PUBLIC HEARING

before

ASSEMBLY AGRICULTURE AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

on

"Progress of cleanup of chemical contamination at the site of the proposed industrial park at Kapkowski Road in Elizabeth"

Held: April 19, 1983
Union County Administration Building
Elizabeth, New Jersey

MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE PRESENT:

Assemblyman Raymond Lesniak (Chairman)

ALSO PRESENT:

Mark O. Smith, Research Associate
Office of Legislative Services
Aide, Assembly Agriculture and Environment Committee

* * * * * * *

P U B L I C H E A R I N G

before

ASSEMBLY AGRICULTURE AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

on

"Progress of cleanup of chemical contamination at the site of the proposed industrial park at Kapkowski Road in Elizabeth"

Held: April 19, 1983
Union County Administration Building
Elizabeth, New Jersey

MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE PRESENT:

Assemblyman Raymond Lesniak (Chairman)

ALSO PRESENT:

Mark O. Smith, Research Associate
Office of Legislative Services
Aide, Assembly Agriculture and Environment Committee

* * * * * * *

I N D E X

* * * * * * * *

JB:1-16

ASSEMBLYMAN RAYMOND LESNIAK (Chairman): I now call the public hearing of the Assembly Agriculture and Environment Committee to order. Before making an opening statement, I would like to announce your presence here, and I want to thank you very much for attending and offering your testimony at this hearing. This includes the Chairman of the Port Authority, Allan Sagner, the Director of Economic Development for the Port Authority -- I believe that is Neil's title now -- Neil Montanus, the Director of the Division of Waste Management for the Department of Environmental Protection, Dr. Sadat, and Dr. Grace Singer. Grace, I don't know what your title is. Dr. Singer is also with DEP. I believe she is their Community Relations liaison person, and she has been very helpful to me concerning water quality in the State of New Jersey. Thank you all for attending.

At this time, I would like to read my opening statement.

On August 25, 1978, the Governors of the States of New Jersey and New York signed legislation authorizing the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey to develop industrial parks in the two states, which promised some 30,000 new jobs and $80 million in revenue to State and local governments. In addition, the Port Authority anticipated almost a $500 million investment in this development project to be matched by $500 million in private capital.

Pursuant to AJR 129, which I sponsored on May 18, 1978 and which passed the New Jersey Legislature in July of 1978, the City of Elizabeth was included in the Port Authority's master plan for industrial park development.

In July of 1979, the master plan was issued, including the City of Elizabeth, and on March 12, 1981, a site was selected for development by the Port Authority -- Kapkowski Road in Elizabeth.

Since then, while the New York development project has gone forward, the development of the Kapkowski Road site has been delayed because of PCB contamination discovered on the site. Concentrations were found in excess of 4800 parts per million in some locations on the site.

This public hearing has been convened to determine the following in regard to the Port Authority's plans for the Kapkowski Road site:

First, what is the extent and source of the contamination?

Two, how, when, and at what cost does the Port Authority plan to clean up the site?

Three, is the cleanup plan adequate to protect the public's health and safety?

Four, is the Port Authority still committed to developing the site, and what are the prospects for development, and how soon can we anticipate positive action in this regard?

At this time I would like to call the Chairman of the Port Authority, Allan Sagner, who I have had a very good relationship with over these past years. I am looking forward to his testimony regarding this development.

Mr. Sagner and Mr. Montanus?

A L L A N S A G N E R: Before I give my testimony, I understand this is a meeting of the New Jersey Assembly Committee on Agriculture and Environment.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESNIAK: That is correct.

MR. SAGNER: I'll take responsibility for the PCB's in the industrial park, Mr. Chairman, but what is the Agriculture Committee going to do about this weather and my daffodils?

ASSEMBLYMAN LESNIAK: I don't expect that we will be doing any--

MR. SAGNER: I think there should be some legislative action. This is outrageous.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESNIAK: I would like you to know that I have already drafted the resolution for introduction on the twenty-fifth.

MR. SAGNER: Well, it was a very sorry condition when I left home this morning.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to have a brief statement. I'm then going to ask Neil to add to that, and then we will be available for questions. If, during the course of that, we don't specifically answer the questions you raise, we will address them very specifically.

