

TRANSCRIPT
OF THE
PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
ON THE
PROPOSED PLAN FOR THE SOIL REMEDIATION PROBLEM
AND PROPOSED ALTERNATIVES
[PCB CLEANUP]

By the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Held at the Tanapag Elementary School
Tanapag Village, Saipan
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands

July 11, 2001

Recorded and Transcribed by:
JUDICIAL SERVICES, PLUS
2nd Floor, Sablan Bldg., Chalan Piao
P. O. Box 500051

Saipan, MP 96950
(670) 235-7585
TANAPAG VILLAGE, SAIPAN, CNMI

July 11, 2001

MR. PETER ADLER: Good evening everybody, if I could get your attention, we'll begin this. I want to thank all of the people of Tanapag for coming to this meeting tonight. I want to thank also the Commissioner of Schools and the Tanapag school for allowing us to use this room. We are here at a public information meeting to talk about the soil remediation problems and alternatives. And that's our focus tonight. That's our purpose.

My name is Peter Adler. I live in Honolulu, Hawaii. I have been asked by the Army Corps of Engineers to serve as a Moderator tonight. I told the Corps of Engineers I'm happy to do this role, but in my job tonight, I'm going to do my very best to be impartial and to try to help us have a very good productive meeting.

I do this kind of work. I work for a small organization called the Hawaii Justice Foundation and I do a lot of this work as a Moderator and as a Facilitator. So, that's my job tonight and I will try to do this with great honor and great integrity in the best the way I know how.

Our meeting tonight has really three purposes. The first one is to communicate, to give the Army Corps some time to communicate to you the alternatives that they have developed. The study that they've done and the nine alternatives they've looked at. Second, to talk about their preferred alternative. They have a preferred alternative and tonight they want to talk

about that with you. But the third part of this is perhaps the most important, and that is for you to talk to the Army Corps of Engineers about your views and your ideas about the soil remediation. So, I see that as my job tonight, is to make sure that the Army Corp hears your comments but that you also hear what they have to say.

I want to start also by acknowledging the frustrations with this. This has been a long time coming and I'm new to the situation, but I -- yesterday we spent the day talking to many people and we feel the frustration. So we know that. I want to acknowledge that the frustration exists, we know it exists, and tonight I hope we can help create a meeting that helps us bring us closer to solutions. So, that's our goal. Those are our purposes.

I know every one in this room has probably been to a meeting that did not work well. Meetings where nobody had a chance to ask the right questions that would help them get information. Meetings where one or two people just dominated everything and they never got a chance to make their comment. Meetings where questions didn't get asked, information didn't get given. So I hope tonight we can avoid that. I hope we can have a very straightforward and important conversation tonight, a true dialogue, a true discussion about it and make sure that we don't leave here more confused than when we came in. So, that's my goal and, again, I will do this the best way I know how.

I want to go over with you the agenda for tonight

and we put some of these things on the wall, and you'll see over here on this sheet it describe the agenda for the meeting and let me tell you what that says because it's hard to read without a telescope I think.

When I'm done, I'm going to introduce Colonel Ronald Light who's with the Army Corp of Engineers and he's going to talk to you for a few minutes, bring you background, and kind of talk about what has brought us to this moment and he has some important comments that he's going to make. He's going to talk for just a few minutes. We're not going to have long speeches tonight.

When he's done, Michelle Rogow, who's with the Environmental Protection Agency and is the On-Scene Coordinator, is going to talk about EPA's role. The role that they play in this.

When Michelle is finished, Charles Adams, who is the Project Manager for this, is going to present the nine alternatives and talk in depth about some of those alternatives, and the strengths and weaknesses of each of the ones that are most important for us to think about tonight.

So, those are the presentation part and then we're going to open it up for discussion and I would like to try to do the discussion in two phases. The first phase is simply for questions for information and clarification. We know that you have many comments to make and we want to hear those comments, but before we take those comments, we want to make sure that people who have technical questions or questions that can be answered for clarification get those answered first.

Then, second, we open it up for whatever comments you want to make.

Finally, when we're done, we will bring this meeting to a close and we'll talk a little bit about what some of the next steps are. So, that's the plan for the meeting tonight. I hope this will be a discussion in a dialogue, I hope we can do that, and I hope also that we will stay here together until everybody has had a chance to speak. Tonight, we will stay here until everybody who wants to, has had a chance to say what they want to say tonight.

We have a translator here, where's Florence? Florence Kirby who will help us and please if you're having a hard time understanding, stop us and Florence can help us with that, or if you want to sit near Florence, if you feel like you need some help with the language, please sit next to Florence or Florence will move to you. We can do this informally. And Florence is fluent in both Chamorro and Carolinian.

We also have our transcribers and we're going to be keeping two records of this meeting. One is the microphones which have been set up along these tables are going to make a recording and they're going to make a transcript of it, and they is Judicial Services, Plus and we have with us tonight Celina Concepcion and Vicky Fitial. Could you just identify yourselves and thank you for coming and helping us with this tonight. So we're going to have a transcript made of the meeting.

And, we also have my colleague from Honolulu Diane Ley and you're going to see her, when we take questions and comments, writing some of those things down so we

have just a running record of what was said and everybody can kind of follow the train of the conversation.

Just a few more thoughts and then we'll begin. Tonight, we're going to be talking about matters of the mind, but we're also talking about matters of the heart here tonight and we know that we come to this room with many different views and with controversies sometimes.

So, I'm going to ask us to try to do things with civility and courtesy, because if we don't do that, people will not hear each other and the most important thing to happen tonight is people to hear each other, not to agree. We don't look for agreement tonight. We are not taking a vote. We're not doing that. But what's really important is that the Army Corps hears what you have to say and that you hear what they have to say even if we disagree. So, I ask for your help with that and I ask you to do three things. One is to listen hard even when you disagree. Even if you disagree, you listen just to hear it. Second, I ask you please not to interrupt other people when they're speaking, particularly if you disagree. And, finally, I'm going to ask you when we open it up for comments to just speak once before everybody -- not to speak twice before everybody else has had a chance to speak at least once so that we really can get everybody's views.

Are these rules okay? Can we use this, can we try this tonight? I would appreciate it if you would allow us to do that and I think it will be a good meeting. Yes, sir?

MR. BENIGNO SABLAN: Mr. Adler, thanks for coming

here tonight. I was asked by TAG that this whole proceeding will be translated in Chamorro and in Carolinian. I'm asking the Translator to translate everything you say.

MR. ADLER: Okay. Thank you. Now, let me introduce the Colonel. You're also going to be hearing some other people tonight, he may ask other people to come in and we'll introduce them later on. Colonel Light?

COL. LIGHT: Thank you very much. Well, ladies and gentlemen, I've got some prepared remarks, I hope you can bear with me as I read them. As Mr. Adler said, I'll only speak a few minutes regarding some things I'd like to share with you to kind of set the tone for tonight's meeting.

My name is Lt. Col. Ronald Light, I'm the District Engineer and the Commander of the Honolulu Engineer District in Honolulu, Hawaii, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. I want to thank you for taking the time to be here tonight. I hope you can hear me, we've got the air conditioners running and the fans and I hope it doesn't get too hot in here and we can get done with what we need to do.

I'm going to echo some of the things that Mr. Adler said so I hope you'll bear with me if I'm a little bit of repetitive, but I want to make sure that you understand where the Corps of Engineers and where I'm coming from tonight.

MR. ADLER: Colonel?

COL. LIGHT: Yes.

MR. ADLER: Florence is going to try and do a

little translation as you read, so if you'll read a little bit and then stop and let her translate? Is that the way you want to do that?

TRANSLATOR: Yes.

MR. ADLER: Okay, all right, you want to sit here?

COL. LIGHT: The purpose of tonight's meeting is to provide you a forum to tell us what you think of our proposed plan to remove PCBs from the village of Tanapag. I know, we know that there has been much discussion about our proposal locally and tonight we want to hear about that from you. I should note that the federal law mandates that we develop a proposed alternative to clean up the PCBs in Tanapag Village and we have done that.

TRANSLATOR: Excuse me, Colonel?

COL. LIGHT: Uh-huh?

TRANSLATOR: I'll translate it in Carolinian.

COL. LITE: Pardon me? Okay, all right, if you'll bear with me, we have two translations we need to do.

MS. RUTH TIGHE: Excuse me. My understanding is that most of the people who have lived in Tanapag speak Chamorro, not Carolinian. I think translating it into Carolinian is unacceptable.

TRANSLATOR: I'm sorry?

MS. RUTH TIGHE: I think translating it into Carolinian unacceptable.

TRANSLATOR: I'm sorry, it's just a request.

MR. VICTORINO IGITOL: No, there's people here that speak Carolinian and they would like to hear that from a -- have a background, ah.

MR. ADLER: Let's allow translation in both

languages for this portion, the remarks, they're not too long and it won't take a long time and if it will help people understand, that's important tonight. Ma'am, we appreciate your forbearance as we do that. It's not something that we planned to do, two languages, thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Adler, we can't hear you.

MR. ADLER: I thank the lady for her forbearance as we translate it into two languages.

COL. LIGHT: I want to emphasize that we have selected a proposed alternative, we have not made a final decision. I'm going to say that again. We have selected a proposed alternative as we are told to do under federal law, but we have not made a final decision. The U.S. EPA will make the final determination regarding the proposed selection that we select -- proposed alternative we select.

I want you to know that neither I nor my staff have all the answers tonight. Let me say that again. I want you to know that neither I nor my staff have all the answers tonight. We have however put forth what we consider to be a good faith effort to devise a solution to remove the PCBs from Tanapag safely and as quickly as possible. If you think we've missed something, please tell us tonight. We are here to listen to you and we'll answer your questions. If we don't know the answer to a question you raised, we will tell you so. Everything you say will be recorded as was noted and the comments you make tonight and the comments we receive from you through the 3rd of August will help us determine if we have selected the right method to clean

up the PCBs in Tanapag.

I know the PCB contamination in Tanapag Village has frustrated and angered many of you. When I was here last September, I pledged to Governor Tenorio that the Corps would excavate PCB contaminated soil in Tanapag Village by All Souls Day. In cooperation with you, the DEQ, and I'm happy to note the DEQ is here tonight, and the U.S. EPA, we did that. In fact, we spent over \$10 million so far on the site and we excavated and stockpiled 20,000 tons of soil.

Now, we need to devise a solution to remove PCBs from Tanapag and I ask you tonight to tell us what you think the best way to do that is. I hope you will stay at this meeting tonight until all of your issues have been heard.

I know the communication has not been great between all parties involved in the effort to remove the PCBs from Tanapag Village in the past. I cannot do anything about the past. However, I am committed to focusing on the future and building new relationships to resolve this matter. That's what the Corps wants, that's what the EPA wants, that's what Greenpeace wants, that's what the CNMI DEQ wants, and I believe that's what you want. I hope you will give us a chance to understand what you want tonight.

In a moment, Ms. Michelle Rogow from the U.S. EPA, one of our partners in this effort, will speak to you about EPA's role. Following this, Mr. Charles Adams, a new member of my staff, will present you with the alternatives we have considered to remove PCBs from Tanapag. We recently hired Charles so one person could

devote full time to this site. Following Charles' presentation, we will open the floor up for your comments and questions.

Again, I do not have all the answers. We are here to learn from you and I truly believe my staff, the EPA, and others have come with open minds to make this process work. Now, let me present Ms. Rogow.

MS. ROGOW: Good evening everyone, how are you doing? You haven't taught me enough for me to be able to address you in Chamorro and....

TRANSLATOR: You have to speak slow and then-

MS. ROGOW: ...[unintelligible]. You need to teach me more. Obviously, I haven't been here long enough.

Hi, my name is Michelle Rogow and I'm the project manager from U.S. EPA who is assigned to oversee the Tanapag PCB clean up.

I'm here tonight to listen to the presentation on the transportation, treatment, and disposal alternatives being presented by the Army Corps, as well as to listen to the public, your comments on these alternatives.

U.S. EPA is currently conducting an independent review of these alternatives and you will also be provided our comments within this public comment period to the Army Corps of Engineers.

EPA will be responsible for review and approval of the final treatment and disposal remedy for this site.

We encourage your cooperation and participation as we move ahead towards a final solution for the Tanapag PCB clean up and I want to thank you all for coming. It's

been a pleasure to work with you. Thank you.

MR. ADLER: Mr. Charles Adam is going to talk to you now about the options, the 10 alternatives and also about five of those specifically and rather than having translation, this piece of paper is in the back and you should have all the material here. I want to see if we can allow Mr. Adams to make his presentation, and then answer questions in Chamorro and Carolinian because otherwise it will take very long and some of this is technical, he's going to try and speak in as simple a way as possible-

MR. SABLAN: [through the Translator]. Senor Adler, because it is -- because of the fact that it's very technical, that's why we want it translated into Chamorro or Carolinian. It's the only way that we can understand all those....

MR. ADLER: We will do it then.

MR. SABLAN:technical words and it's the only way we can also respond and cooperate if we understand.

MR. ADLER: We will do it then. Okay, so Charles, you're going to have to take it in little bite size pieces and let Florence translate as you go along.

MR. ADAMS: Okay, my name is Charles Adams. I'm the new project manager for the Corps of Engineers and I'm in charge of the removal of PCBs from Tanapag. My presentation is a little technical, but we'll try and go through it at least slow and hopefully it won't be a problem. Everybody should have the handout, anybody who doesn't have the handout will just -- it's up here on the board too.

TRANSLATOR: There are a couple microphones here

and the lady wants to see if you can hold it up so they can hear you.

MR. ADAMS: I don't think they -- they....

MR. ADLER: No, these microphones are only for recording.

COL. LIGHT: Yeah, they're only for recording. So they won't -- Charles, why don't you move up here, I'll move this microphone.

MR. ADAMS: Okay. Good evening. My name is Charles Adams and I'm the new project manager for the Corps of Engineers. I'm in charge of cleaning up the PCBs in Tanapag and removing them from back to the island -- back to the mainland. My slide presentation was passed out to everyone.

TRANSLATOR: They hired you for what?

