Fort Edward Public Information Meeting
JUNE 18, 2025

TRANSCRIPT

Good evening. Please take your seats.

Welcome to the Public Information Meeting. I am very pleased to be introducing tonight retired New York State Supreme Court Justice Bernard Malone, Jr. from Albany. He will be our moderator at this evening's informational meeting. Judge Malone is a Vietnam War veteran and was awarded the Bronze Star and Distinguished Service Medal in 1969.

After then graduating from Albany Law School, he was an assistant District attorney in Albany County, then a federal prosecutor in Albany for 15 years before getting elected a New York State Supreme Court Justice. In 1998, he was appointed by two governors, Pataki and Spitzer to Supreme Court appellate divisions in Manhattan and Albany.

He's currently the president of the Northeast Vietnam Memorial Fund. He sits on and is a past chairman of the Albany County Ethics Commission. Judge Malone resides in Del Mar with his wife Paula. They have six children and 11 grandchildren, and he has been an arbitrator and mediator and now moderator since retiring as a judge in 2012.

Welcome Judge Malone.

Thank you. Thank you, Karen. And I think, best of all, I was born in Glens Falls

in June of 1943. when my father was at Fort Benning, Georgia, my mother returned to South Glens Falls to have me. And then some months later we moved to Fort Benning until World War II was over. So thank you for coming to tonight's public information meeting. This meeting is being held consistent with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation Commissioner Policy 29, which focuses on environmental justice and permitting.

The goal is to ensure meaningful public participation in the State's environmental permit review process. We appreciate you joining us and taking part in this important discussion. The new State Department of Environmental Conservation has identified an economically disadvantaged community or potential environmental justice area near the Clean Earth EMSI facility at 3 0 4 Towpath Lane in Fort Edward.

Because of this Clean Earth has been asked to develop a public participation plan for its research development and demonstration permit called RD&D. For their application. You can find the public participation plan and related materials on Clean Earth's public participation website. The web address is provided in the materials that are available to you this evening.

This is ESMI's second public information meeting on this issue tonight. Clean Earth, ESMI representatives David Dunlap and Rob Martin (to my left) will first present a brief overview of the project, including background information, details on the permit that they have applied for, the scope of the work, and the proposed schedule.

We will conclude with a public question and comment period where you can ask questions and share your thoughts. The Clean Earth Representatives, Mr. Dunlap and Mr. Martin will answer your questions,

As approved by DEC Department of Environmental Conservation. This will be a two-hour meeting. I've been told we can stay a little longer if needed. This location, Hudson Falls High School, was chosen to be closer to the environmental justice community of Hudson Falls. And as you can see, it accommodates a large group of people.

We are here both in person and virtually. We'll be taking questions and comments from both you. From those who will be participating on Zoom. If you did not do so on your way in, and if you want updates on the permit application please sign in on your way out on the sheet at the entrance.

And as I am confident you saw, there was a separate signup sheet for those who wish to ask a question or comment this evening. I will call the speakers in the order in which you signed up, and we will take approximately five of you and then approximately the same number of people who will participate virtually on Zoom.

Each speaker will have an opportunity to ask a question or make a comment for no more than three minutes. As you can see, we have a, a time clock. We ask you to please manage your time using this clock as a reference.

This is an opportunity for public input and feedback on the permit application. This is not a debate. We aim for a civil and informative conversation. Any disruptions or overextending your time will interfere with the meeting's objectives, including giving everyone who wants to speak the opportunity to do so.

If you have extremely technical questions, answers will be provided this evening as possible. Clean Earth will also post written responses that will contain more detail. If you don't get to ask your question tonight or think of one later, you can also submit your questions in writing through June 25th via email or the Clean Earth Public Participation website.

A recording and an AI-generated transcript of this event will be posted on that public participation website within the next week. All questions that are asked this evening will be summarized, answered in writing and posted within two weeks. Additionally, detailed information about the permit application is also available on the website.

Before we start, let me take a quick safety moment. If there's a fire or other emergency that requires evacuation, please walk to the back of the auditorium and exit using the doors

through which you entered. Also Hudson Falls High School. school. School, Hudson Falls School Superintendent Dan Ward.

Good evening. Mr. Ward has asked that I read the following statement. It's the Hudson Falls Central School Code of Conduct Statement for public events. The Hudson Falls School District is committed to providing an orderly, respectful environment that is conducive to public events. To create and maintain this kind of an environment, it is necessary to regulate public conduct on school property, and at school functions.

The district recognizes that free inquiry and free expression are indispensable to the objectives of this district. The purpose of the district's code of conduct is to maintain public order and prevent abuse of rights of others. All persons on school, property or attending a school function shall conduct themselves in a respectful and orderly manner.

In addition, all persons on school, property, or attending a school function are expected to be properly attired while on school. Property persons who violate this code shall not be allowed to remain on school grounds or at the school function, and shall be directed to leave the premises. Okay. Let's begin.

David Dunlap and Rob Martin, both from Clean Earth ESMI. We'll start with a brief presentation, gentlemen. Alright. Thank you Judge. Do we have the presentation up

Thank you. My name's David Dunlap. Thank you for coming tonight. Rob and I will try to go through this brief informational presentation as quickly. We, as we can, we'll be switching back and forth. So if we go to the next sign, please. A brief agenda for tonight. For those who are not familiar with us yet we'll give you an introduction into what we do, who we are and what we do.

Then we'll talk about the research. Development and demonstration permit application that we've submitted to DEC. And then the final part of the event will be the public comment period. Alright, here is a quick introduction as to who ESMI and Clean Earth are. We use two different names, ESMI and Clean Earth.

ESMI is the original name of the facility. If you search for us in DEC records, our permit is in the name of ESMI, so that's why we use it. But a number of years ago, it was purchased by Clean Earth. Clean Earth itself is owned by a larger corporation based in Philadelphia called Envi Corporation.

So Clean Earth is one of three divisions of Enviri. Clean Earth's mission is to reuse and recycle the, the, the materials that come from its customers. And that's our goal. That's our mission. We handle specialty waste that is generated by our customers and properly handle it. And, and as I've noticed, try to reuse and recycle when at all possible.

And our most recent record shows that about 90% of all those materials that come through our doors are raised and recycled. overall, the services that, that Clean Earth provides help our, our customers safely manage their waste, achieve their sustainability goals, reduce their carbon footprint, and help them engage in the circular economy.

And with that, I'll let Rob take the next couple slides. Good evening. Rob Martin with Clean Earth office and am officed at the Fort Edward location on 3 0 4 Towpath Lane where the facility is safely and compliantly operated. And it's the present location since 1995. At the facility we utilize a technology, which we will be speaking about tonight, which is called Thermal Desorption.

A brief overview of the technology. It works similar to part of your home appliances, your clothes dryer. Within our primary treatment unit or rotary kiln system, we heat the soil, which has the entrained contaminants to above their boiling points. Similar way your dryer works, it tumbles the clothes to boil off the water.

We take in, within this rotary kiln, tumble the soils to boil and absorb the contaminants, sorry post-treatment. Within that primary treatment system or rotary kiln, the soils are discharged. And after testing, they can be reutilized anywhere from residential to industrial applications based on the analytical results of those particular soils.

Those absorbed contaminants that are driven from those materials are controlled prior to being emitted from the baghouse through a thermal oxidizer. Within that system, we heat the contaminants, break them down to the elemental components prior to separating our particulates final in the baghouse. And then as you'll know, and you'll see in the next slide, those process airstream is emitted to the atmosphere.

What you see in front of you is a duplicate of one of the posters that's out front. It's a, what's called the process flow diagram. It outlines the process components associated with the system. We're not going to spend a lot of time on it, but we're just going to talk about two important sections of the unit which are those that are highlighted and hopefully I see the cursor is occurring.

So there, there's two parts of the process. We have the soil treatment process and the air pollution control system. The soil treatment is that which is highlighted in blue where the cursor is residing now in case you can't see blue or the laser pointer. So materials fed into the rotary kiln, which you'll see here to where it's heated to above the boiling points of the contaminants.

Post that process, it is discharged to a pug mill where it's rehydrated, and then the soils are discharged within the thermal process. That's the only part of the process that treats soil. The rest of the components are therefore the treatment of emissions, which is within the green box. And to speak to these briefly the air's passer with cyclone or larger particulate is captured prior to that airstream being sent to the thermal oxidizer.

Post thermal oxidation. We cool the airstream because the temperature of the, that's required to protect the bags in the bag house needs to be reduced within this evaporative cooling chamber. We inject water. That water then becomes steam within the process. That effluent airstream and then ends up going through a baghouse which is a large vessel, large process vessel holds 1200 bags and does our final particulate separation.

And then the process airstream is emitted out the stack. All the fines that are associated with the cyclone and the bag house all get co-mingled back within the pug mill. So there's only two effluents that come out of the process. The soil and the process. Airstream,

We'll, we'll go into the research development demonstration, permit application and let me hit the right side of that.

So what is the proposed project? Clean Earth had submitted to DEC back in December of 23. A research demonstration yeah, research development demonstration, permit application for the treatment of approximately 5,000 tons of PFAS contaminated soil.

The testing requirements for that are approximately two weeks. Those testing requirements are driven by actually the emissions testing that needs to occur in order to demonstrate the technology efficacy. during the particular test we'll be running all analysis through third party accredited laboratories.

So the soil that comes into the facility, the soil that's treated and the emissions that are generated will all be tested through EPA methods and then run analytically through third party accredited laboratories. Once that project is completed we are required by state regulation to develop a closure document, which will be a report which will contain all the information that has been generated through the process, and that will also be posted on the public participation website.

So how, how will the project be completed to walk through the steps a little bit further? Right. We we're, the reason that we're actually submitting for the research development and demonstration permit is because we cannot accept PFOS contaminants that the facility presently under our existing permits.

In order for us to continue with that process, we have to submit for research permit once, and if that project is approved by the state, we would then take and look to identify soils that we could run through that particular testing operation. Once those are identified, Clean Earth has a robust approvals process.

Analytical has to come into us and accordance with all our permits. We have to go through a profiling process, an approval system, and all this stuff then gets captured within a

database. Once we get to the point, projects been approved, soil's been approved for the facility. The facility will, the soils will be brought into the location.

All soils at the facility have to be stored in our soil storage building. For those who have seen the facility, it's the large building that sits behind the office. That's the only location where we have the ability to store contaminated soils. So the soil comes in, it'll be placed into that building.

Once it's into the building we will actually be analyzing it again. So part of our process is to demonstrate the fact that the materials coming in are representative of what has been received, and plus, that then helps us with our analytical results when we compare them out versus the post treated soil criteria.

We'll then thermally treat the soil during that process. We're grabbing samples as the soil's going into the unit, samples as they're coming out of the unit. And emission assessing will be completed all during and concurrently during that particular operation process project. and then the soil, once it's discharged in the process, again, will be analyzed by third party.

How will the treated soils be managed post-treatment? It's going to depend on what New York state if approved, puts into the research permit. Presently, the facility utilizes soil under a beneficial use determination, as I'd mentioned, that allows us to utilize that material either under residential, commercial, industrial applications.

But really the ultimate use is going to be determined what's allowed within the permit itself. we'll then generate a closure report once all the material's been generated, the material's been moved off site to its final destination. And we will be submitting that stuff to DEC for review, comment, and then potential clarification on, on Clean Earth’s part.

That information will also be posted to the public participation website.

If the state does approve the research permit, it only allows us to treat the information or treat the soils that are received under this particular project. It does not allow us to, to blanketly treat material post the research project. Any sort of project that would occur post would have to go through in its own permitting process.

So this project, as has been noted, is two weeks. And it, it does not provide us the opportunity to treat anything outside of whatever the criteria is within the research permit.

Alright, my turn. Thank you, Rob. So why are we doing this and, and why is it important? so we have a, a facility in Fort Edward that we the sign shows is fully capable of treating can you hear me okay? yes. Okay. Sorry. I was getting a, I can't hear you message. Sorry. we have a facility in Fort Edward, we believe is fully capable of properly removing PFAS from soil and destroying that PFAS.

But it's important that we continue to validate that for others and otherwise prove the existing research that's out there now. So, from a, from a Clean Earth perspective, our purpose is to validate existing re excuse me, existing research that both the U-S-E-P-A and the DOD have published.

But there's a greater importance to this and, and we like to talk about PFAS in general here. PFAS is a substance that is ubiquitous is probably a too far of a word to use, but you, if you look for it, you can find it. And so. Every state, every municipality, every DEC, every community is going to have to figure out a way to come to grips with their particular PFAS issues.

And we believe that this research will help resolve that. what we like to point out is that there's, there's PFAS in many hotspots. Let's use an example of a firefighting training academy. While we, they quite often use PFAS containing materials at those facilities to train for disasters. even though you may not have PFAS in your own backyard, PFAS in another location can be washed out of the soil, come downstream and end up in drinking water that somebody is drinking, obviously current options for the management of that hotspot or that contaminated soil is very limited right now.

You can just leave it in place and, and let it be, and let it do the things that it does. or you could dig it up and transfer it most likely to a landfill. And we know, I think we, we all generally agree that landfills are their own hot topic, but one that is we're not going to cite any more landfills most likely.

And what space we have in those landfills is precious in many respects. So trying to find an alternative to digging up PFAS in one location and putting it another really, it's really just kicking the can. So we believe that the project that we're going to hopefully get a chance to, to run through and prove, is going to prove at scale a technology that cleans soil and destroys the PFAS, that we evaporate off that soil and per and does that in a permanent way.

And I think that's, that's our goal here. All along, we are against PFAS. We Clean Earth and Enviri believe we have a, a process that will help rid PFAS from the environment and help communities stay safer. So that's why we believe it's our purpose and why we believe there's value in doing what we intend to do.

Thank you, Rob. I think it was it me. It's me. Alright. we probably should have had these slides a little different, but how might this project affect the surrounding community? This is always a question. we've done extensive air modeling. we can talk about this more with questions and such that the modeling is used as EPA software clearly shows that what potential emissions might occur are way below any state safe limits for, for contaminants.

We also, there will be no new construction with this project or no other new land disturbances. if you, if you weren't here today, you wouldn't know we were doing anything different at the facility. there'll be no additional solid or dust emissions. There'll be no noise, additional noise, odor or light from the facility.

No additional truck traffic and no liquid water discharge. And I, I'll touch on that point just a minute. There are never liquid water discharges from the facility. We don't have a permit to discharge water and the facility just does not generate liquid water. We do generate steam that comes out of our emissions point.

But there are no liquid water discharges either.

Speak to where we are on the RD&D permit application process or that research development demonstration permit application process. as I had noted earlier, we submitted that initial permit to DEC back in December of 2023. to that point as if you've viewed the. Public participation website.

We've had, excuse me if I don't have the total right. It's either four or five letters from DEC asking for clarification to which we have responded to them with responses in kind. at this particular, at the particular point when we submitted the application, they got asked that we participate in the CP 29 program the public participation policy.

We have therefore the reason that we're sitting here this evening to be in that particular process includes tonight's meeting and then going forward, once this meeting has been completed as judge noted earlier we we'll be compiling the questions that have been asked, providing responses, posting out the video and the transcript from the meeting.

In agreement with DEC that's going to be done within two weeks. Post that completion, we'll be submitting a completion report on the public participation program to DEC for their review and approval. And at that point in time, they will make a determination whether our permit submittal has been deemed complete.

If they deem it to be complete then they choose whether or not they're going to develop a draft. Yeah, excuse me, a draft that was correct. A draft research development and demonstration permit to which then if they do, that will also be going out for public review and comment. But that will be on DEC to provide comment to.

