

SPECIAL TOWN COUNCIL MEETING

32

January 16, 1986

DAG HAMMARSKJOLD AUDITORIUM

7:30 p.m.

A Special Meeting of the Wallingford Town Council was held on Thursday, January 16, 1986 at the Dag Hammarskjold Auditorium. The purpose of the meeting was a discussion on the Resource Recovery Project.

Before the discussion began on the Resource Recovery Project, Mr. Holmes moved to table Addendum Items 1 & 2 which were to consider acceptance of Farm Hill Road and Briarwood Lane in Meadowview Subdivision Sections 4, 5, & 6 and also to consider waiving the bid for expenses of the Lyman Hall-Sheehan High School Championship Ceremony. This was seconded by Mr. Rys.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes with the exception of Mr. Diana who was not present; motion duly carried.

Chairman Gessert then starts the meeting by welcoming everyone to the meeting. It shows a deep commitment to the community and that a lot of people care about Wallingford. He then points out that there is not a person in this room who doesn't care about Wallingford. The purpose of tonight's meeting is to carry on a discussion and hopefully if we carry on that discussion in an intelligent fashion, we will all leave here better informed. He then says they have a permit to use the Auditorium until 11:00 p.m. He then says everyone has a right to talk on the subject but there will be no personal attacks. Keep comments to the issue and to the subject matter. Chairman Gessert then introduces himself, all members of the Wallingford Town Council, Dennis Martin-CRRA Representative. ViCon represented by Dr. Llewellyn Clark, State of Connecticut-Charles Kurker from the Solid Waste Management Group, Leonard Bruckman and Al Conklin from the Air Compliance Unit, Ken Majors from the Water Compliance Unit, Roy Weston-Consulting Firm of Weston, Dr. Kay Jones-CSI Resources, and Representative Mary Mushinsky surrounding Mayor Dickinson. As far as format, we have several people who would like to make introductory remarks about the decision and how we got to where we are. He then says Charles Kurker, Leonard Bruckman and Mary Mushinsky will be speaking first. Once that is concluded, he will not entertain debates because that will leave the opportunity for only 4 people to talk. There are a couple of people who indicated they would like to speak for about 15 minutes, members of the audience, they are from out of town and out of state in some instances. After their presentations, he would like to limit time to 5 minutes each because if we don't too many people will be denied to speak. There will be no rebuttals from this table. After about 1 hour of input, if anyone wants to comment about anything that was said, they will have an opportunity during that 15 minutes or so to do this. If someone has a specific question to any of the gentlemen at the table, he will be happy to address it during the 15 minutes allowed. Other than that, if you want to provide your input, we won't have rebuttal and then we will give the CRRA table an opportunity to speak. At this time he then introduces Charles Kurker and says everyone will be treated cordially and politely and he would ask that they do the same. This way they will all benefit.

Mr. Charles Kurker, Solid Waste Management, Department of Environmental Protection, then says that really with the state the way it is, the only option we have is to go into Resource Recovery, with energy producing steam or electricity, and this tied in with good source separation programs is the source we have to take. This was just not pulled out of a hat. A state plan was developed in 1971, and prior to that three years of study from legislature, citizens, and industry. The decision was made after studying all the technologies. They were all investigated and the conclusion was made that the only viable alternative was this one. In many cases, such as composting, they were operated a number of years and then closed down. Our technologies, which have been utilized on a large scale, for many years, both in Europe and this country and tying those in with the source separation program, you can minimize the volume of what gets buried and maximize the recovery of resources that are vital to us. That is how it was arrived at. The other thing he stresses is that we are using up our permanent landfill capacity. At the present time we estimate that the disposing of waste with the landfill operation will be exhausted by 1988 or early 1989 the latest.

This does not allow us much time. We have to reduce volume to minimize what goes into the ground. This is the only way to go. We 33  
are having suggestions and reports come in to us to transport waste from the southwest portion of the state up to the Rhode Island Border, still within CT because there are no available regional sites where towns that are exhausting their capacities can go. He can't overemphasize the need to get these systems up and operating.

Leonard Bruckman, Director of the Air Compliance Unit, Department of Environmental Protection, then says he is pleased to be here tonight to explain what the air pollution control requirements are for these types of facilities and to be able to answer any questions on this project or any other air pollution questions. As far as Resource Recovery, CT has issued what we consider to be the most comprehensive and tightest permits in the country. There are many facilities like this that did not have the control equipment that we have here. We feel that by controlling the combustion of the refuse, it is a combustion process, and monitoring that continuously, we can be sure that the combustion regulates in the proper manner and that the pollution generated will be minimized. Whatever pollution does stay, will be controlled by a series of scrubbing devices and fabric filters. The fabric filters offer an advantage that some other devices do not have being that the residue that remains on the fabric filters, acts as a secondary reactor and removes some of the gases that are removed in the scrubbing devices that precede these pieces of equipment. We have analyzed 4 facilities here in CT. The first facility that we looked at was the Mid-CT project located in the Hartford area. That particular permit process took several weeks. They had several hearings. The State had some issues that are important in the Wallingford project were important in the mid-CT project. They had days of testimony, experts from all over the country coming to testify. We evaluated all the information and from that information they developed the permit requirements that have basically been followed in the permit of the Wallingford Project. We are confident with the requirements that they have that the facility will be operated properly and the pollution generated will be minimized and there won't be any hazard. The permit review of this particular project, the Air Compliance Unit is developing a new program that specifically addresses hazardous air pollutants. That program will be a leader in the country. That will add specific requirements for all different types of hazardous pollutants. If we find out that any type of facility or any kind of source of air pollution is violating any of those requirements, corrective action will be taken. That program, together with the one we have on the facility, we feel, these types of controls, will minimize any types of air pollution problems. He will be happy later on to answer any specific questions that they may have.

