonds. She was told that once she was over there and she had walked around a certain area that prior to her getting back into her car she should remove and leave her sneakers, so it would seem to me that if someone had made that type of a statement to her, that there must be a great deal of contamination that you're going to have to deal with.

Do you have any idea as to when you're going to commence the cleanup and obviously it's going to take a number of years, but we in the community would like to know when something is going to happen. I have volumes and volumes of written material that I have kept over the years.

I was involved with the contamination in Watertown and worked with Kathy Hochul with regards to having the demolition of a number of homes, so I'm very well aware of contamination and the amount of time it takes to go into it,

but I really feel that our community has waited a long time for this to commence and I thank you.

I thank all of you for the work that you're doing, but I would really like a date as to what we can look forward to as seeing something commence.

that. With regard to the plan commencement, the project is contingent upon -- the funding is contingent upon the national program for FUSRAP and there are a lot of sites that are in the program that are ahead of this schedule that have completed their records of decision and are ready to put the shovels in the ground and start working, so for those projects that are ahead of us they are going to be done and funding is not slated for Guterl to begin cleanup until year 2032.

: Did I hear you correctly? 2032?

: Yes, ma'am, you did.

Well, since 1948 to 2032 1 2 that's a lot of lives affected. A lot of lives. 3 4 Yes, ma'am. 5 But I want to reiterate, you know, the appreciation that you people put 6 forth in trying to remediate it, but I do know 7 8 when I went through with regards to the contamination in Watertown if it hadn't been 9 10 for the fact that Kathy Hochul was in 11 Washington and working at that time with the president, we would not have had any action 12 13 taken. 14 I'm very cognizant that politics play a 15 great deal in how these things are remediated, 16 unfortunately. 17 Yes, ma'am. We're limited 18 by how much money the program gets each year, 19 so there is a possibility that that timeline 20 could get moved up, but as of right now that is 21 the current timeline. 22 What can we do to speed it 23 up?

Speak to your Congress 1 2 people I suppose because they are the ones that 3 put together the bills that create our funding 4 so --5 What about petitions? about if we were to take up a petition and we 6 7 could say, you know, maybe come up with 10,000? 8 Do you think that would have any consequence 9 with it? 10 Possibly could help. I'm 11 not sure. Couldn't hurt. 12 13 Correct. 14 Thank you. 15 Thank you. 16 Thank you for your 17 comments. I just want to remind everybody that on the bottom of your screen on the right-hand 18 19 side as you look at the screen you should see a 20 bubble that says chat because now we're going 21 to -- I need to ask if there's anybody that's 22 on the line that would like to provide comments 23 that didn't sign up to provide comments, if you would please type your name in the chat so that I can call on you.

from the New York State DEC would like to make a comment.

Yes, . Thank you very much and thank you to everybody for the presentation here.

I want to say that I first traversed
this property back in 1999, a long time before
it was even brought into the FUSRAP program,
and it was a long time coming to get to that
point and that was due to the, I guess for lack
of a better term, the openness of the

Department of Energy to consider it because
that's the way these things have to go, so the
fact that this is kind of relatively new
compared to some of the other Buffalo District
FUSRAP sites is the reason that it's so far off
in the, you know, in the project schedule and I
hope that kind of helps clarify things a little
bit.

That being said, the Department may or may not have some comments on the proposed

plan, but I can say that I'm happy to see that 1 2 it was incorporated into the FUSRAP program and we're looking forward to the remedial action 3 being performed whenever it's feasible. 4 Thank 5 you very much, everybody. Thank you, 6 We have , City of Lockport 7 8 resident. She would like to make a comment. 9 Please make your comments now. 10 Hi. Thank you. I just 11 have two concerns, one being the debris from the cleanup, how the process is to prevent that 12 13 from going into the community and the second 14 question is with the debris that the soil 15 that's being removed, where is that being removed to? 16 17 , would you like that 18 one? 19 Yes. For the sake of the soil excavation and debris removal, the 20 exact location of disposal is not decided until 21 the remedial design phase, so it will be 22 23 similar to other projects, but at this time we

don't have an exact location.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Would you mind explaining to her the process of the demolition of the buildings?