MR. ADAMS: To remove the PCB from Tanapag. Ah-

TRANSLATOR: I'm sorry, I haven't translated in Carolinian yet.

MR. ADAMS: You didn't? ...[chuckling].

...[Translation].

...[Applause].

MR. ADAMS: I got so much applause there...[laughing]. The first thing that we had to do was we had to do a focused feasibility study which outlined all the possible ideas and all the ways to get rid of the PCBs and then....

...[Translation].

TRANSLATOR: Feasibility study?

MR. ADAMS: Focused feasibility -- well, focused feasibility.

...[Translation].

TRANSLATOR: To remove the PCB?

MR. ADAMS: Yes, remove them.

TRANSLATOR: I'm sorry, you have to repeat that again.

MR. ADAM: The reason we did the focused feasibility was to make a list of all of the possible treatment, possible remedial actions.

After we did the focused feasibility study, we listed all the good parts, the bad parts; like what was the good and the bad. Several of them follow that being a very good idea, but some of them were obviously not possible to do. So, what we did was we took 10 criteria. The criteria were based on EPA's rules and the threshold criteria, the first two, every possibility was put up and was evaluated against the criteria. The threshold criteria....

TRANSLATOR: I'm sorry, I haven't translated in Carolinian.

MR. ADAMS: Okay, with...[unintelligible].

TRANSLATOR: ...[unintelligible].

MR. ADAMS: Okay.

...[translation].

MR. ADAMS: If it didn't pass the first two, it's eliminated. It means the threshold criteria then it's eliminated from. Because the first two are overall protection of human health and the environment. The second one is compliance with the laws and regulations of the U.S. Government.

The next column the possibilities on the left were evaluated against the technical criteria by the Corps of Engineers which is this stuff here. The technical

criteria are how long it will last, reduction of toxicity, short term effectiveness, ease of instruction and costs which are all checked against them. That's where we are today. We're at that level. We made a list of what we think, you know how far we are now down the list and that's a lot of cost.

Now, the next page over here, this page, these are the 10 alternatives that we studied. Some of them didn't pass the threshold, some of them are like experimental so we kind of eliminated those, so we're down to five now that we have a...[unintelligible].

Okay, now I guess we'll talk about the five that are left.

Alternative No. 1 is no action or on site encapsulation...[unintelligible]. This one though really doesn't meet the EPA criteria either, but we don't -- this doesn't meet all of the original ones either, but we have to leave it because it's what may happen. We have to make a decision--

TRANSLATOR: I'm sorry, you have....

MR. ADAMS: Yeah, I'm sorry. We'll just move on to the next one. Then the second alternative is off-site disposal. We'll take it all back to the mainland and do something with it there. This will take a very long time though. That's a big problem with that....

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, you have to speak up.

MR. ADAMS: This will take a long time to do. Maybe four years.

TRANSLATOR: About how many?

MR. ADAMS: Four, four plus years. Alternative 2B, off-site encapsulation with stabilization.

TRANSLATOR: What is encapsulation, what is this?

MR. ADAMS: Encapsulation means you put them in capsules.

TRANSLATOR: Encap?

MR. ADAMS: Yeah, cover them with-

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Use a permanent....

MR. ADAMS: You surround them.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Permanent covering.

MR. ADAMS: Permanent covering. Alternative 3B, on-site treatment by incineration.

TRANSLATOR: Incinerate? To burn?

MR. ADAMS: Burn, yes. This has some bad parts, it's not as safe as some of the other things because of dioxins. We have stack emissions that we have to monitor very closely.

TRANSLATOR: I'm sorry?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We still can't hear.

MR. ADAMS: This one has some drawbacks and it's not as safe as some of the other systems.

TRANSLATOR: Which one?

MR. ADAMS: ...[unintelligible], the incineration.

TRANSLATOR: This one?

...[translation].

TRANSLATOR: And, so what?

MR. ADAMS: It makes dioxin, a lot of stack emissions.

TRANSLATOR: This makes dioxin?

MR. ADAMS: Chemical that causes cancer also. It can be a gas when it comes out of the -- or it's a powder or something.

Alternate 4e is on-site treatment by indirect

thermal desorption and off-site disposal which is off-island disposal of the residue of the PCBs.

...[translation].

TRANSLATOR: What is ITD?

MR. ADAMS: Indirect thermal desorption.

...[translation continued].

MR. ADAMS: Yeah, we bake the soil, we make the gas, all the PCBs to turn to gas.

TRANSLATOR: Okay.

...[translation continued].

MR. ADAMS: Okay, then we collect all of the PCBs and ship them back to the mainland. This is proposed plan that we, the Corps of Engineers, selected to perform, the best -- this is what we propose to do is to bake the soil and send all the PCBs back to the mainland. And this alternative best meets the first criteria, the criteria -- this alternative best meets the first seven criteria.

...[translation].

TRANSLATOR: The first criteria? The threshold?

MR. ADAMS: The first seven.

...[translation continued].

MR. ADAMS: And, that's kind of the end of my part of it, if there's any question on how any of those, why, how they met the criteria, we can discuss those with you.

MR. ADLER: I want to thank you for your patience as we went through this, it took a long time, and what we want to do now is open it up for your discussion and we want to do this in two parts. First, we want to answer questions for information, not for comments,

then we've done that, we can answer your technical questions then we'll take all your comments. And, Diane is going to write those down, we will record those, and we will capture that. This is the discussion and dialogue part, but first questions for information.

TRANSLATOR: First questions and what's that? Comment?

MR. ADLER: First questions is fine. Just for clarification. In other words, if the people understand or they don't. Tomorrow from 11:00 o'clock to 4:00 o'clock -- 6:00.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICES: 6:00.

MR. ADLER: 11:00 to 6:00, Charles and others from the Army Corps will be available at the Clinic to review these alternatives in more detail and to talk more about their preferred alternative, if anybody wants to follow ...[unintelligible]. Okay, does anybody have questions of a technical nature that they would like clarification on?

COL. LIGHT: Yes. Yes, sir?

MR. WHITE: Yes. On off-site disposal? Your briefing chart says 10 months and Charlie says four years. I'm confused.

...[translation].

TRANSLATOR: How many -- what does the chart say?

MR. WHITE: The chart says 10 months.

...[translation continued].

COL. LIGHT: That's a good point. With funding, if I had \$18,456,000 today, we think it would take about 10 months to take the soil, put them in bags, put

them in ocean going containers, get transport for it and send it to the U.S. mainland.

...[Translator and Col. Light - verification on funding -- translation continued].

COL. LIGHT: The Honolulu District has 503 FUDS sites, Tanapag is a FUDS site, so it is one of 503 sites. I get \$5 million a year for those sites. It's going to take a while to give you this answer, but -- okay.

...[translation].

TRANSLATOR: FUDS sites?

COL. LIGHT: FUDS sites. Sites like Tanapag. I get \$5 million a year for those sites.

TRANSLATOR: For all of them?

COL. LIGHT: Yes.

...[translation].

COL. LIGHT: And those sites are all in the Pacific. To do this....

TRANSLATOR: Oh, I'm sorry.

COL. LIGHT: I'm sorry.

...[translation continued].

COL. LIGHT: To do this alternative, I need to get \$5 million, plus the difference, \$13 million. We think that would take between three or four years to get authorization for that money. That's the problem. I don't have that money in a bank account right now.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Adler?

...[unintelligible].

MR. HERBERT SOLL: The recommendation that Mr. Adams made was the fifth one and that would be the on-site treatment by ITD and off-site disposal. You put

on there five months at a cost of six and three quarter million dollars. Does that mean it would really take two and a half years and not five months because of the allocation of funds?

COL. LIGHT: I've got 5 million right now, 5 to 6 million I think I can apply to a solution. I think I can get two or three million from my Headquarters a lot easier than I can get and a lot quicker than I can get 12 or 13 million. So, once we have the money, we can do -- we think we can do under that alternative remediation within a year. We miss the -- could you restate your question again?

MR. SOLL: I said that the recommended alternative is a, as I said would be done in five months at a cost of six and three quarter million dollars. Does that mean the same formula that you apply to the complete removal solution that it would take about two and a half years to do that?

MR. ADLER: So would it take two and a half years to implement this solution?

MR. SOLL: Solution No. 5.

MR. ADLER: Solution No. 5. That was the question.

TRANSLATOR: At a cost of \$3 million, right, Judge?

MR. SOLL: Six and three quarters of a million.

TRANSLATOR: It was a compound....

COL. LIGHT: Question?

TRANSLATOR: No, statement. I don't remember the second part.

MR. ADLER: He was asking if it would take two and

a half years to be able to secure the \$6 million. If I understand your question.

MR. SOLL: Right, using the same formula that the 10 month estimate would really take four years?

MR. ADLER: And the answer was, no, you have the money now or at least most of that.

COL. LIGHT: I have about \$6 million now that I can apply to all 503 of my sites. Okay, this site has got some priority that I could get additional three or so million dollars and put that money against this site. The \$5 million that I get a year again has got to be apportioned to all sites, all 503 sites, not all 503 sites are sites we are working on.

...[translation].

TRANSLATOR: Right? The \$5 million apply to all sites?

COL. LIGHT: Yes.

TRANSLATOR: And then?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: ...[unintelligible - whispered].

COL. LIGHT: The money that I get every year goes to work on the sites that we have in progress. Tanapag is one of those sites. Because of the difficulty of getting additional funds, it may take up to three or four years to get all the funds to execute that alternative.

TRANSLATOR: Because of the difficulty in getting?

COL. LIGHT: Because of the difficulty.

TRANSLATOR: To get all the funds?

COL. LIGHT: Yes. To get the balance of the funds.

TRANSLATOR: How many years?

COL. LIGHT: Three to four years.

TRANSLATOR: I'm sorry.

...[unintelligible discussion].

SENATOR PETE REYES: Maybe it would help if they -
- first agree what, what's happening here so, so we
don't get further confused.

MR. ADLER: I think, yeah, I think you're right,
Senator. We want to make sure that the question is
asked right and that the answer gets right so we don't
get a lot of confusion.

MS. TIGHE: Can I -- can I try to trans -- what
Herb asked was this proposal up there says it would
take 10 months but the Colonel said because there isn't
any money it's going to take four years. So, then Herb
said there's another proposal and it's for six million
and it's only going to take four months or five months.

MR. SOLL: That's on their information.

MS. TIGHE: Yeah, it says six million and five
months but he doesn't have the money, does that mean
just like that one it says 10 months but it's four
years, that this one says five months but it's going to
be two and a half years.

COL. LIGHT: And the answer is....

MS. TIGHE: That's the question that he asked. In
other words, is the same thing going to happen with
this one, on paper it says five months when it's
actually going to take two and a half years because
there isn't any money, okay? So that's the question.
And what the answer is that is my problem.

COL. LIGHT: Okay. I have between \$5 to \$6

million right now that I could apply to Tanapag. I think I could get in a four- or five-month period of time an additional three or four million for this site with relative ease. I don't think I could get....

MS. TIGHE: Right, 18 million.

COL. LIGHT:18 million. There's \$200 million-

MS. TIGHE: So in other words, the answer is now it's not going to take two and a half years because he thinks he knows...[unintelligible].

COL. LIGHT: That's the answer, correct.

MS. TIGHE: ...[unintelligible].

COL. LIGHT: I'm sorry it's taking me so long or taking us so long.

MR. ADLER: Florence, did you -- can you translate that or is that--

TRANSLATOR: They have to repeat it by sentence, I cannot translate everybody talking and you know, in such long sentences.

MR. ADLER: It's hard.

TRANSLATOR: It's very hard.

MR. ADLER: You're doing a great job.

MR. SABLAN: [through the Translator]. Can I make a suggestion? Can we ask you, the federal government, to please get yourself -- get your act together, get together for at least five minutes and discuss, talk about what you're going to present, because the way you're presenting it is causing a lot of confusion and, in order to go smoothly, get together and see what you're going to agree on.

MR. ADLER: May I respectfully, if we could let -- part of the problem is we're stopping and we're

answering three or four questions at one time. So, let's take it one piece at a time very slowly so we make sure we get the answer. So I'm going to try and restate the question if I can, is that okay? How long will it take to secure the money to do the off-site disposal.

TRANSLATOR: To do what?

COL. LIGHT: Off site. Taking it away.

MS. TIGHE: That's up there. The same thing there.

MR. ADLER: We're trying to get the two comparisons. Okay, I'll repeat it. We'll work on this one. How long will it take to secure the money to do the on-site treatment and off-site disposal.

COL. LIGHT: I think I can get that money in four to six months. Three to six months. I don't -- I don't know for sure.

MR. ADLER: This is for this alternative. This gentleman had his hands first and then we'll come there. Yes, sir.

MR. PELLEGRINO: I don't understand why Alternative 2, off-site disposal, is \$18 million, yet Alternative 2B, off-site, does this mean off the island or to another village? If this means the off-site encapsulation and stabilization for \$4,460,000, how can this be four and a half times more expensive than alternative 2B?

MR. ADLER: So why, the question is why....

MR. PELLEGRINO: They're both off-site. We're having a problem.

MR. ADLER: Can you tell us which two you're

comparing?

MR. PELLEGRINO: The 2A and 2B.

MR. ADLER: Why is?

MR. PELLEGRINO: They're both off-site, right?

COL. LIGHT: Why is 2A and 2B so different in their costs?

MR. PELLEGRINO: Four and a half times.
...[translation].

COL. LIGHT: This alternative takes the soil, all soil, all PCBs to the U.S. mainland.

TRANSLATOR: The U.S. made?

COL. LIGHT: U.S. mainland.

MR. ADLER: Mainland.

TRANSLATOR: Oh. Takes all the soil?

MR. ADLER: All the soil to the U.S. Mainland.

COL. LIGHT: All the soil.
...[translation continued].

COL. LIGHT: This alternative takes the soil to another site on Saipan.

TRANSLATOR: Off -- on Saipan?

COL. LIGHT: On Saipan.

TRANSLATOR: And take it?

COL. LIGHT: Takes it some place else on Saipan. Takes it out of Tanapag to some place else.

TRANSLATOR: And, what did you say? I'm sorry. You said something after that.

COL. LIGHT: I said this alternative takes the soil out of Tanapag, and moves it some place else in Saipan.

