1	1
2	NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF
3	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
4	x
5	PUBLIC HEARING
6	RE: Hunts Point Water Pollution Control Plant
7	Draft Environmental Impact Statement
8	x
9	The Point Community
10	Development Corporation
11	940 Garrison Avenue
12	Hunts Point, New York
13	
14	April 12, 2007
15	7:58 p.m.
16	

17 Before: 18

19	ESTHER SISKIND,
20	New York City Department of
21	Environmental Protection,
22	THE HEARING OFFICER
23	
24	
25	

1	2
2	APPEARANCES:
3	For New York City Department of
4	Environmental Protection:
5	Esther Siskind
б	Assistant Commissioner - Bureau of
7	Environmental Planning & Assessment
8	Matthew S. Osit
9	Chief - Division of Facilities Design
10	North, Bureau of Engineering
11	Design & Construction
12	Julie A. Stein
13	Project Manager
14	Jairo Rojas
15	Spanish Interpreter
16	For AKRF, Inc.:

17	Allison E. Ruddock
18	Senior Planner
19	
20	ALSO PRESENT:
21	The Public
22	
23	Marc Russo
24	Reporter
25	

1	3
2	INDEX OF SPEAKERS:
3	Speaker: Page:
4	
5	LAURA STOCKSTILL8
6	Representing Bronx Borough President
7	Adolfo Carrion, Jr.
8	CARMEN AQUINO14
9	Representing Council Member Maria del
10	Carmen Arroyo, 17th District
11	RALPH ACEVEDO16
12	Hunts Point Monitoring Committee
13	Member (HPMC)
14	CERITA PARKER24
15	MOM Member - Mothers On the Move
16	MARIA TORRES26

17	President and COO of The Point &
18	HPMC Member
19	TYMEISHA MASSEY34
20	A.C.T.I.O.N.
21	ROBERT INGRAM
22	A.C.T.I.O.N.
23	YESENIA ADORNO
24	A.C.T.I.O.N.
25	

1	4
2	INDEX OF SPEAKERS:
3	
4	Speaker: Page:
5	
6	FRANK MARRERO42
7	HPMC Member & Community Board #2 Member
8	MENAKA MOHAN51
9	Sustainable South Bronx
10	SIDDHARTHA SANCHEZ57
11	Representing Congressman Jose Serrano
12	ELENA CONTE
13	Solid Waste & Energy Coordinator -
14	Sustainable South Bronx & HPMC Member
15	LAURA TRUETTNER76
16	Technical Advisor

17	MATTY STANISLAUS82
18	Technical Advisor
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	5
2	PROCEEDINGS
3	
4	THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. If
5	people can have their seats, we are now ready to
б	begin the formal public hearing to hear your
7	comments on the project and the EIS.
8	This public hearing is being
9	conducted in accordance with the following rules
10	and regulations, the State Environmental Quality
11	Review Act and its implementing regulations as set
12	forth in 6NYCRR Part 617, the New York City
13	Environmental Quality Review process as set forth
14	in Executive Order 91 of 1997 and its amendments,
15	the State Environmental Review Process under the
16	State Revolving Loan the Revolving Fund

17	Program, and the New York State Environmental
18	Justice Policy CP29 Environmental Justice and
19	Permitting.
20	I have to say that at every public
21	hearing.
22	We'll be calling up elected
23	officials and then people in the order in which
24	they signed up to speak.
25	If you haven't signed up yet, you
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	б
2	can go to the front table and sign up and we will
3	be calling you. We are going to be here for as
4	long as you want to comment. We ask that people
5	try to limit their comments to about three minutes
6	to respect everyone's opportunity to speak.
7	And when you speak, if you could
8	please state your name and affiliation for the
9	record. There's a stenographer that's going to be
10	recording comments. And also, if there's anyone
11	here who would prefer to give their comments in
12	Spanish, Jairo Rojas is here to assist with that.
13	MS. ELENA CONTE: I have a
14	request.
15	THE HEARING OFFICER: Sure.
16	MS. ELENA CONTE: I have a request

17	regarding time. I understand that three minutes
18	is a guideline that you're asking. Considering
19	there's - I forget how many are on the list -
20	fifteen to twenty to speak, I request that the
21	members of the Hunts Point Monitoring Committee,
22	who are part of the Committee that have been
23	working very closely with the DEP to oversee this
24	process, that they be allotted additional time to
25	give their comments, not that we change the order,
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	7
2	but because they've been following it very
3	closely, that their time be expanded to fifteen
4	minutes. But we'll try to be as respectable as
5	possible; just Monitoring Committee people.
6	THE HEARING OFFICER: Well, why
7	don't we see how it goes. I'm not sure where you
8	who's going to be speaking on behalf
9	MS. ELENA CONTE: Well, the
10	members are speaking individually. We're
11	splitting things up.
12	THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh, so a
13	total of fifteen for everybody. That's fine.
14	MS. ELENA CONTE: No. I think
15	it's up to fifteen minutes for each. We're going
16	to each be speaking.

17	THE HEARING OFFICER: Fifteen for
18	each speaker? I think then in deference to other
19	people here who might want to speak, maybe we
20	should allow you to go first so not everybody
21	it's to respect everybody who's here who signed up
22	to speak.
23	MS. ELENA CONTE: No, we'll be
24	respectful as well. I think the order is fine in
25	which they signed up. And we'll try to be

1	8	3
2	respectful of time. But also, I guess we're	just
3	requesting you weigh the amount of time for ou	ır
4	individual members who have worked very hard o	on
5	this.	
6	THE HEARING OFFICER: We're a	asking
7	people to try to stay to three minutes to resp	pect
8	others here who wanted to speak. We are not g	going
9	to be pulling you with hook off the stage.	
10	If you go beyond three minutes	, we
11	might say "it's three minutes, if you can star	rt to
12	wrap up," that kind of thing. But we're going	g to
13	be loose about it. It's just more to respect	the
14	forum. Because we do have eighteen speakers	
15	tonight.	
16	(Translation by interpreter.)	

17	THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Thank
18	you.
19	Okay. Laura Stockstill from the
20	Borough President's Office, Borough President
21	Carrion.
22	(Audience participation.)
23	MS. LAURA STOCKSTILL: My name is
24	Laura Stockstill. And I'm reading this testimony
25	on behalf of Bronx Borough President Adolfo

1	9
2	Carrion.
3	I offer these comments as an initial
4	response to the Draft Environmental Impact
5	Statement.
6	In my formal review of this project
7	under the Uniform Land Use Review Process, I will
8	submit a full recommendation to the City Planning
9	Commission after holding my own public hearing
10	where I hope to receive further input from the
11	public.
12	The following comments also
13	reiterate some of the concerns I raised at the
14	scoping meeting for this project in February 2005.
15	I recognize the Department of Environmental
16	Protection's challenge in its dual role as both

17	enforcer of environmental regulations and operator
18	of the City's water utilities, but I believe that
19	in the fullest sense of environmental stewardship,
20	the DEP can be an environmental leader and a role
21	model in all aspects of its operations. DEP's
22	mandate allows the agency to simultaneously
23	protect and improve the environment while
24	upgrading its infrastructure.
25	Environmental Impact Statements are
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	10
2	constructive tools to the degree that they fully
3	disclose and assess the impacts of major projects.
4	Therefore, it's essential that the DEIS provide as
5	much detail on the effects of a proposed project,
6	the various alternatives considered, and the
7	possible means of addressing negative impacts.
8	Several sections of the DEIS require
9	additional information and analysis for a thorough
10	assessment. These include, pedestrian impacts,
11	odor control and air quality.
12	Hunts Point is a community in
13	transition, with substantial investment planned
14	for a new greenway that will connect new
15	neighborhood parks and bring more people to the
16	plant vicinity. The EIS must consider the

17	potential impacts of the project on the South
18	Bronx Greenway and offer mitigation measures to
19	protect the integrity of these valuable new
20	community resources.
21	I appreciate the odor control
22	measures already undertaken at the plant and DEP's
23	commitment to ensuring that equipment performs at
24	the highest standards. However, with the Hunts
25	Point neighbors still burdened by odors, I wish to
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	11
2	see a more detailed evaluation of additional
3	potential odor control measures that may be
4	warranted. Furthermore, I call upon the DEP to
5	commit to further odor studies of the community
б	and continued work towards improving the odor
7	reporting and response systems.
8	DEP must improve and formalize its
9	communication channels with both the Hunts Point
10	Monitoring Committee and the surrounding
11	community. While I appreciate the cooperation
12	that DEP has given to the Monitoring Committee
13	since its creation, the agency should seek an even
14	more effective working relationship going forward.
15	Communication and procedural
16	challenges must be overcome. To this end, I call

17	for a commitment from DEP for a community-selected
18	full-time, community liaison to work with the
19	Monitoring Committee for the duration of the
20	review, approval, and construction phases of this
21	project.
22	(Applause.)
23	MS. LAURA STOCKSTILL: Having set
24	a precedent at the Newtown Creek facility by
25	hiring a Community Liaison, DEP owes, and our
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	12
2	community deserves, an equal commitment in Hunts
3	Point.
4	Waterfront access is a priority of
5	my administration. The nature walk currently
6	under construction along Newtown Creek will
7	provide a beautiful amenity for Brooklyn's
8	Greenpoint community. Therefore, I call on DEP to
9	work with the Monitoring Committee on a creative
10	plan for developing public access and natural
11	habitat areas on the water side of its Hunts Point
12	plant.
13	All unnecessary emissions are
14	unacceptable. As you all know, Hunts Point and
15	the South Bronx are burdened with high levels of
16	air pollution and extremely high asthma rates.

17	(Applause.)
18	MS. LAURA STOCKSTILL: Given these
19	background conditions, I consider any avoidable
20	emissions from the Hunts Point Plant to be
21	unacceptable, including the air quality burden
22	created by the plant's participation in Con
23	Edison's Peak Load Management program.
24	I recognize the PLM program's value
25	in regulating energy consumption during times of
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	13
2	high demand. However, DEP's use of dirty diesel
3	generators at the plant will contribute to the
4	degraded air quality and asthma emergencies that
5	typically coincide with these peak load periods.
6	I therefore call on DEP either to
7	withdraw from the PLM program or preferably, to
8	upgrade to clean-burning equipment.
9	(Audience participation.)
10	MS. LAURA STOCKSTILL: Use of
11	highly polluting diesel generators is contrary to
12	the City's own emissions reduction goals and DEP
13	should take the lead in switching to clean
14	technologies for its back-up power sources as well
15	as its normal operations.
16	This is a crucial time in the

17	assessment process and all stakeholders must
18	continue working together towards the best
19	possible solutions.
20	I wish to thank DEP for its ongoing
21	collaboration in the planning of this facility and
22	call on the agency to make every effort to
23	minimize negative impacts and find ways of
24	demonstrating environmental leadership at its
25	Hunts Point facility.

