

EXHIBIT 6

General Electric Company
Hudson River PCBs Superfund Site
Responses to USEPA Comments on the Phase 1 Intermediate Design Report (IDR)
December 26, 2005

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS (USEPA'S NOVEMBER 1, 2005 COMMENT LETTER)

Category	USEPA Comment	GE Response
GENERAL COMMENTS ON REPORT TEXT		
D	<p>Comment 1 (Compliance with Remedial Design Work Plan, All Sections): The intermediate design requires an overall assessment of achievability of the performance standards (see final RD Work Plan). Consideration of achieving the standards individually and in combination is also required. EPA is not asking GE to guarantee achievement of the standards. It is understood that the work done during Phase 1 will help evaluate the ability to achieve the performance standards for the entire project, and whether the design must be modified to achieve the standards or the standards need to be revised. EPA also understands that the design team's intent is to design the project as best it can to achieve the standards. This intent should be clearly indicated in the text of the FDR.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The design is intended to achieve the performance standards, as required by the RD AOC at paragraph 35, "The Remedial Design shall be consistent with, and fully take account of, these performance standards." For the Final Design Report (FDR) the assessment presented in Section 3.1.1 of the Intermediate Design Report (IDR) will be revised to include the results of air, noise, and logistics modeling, which will be completed during final design. The project will be designed to meet the performance standards.</p>
B	<p>Comment 2: Several components including air quality evaluations, noise evaluations and dredge prisms were not advanced to the extent anticipated. As we have discussed, the results of these evaluations will be presented to EPA as they become available, so that EPA and GE have sufficient time to discuss these results prior to receipt of the draft final design.</p> <p>It should be noted that significant design work may be needed associated with the outcome of these evaluations. For example, potential measures to control air emissions including covering and enclosing area sources may be needed. Please submit these items to EPA for review as soon as they are complete. As soon as possible please submit a schedule for these submittals.</p>	<p>The design team has continued to develop, revise, and refine the air quality and noise evaluations since the submittal of the IDR and will be prepared to discuss the analyses of these issues with EPA prior to the submittal of the FDR. It will be difficult to provide final dredge prisms in advance of the Phase 1 Final Design Report (FDR). GE will attempt to provide some additional information on dredge prisms prior to FDR, if feasible.</p> <p>The design team recognizes that the air quality and noise evaluations, and the dredge prism development, are necessary to complete the final design. Providing this information to EPA in advance of the FDR may provide an additional opportunity for review and input by EPA. However, the input by EPA, depending on its substance, pertaining to these evaluations may require that the submittal date of the FDR be changed so that design revisions, if necessary, can be incorporated into the FDR.</p>
D	<p>Comment 3 (QA/QC, All Sections): Instances of inconsistent use of developed design values/approaches were noted (see specific comments provided). EPA anticipates that GE is performing a careful and thorough quality control review of the design and is evaluating the validity of assumptions in order to minimize loss of time by the</p>	<p>GE recognizes the importance of QA/QC on all design reports. GE's contractors are performing a careful and thorough quality control review of the intermediate design and will correct inconsistencies that affect the final design.</p>

General Electric Company
Hudson River PCBs Superfund Site
Responses to USEPA Comments on the Phase 1 Intermediate Design Report (IDR)
December 26, 2005

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS (USEPA'S NOVEMBER 1, 2005 COMMENT LETTER)

Category	USEPA Comment	GE Response
Y	designers due to advancing with potential problem information.	
C	<p>Comment 4 (Conformance with Critical Design Issues Attached to CD, All Sections): The versions of Attachments A, RAMP Scope; B, CHASP Scope; and C, PSCP Scope included in the IDR were earlier versions than those approved by EPA and made part of the Consent Decree. These attachments should be replaced with the final versions that are attached to the Consent Decree.</p>	<p>If used in the FDR, these scopes will be consistent with the RA CD attachments. The planned use of these scopes in the FDR is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RAM Scope will be attached to meet the RD Work Plan requirement of providing an Environmental Monitoring Plan. • The draft RA CHASP will be submitted concurrently with the FDR. The RA CHASP Scope defines the content of the RA CHASP. The RA CHASP will be a stand-alone document and the Scope will not be attached to the FDR • The PSCP Scope will provide a basis for some plans and specifications, but will not be attached to the FDR.
COMMENTS CONSIDERED OF PARTICULAR IMPORTANCE TO COMPLETION OF THE DESIGN AND TO THE PROJECT SCHEDULE		
D	<p>Comment 5 (Property Access Agreements and Use of Canal Property, Section 2.3.4.2, Page 2-13): Page 2-13, 2.3.4.2, para. 2 – The report states GE is currently negotiating with landowners to obtain use agreements for the sites. These negotiations should be given top priority so that all necessary land use agreements are in place before construction begins. These agreements include lease agreements with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> X The NYS Canal Corporation for use of the sediment processing site and other canal lands. X The NYS Department of Environmental Conservation for use of the East River Road site. X Any other lands or properties needed for the project. <p>Comment 6 (Agreement for Use of West River Road Support Site, Executive Summary, Section 3.6.3.2, Section 3.11): Establishing a support facility within the northern end of the Thompson Island Pool for docking project vessels during Phase 1 has obvious advantages compared to using the wharf and or docks at the sediment processing facilities at the Energy Park site. This would help minimize project related boat traffic</p>	<p>GE is continuing to negotiate property access with the appropriate land-owners.</p> <p>GE is discussing the support site with the NYSDEC. The FDR will include necessary design details for the support facility.</p>
D		

