

Special Town Council Meeting Town Clerk's Office (10)

February 10, 1986

7:00 p.m.

A special meeting of the Wallingford Town Council was held on this date. The meeting was held at the Wallingford Public Library and taped live for cable television. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Gessert at 7:03 p.m. All Council members were present for the meeting with the exception of Councilwoman Marie B. Bergamini who was out of State and could not make it back for the meeting.

Chairman Gessert then thanks everyone for attending and also for those who will be tuned into cable television. He then introduces all who will be participating in the discussion. They are Diane Denis, State Health Department; Dr. Brown, State Health Department; Mayor William W. Dickinson, Jr.; Councilman Edward Polanski; Councilman Steven B. Holmes; Councilman Raymond Rys; himself; Councilwoman Iris F. Papale; Councilman Peter A. Gouveia; Councilman Edward L. Diana; Councilman Albert E. Killen; Mr. Walter Mordarsky, a mathematical physicist who lives in Wallingford and spent 27 yrs. with Combustion Engineering; Ian Thompson, CSI; Dennis Martin, CRRA; Phil Hamel, employed by the Town of Wallingford who has been studying Resource Recovery since the mid 70's; Lew Clark, ViCon; Bob Rubino, DEP Air Quality Unit; Ken Majors, DEP Water Compliance; Charles Kurker, DEP Solid Waste; and Representative Mary Mushinsky.

Chairman Gessert then explains that they did ask for questions from the public. They will answer the individual questions first and later on get into the group questions. Council members will have an opportunity to ask questions under the various topics. He then notes that they do have 8 pages of questions from PAGB and depending on how long they take to answer these questions will determine if they get through all 8 pages. Those questions they are not able to answer on TV this evening they will provide written answers to those people that sent those questions in. He then says he would like to comment on the format of this evening and he reads a letter dated Friday, January 17th and received by him on the 18th. The man had said he attended the meeting of the 16th and he wondered if it would be possible to have a debate on the public access channel so that the questions from both sides could be answered and examined by the public. He then says he also received a number of phone calls for this same type of idea. He did not originate the idea but he did feel it was an excellent suggestion and followed up on it. Many people wrote letters, some wrote statements and some wrote questions. For the record he then reads the names of those he got letters from with no specific questions. They are from Mr. John Thurston and Dr. Breck with no specific questions but statements. He has a letter from Ed Bradley with no questions but just statements. A letter from Mr. Ronald Gregory, no questions, just statements and Mr. Geno Zandri sent a couple of letters with no specific questions. We have a letter from S & M Lorenzo on Grandview Avenue with no specific questions and a letter from James & Rosemarie DeVivo with no specific questions. The first letter he received with specific questions was from Nal & Gloria

Pocobello. He then says they will pose the question to the panelist that has the best background who can handle those questions that are addressed. He then poses these questions to Dennis Martin:

- What happens to Batteries?
- What happens to 1/2 full paint cans?
- What happens to aerosol cans? Pillows etc. when burned?

Mr. Martin then says the only danger in burning batteries is with car batteries. The majority of car batteries people buy are recycled and taken back to the place where they buy the new one. The State and the Towns are working toward the establishment of hazardous waste cleanup days during which items such as old paint cans etc. would be collected and disposed of at a hazardous waste facility. The small number of these that do go through the plant will be destroyed with the incineration process. Most are solvents that burn very well. Aerosol cans would get the same response. As far as pillows, the minimum combustion temperature is 1800° F with a maximum of 2000°+ and these materials would be effectively destroyed.

87

Mr. Mordarsky says the materials would not have to be closely monitored since the organics would be destroyed and the metallic materials would end up either as oxides or hydroxides. These metallic oxides are highly insoluble in water and will wind up in the ash that is stabilized with calcium.

Chairman Gessert then reads the 4th question that asks "Will the town have to take out extra Insurance to cover itself against lawsuits in case of a health disaster?"

Mr. Hamel then says most risks will be covered by project insurance and the town will be protected by that. In case insurance is not available, all 5 towns will self insure the plant and they will self insure jointly with the plant owner and any claims on the project will be shared that way. This is not different from our current landfill except that there is no one to share the liability with us now and the Resource Recovery Plant will have less cause for liability than the landfill.

Mr. Gouveia then asks Mr. Hamel who determines if the insurance is not readily available? Mr. Hamel says ultimately it is the policy board. Mr. Gouveia then says his contract says it is CRRA who determines if the insurance is not reasonably available. Mr. Hamel says that is correct but they then have to have that approved by the policy board. The Town ultimately decides whether or not the insurance is readily available. If they determine it is not reasonably available, the project becomes a self insured project in that area of insurance.

Chairman Gessert then says the next questions he has are from Mike and Dorothy Denino from West Street. They have 5 questions. The first is "What if mechanical failure occurs and Where will the garbage be hidden or covered up while being fixed?"

Mr. Martin says the plant is a modular plant and has 3 independent lines in it. It would be very rare for all 3 to shut down. Whenever the plant is shut down, partial or complete, and they expect it for less than two weeks, then they will take the material to the Meriden or Wallingford landfills. If it were for more than the two weeks, 2 months etc. they would take it to the Hartford project or the Bridgeport project etc.

Mr. Gouveia then says that the contract says if the plant is closed in excess of 15 days, CRRA will do their best to see that the garbage is disposed of. Will the garbage remain where it originates or will it still be coming to the plant. Mr. Martin again says once they make the determination that the plant is not functioning, it will go to the Wallingford or Meriden landfill. Mr. Hamel then says there is a 15 day period but the contract says once it is expected that it will be more than 15 days, they will immediately try and move the refuse to another location.

Mr. Diana then asks if Meriden has been given the permit to dump trash in their landfill. Mr. Hamel says CRRA will receive the permit as they will be the operator. They have not yet received the permit. Mr. Diana then says what happens if they don't get the permit. Mr. Hamel says the authority will be required to find a place for the residue. Wallingford could not handle the residue from the plant for any length of time. Mr. Diana says his point is that they are speaking for Meriden when they have not even gotten the permit yet.

Chairman Gessert then says the next question from the Denino's is "How many engineer's (workers) will be employed to operate this plant and know what they are doing? Chairman Gessert says all of them will know what they are doing. Dr. Clark then states that there will be at least 20-25 people on the staff with a minimum of 3-4 all times. One of which at all times has to be licensed as determined by employment.

Chairman Gessert then says question #4 is "Will we have to wait for the State or town to pay a consultant (trouble shooter) to find the problem while the garbage will still be rolling in? Mr. Martin says the answer is no. The vendor by contract has to act immediately to correct the action.

Chairman Gessert says question #5 is "This plant while a good thing for Cyanamid, at least for now, who knows 10 years down the road. With all the money that the Town of Wallinford is supposed to receive, will it be worth while for all the noise, smells and the air people

will have to contend with? Mayor Dickinson says we are not going into this project to make money. The problem is the disposal of garbage within the boundary of Wallingford. We do have payment-in-lieu of taxes with this agreement but the effort is not to make money. Mayor Dickinson does say there are at least 5 other projects in the State. 4 of which he believe have been permitted. Mr. Martin then says these projects are Hartford, Mid-CT project; Bridgeport, Bristol. These are under construction. The others going into permit now are Middletown and Southeastern CT. 88

Chairman Gessert then says the next questions are from Fred Clark of Carriage Drive. The first is "Will Cyanamid be allowed to burn their waste or materials in the incinerator?" Dennis Martin replies they will be allowed as long as it is no different from regular household waste--garbage, paper products etc. Any industries that do have hazardous wastes, that truck will be marked and they will have to dump the material directly on the tip floor for visual inspection. Next, "What are the toxic emissions from the burning of plastics?" Mr. Mordarsky says you would get the waters, carbon dioxide, carbon monoxide, water vapors, in addition, depending on the type of plastic material you wouldn't get chlorides, sulfate as hydrochloric acid, sulfuric acid if there is moisture present and you will also get trace amounts of metals used in plastics as reinforcers as dioxidants and for other physical or chemical properties, Mr. Thompson then mentions the controls that are used to minimize those emissions. The organics and pollutants such as carbon dioxide are subjected to direct flame and it burns itself. The chlorides and sulfur dioxide and sulfuric acid do pass through a scrubber system which removed 80-90% of those and finally the metals.