So just to review over quickly, um a couple of things that judge Malone spoke to earlier in relation to the, the public questions. he's been provided a list of speakers he'll be calling them up in approximately groups of five be changing between those who are in person and then those who will be speaking virtually.

You want me to take care of this? Okay, I can get this one. The in your handout today, you should have got sort of the instructions for in person for those on zoom and phone calls and otherwise virtual. I'll make sure I read this very clearly. if you're, if you're attending virtually you will have an opportunity to ask questions as well or make comment.

You can use the Zoom mini meeting and there's a function in the Zoom meeting that allows you to raise your hand. Our, our AV IT crew will identify you and put you on the list to speak, and that will go through, through the judge, our moderator. you can also submit questions via the chat function that's found in the Zoom.

And then finally, if you're calling in solely on by phone, please press star nine. That's press star nine. And that will identify you to the, to the IT crew here. And they will get your information and they will call you as, as we progress through the comment period. and I think that's it on that one.

And then finally, just a reminder we will attempt to answer your questions. Some will be, might be very technical in nature. if we don't provide a, a, a deep enough answer today, we certainly will attempt to do that in writing. Um,

All of these questions will be answered or posted or the an, the answers to these questions will be posted on the public participation website. We've already said that if you do not have an opportunity to speak tonight or otherwise come up with a question after the event you may also submit additional questions by email, by phone, or through the website.

The there's the next slide we'll show has some information on it, but please try to submit those questions within seven days of this meeting or by June 25th so that we can answer those and get everything posted up within two weeks of this meeting.

And here's the slide where you can for those in person, you do have this, this URL, the Clean Earth webpage is right there. You have that you can view additional materials, et cetera. You can also hear some other email addresses and phone numbers you can use if you like to submit comments through those avenues as well.

And with that, I'm done. We're done with our initial presentation. Okay. Thank you Dave and Rob. Alright, at this point I'm going to call the names of the first six people who signed up to ask a question or make a comment. and I will do my best to pronounce your names as you wrote them on here. and ask that you please come down here with Ms.

McCarthy. the first one I call, of course can come to the podium here, but the other five, if you would please come down with Maryanne who just raised her hand and wait your turn. And then after the first six, we'll go to five or six virtual people. Alright, Jessica Donley, please come to the podium.

And the other five are Amanda Durkey. Megan Munoz. Michael Powers, Rick Zimmerman. And Rick Fisher. Thank you.

Okay. Why don't you wait a minute till we get,

And they, and, and you Feel free to have a seat if you want. You don't have to stand there. Okay. Ms. Donnelley. Hi. How are you? Good, thank you. good evening. My name is Jessica Donnelley. I reside at 19 link Lincoln Street in Hudson Falls. I'm a mother of two beautiful daughters, a wife and a biology teacher serving proudly at one of our incredible high schools in our community.

I hold a bachelor's degree in biology with a strong background in chemistry, biochemistry, and ecological systems. I'm here tonight because I have deep concerns about the flawed science being used in Clean Earth's proposed thermal desorption and oxidation of PFAS contaminated soils at the Fort Edward facility.

David Dunlop, who has no formal scientific training recently stated, we have a very controlled process and we've, as we've tried to explain, that's not just based on me pulling it out of the air. Respectfully, David, that's exactly what it feels like. You're pulling this out of the air. Your process relies on cherry pick studies using sand as the test media, sand not soil.

This is misleading. It does not reflect the complex chemical reality of real wor real world contaminated soils, which contain soil organic matter, or SOM clay, clay microbes, and variable pH levels that affect P-H-P-F-A-S behavior in soil. Even my high school students know this isn't good science. You are introducing bias in your methods, which makes this proposal not just scientifically unsound.

Potentially dangerous both environmentally and for public health. Clean Earth is basing this proposal on low temperature thermal desorption studies that do not represent realistic soil conditions. You refer to prior tests such as the penny soil study from Fort Edward in 2018 and 2019 as a model. That study analyzed 20 PFAS compounds, including PFOA and PFOS.

After treatment, four compounds still remained most notably ppl, PFOS and three other PFAS compounds that is not 99.9% DRE as your permit application claims it's not even close. So how are you calculating this DRE? The math doesn't work and the data do not support the claim. This is also clearly not a closed loop system, as Mr.

Martin described in the Times Union last week. So I ask you, why do you expect different results now using the same methods you've blamed soil organic matter for your failure to remediate in the past? Do you expect the soils used in this new RD&D project to be free of SOM? If not, how will your process suddenly work?

Another critical question. You propose to hold 5,000 tons of soil. Oh, sorry. Are you, are you close? Well, yes I am. Okay, go ahead. so what's your plan during that holding period to ensure PFAS does, does not leach into the surrounding environment you claim. This study will not contaminate cran surrounding soil, air, or water can Clean Earth publicly guarantee without deflection to current New York standards that zero.

Meaning no PFAS will be released into the surrounding environment or impact public health. Please do not cite only PFOA or PFOS New York State Standards. We are talking about thousands of PFAS compounds, many of which are unregulated, but no less toxic. Okay, thank you.

No, thank you. Appreciate the, the questions and comments and statements. I'm going to just work backwards through my notes because I, I, your last comments are at the bottom. in relation to there being zero, as far as New York state's concerned, New York state has not identified zero for any particular PFAS compounds.

The soil guidance concentrations or their soil s soil contamination values, which are in their guidance documents and which are proposed for 3 75 do have PFAS concentrations, which can still reside in soil and be used anywhere from unrestricted to industrial use applications to that in relation to 5,000 tons of soil.

And also too, there is A-P-O-A-A-G-C value to which we actually pro proposed, well, when we performed the air mod modeling the EPA modeling right, it was compared the PFAS compounds we had identified in the model were additively compared to the P OA A GC value. as was in one of the slides we presented the maximum concentration receptor, which is the area of the highest concentration associated with that emission point is at 0.005% of that New York state D-E-C-A-G-C value in relation to the 5,000 tons of soil.

How do we control that material once it's received at the facility? that material is then stored within the soil storage building until it is treated. So our soil storage building is aligned facility. it does have carbon associated with the building itself, and that would be how we would end up controlling those materials.

In relation to the closed loop comment, I'm glad you made it because I would love to clarify it. because when you provide and you're in, in in, in interviewing process what I was referring to was the fact of the soil as it enters the process to where it's discharged and the collection points that it is associated with.

That being the cyclone and the baghouse and the rotary kiln, those are co-mingled and that material is all discharged as a single process media. So the soil that's associated with the process, my language was, is similar to a closed loop because the soil as enters the system, exits the system on the conveyor.

And those materials are all co-mingled. which we could go back to the process flow diagram if that would like to be spoke to. In relation to the 20 18 20 19 project the state at the time was focusing on PFO and PFOS. The state at the time had a New York State DEC 21 PFOS compound list, which was based on EPA method 5 37 0.1.

It might've been modified at the time. I can't remember. And those were the analytes that could be analyzed that particular point in process in relation to pH and soil organic matter. Completely agree. pH and soil organic matter. Soil organic matter is known to actually bind and control the p fs. It's in the soil, right.

The pH adjustment can be cause leaching or it could cause it to stay within that particular matrix associated with a penny soil project that was 22 tons of soil. One of the reasons that we had reached back out to the state to try to do additional research at the time at which we did actually submit to the state to do in 2019, a much larger project, actually the same exact project was to identify how that it is.

We can control that. Within the process, we have different retention times in the, in the rotary kiln, we obviously can hit different temperatures. So the intent was for us to validate and understand that process further and how soil organic matter reacts and is part of that control mechanism within, within soil.

I hope I hit all your points. That was good. Very good. Thank you. Okay. Thank you. Amanda Dike, please.

Good evening. My name is Amanda Dike and I live in the village of Fort Edward. For my allocated time this evening, I'm not going to field any questions. Rather, I'm going to share my comments and feedback regarding the ESMI and Clean Earth Company. Prior to November of 2024, I could not tell you the name ESMI, Clean Earth and or what type of company was there.

Although I walked regularly on Towpath Lane, I never paid attention for me. It was operating unseen, unheard and unknown. In November of 2024, this flyer for the December 4th public information meeting came in the mail and my questions began. I started attending community meetings and board meetings. I began educating myself about the RD&D permitting process.

This company Commissioner's Policy 29 and cumulative impact law from a company standpoint. You had research as outlined. You have it in the Clean Earth, PFAS White Paper, and you are proud of this research. You are marketing this research through symposiums and forums. You hired a former United States EPA Deputy Assistant, Mr.

David Dunlap. You became connected to the Department of Defense for PFAS remediation purposes. You were scaffolding a very, very lucrative business endeavor. In basic terms, this was all a really, really big deal. And yet this pathetic flyer was the way that you informed the community of your work and plans.

Please hold the applause. I have three minutes. While I understand that we have moved on from this flyer, which landed all of us here in this room tonight, I personally need to take these steps backwards to be able to move forward. Here are my opinions on this. You have very, very smart people working for your company.

They knew exactly what they were doing. They were hoping to continue operating unseen, unheard and unknown in the community. They were hoping to push this through and have the permit application deemed complete by DE prior to the updated cumulative impact laws taking effect on December 30th, 2024. I will say this to your company.

You were close. You almost made it. I'm a firm believer that everything happens for a reason. And while I'm petrified about how this permitting process will play out and what else will be uncovered about your company, I am standing here grateful. I am grateful for Commissioner's Policy 29 and the Cumulative impacts Law as these are the things that are giving us the opportunity to actually have a voice in this permitting process.

And I'm standing here to tell you that I vehemently oppose this project in life. I look for the silver linings and the silver lining for me is, is this, your company is obviously no longer operating unseen, unheard and unknown. Thank you for your time.

Thank you Ms. Durkey. Next will be Megan Munoz.

Good evening. My name is Megan Munoz. I live just bought a house last summer across the street, same as Amanda. Had no clue you guys existed. I lived on the other side of town. Thank you for your service. we thank you. Thank you for thanking me. I'm sorry. It was my first thought and it, I just really honestly want to focus on two words, which is truth and trust.

And I was in the virtual meeting and emotions were wild when we had it. And your name, David. It rung in my ears because I run quality for a agricultural company that does formaldehyde. So truth to me about information is very important about how it poses threats to community. You are using words such as we're going to destroy PFAS.

PFAS cannot be destroyed. It's called the forever chemical. You can look at things such as what happened down the road from us in Caho and ask the women who suffered the high rate of cancer right here. This wasn't in your studies, right down the road from us. High rates of cancer because it rained soil, ran off blob, all of the same things.

The rates of all of this, all of these things you're not taking into consideration. Everything the lady said before about picking and choosing scientific data. I ask you, does formaldehyde cause cancer? I ask that, does formaldehyde cause cancer? Because if we're not going to start in truth and trust and why you removed yourself from.

The EPA concerning formaldehyde. Why you hid the fact that you were in, I believe it was nine different meetings about PFAS saying, oh no, I have nothing to do with it. And then we find out publicly that you did it bridges this huge problem with trust in the community. You're coming in saying, trust us.

You don't live here. You don't have roots here. You're not raising children here. You're asking us to trust your word. But everything that I read, I remembered your name because I work with the EPA, the FDA, the DE, we don't work with the DEC, pardon me, Homeland Security. We take in over 20,000 gallons of formaldehyde a day.

We have to wear respirators just to work with it. I'm bringing this point up because truth and trust about PFAS is very important. I get the emails every day from the EPA, not every day. A lot of the times talking about PFAS, it's a known fact it causes cancer. I don't even know why this is being disputed by somebody who was a lobbyist who now works back in PFAS.

Like I, the whole thing is very, very, very, very dirty and you're not being honest with us. And we're the ones who have to raise our kids here. I wanted to talk to you too about your analyzing. You can either only go through PACE analytical or Eurofins. How are you going to do that in two weeks time when they don't test for it?

I deal with both labs and ask them, it will take you over two weeks. They usually have to test PFAS samples twice. It will take you over two weeks just to get results. You're saying, oh, we're going to test it before, test it after. If you're concerned of our safety, why aren't you doing testing on site? Why aren't you investing into the, all of these things?

People in the community like myself who work in this field, agricultural chemicals who work here, we would be willing to sit down, but you guys are doing this so dirty, so hidden. This is all of the information I have in front of me and I've handed it to the town. I've handed it everywhere, which really says, you guys should take a better look at this.

You don't lay your head in this community and you're not expecting grandchildren to live in this community. We are. We love it here. We don't want you here. And we need to, you need to sit down and look at all the data, not please just the data that you've cherry picked. I can make a cow look good in lipstick, but it's still a cow.

Like you, you can't dress this up. This is serious stuff. I know my time's up and I appreciate you letting me go over, sir, but I think truth and trust are the most important thing here, and we're not getting that from you. And that's the, the bottom line is we are, we're just not.

Okay. Thank you. Ms. Munoz. Thank you sir. Michael Powers,

I, I'd like to start by saying, as a fellow vet, I appreciate your service and that you've done for both the country and being a, I don't know how you could be a judge for that long, but I appreciate it. Thank, thank you to you gentlemen. actually I actually served on the appellate division with your former district attorney Tom MCC from Hudson Falls.

Oh, fabulous. And I spoke with him today to get his permission to. To come to Hudson Falls and thankfully, we appreciate you being here, to be honest with you. Thank you. thank you. You got ties to the local community, so that's great. Yes, thank you. So the gentleman up there, I'm sorry, this is the first time I've been in invited to one of these.

Well, I didn't recognize how bad this stuff was until I saw PFAS, to be honest with you, my background is I'm a materials engineer. I have a strong background in processes and process controls, and that's pretty much the focus of my question. well, not question really. I mean, I'm going to make a little bit of a statement, but the so the contaminated soil, ultimately, like right now, I, I now understand that you're, you're doing a, a study to see how this works out.

Correct? You just say yes or shaking, correct? Yes. I just want to make sure because I was under, I didn't understand that prior to this meeting. Alright, so, but ultimately the contaminated soil is going to be imported from other state, you know, obviously you're not, you, you just mentioned it in your brief there that the, you're going to be you.

There's, it's spread out right now, and I make a case that having it spread out is better than contain, than bringing it all into one place and condensing it. especially given how bad this stuff actually is, which, that's what I want to make clear to everyone. This is no joke and I don't normally get involved in this stuff, but I am.

Anyways. The contaminated soil is going to be imported from other states you know, thereby concentrating the p FOAs locally on this site. The EPA limits P FOAs to four parts per trillion in drinking water. that's equivalent to one eye drop just for everybody out there. So you recognize how small the amounts are that if they screw up.

No offense guys. I hope you make it work. But if you screw up, it's that's equivalent to one eye drop of, of one eye drop of DR four per that's equivalent to one eye drop rendering over 3 million gallons, 3 million gallons of water, or five Olympic sized swimming pools of water, non drinkable.

Full containment of the soil is going to be extremely difficult, and I hope you do recognize that. I assume you do difficult during the process, including transport and storage, not to mention the small amounts that will inevitably make it through your process. I mean, I, I'd actually, I'm interested in this because I'd love to see how this works out and how much you do get, but I can't imagine there's any way in hell you're going to be able to actually get this fully cleaned.

So there's going to be some amount that makes it through your process and, and gets spread around. now given, and the problem is you're in a sensitive location as well. because given that our community is along the Hudson have an elevated cancer rate, and I'm sure you're aware of this, you must have done your research due to less toxic chemicals like PCBs, which we just cleaned up the whole Daggum Hudson, which I wasn't necessarily for organs, but they did it, right?