With legislative authority from both New York and New Jersey, the Port Authority in 1978 entered into a program of industrial development directed at creating jobs in the urban centers of the Port district. As you stated, specifically in New Jersey, Elizabeth qualified under the legislation as an urban-aid municipality. The

proposed industrial park site in Elizabeth is a 125-acre tract west of Elizabeth Marine Terminal complex. It lies just north of North Avenue and east of the New Jersey Turnpike. It is a good location as we have all agreed.

The history of the site is that the Port Authority leased the 245-acre parcel from its owner, the Central Railroad of New Jersey, in 1971 for the purpose then of expanding the Port Elizabeth facility for warehouse and distribution. We knew that much of the site had been used as a refuge disposal since the 1950's.

During our lease term, the Port Authority leveled the site, installed a system of drains to de-water the site, and a venting system for methane gas. They then placed a layer of sand, about fifteen feet deep, to compact the subsurface layers and to stabilize the site for ultimate development. This is our usual procedure.

In 1980, we exercised an option that we held and purchased the property from the railroad estate.

In March of 1981, in the initial stages of our new industrial development program, we found that 125 acres of this site laying west of Kapkowski Road could be released from its original marine terminal purpose and developed as an industrial park under the legislative authorization.

We entered into negotiations with the City of Elizabeth and through the cooperation of Mayor Dunn and the City Council, we entered into an agreement covering tax payment and other matters later that year.

In April of 1981, the Federal Environmental Protection Agency issued regulations implementing the newly enacted Superfund legislation. As required under the Superfund notification provisions, the Port Authority submitted written notice to EPA and the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection in June of 1981 which stated that the Kapkowski Road site was a former landfill and that preliminary and incomplete leachate tests had been conducted and additional tests were being performed to determine whether hazardous or toxic substances were present at the site.

The tests we referred to in the notification were those done in connection with an environmental impact statement which we were preparing for the industrial park development.

The results of the additional testing were received from the laboratories in July of 1981. They showed concentrations of PCB's arranging from 100 to over 800 parts per million in the oil collected by an oil/water separator that we had installed as a part of the site drainage system.

Obviously, we had discovered a problem that required further intensive investigation and which could have material effect on our development plan.

I would like to note here, Mr. Chairman, that based on all the information we have, that we don't believe from the site, in its present condition, that there is any danger whatsoever to the community surrounding that area.

Mr. Montanus can discuss the events that ensued, but before he does, I wish to add that the Port Authority is committed to taking necessary remedial measures with regard to the PCB problem. We are hopeful that with a PCB mitigation system in place, it will be technically and economically feasible to develop the site for industrial usage in an environmentally sound manner.

With your permission now, Mr. Chairman, I would like Mr. Montanus to continue.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESNIAK: That you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Montanus?

N E I L M O N T A N U S: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The extensive PCB subsurface test program at Kapkowski Road was undertaken in the Fall of 1981. DEP was designated lead regulatory agency by EPA after the Federal agency had approved the test program. DEP officials have helped the Port Authority in developing the test program and in analyzing the results. We use two outstanding consulting firms in this work -- Camp, Dresser, and McKee, and Garrity and Miller.

Eight months of field tests and laboratory analyses of samples taken from the three subsurface aquifers to a depth of ninety-five feet below the surface of the site at some points, the refuse layer, and the vents that have been installed to release methane gas from the refuse, confirm the presence and location of PCB's.

The PCB's are predominantly located in a matrix of waste oil which is floating on the surface of the ground water in two pools eight to ten feet beneath the surface in the northwest sector of the site and

in another smaller area along the southern part of Kapkowski Road. The refuse in contact with the oil is undoubtedly contaminated too.

Mr. Chairman, the areas of contamination on this approximate 125-acre site are principally here (referring to a chart) in the northwest corner and principally here in the southeast corner.

The PCB's themselves range from readings of 100 to almost 5000 parts per million in the oil. Federal and New Jersey law catagorize material contaminated with fifty or more parts per million as hazardous, requiring disposal at an approved site.

One important and very encouraging result from the test program is that no PCB's were found to be volatilizing, that is, escaping into the air.

The tests in the area east of Kapkowski Road, which is partially developed already for marine terminal usages -- and we plan to expand the marine terminal activities there -- the test showed only two isolated areas of contamination, which are capable of being corrected individually, rather than as part of an overall system.