TRANSLATOR: Right.

COL. LIGHT: That sentence.

TRANSLATOR: Yeah.

MR. ADAMS: That's the difference between those two.

COL. LIGHT: That's why the cost is different. And we are not recommending this.

MR. ADLER: Yes, sir.

MR. IGITOL: [through the Translator]. I like Mr. Adam's representation about taking the soil and taking it off island and I like this discussion. I also would like to discuss about the contaminated crabs that were recently found here in Tanapag.

MR. ADLER: We're going to -- I'm gonna -- Diane? I'm going to ask you to write that down and we will come back to the crabs after we talk about the soils so we don't jump across subjects. We'll come back to that subject. We'll come back to that.

MR. IGITOL:[through the Translator]. We already know. We already heard that you're going to take the soil already and you're going to take it to the states so that should be enough, now we want to address the crab problem.

MR. ADLER: Let's see if there's other questions or comments about the soil first.

MR. IGITOL: ...[through the Translator]. For us, it's good that you said you're going to take the soil and you're going to take it away. That's for us here. Second, you have to know about the crabs.

MR. ADLER: Okay, yes, sir? Is this about the soils?

MR. SYLVESTRE IGUEL: Yes, about the crabs, sir. ...[through the Translator]. Sir, how can we -- sir,

we cannot just discuss the soil without also discussing about the crabs because the crabs live in the soil. If we are to discuss about soil alone, then we like to tell you about the alternatives, no?

...[Mr. Iguel continued]. Because these alternatives that you are giving us is to clean up the PCB in the soil. And, there's a report that came out already about crabs being contaminated with PCB, but not only that, also with heavy metals. So, why are you giving us all those options and then hesitate and say wait, we're going to wait for three months, six months for the money. What are you doing?

MR. ADLER: What is the question?

TRANSLATOR: What's going on?

END OF TAPE 1/CONTINUED TAPE 2

MR. ADLER: What's the question? I don't think we're understanding the question, is the question about--

TRANSLATOR: You're giving all the alternatives -- you're giving them different alternatives and then on the same breath, you're saying you're going to wait for the money to get the money. What's going on?

MR. ADLER: Okay. We'll -- let's let the Colonel--

MR. IGUEL: [through the Translator]. Why won't you discuss the crab tonight?

COL. LIGHT: The purpose of tonight's meeting is to discuss what we have proposed to clean up the soil and to get your comments about that. We will also -- the EPA is prepared to discuss the contamination of the crabs, but we felt it was the most -- the reason for the meeting tonight is to discuss how to get rid of the

PCB contamination in the soil.

MR. IGUEL: [through the Translator]. I understand that, sir. I understand, sir, but why are we going to discuss about the soil only when the crab lives in the soil and the spread is continuing.

MR. ADLER: Would you like to speak about the crab issue?

MS. ROGOW: Yeah, I'm still trying to understand the question.

MR. ADLER: I think the question is about what is the status of the crabs, of their contamination, is that the question? She can answer some of the questions maybe about the crabs, if we understand the question.

MR. IGUEL: [through the Translator]. Okay, the bottom line here is what kind of mechanism, what alternatives we are going to take in order to get rid of the PCB.

COL. LIGHT: Exactly.

MS. ROGOW: We're not going to get rid of the crabs. This is not part this.

MR. IGUEL: ...[through the Translator]. I understand that. My point is how can you say that we're going to talk only about the soil when -- I'm sorry. To clean up the PCB when it shows that there are other that are contaminating the soil? Vic, I'm sorry.

MR. IGITOL: Why are we only addressing the -- why are you only addressing the PCB and you're not addressing other contaminants?

COL. LIGHT: We tested the soil for heavy metals

and we found no heavy metals. We found only in the soil, in the berms in the Cemetery II, we found only PCBs.

TRANSLATOR: Ah we, I'm sorry. You test the soil for what?

COL. LIGHT: We tested the soil for heavy metals and all we found is PCBs.

MR. IGUEL: ...[through the Translator]. So, where did these crabs get contaminated, from the ocean? I mean with the heavy metals, from the ocean?

MR. ADLER: Do you want to address that? The crabs?

MS. ROGOW: We did not find any heavy metals of concern in any of the crabs.

SENATOR REYES: Can you explain what is aroclor?

MS. ROGOW: It's a type of PCB.

SENATOR REYES: And none of that was found in the crab?

MS. ROGOW: PCB was found in the crab.

SENATOR REYES: In the crab?

MS. ROGOW: Yes.

SENATOR REYES: And heavy metals was not?

MS. ROGOW: Were not found at levels of concern in the crab.

MR. ADLER: Could you repeat that? PCBs were found in the crab, heavy metals were not found in the crab.

SENATOR REYES: I have a question. I think it's pretty clear that the people have decided that the only alternative is the off-site, the what you call that? The first alternative. The \$18 million, what was that.

It's off-site disposal. I think it's pretty clear that that's the only alternative that the residents are interested to hear and my question is, if that is the case, does the people have to wait another four years and live for the contamination soil, contaminated soil before something is done about it? And, for our people to continue to suffer, to live with the contamination before funding can be secured? Because my understanding is that the solution to, you know the disposal of the soil and the question of whether or not the United States can accept the contaminated soil into the U.S. was an issue and that has been resolved, in my understanding.

So now, the issue is what are we going to do with the soil because the residents here does not want to hear any other, from my understanding and my personal observations that we don't want to hear any other treatment except the best treatment is to take the soil that's contaminated, take it off island and we don't care where you put it.

MR. ADLER: Let's let the Colonel respond if he can.

COL. LIGHT: Sir, the problem all comes down to what I answered this gentleman earlier. I don't have a pot of money in the District to handle all 503 of my sites. The total cost to fix all those sites, Pacific wide, just for my District is \$2.2 billion. As I said to this gentleman, I get about five million a year. The total amount of money that the Department of Defense programs for the Formerly Used, FUDS program, DOD wide is 200 million. Eighteen million, 19 million

is about 10% of it. I can't tell you that I'm going to be able to get that money. That's my dilemma. I don't have a bank account that I can just draw from.

SENATOR REYES: We understand that Colonel. But you have to understand too that the frustration we registered here, we live with this contamination well over 50 years.

COL. LIGHT: Sir, I know that.

SENATOR REYES: In those period, about 15 years, since 1992 I participated in discussion about the clean up of PCB and the next four years, since 1992, it was a denial period where the Army Corps of Engineers is saying we're not responsible, the military says we're not responsible. Now we're hearing that they are responsible. Am I correct?

COL. LIGHT: Sir, we've worked on this site almost continuously since 1990.

SENATOR REYES: But the fact that the military has agreed, the Army Corps has agreed to do the clean up is a suggestion to us that they have admitted they are responsible.

COL. LIGHT: The Army Corps of Engineers is responsible for the clean up. We do not believe the Army Corps of Engineers brought the PCB transformers here and caused this contamination. We don't know who did it. But we agree that we're going to clean it up.

SENATOR REYES: Colonel, what I'm saying is that the fact that the United States Federal Government has agreed, whether it's EPA, we really don't care. Whether it's Army Corps of Engineer, the EPA, we don't want to bother with the technicalities. What we're

interested in is that the U.S. Federal Government has accepted, the fact that they are going to clean it up and therefore it suggests to us that they have been -- they have admitted responsibility in bringing those poison over to the CNMI and leaving it here. The fact that they are putting up money to clean it up is admitting that that's straight forth. I think if the military or the U.S. is not responsible, they're not going to put out a cent to clean this.

MR. ADLER: Senator, I want to thank you for your comment. We have your card. I don't know if we're going to reach an agreement on this, but you made your statement and the Colonel has made his and I want to let other people make comments too. Thank you. Before we ask people twice, I want to let others speak once if we can. Yes?

MS. CAGURANGAN: Sir, are you making it clear that the Army Corps really wants to do an on-site treatment?

COL. LIGHT: Given the alternatives and the-

MS. CAGURANGAN: Uh-huh?

COL. LIGHT: And the screening criteria we looked at, we think that's the quickest and safest way to get rid of the PCBs. It's not the cheapest, it's not the most expensive and it's not the fastest. Yes, we could -- we could -- if it does, what the EPA has asked us to do up there on the screening criteria, the best. We think that's the best.

MR. ADLER: Okay, others? Yes, sir. Sitting, yes, sir.

MR. IGUEL: Just for the record. ...[continued in vernacular -- through the translator]. I want to make

it clear for the record that Michelle is lying. It says here on the record that the crabs are being contaminated with the heavy metals.

MR. ADLER: Yes, sir?

MR. PALACIOS: Col. Light, can we put Alternative 3B up on the screen?

MR. ADLER: 3B.

MR. PALACIOS: Col. Light, Alternative 3B, was that performed here on Saipan by the Army Corps? Was it ever perform here on Saipan by the Army Corps?

COL. LIGHT: Pardon?

MR. PALACIOS: Alternative 3B.

COL. LIGHT: Yes?

MR. PALACIOS: Has it ever been performed here on Saipan with this remediation project?

COL. LIGHT: I don't believe so. I don't think the Army Corps has ever incinerated PCBs on Saipan.

MR. PALACIOS: Okay...[through the Translator]. Then according to this 3B, according to what I read, this means that it's the thermal incineration treatment?

COL. LIGHT: No.

MR. PALACIOS: Oh, I'm sorry, I'm sorry. The thermal incineration is the one that what I'm trying to ask you, has that ever been done here on Saipan?

COL. LIGHT: Thermal?

MR. PALACIOS: Thermal, sir.

COL. LIGHT: Thermal desorption?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Not on site. Not the technology that we're using now. We used a variant of it using low thermal blankets the last time we were

here.

MR. PALACIOS: That's incineration though, right?

COL. LIGHT: No, sir. No sir, it's not burning at all.

MR. PALACIOS: The one that was done by ah, Terra something? What was that technology.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Blanket.

MR. PALACIOS: Blanket.

COL. LIGHT: It's like a heat blanket?

MR. PALACIOS: But that's direct incineration too?

COL. LIGHT: No sir, it's not incineration.

Incineration is burning. It just applies heat to the soil and it volatilizes the chemical.

MR. ADLER: Did that answer your question?

MR. PALACIOS: Yes. Then also on your preferred method.

COL. LIGHT: Okay.

MR. PALACIOS: Okay, on your preferred method. Strictly, how much water will you be using operating this machine?

COL. LIGHT: How much water we'll be using?

MR. PALACIOS: Per minute?

COL. LIGHT: Allen, how much water will you be using on this indirect thermal desorption.

MR. ADLER: Introduce yourself, if you will, whoever is going to answer that.

MR. ALLEN BEAUDIN: Yes, I'm Allen Beaudin. We will use 6,000 gallons per day.

MR. PALACIOS: Okay, so that means that it's 150 gallons per minute broke down to minutes, right? Wouldn't that be around 150 gallons per minute?

MR. BEAUDIN: One hundred fifty gallons per minute was the peak consumption based on....

MR. PALACIOS: If you would go up to peak consumption, then you would consume 150 gallons per minute?

MR. BEAUDIN: The average consumption is 20 gallons.

MR. PALACIOS: You said 7 -- you said 6,000 gallons per day?

MR. GALDON: That's what I said.

MR. PALACIOS: That's rated down to about 150 gallons per minute.

MR. BEAUDIN: 150 gallons per minute is the peak consumption.

MR. PALACIOS: I don't think we have that water here on Saipan. No where. Nobody in Saipan uses a 150 gallons per minute. None. Right as of today, right now, no consumer uses that much water.

MR. ADLER: So your comment is the water may not be available to do that?

MR. PALACIOS: Logistically, yes.

MR. ADLER: Logistically, okay.

MR. PALACIOS: Logistically, you won't be able to perform this treatment here on Saipan.

MR. ADLER: Is the water -- this is an important comment. This is very important. All of these are important. So water is an issue with this.

MR. PALACIOS: Of course, because we don't have water. Sometimes we don't have water to shower or brush our teeth in the morning.

MR. ADLER: I want to take -- yes, Ma'am and then

we'll come over here. Yes?

MS. GLORIA CABRERA: ...[in vernacular].

TRANSLATOR: What is the first alternative, Gloria? Off-site disposal?

TRANSLATOR: Colonel, her question is on Alternative No. 2. Are you recommending that the soil will be -- or 4, will be cleaned and then moved to another site here on island?

COL. LIGHT: This here? On which one?

TRANSLATOR: On 4. Alternative 4.

MS. CABRERA: 4E.

TRANSLATOR: 4E, I'm sorry.

COL. LIGHT: Here?

TRANSLATOR: Yes.

COL. LIGHT: This alternative cleans the soil here, it cleans the soil here with that machine over there and the PCBs goes to the U.S. mainland for disposal and destruction.

TRANSLATOR: The soil stays?

COL. LIGHT: The soil stays here in Saipan. The soil will be cleaned.

MS. CABRERA: ...[through the Translator]. And you can guarantee us 100% that the soil would be free of contamination?

COL. LIGHT: If not, we ship it to the U.S. mainland. So we're going to get the soil -- we're going to get all the soil that we can super, super clean. Soil that we cannot get cleaned, gets packaged up with the PCBs and it goes to the U.S. mainland. We think we will ship, under this alternative, 450 tons of soil out of the 20,000.

MR. ADLER: Okay, do you have other questions.
Yes?

MRS. PELLEGRINO: ...[through the Translator]. I'd like to know what is the effectiveness of all these alternatives, because if they are that effective, can we also know what is the percentage of its effectiveness overall?

COL. LIGHT: Of all of the alternatives?

MR. PELLEGRINO: Each one.

TRANSLATOR: Each alternative.

MR. PELLEGRINO: No. 2, No. 3, No. 4 what is the percentage of effective, are they all equally effective? Or different effectiveness.

MR. ADLER: Are they all equally effective or are they -- do they have different percentages of effectiveness.

COL. LIGHT: The effectiveness is a function of that criteria. If you -- go to the first one. If you look at that one there, cost wise, it's very effective cost wise because it's very cheap, but it doesn't get rid of the PCBs. So it's not effective in that way. There's a balancing that occurs with these criteria to pick the best alternative. And that's what we've tried to do.

