

**Hoosick Area Community Participation Work Group (CPWG)
Meeting Summary – October 28, 2020**

CPWG Member	Present	Excused	Absent
Marianne Zwicklbauer	X		
Emily Marpe	X		
Loreen Hackett	X		
Brian Keegan		X	
Barbara Lancour	X		
Brian Bushner		X	
Eric Sheffer	X		
Mark Surdam	X		
Rob Allen	X		
Pat Dailey			X
David Lukas	X		
Michael Hickey			X
Facilitator			
Nancy Pattarini, The Paige Group	X		
Carrie McMurray, The Paige Group	X		
Presenters			
Ben Potter, NYSDEC Region 4 Air Pollution Control Engineer	X		
Jim Perazzo, Principal with ERM (Environmental Resource Management)	X		

Note: The October 28, 2020 meeting of the CPWG was conducted via an online video/conference platform due to the restrictions associated with the COVID-19 pandemic. A press release reminder of the meeting date was issued to local media. A meeting date reminder and log-in directions were emailed to all community members who have signed up on the CPWG Listserv. Meeting-related materials may be found on the Hoosick Area CPWG website www.hoosickareacpwg.org and on the NYSDEC website <http://www.dec.ny.gov/chemical/108791.html>

Discussion Summary:

- I. Welcome – The Paige Group
 - a. Facilitator — The Paige Group
 - i. The Facilitator provided an overview of meeting agenda and protocol for online participation
 - ii. The Facilitator noted that the opportunity for comments from participating community members will be provided at the end of each presentation

- II. NYSDEC Update – Following are excerpts from the NYSDEC’s presentations
 - a. Air Emissions – Ben Potter, NYSDEC Region 4 Air Pollution Control Engineer
 - i. Overview of silicone rubber manufacturing at Saint-Gobain
 1. Mixing Operations – production involves mixing raw silicone rubber with peroxides, catalysts, accelerants, pigments and fillers on mills

**Hoosick Area Community Participation Work Group (CPWG)
Meeting Summary – October 28, 2020**

2. Curing Operations – the material is then processed in one of two processes, either rotocuring operations or sponge press operations, depending upon the product desired
3. Post-Cure Operations – finally, the material is processed on a batch basis through post-curing electric ovens
- ii. PTFE billet manufacturing
 1. PTFE powder press and electric sintering ovens within the Skive Area
 2. There are six sintering ovens connected to three stacks
 3. The ovens are designed to vent ambient oven air which heats and expands during the sintering operation
- iii. McCaffrey Street Emissions
 1. Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) 0.6 tons/year (>25 tons/year requires permit)
 2. Benzene - 32 lbs/year (>5 tons/ year requires permit)
 3. Particulate Matter <10 microns - 1.1 tons/year (must be less than 50 tons/year)
 4. Particulate Matter <2.5 microns - 0.9 tons/year (must be less than 50 tons/year)
 5. Oxides of Nitrogen - 0.8 tons/year (must be less than 50 tons/year)
- iv. Permitting Timeline
 1. Application received June 27, 2018
 - a. Full Air State facility application received
 - b. Independent emissions testing submitted qualifying potential process emissions
 2. Registration issued July 13, 2018 expires July 12, 2028
 - a. Requires records of production use of VOC, Benzene, and fuels
 - b. Tracks emissions
 1. Stack Testing within 180 days of startup
 - a. Stack testing will be scheduled at regular intervals
- v. Regenerative Thermal Oxidizer (RTO) Emission Control
 1. The oxidizer will control emissions from the post-cure ovens, the rotocure, the sponge press area, and the pressure sensitive adhesive sheet roller
 2. Will mitigate odor
 3. Will reduce benzene emissions
 4. Estimated concentrations of tetrafluoroethylene (TFE) and VOCs received from EPA ORD in late September
 - a. In-Stack and ambient concentration workplace levels were found to be below occupational exposure allowable levels.
 - b. PTFE sintering ovens will require no additional air pollution controls under our current process operation regulation (6NYCRR Part 212). Our work with EPA ORD to fully characterize PFAS and VOC emissions from this process has indicated in-stack emissions are extremely low and below our current guideline concentrations. If a facility can

**Hoosick Area Community Participation Work Group (CPWG)
Meeting Summary – October 28, 2020**

demonstrate they are below these guideline concentrations at their facility boundary, there are no additional regulatory requirements for the installation of additional air pollution controls.

vi. CPWG Comments/Questions

1. Q: Is PFAS listed on the permits?

A: PFAS is not listed on the permit because the PFAS emissions we detected were extremely low and could not be quantified.