Question #3 is "What are the different types of pollutants and amounts that will be emitted from the smoke stack of the system per year?" Mr. Thompson states that the air permit application for the facility documents full regulation. The quantities based on this application were based on what is expected to be the maximum amounts. The permit issued by the DEP must allow for the worst hourly emissions expected during the entire year. The quantity is based on this.

Mr. Martin then says we don't have the copy of the air permit but all the emission in terms of pounds per hour and tons per year are on the application and it can be reviewed at DEP.

The next question is what is the present capacity in tonage for waste burning and what is the maximum capacity it could be modified to for future use? Mr. Martin says the maximum tons per day is 420 tons. The maximum it could be modified to is the addition of one single 140 ton per day unit bringing the total to 460 tons per day. Chairman Gessert says the last question is "Could the State mandate that Wallingford accept more towns to the trash program in the future, if yes, how many more towns? Mr. Hamel says the state he supposes could. There would have to be a 4th module built in order for that to happen and the limit on waste would be 30-40 thousand tons per year. Therefore, assuming another module were built, they might mandate another community such as Branford. They can't send in waste from all over the State because we don't have room for it. Mr. Charles Kurker then says right now the way the law reads is that the Commissioner, DEP, has a responsibility to prepare a solid waste management plan. This is the plan. Once it is adopted, he will use this as a guide until it is updated. In the meantime, the municipalities may form their plan and submit it to the commissioner for approval and the minute it is approved it will automatically become part of the State plan. At the present time, the plan indicates the 5 towns in this project. He then says there are no plans for mandating this plant.

Mr. Gouveia then asks if Wallingford has any say on the expansion of the 120,000 tons. Does Wallingford have veto power? Mr. Hamel says no. The only 2 circumstances that plant can be expanded are if the vendor requests an expansion and has a contractual right to expand to another module or if the towns together jointly request the expansion. Mr. Gouveia says then if the other towns say yes they want to expand and Wallingford says no, they can go ahead with it anyway and Mr. Hamel replies yes. Mr. Martin then says before they could even go ahead with the construction of another module they would need approval by DEP and Planning and Zoning.

Mrs. Papale then questions if the other 5 plants in the State are being supervised by CRRRA. Mr. Martin replies the Authority is in

charge of the Hartford Plant, Bridgeport and Wallingford. Also the Mid-State Plant and the Southeastern Plant. They are not in charge of the Bristol project, Waterbury, Stratford/Stamford. 89

Mrs. Papale then asks if these are Vicon plants and Mr. Martin says no. Mrs. Papale then asks where do they differ then? Mr. Martin says Hartford and Bridgeport differ primarily in size. They are 5-6 times bigger. One is a mass burn type plant similar to Wallingford and Hartford is an RDF Facility where they presort some of the material prior to burning

Mr. Diana then talks about the enlargement of the plant and says the intent of that was suppose to be as Wallingford grows, more modules could be added. Never was it mentioned that there was legislation in effect that they must accept other towns. Mr. Hamel explains if the 5 towns had 10,000 tons of garbage more then the 4th module would not be running all the time and the state may mandate that another municipalities refuse be brought here. He feels the State would not have any right on their own to say build another module because they would have to come up with money. Mary Mushinsky then says this legislation is already in effect. The deadline for towns to submit their plans is January 1987. The State cannot impose that the town build another module in order to let in more towns. The only thing the State can do is if we were under capacity, the state could bring in another small town to bring it back up to capacity. Mr. Diana then says let's say that they plan on bringing in Durham and Mr. Martin says Durham is linked to the Middletown project. The towns to the east are the Middletown project and the towns to the south are too big for this facility. Mr. Kurker then says he feels the intent of this legislation is who has got extra capacity in landfilling. Many towns are being faced with the closings of their landfills. If you get a town where they want their plant for me, myself and I, they could be hurting their neighbor and this is where the State would come in. He says right now it just says the towns committed to this project will go into this project. In order for more towns to come in, the State plan has to be updated, go through a public hearing process and it is a major undertaking before the changes are in place. Planning and Zoning have to approve the additions to the plant itself.

Mr. Gouveia then says Section 509 of the contract is says "The Authority shall have the right to consent to the expansion of the capacity of the facility up to 560 tons per day without the approval of the policy board." Indeed, they are already making sure there is some capacity left. Mr. Hamel says that is only if they are contractually obligated to do so. Otherwise they must get the approval of the policy board. The next paragraph down suggests that.

Mr. Holmes then questions Mr. Diana on his comments on expansion and Mr. Diana explains he was not aware of the legislation where the state can impose another town. Mr. Kurker says they are saying mandate and the legislation says he may implement the State plan.

Mr. Holmes then asks Mr. Kurker if Wallingford had 10-20 years left on its landfill, would it then be possible that these other towns could be directed to Wallingford's landfill? Mr. Kurker says with about 130 towns that are hurting and 15 towns in the State that have a resource that could help the problems of these towns, his feeling is that pressure would be put on to ask their legislators to do something about the problem. Mr. Holmes then says we would still be faced with a problem and no solution to the trash problem as we see it. Landfilling is not the answer, it is just compounding the problem. Mary Mushinsky says nothing was being done about the landfills and this is why they came up with this legislation. They said all of you Mayors must come up with a plan by January 1987 or we will have to direct your waste.

Chairman Gessert then says the last question from Mr. Clark is what stock exchange is Vicon on? Mr. Clark says it isn't.

Chairman Gessert then explains he has some questions on postcards and the first one is from Tom Chicoski and it asks "Are Dioxins bioaccumulating in the environment?" Dr. Brown says the term bioaccumulate is hard to interpret. It is usually thought of in terms of EDT. He hasn't seen data on dioxins to indicate how they fit into this pattern. There is evidence that he has seen that they are one of the rapidly bioaccumulating compounds. Mr. Mordarsky says you have sources generating dioxin but you also have many mechanisms in nature for destruction. Not only heat, temperature but sunlight, there is

certain bacteria, certain fungus. The very fact that people who have been contaminated to dioxin heal up with no traces of illness says that the biological functions of our bodies either excrete the dioxins or destroy it. 9

Mr. Gouveia then states in view of the recent report objectives of Mary Mushinsky and the Environment Committee of CT General Assembly to regulate garbage burning incinerators and to establish standards for dioxin, how can the DEP tell us that the plant proposed for Wallingford is a safe plant? Dr. Brown then says he didn't set the standards for Massachusetts as Mary just remarked but he was involved in their toxic program. The toxicity of any agent depends on how much of it is in the environment and how much somebody can be exposed to. What he did when Mary asked him to look into this was went to his staff and said lets look at the risk assessments are and what has been done with dioxin. They looked at 4 or 5 locations but he relied heavily on Massachusetts. They had taken a risk assessment and recommended some levels to their legislature. This includes not only the amount of dioxin present but also the amount of the toxic element in dioxin. Not all dioxins have the same biological activity. The Massachusetts report put a limit on the number of the toxic dioxins that could be in the dioxin ash. Based on those numbers he asked if the plant were constructed, could they meet the standards. The answer to that was the plant would meet that. The plant would be safe. The other comment was what is the potential that people could be exposed to dioxins and have accumulations through exposure. There are many different types of dioxins but this plant did not contribute any significant increase to those levels. His suggestion is they monitor what comes out of the plant and they would know what those numbers are. The Health Department is looking at this and will be running risk assessments in New York and Massachusetts.

Mr. Gouveia then says shouldn't these laws and the equipment to monitor the plant be in place before the plant is built? Are we putting the cart before the horse? Mary Mushinsky says we already know from Dr. Brown that the plant already meets the standards. This is why she is not as worried. What she would like to do for the reassurance of the public is put it into statute now before the plant is operational. Again, as Dr. Brown has said, if it meets Massachusetts standards it will meet ours. Mr. Gouveia then says he hopes she is not pushing for this to justify the position she has taken on the plant. If it is safe, why is she pushing for these laws. Mary Mushinsky then says she is convinced these gentlemen are telling the truth. If she did not believe them, she would not be reassured. It is very clear that PAGB are not reassured and therefore she has to put something in the statute to reassure them. There is no doubt in her mind that with a landfill on one hand and this plant on the other, the landfill is much more dangerous.