1 14 2 Thank you. 3 (Audience participation.) 4 MS. LAURA STOCKSTILL: There are 5 copies of my statement on the table near the door. 6 (Audience participation.) 7 THE HEARING OFFICER: The next speaker is Carmen Aquino. 8 9 MS. CARMEN AQUINO: Good evening. 10 My name is Carmen Aquino. I'm 11 coming from Council Member Arroyo's office. 12 I'm going read in a statement that Council Member Arroyo wrote since she has already 13 14 prior engagements and she couldn't be here. 15 I would like to begin my statement by expressing appreciation to the New York City 16

```
17
        Department of Environmental Protection,
18
        Commissioner Emily Lloyd and her staff, for her
19
        ongoing commitment to hear and understand the
        issues surrounding environmental justice we raise
20
21
        as individuals and as a community.
22
                       With regards to the Draft
23
        Environmental Impact Statements we are here to
24
        discuss tonight, I, again, ask that DEP continue
25
        to listen to the concerns raised by Community
               ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167
```

1	15
2	Board #2, local environmental justice advocates,
3	community-based organizations and community
4	residents.
5	The approval of this project brings
б	with it significant and long-term impacts. We must
7	ensure issues that can negatively impact our
8	community are mitigated to the greatest extent
9	possible.
10	The areas of concern include:
11	Visual character of the design;
12	Shadow impacts from the digesters;
13	Noise, odors and dust during
14	excavation and construction;
15	Traffic volumes and impact;
16	Particulate matter standard used

```
17
        when determining adverse impact; and
18
                       The capital investment to be
19
        committed for the various projects identified by
20
        the Community Board and the Hunts Point Monitoring
21
        Committee.
22
                       I urge DEP to make a commitment to
23
        work with us to resolve these issues and to help
24
        us ensure the safety and well being of our
25
        community.
```

1	16
2	Thank you for the opportunity to
3	share my concerns on behalf of the constituents of
4	the 17th Council District.
5	Thank you.
6	(Applause.)
7	THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Are
8	there any other elected officials who would like
9	to speak?
10	(No response.)
11	THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. We're
12	going to begin with Ralph Acevedo.
13	(Audience participation.)
14	MR. RALPH ACEVEDO: Good evening,
15	everyone.
16	My name is Ralph Acevedo. I'm a

17	long-time Hunts Point resident. And I am a
18	Committee Member on the Monitoring Committee.
19	I have a couple of comments on a
20	couple of issues that I want to go over.
21	First, I want talk about the
22	alternatives.
23	In addition to the years of
24	environmental burdens experienced by this
25	community, the Hunts Point community has
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	17
2	historically been and continues to be underserved
3	with respect to parks and open space.
4	We have one of the highest
5	percentages of population under eighteen years old
6	in the City and our youth, as well as our families
7	and senior citizens need open space and parks.
8	(Audience participation.)
9	MR. RALPH ACEVEDO: The South
10	Bronx Greenway and Barretto Point Park are the
11	result of many years of work by the South Bronx
12	residents and its elected officials. And these
13	amenities are two important steps forward in
14	making the South Bronx livable and sustainable.
15	These amenities are there for all of the residents
16	to enjoy and will be used for playing, walking,

17 sitting and bicycling.

18	DEP's expansion cannot reduce the
19	value, the use or the enjoyment of these
20	amenities. All impacts to the users of the
21	greenway must be fully acknowledged and avoided
22	and DEP must conduct this analysis of impacts to
23	the greenway based on the assumption that
24	residents will sit on benches for up to an hour.
25	Impacts to the greenway cannot be dismissed on the
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	18
2	basis of DEP's misguided notions there will only
3	be transient use of this new amenity.
4	(Audience participation.)
5	MR. RALPH ACEVEDO: Furthermore,
6	the idea of extending the greenway along the
7	waterfront must be re-examined. In light of our
8	recent trip to Newtown Creek and the proximity of
9	the nature walk to the plan, we see no reason why
10	the greenway cannot also be designed to work in
11	conjunction with the plan.
12	(Audience participation.)
13	MR. RALPH ACEVEDO: If the safety
14	issues can be resolved in Newtown Creek, it can
15	certainly be resolved here. Through good planning
16	and scheduling, the placement of the greenway on

17	the Hunts Point property along the waterfront can
18	be designed and managed to ensure that the loading
19	of sludge can occur.
20	There is no reason why Hunts Point
21	residents cannot get access to the waterfront.
22	The recently completed Barretto Park, Barretto
23	Point Park must likewise be protected to ensure
24	that it can serve its intended function.
25	However, as currently planned, the
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	19
2	Phase III upgrade would entail the placement of
3	four large egg-shaped digesters adjacent to the
4	park. The bulk and the height of the digesters
5	will be overwhelming to park users. The 130-foot,
6	stainless steel eggs will tower over the adjacent
7	park structures and significantly affect the way
8	kids and adults experience the park.
9	Furthermore, the eggs will likely
10	impact views for those walking and bicycling along
11	the Ryawa Avenue and Manida Street portions of the
12	greenway.
13	(Audience participation.)
14	MR. RALPH ACEVEDO: The EIS
15	implies that the community agreed to live with the
16	impact of the eggs on the park because the two

17	projects were contemporaneously planned but this
18	is not the case. The community had no idea of the
19	extent of the impact of the eggs on the park until
20	the DEIS was released.
21	The community strenuously objects to
22	this significant visual impact on the park.
23	(Audience participation.)
24	MR. RALPH ACEVEDO: Hold on. Hold
25	on. We got more. We got more.

1	20
2	Furthermore, DEP has identified an
3	alternative in the DEIS that would avoid these
4	visual impacts altogether. Site Plan Alternative
5	II will place the egged-shaped digesters in the
6	location of the current digesters.
7	DEP's initial analysis of this
8	alternative was that the construction will be more
9	complex, take longer and cost more. However, the
10	current estimates suggests that it will only take
11	an additional year and a half of construction per
12	pair of digesters.
13	Further, the additional cost of this
14	alternative is about \$15 million which is an
15	increase of about two percent to the current \$700
16	million budget for all three phases of this

17 expansion.

18	DEP also expressed a certain
19	sorry. DEP also expressed some concern that under
20	this scenario the treating of sludge might not
21	meet the PSRP. However, it was later clarified
22	that it was only under maximum design sludge
23	production conditions, which are based on a 2045
24	population, that the PSRP might not be met. And to
25	the extent that NYOFCo will have the extra
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	21
2	capacity as the egg digesters in Newtown Creek are
3	put into operation, the City will have the
4	capacity to treat additional sludge that does not
5	meet the PSRP.
6	Lastly, DEP has identified a number
7	of speculative potential future plant needs that
8	could be placed at the current digester locations.
9	However, in absence of a definite approved plan
10	for future projects that is part of the DEP's
11	current proposed action, such future speculative
12	actions cannot consider the CEQR analysis or the
13	related ULURP proposal.
14	DEP must examine Site Plan
15	Alternative II more carefully and thoroughly. It
16	represents a viable alternative to the current

17	plan for placing the egg-shaped digesters next to
18	the park and preserve a critical community
19	amenity.
20	I want to discuss, really fast,
21	about the soil excavation impacts.
22	DEP is clearly cognizant of the
23	likelihood of impacts to park users in the
24	community during excavation of contaminated soils
25	from the location of the former paint and varnish
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	22
2	facility. They have proposed to conduct an
3	excavation with a ten-foot structure that is
4	maintained under negative pressure to prevent the
5	release of any odors or airborne particulates.
6	In addition, the contractor is
7	required to conduct a community air monitoring
8	program. The HPMC appreciates the extra care that
9	DEP has taken and would like the opportunity to
10	review the air monitoring data collected during
11	this excavation.
12	Other areas such as south of the
13	paint and varnish facility and under the waste gas
14	burners, will also require excavation as part of
15	the expansion, soils in this vicinity of the waste
16	gas burner and the likely and those underneath

17	the southern most digesters are contaminated.
18	While excavation of these soils may not require a
19	tent, a community air monitoring program is
20	critical to verify that these works does not
21	impact park users.
22	The site specific health and safety
23	plan will not address these concerns because its
24	primary focus is on the health and safety of the
25	contractor personnel and not the community and
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

```
1
                                                    23
 2
        more specifically the park users -- are used
 3
        specifically to park users.
 4
                       At a minimum, DEP should require the
 5
        contractor to develop a community air monitoring
 6
        program during excavation activities. Further,
 7
        the results may be provided to the HPMC so that
 8
        they may review the data and inform the community.
 9
                       THE HEARING OFFICER:
                                              It's time to
10
        close your --
11
                       MR. RALPH ACEVEDO:
                                           I have one
12
        more. One more?
13
                       THE HEARING OFFICER:
                                              Okay.
14
                       MR. RALPH ACEVEDO:
                                             The final
15
        remedy selected for the 5.5 acre parcel of the
        plant included excavation of the point-seven acre
16
```

17	former paint and varnish facility area and
18	placement of the decoration liner, two feet of
19	soil across the remainder of the parcel.
20	This remedy was selected despite the
21	fact that significant concentrations of
22	contaminants were detected in the soils.
23	Since DEP has decided to leave
24	contamination in the subsurface, DEP must have a
25	process to ensure that any further excavation at
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	24
2	this site for even routine events such as
3	repairing and upgrading utilities will not impact
4	the community or park users. While the HPMC has
5	asked several times for an explanation of the
6	process, to date, DEP has not provided any
7	specifics.
8	Of equal concern is DEP's assertion
9	that since the site has no public access, no
10	community notification is needed. DEP must
11	recognize that any site disturbances has the
12	potential to impact Barretto Point Park users so
13	dust control during soil disturbance activities
14	and prior notification to the park and greenery
15	users will be essential.