2. Q: If PFAS is not used at the facility, how was it previously detected in air emissions?

A: Some PFASs were detected at extremely trace concentrations during the emissions testing. The primary compound detected was tetrafluoroethylene in extremely small estimated concentrations. This chemical is the monomer of polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) and is known to be a trace emission from the sintering process. Based on the before and after sintering weight of the PTFE billets during this testing, DEC concluded there was no real mass of PTFE lost during the sintering process and the in-stack TFE emissions were estimated to be trace by EPA ORD.

3. Q: If the RTO was used for the PTFE billet manufacturing, would it decrease emissions of other compounds?

A: There was a decision by St. Gobain not to route the emissions from the PTFE sintering ovens to the RTO. Based on the available information, DEC's regulatory authority could not be used to require St. Gobain to install additional air pollution control on this process operation.

4. Q: Are soil samples being taken at McCaffrey Street to identify historical emissions?

A: This is the next phase of study that is currently being explored by New York State.

vii. Public Comments/Questions

1. None

b. Municipal Water Supply Study (MWSS) Presenter — Jim Perazzo, Principal with ERM (Environmental Resource Management)

i. Supplemental investigation "Data Gap Area" scope of work:

1. Gather more geologic information north of Wysocki/LaCroix test wells

a) Indirect technique (geophysical survey) to locate test borings at two locations

b) Shallow and deep monitoring well pairs (within the same borehole) at each location above and below confining unit

c) Groundwater quality tests (21 different PFAS)

ii. Findings and investigation implications

1. Wysocki/LaCroix test wells meet current and conceptual future demand

**Hoosick Area Community Participation Work Group (CPWG)
Meeting Summary – October 28, 2020**

2. Water quality before and after 72-hour constant pumping test satisfies considerations as a potential groundwater source
3. Wysocki/LaCroix well field draws largely from depression in bedrock that is filled with gravel/sand
4. Data gap area (2,000 feet north of Wysocki/LaCroix test wells) has confining clay/silt layer indicating further protection
5. Data gap area aquifer is thinner, more fine-grained, and with shallower bedrock – likely reason drawdown from village well#7 wasn't detected at Wysocki/LaCroix
6. Similarly, drawdown from LaCroix test well was not detected by village monitoring wells

iii. CPWG Comments/Questions

1. Q: It appears the elevation of the new wells is the same as the current wells and not lower. Is this correct?

A: The village wells are at roughly 550', the Wysocki/LaCroix are slightly deeper. The geological composition changes between the current wells and the Wysocki/Lacroix wells.

2. Q: It was the village's understanding that there was an upper and lower aquifer. Are you saying that is not the case? Our concern is whether a Wysocki well would draw contamination down from the McCaffery site.

A: There is an upper and a lower aquifer generally separated by a confining unit throughout the Hoosick Falls area within the valley. The confining unit is absent between McCaffrey Street site and the current village well field. The confining unit is consistently present near the Wysocki and LaCroix well fields. The Village wells and the new Wysocki and LaCroix wells are all screened in the lower aquifer. The Wysocki and LaCroix wells are located upgradient and far enough from the current well field that it is very unlikely that the new wells would draw contamination from the existing well field, or from the McCaffrey street site. Testing to date shows no evidence of hydraulic connection to the current well field, or to the McCaffrey street site.

3. Q: When the new wells start drawing, how will they affect the aquifer?

A: The new wells will draw down the water table around the wells, creating a cone of depression. The local gradient of the water table will be drawn toward the wells. This impact is not expected to reach as far as the village well field, or the McCaffrey Street site.

i. Public Comments/Questions

1. None

III. CPWG Action Items

- a. Multi-Site Health Study Community Advisory Panel (CAP) Update
 - i. Currently working on data tables and setting up repository for related studies and literature
 - ii. CPWG member Michael Hickey has joined Loreen Hackett and Emily Marpe as CPWG representatives on the CAP

**Hoosick Area Community Participation Work Group (CPWG)
Meeting Summary – October 28, 2020**

- b. NYSDOH Update
 - i. New NYSDOH contact name for Hoosick Falls and status of November Water Quality Committee (WQC) meeting date/time and meeting link will be shared once identified/confirmed
 - ii. In the interim, contact Justin Deming with any NYSDOH-related questions. Justin's contact information is:
Justin Deming, Chief, Regions 4, 5 & 8
Bureau of Environmental Exposure Investigation
Email: justin.deming@health.ny.gov
Phone: 518.402.7860
 - iii. Additional information/status regarding PFAS health effects training for medical professionals will be provided and outreach will be conducted as part of the upcoming multi-community health study
- c. Establishment of CPWG Co-Chairs
 - i. The facilitator will recommend a process for selecting co-chairs
- d. Public Comments/Questions
 - i. None

IV. Other Hoosick Area CPWG Business

- a. Meeting Summaries
 - i. Posted on hoosickareacpwg.org
- b. Meeting Schedule – Meeting Location/Format TBD
 - i. 11/18/20
 - ii. 12/16/20
 - iii. 1/27/21
 - iv. 2/24/21