And they're still, it's still contaminated. They never got it all cleaned up, which was kind of obvious to anybody who would be looking at that, right? How the hell are you going to clean up something that big? and they're way less stock than the p FOAs. So my question is, how are you planning to address the contamination concern, concern for the community when the plant is close to the waterway that provides water all the way down to New York City for Pete's sake.

So once you get through this testing, or if you do get it, or whatever the, the concern is, you're going to get rained on. I've seen your site, it's not clean. I, I guess you're going to have to redo the whole thing to make sure that nothing drains off and gets into our, into our local waterways. And that's my primary concern because I looked at your process and no offense, but obviously that was just a bulleted thing or whatever.

But it's going to be, need to be a lot more robust than that to contain the stuff you mentioned a dump. The good part about a dump and putting this stuff into a dump is at least you can put a basin in it. So it contains it. You're looking at pro, you're looking at transporting a whole bunch of this stuff up here and then running it through this process.

Thank you for putting that up. And then going off of elevators and conveyors and all the, the like, and you're going to tell me that you're going to get all this stuff through there without having any leakage that could be exposed to rain, which would then obviously drain it off into the Hudson. Anyways, thank you.

Thank you again, your service. So some very good questions on,

Some very good questions on containment and, and managing it, leaving the site. And whenever any material, not just material maybe that would be associated with the project, comes into the facility, the truck comes in, it's covered, and it goes directly to the covered facility and dumps into that facility directly.

Now that facility that that big shed in the back is protected from wind, rain, snow, the elements. It's also got a concrete pad with a liner underneath. So, and, and by the way, we cannot accept liquids. So, but with the assumption that something might somehow leach through the through the concrete, we have a liner there.

So there's nothing that's going to leave that facility once it's put in. That, that inside to your concerns about outside. First of all, the only material that you see outside of the facilities fac is soil that has been cleaned, right? But we also have a storm stormwater management

pond. So if rain does fall in the facility, it goes into that stormwater management pond that is regulated.

We have to test it on a regular basis back to the, the system itself. And its containment, it's and you'll understand this as a, as a process engineer, a materials management engineer, it has a negative. Pressure on the system. So once you put the soil in the, the, the, the, the dirty soil is, comes from the inside of the shed and goes directly into the thermal unit.

And there's a negative pressure on that where, so there's no leakage, there's no air that's shooting out. The only air that leaves that system comes out the stack after it's been cleaned. Right? So, as we've said before in simple terms, dirty soil goes in, the whole system is under a negative vacuum.

Clean soil comes out and clean air comes out. We test that those air emissions on a regular basis. We have other operating parameters that requires to operate with certain residence times and certain temperatures that ensure that we are treating the soil appropriately in between tests. And I'm talking generally not the PFAS.

And so we, we are very confident that the system that we have is controllable. It's contained. And we and we believe that the research that has been conducted in very similar units by EPA and DOT shows that this unit will perform as we are suggesting, and as we'd like to prove to DEC as part of our permit application.

Thank you. The, the only comment I don't think that, that David didn't get to is where the soil was being brought from. the, to the point, the facility does accept soils from Northeast states. we have not identified a source for this particular soil media. we do know that there are PFOS contaminated soils within, within New York, and we're also aware that there are some within the other states, but we have not identified a source soil yet for this particular project, so.

Great. Thank you. You're welcome. Okay. Thank you. Alright. Next is Rick Zimmerman, please

Hi good evening. my name is Rick Zimmerman. I'm approaching this podium from a little bit different perspective here this evening. And I hope that it's complimentary to the discussions. throughout my professional career for the last 40 years, I've been all about finding solutions to New York's agriculture's challenges.

I'm a former Deputy commissioner in Department of Agricultural Markets. I'm a former executive director of the Northeast Agribusiness and Feed Alliance, and I'm a currently very active Farm Bureau member and used to serve on their governmental relations team as director of governmental relations. So, I've had a, an immense background on finding solutions and looking at the problems.

And I want to talk about the importance of finding ways to clean our state's soil from these forever chemicals. I will acknowledge right from the get go that that's not, not what your permit or your project is focused on. I realize that we're not talking about agricultural soils for this particular trial.

However, I do see this as a real potential of understanding how we can in the future, address this challenge that agricultural soils will most likely face going forward. These forever chemicals are in our backyards and potentially on our farms. We must employ science and technology to clean the soil from every community, every neighborhood, and every farm as going to need this technology going forward.

So I see what you're doing as a real potential to address our reality. We realize that this is a short two week pro proposal, but it can give us valuable insight as what needs to be done to clean our communities. It's initiative. this initiative is a search for a solution. And we must realize that we need to address this going forward including recognizing that the agricultural industry is going to be challenged with this in the future.

PFAS, contamination and agricultural soil stands as one of our most complex and sustainability public policy challenges. The chemical persistence, the bioaccumulative nature, the widespread presence necessitate coordinated action throughout our food and

agricultural system by combining science-driven PFAS, remediation strategies and re, excuse me, rigorous regulatory compliance.

We stand a real chance of finding opportunities to protect our soils, our food systems, and our communities. The research permit will give DEC the valuable information needed to draft effective regulations to compact PFAS and the other, um forever chemicals and advance a cause of sustainable, safe, and effective farming.

As PFAS regulatory standards and best practice guidelines evolve, it's imperative that farmers policy makers, solution providers work hand in hand leveraging technology, ongoing education, and regional adaptation to assure that our food and agricultural system is the safest and most productive system in the world.

I encourage DEC to take the next step toward a safer farming and improve the Clean Earth research permit. Thank you. Okay. Thank, thank you very much Mr. Zimmerman. Alright. And before we go to a, a virtual questionnaire or commenter, we have Rick Fisher please.

If I could just uh. Moderator make one. I was asked just to mention again for those who are virtually in attendance. if you wish to speak and you're on Zoom, please raise your hand. if you are participating by phone please hit star nine to be recognized as a speaker so that they could include you in tonight's meeting.

And I, I apologize. Thank you. I want to thank you for your service and your time tonight. Thank you. I followed five great people. I'm not going to be as good as them. I'll guarantee you that. I'm going to ask easy questions. why Fort Edward? We, we know that you have a portable plant that you can treat PFAS in.

Why do you choose not to use that and rather send 200 truckloads throughout? Who knows where? You guys don't know yet coming to Fort Edward? Little old Fort Edward. another one. Can you guarantee that no p os that are contaminated will, will stay in this area? Can you guarantee that? Simple question, yes or no?

I want to go back and add a little to his question. not recently. a farmer west of Albany received truckloads of P five chemicals that were treated at a plant in Massachusetts. He let 'em set on his fields, and within a month or so, all the wells in that area were contaminated. That's how dangerous this stuff is.

What are you going to do to guarantee that we don't get any contamination at Fort Edward? You just talked about a holding pond that you have there. How do you get rid of that water? It could be contaminated. You said that yourself. How do you get rid of that water? It evaporates once evaporation to, it's going to settle somewhere, right?

In my backyard, not yours. exactly.

Are you, are you gentlemen writing down these questions? That's four so far. And my last question, what's the benefit to the people of Fort Edward and the surrounding areas to have this come into our community? We've had DEC already approve pbcs years ago, and you see what happened to this community then we're still haven't been recovered from that.

And now you want to bring this in to me? It's just crazy. sorry. Thank you for your time and I'll, I'll Thank you.

Thank you for your, for your question. So to start with why Fort Edward and why PFAS? Right. So our Fort Edward facility is our crown jewel in our, in our facilities. We believe it's the, it's it is a it is a very well, well run facility. it is had only one notice of violation in the 25 years it's been here, and that was a paperwork violation.

I, I believe that the, the, the companies that use us to manage their waste and the DEC that oversees us has a lot of respect for what we do and how we do it. And we do it in a very compliant and ethical way. And we're very confident in its ability to, to manage this. So we it, we might have other facilities around the United States, but this is the best one to show that this process works and it works safely for any community.

I'm trying to think about some of the other questions here. Affordable. Why not? Excuse me. Afford, excuse me, ma'am. So the, the portable one doesn't have a location at which to, to operate. It has to be permitted just the same. And we could bring the portable here, but we have one, we have a facility that is prepared site, A portable goes to the site.

Sir, you're not being honest. That's not fair. Okay. Alright. Let's, let's let him answer the questions that Mr. Fisher posed. So the, the, the portable unit is not a feasible for a two week test. So we, we hope that the DEC will approve this. as I noted before, we are very confident the science shows that our unit will properly address the, the, the contamination as we've discussed tonight.

That and that, and then you were talking about the farmers, and I'll let you take care of one of the ones that I've missed, but the farmers that was probably a biosolids or other related issue certainly empathize with a farmer in that situation. I think what's important to recognize is that Clean Earth is against PFAS, just like all of you.

We do not manufacture it. We do not use it. We are helping others manage the problem and eliminate it from the environment. And so we believe that's the most appropriate to deal with this. We encourage the farmers out there. As we heard, we just had a farmer a representative of the farming community indicate that he has concerns as well, but also recognizes that there's a need to figure out and otherwise prove these scientific uh um possibilities or, or otherwise validate the science as has been proved by others in EPA and DOD.

And so we, but the, and when it comes to farming we don't dispose of our material unless it's been certified clean. As we've discussed earlier. And so when it comes to a farming issue, that's not, not part of what would be impacted by what we do. And I'll let you address any of the other questions that I missed.

Um I, I think there was a question on guarantee and guarantee that we would not be contaminated any sites. I can't remember if it was directly Fort Edward or in total as, as was mentioned earlier, the state doesn't recognize the numbers. Oops, sorry. I need to turn on my microphone. Apologize. Um in relation to that, the, again, the intent of the project is to

demonstrate we can replicate some of our earlier research that was done at the facility and that we can have soils that are treated that actually meet the soil cleanup objectives identified by New York State.

Oh, I'm sorry. You can't hear so you can't guarantee it. Yes. Can guarantee it. No. The where yes or no? Can you guarantee Can we ask that anyone speaking? Yes. microphone and speak in turn. we asked at the beginning of this meeting that we have no shouting out. We want to have an quarterly meeting. so we're asking that when you're called, you speak, you ask your questions, there's an opportunity for our panel to respond, and we do not want any shouting out and there's not a conversation happening.

We're here to listen to what you have to say at the microphone. And then we have a panel that will respond and answer. But the shouting is feel like detracting from the meeting itself. And as I indicated earlier, you can submit written questions or comments and, and I know that spontaneous responses are, are human nature.

I understand that. But to, to go back to the statement the intent of the project is to demonstrate that we can meet the soil cleanup objectives and the emission standards for the state. We're not guaranteeing that there will ever be zero. The state does not require zero, right. The state does have POA concentrations that are allowable from an emission standpoint.

They also have PFAS concentrations that are allowable from soil concentrations. Those guidance values can be viewed. we have links that are available on the website and you also could go out and you can research those yourself on the New York DEC guidance documents. Okay. Thank, thank you very much.

All right. At this time we will take a question from a virtual caller. we have opened a line and I would ask the we now have two questions or two people in the queue. I would ask the first person to please state your name and if you will, where you are from.

Good evening, folks. my name is Frank Barranco. Can you hear me? Yes, yes we can. Okay. Thank you for allowing me to speak tonight. And where, where are you? Where are you from, sir? Yes, where are you from, please? I'm sorry. Where are you from, please? Yes I'm, I'm an employee of EA Engineering. I'm the Senior Vice President and Director of Quality programs for EA engineering, science and technology based in headquarters in the Hunt Valley, Maryland area.

I have a working knowledge of working with the, some of the Clean Earth folks on various projects related to PFAS technology. I held a bachelor's degree, bachelor's of Science, and a master's degree in geology and a PhD in environmental Engineering. and I'm also actively involved in the professional community of researchers of PFAS technologies.

I hold a personal interest in finding solutions to the looming problem of treating, you know, what is now of luminous amount of PAS impacted soil sediment and bios, solids around the us. I just, I'd like to pledge my full fledged support for ESMI project to conduct a short term test. this is certainly necessary in the research arena.

CFAS contaminated with soil is, is notable problem and the technology that they're promoting has distinct viability. I, I know that first answer, some of my own research related to thermal technologies and destruction of pfas. These findings will provide crucial data to further assess the efficacy of thermal based technologies, to not only treat pfas impacted media such as soils affected with acqui film forming foams but to also destroy those PAS constituents during treatment.

Many treatment technologies rely on just transferring the waste, concentrating the waste of transferring it to another media, or even worse, as that's been pointed out, simply relying on disposal of PAS impacted waste in, in landfills. I think we can all agree that landfill is not a reasonable solution, you know, for the long term.

So this type of research is entirely necessary. the express need for additional PFAS treatment options has been resoundingly stated by stakeholders in the US including federal, municipal, public, and private entities. further research studies like what ESMI is

proposing. Are extremely important to verify and confirm what has been shown in some recent studies.

That is that we can destroy PFAS under conditions of thermal desorption coupled with thermal oxidation under the right temperature conditions, and treatment duration. And these optimal parameters that have been resolved for operating such a unit have been investigated and resolved, reported and reported in the literature.

the test ESMI proposals will evaluate some of the most pressing research questions that we have on the table, such as validating this technology at a full scale stationary treatment facility measuring treatment performance for the wide ranging types of PFAS waste that are received, and then utilizing reagents like hydrated line, which is a benign reagent to catalyze beef destruct destruction which in turn will lower the energy consumption and increase the fluorine capture.

Okay, sir, you, you probably please, you probably can't hear the the beef or see the time clock, but you're, you're, you're okay. I, I, I'm essentially finished. I have one, one or two sentences to go here. I'll finish up. Okay. please don't miss true. I think there are significant effort beyond testing to turn this into a permitable working practice, but in summary, I'd like to throw my full support into the project.

The information they obtain will be extremely important to the environmental community and state of practice. I do. Okay. Thank you. Who's next? No more in the queue. Okay. I'll go back to, okay. I'll go back to, uh,

okay. Thank you. All right. we'll go back to our live SPE speakers, please. next we have Ben Brandage, Sheila and Paul Itso, Katie DeGroat John Harris and Shannon Gillis. Could you please go forward and will Ben Bra.

All right. Go ahead sir. Alright. Good evening. How's my volume? Good? Yep. Okay. That's good. my name is Ben Ledge. I am a resident of Fort Edward. I am retired from a career in environmental law enforcement. I was a senior manager in that field. a large portion of my

career was spent in hazardous materials release, hazardous materials, response, hazardous materials, investigations and public safety and public health impacts from the criminal standpoint.

And I manage large scale long-term environmental crimes investigations for about 10 years. So, I have a multi-port part question, but it is brief. I believe that I am correct in saying that the 20 19 20 18 soil testing at Fort Edward known as the Penny Project or the penny test, was never publicly discussed as part of this current permit application until after the December 4th online meeting.

It came out at that meeting that that test had taken place and most. I would argue everybody who was in virtual attendance was unaware of that testing even having happened. I also believe that I'm correct in saying that the 2024 last year soil testing at the Fort Edward facility of PFAS contaminated soil has never been publicly discussed as part of this permit application, recognizing that that testing did not involve thermal treatment and was conducted under DE's guidance and permitting, it was still test processing of PFAS contaminated soil at the Fort Edward facility.

That is a problem that has never been publicly discussed or acknowledged in any part of this application process. Now, here are my questions and I've got three of 'em. I can give 'em all at once or one at a time, however you guys would prefer. So in regards to that 2024 test, how long did it take to get that testing developed and permitted by DEC and what was DE C'S role in that permitting?