A substantial part of the environmental investigation begun by the Port Authority in late 1981 involved engineering studies of alternative remedial measures. From the systems analyzed, the Port Authority's engineers and consultants recommended the installation of a subsurface drainage trench and pipe system around the perimeter of the site west of Kapkowski Road, which is connected to an onsite treatment plant. This system would control site ground water, prevent offsite migration, and drain off the PCB oil to the treatment plant. There the oil would be separated and disposed of offsite in accordance with Federal and State regulations. The estimated capital cost of such an installation in 1982 ranges from about $6 million to $9 million and bears an annual operating cost of about $360,000.

In August of last year, the findings of the Port Authority and its consultants on the test program and proposed mitigation system were submitted to DEP. Several meetings were held with DEP thereafter.

DEP recommended testing of an alternate mitigation system, and the Port Authority agreed. This would be based upon a system of recovery wells, rather than a perimeter drain system. It would be a series of recovery wells that would pump PCB contaminated oil directly

from the ground. Thus, it is hoped, it would withdraw the free-floating oil more quickly than the perimeter trench system.

However, at the same time, such a system may possibly preclude development of industrial buildings on large areas of the site until the wells have completed the oil recovery task.

Regardless of which mitigation system is adopted, there are additional questions that must be addressed, those deal with the health and safety of workers on the site. By workers, I mean the people who would install and monitor the mitigation system and the people who would build and occupy any industrial facilities on the site. In this regard, we are receiving valuable help from the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health, NIOSH. NIOSH is an agency of the Federal Department of Health and Human Services, and it will play an important role in the events that are going to transpire on Kapkowski Road.

Yesterday, the DEP recommended test recovery well was installed, and the effectiveness of this system of withdrawing the contaminated oil -- the results of that will be available by mid-Summer. If it is then determined that recovery wells are the preferred mitigation system, we will design a full-site system and simultaneously develop, based upon NIOSH specifications, a program to test worker safety and health through simulation of construction activities that would take place on the site.

If recovery wells are found not to be a better mitigation alternative than the perimeter trench system, and DEP approves the perimeter trench system, we will install a 100-foot length of the drainage trench, a prototype of the full system, in the area of worst contamination. NIOSH will monitor this activity and will be able to estimate, based upon the site specific data, the health and safety impacts, if any, related to construction and occupancy of buildings on the site.

All of the testing work is scheduled to be completed by the end of 1983. Then begins the work of designing and installing the approved mitigation system. It is impossible to give a timetable for the completion of all work, but it will certainly carry through all of 1984.

As to future uses of the site and your specific interest in those questions, Mr. Chairman, our direction, as Chairman Sagner has said, is to make the land available for industrial development. The perceptions of manufacturers and developers of the degree of risk involved in locating at the site are critical.

To learn more about these perceptions, and while we perform the onsite tests, the Port Authority will also test the development market. Initially we will contact those developers who had indicated interest in the site before the PCB problem was known. When we know which mitigation system will be used, and if we have solid supporting evidence on the health and safety aspects from NIOSH, we plan to issue a request for development proposals to private-sector developers in industry. We will seek job-intensive industrial development proposals, and based on current timetables, I am hopeful we will have some positive responses from the development community by mid-1984, or on the downside, know that such development is not feasible.

I would add that throughout all of this, we have kept Mayor Dunn and his staff abreast of developments as they have occurred, as we have tried to keep your staff, Mr. Chairman, briefed simutaneously.

I would like to return the floor to Chairman Sagner.

MR. SAGNER: Just to conclude, Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat my earlier commitment that the Port Authority will take remedial action to contain the PCB contaminated oil and to remove it from the site to the degree that it is possible. Of course, we cannot proceed to undertake the mitigation or the development of the site without the concurrence of DEP. We'll seek that agency's continuing guidance and assistance.

In conclusion, and while I have the opportunity, I would like this forum to acknowledge the cooperation and assistance that the Port Authority has received in the past year and a half from the staff at the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, the understanding of the city administration, and our discussions with you and the time that you have taken to go into depth and understanding with us. It is very difficult, in view of the hopes that we all had, but at least in the environment that has been created by the State, by the local government and by you and the Legislature, we are endeavoring to come to some solution. Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESNIAK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have one serious concern regarding the method that may be used for the cleanup in terms of your testimony, Mr. Montanus.

Concerning the possibility that recovery wells may be the method that DEP would require, you said that that may inhibit, delay or prevent development. Can you expand on that?