The procedures for ensuring

16

17	protection of park	users must be ind	cluded in the
18	DEIS.		
19	Thanl	k you very much.	
20	(Aud:	ience participat:	ion.)
21	THE 1	HEARING OFFICER:	Thank you
22	for your comments.		
23	Ceri	ta Parker.	
24	(Aud	ience participat:	ion.)
25	MS. (CERITA PARKER:	Good evening,

1 25 2 everyone and DEP and the community. 3 My name is Cerita Parker and I'm 4 Mothers on the Move. 5 (Audience participation.) 6 MS. CERITA PARKER: And the first 7 thing that I want to say is that I don't particularly understand all of the technical 8 9 jargon. And what prompted me to come to this 10 meeting was the picture. And they say a picture 11 speaks a thousand words. 12 It was the picture of the two egg 13 digesters, the two proposed egg digesters in the 14 middle of what looked like an oasis, a heaven. I 15 mean just a paradise. (Audience participation.)

16

17	MS. CERITA PARKER: That's what
18	prompted me to come here. I personally don't
19	understand half of what you showed. But I'm going
20	to defer the rest of my minutes to the Monitoring
21	Committee who do know more than I do.
22	But I want it on the record that I
23	think that totally, if you have to do all that you
24	have to do, there has to be a compromise. And the
25	eggs got to go.

1	26
2	(Audience participation.)
3	THE HEARING OFFICER: Maria
4	Torres.
5	Thank you for your comments, by the
6	way.
7	Maria Torres.
8	(Audience participation.)
9	MS. MARIA TORRES: This one's for
10	Maria.
11	Okay. Good evening.
12	My name's Maria Torres. Am I a
13	the President and COO of The Point CDC as well as
14	a HPMC Member, as well as a community resident.
15	Hunts Point has suffered for many
16	years from an overabundance of environmental

17	burdens. The Bruckner, the Sheridan, the
18	Cross-Bronx and the Major Deegan have been major
19	sources of diesel fumes and particulates.
20	We are home to waste transfer
21	stations, wastewater treatment plants and the only
22	facility in the City that pelletizes sludge,
23	NYOFCo.
24	Our kids have one of the highest
25	rates of asthma hospitalizations in the City and
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	27
2	have the additional burden of one of the lowest
3	rates of open space in the City. Only two percent
4	of the community district is open space which puts
5	Community Board #2 in the lowest five percent of
б	the community boards in the City.
7	We need to improve the health of our
8	residents. We need to reduce current levels of
9	pollution. We need to increase the amount of
10	safe, usable green space, and we need to reverse
11	the long history the long history of
12	environmental impacts to the community.
13	The plant expansion
14	(Audience participation.)
15	MS. MARIA TORRES: The plant
16	expansion cannot add to the burdens. The expansion

```
17
        must be part of a new effort to create a
18
        sustainable environment. The expansion cannot be
19
        allowed to diminish the value of our brand new
20
        open spaces and must be built with the goal of
21
       bettering the Hunts Point environment.
22
                       This means DEP setting an example
23
        that it will do more than the minimum - that it
24
        will change its operations and install pollution
25
        controls so that we can build a sustainable
               ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167
```

1	2	28
2	community in Hunts Point.	
3	PM 2.5 is one of the most	
4	significant air pollutants in urban centers,	
5	especially in lower income communities. The h	nealth
6	effects associated with short-term exposure t	20
7	fine particles, PM 2.5, include:	
8	Premature death in people with	n heart
9	and lung disease;	
10	Non-fatal heart attacks;	
11	Increased hospital admissions,	,
12	emergency room visits and doctor's visits for	c
13	respiratory and cardiovascular diseases;	
14	Increased respiratory systems	
15	symptoms such as coughing, wheezing and short	iness
16	of breath;	

17	Lung function changes, especially in
18	children and people with lung diseases such as
19	asthma; and
20	Irregular heartbeat.
21	The existing air monitoring
22	information shows levels of PM 2.5 in Hunts Point
23	exceed the U.S. EPA PM 2.5 standard for 24-hour
24	exposure. However, recent studies indicate that
25	Hunts Point residents are being exposed to much
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	29
2	higher levels of air pollution and are susceptible
3	to severe health impacts because of continuous
4	vehicle emissions from one of the largest
5	concentrations of vehicle traffic in the country -
6	especially from diesel trucks that travel in and
7	around Hunts Point daily.
8	This means that there is already an
9	unhealthy level of PM 2.5 in the air quality. The
10	fact that the Hunts Point community is vulnerable
11	to these impacts must be acknowledged in the EIS.
12	Furthermore furthermore, DEP
13	cannot rely on the outdated DEC Interim PM 2.5
14	Policy that does not account for the more recent
15	technical evaluation of the New York State
16	evaluation by New York State and all the

17	Northeastern states which recommends that a lower
18	threshold for PM 2.5 is critical for protection of
19	urban populations, nor does it account for the
20	change in EPA's PM 2.5 24-hour standard, nor does
21	it I'm sorry.
22	take into consideration
23	background levels I'm sorry. Maria. I'm sorry.
24	(Audience participation.)
25	MS. MARIA TORRES: Okay.

1 30 2 Nor does it account for the change 3 in the EPA's PM 2.5 24-hour standard, consideration of background levels of 2.5. 4 5 At a minimum, DEP must assess its PM 6 2.5 impacts on the basis of New York State DEC's 7 recent technical recommendation for an impact 8 threshold of two. And based on this impact 9 threshold, it must be recognized in the EIS that 10 the impacts to Barretto Point Park and to the 11 South Bronx Greenway are significant. 12 The largest source of PM 2.5 at the 13 plant is the use of the emergency generators in 14 the peak load management program. We see no 15 reason why the plant should volunteer for this 16 program. Use of emergency generators, which don't

17	have any pollution control and use dirty diesel,
18	will contribute additional pollutants to the air
19	during times of already degraded air quality in
20	Hunts Point, which makes this an unacceptable
21	alternative.
22	These pollutants will be emitted
23	during the portion of the day that the parks will
24	be used. The fact that it can only be used for
25	fifteen days does not reduce its potential impacts
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	31
2	because it will be during the worst air quality
3	days in the summer and a single day's exposure
4	would have health impacts.
5	The emissions from the emergency
6	generators during this period will probably be at
7	least the equivalent of 79 diesel trucks. This is
8	dirty energy and DEP's plan to use emergency
9	generators to create dirty energy conflicts with
10	the Mayor's sustainability goals for clean energy.
11	Barretto Point Park and the Greenway
12	could also experience significant impacts during
13	other operating scenarios - normal plant and
14	emergency testing - a major reason for these
15	impacts is the use of diesel at the plant.
16	DEP must mitigate the impacts of PM

17	2.5 by reexamining the use of the emergency
18	generators in the PLM program and looking to use
19	cleaner fuels during normal operations.
20	There are a number of other air
21	pollutants that DEP needs to address.
22	DEP has not done an analysis of the
23	impacts of acrolein, a compound that is known to
24	cause health impacts. DEP must perform an
25	analysis of the potential acrolein impacts based
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	32
2	on available information even if such analysis
3	would overestimate the impacts.
4	DEP's analysis shows that the Hunts
5	Point Plant exceeds the annual New York State
6	levels for three hazardous air pollutants:
7	1.4-Dichlorobenzene, chloroform,
8	dichlorobromoethane.
9	DEP states that it would be too
10	costly to reduce the levels of these air
11	pollutants. DEP must acknowledge that these are
12	additional impacts to the community and DEP must
13	more fully investigate other alternatives to
14	reduce the emissions of these pollutants.
15	We would like to move forward in
16	partnership with DEP as we try to make Hunts Point

17	a more livable and sustainable community. We need
18	to improve the health of the residents and we need
19	to address residential needs for housing, open
20	space and sustainable jobs.
21	DEP can help with all of these goals
22	by becoming an environmental leader and by making
23	the two City-owned facilities in Hunts Point
24	models of minimal environmental impacts.
25	These facilities could be operated
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	33
2	in such a way as to reduce pollution burdens
3	rather than to increase them and could become
4	anchors in our efforts to improve the community.
5	If the internal conflict at DEP that
6	is created by being a regulator and an operator
7	could be resolved, we believe that DEP could make
8	some significant changes that would benefit Hunts
9	Point and other overburdened communities in the
10	City.
11	THE HEARING OFFICER: If you can
12	try to close.
13	MS. MARIA TORRES: I am. Look,
14	it's only that (indicating.)
15	As for next steps, DEP has promised
16	us several additional analyses that we were

```
17
        supposed -- that were supposed to be complete
18
        prior to the hearing tonight and which we have not
19
        received.
20
                       In view of the delays, we request a
        two-week extension of the -- to the date for
21
22
        submission of final comments to give us a chance
23
        to review the new material.
24
                       We expect DEP to work with the HPMC
25
        and its consultants to address its comments and
               ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167
```

1	34
2	develop mitigation measures before the Final DEIS.
3	We expect that DEP will provide resources,
4	including an office, for a community liaison who
5	can serve as a go-between between DEP and the
6	community during construction.
7	(Audience participation.)
8	MS. MARIA TORRES: We expect a
9	re-examination of routing of the Greenway along
10	the waterfront. We expect DEP to continue to work
11	with the HPMC and its consultants during
12	construction activities so that we can monitor the
13	implementation of mitigation measures and prevent
14	impacts to the community.
15	And finally, we expect that DEP will
16	install at least two monitoring stations, one at

17	the park and one along the greenway, to monitor
18	impacts to these receptors during the expansion.
19	Thank you.
20	(Audience participation.)
21	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you
22	for your comments.
23	Tymeisha Massey.
24	(Applause.)
25	MS. TYMEISHA MASSEY: Massey.

1 35 2 Good evening. My name is Tymeisha 3 Massey. And I work with A.C.T.I.O.N. which is 4 affiliated with The Point CDC. 5 And I live and work in this 6 community so I am directly effected by many of the 7 actions that go on in this community. 8 I would just like to say that I'm 9 very grateful for the park that this community was 10 given. And like many of the politicians who were 11 there at the opening expressed, I agree with the 12 sentiments that it will help to revolutionize the 13 way people view Hunts Point and communities like 14 Hunts Point. 15 But I feel like by having these digesters placed so close to the park that it's 16

17	taking away the effect that the park was supposed
18	to have.
19	(Audience participation.)
20	MS. TYMEISHA MASSEY: Also, you
21	take into consideration that the park it's
22	going to cast a shadow over the park, but you
23	haven't looked at the fact that we are trying to
24	build a greenway that it will directly impact as
25	well.

