Final Third Five-Year Review Report for the Hudson River PCBs Superfund Site

APPENDIX 6

FIVE-YEAR REVIEW SITE INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Prepared by:

USEPA

January 2025

FIVE-YEAR REVIEW SITE INSPECTION OBJECTIVES

Site inspections, as part of the five-year review processes, are conducted to provide information about a site's status and to visually confirm and document the conditions of the remedy, the site, and the surrounding area.

The five-year review site inspection checklist, developed by EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), was used for the purpose of collection important information during the site inspection portion of the five-year review. The inspection checklist for the Hudson River PCBs Superfund Site is divided into sections as follows:

I. Site Information
II. Interviews
III. On-site Documents & Records Verified
IV. System Operations Costs
V. Access and Institutional Controls
VI. General Site Conditions
VII. Overall Observations

Site inspections for this FYR were conducted for OU1 on August 30, 2022, and for OU2 on Oct 5, 2022. The inspections were conducted by EPA and included representatives from GE. Beside this site inspections, EPA team has been regularly working at multiple areas throughout the site and making observations. This includes making observations while observing the water, fish, and sediment monitoring programs as well as while observing the habitat restoration program. Additional inspection forms are not provided for these regular observations as they assist to inform EPA and USACE with the context of the site while the Site Inspection is being performed.

Final Third Five-Year Review Report for the Hudson River PCBs Superfund Site

APPENDIX 6-1

FIVE-YEAR REVIEW SITE INSPECTION CHECKLIST
OU1

Prepared by:

USEPA

January 2025

Five-Year Review Site Inspection Checklist – OU1

I. SITE INFORMATION	
Site name: Hudson River PCBs Superfund Site, OU1: Remnant Deposit Sites	**Date of inspection:** August 30, 2022
Location and Region: New York, Hudson Falls and Fort Edward	**EPA ID:** NYD980763841
Agency, office, or company leading the five-year review: EPA Region 2	**Weather/temperature:** Partly cloudy; 80° F

Remedy Includes: (Check all that apply)

☒Landfill cover/containment
☒ Access controls
☐ Institutional controls
☐ Groundwater pump and treatment
☐ Surface water collection and treatment
☐ Other:
☐ Monitored natural attenuation/recovery
☐ Groundwater containment
☐ Vertical barrier walls

Attachments: ☒ Inspection team roster attached ☒ Site map attached

II. INTERVIEWS (Not Applicable - See Part 4 Other Interviews)

1. **System Operations Site Manager**

_____ _____ _____
Name Title Date
Interviewed ☐ at site ☐ at office ☐ by phone Phone no. _____
Problems, suggestions; ☐ Report attached _____

2. System Operations Staff _____ _____ _____
Name Title Date
Interviewed ☐ at site ☐ at office ☐ by phone Phone no. _____
Problems, suggestions; ☐ Report attached _____

3. **Local regulatory authorities and response agencies** (i.e., State and Tribal offices, emergency response office, police department, office of public health or environmental health, zoning office, recorder of deeds, or other city and county offices, etc.) Fill in all that apply.

Agency _____
Contact _____ _____ _____ _____
Name Title Date Phone no.
Problems; suggestions; ☐ Report attached _____
_____

Agency _____
Contact _____ _____ _____ _____
Name Title Date Phone no.
Problems; suggestions; ☐ Report attached _____
_____

Agency _____
Contact _____ _____ _____ _____
Name Title Date Phone no.
Problems; suggestions; ☐ Report attached _____
_____

Agency _____
Contact _____ _____ _____ _____
Name Title Date Phone no.
Problems; suggestions; ☐ Report attached _____
_____

4. **Other interviews** (optional) ☐ Report attached.

Meetings between Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and General Electric (GE) have generally occurred on a biweekly basis over the past five years.

III. ON-SITE DOCUMENTS & RECORDS VERIFIED (Check all that apply)

1. System Operations **Documents**

☒System Operations manual(s)	☒Readily available	☒Up to date	☐ N/A
☒ As-built drawings	☒ Readily available	☒ Up to date	☐ N/A
☒ Maintenance logs	☒ Readily available	☒ Up to date	☐ N/A

Remarks: Documents produced by GE are provided to EPA.