Second question, where did the material that was used in that testing come from and what PFAS compounds were present in those soils? And finally, what were the results of that testing? Where is the closure document that goes with that testing and where did those soils ultimately go? Where were they disposed of or shipped to or reused at the end of that testing?

Finally, I would like to say, because apparently have six seconds left. I agree with what's been said over and over and over the PFAS contamination problem of water, soil just in

general is huge and it's only going to get huger. If that's a word. research on it is imperative. Finding solutions is imperative.

However, in my personal and professional opinion, Fort Edward is not the place for this to be taking place. SMI is not the facility for it to be taking place, and this technology is not the technology to be used for that testing.

Thank you, very much, gentlemen.

 in relation to the 2024 test first part of the question was permitting. Obviously, DEC was involved in the permit. We did submit an RD&D permit application to them for that particular process. I do not recall how long the process took to be permitted. and with, I won't, won't speculate, but obviously you said we, we provide written responses to these.

We can provide written response to that material in relation to them, where the materials were generated. the materials, some of the materials were actually generated out of Glen's Falls, and some of the materials were generated out of Massachusetts. I will verify the Massachusetts, but I, I'm, I'm relatively certain I, I know the property.

I, I certain it's Massachusetts, but we'll validate it in relation to the PFAS compounds that were evaluated. They were the PFAS compounds that could be measured under method 1633 which is a approximately 40 PFAS compounds that could measured under that particular project. the intent of the project was to demonstrate that those materials could be stabilized within the soil and leach less concentrations in the drinking water MCLs for the state of New York.

The test proved positive. Those soils were disposed of at a landfill. A closure report was submitted to DEC. I do not exactly recall the date upon which that was done, but a closure report was submitted to DEC for that process. And so, just to be clear, Rob, you say positive meaning that the, the tests were successful.

Yeah. My bad. Correct. We met the metrics for what the research permit had identified that the, the compounds that were leaching from the soil would be less than the drinking water MCLs for the State of New York. Apologize, thank you for, and there was no, and that did not use the thermal unit at all.

Correct. So there were no, it was purely in a enclosed container that it was done. Okay. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you very much. Sheila and Paul Itso. And you others can have a seat if you want while you wait.

I almost didn't get up and speak because after what the others, how the others spoke was just amazing. so going back to talking about trust and truth, right off the bat, you discouraged me from believing because the EPA even recently, within the past few years, has deemed PFAS as being forever chemicals that you cannot destroy them.

In fact, if you try to destroy them, they can break down and become even more dangerous. So if in your facility, say they seep into the soil or whatever, is that going to is that going to jeopardize our wells and water supply? there's been so many discussions across the country about PFAS and from everything, even the EPA is saying they are forever.

So you saying that you can destroy them, your process and your technology can't, as was said previous. So that right there is making me think, I can't trust you because you're saying false things. I'm also concerned about monitoring who will monitor this if it is the, the two week period from what I understand is going to, if it is approved with a permit is going to continue, is not going to just be a two week testing.

It's going to go on. And I've heard other things that you've been kind of vague about. Where is all the soil going to come from? I've been hearing it's going to come from defense bases, army bases, naval bases, and everyone knows at those facilities, they're one of the most toxic sites ever. So I can see why you would want to get them involved.

The defense, I heard mention that you're connected with the defense department. Well that's perfect for getting into these highly contaminated bases. Let me take it. Alright. And I

was wondering the two week modeling study you're going to do for DC who chooses the soil you're going to test. Is it done by you?

Do you pick the soil? Is it done by a third agent? And if it's done by a third party, do you pay the third party? So that's my question. My thought is you already know where it's going to be coming from, but you don't want to let the public know because it is so, such terrible information. If people heard they're coming, excuse me.

Alright, you're done. We're adjusting. Okay. but if they heard that it will be coming from the dangerous, like Peace Air Force base is just sitting there highly contaminated that would be one of the ones probably that would be named, that you'd like to have. yeah, we, we see a need for something like that.

Because there are lot, yeah. There, there is a need. There's a lot of military bases that are just sitting there dormant. Nobody wants to touch him. I, but, you know, why should we be the ones that fix that problem? They transfer it here. I think it's very important to find some technology to get rid of PFAS, but with your technology, that's not the type, I think it will make the PFAS more dangerous because you're going to be breaking it down and if it does seep into the soil, that's going to contaminate with worse chemicals than you started with.

Okay. Okay. Thank you very much.

So we'll talk about that. Mm-hmm. Okay. Berg just going backwards again in the questions. there was a the, the last question was in relation to. Who chooses the soil or the soil source that will be Clean Earth. we will certainly ask DEC if they have soils that they would like us to utilize within the test.

Chances are, they'll not really recommend any particular projects. But Clean Earth will identify soils through our, through our existing client networks in relation to the two week trial comment that, that allows for. And, and, and I'm sorry if I mistook the statement. it, it almost sounded as if the two week research project then allows us to have ongoing treatment.

That is not the case. in order for Clean Earth to be able to permit to treat the materials on an ongoing basis, we'd have to redo this entire process over again. So the research permit gets closed. If Clean Earth at that point in time was decide to submit for a permit to do it on a continuous basis that would be likely be a major modification to both our solid waste and our air permits.

That would then require us to participate again in the CP 29 program and policy. And we would be redoing this entire process again, permit submittals, public participation programs, and a DC DEC determination on on whether or not the project could go forward. But to go back to the initial point, right, the project is a two week, approximately two week project requested 5,000 tons, right?

And that's pending. DEC gives us the approval to run the project itself. Um,

There was, there was comments made about EPA and their information in relation to not being able to destroy PFAS. they have presented research. Which demonstrates that they've done at the EPAs Office of Research and Development that they've completed in their rainbow furnace using a process which is similar to thermal oxidation, where they've been able to show very high destruction removal efficiencies of PFAS compounds.

That is a document that has been referenced by us and, and has been, I believe it's also supplied on the public participation website. Did I, and you go ahead. Okay. No, I think you, I think you touched on the, the Forever Chemical It EPA research has showed that it can be destroyed and destroyed effectively.

Okay. And in addition to the three people who are still waiting and you can come forward as it Katie De Grove. Yeah. Yeah. We, we, we, I now have 22 more people we're going to speak, so we'll do the best we can to move it along. Thank you. people have thanked you and I want to say thank you for being the moderator, but I also wanted to point out and say thank you to everyone in the audience.

And I hope the DEC understands that it was a beautiful June night out with everyone here, had something better to do than be here and listened to this, but we came because it's really, really important to us. That's why we're here. I have a slightly different take on what's going on. in my research, I came across a very interesting article from your parent company in its May investor report, which you can see online, Clean Earth Parent Company, and Vire states that one of the key assets of Clean Earth is the 80 facilities it owns with existing permits because new permits are not being issued for the type of work.

That that is this because they have health risks involved and so they're being very picky about new permits. from this, it is, it seems like this is a pattern of using grandfathered facilities to process material by leveraging existing permits to extend the scope beyond what would be acceptable in a new review process.

This seems to be exactly what is happening in Fort Edward. How can we trust anything your company tells us when you have such a track record of stretching the truth and making decisions based on profits, not on environmental or community safety? Thank you.

Okay. John Harris, rest the questions. That was, I don't think it was a question. It was a statement. Okay. Thank you. Do you, do you wish to respond to that? I, I would say that it's nothing further from the truth than we just said. We are trying to be as transparent as possible and we believe the science justifies the suggested two week trial that we've pro proposed to the state.

And so we're hopeful that we can continue to educate and otherwise have this discussion. So thank you. Okay, sir, thank you for being here this evening and thank you for being here also. And thank you John Harris. I live in the town of Fort Edward. I have two questions that I prepared for this evening, but I still haven't heard an answer from either one of you of what happens to the water that goes into the pond after the test has been done and what happens to the soil that has been.

Run through the test. You haven't said what happens to either one of those two materials, but my other questions are, will clean Fort Edward will Clean Earth, be processing soils contaminated with a FFF? First question. The next question is from a resident's point of

view, it is extremely unsettling that Clean Earth is still unwilling to give a projected range of PFAS soil contamination concentrations to be potentially processed with this RD&D permit.

In the first presentation, Clean Earth described the soils to be processed as being lightly contaminated As a community, we are not comfortable with this statement. Please provide a potential range of maximum levels of PFAS levels in the soils to be processed at the facilities with units of PPB or PPT.

If Clean Earth is unwilling to provide these projected concentrations, please provide the maximum level of PFAS contamination your facility is permitted to accept by nysed permits issued in the past or future permits being applied for or issued. Thank you. Thank you. I'll start and then I'll let I'll let Rob finish.

I was the one who discussed the storm water management pond. And so any runoff from that facility pass goes into that pond. Now, what I didn't say, and I didn't say that it occurred, is that there's any PFAS in that water that that goes into the pond. And so my point is, is that it's all captured and that it's tested on a regular basis to ensure there's nothing in there.

And if. and frankly, I don't think we've ever had a test that's recorded anything of a negative consequence with respect to the state. I don't know how they might modify a permit with respect to that management pond if we begin to handle PFAS. I think it's a little speculative to state that, but right now we don't handle PFAS and right now any, any wa runoff from the facility goes in the pond.

And yes, water evaporates from that pond. I'll let you handle the soil. I will go to the soil in relation to concentrations in soil general concentrations in soil. Oh, geez, I turned it off. My apologies. I'm going to speak to concentrations in soil. Concentrations in soil generally in the parts per billion range, which are P-P-P-P-P-T-B, excuse me which is 10 to the minus nine concentrations parts per trillion or 10 to the minus 12 concentrations.

You generally tend to see those for drinking water PPB concentrations into the high PPT or what's actually visible through some of the analytical testing methods. Um would we be treating soil that may have been contaminated with a FF that is presently unknown at the time? There are other sources of PFAS that can end up in the soil.

It doesn't need to be stemming from a FF. there are industries that are relative to this area that we're utilizing PFAS compounds and other manufacturing processes that do not generate or stem from a f soil post-treatment. we recently posted, I believe it was actually today, a response that we had received from, or a res, a letter received from DEC and a response to DEC in relation to the soil post-treatment.

We'll be modifying our application to note that the material could either be utilized as. Beneficial use soil pending. It meets the soil cleanup objectives for the state, or used as daily cover as a, at a landfill which is per language in the letter from, from DEC and I believe that was somebody wants to repeat that.

We posted a letter earlier today in re which is from the State of New York Department of Environmental Conservation in relation to requesting us to modify the submittal specifically in relation to the post treated soil use. Um mentioned a few times tonight the facility REU utilizes soil under beneficial use determination.

Presently in the application we're going to they requested that we modify a language that it would actually be a project specific bud, not a modification to the existing bud. and that use would be potentially for somebody who would be willing to take the material and or as a beneficial use as what's called daily landfill cover.

Okay. Thank you very much. Shannon Gillis.

I just want to make a request to see if I can defer my question to the end of the list. I'm just feeling a bit emotional at the moment. Can I Yeah, go at the end? Yes. Well, I'm just looking at my clock and it's we're at seven 40 already. Okay. So are we going to get through everyone or are we planning on cutting it?

No, I'm going to be asking people to surrender their request and submit their request and. There were statements. Okay. I'm going to make a, make a statement or put Yeah. I'm going to make a formal ask the questions in submit in writing. I'll make a formal request that we have another meeting so that we can address everyone's questions and purpose.

Okay. because we have abided by the time rules pretty fairly. Yes. And that if we have that many people that need to ask questions and we've run out of time, I'm simply asking that a request be made for another meeting so that the people can do more than just write a question in writing and be, have their voices heard.

I usually like to go last, as you guys know so I can kind of clean up some of the misconstrued events that I hear throughout the night. So I'm going to do something different tonight and go off on my own. do you, do you know what a land use permit is? so we had some ambitious people here in the 1990s that brought in a lot of ideas about how we could recycle waste like garbage and we could recycle soil that is contaminated with petroleum.

Correct. Why is it that when you brought in PCBs and you brought in coal tar and you brought in sewage sludge and you brought in paper sludge, that you never brought those requests to the village board of Fort Edward to adjust your land use permit? Because as it states at this moment, the only land use permit you have is from 1995, and it only allows you to process petroleum contaminated soil.

And I know that's a big problem for you because guess what? There's no more petroleum contaminated soil. Is there? You guys did a great job cleaning it up and that seems like a pretty difficult thing for your investors, right? You did a good job and now what are you going to do? It's a difficult question to answer.

So I think my question would be why haven't you updated your land use permit with the village board? And is it because you have a fear that then the village board planning, the planning board could then ask you to do an environmental review? When I spoke at their meetings, they didn't know that you burnt PCBs big problem.

They didn't know that you were taking paper sludge, reissuing it under a bud and then distributing it to our dairy farms that are now making milk for our children to drink. And when I spoke with the DEC, you know what they said? Yeah, Shannon, you know what, I think that's a big problem, but they can't do anything about it because you put it in a bud.

And now that that cover that you were just speaking about that you made seem really nice and easy is now in bedding in cows stable, right? Then when they're done with it, it gets put onto the field and now the contaminations are in our soil. It would've been nice if you could have brought that to our village board and you could have asked them, Hey guys, I know we're still working on a petroleum contaminated soil, but you didn't and they have no idea what's going on and you know who had to bring it to them.

I did.

Alright, thank you. Okay, we have 19 more people. Can I ask just a few questions that have not been addressed? How about how about one, why don't you pick one question please. you are. You, can you please make correct your statement about the issues that you've had with contamination at your facility?

Because if anyone in this room does a simple search of contaminated events at your facility, you've had multiple spills that have had to been cleaned up at your facility, and you need to retract that statement immediately. Okay. I have them on documentation. That's not a que that's not a question. That's a statement.

Alright. Alright. I I'll go ahead.

That girl. Multiple spills n no, no. Yeah, no. that, that's we have had equipment spills at the facility. Those have actually been cleaned up and remedied at the facility itself, so, correct. If there's been equipment spills that are at the location, maybe a hydraulic line breaks, maybe a, there's a fuel line that breaks on a piece of equipment.

Those soils are removed, cleaned up by the facility itself, and that information is closed. in relation to sewage sludge, I guess you're probably referring to a research permit we had for utilizing sewage sludge as a soil amendment. that research project was actually never completed. We did not receive any sewage sludge at the facility for processing in relation to paper sludge.

We did bring in a few loads of paper sludge. We did process some, and we did put it out under the bud that was presented at the time. We no longer hold the bud for doing that, and we have not done that process since that operation had occurred. and I think the rest were statements. Okay. I want to keep these, keep this moving.

All right. We have we have someone just keep going. Sorry. Did not answer the question on your gentleman. Well, that, that that wasn't, yeah. That, that, that, no, that wasn't a question. That was a statement that, that a permit was required that presupposes that it was required. That we, we have existing permits as they are at the facility.

Can I ask them? This is, no, we have 19 more pe Sorry. We have 19. I know. yeah, we can, we can't go all night. Sorry. yes. As I said in the beginning you know DEC has said two hours and we're going to go longer, but a but a drop dead time is, is going to be nine o'clock. So that, that's it. okay.

We have one virtual in the queue. waiting.

Alright. Can you please identify yourself and where you are from, please? yes, I can. good evening. Thank you for allowing me the chance to speak. my name is Jared Levy. I'm the currently the president of the Child Life Fire Department, which is located in Monroe County, New York. on behalf of our department just wanted to let the group know that I've been a firefighter for about 32 years.

We've responded as our agency and others, you know, over countless calls. and as you've heard tonight and you've read in the news obviously the Forever Chemicals are everywhere.

but it certainly impacts us as firefighters and we're eager to find a solution to the problem. And I'll comment on that in just a minute.