Mary Mushinsky, State Representative then says, in the last few days, many people have come to her and advised her to go along with the prevailing opinion and try to block the waste to energy plant in Wallingford. They have told her to say she sees some environmental problem and save her political neck. She has had to decide whether or not to come here and be honest with them or come here and be opposed. She would rather tell the truth and take her chances. Why does legislature want to close landfills? Very simply because they leak toxic chemicals into our drinking water. This is a glass of Wallingford Drinking water and she says there are 15 toxic chemicals in Wallingford's water supply. They have picked them up when testing was done of the Oak Street Well field. Why does legislature favor closing the landfill and why does legislature favor resource recovery? She says because they feel it is better than the dump that is now on Cherry street. It is time to close that landfill, the one in Meriden, and the other leakers. If properly controlled, a plant like this is a good trade for the way we are handling our garbage now. If you think about it, we have not come a long way since the stone age when they threw garbage over a ravine. They are basically doing the same thing in Wallingford and that is why it has come back to haunt us in our drinking water. How can she tell you, how does she know that this is a better way to go. How does she know that they won't be covering Wallingford with Dioxin particularly PCDD form which is the dangerous one. Because she has investigated the strategy that was created by the State Regulators to control it. She is convinced that their dioxin controlled strategy works. The DEP like us, was confronted by a blizzard of rival scientific theories about dioxin formation in trash plants. Many of you have been collecting the papers as well as she has and reading them. Which of the scientist is right? Since DEP can't be sure which is right, they have written a control strategy which covers all the control theories. It doesn't matter if Barry Conimer is right and Halsirus is wrong. It doesn't matter because the strategy they have developed is good for any of the 5 major theories of dioxin formation.

34

The strategy attacks the formation of dioxin by attacking the 2 ingredients, Chlorine and Hydrocarbons, and at the trapping end, if any dioxin was accidentally formed. The permit requires the removal of most of the chlorine from such sources as salt, and it also requires combustion conditions sufficient to break apart the hydrocarbons such as cellulose, aspirin, etc. and other common hydrocarbons that could be made into a dioxin. The permit requires the use of oxygen to prevent recombination of the hydrocarbon and its dangerous molecules. At the trapping end, the permit requires capture of the submicron particles to which 50% of dioxin adheres, as well as the metals that environmentalists are concerned about. She has to conclude, after investigating all of the allegations, that the charge that dioxins cannot be controlled is bogus. That doesn't mean we don't have a job to do. Good control of the pollutants in this plant depends on good operators and inspectors, on standard enforcement, and on backup monitoring by those of us here in Wallingford. On Monday, the environment committee discussed this issue and a number of us expressed interest in legislation to further regulate these plants and further reassure the public that enforcement will be done. It will be her job as a legislator on the Environment Committee, and you must help her design the enforcement tools that you want to make yourselves reassured. Tell her what you want on dioxin standards and enforcement and she will do it. For the ash, her preliminary information that she has indicated that there will not be a leachate problem but there is very little data available. Since the information is so scampy and since she is worried about leachate, we must be prepared to treat the ash as hazardous if new tests show that it is. If it is bad, she will work with the people and make sure it goes to a hazardous waste site. She says I am protective of my district. If I saw any reasons to block this plant she would do it. She just doesn't see the environmental problem. She will do her job to see that it is regulated as tightly as she can. We are a long long way from total recyclization. There are a very few people in Wallingford who have pushed harder for recycling that she has. There are very few on the Environment Committee who have filed more bills on recycling than she has. The Town of Wallingford, even with all the efforts, has never recycled more than 5%. In the United States, you cannot find a city that has recycled more than 20%. She was given a report on Wilton, New Hampshire, a community of 8,000 people where the recycling rate is supposedly 53%. She had a legislative research office check that today and they told her it was actually a 35% rate. Not all the people participate. The ones that refuse to separate have a different arrangement to have their trash taken away by a hauler. That is still a wonderful rate and that is a goal that we in Wallingford can shoot for. She says she would like to work with you and the People Against Garbage Burning on recycling. She would like to work with them to regulate the plant as tightly as she can. She would like to work with them to regulate the trucks to Route 5, not through neighborhoods. And mainly she wants to work with them to close the dumps so that we may have safe drinking water. She wants to join with them to solve the garbage crisis in the most intelligent manner possible. Thank You.

Chairman Gessert then says he has about 25 cards. The first three are those who requested about 15 minutes each to speak. After that he would like to limit it to 5 minutes so everyone gets a chance to speak. If anyone wants a card, come down and fill out a card. The first card he has is that of Tom DiMauro, Conservation Law Foundation of New England.

Tom DiMauro then thanks Mr. Gessert for letting him talk. What he is going to do is tell a story. He has testified at a few of these hearings, specifically Portland Maine and Bangor Maine, and he is going to tell them what he saw in the consultant reports there. The risk assessments that were done would probably be similar. He wants to talk about the uncertainties of these assessments. A person tells you 1 in a million chance in getting cancer. He should also tell you how sure he is. That is what he is going to talk about. Pollutant transport. First, that is when the smoke comes up the stack, how it is dispersed in the air. Second is cancer risk. When you breath in dioxin, what chance of you getting cancer from that. The last is reproductive risk. What are the chances of you women having still births, spontaneous abortions, infertility. He then says when people figure out the concentration of dioxin in the air they use the equation concentration equals mass over pi x velocity x 2 dispersion coefficients. People plug in numbers for dispersion coefficients based on a graph. He then shows the graph. No one tells you how certain they are of these numbers. One of them says Turner estimates. He has something from Turner that says you can't trust these within a factor of 3 or so in an area a kilometer or less from the source. Now, in vain, they predicted the maximum concentration to be 7 kilometers away.