MR. ADLER: Colonel, he's asking if you could speak to the effectiveness, I think all five of these, each one in order. Could you do that?

MR. PELLEGRINO: The percentage of success of the removal of PCB. Each one. What is the percentage effectiveness of 1, 2, 3, 4. Not the cost. The effect is the end result the soil being cleaned.

COL. LIGHT: Okay.

MR. PELLEGRINO: Each one is...[unintelligible].

COL. LIGHT: Okay. The no action alternative? It is zero percentage effective. All the PCBs remains.

MR. SABLAN: Could we have that translated? That was a good one.

...[translation].

COL. LIGHT: Zero percent. All the PCBs stay in Saipan.

MS. CABRERA: ...[through the Translator]. So why is it up there as one of the remedies?

COL. LIGHT: Because we are required to go through the process to look at all remedies. We don't think that's the remedy. We are required to do that.

TRANSLATOR: But it's not a remedy?

COL. LIGHT: Can I answer this lady's question?

MR. ADLER: Yeah, let's go through each one in answering his question the best we can and then we'll ask more questions. Let's go to the next.

COL. LIGHT: Off-site disposal, 100% of the PCBs are off of Saipan. Okay, the next one, all here, this is all--

MR. IGUEL: We stop right here.

MR. ADLER: Well, let's let him finish. We want to let him finish answering the question.

COL. LIGHT: 2B, 100% of the PCBs remain on the island. Zero percent effective.

TRANSLATOR: 2B, ah what?

COL. LIGHT: Zero percent effective; all the PCBs stay in Saipan. Okay, all right go to the next one. 3B, it's a 100% effective; no PCBs. Okay? How about

this one. 100% effective. No PCBs on the island.

MS. IGITOL: How can the contamination be taken off island if it's going to be here?

COL. LIGHT: I don't understand, what was the question?

MR. ADLER: What's the question.

TRANSLATOR: Okay, I said, I'm sorry, that this on-site treatment is they clean the soil here, they treat the soil here, the contaminant -- the contamination comes out of the soil, you take that, and get rid of it. The soil stays, but you take the pollution away from here and she said are you sure? Is that possible?

COL. LIGHT: Yes. Yes.

MR. ADLER: Okay, this gentleman and then this gentleman -- I'm sorry, I wasn't sure, okay, first....

MS. URSULA ALDAN: ...[unintelligible].

MR. ADLER: I'm sorry, this lady first, ladies first, then you and then you. Go ahead.

MS. ALDAN: Thank you. Just along the line of Mr. Pellegrino's questioning? Given all the alternatives, can you list us from the top priority listing the safest alternative top to bottom? I think I have two questions; that's No. 1. No. 2, are we given tonight a choice to select which alternative?

MR. ADLER: So two questions. One is what's -- which ones are the safest and your second question is are we here to decide?

MS. ALDAN: To decide.

MR. ADLER: Okay.

COL. LIGHT: Let me answer your question first.

Tonight we're just getting your comments to help us decide what we would recommend to the EPA, where the EPA is going.

MS. ALDAN: You've giving us....

COL. LIGHT: Tonight we're soliciting your comments like we've been getting to help us go back and look at these alternatives and make sure that we've done the right thing. We're not voting tonight or anything.

MS. ALDAN: On that question that No. 4 is the preferred alternative?

COL. LIGHT: This is the preferred alternative that we have selected up until this point. What we've done is to we have taken the alternatives and we run them through the first set of criteria.

MS. ALDAN: I understand. I understand that.

COL. LIGHT: Tonight we're about right there.

MS. ALDAN: Okay. Now, if you were to go back and whatever comments you get from here will hold weight?

COL. LIGHT: Yes, Ma'am. It will. It will. Like if the water thing is an issue, we find that we don't have enough water on Saipan to do that alternative? Then we have to figure out something else.

MS. ALDAN: Can you list now from the top to the bottom the safest alternative?

COL. LIGHT: The safest alternative with respect to getting rid of the PCBs out of Tanapag?

MS. ALDAN: That's No. 4.

COL. LIGHT: That's the safest alternative to get rid of all the PCBs out of Tanapag is 4E.

MS. ALDAN: Alternative 4E.

COL. LIGHT: Yes, Ma'am. The next one would be, go back one, the next one would be the incineration because it generates dioxin, it has a by product. When you burn the PCBs, it has a by product. The least protective of Saipan and the people of Tanapag are the other two because the PCBs are not removed. They are still in the soil. They're just covered. They're actually safer for the Corps of Engineers and for our contractor because we cover it and we walk away. But they're not safe for you.

MS. ALDAN: So, you're saying the Army Corps' decision or preferred alternative is based on the cost?

COL. LIGHT: No, Ma'am, it's based on all that.

MS. ALDAN: Well, the safest is No. 4, yet you chose -- you choose No. 3.

COL. LIGHT: No, Ma'am, we chose No. 4. 4E. Could you go to 4E, please?

MS. ALDAN: I'm sorry. The 4 is to the safest one.

COL. LIGHT: Yes, Ma'am.

MS. ALDAN: But you chose No. 3.

COL. LIGHT: No, Ma'am. This is the one we chose. This is the one we think is the safest and the best to do that criteria. It's not the cheapest.

MR. ADLER: Okay. Did you get your question answered? Do you feel you got your question answered?

COL. LIGHT: I may have confused you.

MR. ADLER: Why don't you restate your question?

MS. ALDAN: I'm confused. The safest is No. 4, Alternative 4E?

COL. LIGHT: Yes, Ma'am.

MS. ALDAN: No. 2 is Alternative 3B?

MR. ADLER: The second safest you're asking?

MS. ALDAN: The second safest.

MR. ADLER: What's the second safest?

MS. ALDAN: Yes.

MR. ADLER: The third safest?

MS. ALDAN: Yes.

MR. ADLER: The fourth safest, okay.

COL. LIGHT: That's the second safest because it gets rid of the PCBs. It burns the PCBs, it destroys it, but in doing that, it creates dioxin, it creates a by product. The other two are safe for us, but they're not safe for you because the PCBs stay in Saipan. They stay in Tanapag. Unless we ship it.

MS. ALDAN: Go ahead, I'll go back -- I mean I'll come back.

MR. ADLER: Okay, this gentleman, then this gentleman. Yes.

MR. FRANK ALDAN: Okay, can we go to Alternative 1, please? I mean Alternative 2? Okay, if, what's this? If the problem there is the cost and you guys can guarantee payment in four years, I think any bank, with a good name, you know the Army Corps of Engineer, any bank on Saipan will loan you the \$18 million to do it tomorrow, you know. Why don't you go on that route? Through that route? Why not don't you try and borrow money if you say that the Federal Government can cough up 18 million in four years, any bank here on Saipan will jump to that, you know that, what's this, opportunity to be given to finance \$18 million to remove the PCB tomorrow. Why don't we ship it out. What's this, if you can guarantee me, I think I,

myself, will be given a loan by the bank if the Federal Government can guarantee that you're to pay in four years. If that's the problem, why don't you go to the bank? You know.

MR. ADLER: Is this a question? Or is it....

MR. ALDAN: That's a recommendation.

MR. ADLER: We'll take it as a question and a recommendation.

MR. ALDAN: And I would like for you guys to give us an answer to that statement.

COL. LIGHT: Can I defer to you on this? Introduce yourself, please.

MR. VINCENT FAGGIOLI: My name is Vincent Faggioli, I'm the District Counsel for Colonel Light. I think the answer to that is this \$18 million is our cost of doing this work. If someone else has \$18 million and would like to do it, then of course they have to get EPA over and go ahead and carry it out, but we certainly couldn't take a loan from the bank with the Corps of Engineers and then repay it over a period of four years. I mean, we are not in that kind of business and we are working trying to move, so the suggestion is that if we can come up with 18 or 19 million dollars now and pay it back over a four year period of time, I'm not talking about 18 million dollars with interest, the bank will charge us another 5 or 6 million dollars interest so the cost is not 18 million. And so this becomes an outrageously expensive alternative.

MR. ALDAN: No, we're talking about the health of the people here.

MR. FAGGIOLI: Sure, we understand that.

MR. ALDAN: And we're trying to get rid of the PCB tomorrow or yesterday...[unintelligible]--

MR. FAGGIOLI: If I could just add, Colonel Light have said some -- certain hazards has to--

UNIDENTIFIED VOICES: Hang on, Vince. Vince. Vince! Wait.

MR. ALDAN: And we are very concerned. Yes, \$5, \$6 million additional cost is not, you know, ah what's this? A burden to the Federal Government.

MR. FAGGIOLI: You can't put a....

UNIDENTIFIED VOICES: Vince, hang on.

MR. FAGGIOLI: You can't put a value on life. I know that.

MR. ALDAN: Right?

MR. SAGYIOLI: Yeah, and our answer is we're just presenting the alternatives that are available to us. Colonel Light has made this the top priority, the No. 1 of all his FUDS sites.

MR. ADLER: We've got your comment as a recommendation. So even though we may not agree on it, we may need to talk about it more.

MR. ALDAN: I think, you know maybe the CNMI Government should look into that, getting a loan that we can guarantee from you people, you know that payment will be forthcoming in four years period. You know, and if you can pay off \$18 million in four years, the bank will jump in, they'll make some money.

COL. LIGHT: May I respond?

MR. ADLER: Yeah.

COL. LIGHT: I don't think we can do that, but

what other places have done, they've had their elected officials put a line item number in the budget and we get specifically targeted for a project those funds. So if the CNMI would like to explore that, if that's a possibility, others have been able to do that. They have said this money is specifically for this issue and then....

MR. ALDAN: Why don't you offer that to the CNMI Government.

COL. LIGHT: Pardon?

MR. ALDAN: Why don't you offer that to the CNMI Government as a remedial alternative, you know? And the CNMI Government, ah what's this, secure a loan and that, what's this, the Federal Government will guarantee annual payment to the loan.

COL. LIGHT: I don't have that authority. I just don't have that authority to do that.

MR. ALDAN: You guys have to discuss that when you go back home.

COL. LIGHT: I will discuss that when I go back home.

MR. ADLER: Yes sir, you were next. Thank you for your patience.

MR. FRANK (?): ...[in vernacular].

TRANSLATOR: Which alternative is that, Frank?

MR. FRANK (?): 4E.

TRANSLATOR: On Alternative 4E, the on-site treatment, if you clean or take the contamination out of the soil and the soil is free of such pollutants, would I be needing fertilizer to re-use the soil?

COL. LIGHT: The soil will be sterile. Introduce

yourself.

MR. CHRIS VAIS: My name is Chris Vais. The answer to your question is that the soil comes out of this process absolutely sterile. In order to grow plants, you would need to add fertilizer and water and other materials to restore its property to grow. Chicken manure, things of that sort can be used to make the soil viable again.

COL. LIGHT: That's a good question, you want to translate that? Did you understand that or do you want me to....

TRANSLATOR: I'll just translate it.

MR. FRANK (?): Yeah, no I understand. I did it because...[unintelligible].

COL. LIGHT: Thank you for asking that, again Florence, do you want to.

...[translation].

MR. ADLER: Okay, yes sir. I'm calling on those who've not yet had a chance to speak before I come back and let others speak two times.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So when the soil comes out cleansed, it's basically dead growing soil. What do you do with that soil? You put it back in piles or do you spread them around? What do you do with dead soil.

Our proposal would be to spread them around in Cemetery II Lower Base yard, back to where it originally came from, yes sir. If I can just spread that out, would stuff grow on it? Or do you have to fertilize it to get it back into in a ...[unintelligible] environment?

MR. VAIS: Maybe -- let me explain how this

process works. When you get soil out of this kind of a process, the normal way to restore it is to spread it out in a thin layer, usually no more than a foot thick and then to apply fertilizer to it and water and then till it with a disk, disk harrow or a plow? And till it and then you grow grass on them. Grass is very high in nitrogen. When the grass is grown, you plow the grass back into the soil and that helps restore it. It's just spreading it out into layer of even thickness and then farming it like you would a farmland.

COL. LIGHT: Let me ask a question. My staff has raised a good point. Does our contract call for that?

If we select 4E to spread the soil to grow grass on it?

MR. DAVE CAVAGNOL: Currently, I'm Dave Cavagnol of ECC. We have a contract to use this unit. Currently the contract, the scope of work has us spreading the soil out on Cemetery II as it is.

COL. LIGHT: As it is?

MR. CAVAGNOL: Without amendments being added to it. That's the current status.

MR. ADLER: Again, I'm going to go to people who have not yet spoken, Ray?

MR. RAY MASGA: [through the Translator]. I would like to find out from what you have up there, what you have written up there, those conditions, there are three different criterias. I'd like to know especially the one on the bottom under the community acceptance, where -- what consideration is it going to be at, especially if you look at the first criteria which is the first under threshold, the -- I'm sorry.

MR. MASGA: The criteria that is listed up there, there's three areas to look at and one being the threshold that determines whether, if you have 10 list of alternatives, any of the 10 that does not meet the threshold are excluded.

COL. LIGHT: That's right.

MR. MASGA: Now, I believe that part of the meeting this evening is to look at what the community feels of the proposed alternative the Corps is presenting. In terms of making the selection ultimately, and EPA will be looking at that as well, where does the community acceptance fall in terms of the consideration. Will it be as listed as being the least of the consideration for the threshold? Or is that one major determining factor as to what the four alternatives are?

COL. LIGHT: The four alternatives that we put up here met all that criteria, the first seven criteria, okay. The others that we showed you did not, so we said those don't work because they don't meet this criteria. Now, what we're doing is exactly what you said, we're evaluating the four that we have up here against the CNMI acceptance and the community acceptance. If the community says, don't do it, then the community needs to tell us what they want us to do and then the reality of the cost and the time and everything else comes into play. And we have tried to balance all those things to include the community acceptance to come up with a proposed solution. It is not easy.

MR. ADLER: Can you translate that? Could you,

Florence? It's hard, I know.

TRANSLATOR: He has to repeat.

MR. ADLER: Ray, would you like to repeat it? I mean, I don't mean -- can you repeat his answer or can you summarize it? Summarize what he said?