Chairman Gessert then says in what they have read, there has been approximately \$800 million dollars in research on dioxins and to date there has not been one death to dioxin contamination. Is that correct? Mr. Mordarsky says that is right. There is no place they can even place the probable cause of death to dioxin.

Mr. Diana then comments that up until last week we could also say that nobody has ever died in a nuclear plant. For years people boasted that nuclear plants were safe. He then says to Dr. Brown on whether or not dioxin is accumulative. Wallingford's plant would be located in what is considered a valley or bowl. There seems to be an atmospheric inversion where there is a cloud that lingers over that valley. Would the dioxins sitting in that valley cause some sort of health problems. Chairman Gessert then wants to wait and answer this question when they get to inversion, but Mr. Diana wants the questions answered now. Mr. Martin says there are two questions involved. One is the question of turning meteorology and molecules and the other is the health facts. DEP could answer about inversions and then Dr. Brown could comment about how that meteorologically affects it.

Dr. Brown then says he cannot talk about meteorology as he is a toxicologist. In terms of health effect, the standard they are looking at didn't rule out the possibility of inversion. So if the questions is would inversion make the level higher than what he thinks it would be, he says no.

Bob Rubino then comments that a comment was made before about putting the cart before the horse in building the facility before the guidelines were established. First of all, with many compounds you can never say that a certain level is safe. There will always be a level

of risk involved. Beyond that, for years they have been trying to develop a new toxic air pollutant program where they would propose standards for about 800 compounds, 600 for which there are numbers existing for occupational exposures. Our program says that until the medical community can come up with a firm number that we can call standard, we will use the number of 1/100th of an occupational level as a guide for setting emission standards in a source. For the Mid-CT project they had applied this technique to pollutants they knew the plant was emitting for which there were standards. The application for the control equipment that we require, which is far above what the federal requirements were, the dry scrubber and the baghouse reduced the levels of those compounds for which we had standards way below 1/100th of the occupational standard. Assuming the dioxin number were picked as similar to the numbers of the compounds, the factor of 1/100th will produce the same measure of safety. This extrapolation is an exercise of faith but he wants to point out that the department has required control technology much greater than would have been satisfactory. Nocturnal inversion comes on any evening in which you have calm winds and a clear night sky. When the sun goes down there is no solar heating of the ground and no heating of the atmospheric contact with the grounds, atmospheric circulation stops during the night. This is aggravated by a clear, cold night. As the ground cools, you get an inversion. Instead of pollutants getting stirred up, the atmosphere becomes stagnant. A pollutant discharged at any level, stays there. In this connection, the plants stack height plus the buoyancy of the plumb would probably get that plumb through the inversion. It would then go into air above inversion. Even on the event it didn't burst through, if the mixing height was 300-400 feet. The plumb would lay under the mixing height at that altitude. All the modeling done doesn't indicate any receptor at such an altitude. All work that we do on this has to be reviewed by the EPA. The EPA models and procedures indicate that a range of wind speeds be used beginning with 1 meter per second and running through stability classes and running through 3 levels of power from the plant at 50, 75 and 100% capacity. Finally we have to use the measured meteorology. There is an immense amount of conservacy in the process. 91

Chairman Gessert says the next postcard is from Mary Jane Chicoski and it says "How pervasive is Dioxin?" Mr. Mordarsky says since dioxins are produced any time hydrocarbon fuels are burned, it has existed on this planet since the first fossil fuel fire. Coal stoves, wood stoves, cigarettes, automotive emissions etc.

Chairman Gessert then says the next question is from Oswald Worcester Jr. It asks "At what concentration is dioxin present in the environment?" Dr. Brown says it depends where you are. He has no exact numbers on dioxins in the environment. What you really want to ask is how much dioxin is there and how much is toxic and how bioavailable are those dioxins.

Mr. Polanski then says there was a statement made that any monetary program should include measuring dioxin level before the plant begins operations and should be able to distinguish between toxic and non toxic forms of dioxins. Are we going to get a measurement of the air now before the plant begins operation? Mary Mushinsky says the Environment committee has expressed the desire to test it before the plant is up so they have some before and after dioxin studies. In legislation they will have air, flesh, food and various things tested around the plant sites.

Chairman Gessert then reads the next question from Jane Bradley, "What are safe levels of dioxin?" He then says according to reports they have certain amounts of dioxin will cause damage to a guinea pig and even death. If your a guinea pig it is one thing, if you're a hamster it is worse. He doesn't know how to answer this as it depends on who you are and where you are. Dr. Brown says the reason he worked with the Massachusetts study was because of the risk assessments done, one by EPA and the other by Comminer, the people from New York; the Hart report. The Hart report when it evaluated the potential from dioxin exposure did not just consider cancer, it considered the other possible actions. It then came up with a safe level. The answer to the question is always going to be difficult to arrive at but we need to look at the best data. And this is the best report which also included birth defects. It also included dioxin as a very active dioxin that may be present in the ash and arrived at their numbers. This is why they are looking at the Massachusetts plan. He doesn't know the maximum number of dioxins that anyone can be exposed to. However, according to the best risk assessments done, this plant would be safe. Diane Denis then comments that earlier it was said that there were no

~~reported deaths due to dioxin~~ and in making the risk assessments Dr. Brown referred to, they used research that had been done on animals because in these instances you can do more controlled analysis of the potential health effects. 90

Mr. Holmes then asks Lew Clark to explain how dioxin is controlled in an incinerator like this? Mr. Clark says that in all the information that one reads indicates that in the process of combustion of municipal waste, as long as you have adequate retention time and have the presence of adequate oxygen, keep the CO down, the dioxins will be as low as they can possibly be. Beyond good combustion conditions, it is the control of the particular matter to which the solid phase may adhere and the State has controlled that by imposing strict requirements. Chairman Gessert then asks Mr. Mordarsky to explain the combustion process? Mr. Mordarsky then says not only dioxins but a large variety of organic chemical compounds can be formed. Dioxin is only a small fraction of the compounds formed. If the temperature is high enough, all organic compounds will decompose. If the temperature is above 1800° you have thermal destruction of all dioxins. If you did not and you looked at the properties of dioxin, the melting point are in the range of 250-300°C. (460-570°F) Below that range you have solids. The boiling point for dioxins is around 1800°C which is about 1472°F. If you had a flame out or whatever and the temperature went below 1472°F, any dioxins in the vapor phase would condense out. If you look at the solubility of dioxin in water, the highest solubility in the series of dioxins is TCDD which has a solubility of 200 x 10 to the minus 12 grams per liter. If you looked at some of the other dioxins, they may have a solubility of 40 x 10 to the minus 12 grams per liter etc. It simply means these dioxins will not dissolve in the water streams. They will adhere to solid materials, fly ash etc.

Mr. Diana then questions the testing that is to be done on dioxins once every two years. Mary Mushinsky then says Bob would know what the frequency in the operator permits is likely to be but they would like to do it 4 times a year.

Bob Rubino then says 4 times a year would be more than they would normally do. If the plant gave the impression that it was badly operated, they might have it tested once a month. Mary Mushinsky then says DEP does not do the test. The test is done by the vendor. The vendor has to hire a consultant. It is also independent companies that can be hired to do these tests.

Mr. Diana then asks when the test the dioxin, where in the plant does this take place? Mr. Martin says it would be at the stack. Mr. Rubino says Dow Chemical gave him some information about incinerator testing performed on chlorinated hydrocarbons and basically it substantiates what you heard. If you keep the temperature above 1800, you will destroy about any compound that you know of. In addition they found if you have a hydrocarbon monitor and/or a carbon monoxide monitor, you can catch a malfunction before it proceeds very far. These instruments are available to continuously monitor the standing compounds of dioxin. Chairman Gessert then points out that there is an auxiliary oil furnace that will kick on in the event the temperature falls below a particular level.