When they tell you the concentration is X, it could be 10 times that very easily. Next is cancer. There are two types of carcinogens. The initiators and the promoters. The Initiators start cancer. A promoter finishes cancer. A promoter cannot start cancer and an initiator cannot finish cancer. If you want to find out how bad dioxin is you give it to some rats and see how many cancers are there. If those rats don't have a lot of initiators in them and you give them a promoter, you won't see very many cancers develop. The problem with dioxin is that the estimates that the EPA has as to how potent dioxin is, is based upon these studies where there were no initiators given. EPA recognizes this and they say that the risk may be greater than the estimated. Probably the most disturbing thing he has seen is the neglect of the use of alternative models. Everyone uses something called the multistage cancer model. He is then told that CT does not use the multistage cancer model. He then says that a consultant at one time or another will say that dioxin gets into your body at this rate. This daily dose. He will use an EPA number and say this will give the number of about 1 in a million. This is what he saw in Portland. The problem is there are other models out there. The Scientific Committee of the Food Safety Council recommends that you use these other models. The EPA itself calculated risks from those other models. Two of those other models predicted risks 1,000 times more dangerous. If a consultant tells you the risk is one in a million of you getting cancer using the EPA Multistage model, it can very well be that it is one in 1,000. Next is reproductive effects. Dioxin causes infertility, stillbirth, spontaneous abortion, liver abnormalities and cleft palates. The problem of reproductive effects is overlooked because of the way EPA calculates the risk based on non-cancer risks. It is done a different way. It is not clear that should be done. The Scientific Committee of the Food & Safety Council recommends that it be done a different way. What he has is a dose response curve. He then shows this. If you were a person who didn't like risk and you had 2 different types of effects. X's are reproductive effects and the O's are cancers. The EPA is basing their risk assessment on these two values where it is clear that there is a higher incidence on any one dose from the reproductive effects. In conclusion, transport models are usually without much care for uncertainty, alternative cancer models may show higher risk. All the models may be wrong, there is something in the way dioxin works that is much different from the other chemicals. (Benzines etc.) He then says two other consultants don't even look at the cancer. They don't know what is going on, they have no clue whatsoever. The experiments may not address the human concerns. That is the promotion initiation discussion and lastly the reproductive tests may be as high as 1 in every 200 women may get reproductive effects. Thank you very much. (applause). Mr. DiMauro then gives his credentials as a bachelor's in Chemical Engineering from MIT, a master's in Technology & Policy from the Chemical Engineering Dept., and he is a PHD student at Duke University. He is a scientist.

Karen Shapiro, Center for Biology of Natural Systems at Queens College. She says for the past 3 1/2 years she has been working with Dr. Barry Comner studying the health problems associated with emissions due to dioxin. From cities in this country and in Europe. She then wants to explain dioxin. She says some of them may have heard of it through the fact that there was a lawsuit by a Vietnam Veteran against a number of chemical companies. Dioxin was in agent orange and that caused a record out of court settlement. Dioxin is also a chemical found in Missouri, Love Canal, and the streets in Newark New Jersey that caused in two of these instances, the government to go and buy the homes of the people living there. It was explained by the previous speaker that Dioxin is known as a tumor promoter. What that means is that dioxin increases the susceptibility of our body to other cancer causing substances in the body. For example, that glass of water held up before with 15 toxic chemical in it, what it means to you people is that if that incinerator is built and you are there breathing dioxin, those toxic chemicals in that water is going to be much worse for you than if you were not exposed to dioxin. It is going to increase the likelihood that you will get cancer from drinking that water. Incinerators that have been tested to burn garbage without processing it emit dioxin. The question that scientists ask and what the people ask is when I breath in the dioxin, what is going to happen to me. That is the risk assessment which answers the question of how many cases of cancer can be caused from exposure to a chemical. What we have to be doing is answering that question before a plant is built and operating. The first thing to do is assume how much dioxin is going to come out of the smoke stack of the incinerator. Dioxin is not just one chemical. It is a group of 75 different chemicals. In addition to that is the chemical group called the Furans which has 135, We are not talking about one substance. It is 210 substances. What happens is this comes out of the stack of

the incinerator, it is dispersed in the air, it lands and we breath it in, it lands on soil and we ingest it. It enters the body several ways. The question is once it enters our bodies, what does it do to us. How many cancers are there going to be because of an incinerator. The final answer to that is a number. There have been many risk assessments done to many incinerators with many different numbers. To help you understand what that number means, when the EPA decides whether or not it is going to act on a chemical, i.e. Benzene, it carries out a risk assessment procedure and sees how many additional cases of cancer result from exposure to this chemical. The basic rule of thumb that is used in our government is that a chemical causes in the area of 1 to 10 additional cases of cancer, then that chemical should be regulated. In fact if you look through the list of the chemicals that the U.S. is trying to regulate, you can see that the chemicals that they regulate are those that cause in the area of 1-10. Those in the area of several hundred is not acceptable to the U.S. Government. The first step we have to figure out is how much dioxin and furans are going to come out of an incinerator. In Wallingford, we don't know, the plant is not built and we cannot test it. Therefore, we have to try to make an estimate. Estimating is not an easy thing. She then shows a lot of numbers up on the screen. These are various incinerators that to date have adequately been tested. Since we do not have an operating incinerator, we have to look at incinerators that were previously tested to get an idea of how much dioxin is coming out of an incinerator. As you can see on the overhead there is a very wide range. The lowest is 192 nanograms, that is  $1 \times 10^{-9}$  to the negative ninth gram per cubic meter of air. The maximum is 56,460. There is a very big difference. She has been reading over the documents prepared by CSI in which they have tried to predict how much dioxin is going to be emitted from the incinerator. There is some fault in what they did. They only look at some of the dioxin and some of the furans. It has now been recognized that this is not the way it should be done. We need to look at the full array of dioxins and furans emitted. It is not just a small group that is hazardous to us but a number of them. Right away already the impact of this incinerator has been grossly underestimated. When you see this wide range of variants on emissions from an incinerator it is because there has been a number of theories proposed. One of the theories is that dioxin results when you don't have good combustion. If you don't burn well you will have high dioxin emissions. If you are burning well, you will have very low emissions. The best way to see if that theory is right is to look at incinerators tested and look at a temperature. That is what they did to an incinerator in Canada. The author concluded that there was no connection between dioxin emission or furan emission and temperature. Some of you may have been told otherwise due to some misinformation. The graphs she shows show the original data of that report. A combustion engineer in New York, Hasilrus, has been drawing lines with the data. Unfortunately, he has been drawing arbitrary lines. The top one then shows it goes contrary to what the author and everyone else who have analyzed the data conclude. The other thing that has been proposed besides controlling by proper combustion is to have air pollution control devices. You may have heard mention of the use of a baghouse. There is no evidence to be able to say that if the facility has a baghouse it will be able to minimize dioxin emissions. To date there is only one incinerator equipped with this baghouse device tested for dioxin. This was in Japan. What happened is that they measured the dioxin going into the air pollution control device and they measured the dioxin going out of the air pollution control device. Up to 7 times more dioxin came out of the air pollution control device than went into the air pollution control device. You should be asking yourselves how someone can get up here and tell you that this plant is going to be safe for you because it has an air pollution control device that is going to protect you from dioxin emissions when its only test thus far it has failed. (applause) There are several other problems with other control devices such as the ones used before that, they had not held back dioxin either. All the things proposed to minimize dioxin emission, high temperature, high combustion, air pollution control devices, when you look at the data, you will see that the evidence is contrary to the statements that you are being told. What you people need is to be educated. She then says there are other things you can do besides burying or burning garbage. That is recycling. Looking at the ages here she can tell there people who lived during World War II and they know what this is all about. It is not a new idea. It is an old idea. It is not a high technology idea. There was a town in Woodbury, New Jersey that is recycling 50% of its garbage and that is based only on participation from home owners. Based on that participation they are already getting a 50% reduction. Not only can recycling be done at the house, it can also be done at mechanical separation plants. These are plants that the garbage is separated as delivered. It isn't done by people standing into an assembly line.