2. **Site-Specific Health and Safety Plan** ☒ Readily available ☒ Up to date ☐ N/A
☐ Contingency plan/emergency response plan ☐ Readily available ☐ Up to date ☒ N/A
Remarks: GE maintains Health and Safety Plans for the Remnant Deposits

3. **System Operations and OSHA Training Records** ☐ Readily available ☐ Up to date ☒ N/A
Remarks_____

4. **Permits and Service Agreements**

☐Air discharge permit	☐ Readily available	☐ Up to date	☒ N/A
☐ Effluent discharge	☐ Readily available	☐ Up to date	☒ N/A
☐ Waste disposal, POTW	☐ Readily available	☐ Up to date	☒ N/A
☐ Other permits:_____	☐ Readily available	☐ Up to date	☒ N/A

Remarks:_____

6. **Discharge Compliance Records**

☐ Air	☐ Readily available	☐ Up to date	☒ N/A
☐ Water (effluent)	☐ Readily available	☐ Up to date	☒ N/A

Remarks: _____

7. **Daily Access/Security Logs** ☐ Readily available ☐ Up to date ☒ N/A

Remarks: Access is controlled and restricted with fences surrounding deposits.

IV. SYSTEM OPERATIONS COSTS

1. **System Operations Organization**

☐ State in-house ☐ Contractor for State
☒ PRP in-house ☒ Contractor for PRP
☐ Federal Facility in-house ☐ Contractor for Federal Facility
☐ Other

Remarks: OM&M is performed by GE and overseen by EPA.

2. **System Operations Cost Records**

☒ N/A ☐ Readily available ☐ Up to date

☒ Funding mechanism/agreement in place (GE performing remedy, including O&M, pursuant to 1990 consent decree with the United States)

Original System Operations cost estimate_____ ☐ Breakdown attached

Total annual cost by year for review period if available

From_____	To_____	_____	☐ Breakdown attached
Date	Date	Total cost	
From_____	To_____	_____	☐ Breakdown attached
Date	Date	Total cost	
From_____	To_____	_____	☐ Breakdown attached
Date	Date	Total cost	
From_____	To_____	_____	☐ Breakdown attached
Date	Date	Total cost	
From_____	To_____	_____	☐ Breakdown attached
Date	Date	Total cost	

V. ACCESS AND INSTITUTIONAL CONTROLS X Applicable ☐ N/A

A. Fencing

1. **Fencing damaged** ☐ Location shown on site map ☐ Gates secured ☒ N/A

Remarks: Fencing is inspected in the fall and spring of each year; any damage is quickly repaired.

B. Other Access Restrictions

1.	**Signs and other security measures** ☐ Location shown on site map ☐ N/A Remarks: OU1 remnant deposit signs were inspected on August 30, 2022 and were satisfactory. These signs are inspected regularly twice a year and replaced as needed.

C. Institutional Controls (ICs)	
1.	**Implementation and enforcement** Remarks: The ROD did not identify institutional controls for the remnant deposits. However, EPA has identified institutional controls that should be implemented to restrict future use of the remnant properties to uses and activities that would not compromise the integrity of the cap system or result in unacceptable risks of exposures to contaminants. EPA, New York State, and GE are researching ownership of the remnant sites so that an appropriate institutional control can be implemented.
2.	**Adequacy** ☐ ICs are adequate ☒ ICs are inadequate ☐ N/A Remarks: See Above.
D. General	
1.	**Vandalism/trespassing** ☐ Location shown on site map ☒ No vandalism evident Remarks: No vandalism observed during the inspection, The sites are inspected a minimum of twice a year and evidence of trespassing and vandalism are documented. It is common to find evidence of trespassing (i.e., four-wheeler ruts) but these unauthorized activities have not impacted the integrity of the cap. Ruts have been filled. Signage and fences are inspected and repaired as needed to limit trespassing to the extent practicable.
2.	**Land use changes on site** Remarks: None.
3.	**Land use changes off site** Remarks: None.

VI. GENERAL SITE CONDITIONS	
A. Roads ☒ Applicable ☐ N/A	
1.	**Roads damaged** ☐ Location shown on site map ☒ Roads adequate ☐ N/A Remarks: No issues observed, roads are repaired on an as-needed basis to provide access to the Sites.
B. Other Site Conditions	
	Remarks: A downed tree from a landslide was observed on the land-side edge of the cap for Remnant Deposit 2. The tree was subsequently removed, and GE reported no significant damage to the cap.