Firefighting sometimes, obviously we've used PFAS with a FF we've sprayed the foam during training exercises at our facilities. and it is a threat to our human health. you know, and obviously that was something we were told was safe to utilize. And now we have a contamination property at one of our, our main firehouses that we're working with DEC to, to remediate.

And we're doing our part, not only does PFAS it shows up in our. Soils, it shows up in our turnout here too. you know, for us, so preventing soil to water contamination is crucial. getting PFAS from the soil helps prevent the chemicals from leaching into our groundwater and other sources in our area, and it helps mitigate the potential health risk for firefighters and, you know, the general public that we, that we serve.

In essence cleaning PFAS from soil is a proactive measure to minimize exposure to these harmful chemicals while also preventing further environmental contamination. so we, you know, we support clean House initiative and obviously we need to figure out a plan to remove the contamination out of the soils.

And like I said we currently have that problem right now with one of our main firehouses, which has a training facility. and not only are we, we're not the only fire department throughout the state, in the country but obviously we're at the forefront and working closely with DEC to, to come up with a solution.

It's great that we're having these conversations. That's the first step. and we need to obviously take some sort of action and I support the efforts of the folks that are leading the effort to come up with a solution to, to hopefully remediate and, and get rid of PFAS. And I appreciate the time.

Thank you. Okay. Thank you very much. Uh I'll take one more that's in the virtual queue. Can you please identify yourself and where you are from, please? good evening. My name, my

name is George Bransky. I'm from Albany County. I've been avid fisherman since I was a child. I grew up here in upstate New York and have spent time in many of the lakes and streams all around this area.

As many of you know, what is now known as forever, chemicals are now using so many products that we see in our daily life. I, ironically, some of those clothes that we wear have the chemicals in it. That make them waterproof because of its pro province, we are seeing PFAS in the soil and water in upstate New York.

It gets in the water when it rains and washes away contaminated soil. We need to figure out a solution. We need to confirm a way for us to clean the soil. This quick two week test is a great start. It's a way to solve a problem that is truly going to be needed in every community. thank you for your time.

Okay, thank you very much. Alright, I'll, I'll, I'll read the next speakers, please. Henry and Avery Plude Cynthia Roberts, Sarah Ledge, Michael Dickinson, Ron Atkinson and Tracy Fri and Ken Henry and Victoria Plude. Please come forward to the podium please.

And you people can have a seat over there if you want. Are the plumes here, please? No, she's right here. Okay.

I'm going to pass on my,

okay. Thank you. Victoria and Henry Ploud. No, right there coming. Oh, oh, Avery, I'm sorry. It looked like Henry. Sorry, I, sorry.

Hi, I'm Avery Ploud and I'm an upcoming sophomore this fall at Fort Edward High School. I'm just curious to know that you failed to answer my question the last time when I called in on December 4th. My question was, your site where you're burning all these chemicals and whatever is less than a mile than the school.

Would you feel comfortable sending your own children to this school while burning these? Would you feel comfortable living here where everyone else is? Would you enjoy it? Would you feel safe understanding the process as I do? I'm from Saratoga County. yes, I would send my kids to the school. Truly, yes.

Right. I, I don't live at, I've live in Saratoga years. I believe in the science, I believe in the technology. So yes, I would Can you explain the science and the technology? So in relation, truthfully, I believe we've tried to do our best to explain, explain these questions. Just one please.

So the science in relation to the destruction, there, there are criteria that we have to meet in order for us to comply with our permits at the facility, right? Those include what are called destruction removal efficiencies. Those destruction removal efficiencies are measures that are made based with soil and emissions.

And that we then have to demonstrate that we meet the state's air guidance concentrations so that we can meet the Department of Health and department of DEC criteria, those criteria on those emissions, meet those particular values. And hence why the facility has a permit. We fully believe in the technology and that we're actually doing a good thing for the environment.

Anything further? Nothing. Okay. Alright. Thank, thank you very much.

Cynthia Roberts,

Thank you for being here. And thank you for your presence. It's really important. And to everyone here, thank you for fighting for our community. I have a couple questions and a couple quick comments. when I was a freshman at Brown Harold Ward, the sort of noted environmentalist talked about nimby, something I'd never heard about as a kid, not in my backyard.

It's an acronym for Not in My Backyard. And the reason for this acronym, the reason it got so much attention and put into use was because people in communities that are already suffering a great deal of environmental burden, were being asked to suffer more. And I think that's what's happening here. I've learned some really disturbing things tonight that I didn't even know before coming here.

I was very involved in our, our work to protect our community from the Saratoga Biochar Initiative. And we're finding that we're back in the same spot, and that's why you have a room full of people that would be even more if we weren't already fatigued. so my questions are one, is it the corporate intention?

Should this RD&D process go forward and prove through your purported data to be effective? Is it the corporate intention to build this facility out at scale to manage a larger quantity than 5,000 tons of contaminated soil? And what would that quantity be? On what basis for how long? And what would be the projections related to that for air emission soil contamination and water contamination?

So, larger question, more granular question. My next question is, is it the corporate intention to apply for, you said you're adjusting, you know, based on the DEC, adjusting the, the Bud Permitting process or application component to your, to your permit application. Would it be the intention to create a beneficially use determinant product at the end of this from the PAS initially PFAS contaminated input?

Is that an intention? And again, at what scale? And then I'd love for you guys to you, sorry, don't mean to be too casual. I'd love for you all if you would, to explain to the audience and to myself, you know, the discrepancy between the six regulated PFAS by New York State and the over 12,000 known PFAS chemicals that exist.

And let us know exactly where the input lies in relation to that. So the data that you're producing in projections is interesting, I'm sure, and, and in some sense, you know, worth evaluating. But I'd really love to know where does that discrepancy lie? You know, so what are we really dealing with? and then finally, I would love to just make the statement that so

many of us in this community live here for the beauty of the place, the place that this is, it is some of the best farmland around.

It is one of the most gorgeous, beautiful places with the Adirondack National Park. And this is a place where people are raising their children, and I want to make sure that we know exactly what the risks are, and they're permanent risks, they're dangerous, and their risks to the children you see here, who would so much rather be outside tonight on this beautiful June night.

So, those are my questions, and I appreciate your time, and again, appreciate your service. Thank you.

So we'll tag team this a little bit and as we quite often do, we'll go backwards with the latest questions and feedback to it. So, but some good questions there. on the, the six D-E-C-P-A-S and then that, that line that you take to the hundreds, if not thousands of different PFAS. Totally agree. There are thousands of different PFAS.

We, I, I think what's important to recognize is that they're not all the same. Right. One P-P-P-F-A-S is not the same as some other PFAS substance. and so what we have done is we are testing for as many of the PFAS that there are analytical methods available, and that's approximately 40. If that's 40 45, I, I can't remember exactly the number now.

Why only 45? And what does that mean? What is the connection there? So in engaging, in our, our discussions with EPA, in particular, the people down in the Office of Research and Development down in North Carolina, they have identified PAS that they believe are the representative of the whole, right?

So if you start talking about thousands, you can't test for all 1000. Nobody tests for all every substance. They test for representative substance substances. That, that then tell you if substance A is not present, then substance B, C and D are not present. And so we have the, we if in our permit application and in discussions in DEC, we are going to test for those

representative compounds that are part of a recently approved EPA analytical methodology for both in the soil and in the, in the air emissions.

And as we've modeled, we've modeled those emission emissions for those substances that the state has safe limits or annual guideline concentrations for. So that's the connection there. and then I think if I can, I'll just add one. Yep. I'll just add one point to that. a lot of the states, and if you look at what they've done, regulatorily, they've identified and they've looked at those compounds, which they deemed to be the most toxic.

So there's to, to your, your comment and maybe, and I just want to make sure we were trying to address it, the disconnect between the six compounds that the state has identified and they're working with versus what, what, what could be out there? from, from the thousand standpoint you know, they, they, they've obviously taken some guidance recently associated from EPA because these EPA identifies similar compounds and they, they have a toxic additive that they use if you look at the MCL drinking regulation for the federal government.

So when, but when, when the, the governments are looking at it, they're, they're working with the compounds that they believe are the most toxic and then they're trying to expand their information from there. So just a point of reference in relation to, to that, that differentiation there. in relation to the facility you mentioned being at scale the facility is a scaled facility.

There, there would be no build out to increase capacity or anything with the unit. The unit has a specific design. there is no intent to increase that design capacity at the location to modify that, that plant. So a processes more we are continually looking to increase efficiencies at the facility, but in relation to that plant being considered a scaled operation, that is a scaled operation from that standpoint.

In there was a I'm going to go to the bud and I'm going to go backwards to the initial scaling. in relation to the bud in to the two week project. Yes. We did ask for a bud to be produced for the reuse of that soil based on the, the state's soil cleanup objectives. So we did request that a bud be developed based on the soil cleanup objectives from New York State which

they do have a guidance sacrament out there for which they've suggested regulations for 3 75, which is the part of the state regs that references soil cleanup in relation to if it is successful.

And would we then look to do this on what, using your term, a full scale process or a permitting process if the test is successful, that's something that would be looked at? Yes. Okay. Okay. Thank you very much, sir. Bramlage, please.

Thank you guys for being here tonight. good evening. My name is Sarah Bramlage. I own a home in Fort Edward. I'm a sixth generation resident in this community. Over 150 years ago, my family opened the Watkins Garden Center, which is still operational and family owned. I currently work for New York State as a manager of statewide environmental programs.

I previously worked for DEC as a permit analyst in the region five office, and I have a degree in environmental science. My, my question is in regards to the safety of the PFAS processing at your facility, specifically regarding the potential for public exposure to PFA SS and air emissions. You've previously described your system as a closed loop, which you did address earlier.

However, that's not correct. You have an air emissions permit that allows certain emissions, and in your application, you clearly state that emissions will be controlled. Emissions don't need to be controlled if they're in a closed loop process. We know that heating PFOS can lead to the creation and release of greenhouse gases and additional PFAS compounds as a product of incomplete combustion and incomplete destruction.

We know at least some of the health risks from exposure to these compounds, and we know there's no real time.

We know that there is no real time emissions at your facility and that your emissions reporting is based on mathematical equations, not actual emissions monitors. We know that there are no stack scrubbers or stack filler filters at your facility. Additionally, we know

from your own Airborne annual PFAS particulate deposition modeling on pages 70 to 73 of the application.

The highest concentrations other than immediately north of the facility are the far northern portion of the one and a half mile endpoint required by DEC For the modeling, I'm referring to the annual modeling, not the maximum hourly modeling that Northern one and a half mile endpoint area of highest concentration is in Hudson Falls, a densely populated disadvantaged community and a recognized environmental justice area.

Given all of this information, plus a myriad of other own unknowns with this proposal, how do you guarantee that this project will not expose the public to dangerous levels of PFAS carried as particulates in the emissions from your facility? And I have two more things to say. you have an air permit at your current facility.

Air permits do not require testing of the water in your retention pond. So I'm curious when you're saying we, we test our water in the pond and it meets all of the what it's supposed to, you don't, there is nothing in your permit for testing of the water in your retention pond. So I think maybe some clarification on that would be good.

And I'm just curious that all of the people that seem to be calling in tonight are all in favor, which is fine. We need to come up with a solution to this, but it's just convenient that they're all calling in. And where did you get these ringers that, you know, want to like, that don't live here? So, thank you

Controls to speak to the emissions model, which you, which you referenced. what's shown on the, on the screen is actually the. Document that was part of the submittal. This was the summary table that was in the air mod that was supplied which we've actually provided also in the responses to the December 4th meeting.

This document is in there. It's also been put out to responses to other community members who have questioned on it. the 1.5 mile endpoint, which is the second row there,

which says total sampled PFAS with a 99.9% DRE 1.5 mile endpoint. And that percentage that you have a GC that you referenced is 0.001% of the New York State a GC value for POA.

So we took the additive of those compounds, which were modeled, compared that additive to that P-O-A-G-C value and then derived that value. So when you were talking about health based standards and safety, that's where we're deriving that safety from. Right? That P four A value is a health-based safety standard from an air criteria and by modeling it's roughly one, 1000th of a percent, which would be representative of the emissions associated with the project.

So that's where we're deeming or we're coming up with a statement that the, the process is safe in relation to the air permit. Absolutely. We do have an air permit within there, there are criteria. you know, I think we've mentioned earlier that the point that there, there is never zero, right within that permit specific language, if I remember correctly, that, you know, the discussions one of our last stack testing results having five and a half nines removal efficiency, and that's part of the calculation, which you referenced in relation to our annual reporting that's required by the permit itself.

So, you know, from a, the, the ability of the pro unit, the process materials and control those emissions, it, it does a very good job of controlling and it's been demonstrating in past testing. Um. I feel like I missed something. Do you have anything else in your notes? oh, the water goes through is, is sampled, the pond is sampled annually, so there, there is sampling of the process.

I'm sorry, can you say that again please? the, the sample, I'll verify this. I the pond, not the sample. The pond I will verify will provide it in writing, I believe is sampled annually. I referring to, said there is not a permit to do that. Please have them. Yeah. Is a permit required? I if, you know, I I'm going to, I I'll have to revert back.

I do not. Okay. That will be, yep. A question will be answered. Thank you. Yeah. Okay. Thank you very much. Michael Dickinson, please.

Hi, I am Michael Dickinson. I live at, for East Road Fort Edward, right across the canal with the odors and the smell and the smoke blows to You made a statement that you had an enclosed system. I have, I also own property across the canal from your facility. And I have witnessed many, many times with the doors wide open during process.

That's not a closed system. Okay. We're, we've, I want to speak to your management ability. Many times we've called the DEC and mentioned in public meetings the odors that we're getting, and you're denying that there are any odors. I don't know if you think we're lying or you just don't care. I'm curious about that.

I. You know, we've made calls, we're on record for the smells. I want to comment on the fact that you operate predominantly overnight when people are asleep and not outdoors. That's a little suspicious to me. You know, we, you know, I raise cattle right across from you, you know, and I, I just, I'm afraid that, you know, what you're doing is going to cause us problems down the road.

You know, I don't want to find out 20 years from now that we're entitled to a $5,000 settlement, you know, after we're dying. You know, that's not appropriate, guys. You know, you've got to start thinking about how to treat this, where the problem originates. Why don't you invest in a mobile unit that can go to where the toxins are originated and deal with it there?

We had PCBs here. We dealt with it, we handled it. We've, you know, we worked with General Electric to clean it up. We understood that because it was originated here. Why would we want to bring something here that we don't currently have here now? Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Dickinson. Ron Atkinson, please. Oh, what he did have some questions I took notes on, so I, I, I, I do want to go back to those. Okay. let's see. again, I'm working backwards a little bit. overnight operations the process done, this does operate 24 hours usually over a five to five and a half day period.

the tent, and the reason it operates over that 24 hour period is once the facility is heated the intent of keeping the heat in the process so it is more efficient as to run it. over a 24 hour period. So on the days that we're operating, yes, we operate from midnight to midnight or noon to noon, whatever, where that consideration happens to be.

In relation to reports, recent reports of DEC we are aware of them. DEC has been to the facility. They have been on the road they have been on E Street, they've been up to Price Chopper, they've been into Hudson Falls which we are all aware of because they do contact us every time a complaint or a notice comes into them to inquire about what it is that we're doing.

so that those reporting or any sort of reporting that has come from them we're not aware of, well, we're not necessarily made privy to that information just based on the fact of them not wanting to release information by those who are, who are calling in to those particular locations. but to this point in time, they have not contacted us telling us we have done anything that's outside of the bounds of our existing facility operations.