MR. MONTANUS: Yes, I can, sir. I chose the word "may" very carefully because we don't know. The recovery wells are essentially -- I'll call them a small projection from the ground, maybe six or seven feet-- they may have to have a small building around them to protect them. Depending upon how many of them we need, you could have be dotting the landscape like an Oklahoma oil field, which would preclude, naturally, construction activities and building erection of the site. Now, I don't want to prejudge this, but this is the case we must anticipate.

The first test well on which work began on yesterday will determine how effective this is and how many of these things would be required if that is the chosen mitigation system. If only a handful are required, it will have very little effect on the construction activity on the site. If the landscape is full of them, then it would possibly preclude construction until they finish their job.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESNIAK: What concerns me is that recovery wells were listed as one of the possible methods for mitigation in the April, 1982 Camp, Dressler, and McKee report, and it hasn't been until just recently that the DEP has ordered that we test for the efficacy of recovery wells. How did we lose a year between the initial report and DEP's testing?

MR. MONTANUS: I don't think we've lost a year. Among the many alternative that we and Camp, Dresser, and McKee evaluated, we chose, following their report, and several months went by in this process, the trench and drainage system as the preferred alternative. Frankly, one of its greatest advantages, as we saw it, was that everything was going to be happening subsurface, and there was a much greater potential for the industrial development to go ahead.

I'll let Dr. Sadat comment on the time period for DEP's involvement in this, but after DEP in the fall of last year asked us to try a test well, we didn't have the easiest time in the world finding a contractor who wanted to work in that area. I think our contracting process alone took us almost three to four months, and it was not until yesterday when the contractor got his insurance that he was allowed on the site.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESNIAK: From reading the report, I have ascertained that we really don't know where the origin of the contamination is. Is that correct?

MR. MONTANUS: That is true, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESNIAK: The Port Authority's commitment towards developing this site -- and I really appreciate, Mr. Chairman, your coming here and reaffirming that, because as Mayor Dunn has said on many occasions, and I have said on many occasions, it is vital to not only the City of Elizabeth, but to this area, as you well know and agree with. I am confident that the Port Authority will make every effort to develop the site.

Are there any alternative possibilities in the event that this site becomes not viable because of the test results?

MR. SAGNER: Nothing precludes us from working with local governments in communities that are qualified, and Elizabeth still remains a community that is qualified under the legislation. We still feel very strongly and contrary to the views of some that we should forget about blue-collar work in this region, and that every town and community should be a high-tech center.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESNIAK: We don't have the workers for those jobs right now.

MR. SAGNER: Not only do we not have the workers for those jobs, but we also have to have some amount of high-tech jobs available in every one of the fifty States and subdivisions thereof. There is a need for blue-collar jobs, labor-intensive jobs, particularly in this region. We haven't changed our view on that, and we are ready to work with the community of Elizabeth and other communities in this region. We are willing to explore the alternative that you suggested if we find out that we're at a dead end here. I mean, you go as far as you can

go, but we should not delay forever what started us on this. If we find out that we can't do it--

ASSEMBLYMAN LESNIAK: You would be willing to look at other possible sites in the City of Elizabeth.

MR. SAGNER: Yes, sir. We have already publicly made that statement, and I would like to repeat it here. Our staff has not changed their position that this is an authorized purpose and a very important purpose of the Port Authority.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESNIAK: I want to thank you very much. This problem presents a unique position of environmental concern and economic development at the same time. Generally, we hear that environmental regulations inhibit development. In this case, if we had the environmental regulations that we have, if we had them ten or twenty years ago, it certainly would have enhanced the economic development. So, this is a great example as to why we need environmental controls.

Just let me ask one further question. Do you do continuing ambient air samples on a regular basis?

MR. MONTANUS: Let me ask Eileen. Eileen Daly is the person who worries about this twenty-four hours a day. She is very anxious to have this resolved, too, Mr. Chairman.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESNIAK: Thank you, Eileen.

E I L E E N D A L Y: We are in the process, Mr. Chairman, of developing, in cooperation again with the Department of Environmental Protection, the interim monitoring program for the site, which ultimately will be converted into a permanent monitoring program. As well, once permanent mitigation is installed, we will be doing regular monitoring of the subsurface aquifer on a quarterly basis, the level of oil contamination, and as you mentioned, monitoring the methane vents for air quality.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESNIAK: As of now, it has been determined that there aren't any detectable PCB's, at least in the air.