...[translation by Mr. Masga].

MR. TENORIO: May I?

MR. ADLER: Wait, wait, wait, one question, are you all -- you're finished.

MR. MASGA: Yes.

MR. TENORIO: May I just add in Chamorro?

MR. ADLER: Yes.

MR. TENORIO: ...[in vernacular].

MR. ADLER: Could you translate now?

TRANSLATOR: Can you translate that, John?

MR. TENORIO: I just said that Colonel Light answered Ray by saying that there are 10 alternatives.

In the 10 alternatives, they have looked at the seven, the top seven and after looking at the top seven, they have taken off six and four are available now as option and those four now will be looked upon by the community acceptance, as well as the CNMI Government acceptance and use that to meet all the criteria, the nine criteria up there, they evaluate and select one. Thank you ladies and gentlemen.

MR. ADLER: Thank you.

COL. LIGHT: Let me make a comment.

MR. ADLER: Yeah, go ahead please.

COL. LIGHT: We take everything that you said tonight, we take all the comments that we get from you up until the 3rd of August. We evaluate what we've

done. We may in fact recommend something else to the EPA or we may in fact recommend this. We recommend to the EPA as our solution, EPA then says yes or no, and then we would hope that EPA would come up with a different -- a solution if they don't like the solution that we recommend.

MR. ADLER: Okay, we're taking comments from those who've yet not spoken. Yes sir. Yes?

MR. JERRY CRISOSTOMO: Colonel Light, you keep emphasizing that the cost, about the cost. It's expensive. It's your problem that you complete this job, this project. When we met before with one of your staff, Adler, about two or three weeks back, the question that came out of that meeting was what is the military going to do after they have made the decision on what kind of mechanism there is and if that mechanism is not working? Adler said -- Adler also said that if that mechanism doesn't work, they set it aside and then they look at other alternatives and see if that would work -- and see if it would work. Me, Colonel, as a member of this community, I'm saying that you're lying, that you don't have any money.

COL. LIGHT: What? I didn't say that I don't have any money.

TRANSLATOR: That there's no money.

COL. LIGHT: There is money.

MR. CRISOSTOMO: And this project can be completed for not more than 18 million.

COL. LIGHT: I'm confused. You asked that question. There is money. I have \$5 to \$6 million.

MR. CRISOSTOMO: I'm saying that you're not

telling the truth because this project can be accomplished without having to spend \$18 million. It can be contained, this project can be contained, haul it out of here with the help of our sailors out there.

MR. ADLER: Okay, we'll take that as a comment I guess.

MR. CRISOSTOMO: So, that's all I'm saying is that let's stop about all these four alternatives, the community is saying get rid of it and get it out, get rid of it. And, there's no sense using those words, CNMI acceptance or community acceptance, if you're not going to listen to the community.

MR. ADLER: Thank you. Thank you very much.

COL. LIGHT: We are listening to the community that's why we're here tonight and I am not a liar. None of my staff is either.

MR. ADLER: I want to present the floor to anybody else who has not spoken.

MR. SABLAN: I'm going to have to talk in English because my good friend Florence has butchered the Chamorro language so as the English language. So, Colonel Light, on behalf of the Tanapag Action Group and the residents of Tanapag, we give you the signatures of our officials, our petition on tonight's public hearing. but I'm going to make statements.

I don't think Jerry was very far from some of the things he said. First and foremost, the Tanapag people believes that this is a predetermined project. Somebody has already determined that it will be done here on island. No. 1, Jerry and John went to California to observe the machine working there. That

machine is the miniaturized machine from the ones that were used to burn off PCB in some place in the United States. We know that it's made for that size so that it can be packaged, put in container and brought it here and I believe at this moment that that machine is on the way to Saipan. No. 1, or No. 2, there is already a pilot project talk that they're going to bring the machine here so that they can burn to study whether it's going to be effective or not.

COL. LIGHT: Experiment on what?

MR. SABLAN: They're going to experiment. Folks, we got enough experiment, for the last 30 years, we've been experimented. This citizen of Tanapag will in someday history will come down as the Federal Government genocide. They're going to kill us all. Because there will be contamination even if they said they clean the soil. Take a look at the crab. They don't want to talk about the crab. The crab has 99% contaminated from areas that doesn't have PCB canisters. Nothing. All the way down to the cemetery, above the road, there are contaminations, folks. There are PCBs around here. They may think they don't know that, they do. They have information. This is the crab data. And so, by coming up with alternatives, what essentially they're doing is confusing you.

Why did they put something up there that doesn't work? In our field of science, you don't say there is no crab. You just don't say it, you don't write it down. But folks, these guys do. They write it down. It's all up here. It's evidence that these people are here to confuse us more and they ask for public

relation. Excuse me, folks. They can't make public relation. When Adams spoke up here, he spoke to the Translator. He's not looking at you because he is not truthful on a lot of things he said. He couldn't figure things out himself. He's a project manager. Why do you think Helene Takemoto was kicked out? Because she wasn't telling the truth. She lied to us so many times and I see another one coming up.

What I gave Colonel Light is the position of Tanapag residents, Tanapag Action Group to take the 11 stockpiles of contaminated soil off island. Treat it some place out there and, let me read, let me read what we put down as the decision position for this village, the people of this village, the Tanapag Action Group.

TAG position on focus feasibility study. The Tanapag Action Group adopted unanimous vote of 68 and the over 1,000 signatures of Tanapag residents to ship all 20 tons of PCB contaminated soil to off-island treatment location where appropriate on-site expertise and equipment availability. And I want to make sure they don't bring pilot project machine here, we put down the pilot project for testing of indirect thermal desorption incineration must be conducted off-island treatment location where appropriate on-site expertise and equipment availability.

Folks, I got two other more, but I'm going to stop here because this is where the buck stops. The people of Tanapag, the residents of Tanapag, those who have died would have wanted the soil off island. Cost? Who said that? Jerry? You said somebody is lying about money? Folks, if they said 10 months up there and

somebody stood up here and says four years, definitely somebody is lying. We know that. Now, if they put 10 months up there and they say 18 millions, why did they do it when they know that every year they will get only \$5 million. It doesn't make sense and you guys are not catching it because it's not written up there. They wanted to see you read what they have so that you can be all confused.

Michelle lied also. Heavy metals are abound here. Arsenic, chromium, bromine, we got them.

Folks, this is former military use area. FUDS. Former defense site. All of Saipan is bombed and stored oils and barrels and barrels and millions of oils are stored in our village. They brought more than 200 canisters, how many did they find? 53. Where are the others? Maybe somewhere out there with the crabs that found the PCB.

And, let me tell you, all of us have PCB. Medical profession lied to us. They tested us on Aroclor 1260 where in fact the Aroclor, the poison that we have here, is 1254. Take a look at the crab sample. The crab sample says Aroclor 1260 nothing, but bingo when they said Aroclor 1254. Plenty.

We have to work on congener specifics because these guys are not going to do it. They're going to leave us with dirty contaminated soil from the military and they won't clean it for us because they're going to bring that machine.

They owe this company, I don't know why. You know this company was indicted? ECC was indicted in the United States today and they still want to give this

company the contract to come and clean. And did you know that the first thermal blanket desorption was practically the same company who went broke and left everything in there and then say ah, it's okay, everything is fine? No folks. There were canisters found there. There were high contamination of PCB still in Cemetery II. Let's vote tonight.

MR. ADLER: No.

MR. SABLAN: I want the people of Tanapag to say, how many of you would like to send this soil, contaminated soil to the United States? Please say yes or raise your hand!

MR. ADLER: This is not a vote. No, we're not going to take a vote tonight.

MR. SABLAN: Look at the numbers! Get the numbers so that we can show you that this is what the people wanted, this is what the community wanted, this is what the village of Tanapag wanted is to ship your garbage off our land.

COL. LIGHT: Thank you.

MR. ADLER: Are there other people who would like to make a comment? We'll go back around to those who've spoken. Senator?

SENATOR REYES: Thank you, thank you Mr. Adler. Well, first, let me say that you have to, you have to excuse our guarded optimism when you guys, you folks come. We have been talking to you about this PCB for the longest time and it's a repetitious of the same language that we have been hearing and if we appear to be guardedly optimistic, then excuse us for that. But somebody said when they were up here that we cannot do

anything about what happened in the past. Let's look forward into the future, but let's talk about the past because it's the past that is haunting, not just us but also you guys.

MR. SABLAN: Listen to the old man. He said take your soil and go away. He's angry now.

MR. ADLER: Okay. Thank you. I ask you before if you would please not interrupt, you've been really patient and I appreciate that and I know you feel very strongly about this issue--

MR. SABLAN: And I told you that I can interrupt!! We made that agreement in our meeting yesterday.

MR. ADLER: We made this agreement. Please let him finish.

SENATOR REYES: Thank you. And I think that the community must be told exactly what are in these four alternatives and the first alternative is, of course, to ship it off island. That's something that appeals to the community.

The second alternative is to take the contaminated soil and transfer it to another location within the Marianas, within Saipan. That is not an acceptable alternative.

And the Attorney General is here. I have introduced a resolution asking the Governor to file a lawsuit against the military on December 28, 1999. Again, I'm reminding the Attorney General of that resolution.

The other alternative is the remedial alternative on 3B and that is on-site treatment. What this alternative is doing is that they are going to burn

this in the incinerator, getting rid of PCB and generating another poison, the dioxin. And we're going to come back and sue them again for generating that. So, that's not even an alternative.

The last alternative is the thermal desorption. This I believe is an experimental process here. And I have to agree with the former Speaker Ben Sablan in his observation that we feel, we sense that this machine is on its way over here while we talk about this right now, so there is a predetermination what kind of alternative you are going to select on our behalf. This discussion here is just that. This is a discussion just to inform us and try to get something back, but there is already a predetermination on what type of -- from what we hear so far -- what kind of treatment are going to be decided upon. Again, I wanted to emphasize that when, I don't know whether it's you Dr. Adams that came up here and said that a decision has not been made of the four alternatives and that you have -- and then Michelle came up and said that their agency is tasked with the responsibility of deciding and approving which alternative is going to be chosen, to be selected, but from what we are hearing, there is already a predetermination selection and that is the thermal desorption.

COL. LIGHT: May I respond? The Army Corps' responsibility, sir, is to make a selection from the alternatives that we looked at. We have done that and that's exactly what we should have done to this point and we have selected 4E. This process then kicks in and we're trying to hear your voice and hear the

various voices here. The voices and the things that we've heard tonight may affect the decision that we have in fact made for 4E, or they may not. We will go back, we will evaluate the comments tonight, we will look at the other comments that we receive by the 3rd of August and then we will revisit the decision that we made and either this alternative or another alternative, we will decide that and then we will send that to EPA. So, in fact, we have decided and that's our role, that's what we should have done at this point, but it is not something that is inappropriate or that is unchangeable.

I would like to note for the record that a year ago, the Corps of Engineers met with members of the community who are here tonight and on record we understood, we understood at that time that the members of the community expressed a desire for the low thermal desorption technology. And we have that on record and I can show you who attended the meeting. So we have been under the assumption for the past year, that is why we asked the contractor to build the units, that is why we have representatives of the community -- if I may -- to look at the unit. We have been under the impression that that was an acceptable alternative.

MR. SABLAN: How can you lie like that? Man, you're a liar! Bull shit!!!

SENATOR REYES: Can I just respond that....

MR. SABLAN: He is lying. Nobody in the village said that they wanted to do it here.

SENATOR REYES: If that is the case though, Colonel Light, you know and it really saddens me to say

this because I'm a veteran of the U.S. Army and the military is notorious in giving us all this run around, forgive me for saying that. But if the machine is already ordered and selected, then why give us these four alternatives? Why present the four alternatives to us which include the off-site treatment?

COL. LIGHT: Sir, we built the machine, to try to get it under power, to try to get this thing done fast.

If you don't want that technology and we chose -- the decision is made not to use the machine, this machine here, we will use it some place else. We have sites in other places in the Pacific. The 503 sites that we have, others have PCBs. I would also like to note that as far as I know and I think as far as my staff knows, that equipment is still in Indio, California.

MR. ADLER: Hang on, if anybody else who's not spoken? Yes sir, go ahead.

MR. PALACIOS: Colonel, you said you have 500 other sites, PCB sites?

COL. LIGHT. No sir, I said I have 503 FUDS sites, some of which have PCB contamination as well. For example in Palmyra there's PCB also.

MR. PALACIOS: Of those 500 FUDS sites, contamination FUDS sites, how many FUDS sites do you have community involvements on any of those projects besides the Tanapag contamination?

COL. LIGHT: We have a current site on the Big Island of Hawaii called Waikoloa with community involvement on that site.

MR. PALACIOS: That's only two that you said out of 500 sites.

COL. LIGHT: Yes sir, we're not working on all 500 sites at this time because we don't have the money. That's the point I was trying to make earlier.

MR. ADLER: Are there other? Yes sir, you had a question, all right go ahead.

MR. PEDRO TEGITA: ...[through the Translator]. Can you, we go back to Alternative 2, please? You said that it's going to cost about \$18 million for Alternative 2. I'm sure that it can be reduced if we use the military ship for transporting the soil off island since the ship is a military ship and the staff are getting paid already. And it's not going to cost that much.

COL. LIGHT: We should probably take that as a comment.

MR. ADLER: We'll take that as a comment. You have a thought on that, we share it, if not, we'll....

COL. LIGHT: We have not explored using military transport to move the PCBs if we ship them off island. If military transport was available, he is right, the cost will come down, but I don't know of the availability of military transport.

MR. TEGITA: There are two of them out there, anchored out there.

COL. LIGHT: They have equipment on them.

MR. TEGITA: There a lot of containers at Stevedore, so rid of the military stuff on board and put on the container.

MR. ADLER: One of the reasons we're having a meeting like this is sometimes there are new ideas that come out that nobody has considered. I don't know if

this one has been or hasn't been, but we're going to look at that. That's on the record to be considered.