Um in relation to the smoke part, the facility does not emit smoke. This facility has a steam plume that's associated with it, which is visible during certain times of the year and, or evening, morning. It depends on the atmospheric temperature humidity content of the environment. during the, the summer, if you look at the steam, the stack, you basically see heat waves.

If it's the middle of winter, you're going to see a visible steam plume from the facility. But what comes out the stack is not smoke, mis smoke, it's not steamable. What is it carrying that we're carrying? The intent of the oxidation system is to control any sort of smoke or odor that's generated from the process.

Yeah. The que the question was what, if anything, does the steam carry? well it's, you know, as, as David and I think have made statement to it's there, there is never zero. As was just noted in the, the previous question and comment in relation to what the facility has the potential to emit. Our, our calculations on emissions are based on a five and a half nines removal efficiency.

So we have a destruction removal efficiency that's 99.9995%. So the materials that are going into the facility, that value is what's utilized to determine the emissions that come out based on the contaminants that are being loaded. Okay. That information is submitted in reports to DEC. Okay, thank you.

Mm-hmm. Ron Atkinson.

My name is Ron Atkinson. I live on in Hudson Falls, and we're going to have few questions here for you. I also am a member of the Breathe three Hudson Falls, which has issue with the controls at Wind Waste Wheel of Raider here in Hudson Falls, the trash incineration plant. while reviewing the 2023 operating report for that facility wind waste, I noticed that there was 12,222 tons roughly of solid waste that had been sent from ESMI to the trash incinerator plant.

I'd like to know what that is. I'd also like to know if that whatever was done in 23 is continues to be done to today. and when you made reference to the bag house that you apparently have at your facility, uh. There's a lack of that at the, at at the wind waste wheeler bra. The smoke stack that you're making reference is just steam coming out.

There, there's no it should be continuous monitoring of any smoke stack to find out just what is coming out of that. I mean, you're, you're not really specific on just what those vapors are. Whatever they do contain, I'm sure some contaminates of some level. What are those levels? I also would like to you make throughout this whole presentation, you make reference to frequently monitored what is frequently monitored to me.

When you're dealing with hazardous materials, there should be continuous monitoring of all facets of, of that process by which you're, you're trying to decontaminate the soil, which you're, that you're dealing with. I'm, no, I'm certainly no expert, but in that bag house, I trust there's filters in it. Are those filters being sent to wind waste wheeler radar to, to burn them and another trash incineration place where you can't get rid of it in that facet?

I'm, I'm not sure, but that's a question. you're claiming there's no scrubbers or anything at your facility. so the risk of vapors, contaminants of any sort should be monitored in that. To me, as we're doing with the incineration plant, continuous monitoring is certainly a step to, to determine what is coming out of there.

You can't just say that it's a vapor and it's not harm to anyone. You really should confirm what is going to happen. Now, just as a DEC note, there's smokestack. Tested one time per year and very liberal in the way they, they dress it, they pick who they, who's going to do the testing. At the end of the day, they, they, they ultimately, they do get approved for it.

So that's done every year. So once a year is not sufficient. Okay, sir. People here need to be comfortable and what's all that stuff? Alright, we're, we're, we're losing a lot of other Okay. People here. Sorry. Thank you. Okay. That's several questions. Uh,

I'm going. Alright. materials sent to wheel ator are materials that were removed from soil that are non amenable to thermal. Desorption. trucks have plastic liners in them as a for instance. maybe there's other materials, maybe there's wood. there could be other materials that are in there that are separated from the soils.

Those materials are placed on the roll off, and those materials are sent to the Wheeler braider facility. does the process still occur in that manner? Yes. We still send stuff to that facility for management in relation to testing and monitoring within our permits thermal oxidation temperature is used as a surrogate of destruction.

When we perform stack testing the testing is capturing oxygen carbon monoxide and carbon dioxide, which are, are surrogates of destruction, removal, efficiencies under certain federal and state regulations. And that temperature then is set as a surrogate which we take and we monitor. So we have permit conditions that are based around that surrogate temperature, which then ties to the efficiencies associated with destruction that the, the facility meets.

Um, there's, there's been several comments tonight about a scrubber. The facility is not fitted with a scrubber. that is a, is a correct statement. in relation to the particular test if in, when you, when you look through the application, we actually reference the utilization of carbon a hydrated lime product which is a, a carbon a calcium based material.

One of our tests is to, to try to demonstrate the material can reduce the oxidated temperature of PFAS, which there is science out there to support. that process does also help to control any sort of acid emissions that would be associated with the process. And just to one clarification, excuse me just a moment.

When when Rob says that there's no scrubber, that's not to imply that there's, there's no, there's no air emissions controls. We have the oxidizer, which heats up the air column to a very high temperature and destroys all the, or organics. And then any particulates that are entrained in that airstream are removed from the bag house.

So we do have air emissions controls. It's just not called a scrubber or a wet scrubber. We don't have a wet scrubber. We have a thermal oxidizer and a bag house. And back to the bags on the, the material cap, the bags are intended to be re reused indefinitely until they potentially break down. The material that's captured in the bag house is recycled back into the facility and treated again.

Okay. And that was where I was going back to there, the question whether there were actually bags in the baghouse. There are there's 1200 bags in our existing baghouse. So and that, that's by design. So and as David mentioned, the way that works is the particular captures on the outside of the bag, we actually use an air, air jet pulse.

It's called the pulse jet system, which actually takes and frees the, the particulates from the bag. They drop into a hopper on the bag house. And then that material is actually conveyed back to the pug mill, which we talked about earlier. So that's the co-mingling of all the solid streams that are part of the process, that coming from the primary treatment unit, the cyclone and the back house are all co-mingled.

And then discharge and analyze, post post-treatment. Okay. Tracy Fri please.

Hello. I'm going to start with something personal. last Monday I had a brain bleed and was in Albany, Albany Med for four days. I would be better off if I rested at home, but this is very important. This is an existent, an existential threat to this community. This is an assault. There is absolutely no reason to bring PFAS contaminated soil from, I believe military sites in Pennsylvania from firefighting foam.

I just, when I went to the very frustrating fiasco of a public participation meeting online and couldn't speak because I couldn't simultaneously hold my phone and watch the online program. you said you didn't know where it was coming from. Well, even before that, I had found an article in the online publication Waste Dive, which said that I'm going to read the, the, the headline Department of Defense taps, PFAS, remediation companies, including Clean Earth for a mitigation research project.

It's known, you know where this is coming from. I believe you're, this would be coming from two bucks. County department, military bases. That have contaminated groundwater wells and caused countless human health problems. Of course, we should be remediating PFAS contaminated soil. But when I heard about this, I reached out to a concerned hu Fort Edward resident who took me around, showed me the Clean Earth facility, and I was shocked that it was a pole barn that's not precise.

There's nothing precise about this facility. and then she took me around and showed me fields on county Route 42, where some of the cleaner dirt is disposed of. So we're spreading contamination because there's no transparency about the test results. or even what is being, what is being remediated at a given time.

Is it PCBs or, or petroleum or other kinds of contamination? And so this, this, and, you know, I heard about the, the dairy farm in Kingsbury that has, has accepted this dirt from through someone I know whose son was a truck driver there. There's, you know, we are a small community. We hear about what's going on.

We see what's going on. This is, this is horrific. Prevention is the best po best, the best way to address PFAS. And the state currently still allows the spreading of sewage sludge, which is ubiquitously can contaminate with PFAS and a neighbor's. Well, we tested a neighbor's well and it had 10 times the PFOS allowed by, in, by New York state just downstream of where sewage sludge was spread.

We should not be remedy. We can never remediate re we can never remediate. Farm soils that have been contaminated with sewage sludge. First of all, we d would destroy the, the soil structure, the soil organic matter, and all the other beneficial things that natural soils have. We might destroy the PFAS, it would cost a fortune and it would also contaminate the air and possibly other media.

PFAS contaminate soil can be, can be remediated on site. I watched a really good webinar by a company called TRS, which also has a contract with DOD, and they used a very controlled process and they were able to test, there was no, it was all contained, and they were able to test the soil during that process to pull out samples and test it.

What everyone here should know is that you, there's no quick test for PFAS. You could do a quick sample, but it's going to take a few weeks to get the, the test results. Okay. Ms. Fris, I'm sorry to interrupt you, but you're, I'm going to ask one question. You're using other people's time. If I can ask one question, I would like that.

Go ahead. Okay. Are you going to follow the law and go to the, go to the Fort Edward Village Planning board and talk, tell them what you plan to do and are you going to let this project be reviewed under the State Quality Review Act? Environmental Quality Review Act as is required by law. Okay. Thank you.

And I would like an answer, so I'll let, I'll, I'll address the last one. Thank you. I'll address the last question. Thank you for asking those questions and sharing your concerns. I'll address the last, and then you'll address some of the DOD questions. we have. full intention of complying with the state's regulations, whether it be the cumulative impact law, the COP 29 regulations any of their air and solid waste requirements that it's part of this process and

it's part of the RD&D permit application is permit part of the draft r and d permit document that will be generated.

Assuming that all goes well and that will go out for additional notice and comment to the community. So we're very, very early in the stage. Once we have completed this process and submitted our certification that our, we believe our permit application is complete, then the state will, if they agree, will then issue a draft permit for everybody to take a look, a notice and comment on.

So you will, they will in and in part of that permit, they will insert all of the requirements they believe are necessary to, um make to ensure that this operation is conducted safely and they will account for your comments and concerns as well. So that's the addressing the laws and such. And so I'll let you take sort of the questions that came, I think in the front.

I think in relation to the village. Yeah, the village planner, sorry. I'll remember one of these times in relation to the village. the village members are aware that the situation, we've had someone out to the facility to, to view the facility itself. And we did receive a letter from the village code enforcement officer at some point in time.

I can't remember exactly the, a date on it where there was a letter which, which talked about response to them in relation to the research project in relation to beneficial used soils and test results. In accordance with our bud, anyone who takes our soil for beneficial use has to be provided the analytical associated with the soils.

So information is provided to those who utilize the, the soils under a beneficial use determination, and they're requested, they have the ability to request the analytical associated with those treated soil piles. So there can be knowledge to those individuals in relation to what the soil contaminants are.

The soil concentrations of identified contaminants may be within those project Robin J. But just to be clear, it, it has to meet the beneficial Correct. Use criteria before has to meet the

beneficial use criteria for either residential or non-residential soils in order for the application to be the material to be used in a particular application.

Those, those standard in relation to the DIU project? You are correct. Clean Earth is a member of the DIU project. What I will correct the statement for is that Clean Earth is participating with that in relation to the destruction of liquid wastes. We are not associated with a project, with anything from a soil concentration.

I also manage that project. Those materials are actually being shipped to two other Clean Earth facilities where there are liquid destruction technologies that are demonstrating their technologies on concentrates. PFAS concentrates that were generated at the, those two facilities in Pennsylvania, Fox County, correct?

Yes, ma'am. So, and those, so there, there, so Clean Earth is not accepting soil from that location. There is no intent for us to accept soil from those locations, but we are associated with that project. And it's a liquid based destruction trial that is being demonstrated by, if you look at the DIU website, by the four technology companies that are listed on their particular site.

And, and to clarify, the Fort Edward facility does not accept liquids. Fort Edward facility is not accepting liquids and they're not a member or participating in that DIU project. Okay. We have 17 down plus three. Uh. Three zoom. So we have 20 down and we have 12 to go. If any of you who have signed up who haven't gone to the podium yet, have had your questions already answered it would be helpful if you want to surrender your spot.

But let's keep going. I have seven more on this sheet and then five more and three other sheets. Angela Presley, Daniel Ward, Denise Mayer, please come forward. Denise Mayor, all of you, Sarah. Milano, Ethan Pike. Lauren Grogan, and Melanie Dickinson. And if Angela is, if Angela Presley who's the first name I call, could come to the podium first.

Please, Ms. Presley. Thank you, judge. My name is Angela. I live in Fort Edward. I have a PhD background and in my career I help top tier researchers bring their innovations into the

market. So I'm confident to say that I understand and appreciate quality research when I see it. And this is not it. Where are the scientists on this project?

We have Rob Martin, who on LinkedIn, has the title of technical Director of PFAS, but he has an associate's degree in Environmental science and a bachelor's in biology. I don't see any key opinion leaders whose reputation is on the line if something goes wrong, that's why you need a scientist on the project.

Where's the past research? The only publication from this research team is A PDF that you put on your website about that previous pilot study that's, there's been much talk about that. I'm not going to talk about it more, but that white paper is full of holes. It really leaves more questions than answers.

No wonder it was never published. That pilot study was a failure, not just because you failed to remove PFAS the first time that you tried from that soil, but because the study design was weak and the data that was collected was incorrect, and the analysis was sloppy. So why would we give this research team more soil to work with another time that just doesn't make sense.

I've been speaking with experts in the PFAS removal field, and I've been asking them, what would you be concerned about if this was happening in your backyard? Keep in mind, these are experts who are used to thinking about the thermal remediation of PFAS, and they've told me over and over again, in fact, every single person said their primary worry would be about the emissions.

And that's because there is a huge knowledge gap around the emissions for thermal DESORPTION of PFAS. We've been talking about this this whole time as a research project because there are questions that need to be answered, so we shouldn't be casually saying that we are sure that you can have a hundred percent destruction, or 99.999.

We are not sure of anything. What we are sure of is that PFAS doesn't magically disappear. We do know that when you thermally treat it, it's released from the soil and then it has kind

of four options. So it could mineralize, it could turn into other nasty chemicals, it could cling to the soil, or it could be released into the air.

In order to solve that mystery, you have to do extensive testing, which you're planning to do as part of this, which is great, but you have a third party lab who's going to do that testing, and it takes 30 days to get those results back from the lab. Your test will already be over by the time you get your first results, so you'll have no time to modify anything.

If it turns out that there is excessive PFAS in the emissions, all you'll know is how much you polluted our air, not how to stop yourself from doing it. That's unacceptable. This is not a place for you to play chemistry lab. If you're going to be doing serious research with toxic materials, we need a real team of scientists and a real lab.

Okay. Thank, thank you Ms. Presley. Mr. Ward,

Thank you for the opportunity. Thank you for your service. As many have said, we appreciate it very much. You're welcome. my name is Daniel Ward. For those of you who don't know, and I know many of you do, I'm the superintendent of schools here at Hudson Falls. I've been at several of the public meetings at the village board at Fort Edward and I have a very similar statement.

So two pieces. One in my capacity as superintendent anything that can be done to make sure that all the pain and heartache has been felt by this community by other pollutants in our community, it's of great importance to me and great importance to all the people out here is great importance to the 2200 school children to go to Hudson Falls schools each and every day, and the 500 people that work here each and every day.

And I'll go back and speak about Fort Edward and the about 400 school children that go there, and the about 75 individuals that work there, not to mention all the residents that live in this area. in my 29 year career, the last 10 or so of which have been Hudson Falls and Fort Edward, we've suffered a lot of loss of young people and a lot of loss of older people as well due to things that are linked back to the pollutants in our community.

And, and I am concerned that bringing more pollutants here because this is the place where pollutants go, pollutants go to Fort Edward and Hudson falls to be dealt with. that, that that's not your consideration. But the consideration of people who make decisions about this process I can tell you that it may seem like I'm playing on emotions and people want to talk about data, and I also have a science background.

That's what my, my degree is in. but emotions are real. and if you don't think they are, come to a funeral that's held for a young person who's passed away for something that just doesn't make sense that can be linked back. Maybe not to a specific pollutant, but back to things that could be caused by pollutants in our community and, and listen to what the family says and experience what the family goes through and experience what an entire community or entire school goes through.