1	36
2	(Applause.)
3	MS. TYMEISHA MASSEY: Lastly, I
4	don't know if you heard, but the Mayor has a plan
5	for New York City as far as into 2030. And I just
6	wanted to know where DEP sees itself and how it's
7	planning to fit into that plan. Because from what
8	my decision, it's not really taking it into
9	consideration.
10	(Audience participation.)
11	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you
12	for your comments.
13	Robert Ingram.
14	(Audience participation.)
15	MR. ROBERT INGRAM: I'm Robert
16	Ingram.

17	I'm from A.C.T.I.O.N. at The Point
18	and this is my statement.
19	I've been at The Point for all my
20	life and it's been an honor. The Hunts Point
21	community has grown on me and I enjoy coming here.
22	I was also very excited that the
23	City was giving us a park. But I don't like the
24	idea that 130 feet egg digester-looking buildings
25	are going to be built right near the park and the
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

17

```
1
                                                     37
2
        volley ball field.
 3
                       I understand the City gave us
        Barretto Park but now DEP is saying that we knew
 4
 5
        the eggs were going to be built. I would like to
 6
        know where they told us that because I didn't hear
7
        that about eggs going on when the ribbon cutting
 8
        was there so.
9
                       I mean -- excuse me. It is -- I
10
        mean it is a beautiful park, but unfortunately
11
        that beautiful park is going to be known as the
12
        "park with the ugly eggs near it," which I don't
        think is going to be cool. And all I ask is that
13
14
        the park -- I mean that if the eggs can be built
15
        somewhere else on DEP land.
```

16 Thank you.

17	(Audience participation.)
18	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you
19	for your comments.
20	Yesenia Adorno.
21	(Applause.)
22	MS. YESENIA ADORNO: Good evening.
23	My name is Yesenia Adorno and I'm
24	with The Point CDC.
25	This is a statement on behalf of all
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	38
2	the members of A.C.T.I.O.N.
3	First and foremost, we want to say
4	that we love our brand new park given to us by the
5	New York City Parks Department. A few of us were
6	at Barretto Point Park on the day of its grand
7	opening.
8	Many political leaders were there,
9	too and bragged about how great the park is for
10	the community and how it will be a great place for
11	the people in the community to get together. They
12	spoke about the real need for open space in the
13	South Bronx and how a park like this was long
14	overdue.
15	We agree. But much later on we
16	learned about these large digester eggs that are

17	going to be put right next to this park. And we
18	just want to ask you, why would you do this to us.
19	The Department the DEP claims that "we" knew
20	all about the digesters being built from the very
21	beginning. But who do they mean by "we"? I mean I
22	know that I had no idea about the building of
23	these egg-shaped objects and neither did anyone
24	else I spoke to about the park.
25	If this is really if this was

1	39
2	known, how come it was never mentioned on that day
3	when the park opened and all those guys had plenty
4	of time in front of the microphones and cameras to
5	talk about how wonderful the park was now and in
6	the future.
7	We were there and not a single
8	person mentioned it on that day either. How and
9	why would they just give us this great park
10	without telling us anything about the fine print.
11	Just to be clear, we are not against
12	the eggs in general. We like the idea that they
13	are going to improve the waste-handling facilities
14	and everything else. But we do not like the
15	location chosen. We would like to ask you to
16	reconsider the location for the eggs because it is

17 too close to the park, which the community is
18 excited to use.
19 We understand that it would cost

20 more money and take a longer period of time for 21 these relocations. We're okay with that. What is 22 a couple of years waiting time to get the results 23 we want compared to getting a result we do not 24 want for the rest of our lives. 25 We feel as though it is better to

1	40
2	take longer for the eggs to be built in a
3	different location than to deal with the long-term
4	effects of having it built so close to the park.
5	Why build them there and not in a more secluded
6	area away from where people are going to be.
7	Also, DEP says that the digesters
8	will only cast a shadow over the park between 7
9	and 9:45 a.m. and so shadows are not a concern.
10	However, after 9:45 a.m. they will start to cast a
11	shadow over the area soon to be the South Bronx
12	Greenway.
13	While the DEP did not have to think
14	about the greenway because it does not exist, we
15	do think about the greenway because we are excited
16	about it and are looking forward to using it. But

17	how great would it be walking through the greenway
18	in darkness created by these gigantic eggs.
19	The last issue we want to address is
20	air quality. Not that we're experts on it, but as
21	teenagers living in the South Bronx we are exposed
22	to air pollution daily, especially in Hunts Point,
23	asthma rates are very high.
24	Recently, A.C.T.I.O.N. attended a
25	youth event outlining the Mayor's sustainability
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1 41 2 plan for the year 2030. They had all these cool 3 ideas for the future and ways to make the City 4 better. 5 DEP has a chance to do the same 6 thing here in regards to air pollution, but 7 instead are only trying to just meet required 8 standards. Why not try to step forward and have 9 vision, future planning like the Mayor's plan, to 10 actually change things for the better of this 11 community instead of just following the limits. 12 We, at A.C.T.I.O.N., believe the air 13 quality should be improved instead of just 14 maintaining status quo or maybe even getting 15 worse. Our question for you is, what if 16

17	this was your neighborhood, would you want your
18	park made uglier by 13-story eggs placed right
19	next to it? Would you want stretches of your new
20	greenway in constant shadow? Would you want major
21	development in your area that pays no attention to
22	the health problems that are already a major
23	concern? Well, neither would we.
24	(Audience participation.)
25	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you

```
1
                                                     42
 2
        for your comments.
 3
                       Frank Marrero.
 4
                       (Audience participation.)
 5
                       MR. FRANK MARRERO:
                                              Okay. Give me
 б
        a second while I compose myself. This is a very
        tough issue for myself after dealing almost
 7
        fifteen years, maybe twenty years with this
 8
 9
        problem with DEP.
10
                       Frank Marrero.
11
                       I'm a community resident first, a
        Community Board #2 member, a HPMC member and a
12
13
        mechanical engineer by trade.
14
                       I'm going to read this because I
15
        think this is important we have, as a result of
        your listening, to a lot of these being ready.
16
```

17	But the HPMC worked very close with our consultant
18	to prepare these so they could be put in the
19	minutes of this public hearing. So I just want
20	you to bear with us as we read these into the
21	record, okay?
22	For fifteen years I have been
23	complaining about odors in the community and
24	particularly odors from this plant. That's a
25	mistake. I've been complaining more than fifteen

1	43
2	years. It's more like 25 years. I've been a
3	resident in this community for fifty years.
4	DEP has been known for years,
5	since the consultant published its report in 1996,
6	that the plant is a source of significant odors
7	that need to be addressed. The fact that little
8	to nothing has been done to address these odors is
9	extremely frustrating to the Hunts Point residents
10	and the elected public officials.
11	The question we keep asking is why
12	has nothing been done. And we think that one of
13	the answers is that DEP plays the role of plant
14	operator and plant regulator. That's like the fox
15	watching the chicken.

There's an inherent conflict with an

17	entity that is operating a facility and is also
18	responsible for regulating that facility.
19	There needs to be complete
20	independence between the operation of the facility
21	at Hunts Point and their regulatory oversight.
22	The City needs to completely separate the
23	regulatory side of DEP from the utility operation
24	side.
25	The HPMC

1	44
2	(Audience participation.)
3	MR. FRANK MARRERO: The HPMC no
4	longer has any confidence in the ability of DEP to
5	regulate itself. Why should DEP facilities have
6	less independent oversight than a private company.
7	While we do not have a solution for this very
8	frustrating problem, one idea might be to have the
9	regulatory side of DEP report directly to the
10	Mayor and leave the utility side under the DEP
11	Commissioner.
12	If the regulators who are writing
13	the EIS could do so independently of the operators
14	who will be overseeing the construction, it might
15	enable a more objective assessment of the impacts
16	of proposed construction projects.

17	(Audience participation.)
18	MR. FRANK MARRERO: As it stands
19	now, the regulators are in the awkward position of
20	having to defend their actions to their coworkers
21	which is likely to bring more erroneous tasks and
22	have more repercussions than defending their
23	actions to a private company.
24	The current construction schedule
25	included in the DEIS is a case in point. The
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	45
2	construction schedule, which shows that
3	construction will be complete in 2014, does not
4	include all of the activities described in the EIS
5	and is therefore an inaccurate representation of
6	the construction for Phase III.
7	The schedule is missing the timing
8	the construct a second set of digesters, which
9	according to the EIS, will start as early as 2015
10	and will add four more years of construction to
11	the schedule. I'll have you know that there's two
12	going up but there's really four of them that are
13	going to be eventually constructed.
14	The schedule is also missing, as far
15	as showing the time needed, one, the time needed
16	to complete the remediation of the point-seven

17 acre.

18	Two, the remediation of the
19	remainder of the 4.3 acre parcel with the new
20	digesters, and
21	Three, the 1.2 acre construction
22	staging area that is to be added to the park after
23	the construction is complete.
24	The DEIS specifically states that
25	the remediation of the 4.3 and the 1.2 acre
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	46
2	parcels will happen at the completion of the
3	construction staging, which indicates that these
4	activities will increase the duration of the
5	project, which is the schedule could be short
6	by as much as five years as it stands now.
7	Construction noise. That's a joke,
8	right?
9	The analysis of the EIS included
10	concluded that the noise caused by the
11	construction would exceed acceptable levels at the
12	park during one 1.5-year interval and later in the
13	project for three months.
14	The HPMC strenuously objects to the
15	conclusion in the EIS that these noise impacts are
16	not significant because of their duration.