Mr. Rys then says at the end of the process, 10% of the material is suppose to be fly ash or bottom ash or a mixture of both. Will dumping this in the landfill in Meriden contribute to contamination of our wells at that end of town? Mr. Mordarsky says they have a dry scrubber system. The water for the dry scrubber is used for a carrier for lime. Water evaporates as released to the atmosphere. The metallic oxides have no solubility to water vapor and have very little solubility in water in the liquid phase. Both the dioxins and the oxides travel with the ash. Because fly ash has a tremendously large surface area the oxides of the metal and dioxides will then adhere to the fly ash. With the lime added, you have a stabilizer. This means they are then bound to the structure which is very similar to mortar. Since they are not soluble in water, you will not leach them out. The only way out is mechanical transport. This is quite different from the landfill. In a landfill, metals have available to them nitrate, sulfate and chloride iron. They will form metallic salt which are soluble in water and therefore will leach and travel. Any plant that converts metals to oxides will provide you a material that is far less leachable.

Mr. Diana then says to Mr. Kurker that Mr. Mordarsky just gave an opinion and he then says are we doing something in Naugatuck right now that is contrary to that. Mr. Kurker says he won't say that yet.

The one sample they found some dioxin in, has never been duplicated and secondly they are not sure what the source of that dioxin is. He doesn't feel that has any relationship to the subject here tonight. Mr. Diana then says the problem is the fly ash is being dumped in Meriden on Wallingford property so you can understand the concern. Mr. Diana then questions the metal oxide and Mr. Kurker says the metal oxide will not go anywhere unless it is exposed to an acidic environment. That could force it to be put in a solution. Mary Mushinsky says the acidic situation is worse. That is the raw garbage being put in there and that is what is leaking into our wells. This will decline. The reason is raw garbage, all the molecules are not broken up and they are in an acidic environment and leach more readily. Whereas, after they have been through the 1800° plant they will be broken up in an alkaline environment.

In the landfill the metals are not held because they are acidic. Mary Mushinsky then says she feels this alternative is a better solution than landfilling.

Chairman Gessert then moves on to answer the questions submitted by the P.A.G.B. Members. He then states that the first 9 questions pertain to traffic and asks Mr. Hamel to answer these. Mr. Hamel then says a professional traffic study which was commissioned by Vicon and performed by Environmental Research & Technology Inc. which is a respected nationwide consulting firm. The study was done to provide information for the State permit application and this is a standard practice. The data was reviewed by Linda Bush, our Town Planner, John Costello, our Town Engineer and Mr. Bernstein, the transportation planner for the Council of Government during the preparation of the study and data was also reviewed after the study was done. Other town trash trucks and ash trucks will primarily use state highways and will not be involved in residential neighborhoods. Local trucks are expected to use the routes they use today. The Town has the right to establish routes for ash and other town trucks and they establish routes for local trucks by ordinance. All licensed trucks will have stickers on them identifying the towns that licensed them and these trucks will also have stickers on them if they pick up from certain industries that generate hazardous waste. Therefore, we will know when they arrive at the plant and that we should watch them. This is a standard control procedure. This has been established in Pittsfield and it works there. The plant operator will not accept refuse from any unlicensed truck. There will be approximately 8 ash trucks per day. In response to question 9 regarding the uncovered trucks. Vicon has agreed to reject refuse from trucks that are not properly covered after 1 warning and this will be a better enforcement than we have now.

Mayor Dickinson then answers questions 10-13. He says questions 10 asks if the Town of Wallingford will purchase another road sweeper just to clean routes being used by Vicon. The answer is no. They have 3 sweepers and we will only be replacing equipment as it ages, not for the purpose of the roads being used by the trucks. Question 12-13 is concerning the John Street Bridge and the Town Engineer has reviewed the bridge and has told him he felt it was structurally sound and there would not be a problem with such traffic using that bridge. He did not feel there was any reason for concern. Mayor Dickinson then says question 14 deals with leaving the plant and going to the landfill. Phil Hamel then says that the town by contract has the right to control the routes of ash and other town trash trucks. The ash trucks are the ones coming from the plant. Chairman Gessert then notes that Mr. Hamel is trying to come up with an alternate route into the plant directly off of Route 5. If Mr. Hamel is successful he feels it will solve a lot of problems and they hope he can do that. They did look at other options but none have been feasible.

Part II on Water and Waste Water is then up for discussion and Mr. Martin answers question 1 on "Does the burned garbage go through a water-rinse process. Mr. Martin says the answer is yes. When the ash coming out of the tail end, is dropped into a water system which cools it off. The rest of the issues will then be covered by Ken Majors from the Water Compliance Unit.

94

Ken Majors then answers the question "This water, plus cooling water, will generate approximately 40,000 gallons of "Waste Water." Will this water be treated in our sewer plant?" He says waste water is generated through ash quenching. It is a recycled process and therefore will not enter into the sewer system. Vicon has not applied for a permit for that waste water. Question 3 asks "How will this affect our already taxed sewer capacity?" Mr. Majors says at the present time the department is not aware, they are not placing a moratorium on the Wallingford Sewer System. Chairman Gessert says the sewer plant is under construction and is expected to be on line in 1988 and will handle any additional sewer or waste water generated. There will be a limited amount of sewer water coming from the toilets or that type of thing from the plant and the sewage requirements of the plant were taken into consideration when P & Z approved this particular parcel of land. Ken Majors then says the waste water will be first the discharge from the demineralizer facility and this will be discharged into sewer after neutralization. The 2nd discharge is a cooling tower blow down waste water which would be neutralized and go to the sewer also. Chairman Gesser then says question 6 is "What is Vicon's water source within the plant" and he says they will become a customer of the Wallingford Water Dept. and Vicon will buy the water from them. Ken Majors then says question 8 "How will approximately 40,000 gallons of 'Contact polluted' scrubber water be handled?" He says that 40,000 gallons is being thrown around. Again, there isn't going to be a discharge of scrubber water to the sewer. He feels with the air compliance control system it will either evaporate or be absorbed on the ash. Chairman Gessert then questions Dennis Martin if this is a wet scrubber or a dry scrubber and Mr. Martin replies Dry scrubber. The water is used only to carry the lime. Ken Majors then moves on to question 9 which says "Will the discharge wter, coming out of the Vicon Plant, be carefully tested before it enters our Sewage Treatment Plant?" The Department has drafted a permit and there are several mechanisms which they will pick up testing on the Vicon plant. The state will probably quarterly monitor the PH and flow on a regular basis. Also, the company will be required to do monitoring on a monthly basis for those parameters enforced in the draft permit. When the facility is constructed and the permit is issued, they will be required to initiate this standpoint. Question 10 then says Scrubbing processes were designed to remove toxic emissions, inclusive of dioxin. If this process is successful, then the water used in the process will become toxic. Should these waters now be considered hazardous waste? If not why? If yes, how will these toxic waters be handled? Mr. Mordarsky says since the water leaves the system in a vapor phase up the stack and dioxins and metallic oxides have no solubility in water in the vapor phase, they stay behind. The water leaves the vapor or steam and it is not toxic. Ken Majors then comments that the DEP records are located at 122 Washington Street in Hartford and these are public records which can be reviewed Monday-Friday from 8:30-4:30. Chairman Gessert then reads Mr. Bradley's questions which ask "What effect on the aquifers will fly ash have and what affect will it have on the aquatic life in the Quinnipiac River?" He then says he feels Mr. Mordarsky has answer about the aquifers. Mary Mushinsky then says as far as they can tell, because it is an alkaline ash, there should be less leachate than there is now. As long as we keep the ash separate and keep the alkaline separate from the acid, we should have a cleaner system. Less leachate. Just to be on the safe side the environment committee is going to require ash testing 4 times a year.