And again, unfortunately in my career that that's occurred for me a few times, and I know it's occurred for many of you out there. I just want to put that out there. I live on East Road, which you've heard a couple other people. You heard Mikey and Mike. Almost everybody on the road's name Mike. I'm named Dan.

I live there too. it's very close to your facility. It's across the water through the woods a little bit. it concerns me for my own family's wellbeing and my in-laws live right across from the middle school here in Hudson Falls. So I have a personal stake in this. I have a professional stake in this, and I just have a, a very strong emotional stake in all of this for the residents here and for the school children.

I, I really hope that anything that's done will be under really high scrutiny and done with all transparency because the people here deserve it because they've been through enough. Again, I appreciate the time to speak tonight on behalf of the schoolchildren and people who live here in the communities and on my own family's behalf.

Thank you so much. Thank you.

Thank, can will, will, will. Denise Mayer, please come forward.

Hi, I am Denise Mayer and I live on East Street in Fort Edward. I have a PhD in biology with a minor in chemistry, and I have been a research scientist for over 30 years. Clearly, I understand your proposed process as well as its risks, as do others attending in this room and virtually. We also understand that the Clean Earth facility in Fort Edward is designed to remove hydrocarbons from contaminated soil.

Oil-based compounds are relatively easily destroyed by heat. In contrast, the facility is not qualified nor equipped to safely conduct research, test, or process the manmade heat resistant PFAS compounds. And it is really too high risk to have our region exposed to the toxins that are released during these tests.

Admittedly, this isn't really all on you. The science on these PFAS contaminants of emerging concern is simply not yet advanced or adequate enough to track the byproducts in real time in order to detect and then prevent the emissions that are nevertheless hazardous to human and environmental health.

Despite what you may believe, peer reviewed scientific studies, non-industry supported scientists, unlike Frank, and those of us here tonight, agree that your proposed methods do not result in consistent and complete destruction of PFAS. In the recent Times Union article, and you addressed this a little bit, for example, Dr.

Carlson, a professor from Maine, questioned that closed loop statement claim of Clean Earth representatives stating that such a claim would be revolutionary to science. To be clear, it is not a closed loop when the byproducts are released into the air. Even if the reportable portion of the PFAS compounds are within regulated levels, air samples collected onsite and measured and reported by an offsite lab 30 to 60 days after the controlled release of emo emissions do not satisfy our concerns.

We want PFAS emissions prevented, not merely controlled. And I'm going to repeat this notion that I don't, I mean, you kind of fluffed this off, but on your website, your mobile units

are described as efficient, nationwide mobile treatment units. Rather than proceed with your long-term intent to make Fort Edward an epicenter for receiving PFAS contaminated materials from afar, why not treat these soils on site in your mobile units and maybe focus on that research as a chemical mass balance?

It would be safer and beneficial, beneficial to the region actually having the contamination by decreasing their overall PFAS load rather than imposing an ever accumulating contaminant load on our region. We know all too well that long lasting cumulative impacts are real, and we've had enough. Thank you.

Sarah Milano, please? No Ethan Pike.

Hi. My name is Ethan Pike. Thank you, judge. Thank you, Mr. Ward, for giving us the space to use. If you guys could just answer my questions quickly, they'll be like yes or no. I just figure out questions quickly for you here. So I'm from Hartford, New York. You just take E Street and keep going a bit.

You end up at Hartford. I've got a background in engineering and I do like process engineering and internal consulting for a Fortune 100 company. some of the questions that I, I have coming out of this is, is your current site profitable and what is your average profit margin?

I mean, I think we'd be best if you just listed your questions and then we'll answer them at the end. But we are, this is, it's, and I just quick bullets, sir, it's, I, I do not have the profit numbers on it and it's irrelevant to the science that we're trying to discuss today. so my questions are more about what you're providing to the community because if you're running a profitable business and you, you're looking to do research and development, the only way I could justify bringing a new technology into this community is if the risk is that this, this current facility is underwater.

It has year after year of unprofitable history in the past. Is that true? You're, you're incorrect. That that is not, not the true case for this. This is a pro profitable FA facility year over year.

Clean Earth is a profitable business in Fort Edward is a well run facility that makes money for the company, but it's irrelevant to the situation that that's awesome.

That's really good. So, and we provide good jobs. Yeah. And I think that's very important and we do a good service for the, the local region and the northeast area in, in, in, in dealing with contaminated material. And I think that gets lost here, but go ahead. I know, sir. That's, that's what I wanted to bring up.

I think that's a very good thing that you guys are bringing to the community. I'm grateful of that we need more good jobs in the area. but my question is, if you're asking to expand your business model here and probably become more profitable if you're able to develop this technology. What does Fort Edward get from your business becoming more profitable?

Okay, so I, I think the, your question is makes some assumptions there to degree to which the business will be more profitable. We don't know. What we're trying to determine right now is to validate the science that has been published by all sorts of EPA and other scientists around the country that says a system like ours exactly like ours, run at the temperature and the residence times that we use, using the oxidizers and bag houses that we have, will effectively destroy, remove PFAS from soil and destroy that PFAS below the levels, the safe levels that state mandates.

And that's what we're attempting to do here. So we have not done some sort of financial analysis. We have not made any decisions that you're implying there. What we're trying to do first is validate that this to the, to your satisfaction as well as the state's satisfaction that the system operates as we believe it will.

And I, I see my time's up. So I, I'll just leave with two quick questions. So you would go on record saying that there's been no value proposition research done into disposing of PFAS and there is no current thought of a value proposition to propose to the community for them taking on the inherent risk of this material being brought into the area.

We have not, we, we have not examined the value proposition as you describe it. we don't have that to present to anybody on this situation. We certainly know that we have many customers who ask us, can you manage our PFAS materials for us we, as we described, we are working on a DIU project.

we are investigating it. We're trying to validate and permit the technology. That will do it to the satisfaction of the state regulators in the, in those states that we work. But beyond that, we recognize that it's an opportunity, it's an opportunity to clean up PFAS that all of you acknowledge today needs to be done.

Okay. Thank you Mr. Pike. Okay. Okay. next person is Lauren Grogan, please.

Thank you all for your time. I don't have questions, I just have a statement. I came to the Adirondacks every summer as a child, and so when the opportunity arose from my husband and I to move here in 2010, I was thrilled at the idea of being adjacent to the like natural playground that I knew.

I was very surprised when I moved in here and in particular when I opened my business in Fort Edward to find out that there are people who won't drink the water and won't go in the river. I didn't understand it. I started to pay attention more because I was of childbearing age and was not, it was suggested that I not eat the fish.

And that was when my education to what had happened in this area started. And I think that the history of completely legal pollution is so deep and so meaningful, and you've heard it from so many people here tonight. and it affects so many families and. Even if all of this proceeds completely legally to the state standards, that margin of error slim though it may be is too small or is, is, shouldn't exist.

We can't, we can't tolerate the risk of even a slim margin of error is what I'm trying to say. when I bought my 29 acres in Kingsbury, it was so that my kids can play in the water and breathe clean air and that we can reforest this area and work to make it beautiful. and I think that this project puts that in real danger and that's why I'm here today.

Okay. Thank you very much. Melanie Dickinson. Is Melanie Dickinson still here? Tick, tick, tick.

Alright, let's see. Some of my questions were answered, but I do still have many concerns. my one, can you get a little closer to the microphone please? Oh, sure. Oh, the mic there. my, one of my biggest concerns is that we moved here into Fort Edward and, um we came here because we wanted clean air.

We wanted clean water, we wanted fresh land and to grow things. And unfortunately we have noise from one facility and now we have pollution from another facility. And I know you can name numbers and call it whatever you want, but your steam stinks. Okay. I've called the EPA, I've talked to the Beth at the DEC, and it's, it's, I don't know what to tell you, but the odor is absolutely there and it's sometimes nauseating.

Now, recently you guys have not been burning, so it's been. Rather pleasant actually. But when you were burning the petrole I think it is soil, it was really smelly. And I had kept a list of every day and it was really bad. Some days I had to close my windows at night because it was making me ill. And let's see, the odors that came out of there from petroleum were frightening.

But the odors that are coming out now, I should say last year are different. And I can't really describe it, but it's a chemical smell. we, you say that the facility is also safe and enclosed. I happened to be driving by and a truck was unloading both. The truck was unloading in one bay and the other bay was open.

Well, he came in and he dumped his load. And this giant white plume of smoke just, or I don't even know, not smoke, but dust or something blew through the air. It was a windy day. It came out the door. I have a video if you'd like to see it over the top of the building and out through wherever it went towards Hudson Falls.

So my question is, you, you're saying all these things are safe, but I'm visually seeing and smelling that they're not safe. Also, one evening I was sitting at my neighbor's house and I smelled this weird chemical smell and I'm like, Ooh, are they burning? I'm like, turned around and they weren't burning and I kept smelling it and he's burning my throat.

And I'm like, what is that? And we hear the trucks over there. The truck's over there backing up. Putting, making noise. They were loading the Clean Earth into trucks and taking it away so that earth was not clean. because that was smelly. You could smell it coming across the canal. Now I know you people think we're all crazy and this is not happening, but your tests are not accurate.

Okay? I don't know where you're getting your information from, but they're not from the reality of the, the site. The site is over 30 years old and it's really not qualified to be doing pfo a. You can't, you can't process them there. They're never going to come out clean. And we're the ones who are going to suffer.

Not you. We are not your companies, not your billion dollar company who breaks in the millions cleaning up this earth. Take your portable machine and take it somewhere else. because we don't want it. We're done.

Thank you, Ms. Dickinson. Hey Jo, Jody Butcher and page to me. We also have Pete, Pete Kna, Amy Burns, and Therea Gillis,

Please.

Good evening. My name is Jody Bower. I'm a resident of the village of Fort Edward. I'm a mother of three teenage boys and I'm also a registered nurse here at Hudsonville School. I'm here to speak on behalf of all the children in our community. Mr. Ward did touch on that briefly. but first I want to assume that you are aware that there is a public park directly across from ESMI.

I'm sorry, I couldn't. There is what? A public park. Okay. I would hope that you are aware. Okay. So that's where our kids play. That's where families gather in the proximity alone to your company should be a huge red flag. Second, have you truly considered the risk of trucking contaminated materials through all of our small village straits?

They're narrow roads lined with homes, schools, playgrounds. People live there. Our children ride their bikes. It should not be put out. They should not be put at risk. What is your plan if a spillage occurs in our community? How do you, how do you a hundred percent convince our community residents that they are safe if a spillage does occur, that you've cleaned up that area?

And third, this is personal for me. It's making me a little upset. We're already seeing the devastating effects of cancer in our community. Residents in this town and village are always receiving the unthinkable. A cancer diagnosis. I myself had thyroid cancer. Washington County cancer rates are 10%. As a school nurse, I've seen far, far too much.

We're losing our local children to cancer. Children that go to school here in this current district. It's not hypothetical. It is very, very real. They're dying and they should not be. Think about this as you put your head on your pillow tonight. This community has already endured enough. The Ford, Edward and Hudson Falls communities should not be your sacrificial lamb for corporate convenience and greed for you both to sit there with no empathy instead calloused to all of our concerns is really appalling.

Okay. Thank you Mr. Butcher. Alright. Page to me. Uh judge. Yes. there were, there were a couple questions in there. So, okay. just wanted to, to, to speak to those in relation to transportation and the movement of material through the. the village and the township of Fort Edward towards the location and surrounding communities.

it's a, a process that's occurred safely since 1995. So we are in the process presently of moving material through the, through the facilities in a safe manner to the facility location and in relation to material that gets spilled within the community. soils will be cleaned up as if they were any other contaminant spill response contractors will be deployed by either

the transportation company or the material that the, the company that're shipping us the materials.

And those materials would be cleaned up as would be with any sort of spill that occurs from a, a truck or some sort of mobile transportation system. Rob, have we ever had a, a truck have an accident? Not to my knowledge. Okay, Dave. Okay. Alright. Next, please. Page to me. so I felt compelled to jump up here tonight after listening to everyone before me.

So I scratched this down quick, so bear with me. it's clear that PFAS are a problem across our country based on its impact on human health and its abundance. When I prepare my students for their science exams, we talk about ways to improve those experiments or concerns or problems that they see in them that we need to identify things like is there bias, or how large is this sample size?

How many times have they taken this sample? Um. Many times the state wants students to see how experimenting on humans really is dangerous, and we should find other means should be tried to tested first. So how can you be so willing to gamble with our lives to test your experiment? Will you be moving in?

You said? maybe. So there's some houses on the market. I live on the path of your trucks. That was one of the answers that you gave to me last time when I called in. And I also work extremely nearby. I work at the Fort Edward School. I have softball practice at the park. I've already expressed my concerns again for any potential accidents.

And you said, well, let's just hope it doesn't happen. Why Here in Fort Edward and Hudson Falls like already mentioned, any accidents may not just cause problems in our own community, but everything downhill, everything downstream. What benefit is there for Fort Edward to take on this huge risk is a question that's been asked over and over and over again, and I still feel like has not been fully answered.

Everyone in this room, like Jodi just said, knows someone who has already gotten sick or passed away from environmental contamination. Here. Do you see us as a dumping

ground? Can you guarantee there will be no leaching? Can you guarantee nothing dangerous? Or maybe something yet to be identified is being emitted from your plant?

And just to kind of add, again, as a science teacher, we say that science theories are tentative. We get better technology. We, we learn more from our mistakes. So regulations of today may become much stronger tomorrow. And I hate to be finding out as again previously mentioned that oh, you know, oh, well, too late.

Thank you. Right. Thank you very much.

Speak to the what you discuss is some of the items that you look to teach your, your science students within school and improving concerns and understanding bias and, and perhaps running analysis and triplicates or, or, or multiple iterations. Which is actually part of the process which we have requested be utilized in this particular operation and trial.

Emissions testings, one of them for them to be accepted as validated need to be run in triplicate. That's based on, on standard EPA methodologies and acceptance. So in that particular research submittal that we had put forth in relation to the language associated towards emissions, each one of those temperatures that we had noted as testing, there would be triplicate results generated for that, which does generate additional information and helps to remove any sort of variance or, or particular biases associated with the analysis.

In relation to the soil as well being fed to the system general practice is acceptance and sampling on 10 minute intervals where that material is then composited and those composites are broken out into triplicates and submitted to analysis. So part of the process, which is going to be run or would be run should the project be approved, is to generate science as has been asked and has been referenced here, in order for us to make decisions and provide information to the state so they can make, if it was approved, make reasonable decisions on whether or not the, the process would be acceptable for, for treatment.

Okay. Wait, thank you. No, we have, okay. I think we have somebody in the queue here. No. Okay. Go to the side. What benefit, what benefit are we talking about? What's a benefit to the community? We've go to the side.

Okay. Can you approach the podium please?

Can you hear me? So I have a couple questions about like your retention pond you were talking about for one, a little closer to the mic please. For one is your retention pond isn't lined and to come after that, if it's lined. And do we test to make sure it's not leaking at all, leaching out? And what would happen if we have some heavy rains that God forbid we do have, is it going to overflow?

And where's that going to go? That's a couple questions I have there. Also, you were talking about non waste non soil waste that was getting sent to the trash plant. Where are you storing that on the facility? Is that going to be covered, protected in a spot where that No products can leach out of it while it's sitting there, whether it's wood or anything else that was buried, gone through.