17	However, this statement totally ignores the fact
18	that during the warmer months the park is utilized
19	during the weekdays and weekends and these impacts
20	become very significant.
21	Unacceptable noise levels day in and
22	day out during the warmer months will -page two -
23	make the park make the park uninhabitable for
24	families with young children and difficult for
25	senior citizens who want a quiet place to sit.
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	47
2	The construction noise impact must
3	be acknowledged in the EIS as a significant impact
4	and all potential options must be presented to
5	reduce the noise impact.
б	Then there's the construction
7	pedestrian impacts.
8	The EIS did not contain a
9	quantitative analysis of the pedestrian impacts
10	from the project. The rationale provided was that
11	no dangerous intersections were located in the
12	study area. However, the Hunts Point Vision Plan
13	reported that there were several dangerous
14	intersections on Hunts Point Avenue with unusually
15	high pedestrian accident rates.
16	(Audience participation.)

17	MR. FRANK MARRERO: Furthermore,
18	the EIS was based on current pedestrian activities
19	and these will change, particularly during the
20	summer with the opening of the park.
21	Although DOT may be evaluating
22	traffic calming measures for pedestrians using the
23	park, these measures did not take into account the
24	impacts of the project. And the DOT study cannot
25	be used as a substitute for a quantitative
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	48
2	pedestrian analysis.
3	In addition to concerns about
4	construction impacts to pedestrians using Hunts
5	Point Avenue and to those using the park, the EIS
б	should be consistent with the Hunts Point Vision
7	Plan which identifies support of safe connections
8	as one of its primary goals. DEP must recognize
9	all of these concern/conditions and conduct
10	qualitative analysis of pedestrian impacts.
11	Construction, air quality impacts.
12	The DEIS indicates that construction
13	activities will generate PM 2.5 concentration in
14	excess of the proposed New York State DEC
15	threshold of two at the Barretto Point Park
16	fenceline and on Manida Street along the greenway.

17	In addition, the DEIS reported that
18	sludge and grit removal from the digesters and the
19	sludge storage tanks had the potential to cause
20	odors. Yet the DEIS did not contain a
21	quantitative analysis of these odor impacts.
22	DEP cannot dismiss these air and
23	odor impacts. They must be more carefully
24	quantified and measured and measures developed for
25	mitigation.

1	49
2	You know, I I just want to add
3	this. When I go to these meetings with DEP and
4	there's like five of us that are community
5	residents and there's about twenty that are from
6	DEP. And I am very frustrated of the fact that
7	we're the ones that are smelling the odors in the
8	communities.
9	(Audience participation.)
10	MR. FRANK MARRERO: And there's
11	four of us and there's twenty of them and to them
12	we just a number of PM 2.5. We are just well,
13	you're not going to have a problem with this park
14	because, you know, the hours that the shadows are
15	going to be there are between this and this and
16	the fence line. Don't go near the fence line.

17	You can't be near the fence line for an hour and a
18	half, you know.
19	And what I suggested at the meeting
20	was that all you guys of the DEP should come and
21	move into this neighborhood.
22	(Audience participation.)
23	MR. FRANK MARRERO: Okay? And you
24	should smell this stuff, okay, and then you will
25	know what we're going through, okay?

1	50
2	Finally, as far as the size of the
3	digesters we were advised of the digesters that
4	they were coming in. But I was I had the
5	misfortune of seeing what you saw. And what I say
6	is that they told us that we were going to get a
7	yacht. We ended up getting a cruise line.
8	This these digesters are
9	humongous. We went to see the ones in Newtown
10	Creek. I don't think they can fit it in that plot
11	of land they have over there, not one, let alone
12	four.
13	If you see them, you see 13 feet
14	I mean 13 stories up in the air, but they are four
15	stories in the ground, okay. And they're so
16	wide. I never seen anything like that. I'm

17 aghast.

18	I have to take sides with Orlando
19	because Orlando said they were ugly. But they're
20	cute, but they're big. They're very big. I mean
21	if they're cute probably you can see like the
22	Pyramids up in the you know, from a satellite.
23	You could probably see these digesters, that's how
24	big they are. So these pictures that you see here,
25	they don't you justice, okay.

1 51 2 Now, another thing I just want to 3 mention is that there's -- they talk about our 4 consultant, the HPMC consultant. The HPMC 5 consultant, I have to give propers to Elena --6 (Applause.) 7 MR. FRANK MARRERO: -- because Elena was the loan voice on all these twenty 8 9 people against her for us to get a consultant. 10 They fought us for every inch we got. And we 11 finally got Matti and Enviro Sciences (phonetic.) 12 They even picked up a competitor to come against 13 you, right? We fought them off. 14 But we have a consultant and thank 15 God he's independent and he's working with us. And I want to give a round of applause to him. 16

17		(Applause.)
18		MR. FRANK MARRERO: Thank you very
19	much.	
20		That's the end of my comment.
21		THE HEARING OFFICER: Menaka
22	Mohan.	
23		Thank you for your comments, Frank.
24		Menaka.
25		MS. MENAKA MOHAN: Good evening.
	ROY ALL	EN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	52
2	My name is Menaka Mohan and I'm
3	representing Sustainable South Bronx.
4	Sustainable South Bronx is a
5	nonprofit organization dedicated to the
6	implementation of sustainable development projects
7	for the South Bronx that are formed by the needs
8	of the community and the values of environmental
9	justice.
10	For the past two years I've had the
11	pleasure to work as a South Bronx Greenway
12	coordinator. As part of SSB's efforts to improve
13	the health and quality of life for South Bronx
14	residents, the organization helped to spearhead
15	the South Bronx Greenway.
16	When completed, the South Bronx

17	Greenway will be a nine-mile green bike and
18	pedestrian path all along the Hunts Point and Port
19	Morris waterfront. The Greenway will have many
20	uses including biking, walking, and will have
21	destinations where people can just sit and relax.
22	It provides a linear park system in
23	an area that hosts 11,000 per day, fifteen waste
24	transfer stations, and has less than point-five
25	acres per thousand residents of open space. The
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	53
2	New York City average is around 6.2 acres per
3	thousand residents.
4	The greenway is a solution to the
5	devastating health impacts such as asthma, obesity
6	and diabetes that the South Bronx is facing.
7	There are projects along the
8	greenway that will be effected by the expansion of
9	the GEP Waste Water Treatment plant, for example,
10	the plant at Ryawa Avenue including a
11	demonstration garden that will show the benefits
12	of storm water filtration and cleansing.
13	Currently DEP conducts its
14	environmental impact analysis based on assuming
15	that residents will be moving through Ryawa Avenue
16	quickly and this is not using the federal one-hour

17 standard.

18	It's not a big leap to assume that
19	people will sit and enjoy the park and eat lunch
20	for more than an hour. In other words, DEP is
21	assuming that residents will be spending less than
22	an hour on the demonstration garden.
23	DEP cannot restrict the uses of the
24	greenway. Users of the greenway will be stopping
25	at several places for extended lengths of time and
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	54	
2	as projects continue to get built, the design will	
3	change to reflect the needs of the neighborhood.	
4	Benches will be added, benches could be lights	
5	could be added. You can't restrict what people	
6	will be doing on their biking and walking.	
7	The other major destination along	
8	the greenway is Barretto Point Park. The park is	
9	a welcomed addition to the community that is	
10	starved with open space. Barretto Point Park	
11	opened last year and will be significantly	
12	impacted by the DEP expansion.	
13	DEP's current plans for the egg	
14	digesters will be overwhelming to park users. DEP	
15	must fully consider eliminating the impacts to the	
16	Barretto Point Park by placing the digesters at	

17	their location that would be by the existing ones.
18	The slight cost in time increase and
19	constructional difficulties are well worth
20	preserving the community residents' enjoyment and
21	the investments in the park and the greenway.
22	Many of the users at Barretto Point Park are
23	children who live in this community and who suffer
24	health impacts such as asthma. DEP must be a
25	leader in reducing air pollution.

1	55
2	Currently DEP's existing levels of
3	PM 2.5 exceed the U.S. EPA standard. PM 2.5 is
4	particulate matter and is one of the most
5	significant air pollutants in urban areas. This
б	means that there are unhealthy levels of air
7	quality and that residents are more susceptible to
8	health problems such as asthma in children
9	sorry. Premature death in people with heart
10	disease and increased hospital admission and ER
11	visits for cardiovascular disease.
12	The DEIS could expect construction
13	activities will generate PM 2.5 concentrations in
14	excess of the Federal standard at Barretto Point
15	Park and on other streets and the greenway.
16	Recently, the Bronx Borough

17	President's office pulled together the Bronx
18	Greenway Task Force to develop the Bronx Greenway
19	Plan. And when it's completed, it will be a
20	comprehensive document that shows all the
21	different greenways in the Bronx.
22	Many recommendations were made to
23	the plan, including bike signs along Manida Street
24	as the designated route to Barretto Point Park.
25	DEP cannot dismiss these impacts. They must be
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	56
2	more carefully quantified and measures developed
3	for mitigation.
4	The construction timeline for the
5	plant did not include the time it will take to
б	construct the second set of digester eggs which
7	will have an enormous impact on the continued
8	development of the greenway.
9	The greenway is also broken down
10	into several construction phases. The first one,
11	five to ten years, which would also be 2015.
12	DEP must also do a quantitative
13	analysis of residents walking to Barretto Point
14	Park and they must continue to do this as the
15	greenway continues to be constructed.
16	Finally, I ask that DEP re-examine

17	the routing of the greenway along the waterfront.
18	As other speakers have stated, there is precedent
19	for the Newtown Creek and Hunts Point residents
20	deserve the same.
21	Thank you for your time.
22	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you
23	for your comments.
24	I'd like to give the opportunity to
25	Siddhartha Sanchez from Congressman Serrano's
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	57
2	office.
3	(Audience participation.)
4	MR. SIDDHARTHA SANCHEZ: On behalf
5	of Congressman Serrano, I'd like to present a
6	partial statement regarding the expansion of the
7	Hunts Point Water Pollution Control plant.
8	I am writing a response to the Draft
9	Environmental Impact Study of the Hunts Point
10	Water Pollution Control Plant Phase III expansion
11	conducted by our agency.
12	I have a number of concerns about
13	this project, its potential impacts on the
14	surrounding community, the environmental justice
15	precedent it sets and the lack of transparency and
16	oversight by which this project has been advanced.