MS. DALY: That is correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESNIAK: Nor any other volatile, organic, or contaminant that would be of an unusual nature.

MS. DALY: No, as far as the methane vents that we measured for particulates, for PCB volatilization and for toxic volatile organic compounds are concerned, we found none detectable.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESNIAK: Thank you very much. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much, and Mr. Montanus, thank you very much. I am very interested now to hear from DEP regarding their role in this cleanup effort. Dr. Sadat?

D R. M A R W A N S A D A T: Mr. Chairman--

ASSEMBLYMAN LESNIAK: Dr. Sadat, do you have a prepared statement, or are you ready for questions?

DR. SADAT: No, I jotted something down on the way here. Mr. Chairman, I was advised that you were holding this hearing last night, and we really didn't have time to put anything in writing. However, I have been personally involved with that site since I took over my function as the Administrator of the Hazardous Waste/Hazardous Sites Mitigation Administration.

Mr. Chairman, we met with the Port Authority-- I personally met with the Port Authority in August of 1982, at which time they submitted to us the Camp, Dresser, and McKee cleanup program, as well as other documents concerning this site.

The site is extremely difficult to deal with. From a technical point of view, in my estimation, it is one of the most difficult sites to clean up, mainly because we have a very shallow aquifer, which means that we can't induce a very large potential in any of the recovery wells or in a trenching system. In addition, the oil has been detected as extremely viscous. It is similar to bunker oil, and therefore, does not move very readily through the combination of soil and refuse which has been dumped at the site.

When we met with the Port Authority in August, we suggested that although eventually the trench system would recover most of the oil, and we are talking about large quantities of oil, Mr. Chairman -- we are not talking about just a few thousand gallons -- we are talking about a few million gallons. We suggested that possibly we should look at recovery wells to accelerate the process of recovering the oil since obviously for the oil to travel through the mass of soil and

refuse to the peripheral French drain system is a process which may take some time. We felt that maybe we should look at the possibility of installing recovery wells. I can assure you that we are really at the edge of technology in terms of recovery systems. I am not aware of too many other sites where anything of this magnitude has been undertaken, and I have to tell you that we have been extremely impressed by the professionalism of the Port Authority and their consultant.

At this time, we are also conducting a program in connection with EPA and the cleanup at Kinbuck with Dr. Pindue at Princeton University. The problems are somewhat similar in nature. We would hope to have some additional results, and we are going to be looking at both recovery wells and a drainage system. We are going to be doing some extensive mathematical modeling. In fact, Dr. Pindue is in the process of putting together the model, and we would hope that we could use some of these results and convey these results to the Port Authority to assist them in their cleanup program.

It is an extremely complicated cleanup program; however, I feel that the site can be decontaminated. I am almost positive that it can be decontaminated. We have seen no evidence of any public health threat at this point. The emissions of volatile organics and PCB are negligible, and we are indeed very fortunate that PCB has an affinity to go into solution in oil. Therefore, most of the PCB's are, in effect, in the oil matrix.

In addition to that, we feel that with respect to development, the Port Authority should certainly have the option and should very seriously consider proceeding with the development of the eastern part of the site since the eastern part of the site, although there is one pool of oil on the site, is not an extensive problem. Possibly this is something the the Port Authority would want to consider.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESNIAK: I think their position was that-- Mr. Montanus, can you join us? I was going to respond for you, but could you respond to that possibility?

MR. MONTANUS: Yes, I believe the question was the development of the eastern side of the site. The site is roughly divided in half by Kapkowski Road.

As you recall, Mr. Chairman, the Port Authority originally bought the property for marine terminal expansion. The development plan was from the Newark bay side, or the east westward. The eastern portion of the site has already been developed for marine terminal usage. There are three tenants there now who have to have access to the water, and they have that from the eastern part of the site. The rest of the site has been surcharged to accept warehouses that require 500 pounds per foot loading. That surcharge is on the site now, and development plans are ready to go, including eight warehouses there. So, that eastern part of the site is very much needed for our marine terminal purposes.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESNIAK: For warehousing purposes.

MR. MONTANUS: Yes, and other marine-related activities.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESNIAK: Not the type of labor-intensive manufacturing that is to be developed.

MR. MONTANUS: No, not manufacturing.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESNIAK: Okay, thank you.

DR. SADAT: Mr. Chairman?