Inspection Roster

Organization	Name
EPA	Michael Cheplowitz
EPA	Matt Wiener
Arcadis on behalf of General Electric	Zachary Evans

VII. OVERALL OBSERVATIONS	
A.	**Implementation of the Remedy**
	Describe issues and observations relating to whether the remedy is effective and functioning as designed. Begin with a brief statement of what the remedy is to accomplish (i.e., to contain contaminant plume, minimize infiltration and gas emission, etc.). Remarks: The remedy currently protects human health and the environment as the in-place containment and cap system prevents human exposure, and perimeter fencing and signage continue to be maintained. However, in order for the remedy to be protective in the long-term, an institutional control needs to be implemented to ensure that future use of remnant deposits does not compromise the integrity of the cap system or result in unsafe exposures. Containment of contaminated sediments is functioning as expected.
B.	**Adequacy of System Operations** Remarks: None.
	Describe issues and observations related to the implementation and scope of System Operation procedures. In particular, discuss their relationship to the current and long-term protectiveness of the remedy. Remarks: None.
C.	**Early Indicators of Potential Remedy Problems**
	Describe issues and observations such as unexpected changes in the cost or scope of System Operations or a high frequency of unscheduled repairs that suggest that the protectiveness of the remedy may be compromised in the future. Remarks: N/A
D.	**Opportunities for Optimization**
	Describe possible opportunities for optimization in monitoring tasks or the operation of the remedy. Remarks: The remnant deposits have typically been mowed twice per year, once in the spring and once in the fall. There may be advantages to only mowing once per year that include increased habitat for wildlife and potential to reduce costs and emissions associated with mowing. EPA and GE will discuss if this is practical, as an annual mowing is more difficult to complete and may not be practical. NYSDEC is supportive of reducing the mowing to once per year.

Final Third Five-Year Review Report for the Hudson River PCBs Superfund Site

APPENDIX 6-1

FIVE-YEAR REVIEW SITE INSPECTION CHECKLIST
OU1

ATTACHMENT A

INSPECTION PHOTO LOG

Prepared by:

USEPA

January 2025

Photo 1. Remnant Deposit 1 (island and nearby shallows).

Photo 2. Remnant Deposit 2 with a fallen tree in the background.

Photo 3. Remnant Deposit 2 (facing northwest from Remnant Deposit 3).

Photo 4. Remnant Deposit 3 (facing north).

Photo 5. Remnant Deposit 3 (facing south).

Photo 6. Remnant Deposit 4 (facing southwest from Remnant Deposit 3).

Photo 7. Remnant Deposit 4.

Photo 8. Remnant Deposit 4 (facing south).

Photo 9. Remnant Deposit 5 (facing northeast from Rogers Island).

Final Third Five-Year Review Report for the Hudson River PCBs Superfund Site

APPENDIX 6-2

FIVE-YEAR REVIEW SITE INSPECTION CHECKLIST
OU2

Prepared by:

USEPA

January 2025

Five-Year Review Site Inspection Checklist – OU2

I. SITE INFORMATION	
Site name: Hudson River PCBs Superfund Site	**Date of inspection: 10/5/2022**
Location and Region: New York, Hudson Falls to Battery in NYC	**EPA ID:** NYD980763841
Agency, office, or company leading the five-year review: EPA Region 2	**Weather/temperature: 70ºF, cloudy with scattered/light rain**

Remedy Includes: (Check all that apply)

☒ Landfill cover/containment (in-river caps)
☐ Access controls
☒ Institutional controls
☐ Groundwater pump and treatment
☐ Surface water collection and treatment
☒ Other: Dredging of contaminated sediments
☒Monitored natural attenuation/recovery
☐ Groundwater containment
☐ Vertical barrier walls

Attachments: ☒ Inspection team roster attached ☐ Site map attached

II. INTERVIEWS (Not Applicable - See Part 4 Other Interviews)

1. **System Operations site manager**

_____ _____ _____
Name Title Date
Interviewed ☐ at site ☐ at office ☐ by phone Phone no. _____
Problems, suggestions; ☐ Report attached _____

2. System Operations **Staff** _____ _____ _____
Name Title Date
Interviewed ☐ at site ☐ at office ☐ by phone Phone no. _____
Problems, suggestions; ☐ Report attached _____

3. **Local regulatory authorities and response agencies** (i.e., State and Tribal offices, emergency response office, police department, office of public health or environmental health, zoning office, recorder of deeds, or other city and county offices, etc.) Fill in all that apply.