MR. (?): I thought I read somewhere in one of these documents that of that \$18 million, well, in addition to that is the shipping cost. In other words, you've got to spend \$12 million to get it in the United States, then you've got to spend \$6 million using this machine to do it, I mean, you know, you got two problems. You've still got to get rid of the PCB whether it's done here or there. The only thing we've got is \$12 million cost, again I read that from some of these documents. The 12 million of that 18 million I presume, the shipping cost of which \$6 million. Your alternative 4E kicks in with \$6 million. Just adding 12 and 6 coming up with the 18 that you got.

COL. LIGHT: Let me ask Chris to clarify that.

MR. VAIS: On this alternative, when you send the PCB contaminated soil to the mainland, it does not get treated. It gets put in what's known as a TSCA landfill probably in Utah would be my guess. Is that correct, Dave?

MR. CAVAGNOL: Close enough.

MR. VAIS: Yeah, it would be -- it just goes....

MR. (?): Just dump it in a hole.

MR. VAIS: And they put in a landfill designed to take it so there's no treatment involved.

MR. ADLER: Yes, sir?

MR. PETE TENORIO: My name is Pete Tenorio. I'm from Saipan, I'm a hydrologist by profession in my academic training and I'm very interested in this particular problem because I know that it not only

affects the soil here, but the groundwater as well, regardless of whether the groundwater is drinkable or not. I think I see a possible solution to the problems or the debate that's going on this evening.

First of all, I want to point out to the Corps its primary goal and when you read what the primary goal of the Corps is, it says the goal at the Tanapag clean up site is to eliminate the risk of human exposure to PCB contamination and to leave the site clean for safe use in the future. I don't think that any of the alternatives there, other than the one calling for off-site disposal, would meet this goal.

You discuss other areas where you want comments and you want the community to evaluate? In my own opinion, I think -- I feel that the off-site disposal meets the goal of the Corps. I don't know why you put this sentence down, but it seems to me like it's a very striking reminder that what you really want to do is eliminate the risk. Eliminating the risk means taking something away from an area, you know from being -- from you know to expose it, for people to get exposed to, so I don't see any other alternative other than to do an off-site disposal.

The other alternatives? You talk about the production of dioxin when you incinerate it and the others may be a partial clean up. And, even on that, my own feeling is that when you talk about cleaning of the soil and trying to get rid of the PCB on the soil, you're actually just sort of scratching the surface. You're forgetting the fact that groundwater moves and since this PCB is a soluble material, you know it

dissolves in the water and then it travels with the water, either going outward into the ocean, inland, or even filter down and goes into the bedrock. And, there is another major problem that I don't think that any study has actually addressed yet, and that is the residue that is deposited in the form of a soluble compound on the bedrock. The bedrock, remember, is a coral base material and coral base is very absorptive to different kind of materials. You know, it's one of these things that I think if you can theorize that once you get rid of the soil, covering the soil layer, you're getting rid of all the contamination, the contaminants, but that's not true and you know it. I know it.

Contaminants tend to get into the soil, it filters down into the groundwater and down to the bedrock and it stays there. So how are you going to really realistically remove the PCB to ensure that there is no risk to contamination to the local community? And you're talking about spot areas now. I've seen the sites, I've seen where you have dug up and tested the soil, but I don't think that you have done any major comprehensive soil testing and water testing on the area, on Tanapag Village itself where the people are residing right now. And I think that instead of trying to convince people to select an alternative to this whole process, I feel very strongly as a professional myself that you must conduct additional and more comprehensive soil analysis, groundwater analysis and even chlorine. Do a chlorine analysis, chlorine test to determine whether or not there is in fact residue in

the bedrock or the coral material underneath the soil.

And you know, everybody is rushing to get this thing off their back, to get rid of it, and I don't blame the people here because they have been exposed for a long, long time. Nobody can really measure the kind of damage, the kind of health problem that they have been exposed to or what they're suffering right now. We are all guessing that, you know somebody got a scar over here putting as a result of the PCB or eating crab or something. I feel that it's the obligation of the United States Government to conduct a much more comprehensive study and let's not force people, the people here to accept something that very few of them really understand.

I don't understand the whole thing about this process and I'm a scientist myself, but I got to study it. Can you imagine the common people here, even if you translate them in English, Chamorro, in whatever language, the technical aspect of this particular problem is so complex that you should not expect them to understand it no matter how many public hearings you have.

I feel that there should be more professionals to be brought over here. We got people from different agencies of the United States Government that are capable of doing a much more comprehensive, much more complex and much more refined studies to ensure that the facts are there, to ensure that you know we are not making decision for these people which we would all regret in the future. I fully believe that the U.S. Government is trying to rush this through and I think

it's wrong.

Look at the problems in Bikini. I was there. I went over there to look for the water -- to study the water situation and people were almost resettle there, but good thing the Atomic Energy Commission did an analysis of the groundwater there in Bikini and they found out that the darn thing was contaminated, is radiated. It's got a lot of strontium and whatever other you know, radionuclides in the water. So they delayed, the U.S. Government delayed the resettlement of Bikini because of the fact that it was contaminated and nobody knew about that until they did the study. So, I would strongly suggest in the interest of the health of the people here, in the interest of United States Government and in the interest of protecting your very own fellow citizens to do something more than just rush a decision through. Do a much more comprehensive study. That's my recommendation.

MR. ADLER: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Tenorio. Are there other people, the floor is open, would like to make a comment or?

COL. LIGHT: Didn't we test the groundwater? Have we already tested the groundwater?

MR. CAVAGNOL: There's a study that's being planned.

COL. LIGHT: Would you make that point?

MR. CAVAGNOL: I'm sorry?

COL. LIGHT: Would you make that point?

MR. CAVAGNOL: Well, would I make that point? Okay, there is a study that's forthcoming that will investigate groundwater impacts on the Tanapag area.

Currently the plans are in draft form, under review, and I'm not quite sure of the timetable to go final, but I know they will.

MR. ADLER: Okay. Yes sir?

MR. ALDAN: I just want to add in addition to what Mr. Tenorio was saying that you know, the PCB clean up here in Tanapag was done only on public land and you know, I got properties that are adjacent to, what's this, clean up areas in Tanapag and which is, you know boundary and they dug down to about 10 to 15 feet. And then my property, you know was left alone. It was never inspected if there's PCB. I think there should be a comprehensive complete testing of the whole Tanapag Village to ensure that, you know the clean up process is complete instead of just saying that just because you have 20 tons of contaminated soil over there in the cemetery, you're saying that you know, we have done our job, we're out of here, we already clean this place, so we're done. You guys are not done yet.

You have not, what's this ah, first thing. I know you guys know how many, the numbers of capacitors that were shipped out here from Kwajalein to Saipan and was taken from, you know Lower Base and brought to Tanapag or somewhere else on the island. Then you know, you guys have to identify the number of capacitors that were shipped to Saipan so that we'll know whether it's only 57 that was located or there's more and there's probably more contamination somewhere else aside from Tanapag. So there's got to be a comprehensive study done in Tanapag, including identifying the numbers of capacitors that was brought from Kwajalein and that was

shipped by the military. So I think you guys should do that, what's this, before you complete your PCB clean up. In the meantime, ship the 20 tons of soil out of here. We don't need it.

MR. ADLER: I want to just remind you one thing we said at the beginning which is that there are other ways to put in comments. This is not the only time and we've given you on the handout information for E-mail, fax, mail, it's up there on the wall too, so there are other means also to bring in comments. It's just a reminder of that. Are there other questions or comments you would like to make?

MR. SABLAN: Last comment, please?

MR. ADLER: Sir? We'll come back to you in a second.

MR. SOLL: Colonel, before you decided tentatively to recommend 4E, did you do a characterization of the wastes for all potential contaminants in addition to PCB in the soil?

COL. LIGHT: Did we do a characterization of wastes?

MR. SOLL: Characterization of wastes for potential contaminants in the soil.

COL. LIGHT: We did. We studied, we looked at the soil and all we found in the soil was PCBs.

MR. SOLL: What else did you test for?

COL. LIGHT: What else did we test for? Heavy metals.

MR. CAVAGNOL: We tested for heavy metals. We tested for pesticides and herbicides. We tested for SVOCs, VOCs, reactivity, corrosivity, dioxins and

furans.

MR. ADLER: Okay.

MR. SABLAN: Yes, last comment. The rainy season has approached the CNMI and we've asked many times the Army Corps and EPA to do something about the vinyl covering of the eleven stock piles. We're concerned on infrared rays coming down even if it's not very sunny. The last sunny days three, four months ago would deteriorate those vinyl covers.

Now, if this is going to take a long time and those piles are going to expose to weather, typhoon, tsunamis, earthquake, we would like to see that Army Corps comply to the order, the plan to put the seal of six inches on top of those piles so that we can be continued to be protected. Otherwise, they'll be all over the village again and that would be even more detrimental than when you first remediated the soil. So, I'd like to submit that.

COL. LIGHT: I'd like to respond to that?

MR. ADLER: Yes, please.

COL. LIGHT: We share your concern about that. It was our initial plan to put six inches of crushed coral on top of these liners. The manufacturer of the liners indicated that they are good for UV protection for several years. I can show you the documents from the manufacturer if you'd like.

MR. SABLAN: Documents don't work for us out here, if you want to debate this issue. You've never lived here. We have. A lot of our plastic materials here don't withstand our sun and I'm telling you the truth.

COL. LIGHT: May I finish, sir?

MR. SABLAN: No. I don't want you to finish it because you're going to lie to us again.

COL. LIGHT: I will finish.

MR. SABLAN: So, go ahead and finish it!! You guys can finish it!!

MR. ADLER: Let him finish. Let's let him finish his comment.

COL. LIGHT: If this selection here, this remedial alternative is selected, we think we can have the soil cleaned up before the liner deteriorates. If this is not selected and we end up with shipping off-site with another proposal, then we will add the coral fill.

MR. SABLAN: Just comply to that, Colonel Light.

MR. FRANK BORJA: Sir, how long has the coral fill been sitting there already? How long has it been sitting there already? Because it's really getting close to maybe a typhoon season and it's going to start raining hard.

COL. LIGHT: The coral fill....

MR. BORJA: I mean -- no, the tarp, the lining? I mean you guys are not going to wait until a typhoon comes and it flies away.

COL. LIGHT: Six months. The liners that you see in the Lower Base yard have been there for six months.

MR. BORJA: Six months already?

COL. LIGHT: Six months already.

MR. BORJA: And how many more?

COL. LIGHT: They are rated to typhoon winds. They are rated to typhoon winds and the manufacturer guaranteed that they will withstand UV radiation for several years.

MS. CABRERA: Are they rated for super typhoons?

COL. LIGHT: No, Ma'am.

MS. CABRERA: So, in the event a super typhoon comes since we are in the typhoon season, there's a possibility that the PCB contaminated soil will be spread throughout the entire village again.

END OF TAPE 2/CONTINUED ON TAPE 3

COL. LIGHT: If a super typhoon came, with or without the coral on top of the liners, we believe that the possibility exists to have the PCB soil spread, with or without the liners.

MR. PALACIOS: Colonel Light, I pass by the site almost everyday going to work, coming back from work and you said that this thing, a 30-mil liner is supposed to last a long time, nothing dramatic has happened. But I've noticed, I'm not sure if Dave has visited the site, but I've notice that there has been patch and repairs on those liners.

COL. LIGHT: Yes, there have been some repairs.

MR. PALACIOS: So why are you saying that those liners will ensure without anything, a typhoon, and we have had nothing and a repair has been done on those liners?

MR. CAVAGNOL: I might be able to explain that.

MR. ADLER: Dave, stand up, people can't hear you.

MR. CAVAGNOL: There are some patches on the liners. Primarily those patches are as a result of doing some post stockpile sampling. We actually had to penetrate the liners to get soil samples to conduct the large sweep of sampling that we just discussed? Heavy metals, SVOCs, pesticides and herbicides. That request

was made of us after the soil was in the liner, so we had to impact the liner to get the soil and, in doing so, we had to patch them. So, those patches I believe for the most part are a result of that action.

MR. ADLER: You have one more question.

MR. BORJA: Yeah, I thought I read somewhere that like Saipan, the Marianas Islands are really rated like a Condition 4 wind zone, something like that? Where the wind's velocity could just pick up in a matter of 24 hours.

COL. LIGHT: Say it again? I'm sorry?

MR. BORJA: Where it's either 72 hours in a matter of like that. So, was that taken into consideration?

COL. LIGHT: I'm sorry, with respect to?

MR. BORJA: With respect to our location, our area? Location? We're rated as like a Condition 4-

COL. LIGHT: I have to ask, but I think so, let me ask. Were you aware of that rating?

MR. CAVAGNOL: I'm sorry?

MR. ADLER: The question was were you aware that this is -- has a rating of four....

MR. BORJA: Condition 4 always.

MR. ADLER: Condition 4 which means high winds can come up within 72 hours. Am I right?

MR. BORJA: Those are typhoons, Condition 4.

MR. CAVAGNOL: I understand what Condition 4 means.

MR. ADLER: Okay, and you are aware of that is the question. In other words, I think in the selection of the liner, the placement of the liner, you're asking was that taken into consideration?

MR. BORJA: Yeah, did they, did they think about that?

MS. CABRERA: Climatic conditions, were climatic conditions taken into consideration in the selection of the type of material you used and in the placement of that material?

MR. ADLER: Yes?

MR. MASGA: Okay, if I may add?

MR. ADLER: Well, let's get an answer to the....

MR. MASGA: If you look into the feasibility study? The handbook? Look on page 63. At the very bottom paragraph it states, 'the CNMI is situated about 600 miles east of an area in the Western Pacific Ocean that is considered the breeding area for tropic disturbances. As a result, the CNMI is in a weather condition 4 at all times signifying that 74 miles per hour winds are possible within 72 hours.'

MR. ADLER: So, I want to just check again. Your question was, was this taken into consideration as a factor in the selection of that material and the use of it? That's the question.

MR. CAVAGNOL: The material, the selection of the material was for....

MR. BORJA: In regards to the area, sir.

MR. CAVAGNOL: Of course, it's for a temporary solution, but the material was not selected to cover these soil stockpiles for a period of 10 years. The material was selected because of a short-term requirement to have the soil stockpiles covered which is why it was suggested that the material was durable for several years, not a decade. So, as the Colonel

suggested, that there is a delay in the implementation of a plan to remove the soil, treated or otherwise, there may need to be some additional efforts put forth to protect the piles.