The next section of questions concerns Air Compliance and the first question is for an official from DEP to state his qualifications etc. then it asks him to define Nocturnal Inversion, the cause of it, the atmospheric conditions and modeling data. Chairman Gessert says that Bob Rubino has already defined these. The only thing he did not give was his credentials. Mr. Rubino then says since 1972 he has been assistant director of the Air Compliance Unit. For approximately 10 of those years he was responsible for the permit approval. Currently he is responsible for the technical analysis section in terms of the main project for developing the toxic air pollutant program, and analyzing the auto inspection program and providing modeling and meteorological support for the permit. He has a bachelor's degree in Mechanical engineering from the University of Southern California, a master's degree in mechanical engineering from the University of Connecticut, he spent approximately 30 years specializing in combustion, and combustion devices, and have a patent in low emissions gas turbine combustion. Chairman Gessert then says question 4 is How can the DEP justify the use of Bradley

International Airport as a base for modeling when its topography differs so drastically from Wallingford's. Mr. Rubino says they routinely run 3 types of modeling analysis. One is a model that is CT developed. They were forced to develop this model since EPA doesn't have an official approved model for areas known as complex or hilly terrain. The only reason EPA lets them use it is because it is more conservative than anything they might have used. We run that model and it passed that check. Then they ran an officially approved EPA model which does a couple of things. He then explains what this does and says finally the EPA approved model assumes a flowing wind condition. Nobody is doing modeling for permits assuming the wind is not flowing. He then explains about the wind conditions and says it is the wind conditions in between that gives you the worst combination. In this case, it would probably not be worse than a 2½ meter per second case. One of the things concluded in a recent study was that they do need a met station for coastal sites and we do met station for very narrow valleys like the Naugatuck Valley. The rest of the state is very well represented by the Bradley Field Data. There is some difference in the topography but it is not enough to have a major affect. This is supported by EPA. 95

Chairman Gessert then moves on to the next question which says can you enumerate, in detail, all the air, ash and water monitoring equipment to be used in this plant? Mr. Clark then says most of this information is in the printout. All the things that have to be monitored continuously with demonstrated characteristics of combustion, CO, CO<sub>2</sub>, O<sub>2</sub>,-- will all be monitored. Chairman Gessert then asks who pays and provides the monitoring equipment? Phil Hamel says that is a project cost and the operator pays for it. Chairman Gessert then asks who operates the equipment and Dennis Martin says the equipment is automatic with a self calibration technique. It is not run by anyone. Once it is set up it starts operating, gives you the data and then you have the factory technicians to come and check it periodically. Some of this is second by second recording. Mary Mushinsky then says that is different from the 4 times a year test. The outside stack tests are the expensive ones that you will have to hire an outside consultant to do. Chairman Gessert then asks what levels of sensitivity are these devices capable of? Mr. Martin says they are in the parts per million range. He then asks what qualifications will the monitors of the equipment possess? Mr. Martin says the equipment all has to be approved by EPA and by DEP. The people who check the equipment are lab certified technicians. This is for continuous monitoring. Mary Mushinsky comments that the stack tests it reads down to 4.39 nanograms per second. Bob Rubino then comments that about the consultant doing testing, the people probably don't know that the air compliance unit requires a consultant prior to performing testing, we basically review what they plan on doing, how they plan on doing it, and before they are allowed to do it we pass judgement on it. Plus we observe the test and review the test results when done. Chairman Gessert then asks if the plant is notified when they are coming to do the tests. Mr. Rubino says they can show up at any time. As a practical matter you have to give the operator some notice that you are coming. A stack test is basically the proof that the device can work, it is not necessary the proof that it is always working well. The stack test ought to act as a calibration for the continuous monitors. It is the continuous monitors and the inspection by a human being that will ensure that the facility is working when you are not there. Chairman Gessert then says there is a written record of those continuous monitors and Mr. Rubino says that is correct. They are currently thinking about hooking up a remote monitoring site. Hooking up through telephone line to computer. He then says therefore if they had people who wanted to look at the data, there would be no problem at all.

Mr. Diana then asks if they did check the stacks and it was what would be determined as exceeding excessively safe levels of dioxin, what is the next process. Mr. Rubino says normally the operator is served with a notice of violation which begins a schedule of plan to meet the compliance. This is normal practice but this may not be true for the plant. They have not fully worked that out. Mary Mushinsky says legislation says it has to be shut off. Mr. Rubino then says they don't have police power or the power to shut down as a local Health Official can do. They cannot fine. Mr. Rubino says if the health department ruled that the levels coming out of the stack were dangerous than they could direct the Mayor to have the plant shut down.

96  
Mr. Diana says then the DEP comes in and padlocks the door because it does not meet standards, the town now is faced with what do we do with the garbage. Who's responsible for it? Mr. Rubino feels the commissioner would discuss with DEP & the Health Department the appropriate thing to do. Mayor Dickinson says DEP is limited by statutory authority. We do have greater authority in some areas within the town. He then says he is looking for the Town of Wallingford to continuously review the monitoring. If it comes to our attention that there is a problem we will act on it. What happens to the garbage, Mr. Hamel says if the plant is closed down, CRRA by contract must take the refuse. If it is going to go longer than 15 days they have to make arrangements.

Mr. Diana then says if the acceptable standard is 5 and the reading now is 10 coming out of the plant which is totally unacceptable, what he is afraid of, because the plant can't come on line, because it is a \$34 million plant, we certainly aren't going to tell them to take it down brick by brick. He is afraid the State will then say you get your levels down to  $7\frac{1}{2}$  and we will raise our standards from  $5-7\frac{1}{2}$ . Could that take place. Mr. Martin says it is very clear in the contract that if the owner of the facility cannot operate under his permit conditions, they would be obliged to declare those people in fault of the contract and shut them down ourselves and they would be obliged to pay the bond issue and pay damages to the town. As far as bankruptcy, we are looking at a billion dollar corporation a year which is backing Vicon.

Mr. Gouveia then questions that acid-gas monitoring must be installed as required by DEP. Mr. Rubino says for resource recovery facilities that is correct. Mr. Gouveia then asks why the people in Wallingford have the gas scrubbers. Mary Mushinsky comments that the original permit was granted in 1981 before they knew they needed dry gas scrubbers. At the time they were permitted, they met the permit. A statutory change would have then had to take place to change this to make everyone comply including Windham. Once you put it in statute, that covers the entire industry, not just plant by plant. She feels it would be more reassuring if all the plants were under one category in the statute. They could then all be upgraded at the same time. Mr. Gouveia then comments why didn't they look at these things before they signed the contract for this facility. Again, the cart is coming before the horse.

Chairman Gessert then says we have a number of questions on CRRA and most of them are related to Phil Hamel. Mayor Dickinson then says Phil Hamel was hired by the Town of Wallingford in February of 1970. From 1970 to the present date he has been continuously employed by the Town of Wallingford. Most of that time he was in grant administration. Planning and coordinating various projects including the railroad station renovation that occurred several years ago. He also has been involved in Resource Recovery as a subject and planning item since 1973. His salary is paid by the Town of Wallingford through State and Federal Grant money. His chief function since 1984 has been negotiating resource recovery. Late spring in 1984 it was clear they needed a person devoted full time to that task and it came to him to see who was best qualified and it was his judgement that Phil Hamel filled that role well. He is very familiar with the subject and is a very capable negotiator and informed individual as to what the town needs. Another question is whether his capacity changed. It really did not change. They did get a grant that permitted him to do what he was already doing and that was representing municipalities in this project and to understand that you have to realize that municipalities are basically in a very similar position. We have multiple parties in this project. CRRA, State, Cyanamid, Vicon Guarantor of Vicon and the 5 municipalities. The municipality role is to provide trash or garbage. Phil Hamel was representing the interests of the Town of Wallingford and the interests of the other municipalities in that they are providing trash for the plant to operate. Who is paying his salary? Again it is a State grant through DEP but the employer is still the Town of Wallingford. Did he draw up, negotiate or write any part of the contract? Yes. He acted as a negotiator and still is with the agreement and assistance of all the selectmen, Mayors, and legal departments of each of the municipalities. Is it true that Mr. Hamel will be employed by CRRA once the plant is completed? No. He will continue with his employment with the Town of Wallingford. The only change would be if he would be employed by the Policy Board. That has not been resolved as of yet.