ASSEMBLYMAN LESNIAK: Is that it? Is that all there is? Thank you very much, Dr. Sadat.

I don't know where to begin. The recovery well system, and we're really talking as you said about basically a new process in terms of recovery -- how long would you expect it to be before it can be determined whether that type of recovery system will be sufficient to satisfy the Department?

DR. SADAT: I think the tests themselves should be conducted probably on a period of no longer than thirty days. Then the data has to be analyzed.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESNIAK: Thirty days after the drilling.

DR. SADAT: The drilling is completed. It is my understanding that the well is in place already, Mr. Chairman.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESNIAK: Is that correct?

MR. MONTANUS: It was started yesterday. This is not a very extensive field operation.

DR. SADAT: The contractor is on board, right?

MS. DALY: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESNIAK: So, you would think that the test results would not take that long a period of time.

DR. SADAT: No, the test program -- thirty days of testing, of pumping, and after that, analyzing the data. It would seem to me that the mid-Summer date that has been given by the Port Authority is certainly reasonable.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESNIAK: And, what criteria would you use to determine whether this is the method, or what criteria would you use to reject, for instance, the drainage method?

DR. SADAT: I think we have to look at-- I want to make one thing very clear. We certainly would have approved the French drain system. We had no objection in approving it. We suggested the recovery system because possibly this would accelerate the decontamination.

ASSESMBLYMAN LESNIAK: Accelerate the decontamination, but delay the development.

DR. SADAT: Not necessarily. I think it depends on how many recovery wells you are going to need. Conceivably, at one point we tried one recovery system where a series of well points were drilled very rapidly, and that recovery system worked very well, except we were dealing with oils which were much, much more viscous than the material we understand is at the Kapkowski Road site. It is going to require a large number of wells, I think.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESNIAK: That means it flows--

DR. SADAT: It flows more readily. The oil, we understand from the Port Authority, has a consistency of almost molasses, and it doesn't flow very readily. So, the recovery system may not prove to be effective. It may prove to be effective on a very small diameter which means that we need a very large number of wells. It is a very complicated technical problem.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESNIAK: What happens in that event?

DR. SADAT: At that point what the Port Authority is going to have to look at basically is cost effectiveness. Do we have an oil recovery system where we are going to need such a large number of wells that it becomes uneconomical?

ASSEMBLYMAN LESNIAK: Could the development proceed if the drainage system was approved?

DR. SADAT: I see no reason why it could not proceed if we were to ensure ourselves that together with NIOSH and EPA that we could make sure that we had isolated any possible emanations from the soil, any possible volatilization of the oil coming through the soil. It could proceed, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESNIAK: But, you're not assured of that as of yet.

DR. SADAT: No, I'm not assured of that, although I think technically it can be done.

MR. MONTANUS: If I may interrupt Dr. Sadat and comment on that, Mr. Chairman, in my testimony I said, too briefly perhaps, that if we do the perimeter trench drainage system, this is where NIOSH comes in quite heavily, because we will put in a hundred foot test section, which literally means putting workers on the site and digging holes to lay the pipe in the trench. The trench will be twenty to twenty-five feet deep. It is going through the refuse layer in which the PCB's may or may not be at that given time and at that given place. We will monitor each of the worker's health. We will, in effect, have a laboratory on the site while that test is going on.

So, what Dr. Sadat just alluded to is the necessary precautions that will take place, even if this system we all agree upon today was going to start tomorrow. That is the absolutely essential next step in this process.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESNIAK: I have one last question. Dr. Sadat, when the test results come in, how long a period of time do you think will pass before we have a decision?

DR. SADAT: Probably no more than two to three weeks. We have been very good in turning these projects around, I can assure you, Mr. Chairman.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESNIAK: I know that I need not impress upon you our concern that this be done as quickly as possible, that the Department gives a priority to this, because not only is this an environmental concern, but it is an economic concern. It is something that we anticipate with great optimism.

DR. SADAT: We are very sensitive to that site, Mr. Chairman. I can assure you that we have worked very closely with the Port Authority. We have had nothing but cooperation from them. Of course, our concerns are a little different. Our concern is to protect the environment; however, I can tell you that we have had excellent cooperation from the Port Authority.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESNIAK: Thank you, Dr. Sadat and Mr. Montanus. The public hearing is closed.

(Hearing concluded)