MR. ADLER: Okay, other questions? Yes.

MS. CABRERA: Okay, so now you've answered that question. Now my next question is a follow up question to ask. In the process of arriving at a solution to this problem, did you Lieutenant Colonel Light. Light take that into consideration we are situated in a typhoon belt and there have instances where we've had have three super typhoons one after the other. Given that this is taking a while, even to arrive at this level, are those things taken into consideration?

COL. LIGHT: That's a great question. The answer is definitely yes. Let me refer you back to the screening criteria. We try to balance getting the stuff treated, getting the stuff out of your hair as soon as we can. We look at all the other factors that are involved. You've looked at the factors we looked at. So, if I have to wait 2 or 3 or 4 years to get the additional money to send it to the mainland, those soils are going to sit in Tanapag Village, Cemetery II, Lower Base yard until I get that money. And honestly, in spite of what some people said here today, I have no way of knowing how long it might take me to get it because I compete with 41 Districts in the Corps of Engineers for \$200 million. So, yes, we have to look at all those factors and based on all those factors, we think that that's the best solution. And we knew coming here that that is not the solution that you

wanted. We're trying to at least convey to you the complexity and the difficulty of trying to get a solution that meets those criteria, gets the stuff out of here, and is achievable in a way that is acceptable to you. In other words, relatively fast. So, yes Ma'am.

MS. CABRERA: I do understand, but I think one of the problems is that even with this particular alternative, this specific alternative, there is no guarantee that the funding will be secured. As we all -- any one of us feels the funding, federal or local, we know that when you're competing with other programs, you're not assured of that funding and in this case we're competing with 502 other sites.

COL. LIGHT: That's just in my District.

MS. CABRERA: That's in your District and none of us here know where we fall on the priority list and so even with this particular alternative, there is no guarantee or assurance that that funding will be there to be diverted specifically for this particular clean up.

COL. LIGHT: As I said, you're exactly right, you're exactly right. I don't have a crystal ball that says I'm going to have the remainder of the money to get this thing done, that this is what we've selected, that EPA approves, that I'm going to have it by a certain time. I think, based on my experience in command for the past years and based on what my staff has told me that I can probably talk my Headquarters out of two or three million relatively easy. Now, if you don't want to wait until we get 18 million and you

don't want to wait until we get all that money -- go to the first alternative. I have that money right now.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 1,039,000.

COL. LIGHT: I have that money right now. Go to the second alternative.

SENATOR REYES: But Colonel, that's only to cover again the pile.

COL. LIGHT: Yes, sir. Yes, sir. That's exactly the point here. We know that that's not acceptable to you. I have that money available, so we haven't recommended or chosen that, that alternative, because we're trying to do exactly what this woman suggests and that is, look at that the risks, look at the issues. We need to get the stuff out of here, evaluate the cost, evaluate what's protective of the people's of Tanapag. That's the dilemma. If it were easy, we would all be having a barbeque right now.

MR. ALDAN: Perhaps we can move the contaminated soil to American Memorial Park.

COL. LIGHT: Would you like to make that comment for the record, I didn't -- could you repeat your comment, I couldn't hear it.

MR. ALDAN: We would like to move the contaminated PCB soil to American Memorial Park.

COL. LIGHT: The Department of Interior would like that.

MR. ADLER: Yes, you.

MS. ALDAN: If we were put in the -- if we were listed as a priority, would we be given the funds? The 18 million? I mean, I think that's a question to the EPA? I raised that up a year ago that we should be

considered and put as priority listing. I don't think we have failed, and so we would still be dealing with whatever funds is available and only at such time that we're placed up on the priority list.

COL. LIGHT: The National Priority List, the Superfund list, this site is not qualified because it's -- I hate to tell you this, but it is not that bad. And I know that's not something that you want to hear but in terms of all the sites all over the world that the EPA deals with-

MS. ALDAN: Have we submitted the application or has EPA submitted the application?

COL. LIGHT: I don't think it meets the risk criteria, but let me defer to Michelle.

MS. ROGOW: At the request of, I believe that there was actually a legislative request that was made for EPA to conduct a preliminary assessment and a site investigation of the Tanapag PCB site. That investigation was conducted as part of our multi-matrix sampling that we did in May of 2000 and....

MS. ALDAN: Sampling as in what, the health screening?

MS. ROGOW: No, it was soil sampling and biota sampling. It was the sampling that basically initiated a lot of the, you know the site work as well as further land crab testing where we tested the fish and the yam and the taro and the chicken eggs and the land crabs, have I forgotten biota probably. So we basically did an evaluation and a screening of those different media, the soil, we took samples of the groundwater from the groundwater wells and an evaluation to see whether the

site did what we call, what we use a ranking factor in a scoring? Where it would score to be placed on the National Priorities List.

MS. ALDAN: And we did not meet it?

MS. ROGOW: At this point, we are in the process of ranking to see whether it meets the criteria and basically the thing that we're waiting for is to see whether or not a permanent solution is going to be implemented for the site or whether the soil is going to remain here. And that makes a difference in terms of how the final evaluation on the NPL goes. At this point though, from a risk based perspective which is what the NPL looks at, the risk of the soil has been removed and is now contained and it does not look very likely that the site will score on the NPL although that is still sort of in the process of waiting to see you know, what the final outcome of this is.

COL. LIGHT: Michelle, if you can say, is there a time table on this?

MS. ROGOW: Is there a time table on this decision making?

COL. LIGHT: Yes.

MS. ROGOW: For the NPL? Or for this treatment and disposal?

COL. LIGHT: No, for the....

MS. ALDAN: NPL.

COL. LIGHT: NPL. I'm just asking that, you may not know.

MS. ROGOW: Right. We are hoping that in the next few months that our final documents will be ready.

MS. ALDAN: Well, what I'm hearing from you is

that you've given us an alternative again here. You're addressing these things with an alternative and you have not done the national priority listing or in other words, you know try now to see whether we qualify or not.

MS. ROGOW: We have done a considerable amount of work on....

MS. ALDAN: The risk assessment that is done, was it done by your agency?

MS. ROGOW: By EPA.

MS. ALDAN: EPA?

MS. ROGOW: Yes.

MS. ALDAN: Wasn't that suppose to be done by (?) or something like that? I remember I have a paper and I submit it to Mr. Norman Lace....

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Lovelace.

MS. ALDAN: Lovelace?

MS. ROGOW: We're all hoping at some point in time if you want to look at it after this site, who knows though. You submitted a paper to him?

MS. ALDAN: Yeah, I mean I write...[unintelligible] through the Internet and what I found was there is some criteria and I thought that we could meet that criteria, one of those criteria.

MS. ROGOW: And, which was that?

MS. ALDAN: I can't remember. I don't have it with me, but how far....

MS. ROGOW: Okay, I will look, I can look, I can agree to look into that?

MS. ALDAN: How far have you taken it already, where are you at now, have you put the application

somewhere in the government? Or somewhere....

MS. ROGOW: It's not actually an application process? It's an evaluation process?

MS. ALDAN: I know, part of it asks for a risk assessment.

MS. ROGOW: Right.

MS. ALDAN: And it's suppose to submitted somewhere to be determined.

MS. ROGOW: Right.

MS. ALDAN: How far has EPA gone on that.

MS. ROGOW: On the National Priorities Listing? We're pretty far along on the National Priorities Listing.

MS. ALDAN: The bottom line is still we're not qualified?

MS. ROGOW: At this point, it is very unlikely. Unless the circumstances change, looks like you don't qualify.

SENATOR REYES: But Michelle, if the evaluation is not conclusive and so there's no consideration being made whether we qualify for the Superfund or not?

MS. ROGOW: I don't understand.

SENATOR REYES: The National Priority List, because the evaluation is not yet completed, we have not even been considered. We have not been considered until such time that the evaluation is completed and submitted for review or....

MS. ROGOW: By who?

SENATOR REYES: Is this something that you guys review.

MS. ROGOW: No, this is something that we decide

as an agency. We have a process by which a site is assessed and assign a score and that score has to meet a certain threshold number, okay?

SENATOR REYES: But you just told us that your review, your evaluation is not yet complete.

MS. ROGOW: It's not yet fully completed.

SENATOR REYES: So that, unless I'm mistaken--

MS. ROGOW: We have not finally scored the site. We have not given it a number. Okay? Because at this point, we are currently -- one of the things that we're waiting on is we're hoping that additional groundwater testing will go on, because that might give us some more information to be able to, if there is a pathway there, that might add some points to the score?

SENATOR REYES: So hypothetically, if the soil is not yet contained where they are right now, then the likelihood of us meeting the National Priority Listing would be unfavorable.

MS. ROGOW: Potentially, although maybe not. The issue is that the levels of soil in the village were relatively, although they were above our action level, they were still relatively low from a national perspective in terms of PCB sites.

SENATOR REYES: I'm just a little confused because it's like the analogy to that is like giving her a test--

MS. ROGOW: ...[unintelligible].

SENATOR REYES: Giving her a test in school and before she even completes the test, I'm already saying that the likelihood of you not passing the test is there. You know so....

MS. ROGOW: Right. Well, I can say, you know from my perspective that we haven't run the numbers at all. We've run sort of baseline numbers. We've looked at it and said, okay, is there any additional data that we can gather on this. Okay? Do we have any holes and we've identified the holes that exist in some of our information and where we might to be able to obtain more to have a more complete score, okay? You know, and that's where we're at. We've gone, reports have been prepared, we've looked at it, we've identified areas that we think, okay, we have, you know like the soil pathway, we have a lot of information on the soil pathway, okay?

MS. ALDAN: Did you come back to the TAG group though and tell them what we need in order to us to see if we can qualify?

MS. ROGOW: No, we haven't, but I can do that.

SENATOR REYES: Would that type of information accelerate the availability of funding?

MS. ALDAN: Yeah. Definitely.

MS. ROGOW: I'm sorry?

MS. ALDAN: Once we're on the national listing, we're going to get the 18 million.

MS. ROGOW: I'm sorry, I missed that quite a lot.

SENATOR REYES: The question is with all the information, the feedback that you need justifying that the risk factor is high, that is would enable the availability of funding much faster than going through the normal process that we're doing right now.

MR. ADLER: Can I just summarize the way I'm understanding this and let's see if I got it right.

I'm not a technical person. I do not work for the Corps or EPA. What I hear them saying is they have run some tests, are in the process of doing that. They haven't concluded yet definitely what the results of those tests are. The preliminary early look at the information, suggest you're not going to qualify for a Superfund site. That's how I'm hearing it.

MS. ROGOW: For the NPL.

MR. ADLER: On the NPL. For the NPL. That's what I'm hearing. So, it's not -- I think what she's trying to say is it isn't finally decided but she's look -- it's like looking at this in progress and say I don't think it's not going to qualify, early returns are not good, that's how I'm hearing it, in terms of answering what you're looking for which is conclusive information that would lead you to the solutions that you're looking for.

SENATOR REYES: No, but part of the justification is the fact that the contaminated soil is now contained, but prior to the containment of those soil....

MS. ROGOW: We did an evaluation prior to containment as well.

SENATOR REYES: And it does not present a high risk factor?

MS. ROGOW: We have done evaluations of both scenarios and what we're currently doing is seeking pathways of additional information.

SENATOR REYES: And again, Ma'am, I ask you it does not present a high risk factor as far as your evaluations go? I know you're trying to conveniently

ignore....

MS. ROGOW: No. No. What I'm trying to do....

SENATOR REYES: Trying to....

MS. ROGOW: What I'm trying to do is answer your question? But I'm not the person who's directly responsible for the NPL because, you know, that's happening in our office with people who do that specific type of work. You know, my responsibility is for site clean up, but what I'm attempting to do is answer your questions to the best of my ability. Yes, ?

MS. VICKI ROSEN: Michelle? Can we get the information for them from Caroline? You know what, how it is that they have such a...[unintelligible].

MS. ROGOW: Yeah, what information you think we should get from Caroline?

MS. ROSEN: How did you...[unintelligible]

MS. ROGOW: I think I've said that.

MS. ROSEN: Okay, so what about completing the process.

MS. ROGOW: They have set a deadline the next few months to complete the process.

SENATOR REYES: So it does not present a high risk factor?

MS. ROGOW: It does, the site -- you know, and the only thing that I can say is that from the information that we have now, it does not appear that the site will score high enough to rank on the NPL, but we are attempting to working on trying to obtain additional information which will either further show that it will not rank on the NPL or maybe put it into a realm where

it will rank on the NPL, but right now, in terms of the pathways and the knowledge that we have currently, it does not appear to get a full score, what we consider a full score.

COL. LIGHT: Let me make a comment that my staff asked me to make. Last year, we had the initial \$5 million in our budget. We spent 5 million on Tanapag. We got an additional two million for other sites, but we spent have 5 million on Tanapag. It is my number one site in the District. So, although it's not on the NPL, it is the number one site of my 503, so, whatever we choose to do, I'll be happy to get those additional funds.

MR. ADLER: Let's take few more comments and then I'm going suggest that we bring ourselves to a close, but stay and just talk informally. So, last few comments, if you will. Thank you, Michelle.

MR. TENORIO: If I may? You know it's not fair that now Ms. Rogow is saying that the chances of the Tanapag site not making the NPL scoring is actually not right.

Because, No. 1, way back in 1988 when the site was first identified, the first sets of tests on soil samples that were produced, it has a PCB level of 26 or over 26,000 parts per million. The Corps came in and do -- I have the report -- came in and do two what you called experiments. During this two experiments, everybody knows, you know, I know, they produce dioxin. Smoke is all over! The lady in last year's meeting said that, what is this odor we're smelling every time we pass by.

They came in here 2000 and did the scoring. We have been telling them, do the scoring based on the 1990 soil samples and the site will qualify. To me, that's not fair. I hope that it is not discussed, because you know and I know that they are lying!! You know it makes me mad to bring up something when your paper is telling us that you did an experiment, you know damn well that the two tests will never work. You send it out here to test it and to see if it works. It was declared. I have the document, it is declared that it doesn't work. Come on. Please, can we stop fooling each other? Don't you think that we are not able to absorb all of these information that you're giving to us? You are dead wrong!