Agency _____
Contact _____ _____ _____ _____
Name Title Date Phone no.
Problems; suggestions; ☐ Report attached _____
_____

Agency _____
Contact _____ _____ _____ _____
Name Title Date Phone no.
Problems; suggestions; ☐ Report attached _____
_____

Agency _____
Contact _____ _____ _____ _____
Name Title Date Phone no.
Problems; suggestions; ☐ Report attached _____
_____

Agency _____
Contact _____ _____ _____ _____
Name Title Date Phone no.
Problems; suggestions; ☐ Report attached _____

4. **Other interviews** (optional) ☐ Report attached.

Meetings between EPA and GE have occurred on a regular basis over the past five years, EPA oversees GEs work and interacts with GEs contractors during work.

III. ON-SITE DOCUMENTS & RECORDS VERIFIED (Check all that apply)

1. System Operations Documents

☒ System Operations manual(s)	☒ Readily available	☐ Up to date	☐ N/A
☒ As-built drawings	☒ Readily available	☐ Up to date	☐ N/A
☒ Maintenance logs	☒ Readily available	☐ Up to date	☐ N/A

Remarks: Documents produced by GE and its contractors are provided to EPA and are kept at the EPA field office located at 187 Wolf Road, Albany, New York. Electronic records are also kept and stored by EPA. In 2021 EPA began the process of optimizing the OM&M work, the optimized program is being documented in the long-term OM&M work plan.

2.	**Site-Specific Health and Safety Plan**	☒ Readily available	☒ Up to date	☐ N/A
	☐ Contingency plan/emergency response plan	☒ Readily available	☒ Up to date	☐ N/A
	Remarks: Community Health and Safety Plan was also in place.			
3.	**System Operations and OSHA Training Records**	☐ Readily available	☐ Up to date	☒N/A
	Remarks_____			
4.	**Permits and Service Agreements**			
	☐ Air discharge permit	☐ Readily available	☐ Up to date	☒ N/A
	☐ Effluent discharge	☐ Readily available	☐ Up to date	☒ N/A
	☐ Waste disposal, POTW	☐ Readily available	☐ Up to date	☒ N/A
	☐ Other permits:	☐ Readily available	☐ Up to date	☒ N/A
	Remarks:			
6.	**Discharge Compliance Records**			
	☐ Air	☐ Readily available	☐ Up to date	☒ N/A
	☐ Water (effluent)	☐ Readily available	☐ Up to date	☒ N/A
	Remarks:			
7.	**Daily Access/Security Logs**	☐ Readily available	☐ Up to date	☒ N/A
	Remarks:			

IV. SYSTEM OPERATIONS COSTS

1.	**System Operations Organization**	
	☐ State in-house	☐ Contractor for State
	☒ PRP in-house	☒ Contractor for PRP
	☐ Federal Facility in-house	☐ Contractor for Federal Facility
	☐ Other	
	Remarks: Handled by GE and their contractors.	

2. **System Operations Cost Records**

☒ N/A ☐ Readily available ☐ Up to date

☒ Funding mechanism/agreement in place (GE performing remedy, including O&M, pursuant to 2006 consent decree with the United States)

Original System Operations cost estimate_____ ☐ Breakdown attached

Total annual cost by year for review period if available

From_____ To_____ _____ ☐ Breakdown attached
Date Date Total cost

From_____ To_____ _____ ☐ Breakdown attached
Date Date Total cost

From_____ To_____ _____ ☐ Breakdown attached
Date Date Total cost

From_____ To_____ _____ ☐ Breakdown attached
Date Date Total cost

From_____ To_____ _____ ☐ Breakdown attached
Date Date Total cost

V. ACCESS AND INSTITUTIONAL CONTROLS X Applicable ☐ N/A

A. Fencing

1. **Fencing damaged** ☐ Location shown on site map ☐ Gates secured ☒ N/A
Remarks:

B. Other Access Restrictions

1. **Signs and other security measures** ☐ Location shown on site map ☐ N/A
Remarks: Fishing advisory signs along the Hudson River are checked regularly and replaced as needed.