This is a type of separation done through mechanical process. These plants are operating. It is proven technology. Once separated, these various components of the garbage can then be recycled. Unfortunately not everything in our trash is recycleable. These things still would have to be burned or landfill. However, once these things are separated, we could burn separately and not burn together where they would form dioxin. At the same point in time, one thing they may not have been told is that incineration is not going to end landfilling. Approximately 20-30% of incoming garbage goes out as ash material that has to be disposed of. The video later will show that this ash is not an inert material. Chairman Gessert then says her time is up. The audience wants her to continue. (applause) She then says the people have not been given all the straight facts. She can see by what was being told up here earlier. It is important that they get the straight facts. You people are the ones to tell the government that we want our town to be safe. (Applause) 37

Chairman Gessert was then going to let the gentlemen from the Air Compliance unit speak but was told by the audience there was to be no debate. The gentlemen does sit down but Chairman Gessert then says that he will be allowed time to speak later. He then says it would be nice to let one person take up all the time to speak. If one person monopolizes the microphone then there is an awful lot of people who won't get a chance to speak. The next card he has is Linda Smith.

Linda Smith, organizer of People Against Garbage Burning, then says she would like to thank Tom & Karen coming to speak. Also, she would like to see people against the Garbage burning stand up. They then do so. She then says she went up to Pittsfield to see that plant. She brought samples along. She says she is not an expert and that the dioxins will be destroyed with high temperatures. She then holds up readable newspaper that did not burn. She also holds up a tin can. She says there are a lot of things that don't burn. She then says they have fly ash which is suppose to be hazardous waste and up there they just dump it. She hasn't heard that they were going to treat it as hazardous waste here either. It is a fine black flour. The other bottle is another ash. There is condensation in the jar because they pour water on it and that drains all over the place. This is a heavier grade of ash and she shakes it and lets them hear metal in the ash. The people against garbage burning have packets of information for the Council so they can read about why they are taking the position they are taking. Two of the papers in here, Karen Shapiro worked on. She then distributes these to the Council. She says she also got a letter in the mail today from a women in Windham. There is a picture. She then read the letter. They have a plant in Windham. It says "Dear Linda, I heard about your meeting with the Town Council and thought I should write. My family and I live in the Town of Windham. We have had an energy recovery facility across from our home since 1981. The area residents and I think it stinks. Both figuratively and literal. The garbage from 7 area towns is dumped just in front of the main door. The main door is usually kept open. We have two hospitals in the area. We have not been able to find out if they are joining in. The Town is not giving out any answers.

But what if they are. There is radiological disposal, research disposal and operating room and drug disposal. The flies at the plant are horrible and carry disease. When the plant breaks down, and they do, the garbage is still dumped in piles. We have seen this pile as high as 10 feet. The door is open and we get a good view. Sometimes the garbage can't fit inside so it gets piled outside. The smell has made us very nauseous. There is rodent control but we have seen rats. Now to the garbage itself. Plastic containers, household cleaners, bleaches, metal all substances that DEP have stated are connected to Upper Respiratory Disease. The filtering system that allows the smoke you see in the photo also allows unseen gases from the garbage escape. They can sometimes smell. The ash and soot have covered our homes. In getting the signatures for the petition presented to the Town, I encountered complaints of children with rashes and coughs, some had difficulty beathing. The State DEP has said our town should put scrubbers in the plant, the town says we can't afford it, the State should pay. The town says the state should pay. While the town and the state play games, the burning goes on. At last weeks meeting, the town is taking under consideration the suggestion to burn bulky waste mixture, the by-product of sewer, SLUDGE. Linda, please get the Council to say no!!! (Applause) An energy recovery plant not only smells bad, cause residue to our homes and fields where our food is grown, energy recovery plants like ours will end up killing." It is from Susan S. Hollister.

38

She then introduces a video and says she talked to Dr. Paul Conet who is a chemist and scientist at St. Louis University who has done a lot of research on Resource Recovery, and he couldn't be here tonight but he sent a video and the People Against Garbage Burning would like to share this with you. The video then comes on and shows a picture of an ash landfill. The man in the picture stands 6 ft. 2 in. tall and shows how it looks compared to the landfill. Also, in the picture it looks like a small wall when actually it was a cell for the ash. That one was built last year and is now already filled and they are building another. Next they go to a leachate pond from the ash landfill and the pond is 2 feet from going over the top. If they had a big rain storm it would overflow and drain into the natural pond. There are no fish left in the natural pond. They believe this is on top of a landfill. A well digger has signed a statement that the ash landfill is on top of a landfill. They started out covering it once a day and now it is once a year. There is clay on top and the ash is coming through. 6 months ago they dumped here. At the end of what was grass is just clay on top. This is 50ft above ground level. New ash that was dumped and they are filling up cells and steam is coming from the top. Also, you can notice things that were not burned. A plastic bottle is shown. It is not monitored, they don't take care of them, they don't burn the garbage properly, they state they are burning at a high temperature and they don't. There are pictures of plastic toys not even touched at the landfill. These people say if they could, absolutely guarantee that this landfill would not leach. That they not reach  $\frac{1}{2}$  full for the leachate ponds. Make sure the ash is covered at a daily basis. The ash is sitting in the landfill--in cells. A man then complains that his cows had sores all over them and they only cleared when taken away from the brooks where they drank from. Two of the cows never recovered.