So, Michelle, you should go back and use the raw data that were done way back in 1989, 1990 when the sites, the soil were not contained. They were all over the community, and the scoring back then was 36,000 parts per million and some sites even had more than that. The two stockpiles down in cemetery? You know damn well that I know and you know that it contains more than 24 parts per million. And, then you use your information on the sample in year 2000 to score Tanapag? Definitely, it will not qualify. So, come on, let's stop this crap!!

I'm sorry, I didn't mean to burst out like this, but when you're giving information to try and understand the situation and then you stand up in front of us and lie then? Put yourself in my shoes!!! I've lived here for 53 years. I am a grandfather. My kids are gonna grow up having to endure with all this

hardship that I have endured all my life. So, please, I wish that it is not brought up. I wish that we will continue to where we are right now and move forward. So, I'm sorry, I really don't mean to have this outburst, but it just makes me mad having to be so informed.

Gentlemen, go back to your first paper. The only local name you will see is my name. I brought this up again in 1992, 1991 when I was in congress, but nobody, nobody wants to listen to me because they thought I was stupid. They thought I was crazy back then. Nobody knew what is PCB. Not even the government, our so called expert, all we had here were Americans back then who were handling DEQ and EPA. I can give you names. They all become businessmen. All made money now living in the States.

You know, I'm glad that this project is where it is right now. I'm really glad. I am really more happy that we're almost coming to the conclusion. My goal from the very beginning is to clean it and let's be over with it. Clean it the best way that it can be clean so the people of this community can live their life happily ever after. I believe that it is not done accordingly and that is why we're here.

I witnessed the machine. I've seen great improvement of the machine and I was very honest. Mr. David Cavagnol there can attest that I was very honest during our meeting about the machine. They promise they would take every measure to correct whatever we, we decide as potential problems and I'm pleased. I'm not gonna doubt them. They are the

experts. I am not going to say that the machine is going to work or I am not going to either say that the machine is not going to work. That is yet to be seen.

I am excited to see it work. I think I have to be fair.

Before I left the CNMI, the Tanapag Action Group asked me to go with an open mind. I went there with an open mind. I shared the goodness and I shared what I feel are potential problems. Thank you, they took my comment seriously and I'm very proud of that. I'm happy.

But anyway, it bothers me one thing though. That should 4E? 4E? Is that 4E? Or 4A.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 4A.

MR. TENORIO: 4A?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 4E.

MR. TENORIO: 4E? It bothers me that if, if the Corps decides to use 4E, that they will treat the first 10,000 tons of the stockpile and then stop and send the samples to Canada and only upon the result of those tests that EPA will give a green light to go ahead and treat the remaining or to stop and whatever options there is, I don't know, but that's my understanding.

My question comes right back again to what if. What if the machine don't work. What are we going to do next?

MR. ADLER: Let's got an answer to that question.

MR. TENORIO: Yes.

MR. ADLER: Thank you. Who can -- Colonel, can you answer that?

COL. LIGHT: Before I do, I just want to make a

clarification of what I said to you, Ma'am. Last year, we did not spent 5 million. This year we spent 5 million on Tanapag. My staff just corrected me. It may or may not make any difference to you, but this year we spent 5 million.

The machine? This is the third generation of the machine. The first generation was used in New Jersey and there was a second generation, this is the third generation and I think you understand that the machine, the technology is proven technology. If the machine breaks? They will get repair parts from the U.S. mainland and they will repair the machine.

We talked yesterday about something about two months, what was that? I couldn't, I can't remember now how that bears on his question.

MR. BEAUDIN: What. In terms of time?

COL. LIGHT: If the machine broke down.

MR. BEAUDIN: Oh, there was a question yesterday on that if a super typhoon came and something catastrophic broke or in the process of shipping a piece of the machine it was damaged in shipment, how long would it take us to repair that problem? And, my answer to Col. Light was we have put this machine together in four months. If a portion of that machine breaks, we can repair it, have it here in two months if there is catastrophic damage to the machine. And that is the answer.

MR. TENORIO: May I? May I just clarify something?

COL. LIGHT: Please.

MR. TENORIO: I think my question is not referring

to break down of the machine. I think we have discussed that, although I have some questions with that regard. My question is maybe perhaps the second generation of the machine that was used in New Jersey do its purpose and should have shared with me, the community in New Jersey are not happy, kids are playing on the same ground where all the treatment was done, but we also discuss the environment, the difference of the environment there and here.

So, with all that taken into consideration, my question is what if the machine, after going through the process, the end result from where, the end result from bringing to where we're all expecting to bring the level of PCB, perhaps an alternative is to send the soil right back into the machine and see if it would do a good job. And I remember back in year 2000 when I requested that. Again, I brought that up, you know, but then again what if the second treatment still the result comes out to be the same? That is my what if.

MR. ADLER: Let's find out. What happens if it doesn't work?

MR. TENORIO: Yes.

MR. ADLER: That's the question. If 4E does not work, Colonel, what happens? Or technical experts? What happens.

COL. LIGHT: I think we start the process again and re-evaluate. We believe the machine has worked, the EPA believes it's worked. It's not -- I -- you've seen the machine, I've not seen the machine other than the pictures and the reading that I've done. I think the machine will work with the same degree of surety as

your car works. I don't think it's a question of working. I think it's just a question of it breaking down. If the machine does not work, the Army Corps of Engineers is still responsible to solve this problem. We're not going to walk away and say to you, I'm sorry, you bought the machine, we're out of here. We would still be responsible to figure out what to do next.

MR. TENORIO: So, in essence, you're saying that the top four options right now under consideration and again going back to the what ifs. What if. I'm sorry, I like to -- I like to play this devil advocate, what if. Do we still have those three options. If the what if prove to be what if it doesn't work, could one of the three options be considered then?

COL. LIGHT: I think so. The options, unless new technology came along, the options that we looked at would essentially be the same. So, if this, if 4E is selected and fails, then we would go back to the other alternatives. Go through this same quick process, if it's not quick, go to this process again and decide what to do.

MR. TENORIO: I mean you know, gentlemen, like said I am sorry but I, for some god given reason, I hope it's good. I just like to look at the worse scenario because sir, with all due respect, this is military teaching that I also have to have Plan B fall back if the what if gets to me, so that's, again, you know, I'm coming back. So I just wanted the residents to understand that when we decided on whatever option and it doesn't work, then the other options that were not selected are still open for further consideration.

MR. ADLER: I would like to say something, if I could and I really -- I know how difficult the questions are and I know how difficult this is for you here. I'm an outsider, he's an outsider, we're all outsiders. We don't live here, we walk away from here. But I really believe tonight people have spoken their heart and they tried very hard to communicate. Sometimes it's angry and there is much anger, so we know that. Let me finish, please.

MR. TENORIO: Oh, yes.

MR. ADLER: So we know that. So, I just want to appreciate the courtesies that you have shown and the willingness to talk. I appreciate the Colonel attempting to try to answer. He doesn't have all the perfect answers that you may want to hear, but I just need to say that as the Moderator tonight. I compliment you, I comment you on struggling to try to understand each other even if we disagree. Even if we disagree on things.

Two things. One is I really want to encourage you to use those, if there are more thoughts after this meeting, you want to submit a comment, the end of this meeting is not the end of the comments. It's August 3rd. And, second of all, tomorrow from 11:00 o'clock to 4:00 o'clock, the Army Corps, these consultants....

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 6:00 o'clock.

MR. ADLER: To 6:00 o'clock, excuse me. 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., these folks will be at the clinic all day. They will be there to talk informally. They'll bring their pictures. They'll bring their charts. It's another opportunity to exchange

information, to gather information to try to understand the situation even better. So, I don't want to pretend like this is our last moment, our last chance, it's not. So I'm going to open up for a few more comments and then I'll let Colonel have his last word and then we'll....

MR. TENORIO: Before -- before you take -- can I -- before -- if no more comment? Can I?

MR. ADLER: There is a comment. No, there's somebody....

MR. TENORIO: No, but if....

MR. ADLER: Somebody at the back.

MR. TENORIO: If no more comment, can I please say something to close the meeting?

MR. ADLER: That's fine, sure. Yes.

MS. CABRERA: Yeah, just one question, I don't mean to be picking on you Lieutenant Colonel, but....

COL. LIGHT: That's what I'm here for.

MS. CABRERA: You are the responsible party in this case and therefore you're it.

COL. LIGHT: Yeah, I'm the only one with the uniform, so go on.

MS. CABRERA: Let's say that we live in a more ideal place and let's say that Alternative 4E is the most practical solution to this issue, and let's say that hypothetically speaking you are able to secure the \$2 million as you had mentioned earlier, plus or minus financing. How far into the clean up process can you actually go with \$2 million, granted that you provided us with a figure of about \$6 million and if....

COL. LIGHT: I have 4 to 5 of that, 5 to 6 right

now.

MS. CABRERA: Right, but you're also mentioning that rather 6 -- ah, no, 5 or 6 million is not a guaranteed figure that--

COL. LIGHT: I have that right now. That I have.

MS. CABRERA: And you can divert all that into....

COL. LIGHT: I plan to use that on Tanapag.

MS. CABRERA: You can divert all that?

COL. LIGHT: ...[unintelligible - hereon too far from mike]. I can assure you that right now. That's money that Headquarters has given me to manage my 503 sites. We have determined that this site is the most important site.

MS. CABRERA: For the sake of our people, our residents of Tanapag, you went back to Hawaii and you justify that this needs to be diverted into this clean up, in the next five months we will not hear from you or at least within the next eight months, this issue of PCB will be resolved?

COL. LIGHT: Well, what has to happen is this. We'll take all these comments. We'll evaluate all these comments, make our recommendation to EPA. EPA will say yes or no. If EPA says yes, we selected this one and at what point should we -- I think we can start working together on this. Once we get a notice to proceed, 60 days. Sixty definitely. I don't know how much time EPA needs. So if comments come on the 3rd of August, probably at least three weeks to see all the comments. Pardon? I'm sorry?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: ...[unintelligible].

COL. LIGHT: ...[unintelligible] so I think around

October, November -- I'll have the money at that time.
That's shipping the unit here, setting the unit up,
tying the unit down with tie wires, securing the unit.
Three to four months. Three to four months.

MS. CABRERA: And this involves the 150 gallons of
water per minute, does it?

MR. BEAUDIN: The nominal capacity is 20 gallons.
The average.

MR. PALACIOS: Minimal of 20.

MS. CABRERA: 20.

MR. BEAUDIN: No, the average.

MS. CABRERA: Average. 20 gallons.

MR. BEAUDIN: And most of that is actually made up
by rain water.

MS. CABRERA: Just so that I understand, Tanapag
Village has a very limited water supply and the last
thing that we want is to further...[unintelligible].

MR. BEAUDIN: Yes.

MR. ADLER: Are there any questions? Okay, Juan,
if you'll say something briefly and then I'll turn it
over to the Colonel.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There's one in the back.

MR. ADLER: I'm sorry? One more question? Yes?

MR. BORJA: Like the machine -- is running on
fuel, right? As well as water too? Did you guys hear
of the gas crisis or oil crisis here and all of a
sudden we run out of gas? I can't almost, you know
drive around the island, you know.

COL. LIGHT: I'm not driving...[unintelligible].

MR. ADLER: The question was, have we considered
the price of fuel?

MR. CAVAGNOL: Absolutely. We have carried on discussions with both Shell and Mobil on this regard and they have assured that their ability to provide the needed fuel is not a problem. And, of course, we're checking the stock market price as well.

MR. BORJA: That's a big problem here too with water. Thanks.

MR. ADLER: Juan Tenorio.

MR. TENORIO: Well, ladies, gentlemen, especially our visitors sitting over there. Thank you. On behalf of the residents of Tanapag we thank you for coming. And despite our differences from the beginning and I guess shown again tonight and please take our comments, get the attitude as a sign of the frustration that's going 14 years now.

And, it's not easy to live in an environment that we all see people await or always conscious of our health, children's health. It is very hard. I believe that we should give you the benefit of the doubt that all the action then and now are all intended to be the best for the people of Tanapag. At times, we don't feel that they are to the best of our interest but then again, we have to give you that benefit of the doubt.

We thank you for coming, I believe that tonight is a very educational night. Our comments are almost become a confrontation, but with the composure of both groups, I believe that the meeting went well. I think I have been shown with a good hospitality by both the Corps and ECC during my trip to witness the operation of the machine. I would like to return that favor. Me and my wife, my family and, of course, members of the

TAG are more than happy to be with me. I'd like to do a small barbecue for you people before you leave, so please let me know. Let me know. I am offering this. I know maybe I'll get my neck wring as soon as I leave, it's okay.

There are some things that I witnessed personally and I take that personally and I would like to return that as an island hospitality style, I would do that. So please, please let me know before you leave so that I can do this planning. Thank you.

MR. ADLER: Thank you.

COL. LIGHT: Thank you. We knew coming in tonight that this was not going to be easy for you, we knew that this was not going to be easy for us. I think we all would have preferred to just avoid all this but the right thing to do is to do this meeting. I appreciate those of you who have stayed the entire time. I appreciate those of you who shared your comments with us.

As I said in the beginning, I don't have all the answers, my staff doesn't have all the answers, but what I do know is that none of the people behind me from the Corps of Engineers, from the contractor, or from the EPA caused this problem, but we're here to try to solve the problem and try to fix it.

I hope I've made clear that there are competing demands, there are competing things that cause us to do this or not to do this and I hope you have a better understanding of that. I think that's all I want to say, I really do appreciate everybody being here tonight and thank you very much for the good comments.

Thank you.

...[applaud].

****END OF PUBLIC HEARING****

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, Celina A. Concepcion, of Judicial Service,
Plus, hereby certify:

That the foregoing is a true and correct transcript (except those noted as (?) and "unintelligible") from the electronic sound recording of the taped public hearing conducted in the above-entitled matter transcribed under my direction and thereafter verified by me to the best of my knowledge and ability.

Dated at Saipan, Northern Mariana Islands, this
____ day of August, 2001.