And last but not least, I work for the state. I work with the foam task force for office of Fire Prevention Control. I shouldn't be saying that, but I did. But anyways, we have chased this the pfas here with the Atri left home. We have seen the markers move. You're going to tell me and sit up here at this point in time where less than 20 years ago, we changed formulas and said, Hey, that's safe.

Now we're coming back and saying, oh six years, seven years ago, we said, we're not going to use that stuff anymore. It's not going to be sold in the state of New York. It's still out there. Still going to be used. The markers change with the levels on that. What's going to change with the levels coming down the road?

You're saying, we're at this level now, we're safe. What's going to happen down the road? That's all I have. Thank you.

So on the, on the, on the, the use of PFAS and such I can't guarantee you that there won't be a change in the future. I can't dare as I think we've always said, there is no zero in life. There is no zero risk in life. And, but we have, there has been a lot of work. I think as we all know, there's been a lot of attention to PFAS over the last number of years.

There's been a lot of researchers across the spectrum who have looked at the, the potential toxicity of the various PFAS one. People are trying to phase it out. and so when you talk about those markers, I'm not sure exactly what you're talking about, but yes, one type of PFAS, then another type of PFAS and such.

It should be, you know, made abundantly clear. We're against PFAS, we want to destroy PFAS. We don't use PFAS, we don't we, we don't manufacture PFAS, we don't pr you know, we, if, if, and right now we don't bring it into our facility at all. All we're asking for is a very short two week opportunity to show that the science that exists outright out there right now is has, has been proved multiple times and is, and the state says, prove it again.

And that's what we attempt to do. Right. back to the, to the issues of, can I ask something about that? Come back up to the podium please. I try to answer your questions, but Right. We're trying to stay within time and I, I get it. It'll be real quick. I wasn't stating that you guys are for it or, anyway, I get it.

I understand it. I also know the trials and tribulation trying to get that stuff we're sitting on more than we know what to do with. my question was, is the limits are changing so. What's going to happen when they, once again, because they were doing it in parts per billion at one point in time. We're saying that's what our threshold is.

Now we're talking part parts per trillion. Mm-hmm. Where are they going to go from here? And then where we stuck at when that's going to happen. Yeah. Well, and I, you know, I'm, and that's, that's, I mean, and I, and I, I tell that more of a statement than a question, and I think, but that's where I was going with that.

Okay. And I, and I, I appreciate that. I hear you very closely. I, I, you know, I think I failed, and it was my fault to mention some of my qualifications from earlier. I'm a chemical engineer. I've been in the environmental business for 40 years in a variety of capacities. I worked at EPA for two and a half years.

I managed the USE CPA's, PFAS task Force, the research in ORD. And I've seen, and I've, I, I've talked to the scientists. I've seen, to your point, it was in parts per billion. It's in parts per trillion. not until just recently did the US EPA actually come out with a actual drinking water maximum contaminant limit.

So the previous numbers were all based on early assessments, I want to say. Okay. And what happened between the, the health based numbers, the health based limits, and the actual MCLs, is that there was the, the agency recognized that there needed to be A MCL, or they should least consider developing an MCL.

Their scientists, third party scientists did work. They pulled all that together and they came up with that number. I think they're pretty c about, it's very low. It's actually as low as you can detect. and it goes back to the zero thing. You want to find it somewhere, you're going to find it. So now I want to back and try to address the benefit issue.

There's PAS everywhere, and I'll let you talk about some of the other, go to that eventually. Okay.

There's PFAS everywhere, and as I said. Just because it's not residing in your backyard doesn't mean it's, it's not reaching out and getting you some, some way we know that a contaminant can move. We know that. back to the fire training issues and the use of a FF. You have material, you have contaminated soil, it rains that gets washed in your groundwater.

Somebody's local, well now they're drinking PFAS. It gets washed in the river. It gets picked up by a local, um water utility. The, the village has PFAS and it's water. It's not because of

us, right? It's because there was PFAS used someplace upstream and or in, in the, I think they used reservoirs and wells and spraying boxes.

Somewhere in that, that process, there was PFAS released into the environment and it ended up in the water. And it's going to, and you know, back to the forever issue. PFAS can be destroyed. People like to call it forever because it's hard to destroy. But to my, the point I like to make with people is that if you don't begin to address the issue with respect to PFAS in the environment, it will be a forever problem.

And you have to find a way forward with this. the state, the communities, the federal government, all have to come to grips with this, that every, it's, it, it's in everybody's backyard. Back to nimby. It is back. It's in everybody's backyard. And you're going to have to figure out a way to address this. And putting in a landfill is not going to help.

Ignoring it is not going to help. Sending it to another state probably won't happen. A good example, there was a train derailment in Ohio a couple years ago. Excuse me. Excuse me. There was a train derail in a couple years ago, and they tried to d manage the waste that came from that that train derailment.

And I think it was in Ohio and the state of Ohio had a hard time finding a place to send that waste. Every state is going to have to come to grips with their issues and manage it themselves. back to, sorry, we're not back to the, the question on I'm No, we're up here. Go ahead. I was going to respond to the question on the pond.

Yes, Rob. we recently had an, an engineer redo the design for the pond to, to meet the current a hundred year flood criteria. that was completed within the last set years. I actually don't remember, and actually everybody was in the last two or three years. the, the pond itself is clay lined, is a clay, clay line pond at the facility.

Okay. Are you Amy Burns or there Gillis? I'm there Gillis, but Amy Burns can come up first. That's absolutely fine. No, please, please go ahead. No, please, please go. Alright. Rob

Martin, so nice to meet you. We talked very, very early after discovering the permit that you guys were applying for. So, hi Rob.

I've seen you at five meetings. I'm sure you know who I am, but you did not care to introduce yourself to me, which is what I said initially about an online meeting. It's good to look in your eyes about what ESMI is trying to bring to our community. And I think for you to say you would raise your children here and you would let your children and maybe your grandchildren be in this environment is insane.

I worked in CT 38 years. I took scans of kids with tumors that were 15 years old. This is not the right community to present this in. We're done. We've been devastated by PCB pollutants. We tried to clean them up. That didn't work. But now I will start if I can, two minutes later. I'm glad you're here.

Thank you so much. Welcome. I, I am very glad that you're letting this extend because we've been waiting since November for this face-to-face meeting, and perhaps the numbers aren't as great because the longer we go, people lose interest. But this core group that are here tonight, we are not going away.

You guys? Okay. I reside at 24 East Road in Fort Edward. You all know I've been a long time advocate of this majestic Hudson River corridor. It's been repeatedly inundated by pollutants from long past industry. These communities within this corridor have suffered the consequences. Too many to mention in my three minute time, which I'm going to go over on anyways, but I'm sure Rob will allow that.

We can withstand no more. I and others have voiced and you have heard multiple concerns and questions regarding this RD&D permit application since December of 2024. It's only gained momentum in the delays, in the challenges that have been put before us. This fort just grows larger. This is not about Fort Edward.

This is about this entire region. Students from area school districts deserve to have a voice, a voice in this matter. They stepped up to the plate at the virtual meeting, and I believe they

are again, they were going to try to express concerns that they have. They are the future of this region, and they are fighting, making their voices heard to protect it.

These young adults have already been impacted by the loss of close friends, educators and relatives. They have worked together to organize and participate. In regional community fundraisers in South Glens falls with the marathon dance in Hudson Falls with living for Mia in, in Fort Edward for supporting beaner along many others that they've lost.

That's what you guys are not taking into consideration, okay? Is where we're coming from and the impact this has. Local environmentalist that inspired me daily have long passed away. Most from cancer in my continued involvement comes from the newly charged younger members of these communities who are willing to carry on the torch.

All of you guys that I am so proud to be a part of new, educated, instrumental knowledgeable advocates will not simply dismiss this challenge from the DEC nor ESMI Clean Earth. They have the energy to carry this forward for as long as it takes. Fort Edward will not be the testing ground for the contamination, the decontamination of PFAS we live here.

And Rob, you're crazy if you think you want to raise your kids here or your grandchildren. We live in this region. We raise our families here and we've all lost too many friends and family members to allow PFAS in huge concentrations to be brought here. It's my hope and belief that the Communative impact law disadvantaged communities established in mapped environmental adjusted stones will not fail us.

Fort Edward finally made the map. Understand that this recognition is not really a feather in our cap, but more protection from further applications like yours. Are you almost finished? I am. One more paragraph and I appreciate it. Okay. Truly do. In conclusion, my question for you tonight is, what operational change has taken place at ESMI cleaner since January, 2025?

Are you perhaps not accepting the same soils that you were previously? because Melanie Dickinson and me are not crazy. It smells better. In fact, Rob, there are no smells. This creates in me personally, a true mistrust in your business. You have recently cleaned up your act. Perhaps DEC is paying more attention to your activities.

At any rate, I thank you. This community thanks you. Our children playing activities in sports at Mullen Park with her coaching. This is not the same as what we've been exposed to for the past few years. Our odors have dissipated and not returned. Rob, since January when you did your shutdown for a gas shortage.

Got it. Keep up the good work. However, I still feel strongly in the hope that DEC rejects your RD&D permit to protect this region. Therese Gilis, you all know my contact information. You probably have my cell phone number and irate your response, but you have cleaned up your act. Thank you, Ms. Gils. Amy Burns, I'll, I'll no judge, I, no.

Yeah, I was going to want to comment, address the question. You want to comment? Rob, I've, I think I've done a good job of interjecting when a statement's been questions been made so I can, I can provide, so, right. I was so operationally at the facility as far as, sorry. No, that's that's fine. That. I didn't really get a question out of that thought.

It's, no, there was a statement was one at the end. Yes. Yeah. So operationally at the facility, since the, since January there have been no operational changes. We are continually operating at the, the standard temperatures. I don't trust you, Bob. Okay. That's, it's all good. That's fine. But that's, that's good.

Okay. Okay. Alright. Thank you. Alright, Ms. Amy Burns. Thank you. You're welcome. I appreciate that you've allowed the public to, can you get closer to the mic, please? Sure. I'm sure. What waste management is a worldwide problem, and I'm glad to know that they've got two qualified people here to represent the company.

Although I disagree fully, even 100% doesn't quantify my dislike. I'd like to demand a halt based off of environmental justice for Fort Edward, who has a history of industrial pollution

and shouldn't be targeted. Again. I contacted our local perg office in Albany and I also called the New York City office to see if they could also get involved to help our environment.

Here I strongly oppose the transfer of PFAS contaminated soil from out of state or in New York to Fort Edward. Our community has already borne the burden of industrial pollution for decades. The thermal treatment of PFAS remains unproven at this scale, and any system failure could result in toxic emissions.

We deserve a full environmental impact, study transparency from Clean Earth and the right to protect our air and water from further risk. I'd also like to ask why has the contaminated origin of soil not been publicized? I also found a guide for Citizens on thermal desorption. I found that it may take several weeks, in fact, years.

I also found that treated soil can be used to fill in excavation at the site originally found. If treated soil contains contaminants that do not evaporate, such as most metals, they may be disposed of and capped on site and transported offsite and put to appropriate landfills, which you spoke of earlier.

One thing I didn't hear anything about was the vapor treatment system, which is also part of thermal disorders and what happens. And you know what led me here, and I don't need to read my notes for this as I walk past your business several times a week with my dogs and I see that we have historic sight along our tow path and I'd like to protect it.

I also see hundreds of thousands of birds throughout the year when I walk there and it's a wetland and I'd like it to be protected. I live here and I know that there are lots of smells, including that we have landfills. I started by saying waste management as a worldwide problem. And I'd like to see you add to your list benefits.

That is part of what the public is really asking for. So if you could help us all learn how to, at our own homes realize that we are also part of the problem. You know, I could spill fuel

when I'm trying to have my lawnmower and I heard the bell, so I'll just go to my last question. I am a customer of your neighbor real bark mulch.

And if you have a facility which most people are deeming, is not ready for storage, cannot control dust, cannot control vapors. And you haven't disclosed again, the thermal disorders also create a vapor treatment system and what happens to that waste? I'd really like to know if you are prepared that the town may contact a low, a local environmental attorney.

I'd like to know if you guys are prepared that it's within our right to get an injunction and file for a temporary restraining order against these shipments. Okay. Thank you very much. You're welcome.

I'll adjust the last point. Good. And then I think that's a, that's a lot of questions. That's a lot of questions. We wrote 'em down. The last one is we're certainly aware that the village has proposed an ordinance to ban the use and management of PFAS within the village. And I don't know what the current status is.

I think they sort of got that on hold. They're trying to understand some of the things they've written down themselves, but we're certainly aware of that. So you, you had another, a number of other questions with regard to soil origin. Metals vapor treatment are the three main ones I got, and I'll let you start and if there's anything you want me to jump in on.

Soil origin we have not identified microphone. We have not identified a site of soil origin because we are not permitted to receive PFAS contaminated soil for treatment. The reason that the company has not gone out and actively look to identify the soils is we're not certain that we actually will get permitted to be able to run the research project.

From a business standpoint, it doesn't really make sense for us to go out to identify soils, which we do not know that we'll be able to treat and then ask a client to hold such soils if they have other management options for it. So in relation to metals that the process doesn't treat metals we, we don't.

Heat the material to a point where we degrade metals and drive them out of the soil. Any sort of vitrification process, that's not something we do soil in is soil out. Soil analysis is completed on the soil post-treatment, and that's a requirement of our beneficial use determination. So we do analyze for soils.

The reuse of those soils is also driven by those metal concentrations, even though we don't treat them. How that material is reused in the environment under the bud is driven by those that Amal metals analysis that's completed with the particular material. and to address, you forgot the input side of things is that all of the soils that currently come through the facility are profiled.

They have a chemical analysis that looks at the organics that we intend to treat and destroy, but also looks at the metals. We are not allowed to handle any hazardous waste at that facility. So if there are metals in excess of those hazardous waste limits, they do not come to our facility. So when you talk about metals, we don't treat for them.

We don't actively seek them, and we don't handle any soils with excessive metals in them. last one was treating the vapor. so back to yeah, the, the disor contaminants and how they are treated. we, we spoke tonight a few times. we, we showed the process flow diagram. Those materials are managed in a thermal oxidizer.

So we increase heat within the process in the thermal oxidative state increase that temperature to degrade those compounds to basically bust the, the bonds that hold those compounds together. And that, that is part of the thermal process. Actually, the EPA guidance document that you, you, you reference which is for the thermal desorption, it's I think it's entitled The Community Guide to Thermal.

Desorption actually does have some language in there as well, discussing thermal oxidation. they also do generate some other reference documents, which you can, you can also forward on that. And, um I believe we actually, if it's not posted to our site, I know we made reference to it in our application, and we can certainly post that EPA guidance, like out there as well.

And, and sort of back to all of the, the science and such, it's cited, you know, when we had the, it was back in December where we had our first virtual hearing, and we answered a lot of questions. We put those down in writing. There's a document on our website. It references all of that science.

It has links to all those science. We also on the public participation website, it's in your, the URL is in your document. We actually post it. I think most all of the, do, all of the science documents, all of the peer reviewed documents that talk about the effectiveness of our system, they're posted on there for you to look at and review.

So as, as noted we believe that the science supports at at least a two week window of validating that our unit will do things effectively as we, as has been done other way.

Okay? As I stated in the beginning you can submit any questions in writing that you wish to through June 25th via either email for the Clean Earth Public Participation website and a recording of this and an AI generated transcript. This event will be posted on the public participation website within a week.

All questions asked tonight will be summarized, answered in writing and posted within two weeks. So thank you all very much and have a pleasant evening. Thank you for coming. Thank you. Thank, thank you all very much. Safe trip home

###