Chairman Gessert then comments that he got a letter from the gentleman who spoke at our last meeting, the public hearing at Dag, and represented himself as being from the Conservation Law Foundation and MIT. He then says he got a letter January 28 that says this letter is to clear up any confusion on the subject of his testimony and policy position of the Conservation Law Foundation regarding resource recovery facilities. He goes on to say that we know that many landfills cause ground water pollution and threaten human health. In addition, the management of these landfills has been poor and available space for landfilling is running out. We are uncertain as to the risk of the resource recovery facility and do not know if they will prove to be the best method of solid waste disposal. The only certainty is that society will continue to generate trash and we need to develop acceptable strategies for the disposal of recycling of those materials. Landfilling is not an acceptable answer to the solid waste problems. CLF is not opposed to construction of Resource Recovery facilities. As an organization, CLF is wrestling with the need for solid waste management programs in all 6 New England states. The problems with present methods of disposal are obvious and severe. We expect that the ultimate answer will be the combination of vastly expanded source reduction, recycling programs, closure of all open dumps, and construction of a limited number of trash burning facilities, and secure landfills to handle regional waste. This is from Thomas DiMauro, Staff Scientist. 97

Chairman Gessert then moves on to the questions on contracts. The first question is "Are Wallingford and the other four towns committed to a specific amount of garbage per year?" Mr. Martin says yes. How will this effect recycling efforts? Mr. Martin says it is highly unlikely that towns will fail to meet their minimum commitments if recycling programs were initiated. The most successful recycling program in the State today averages about 10%. Keep that around 16% and using these numbers if they met them, they would still be able to meet the commitment of the plant. Is there a penalty if the commitment is not met? Mr. Martin says the 5 towns as an aggregate have to commit 125,000 tons of waste per year. Each town also has its own individual commitment. However, as long as the aggregate commitment is met, no town will incur a penalty for failing to reach their individual minimum commitment. Should the aggregate commitment of 125,000 tons not be met, then an individual town would only have to pay a proportional amount of the shortfall if it happened to contribute to that shortfall. Does Vicon or CRRA or anyone else have the right or power to ask other towns to participate in bringing their trash to Wallingford? Chairman Gessert then notes that that question was answered earlier. Because Wallingford is the host town, does Wallingford have the final say on decisions affecting the operation or expansion of this plant or its effect on the people within our community?

Chairman Gessert says again P & Z requirements again was discussed earlier. With 5 towns Participating, and Wallingford being the plant locale, what kind of voting power does Wallingford have in governing decisions that affect our Wallingford residents? Mr. Martin says the basic business decision, the operating of the plant, each town involved in the project gets one vote. This is not usual with our project. Usually the votes are recorded according to population. In this case for instance, Meriden would get more votes than Wallingford. Chairman Gessert then states the next questions deal with drawing up the contract and the Town Attorney if he consulted any other lawyers in studying the contract for benefits, clauses, drawbacks, cancellation, protection for escalation etc. Mr. Hamel then says the Town Attorney's were consulted through the negotiating process. Mayor Dickinson is also an attorney and participated in discussions and negotiations.

Mrs. Papale then asks if it was just the Mayor and Attorney McManus who talked with CRRA. Mayor Dickinson says CRRA has an attorney who was involved. There are attorney's for each of the other municipalities involved. The negotiations went on for weeks, 8-12 hours per day so it was continuous discussions involving Phil and other parties. The Town Attorney's, the Mayors, the other selectmen made final decision on approval of language and raised questions during that process but the continuous discussion which involved full time activity, Phil Hamel was involved in.

Mr. Holmes then comments that during the past weeks it has been said that the Council signed this agreement flippantly. It has

been stated that we didn't know what we were doing, we were looking for a way out and we don't know how to get there. This is not true. We were informed every step of the way by CRRA and we had 8 meetings on this subject alone last year. To say we were not informed is grossly unfair and untrue. 98

Mr. Diana then asks what Town Attorney's were involved in the negotiations. Mr. Hamel says Vincent McManus was involved in the earlier draft and was not available for later negotiations. Adam was involved in some of them. The Town Attorney's from the other 4 towns were also involved. As well as the Chief executives of the Towns. They all participated in various points of negotiations. Sometimes they would review the contract and say no and they would have to go back and redraft it. Mayor Dickinson then says these are service contracts. The service contract comparing one municipality with another are almost identical. There are some differences. Wallingford has a lease involving our landfill, we have payment-in-lieu of taxes. There is a different tonage. In general we are talking about service contracts with each municipality similar. In this way he feels the contract did get a very thorough review. Phil Hamel also points out that early drafts and summaries were sent out to the Council for review. This was sent to all the legislative bodies. There were a lot of people involved in these negotiations.

Mr. Diana then asks if the last contract or the last draft was reviewed by Attorney McManus. Phil Hamel is not sure of this.

Peter Gouveia then says in view of the recent program "Meet the Mayor" and Mayor Dickinson's comment about the federal tax changes that will affect bonds issued and credits for the Resource Recovery Plant, and in view of the fact that the Wallingford Town Council was told to act before January 1, 1986, are we to understand that of February 10, 1986, these incentives have not yet been abolished.

Mayor Dickinson then says we sold the bonds on December 31, 1985 to avoid the consequence of a 1986 sale when there is a good change that the change in legislation will affect whether it is tax exempt or not. We are protected because of the date the bonds were issued. If the law does change we are still in effect in an exempt position. Also, they are not Town of Wallingford Bonds, they are CRRA bonds. Phil Hamel then says the only way they could be certain from their state Legislators of having those tax benefits was to finance the plant by December 31, 1985. It is true that a bill was passed to give us another year, but whether that bill will survive the Senate in terms of allowing those same benefits we don't know. The tax situation is so uncertain that people are unable to sell bonds today. We know there is going to be a change in the tax law and we don't yet know what it is. At the present time the law has not changed but it could very well be retroactive January 1st. Mr. Gouveia then says does he actually believe that these incentives will be taken away and Mr. Hamel says yes. He feels the Federal Government is having great difficulty with revenue. The advice we got is they are not willing to make exceptions. Chairman Gessert then says if the Town of Wallingford had not acted this way, they could easily be accused of being irresponsible to the taxpayers of this community. Chairman Gessert then notes that Mr. Gouveia's question had Mr. Gregory's signature on it and he did say that signed questions would be asked and he did not want anybody coming back and saying we did not answer their question.

Mr. Gouveia then says it has been mentioned that Planning & Zoning has the authority to issue the permit for this plant to be expanded. This is his understanding when he met with Phil Hamel and Mr. Martin for 5 hours. However, it was his understanding that this power could be taken away from Planning & Zoning when it refers to a garbage buring plant. Is that correct? Mr. Hamel says to the best of his knowledge, in order for the plant to put on a 4th module it requires Planning & Zoing approval. Is it possible that could change? Certainly. Our powers are given to us by the State. Mr. Kurker then says it has been on the books that Planning & Zoning has certain authority and responsibility. In 1978 the General Assembly made it a point to single out the solid waste facilities and give us authority. In 1985 they reinforced that authority even stronger although we felt it was a deterrent to getting progress in solid waste and requested it be removed and what they did was say not only do you have local authority but we cannot issue our permits until such time as we see something in writing from Planning & Zoning. All the legislature has done is increase the local authority in this area.

Mr. Rys then asks if Wallingford decided to pull out of this contract what would happen to our trash and what would happen to the concepts of the plant. 99

Mr. Hamel says we have a lease with CRRA which says they have a right to our landfill so we may not in fact have a landfill if we were to pull out. It is probably likely the court would hold that lease. Second, the authority could bring in refuse from another town. We are not building the plant, all we are doing is buying service from CRRA. They have the site, zoning approval, bond money. They have not built it yet but there is no legal reason for them to stop. If Wallingford pulls out, that plant may very well be built using somebody else's trash.

Mr. Holmes then says the feeling is that we rushed to sign the contract because of the situation of the exempt bonding status. But the timing of the signing of the contract fell in line with the guidelines and the schedule we saw in the beginning of the year. This was not rushed into and it was established time constraints.