17	In addressing the impacts from the
18	expansion of the water pollution control plant,
19	the context of the community which hosts this
20	facility - a facility that serves to benefit the
21	entire City - needs to be considered carefully in
22	assessing both impacts and mitigating efforts.
23	The Hunts Point community's health
24	is effected by numerous sources of contamination.
25	As circled by major highways, Hunts Point has one
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	58
2	of the highest numbers of daily truck traffic in
3	the country. Compounded by local truck traffic to
4	the Hunts Point Market and waste transfer station
5	serving the region, diesel soot levels currently
6	exceed 24-hour standards.
7	The South Bronx Environmental Health
8	and Policy Study, a study that I commissioned to
9	understand the impact of soot, recently confirmed
10	that this contaminant is directly related and
11	responsible for childhood asthma rates in this
12	community.
13	DEP's reliance on the DEIS on the
14	outdated PM 2.5 standards does not account for the
15	change in EPA's PM 2.5 24-hour standard nor does
16	it take into consideration background levels of PM

17	2.5. At a minimum, DEP must assess its PM 2.5
18	impacts on the basis of DEC'S recent technical
19	recommendation for two micrograms per cubic meter
20	impact threshold.
21	Using this benchmark, the DEIS must
22	recognize that the impacts to Barretto Point Park
23	and to the South Bronx Greenway are significant.
24	My biggest concerns with regard to
25	the potential air quality impact of the plant are
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	59
2	the dirty generators - essentially the worst kind
3	of power plant and how what they will have spewed
4	will affect the children of Hunts Point.
5	For DEP to propose plants to
6	generate dirty plants for this City flies in the
7	face of the history of this community as it
8	struggles to improve industrial contamination of
9	air.
10	Just one day of these generators is
11	enough to make a healthy adult sick, according to
12	state samples. To propose running these
13	generators for fifteen days at a time during the
14	summer months when Barretto Point Park is most in
15	use, is incomprehensible.
16	I oppose any power generation that

17	is not absolutely necessary for plant operations
18	and that does not use the cleanest of
19	technologies.
20	My goal is to make Hunts Point more
21	livable and odor impacts from the proposed
22	expansion are impediments in meeting that goal.
23	DEP's stake in this community is significant.
24	Operating a sewage treatment plant and contracting
25	a sewage pelletizer plant adjacent to the first
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	60
2	major waterfront park in decades, DEP can choose
3	to either add to the problem or add to the
4	solution.
5	For decades odor complaints from the
б	water pollution control plant were ignored and
7	even after identifying sources, measures taken to
8	address these serious problems have been slow and
9	insufficient.
10	Similarly to odor problem in NYOFCo
11	where private entities processes sewage on behalf
12	of DEP, the water pollution control plant has the
13	conflict that DEP, charged with addressing odor
14	problems, is, in fact, creating the odors through
15	its operations and practices of the water
16	pollution control plant.

17	This expansion provides DEP with the
18	opportunity to be a leader in controlling odors in
19	the community by controlling the odors from their
20	plant. The best example of DEP's tone in
21	addressing odor impacts is demonstrated in their
22	response to the Draft Environmental Impact
23	Statement's indication of a significant odor
24	impact from the water pollution control plant
25	along the Ryawa Greenway connect.

1	61	
2	DEP needs to lead by example rather	
3	than dismissing the need to address these odors	
4	based on the assumption that people will pass	
5	through the bad smell coming from the plant.	
6	A thorough analysis of odor control	
7	options for each of the odor switches of the plant	
8	is essential to understanding the best way of	
9	addressing odors.	
10	The consultant DEP hired ten years	
11	ago to assess odor problems recommended the	
12	implementation of a comprehensive odor management	
13	program. The time for this plan is long overdue.	
14	DEP must diligently pursue odor	
15	complaints for the water pollution control plant	
16	and NYOFCo, at both facilities, to ensure that	

17	complaints are addressed. To assume that my
18	constituents can identify the origins of odors in
19	the sewage treatment process and therefore, not
20	investigate both sewage processing plants is
21	irresponsible and disrespectful to the community.
22	As in the odor survey performed last
23	winter, it was determined odors from one facility
24	can travel the two blocks apart from separating
25	the plants and vice versa.

1		62
2	In addition, odor monitoring	devices
3	must be incorporated into the water pollution	on
4	control plant to ensure that neither the cu	rrent
5	park adjacent to the plant nor the future l	inear
6	park, that will cross in front of the plant	, will
7	be impacted by the plant's operations.	
8	One of my major concerns wit	h
9	regards to the vertical expansion of the wa	ter
10	pollution control plant is the potential vi	sual
11	impact on the Barretto Point Park.	
12	As it's currently planned, D	EP will
13	place four large egg-shaped digester struct	ures
14	immediately adjacent to the park. The trem	endous
15	size and towering aspect of these structure	s will
16	significantly affect the park user's experi-	ence of

17 the park.

18	DEP dishonestly dismisses these
19	impacts in the DEIS by claiming that the community
20	agreed to these impacts in planning a park next to
21	the park next to the plant during its
22	expansion. The truth is that the location of
23	these structures, the tallest buildings in Hunts
24	Point, was not clear to me until the DEIS was
25	released. The impact of these mammoth structures
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	63
2	changes dramatically the closer they are to the
3	park.
4	As included in the DEIS, an
5	alternative build site would minimize impacts with
6	only a two percent increase in cost and an
7	additional year and a half in construction
8	schedule.
9	Any project of this scale presents
10	obvious construction impacts which is significant,
11	particularly considering the proximity of truck
12	deliveries and heavy equipment, to children and
13	families using the adjacent park.
14	However, DEP's role in assessing
15	this impact is limited by the fact that what is
16	being built is also being managed by DEP.

17	The role of DEP as both regulator
18	and operator conflict conspicuously when assessing
19	the impact of construction. To begin with, the
20	role of construction schedule does not the role
21	of the construction does not include all of the
22	activities described in the EIS and is therefore,
23	an inaccurate presentation of the construction for
24	Phase III.
25	This schedule completely leaves out:
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1 64 2 The time needed to build the second set of digesters; 3 4 The remediation of the point-seven 5 acre lot; The remediation of the rest of the 6 lot currently preferred for the new digester 7 8 structures; and The remediation of lot 901 that 9 10 would revert to parkland after the expansion. 11 By counting for these omissions and 12 the fact that the park's phase II construction are behind by up to three years, the schedule should 13 14 -- could be short by as much as five years, 15 dragging construction as long as 2019. Furthermore, the noise impacts of 16

17	construction is acknowledged in the DEIS to exceed
18	acceptable levels at the park for a 1.5 year
19	interval, year-and-a-half interval and later in
20	the project for up to three months.
21	To say, as the DEIS claims, that
22	these noise impacts are not significant because of
23	the short time span, is ludicrous when considering
24	the park as a sensitive receptor. These
25	construction noise impacts must be recognized as
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	65
2	serious and all potential alternative options must
3	be explored through these impacts.
4	The DEIS did not include a
5	substantial analysis of pedestrian impacts from
б	the expansion. DEP claims that no dangerous
7	intersections were located in the study area.
8	These claims are based on current pedestrian
9	activities, that will necessarily change,
10	particularly during the summer with the opening of
11	Barretto Point Park.
12	The impact of construction,
13	furthermore, on air quality is minimized by DEP in
14	the DEIS. Although it is acknowledged that the
15	use of diesel machinery and trucking of material
16	will result in the DEC standard for PM 2.5 being

17	exceeded both at the park and greenway, and that
18	odors are likely are likely work related to
19	existing digesters and storage tanks, nothing is
20	proposed to quantify these problems and mitigate
21	for these significant impacts on a community
22	already burdened by poor air quality.
23	With regards to soil remediation and
24	the excavation of hazardous materials, it is
25	essential that DEP monitor air quality in the
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1		66
2	community and particularly in the park in a	formal
3	and transparent manner. Choosing to leave	
4	contaminants in place and not considering th	le
5	likelihood of contaminants existing in the a	area
6	immediately adjacent to the toxic stores, DE	ΓP
7	needs to ensure that no hazardous materials	are
8	released by accident during any remediation	of the
9	proposed build site.	
10	Asbestos and led-based paint	removal
11	should also be treated with the same intenti	on,
12	monitoring and reporting to the community	
13	particulate levels of these containments dur	ring
14	any work dealing with these toxins. Furthern	nore, a
15	clear plan for dealing with future excavatio	on and
16	the containments left in place must be detai	led in

17 considering the health of the community and park 18 users.
19 This statement represents a piece of 20 what I have to say with regards to this expansion.
21 I will be submitting a more comprehensive analysis
22 within the next few weeks that will further detail
23 the problem and potential mitigation measures that

24

25 Thank you.

DEP must consider.

1	67
2	(Applause.)
3	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank for
4	your comments.
5	Elena Conte.
6	(Audience participation.)
7	MS. ELENA CONTE: Hello? Is that
8	clear? Is that good?
9	Hi. Good evening.
10	My name is Elena Conte. And I'm the
11	Solid Waste and Energy Coordinator for Sustainable
12	South Bronx.
13	And we are a community-based
14	organization that is dedicated to environmental
15	justice. I'm also a member of the Hunts Point
16	Monitoring Committee.

17	This is not going to be our full
18	comment. We will submit longer ones in writing.
19	But I'm going to talk a little tonight about odors
20	and about mitigations.
21	Okay.
22	So the Hunts Point Monitoring
23	Committee sorry.
24	The Hunts Point Community has one of
25	highest percentages of population under eighteen
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	68
2	years old in the City and one of the worst child
3	asthma hospitalization rates in the City. We all
4	know that it's predominately a community of color
5	comprised of groups who are especially vulnerable
б	to air pollutants and who experience a high
7	occurrence of upper respiratory illnesses and
8	cardiovascular disease.
9	The community has a long history of
10	environmental impacts from many sources, including
11	the highways that envelope the area, the waste
12	transfer stations, NYOFCo, and this plant that's
13	being discussed tonight.
14	The background levels of particulate
15	matter 2.5 in this community already exceed the
16	EPA's 24-hour standard and we don't need and

17 simply cannot tolerate any additional impacts from 18 the plant.