General Electric Company
Hudson River PCBs Superfund Site
Responses to USEPA Comments on the Phase 1 Intermediate Design Report (IDR)
December 26, 2005

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS (USEPA'S NOVEMBER 1, 2005 COMMENT LETTER)

Category	USEPA Comment	GE Response
D	<p>that would otherwise need to use Lock 7 of the Champlain Canal in order to access the work area and return to the Energy Park site as shifts change each work day. NYSDEC's planned public boat launch for this location is currently in the design stage and is expected to be constructed in 2006. The NYSDEC has advised EPA that the West River Road site could also accommodate the project support function as described in the IDR. However, revisions to the IDR's support facility layout as depicted in drawing P-0205 will likely be required in order to accommodate both uses simultaneously. These revisions can be incorporated into the draft Phase 1 final design.</p> <p>Comment 7 (Impacts on Canal Operations at Lock, Section 3.6.1.2): The Canal Corporation has advised EPA that it must have unlimited, uninterrupted, 24-hour access to Lock C-8 through an uncontaminated area. Also, the Canal Corporation has stated its opposition to closing Lock C-8 to the public. It is anticipated that an arrangement acceptable to the Canal Corporation will be worked out between GE and the Canal Corporation during negotiation of the lease agreement for use of Canal lands and that any changes in the layout of site roads will be described in the Final Design Report. It is requested that GE keep EPA informed of its progress on this issue as the Final Design is being completed and that GE notify EPA promptly if these negotiations reach an impasse.</p>	<p>GE is continuing to discuss the use of NYSDEC property for the project. As requested, GE will continue to keep EPA informed.</p>
C	<p>Comment 8 (Exemption from Canal Corporation Permit Requirements, Section 6, Page 6-1, Paragraph 1): The specifications prepared by GE for the remedial action should require contractors to comply with substantive provisions of relevant laws and regulations for all on-site work, and should include references to Canal Law (Chapter 5 of the Consolidated Laws of New York State), Navigation Law (Chapter 37 of the Consolidated Laws of New York State) and Canal Corporation Rules and Regulations. The specification should also advise the contractor(s) that all vessels must obtain passes for use of the locks on the canal system.</p>	<p>These provisions will be included in the appropriate specifications.</p>
D	<p>Comment 9 (Impacts on Fort Edward Yacht Basin, Section 3.5.1): The report states that the Fort Edward Yacht Basin will be closed for Phase 1. EPA has heard from numerous parties that the impact of closing this basin on</p>	<p>Public safety was the primary concern in determining the need for closing the east channel of Rogers Island to recreational boaters while conducting</p>

General Electric Company
Hudson River PCBs Superfund Site
Responses to USEPA Comments on the Phase 1 Interim Design Report (IDR)
December 26, 2005

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS (USEPA'S NOVEMBER 1, 2005 COMMENT LETTER)

Category	USEPA Comment	GE Response
B	<p>tourism on the Champlain Canal could be significant. As GE is aware, the Fort Edward Yacht Basin is about one day's travel time from Waterford in the south and White Hall in the north and is the only public stop-over point between these two locations. Closing this basin may deter boaters from using the canal and have an impact the volume of traffic and waterborne tourism south of Lake Champlain.</p> <p>The Canal Corporation has advised EPA that it would much prefer that the Yacht Basin remain open, at least for a short time each morning and evening, during the dredging and that it believes that this can be accomplished without endangering the public. EPA understands that GE will be meeting with the Canal Corporation's safety personnel in the near future to discuss how this might be accomplished. Other potential solutions could involve providing an alternative docking facility for the boats that would normally use the Yacht Basin. Public comments also have been received on this issue and argue for some accommodation of boaters that use the canal for passage through the area. EPA considers this to be a highly important issue that deserves the focused attention of the GE and government design teams. GE shall provide a recommendation to EPA and the Canal Corporation as to how this issue will be addressed and include a description of the agreed upon solution in the FDR.</p>	<p>dredging and backfill activities in Phase 1. There are four locations between Waterford and Whitehall other than Fort Edward where stop-over facilities are available to the public (e.g., Schuylerville Yacht Basin, Coveville Marina, Admirals Marina, and Lock 1 Marina).</p> <p>GE is discussing with NYSCC and EPA the possibility for part-time access to the Yacht Basin, during periods when dredging is not occurring, or potential alternative docking facilities. However, public safety will be the primary consideration in making this design decision.</p>
D	<p>Comment 10 (Concerns About Ability to Operate in Canal, Section 3.4.1): The use of the Champlain Canal is an important element in the design and implementation of the project. Concerns have been raised about the on-water logistics during the project as described in the IDR. Of particular concern is the potential for a large volume of traffic in the vicinity of Lock 7 and the East River Road site during initial work under Phase 1, the need for a snubbing post or other means of assisting the barges leaving the East Channel of Rogers Island in turning to enter Lock 7, the need for mooring points for barges and other vessels in the River near Lock 7 as they await passage through the Lock, moorings for vessels on Sundays when dredging is not currently planned, and interference by curious boaters and the press with project vessels during the initial stages of Phase [1.] Traffic management may be needed during this</p>	<p>The final design will provide specifications for mooring points and a snubbing post.</p> <p>The Performance Standards Compliance Plan (PSCP) Scope states (on page 6-2): "Project-related river traffic shall be controlled and scheduled so that interference with non-project-related vessels is not unnecessarily hindered, while at the same time allowing efficient performance of the project." The Phase 1 FDR will be completed in accordance with this objective. Traffic management requirements will be described in the appropriate specifications and the marine contractor(s) will be required to provide information regarding waterborne traffic management as a component of the Remedial</p>