Mr. Polanski then says there was an insinuation that we should wait. Look back a few years and the Town of Wallingford waited on the sewer contract and the State funds dried up. An insinuation was made that do you think the State would dare not give us any money. It has been proven that the State will not give you money and the Federal Government won't give you that money and he didn't like the insinuation

Mr. Gouveia then says in the landfill lease, Article 20, it states Limitation of liability, and it says it is understood that the authority does not pledge its full faith and credit for the payment of basic rent or any other sums which may become due under the provisions of this lease. That bothers him. He took his time to read the contract because he was not under the Council at that time and it is beyond his comprehension why there are certain items on this contract that could have been negotiated a little better. When you deal with industry you have to be argumentive.

Chairman Gessert then makes a few comments concerning landfills vs. Resource recovery and he feels resource recovery is the better alternative. He then says they are over the deadline and he will close the meeting. He then thanks all the members on the panel, the audience and those who sat at home and watched it on television. He does say they got through the 4 pages of questions and any questions that were not answered here will get a written response. He also thanks the library for all their help with this meeting. The meeting is then adjourned at 9:32 p.m.

Lisa M. Bousquet  
Council Secretary

Approved:

*David A. Gessert*  
David A. Gessert, Council Chairman  
~~MARCH 11,~~  
~~February 25,~~ 1986

*Rosemary A. Rascati*  
Rosemary A. Rascati, Town Clerk  
~~March 11,~~  
~~February 25,~~ 1986

QUESTIONS THE P.A.G.B. REQUEST TO HAVE ANSWERED CONCERNING  
THE TRASH PLANT

Page 1 of 8

I. TRAFFIC

Q. 1. Was there a study conducted on the impact of Truck Traffic (caused by the Trash Plant) on the Town of Wallingford?

- A. Who conducted the study?
- B. Who was this study done for?
- C. Who paid for this study?
- D. Was an independent source asked to conduct a study?
- E. If not - why?

2. What routes will out of town trucks take when bringing trash to the plant?

- 100
3. What routes will trucks take when hauling the burned, possibly toxic, ash from the incinerator to the landfills?
  4. Are these routes written in the contracts?
  5. What routes will local truckers take?
  6. How will we be able to distinguish between local trucks vs. out of town trucks?
  7. How will we know if trucks will be coming from towns not authorized to participate in this project?
  8. How often will trucks carrying the ash be leaving the plant?
    - A. Daily
    - B. Weekly
    - C. Other
  9. There is a town ordinance which states that all garbage trucks must be covered. As we all have seen and know, this ordinance is not enforced now. How will any regulations be enforced regarding this problem, considering the sizable increase in trucks entering our town daily?
  10. Is it true that the town of Wallingford has made plans to purchase, or has already purchased an additional "road sweeper" to clean routes being used by Vicon ash hauling trucks?
  11. Who has paid or will pay for this?
  12. The John Street Bridge was rebuilt in 1966 using the old bridge abutments. They were for legal load limits established at that time. Has this bridge been checked recently to test if it is structurally sound to withstand the new anticipated heavy loads coming in and out of the plant?
  13. Who checked the bridge? Is a report available for public scrutiny?
  14. Is it true that trucks leaving the Vicon Plant may use any convenient access way en route to the landfill?

-2-

EXHIBIT 1  
Page 2 of 8

QUESTIONS THE P.A.G.B. REQUEST TO HAVE ANSWERED CONCERNING  
THE TRASH PLANT

II. WATER AND WASTE WATER

- Q. 1. Does the burned garbage (now hot ash), go through a water-rinse process?
2. This water, plus cooling water, will generate approximately 40,000 gallons of "waste water." Will this water be treated in our sewer plant?
3. How will this affect our already taxed sewer capacity?
4. If our sewer plant runs out of capacity, will the other towns be required to contribute with the construction cost of additional facilities?
5. Will the four other towns contribute to the cost of treating this "waste water" on a daily basis?
6. What is Vicon's water source within the plant?
7. If town water is used, will Vicon pay for it?
8. How will approximately 40,000 gallons of "contact polluted" scrubber water be handled?
9. Will this discharge water, coming out of the Vicon Plant, be carefully tested before it enters our Sewerage Treatment Plant?  
If, "Yes" How often? By whom? Will the schedule be made public?
10. "Scrubbing" processes were designed to remove toxic emissions, inclusive of dioxin. If this process is successful, then the water used in the process will become toxic.  
Should these waters now be considered, Hazardous Waste?  
A. If not - Why?  
B. If, Yes - How will these toxic waters be handled?

III. Air Compliance

- Q. 1. Would an expert, from D.E.P. (please state your qualifications, credentials, etc., before answering)
- A. Define for the residents of Wallingford, the term "Nocturnal Inversion" and

- 101
- b. Explain the cause of a nocturnal inversion and
  - c. Primarily, what are the resulting atmospheric conditions?
  - d. Provide the modeling data for this situation.
2. Explain to the residents why you cannot model for a nocturnal inversion when wind speeds are 3 m.p.h. or less. (Why is your limit one meter per second?)
  3. Extrapolate for a true calm nocturnal inversion in the vicinity the incineration plant will be located.
  4. How can the D.E.P. justify the use of Bradley International Airport as a base for modeling, when it's topography (Bradley's) differs so drastically

Exhibit  
Page 3 of 8

QUESTIONS THE P.A.G.B. REQUEST TO HAVE ANSWERED CONCERNING  
THE TRASH PLANT

III. AIR COMPLIANCE (cont'd)

- from Wallingford's topography? Bradley Airport has a broad flat terrain, in direct contrast to Wallingford's valley-hill topography (making us so prone to nocturnal inversion). The two sides compared have nothing in common!
5. Show and explain the values of your model for a nocturnal inversion.
  6. Can you enumerate, in detail, all the air, ash and water monitoring equipment to be used in this plant?
    - A. What levels of sensitivity are these devices capable of?
    - B. Who will provide and pay for this equipment?
    - C. Who will conduct the monitoring?
    - D. How frequently will the monitoring be carried out?
    - E. What qualifications will the monitors of the equipment possess?
  7. Will the D.E.P. and/or the E.P.A. check on this plant and all the monitoring devices. If, Yes
    - A. How often?
    - B. Will any and all results be made available to the public?

IV. C.R.R.A.

1. When was Phillip Hamel hired by the Town of Wallingford ?
2. What was his job ?
3. What are his qualifications, education, credentials and work experience ?
4. Who paid his salary ?
5. Is it true that Mr. Hamel's chief function was to represent Wallingford in negotiating resource recovery ?
6. Did Mr. Hamel's initial capacity as representative for Wallingford change later to include representing the other four towns involved in this trash incinerator project ?
7. Because of this change, was Mr. Hamel's original position filled by someone else ?
8. If yes - who ?
9. In Mr. Hamel's new position as representative for all the towns involved, who then paid (or is paying) his salary.
10. Did Mr. Hamel draw up, negotiate or write any part of the contract between CRRA and the towns involved in the incinerator project ?
11. Is it true that if this plant is completed Mr. Hamel will be employed by CRRA ? Or if not by whom ?
12. If true - This constitutes a direct conflict of interest ?