Very careful Sure. engineering controls would be put in place, meaning dust control measures, everything from misting, using water to keep down dust. will be monitoring of the environment both locally and at the fence line as well as for occupational health purposes for workers, so any indications of any migration of contamination from the point at which the deconstruction is happening and making sure our engineering controls for controlling those contaminants from becoming airborne and moving on towards the community and outside of our control is paramount to verify that our controls are working.

: For the members of the team, would you please state your name and what your position is for the court reporters record.

My name is 1 2 and I'm a Health Physicist with the Buffalo District Corps of Engineers. 3 4 5 Project Engineer. 6 Thank you both. 7 do you have additional comments? 8 9 No. That was all. 10 Thank you. 11 Anyone else that would like to provide comments that perhaps is on a 12 13 phone and is unable to chat? Please unmute 14 your mic and state your name and affiliation if there's someone on the line with those 15 circumstances. 16 17 Not hearing anyone, I am going to go to She is going to let us know if 18 19 there were any questions in the chat box during 20 the presentation. Hello. This is 21 Yes. 22 My apologies if I do not 23 pronounce your name correctly, but

has asked the following question:
What degree of confidence does have
for an actual record of decision to be
committed?

In other words, we would do a record of decision in 2020. However, the pandemic hit so now we're in 2021 and still awaiting a record of decision that's already 20 years in the making. Thank you. End of question.

Yes. There was a little bit of a delay with regard to the pandemic, but really that didn't effect our completion of the report. It was just a matter of ensuring that we had all the data in all of the alternatives in the way that we wanted them in there, so really at this point from this day, now that we're done with the public meeting, and once we receive all of the public comments that we're going to include in the record of decision, we will begin directing that in FY '22 which basically begins in October of 2021 and then we're expecting to have that completed and reviewed and approved

by FY '23 or 2023.

So it will get done in the next couple of years, so yes, there's a high degree of confidence.

: Anyone else that would like to either chat in a question or would like to make comments?

Okay. I am going to put the information for -- our contact information in the chat so that if you need to reach us for anything you can give us a call, you can mail your comments to the Buffalo District or you can email us. The email address is fusrap@usace.army.mil.

I also want to remind you that we have an electronic newsletter distribution list that we use to send updates when we have new information about the Guterl Site and if you're not on that list and you would like to be, please email fusrap@usace.army.mil to let us know you'd like to be added to the distribution list.

So our comment period is going to last until September 10th, so please provide your

comments to us by then. We do encourage you to email your comments. We're never quite certain what the COVID restrictions are going to be and it may delay receipt of our postal mail.

I'm going to -- we are going to leave this slide up and we're going to stay on the -leave the meeting open for 15 additional minutes in case you have any additional questions that you want to put in the chat.

The team will be leaving the meeting so your questions will be responded to at a later date on the project website.

So thank you for attending our meeting. We are very thankful that you were able to participate and please enjoy the rest of your evening and, again, the chat will remain open for another 15 minutes. Thank you very much.

(Proceedings concluded at 7:53 p.m.)

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.2

23

STATE OF NEW YORK) 1 2 3 COUNTY OF ERIE 4 5 I, Rebecca Lynne DiBello, CSR, RPR, Notary Public, in and for the County of Erie, State 6 of New York, do hereby certify: 7 8 That the witness whose testimony appears hereinbefore was, before the commencement of 9 their testimony, duly sworn to testify the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth; that said testimony was taken pursuant 10 to notice at the time and place as herein set forth; that said testimony was taken down by 11 me and thereafter transcribed into typewriting, and I hereby certify the 12 foregoing testimony is a full, true and correct transcription of my shorthand notes so 13 taken. 14 15 I further certify that I am neither counsel for nor related to any party to said action, 16 nor in anyway interested in the outcome thereof. 17 18 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my seal this 19 1st of August, 2021. 20 Rebecca Lynne DiBello, CSR, RPR 21 Notary Public - State of New York 22 No. 01D14897420 Qualified in Erie County 23 My commission expires 5/11/2023