One of the livers just shrunk up. When the cows went to a new pasture with different water they were fine. As soon as they got away from the brook they were fine. The brook is spring fed. It comes from the inside of the ash landfill. 12-13 cows were affected by the sores. One had a sore 6" long and 3" wide. It was a black scab and when that fell off it was pussy and bloody. The boy then shows a rash on his arm from grabbing one of the cows and putting it in the headlock. They treated him for a fungus but it never went away. This was in June, so that was 5 months ago. Originally it was all swollen up off the surface and scaly. There were yellow spots and turned black and came and fell off. This was just from touching the cow. Also, breeding the cows has been bad. Many cows lost calves after 2-3 months. They come in heat and nothing happens. 30-40% have trouble breeding. The breeding was done by artificial insemination. The video then goes to talking with a Councilman of the city of Auburn, Maine where this video takes place. The tests so far haven't shown that the landfill is damaging the water in the area. He is concerned about 20 years down the road. Also, he is concerned that they don't have city water now. Should this damage the water supply then they would have to bring in city water at great costs. EPA recently did a test and the results have not come back yet. The incinerator itself is running at a considerable loss. The councilman says they just hired a consultant to look at the whole process and report back to us. Now it is running about \$1 million a year. They then talk about the ash landfill. It was agreed upon that they would cover this on a daily basis with 6" of soil. Apparently this was changed and done twice a year and now only once a year. Their explanation is because they got approval from DEP who say the original plan was to put in solid waste and the every day coverage was for the solid waste and because they changed it changed. His argument was that these agreements were reached informally and then OK'd by the DEP. As for the twice yearly, they feel they are doing that. If they are only doing it twice a year, every time it rains or there is a snowfall, when it melts, water will be going through this landfill. That will be leaking out some of the toxic material. The Councilman then says it will go to the leachate pond. The water that overflows goes into a brook nearby. The pond and the brook have been tested and they say it doesn't show up there. The Councilman then says everyone says a contract is a contract and you have to honor it. Obviously, if it is going to destroy the city we can't go on. In the long run we may have to close the place down completely. We can't expect the taxpayers to go on paying just because a mistake was made. They may close it down and ship it somewhere else. The other may be to send out trash altogether. We have to draw the line somewhere. Our ash landfill is filling up and we will have to find something else. The taxpayers expect us to take a tough stand. We have to renegotiate. This is then the end of the video. (Applause from the audience).

Tom DiMauro then gets up to say the people have thought he might have said This is going to happen, for example when he said 1 in 200 might have reproductive effects. He had thought he said there is a great deal of uncertainty. There is a large range, ..It may be. He wants to reiterate that to be sure everyone knows this. 39

Chairman Gessert then says as he said before they would allow an hour of talks and then allow the people at the CRRA table to comment.

He then says before anyone does start talking he hopes they will allow them the courtesy that has been shown to the speakers so far.

Leonard Bruckman then says earlier Ms. Shapiro said how a State official can get up and look at this permit and ask we approve it and make the point it was checked by Public Health. He was the State Official with the major responsibility of approving that permit. It is simple for him to answer why he recommended that the permit be approved. (The audience comments and Chairman Gessert says give him his chance to speak). Mr. Bruckman then says that this is an informative meeting for everyone to benefit from if they would listen. He says they listened to some people who have had comments, none of these people have done studies on their own, they all have reviewed or utilized information performed by other people. The proper place to view technical information is in the technical field where the scientists go through and review the information, there is accuracy, etc. What people interpret from this is their opinion of what this information means. An instance was the dioxin information from the different facilities. The Resource Recovery process is not an incinerator. It is a combustion process, it burns the fuel, and then uses it to generate power. The technology is different. Specifically, the reason there is very little information on these plants is because it is new. It is a state of the art. It is so new that plants have not been able to be tested. The incinerator tested in Japan that indicated the acids were higher after the control than before the control. The test was done in Japan. The team of American scientists that went out there had no control over that test. They had no control over the plant before the test was conducted. The incinerators were operating long periods of time at very low temperatures. If you think about it, this indicates that the fabric filters collected dioxin. If they were produced afterwards they somehow had to get on there. The way they got on there was the control equipment worked. It removed the dioxin from the waste. The incinerator was operating much lower than it should have been and much more dioxins were forming than should have been. When the American Scientists came they told the Japanese people to operate the incinerator at a higher temperature. When the temperature was raised, the dioxins that were already in the fabric filters were released. Therefore, what went in from the tests now that it was operating properly was low. What came out were emissions that were very high. This was collected on the fabric filters. This indicates that the controls do work. The Dioxin does adhere to the particles. When people talk about combustion, high temperature as a way of controlling dioxin, that is not correct. When you design a combustion chamber, you design it for high temperature and that is true. It is a very big fire box. You can't get a good reading of the temperature. How do you know you are getting proper combustion? You measure certain products that can tell you what the efficiency is of the combustion process and that is what we require. We require combustion efficiency measures and requirements that are high and if anything happens to that, we can then adjust the operation of the facility. If you have the combustion efficiency, you're going to destroy any hydrocarbons formed. These resource recovery facilities are operated with the kinds of combustion requirements that you would find on a hazardous waste incinerator.

We wanted to be sure that any hazardous waste that could find its way into the way stream could be removed. This is why they monitor it, and have acid gas controls. It is state of the art. So much so that they have not been able to get information on them. He then introduces Dr. Kay Jones.

Dr. Kay Jones then wants to make some comments on what Tom DiMauro and Karen Shapiro said. He then says he has his bachelors as well. He has his masters and a PhD in environmental engineering at the University of California at Berkley with minors in Toxicology and Clinical engineering and his PhD thesis was in the area of combustion. He then feels debates are good and he goes on to say there was a comment made by Tom DiMauro on risk assessments performed in