19	We need to move the Hunts Point
20	community from an overburdened community to one
21	that is more livable and sustainable. This is the
22	goal that the Mayor has embraced and one that DEP
23	must support in all of its projects.
24	Sustainable South Bronx's goal is to
25	make Hunts Point more livable and the odor impacts
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	69
2	from the and odor impacts from the proposed
3	expansion stand in the way of this being a truly
4	livable community.
5	The Hunts Point community has
б	complained for many, many years about the odor
7	impacts from the plants. And in '96, as a result
8	of these complaints, DEP had a consultant conduct
9	an odor survey at the plant. And the consultant
10	identified numerous sources of odors that were
11	impacting the community.
12	However, ten years later, DEP has
13	not meaningfully addressed odors in Hunts Point
14	and the community has continued to suffer as a
15	result.
16	A proactive environmental agency

17	would never accept such delays by a private
18	facility. And what's even worse, that this delay
19	in ignoring the problem is being done by the very
20	agency that has the responsibility of addressing
21	odor impacts.
22	Now, in all fairness, DEP's recent
23	construction of some odor controls at the plant is
24	a welcome beginning, but it's just not enough.
25	The expansion provides DEP with an
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	70
2	excellent opportunity to be a leader in
3	controlling odors in the community by controlling
4	odors from their own plant first.
5	Right now, DEP's own analysis in the
6	EIS shows that the odors from the Hunts Point
7	Water Pollution Control Plant will exceed the
8	City's odor impact standard on the greenway. DEP
9	cannot simply dismiss the need to address the
10	odors by stating that people will never be at a
11	location for more than an hour or for even an
12	hour.
13	DEP needs to be a leader. We want to
14	help you be a leader, and not, you know, try and
15	figure out how to just get away with the bear
16	minimum in this community.

17	DEP needs to conduct a comprehensive
18	analysis of odor control options for each of the
19	odor sources at the plant. Look at what's going
20	on there, do a full analysis and then start from
21	there.
22	And DEP needs to develop a
23	comprehensive odor management program as was
24	recommended a time ago by its very own
25	consultants.

1	71
2	DEP must also become more vigilant
3	about investigating the plant when it receives an
4	odor complaint. Even if the complaint comes in
5	under NYOFCo, they should check their own plants.
6	It's a similar smell. They should be expected to
7	know it. It's a very simple procedural thing that
8	needs to be done in tracking responses to odor
9	complaints and is essential in making sure the
10	sources of the complaints are addressed.
11	DEP must also install H2s monitors
12	to verify that the DEP plant is not impacting the
13	Barretto Point Park and the greenway. DEP must be
14	a partner with the community to address odors from
15	its facilities, both plants in NYOFCo. And it's
16	very fair to consider NYOFCo a DEP facility since

17 it contracts with it under City contract and DEP 18 pays them. 19 DEP has promised for over ten years that it will control the odors from NYOFCo and 20 21 other sources in the community and we want 22 results. The community demands a transparent 23 process for investigating and controlling odors 24 from NYOFCo, the plant and other significant 25 sources in the community. You have an able and

1	72
2	willing community that will work with you on that
3	to set up the appropriate provision that need to
4	happen so that you can have that happen honestly.
5	But it must happen.
6	Mitigation measures.
7	Okay. The DEIS right now, the
8	study that we're talking about, really only says
9	that there's two impacts: One, the eggs are big
10	and you can see them. It says that, it
11	acknowledges that.
12	And it acknowledges that at one
13	intersection it's going to be a little bit more
14	crowded with trucks and so we've got to change the
15	light signal. That's the only full
16	acknowledgement. There's a lot of spin there.

```
17
        There's a lot of chatter. There's a lot of
18
       yackety-yak but at the end when they summarize it
19
       up, they're only saying those are the only two
20
        impacts that we're going to speak to acknowledge.
21
        That is deeply insufficient.
22
                       The DEIS must acknowledge that
23
       particulate matter 2.5 generated by the peak load
24
        mass program, that's the generator program, as
25
       well as the odors and the volatile organic
```

1	73
2	compound generated by plant operations, will
3	impact the greenway and the park. We can start by
4	building trust by acknowledging what the impacts
5	are and then working together to actually address
6	them.
7	We should also acknowledge that
8	there are going to be permanent shadow impacts
9	created by the egg both on the park and on Manida
10	Street. And in addition to that, construction is
11	going to cause air quality and noise impacts and
12	possibly pedestrian impacts. And the current and
13	future excavation of the plant is likely to cause
14	additional dust and air quality concerns. So it
15	is going to be important to consider the duration
16	of construction.

17	Phase I of the expansion started in
18	2002, then underway, so it means that at a
19	minimum, the community will have endured 12 years
20	of construction. But the construction will
21	undoubtedly take longer because of private delays
22	that already exist and the fact that the schedule
23	does not include being in construction, the second
24	batch of egg digesters.
25	DEP must not dismiss these impacts
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	74
2	just as it must not dismiss the impacts already
3	discussed, particularly because the City has
4	invested a significant amount of time and effort
5	to building that very resource like the park and
6	the greenway and these are where most of the
7	impacts are going to occur.
8	The treatment plant cannot restrict
9	the use or reduce the value of these community
10	amenities. Instead, the construction and
11	operation of the plant should be designed to meet
12	the goals established in the Hunts Point Vision
13	plan for safe connections, improved environmental
14	quality and health.
15	So some of those impacts that are
16	noted can be mitigated in the following way.

17	The particulate matter 2.5 impact
18	could be eliminated by agreeing up front that the
19	plant will not participate in the peak load mass
20	program and by using cleaner diesel fuel. It is
21	also possible that a more careful evaluation of
22	odor-causing operations could lead to the
23	implementation of individual or smaller scale odor
24	control operations.
25	It may be possible to get a lot more
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	75
2	bang for your buck in terms of odor control if you
3	actually do that survey and look at what's there.
4	The visual and shadow impacts
5	created the egg digester could be eliminated by
б	constructing the Site Plan Alternative II. At the
7	very least, it really needs to be fully analyzed
8	and considered and not considered a done deal.
9	Agreements to implement community
10	air monitoring programs during any excavation on
11	the 5.5 acre parcel, such as the land that they're
12	going to be expanding into, so basically
13	anyhow, could mitigate the impact of any
14	construction and will provide the data through the
15	
	Monitoring Committee, to the group that's going to

17 dust control issues are effected.

18	So it may also be that the visual
19	shadow, VOC and noise impacts cannot be avoided.
20	In that case, DEP must find alternative ways of
21	mitigating the impacts. But these methods can
22	only be developed once all of the impacts are
23	fully acknowledged. Let's just say where we're
24	starting from, put that out there and then we can
25	do the work together.

1	76
2	So all mitigation measures and any
3	amenities provided to the community in connection
4	with the upgrade must be included in the ULURP
5	process via a ULURP resolution. This procedure
6	has been used in other ULURP actions and it's
7	really the only thing that will ensure that DEP
8	addresses the impacts. And actually, in a certain
9	way, gets DEP off the hook from having to enforce
10	it. It's written into the ULURP resolution. You
11	know what you have to follow. You know what the
12	law is and you have backup.
13	And with that I'll wrap up.
14	Thank you.
15	(Applause.)
16	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you

17 for your comments.

18 Eva Sanjujo? 19 (No response.) 20 A VOICE: She left. 21 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Laura 22 Truettner. 23 MS. LAURA TRUETTNER: I'm Laura Truettner. And I'm one of the technical advisors 24 25 to the Hunts Point Monitoring Committee, who have ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	77
2	done a fabulous job tonight. But there are a
3	couple of points that I would like to reiterate
4	that are related to the construction impacts, the
5	hazardous material impacts and the way open space
6	and the way open space is evaluated.
7	In terms of the the EIS does a
8	good job of laying out the different impacts that
9	need to be considered. But one of them, one of
10	the critical impacts, which is the construction of
11	the second pair of digesters, is not included in
12	the EIS schedule.
13	And in order for the EIS schedule to
14	be consistent with the activities described in the
15	EIS, and in order for this document to fully
16	disclose all the impacts of the project, the

17	second set pair of digesters must be included
18	in the schedule.
19	Similarly, the construction noise
20	impacts that were acknowledged as being presented
21	for at the one-and-a-half-year interval, need
22	to be acknowledged and included in the EIS.
23	These noise impacts are going to
24	happen fifty feet from the park, from activities
25	like pile-driving and construction equipment. And
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	78
2	they will absolutely have an impact, particularly
3	during the summer when the park is used during the
4	week.
5	Similarly, the pedestrian impacts
6	need to be evaluated. The EIS stated that between
7	500 and a thousand daily visits are anticipated to
8	the park. And the pedestrian impacts from the
9	project on those visitors has not been evaluated.
10	In terms of the soil excavation
11	impacts, I think that DEP and DEC have done an
12	exemplary job of protecting the community and the
13	park during the excavation of the point-seven acre
14	area. But we would ask that they use similar
15	procedures when they're excavating in other parts
16	of that 5.5 acre parcel.

17	There's no question that there are
18	contaminated soils in the remainder of that
19	parcel. There are semi-volatiles and metals in
20	concentrations that exceed the DEC TAGMs. That
21	means that park users need to be protected during
22	excavation and the contractor needs to be required
23	to write and implement a community air monitoring
24	program. And as many HPMC members have suggested,
25	the data needs to be given to HPMC.