C. Institutional Controls (ICs)

1. **Implementation and enforcement**

Site conditions imply ICs not properly implemented ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A

Site conditions imply ICs not being fully enforced ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A

Type of monitoring (e.g., self-reporting, drive by) Drive-by

Enforcement: Fishing license and/or enrollment in the recreational marine fishing registry required to fish in the Hudson River. New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH) issues fish advisories and New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) issues regulations for fishing in the Hudson River.

Frequency: Continuous

Responsible party/agency: EPA, NYSDOH and NYSDEC.

Contact	Name	Title	Date	Phone no.
	Bridget Boyd	NYSDOH Public Health Specialist		(518) 402-7860
	David Tromp	NYSDEC Section Chief		(518) 764-2401

Reporting is up-to-date ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Reports are verified by the lead agency ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Specific requirements in deed or decision documents have been met ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Violations have been reported ☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A

Other problems or suggestions: ☒ Report attached

NYSDOH maintains an outreach program to inform the public about the advisories and restrictions. A discussion of this program is included in Appendix 8.

2. **Adequacy** ☒ ICs are adequate ☐ ICs are inadequate ☐ N/A

Remarks: Advisories and restrictions in place, exposures to public are being controlled. However, there is evidence that some anglers disregard the advisories and restrictions and consume fish from the Hudson River.

D. General

1. **Vandalism/trespassing** ☐ Location shown on site map ☐ No vandalism evident

Remarks Signs are checked regularly, if reported missing, signs are replaced.

2. **Land use changes on site** ☒ N/A

Remarks

3. **Land use changes off site** ☒ N/A

Remarks

4. **Implementation of fish consumption advisories**

Remarks: Advisories and restrictions are in place. NYSDOH continues to make regular updates to the outreach program.

5. **Implementation of fishing restrictions**

Remarks: NYSDEC regulations include catch and release only for the Hudson River from the Troy Dam upstream to Bakers Falls in the village of Hudson Falls and tributaries in this section to first barrier impassable by fish, including Mohawk River below the Route 32 bridge.

VI. GENERAL SITE CONDITIONS

A. Roads ☐ Applicable ☒ N/A

1. **Roads damaged** ☐ Location shown on site map ☐ Roads adequate ☒ N/A

Remarks:

B. Inspections (Not Applicable)				
Name (nearby location)	**Inspection Date**	**Purpose of Site**	**Identified Incomplete or Deficient Items**	**Follow Up**
North Rogers Island	10/5/2022	Site of Former Fort Edward Dam, and a water quality sampling location	None	N/A
CUs 0 and 1	10/5/2022	Dredging location at northern end of site.	None	N/A
TD1 Fish Station	10/5/2022	Annual fish sampling location	None	N/A
Moreau Launch	10/5/2022	Barge loading area for fill and cap materials	None	N/A
TD2 Fish Station	10/5/2022	Annual fish sampling location	None	N/A
TD3 Fish Station	10/5/22	Annual fish sampling location	None	N/A
TD4 Fish Station	10/5/22	Annual fish sampling location	None	N/A
TD5 Spring fish station	10/5/22	Annual fish sampling location	None	N/A
TD5 Fall fish station	10/5/22	Annual fish sampling location	None	N/A
South Griffin Island riverine fringing wetland reconstruction	10/5/22	Riverine fringing wetland reconstruction area	None	N/A
ND3 Fish station	10/5/22	Annual fish sampling location	None	N/A
NYSDEC Hotspot 28	10/5/22	Habitat reconstruction area.	None	N/A

Inspection Roster	
Organization	**Name**
EPA	Daniel Wiener
EPA	Michael Cheplowitz
WSP	Michael Traynor
WSP	Juliana Atmadja
WSP	Solomon Gbondo-Tugbawa
WSP	Kenneth Takagi
Anchor QEA	Ryan Davis