Portland, Maine. His firm did those risk assessments. The maximum impacts were in fact not 7 kilometers for the design as it now exists but  $1\frac{1}{2}$  kilometers away from the stack. The curves that he showed you in terms of dispersion coefficients in fact are based on actual field measurements and the kind of terrain settings that were experienced in Portland, Maine. He also might point out if we could choose among those graphs, where in fact, those coefficients are chosen on hour to hour factors. There has been research studies that show those curves can be used very well when looked after the major concentrations in the field well within the State of the art risk assessment. In terms of the issue of what model should be used, he would only refer anyone to review EPA's peer review cancer assessment guideline on dioxins which is probably at least 3" thick. This was done by top scientists of the State. The model that is used for dioxins, has been selected as being the most appropriate one. It is right that you apply different types of models to different types of data. The model used for dioxins has been accepted internationally in terms of calculating risks of dioxins. The other thing referring to reproductive risks, it is clearly shown that the conservative assumptions relative to carcinogenesis is much more conservative than the effects of the reproductive effects. It is almost 100 times more conservative than the model used for calculating reproductive effects. He then goes on to Karen Shapiro's comments and says he wants to be clear that the paper she referred to by by Cominer, Shapiro and Hall has never as yet been submitted to the Journal as yet for peer review. Karen Shapiro then says they have had papers Peer reviewed. He then says that is some of the data from around the world. It is not all of the data and it does contain some horrendous data and contains data on some areas that are of no relation to the design talked about here. Also the comment about the fact that the government takes action when the risk is showing between 1-10 is absolutely incorrect. The federal drinking water standard allows a permissible standard risk of 10 per million. Benzene as an example in this city probable produces a risk of about 40 per million. Also, this does not mean there will be 40 cases per million. It is a statistical calculation to compare risks. It is not an absolute tool. He also pointed out that the data on the Japanese incinerator is undergoing peer review at the present time and basically should not be discussed in that context but since we are discussing it, the emissions even though they were high, were lower than the mean value of all contemporary facilities in the world. When we talk about recycling. Even if you recycle, you still have to burn refuse.

He then says when you burn that refuse, you will still produce dioxin at the same amount of ton input as you will from a mass burn facility. Therefore the risk is essentially proportionate with how much you remove. Even if you remove  $\frac{1}{2}$  the risk is  $\frac{1}{2}$ . His last comment is that his firm, in fact last October, made measurements of two consecutive days at the Vicon Plant in Pittsfield. The emissions made at that facility were non-detectable. Even if they assumed they were at detectable limits of the measures we made were done by US EPA procedures, the well was  $\frac{1}{4}$  of the current Mass. guideline for dioxins and furans. The guideline was they are employed to assess plants in Mass. that is equivalent to 6 in a million. The point would be that if they were detected they would be  $\frac{1}{4}$  of that and the risk from the facility in Pittsfield would have been  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per million. They do have data on a facility like this one. (The audience then boos Dr. Jones)

Chairman Gessert then says he did not hear them boo at the speaker who spoke for an hour. This meeting is to inform one another. He doesn't know what information is derived from a boo but he would imagine it to be negligible. Charles Kurker has some short comments on recycling.

Charles Kurker then raises the question that she mentioned a 50% reduction and she didn't say by weight or by volume for a recycling program in New Jersey. Is that by weight or by volume. Karen Shapiro then says by volume. He then says we estimate there will be a 90% reduction of volume for this type of operation compared to 50%. The follow up is how much of the recycled material was plastic. There are hydrocarbons in plastic bags that may be contributed to these dioxins. Do you know if any of the plastics were recycled. Karen Shapiro says she does not know. Mr. Kurker says the point he was going to bring up is that if they were going to separate the different types of plastics, then they are recyclable. The problem is the majority of people cannot separate

plastic and they will end up increasing the emission. Charles Kurker says he wants to go on record as saying they encourage and wholeheartedly support recycling programs. They have been promoting them for 15 years in the state of CT. However, it is not the only solution but part of the total solution. 41

Another outbreak from the audience and finally Chairman Gessert says the next card he has is from Jim Heilman, High Hill Road.

Mr. Heilman then says he is pleased to see so many concerned citizens. Wallingford is a secondary concern. The primary concern is for their health. He is opposed to the plant for one reason. He is concerned that we will only get 10% of ash out of this which means more has to be emitted. In the morning, on occasion, he takes his student to look at a layer of cloud hanging over the Town of Wallingford. The reason that the trash facility is located in the valley. That cloud clings there. They can see the emissions from wood burning stoves, trucking depots, and from traffic generated. The cloud stays there for the most part of the morning when the atmospheric conditions change. I feel that I lack faith in the model that is used by DEP. That modeling has been balanced against economics and it is health that is a primary concern. Yesterday there was a photo of the Pierce Generating plant being fired up.

He shows this to the Council to show the pathway from emissions from that plant. They are emitted, they move aloft and plunge down. This was late afternoon. Any emissions emitted in that valley, stay in that valley. You are talking about 24 hour a day burning, 365 days a year. At nighttime, those emissions will stay right on top of the residents within that valley and the modeling that DEP uses does not address that. In that modeling, essentially all emissions move along at a given angle depending on buoyancy of the atmosphere. They do have some models that deal with some various kinds of stability but it doesn't address the true conditions that happen many nights of the year. You can actually see it there regardless of what modeling says it should be doing. He is also concerned about the town administration, past and present, that is pushed by economic development committees to grow and develop. This state, during our recent depression, fared quite well because of its industrial diversity. We have to have strict rules against pollution. Those regulations are diversity that we have. What he has not seen DEP address are synergisms. The study of all these different things that come together and get into your system. We have a Planning & Zoning Commission that has recently told us how they want to expand the east side of Wallingford's water shed yet at the same time we have seen tremendous industrial development at the headwaters of the water shed. All of this with DEP approval. They have to, It's the law. Where is the trust? I have lost mine. When he looks at the modeling that was done and he sees where they parallel terrain, in other words, emissions come out, reach a certain elevation and parallel terrains. It goes up emissions go up, it goes down emissions go down. What happens when it reaches a cliff? The same kind of thing happens in the valley that you live in. Those emissions from that incineration plant, during the nighttime, unless they build a 650ft stack to overcome nocturnal inversion or a 1,260 ft stack to overcome summer time cross atmospheric conversions, those are the only things that would handle those situations was done in Sudbury, Ontario. Why was Wallingford chosen? There was a place to sell the energy. DEP should be called the department of economic proliferation. He would like to see modeling done by local universities. Not by generic modeling. Modeling that addresses itself to the real situation, not balanced against economics but against health and risk. Thank You. (applause)