1		79
2	I also want to touch on the	
3	institutional controls that are supposed to	be put
4	in place to protect park users after the	
5	excavation is done.	
6	These required laying down a	plastic
7	membrane and then two feet of soil cover on	top of
8	that. But that two foot of soil cover needs	to be
9	maintained or if it doesn't, it will not pro	tect
10	either plant workers or park users.	
11	And any time DEP has to work	on the
12	underground utilities, underground piping, t	here's
13	going to be soil excavation. And there need	s to
14	be procedures in place that explain how the	park
15	users and the greenway users will be protect	ed.
16	We've actually asked for thes	e

17	procedures and we have yet to receive them. And
18	HPMC really needs to be able to review those
19	procedures before the EIS is completed.
20	The last thing I want to touch on is
21	the way the open space impacts have been
22	evaluated.
23	As you've heard tonight, the park
24	and the greenway are a very significant and
25	important amenity the community and the impacts to
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	80
2	the park and greenway from the proposed action are
3	a very significant concern.
4	Barretto Point Park, as I'm sure
5	most of you know, is a five-acre, waterfront park
б	with basketball courts, playing equipment, an
7	amphitheater, a boat launch, landscaping and a
8	waterfront promenade.
9	And I cannot overemphasize the
10	importance of this park to the community and the
11	fact that the park has a series of benefits beyond
12	just recreation, including neighborhood
13	revitalization, economic opportunity for youth,
14	creation of social fabric and promotion of good
15	health.
16	The CEQR technical manual recognizes

17	the value of open space and provides a directive
18	to evaluate impacts on open space. And I'm not
19	just talking about the shadow impact and the
20	visual impact that we've discussed, but a
21	comprehensive analysis of all the potential
22	impacts, including air quality, including noise
23	and including odors.
24	While some of these analysis are
25	included in the EIS, as it stands, the results
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	81
2	have generally been dismissed as insignificant
3	and they should they cannot be dismissed. And
4	moreover, they need to be examined collectively so
5	that they provide a complete picture of the
6	impacts to the open space.
7	The CEQR Technical Manual also
8	recommends a user survey be conducted to determine
9	whether any of these impacts would discourage
10	public use. There needs to be a user survey done
11	to determine whether the siting of the eggs would
12	discourage use of the park, whether the air
13	quality impacts would discourage use of the park.
14	And this has not been done yet.
15	So in closing I would say that DEP
16	really needs to analyze the impacts of the

17	expansion on both the park and the greenway and
18	they need to do it comprehensively and they need
19	to consider all the impacts together rather than
20	in fragmented sections the way they've done.
21	Thank you.
22	(Audience participation.)
23	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you for
24	your comment.
25	Marie Horne?

1	82
2	(No response.)
3	THE HEARING OFFICER: I may be
4	pronouncing the name wrong.
5	Corpus Christi Monastery?
6	A VOICE: They had to leave.
7	THE HEARING OFFICER: They had to
8	leave.
9	Marie Davis?
10	A VOICE: She also left.
11	THE HEARING OFFICER: Matty
12	Stanislaus.
13	MR. MATTY STANISLAUS: Hi. Matty
14	Stanislaus, also a technical advisor to the Hunts
15	Point Monitoring Committee.
16	And I'm going to limit my comments

17	to two issues, air quality and odors. And I'm
18	going to be working with the Hunts Point
19	Monitoring Committee to submit some formal written
20	comments.
21	First I want to start with PM 2.5.
22	And I'm happy that DEP, I think, has
23	agreed to use a two-microgram-per-meter standard
24	to assess the impacts. I think that's the only
25	choice that they have. It is the recommendation
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	83
2	by the DEC's technical staff. It has been adopted
3	by all other Northeastern states as a technical
4	basis. And it is the same organization or same
5	group of Northeastern states that DEC used to
б	develop its interim policy. So DEC does not stand
7	behind the five-micrograms-per-meter standard now,
8	neither should DEP.
9	And DEC has told me just last week
10	they will issue a letter stating that they stand
11	behind the two-microgram-per-meter standard as the
12	basis for determining significant impacts from a
13	technical basis.
14	So I think it's a good thing that
15	DEP is going to look at that in terms of assessing
16	the significance of the impacts. But I also want

17 to kind of address some of the current statements 18 in the DEIS.
19 One of the things is that even
20 though they may have not accounted for the fact of
21 the revised 24-hour standard, they've gone beyond
22 it because they looked at the fact that when
23 people will be in those areas like the park and

24 the greenway, to be exposed.

25 And I will say that is a completely

1	84
2	incorrect position by DEP to take. It conflicts
3	with U.S. EPA methodologies. It conflicts with
4	DEC methodology. If you exceed an impact
5	threshold, the accepted methodology is that you
б	have to mitigate. You cannot explain that way.
7	Moreover, one thing that is not
8	acknowledged in the DEIS is the fact that the use
9	of emergency generators during the PLM program is
10	in coincides identically to when the park is
11	open. And so the maximum impact occurs when the
12	park is open.
13	And it is true that the PLM program
14	is for fifteen days. It is expected to be the
15	fifteen worst days of the summer, with the worst
16	ozone air quality and so there is tremendous

17 concerns because of that.

```
18
                       EPA's recent federal rules regarding
19
        the 24-hour standard acknowledges that a single
        day of excessive impact will result in health
20
        consequences. So, again, the two-microgram-per
21
22
        meter standard must be used to assess the impacts
23
        and mitigation must be done.
24
                       Secondly, in terms of construction
25
        impacts, again, if you use the two-micrograms-per
               ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167
```

```
1
                                                     85
2
       meter standard, there would be excessive impacts
3
        at Barretto Point Park and the greenway. So DEP
        must look at mitigations to reduce it below the
 4
 5
        two-micrograms-per-meter standard.
 6
                       The last item I'm going to address
        is odors and it is a significant issue, as you
7
 8
        heard, from many people.
                       DEP does, in fact, exceed the DEP
9
10
        threshold. But DEP again tries to explain it away
11
        by saying that people will only be there in
12
        transit periods of time.
13
                       The CEQR Technical Manual does not
14
        permit such explanation.
15
                       I will quote from the CEQR Technical
16
        Manual.
```

17	DEP considers a 1 ppb increase of
18	H2S as a significant odor impact on waste water
19	related processes.
20	So first, DEP must acknowledge that
21	it is a significant impact. It cannot explain it
22	away. The CEQR Technical Manual simply does not
23	permit that.
24	So the other aspect of the CEQR
25	Technical Manual that DEP must look at is the CEQR
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	86
2	Technical Manual requires the lead agency to do a
3	reasonable worst case analysis. And there's the
4	issue of what will be placed on the greenway.
5	And it is clearly foreseeable that
6	people will sit or stand on the greenway for up to
7	an hour. And for DEP to assume that people will
8	not be at any location for one hour, simply, I
9	think, contradicts what is required in the CEQR
10	Technical Manual.
11	(Audience participation.)
12	MR. MATTY STANISLAUS: DEP also
13	concluded that it's in compliance with the State
14	H2S standard, all the odor one of the odor
15	compounds that is regulated by the State.
16	And it may be true. But frankly, we

17	don't know. And we don't know because DEP assumes
18	the background of odors is zero, and I think given
19	the fact that just this week DEP disclosed the
20	fact there were multiple odors in the Hunts Point
21	area.
22	So at a minimum, DEP should
22 23	So at a minimum, DEP should acknowledge and document the multiples of odor
23	acknowledge and document the multiples of odor

1	87
2	complained for years known as NYOFCo.
3	DEP could and has the tools to
4	conduct a cumulative impact analysis as it has
5	done for other air quality analysis. And I think
6	this is one of the communities in the City that
7	such cumulative impact analysis should be used
8	given the multiples of the H2S impacts.
9	And, again, DEP should perform
10	short-term air monitoring at Barretto Point Park
11	and the greenway once the upgrade is completed.
12	In terms of the odor analysis
13	itself, I believe DEP has underestimated the odor
14	impacts discussed by DEP. And I believe DEP is
15	looking at this as they conduct a further
16	analysis.

17	I believe DEP underestimated the
18	impact from a very significant odor source known
19	as a sludge storage tank and that DEP must look at
20	the increased odors from the sludge storage tank.
21	DEP also makes an assumption that
22	even the sludge storage tank that drives sludge,
23	that has formed a floating crust with some cracks,
24	will act as a permanent control. And I just have
25	a hard time agreeing with sludge crust as being an
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	88
2	equivalent to a design control.
3	And I think DEP must re-examine the
4	odors coming from cracks in the crust and whether
5	it is acceptable to assume that dry crust is a
6	proper and permanent control of odors.
7	DEP has a number of uncontrolled
8	sources at the plant and I'll go through some of
9	them:
10	The primary clarifying weirs;
11	The primary effluence channel;
12	The secondary aeration tanks;
13	Sludge thickeners;
14	Sludge storage tanks 8 and 9; and
15	The return of sludge channels.
16	In an odor study done in 1996 by a

17	consultant hired by DEP, it concluded that DEP
18	should investigate a number of odor control
19	measures. These include:
20	Looking at sludge thickeners;
21	Looking at chemical treatment of
22	sludge and the production of a sludge blanket;
23	Covering of the acrolein wiers;
24	Increasing the odor control
25	efficiency to control odors from the sludgy
	ROY ALLEN & ASSOCIATES, INC., (212) 840-1167

1	89
2	watering, particularly during upset conditions.
3	And my recommendation to DEP is to
4	conduct a comprehensive odor analysis and not
5	merely dismiss that it would be expensive. And I
6	think an odor analysis should contain should be
7	broken up in two separate parts.
8	One is an odor control analysis to
9	look at permanent, fixed controls of each of the
10	uncontrolled areas that are identified.
11	Separately, an odor management
12	program that looks at a continuous management of
13	odors, you know, beginning with the recommendation
14	in the 1996 report.
15	And I will close with an acrolein
16	compound which is a compound from combustion. DEP

17	has, in fact, done an analysis at Newtown Creek
18	under similar conditions. They can use the same
19	methodologies. And I acknowledge that there are
20	some issues with the data that may overestimate
21	that.
22	DEP could do exactly what it did to
23	determine that. They could do the analysis and
24	explain the findings from that analysis as it
25	relates to the State standard.

1	90
2	Thank you and you'll be getting some
3	specific written comments as whenever the hearing
4	here will be due to DEP.
5	Thank you.
б	(Audience participation.)
7	THE HEARING OFFICER: Would anyone
8	else like to speak?
9	(No response.)
10	THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. This
11	concludes the formal public comment period.
12	I want to remind people that they
13	can submit written comments until April 23rd. And
14	the address where to send the comments to is at
15	the front desk here.
16	Thank you for your comments.

17	We received many thoughtful comments
18	tonight and that they are going to give us a lot
19	of food-for-thought. And we will be writing
20	responses that will be incorporated into the Final
21	Environmental Impact Statement.
22	Thank you very much.
23	(At 9:22 p.m., the proceedings were
24	concluded.)
25	

1 91 CERTIFICATION 2 3 4 STATE OF NEW YORK) 5 SS. 6 COUNTY OF NEW YORK) 7 8 9 I, MARC RUSSO, a Shorthand 10 (Stenotype) Reporter and Notary 11 Public within and for the State of 12 New York, do hereby certify that the 13 foregoing pages 1 through 91 taken 14 at the time and place aforesaid, is 15 a true and correct transcription of 16 my shorthand notes.