V. CONTRACTS

1. Are Wallingford and the other four towns committed to a specific amount of garbage per year ?
2. How will this effect recycling efforts ?
3. Is there a penalty if this trash amount is not met ? If yes, explain.
4. Does Vicon or CRRA or anyone else have the right or power to ask other towns to participate in bringing their trash to Wallingford ?
5. Because Wallingford is the host town, does Wallingford have the final say on decisions affecting the operation or expansion of this plant or its effect on the people within our community ?
6. With five towns participating, and Wallingford being the plant locale, what kind of voting power does Wallingford have in governing decisions that affect our Wallingford residents ?
7. Initially, in the writing and drawing up of this contract, did our Town Attorney, Vincent McManus consult any other lawyer(s) in studying the contract for:
  1. Benefits to the town ?
  2. Drawbacks to the town ?
  3. Possible "out" clauses ?
  4. Protection of the town if we cancelled our agreements ?
  5. Protection of the town against escalating costs to our residents from Vicon ?
  6. Protection from Vicon to expand this plant contrary to the public's wishes.
  7. Did he take any steps to protect the town from law suits coming out of any pollution problems ?
8. At present Wallingford residents may bring their garbage to the dump at no charge. According to the contract signed by our Town Council, will Wallingford residents be allowed to bring their garbage to the Vicon plant at NO CHARGE ? If, no, what will the residents be charged for delivering their own garbage to the plant ?
9. Will FREE LEAF pick ups still be in effect as has been done in the past by the Town? If yes, will the Town be charged by Vicon to burn these leaves?
10. What annual cost (per household or customer) can be expected by residents for the pick up of garbage ?
11. Is there an established "ceiling" cost for garbage pick up ?
12. Is there a five year (more or less) plan to escalate prices by Vicon to the Wallingford public, as indicated by Mayor Dickinson ?

V CONTRACTS (cont'd)

13. Can or will the Town be held responsible for debts unpaid by private haulers ? If yes why ?
14. As Councilpeople are not experts in the fields of:
  - Traffic
  - Waste water
  - Toxic waste
  - Hazardous ash
  - Air compliance
  - Contract negotiations
  - Plant engineering
  - Landfills
  - Air testing and water testing
  - and the monitoring of those elements

Who, besides the representatives of Vicon, DEP and CRRA (a non expert group whose chief "job" is to "sell" towns the idea of trash incineration plants) advised the Council impartially on all of the above matters ?

103

15. What independent scientists, environmentalists, engineers, lawyers were consulted ?
16. We would request that each Council person tell the public (nbw) how long he or she has personally "studied" these questions put forth - prior to the signing of the contracts.
17. Were any other companies asked to bid on this plant ?  
If yes - who ?
18. Why was Vicon chosen as the builder of this plant ?

VI HAZARDOUS WASTE

1. Is hazardous waste going to be burned in this plant ?
  - a. If not why ?
  - b. If yes - why?
2. How will hazardous waste be kept out of the incinerator ?
3. Is it true the only real check or monitor to keep hazardous materials out will be the actual driver (operator) of the pay loader truck who will be pushing tons of garbage into the incinerator ?
4. Are you going to accept and incinerate industrial solid waste, and sludge from Cyanamid, Upjohn and Allegheny Ludlum ?

6

Exhibit I:  
Page 6 of 8

VI HAZARDOUS WASTE (cont'd)

5. How will "bagged" refuse be checked for hazardous waste (4 1/2 tons every 15 minutes) ?
6. The towns of Cheshire, Meriden, Wallingford, North Haven and Hamden will produce tons of grit, scum, screenings and sludge from their own sewage treatment process. Will this be sent to the Vicon plant for incineration ?  
If yes - why?  
If no - how will it be handled ?
7. According to the DEP, Meriden and Wallingford will deposit their sludge in our landfill. The other towns will have to take care of their own - How ?
8. Will Cyanamid continue to operate its own incinerator?
9. At what temperature will garbage be burned in the Vicon plant ?
10. Is a minimum temperature a contractual requirement ?  
If not - Why not - since as per CRRA, 1800 °F is essential to efficiently keep most of the dioxin in the ash - not in the air.
11. Will these temperatures be monitored for the efficient running of the incinerator? By whom - will these records be made available to the public?
12. If the temperature falls below the ideal temperature required - how will the ash be treated ? (as ash will now contain unremoved toxins)
13. Is this an oxygen fed system ? Why ?
  - a. What happens if not enough oxygen is fed in ?
  - b. Is this monitored and how often?
14. Will there be on-going cancer causing dioxin testing done at this plant for the constant safety of our residents ?
15. Is it stated in the contract between Vicon and CRRA that garbage will be reduced 70% by weight and 90% by volume ? Is it guaranteed ?

VII ASH, SOLIDS AND HEAVY METALS

104

1. Is it true that some States have labelled "flyash", solids and heavy metals generated by trash incinerators as hazardous toxic wastes
2. How has Connecticut labelled this waste and why ?
3. Where do you (Vicon) plan to dispose of these wastes produced within the incinerator ?
4. It should be noted that the Pittsfield plant does not contain a "bag house" filtering system which "traps" many toxic emissions. Pittsfield's toxic emissions are not contained in the burned ash because they are emitted into the air. Our ash will contain these toxic particles because the bag house filters will trap them and they will then be disposed of

Exhibit I  
Page 7 of 8

VII ASH, SOLIDS AND HEAVY METALS (cont'd)

into our landfill. Will our "fly ash", collected by the "Bag house" filters, be tested for dioxsin and toxic elements prior to mixing with the lesser toxic "bottom ash".

5. Where do you plan to dispose of this incinerator ash ?
6. How will these concentrated toxic materials in the ash be kept from entering our already polluted waters ?
7. It is the claim of the DEP that the filtering safeguards of the incinerating plant will virtually eliminate dioxsin, as such, it will become part of the burned ash to be dumped at the land fills. Should Rep. Mary Mushinsky plan to add dioxin to the list of the fifteen carcinogens already documented in Yalesville's water?
8. Who manufactures the "filter" in the bag house ? What happens if the "filter" fails to operate properly ?
9. Is there a contingency program if the "filter" fails ?
10. What will be done with the 420 tons per day of garbage if the plant must be shut down for any period of time ?

VIII MISCELLANEOUS

1. How was the west side chosen for the plant?
2. Did Cyanamid sell this land to Vicon ?
3. Were any tax breaks given to CRRA, Vicon or Cyanamid for locating of this plant in Wallingford ?
4. Has Cyanamid paid all their back taxes to the town of Wallingford ? If not - why ?

IX QUESTIONS FOR THE COUNCIL

1. Did any council member visit ORFA's plant in Europe to observe their facility in order to make a fair comparison of the two proposed plants?
2. Was the council aware of the fact that ORFA's has and will completely fund construction of their plant here?
3. Was the council aware of the fact that ORFA's will take complete responsibility of marketing the by products of their recovery plant ?
4. Was the council aware of the fact that the ORFA plant will dispose of 100% of all trash with nothing going to the landfill?
5. Was the council aware of the fact that the ORFA plant can be located

IX QUESTIONS FOR THE COUNCIL (cont'd)

- anywere because it has no ties with other facilities like Cyanamid or the electric company?
6. Was the council aware of the fact that the Chairman of the Board of ORFA is willing to come here and explain to us their process and to work with us on solving our waste problems ?
  7. Is the council aware of the fact that two of ORFA's plants are under construction in the United States?
  8. Did any council member in their decision making process on this plant consult with any citizen of Wallingford to get their feelings regarding this project that will affect us all not only financially but health wise ?
  9. Exactly what costs are the Town responsible for in regards to construction, operation, testing, etc. of this plant?
  10. The Vicon plant will affect the lives of approx. 38,000 people in the Town of Wallingford was any through health risk study conducted by the State Dept. of Health - local agencies or health facilities i.e. Gaylord, Masonic Home, Heart and Lung Assoc., American Cancer Soc., etc.  
Why not?
  11. Is it a fact that the Wallingford and Meriden landfills are polluting our water supplies? Yes or No. How, then, will adding toxic ash, Dioxsin and heavy-metal laden ash solve the already existing water pollution problem? Therefore, polluted water added to polluted water equals polluted water.
  12. What is a lined landfill? What is the purpose of having a "lined" landfill?
  13. Can an unlined landfill prevent polluted toxic leachate from entering the water system?
  14. Does Wallingford and Meriden have lined landfills?
  15. Do we plan to construct one?
  16. Will the DEP, CRRA, Vicon or our Town Council guarantee Wallingford residents that no health hazards will occur from the operation of this plant, transportation of ash from this plant, and the dumping of this ash in our landfills?

We, here, the undersigned present these questions to our Council. These questions have been posed by the following members of People Against Garbage Burning. We request that each question be answered honestly and fully for the understanding education of everyone.

Respectfully,

The P.A.G.B.