Ed Bradley is the next speaker and he says he has been studying incinerators for the last 4 months. He is not an expert or chemist. He holds no degree but he will challenge any expert here and any comment he makes he will challenge. If he is wrong, tell him he is wrong. He then says they are here because they are concerned residents of the Town of Wallingford. They are concerned about the air and water and natural resources of their town. The main reason is health concern about the trash to energy plant and also there are many air quality problems that are not resolved, that being American Cyanamid. Local officials may be saying where have you people been for the last 10 years, ... Well, as always the residents of Wallingford have been the last to find out about the health concerns that have recently been brought to light by other concerned citizens of the Country. Why is this that local and State officials have not talked about the health issues related to this plant. He is conceived that they truly believe there are no

health concerns related to these plants. While other parts of the northeast are concerned and angry about the health matters. The reason these officials may be concerned is that he and others will be telling them something they don't want to hear about incinerators. He says he has been before the Town Council with some of his concerns but as usual, no concern was shown. (Mrs. Bergamini then says he lies. Where was he when the zoning was changed.) He says he will challenge her as he stands there. He then says he is glad that he is not alone in protecting our environment. Chemical Industry had a series of articles June 6, 1983, special series on dioxin. It states that control of dioxin are highly complex. It also says dioxin represents a big problem with waste disposal. In fact, a case has been made that many reactions occur when organic and chlorine containing material are burned together and that one of the things that happen are trace amounts of CDD's, chlorinated dioxins. Current problems on the matter of dioxin contamination is controversial. The dispute being what level are acceptable, if any, in our environment. In the every day combustion process, the number of dioxin produced is very small and not much can be done about that anyway. Trace amounts of dioxin have been found in your fireplace, catalytic converters. In the incineration which contains a sufficient amount of chlorides, it can preserve wood products. There are many unanswered questions as to how much you are exposed. Mr. Bradley then explains what dioxin is made up of. He then says dioxin can be found in anything containing hydrogen, oxygen, carbon and chlorine. Dioxin is incredibly lethal to guinea pigs. By the way toxicologists measure things, it is about 10 times as efficient at killing guinea pigs as nerve gas is at killing humans. Dioxin is less lethal to certain laboratory animals but on some circumstances it can cause cancer to mice and rats. No report of deaths have been attributed to dioxin exposure. Yet there is a link in the increase of birth defects from agent orange, dioxin being a trace contaminate. It can also cause liver damage and a serious skin disease known as chloroacne. He believes this was seen on the young man's arm in the video. It is also suspected of causing bladder and soft tissue cancer which is usually rare but has been linked. About 1,000 issues of soft tissue cancer reported at the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology involved men between the age of 25 & 40 who might have been in Vietnam when the spraying of Agent Orange was evident. Final results of this are expected. He then says he has the final decision on the DEP Hearing. At that time he raised the question of fly ash and the separation of fly ash and what effects it would have on the water. He rebutted one man on this topic. The question in there is what will the effect of residue disposal be on the ground water in the area of the Meriden landfill. The answer that they give DEP, is presently the department does not expect the residue to have any worse effect than unprocessed municipal waste. We heard alot of people talk about fly ash. He then reads a paragraph from a Mr. Cable who is with Dow Chemical. He says dioxin is very tightly bound to fly ash. It is also very tightly bound to soil. To remove dioxin from soil, one has to do exhausted benzine, toluene, rock salt extractions for 24 hours. It is very tightly held. What they did is they didn't really understand where the dioxin was coming from. They brought in some fish that was suppose to be clean and free of everything and subjected them to fly ash. They put the fly ash into a control tank and then into the fish tank. 2378 PCB content was about 160 parts.

This represented about 0.48% of all the tetraiododerms present. After 30 days in the tank, the fish were taken out and analyzed. 84% of what was found in the fish was 2378 PCB. Cable theorizes that there is some weird mechanism in fish that fades out two of our studies. They don't understand how the dioxin leaves the fly ash and gets into the fish. Here one has to wonder what will happen to the water supply. He then addresses DEP enforcement. He says the reservoirs were shut down twice because of high trepidity levels from a construction site. DEP said nothing. The town officials did nothing. Your Mayor did nothing. Oh yes they listened but nothing was done. Then we come to the incinerators at Bristol-Myers. The intervening parties find that the incinerators have been built before permits. DEP says they know nothing about it but yet they are up there 3 weeks prior to that, their inspectors certifying their boilers, and 1,000 feet to the left, they can't see. He then says he sympathizes with DEP. He spends many lunch hours there and they hate to see him walk down the hall. They don't have the necessary staff to enforce, they don't have the necessary dollars and they don't have the necessary sophisticated equipment to monitor these plants. Whether the incinerator on the west side or east side. He then wants to draw a little analogy on testing. Fly ash or bottom ash. In the incinerator on the west side, they are going to do several studies. Bristol Myers, they are going to test it one time. If it is not toxic, that's it. He then addresses members of the Council

He says he had a lot of questions and he did hand out the packets he wanted to and he hopes they read them. We have a problem, a very serious problem. He doesn't feel this is an alternative. He says he does have an alternative that is still a burning alternative. He then says the people here put a lot of trust in the elected officials of town. He has tried to study his subject to know what he is talking about. He tried to get an education to learn more about this. He has not heard the Council people. not one of them, say to him or any of the other commissioners on the Conservation Commission. What do you think of this. Can you research it for us. Should we have a committee. He says we have a serious problem with a very serious situation and put it in a populated area and have put the people sitting here, you have put their health in jeopardy. 43

Chairman Gessert then disagrees about Mr. Bradley's comment that they have done nothing at the Bristol Myers site. He says he has walked that region with Mr. Bradley and on several occasions he has seen the Mayor up there. He says to blame the Mayor for this problem is like blaming the Wallingford Police Department for the Cocaine in Miami. (Members from the audience then speak out and don't let Chairman Gessert speak).

Mr. Bradley then says he did not blame anyone. He did not mean to put blame on anyone.

Chairman Gessert then says the next speaker card he has is Sue Grenfell.

Sue Grenfell then gets up to speak and says she has written her speech and reads the following:

**SPARROW**

• p.o. box 1777  
Wallingford, CT  
06482

Good Evening Mayor, Council members and concerned citizens.

My name is Sue Grenfell and I'm a member of SPARROW (Support Preventive Air Regulations Residents of the World). My concerns are many but I will try to be concise. As you know SPARROW has been involved with health effects due to chemical poisoning for the past two years. I would like to say I'm proud of being part of a movement to educate the town of Wallingford in environmental problems and that Wallingford has finally started to educate itself and take action in matters that affect all of us and our families.