VII. OVERALL OBSERVATIONS	
A.	**Implementation of the Remedy**
	Describe issues and observations relating to whether the remedy is effective and functioning as designed. Begin with a brief statement of what the remedy is to accomplish (i.e., to contain contaminant plume, minimize infiltration and gas emission, etc.). The goals of the remedy are to reduce the risks to humans and ecological receptors by reducing PCB levels in fish and to minimize the downstream transport of PCBs by reducing PCB concentrations in river sediments through dredging, capping, and monitored natural attenuation. Dredging as prescribed in the Record of Decision (ROD) has been completed and backfill has been completed. Habitat reconstruction has been completed and is being monitored for benchmark and success criteria. Monitoring of natural recovery in water, fish, and sediment will continue. Fish data will be assessed against the remediation targets and the remediation goal as defined in the ROD.
B.	**Adequacy of System Operations**
	Describe issues and observations related to the implementation and scope of System Operation procedures. In particular, discuss their relationship to the current and long-term protectiveness of the remedy. Land-based facilities have been demobilized and restored. OM&M sediment sampling commenced in the fall of 2021. EPA is reviewing GE's updated OM&M plan, which was submitted in 2022. OM&M plans are being reviewed on an ongoing basis. OM&M for Phase 1 and Phase 2 caps and habitat is ongoing. Reconstructed wetlands were observed on previously dredged and capped portions of the river bottom. Additional planting and habitat construction and maintenance items measures were discussed and implemented for the program. Sediment cap integrity was not assessed during the inspection, but a cap assessment is included in Appendix 4 of this five-year review.
C.	**Early Indicators of Potential Remedy Problems**
	Describe issues and observations such as unexpected changes in the cost or scope of System Operations or a high frequency of unscheduled repairs that suggest that the protectiveness of the remedy may be compromised in the future. Data collection for OM&M underway (i.e., sediment, fish, water). Data are being reviewed as they are received. No problems have been noted to date.
D.	**Opportunities for Optimization**
	Describe possible opportunities for optimization in monitoring tasks or the operation of the remedy. A new iteration of the OM&M plan is being implemented. The scope for the OM&M program is under continuous review with an adaptive approach for updates and revisions. Variability (in year and year to year) in water, fish, and sediment datasets presents a large challenge for assessing the remedy as part of OM&M. Additional adjustments to the monitoring program may be made as necessary in the future.

Final Third Five-Year Review Report for the Hudson River PCBs Superfund Site

APPENDIX 6-2

FIVE-YEAR REVIEW SITE INSPECTION CHECKLIST
OU2

ATTACHMENT A

INSPECTION PHOTO LOG

Prepared by:

USEPA

January 2025

Representative photographs with descriptions taken throughout the 40 miles of OU2.

Photo 1. Water column sampling location north of Rogers Island. Remnant Deposit 5 is visible in the background.

Photo 2. Location of CUs 0 and CU 1, where silting in after dredging was observed.

Representative photographs with descriptions taken throughout the 40 miles of OU2.

Photo 3. Cove in CU8 that is included in the TD1 fish sampling area.

Photo 4. TD1 fish sampling location and CU6 (looking south).

Representative photographs with descriptions taken throughout the 40 miles of OU2.

Photo 5. NYSDEC Moreau launch and loading area during dredging (Reach 8).

Photo 6. TD2 fish sampling area. A short-term response action (shoreline stone placement) is visible along the shoreline in the background as part of the Hudson River floodplain program.

Representative photographs with descriptions taken throughout the 40 miles of OU2.

Photo 7. TD3 fish sampling location near the confluence with Snook Kill.

Photo 8. Fish sampling location TD4.

Representative photographs with descriptions taken throughout the 40 miles of OU2.

Photo 9. Fish sampling location TD5 along West Griffin Island.

Representative photographs with descriptions taken throughout the 40 miles of OU2.

Photo 10. Reconstructed wetland at the southern tip of Griffin Island.

Photo 11. Fish sampling location ND3.

Representative photographs with descriptions taken throughout the 40 miles of OU2.

Photo 12. NYSDEC Hotspot 28, which was identified as a high-priority dredging area. A monitored habitat construction area was established on top of the fill.

Photo 13. The southern extent of NYSDEC Hotspot 28.

Representative photographs with descriptions taken throughout the 40 miles of OU2.

Photo 14. Fish sampling location ND4.

Photo 15. Fish sampling location ND5 with a wetland reconstruction area in the background.

Representative photographs with descriptions taken throughout the 40 miles of OU2.

Photo 16. The Schuylerville Dix Bridge water column sampling location.

Photo 17. Fish sampling location SW1.

Representative photographs with descriptions taken throughout the 40 miles of OU2.

Photo 18. Fish sampling location SW2.

Photo 19. Fish sampling location SW3.