Before my involvement I thought we were protected by the government. I was sad and angry to learn the polluters who are destroying our planet are protected and my family and friends are not. Right here in Wallingford American Cyanamid was brought up on criminal charges for transporting hazardous waste from other towns and processing it through their waste treatment plant which is not equipped to handle hazardous waste. 150 counts were known, but they are only being brought up on 10 counts. That was two years ago and they still haven't been in court. When they had testing done by TRC they used the only company available to do air testing, leaving the under staffed and non-equipped Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) impotent. So, the Federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) was called, of course, the odors amazingly were

gone and so were the acute symptoms. Why do I bring all this old history up? Simple, it serves to show that the local state and federal agencies designed to protect John Q public can't! They haven't the funds the

44

**Support Preventive Air Regulation  
Residents Of the World**

**SPARROW**

• p.o. box 1777  
Wallingford, CT  
06492

trained staff nor the time to monitor the existing problem let alone something as volatile and experimental as Resource Recovery. Dioxins have been named over and over again as a main concern. There are also heavy metals linked to nervous system damage such as cadmium, mercury and lead. There have already been two cases of cadmium poisoning in town and the source has not been identified, nothing makes sense as to where it could be coming from. What happens when we know the source and more people are poisoned?

With Bristol Myers, Cellular Phone, Resource Recovery and even more advertising for industry to come to Wallingford we, not just the council, but all of us had better decide where Wallingford is going. It's not the quaint little town my family and I moved to 16 years ago. I fear Wallingford residents will be the losers, our profit is minimal. We have to pay insurance costs, our waters will become more polluted, our streets littered and what good can 125 garbage trucks a day do for our road conditions and traffic congestion. Dominos Pizza was not allowed to locate in Wallingford because of the traffic congestion it would cause. So, how can our town fathers see Dominos causing a problem and not 125 garbage trucks?

Why wasn't an Environmental Impact Study done by someone working for the citizens of Wallingford and not just for Connecticut Resource Recovery Authority and Vicon? My concerns are for the health and well being of the people of Wallingford. The government agencies can't monitor the existing polluters so how can we be sure if hazardous chemical waste is not only being transported from the other 4 towns, but disposed of

**Support Preventive Air Regulation  
Residents Of the World**

**SPARROW**

• p.o. box 1777  
Wallingford, CT  
06492

and burned with 240 tons of garbage daily.

It is not too late to stop Resource Recovery, with an existing problem already known how can we add more? By saying no to Resource Recovery you are saying you care about us the people and not just about

saving face, and the "good corporate neighbors" who are polluting us out of our homes.

Sue Grenfell is then applauded by the audience.

Chairman Gessert then says the next card he has is Janice Nuzzo, South Whittlesey Avenue.

Janice Nuzzo then gets up and says she is glad to get a chance to get up here tonight and speak. What her kids are going through and what the DEP has done in her home. She holds up a container of pesticide and says the DEP has found Petroleum distillants in her home. Her blood work shows colonestrone inhibition which is only caused by exposure to pesticidal poisoning or nerve gas. Where is this coming from. To use the pesticide you have to cover your floors, cooking utensils and fish. We have lost all our small animals. Her kids go through hell. Mr. Heilman told us about nocturnal inversion. She doesn't have to go outside. She knows it. Her baby is up screaming. We have a problem here that we have worked on for 2 years. A man said if there was proof of a health problem, fine, then we won't go this way. I have boxes of proof. It is very difficult to prove a problem. She says nights her daughter went to the Emergency room, another mother down the street was there vomiting blood. She is not psychic. She knows what is going on. They have started to institute a blood testing program to see if they can get a handle on what is going on. She then asks if they would want pesticide opened up in the kitchen. It rolls in like a fog and makes you sick. It will make you throw up in large quantities, it can cause heart attack, miscarriage and this is only one reaction we are getting in Wallingford. It is here now and it hasn't been addressed. She has talked to the DEP and the EPA. They have called her to see what she feels about Resource Recovery! Where the hell is the Health Department in this. The DEP is here because they have something to cover. Where are the health officials for my baby. If resource recovery goes in, it is an expandible modular unit which means we can take in more. We won't have much say in how much more. What we will have is a designated waste site. Do you want your kids and grandchildren growing up in this dump?????(Applause)

Chairman Gessert then says the next card he has is Mr. Ronald M. Gregory, 59 Hill Avenue.

Mr. Gregory then says before he speaks, he wanted to say that he was one of the first people to sign up to speak. He was here 15 minutes early to sign up to speak but as usual, the tactics of the Council have shuffled the cards.

He then says he has worked on this for 2 months and he is trying to work for the people of Wallingford and he hopes they will allow him to say what he has to say and finish what he has to say.

He then reads the following report:

January 16, 1986

To: Mayor, Town of Wallingford  
Members of the Wallingford Town Council

From: Ronald M. Gregory, 59 Hill Ave., Yalesville 269-3498

Re: CRRA Incinerator in Wallingford  
Is this project safe? Is it required now in Wallingford?  
Is it safer than landfilling?

I am not a scientist nor an expert in this area but as a concerned citizen exploring this issue, I am convinced unequivocally that this plant should NOT be built in Wallingford. The plant site is unacceptable and the site for disposal of the ash is unacceptable for obvious reasons.

An incinerator in Wallingford is not mandated at this time. Technology and science are changing too rapidly. We don't have the safeguards necessary to protect our residents. Health and pollution problems are indisputable.

To me, it is clear that this is NOT a "safe and reasonable" answer to our solid waste problems at this time. 46

I appeal to our Mayor and each Council person to weigh the real, undisputed facts. That review should result in a decisive resolve to STOP THE PLANT.

If this plant is an alternative which no one really wants, understandably those who defend it with vigor in view of the undisputed facts becomes suspect themselves. Those who proudly refuse to listen are insensitive and they have lost touch with their responsibilities as elected officials.

And while I appeal to reason and common sense, I cannot help but express my anger with the decision to construct this plant in Wallingford and deposit the ash just north of town owned wells in Yalesville. He also adds that most of the action taken on this project happened after the election in November.

If you listen and reconsider, I believe you too will become angry. Rescind the resolutions authorizing this plant---PLEASE!!! It appears that the contract already signed can be terminated by mutual agreement.

Page Two

January 16, 1985

As in the case where a jury convicts a person based on the evidence before it, if new evidence is later offered, the conviction may be overturned to right a previous wrong.

RIGHT THIS WRONG BEFORE IT IS TOO LATE!!!!

I am enclosing a statement about some of my concerns in this matter:

- (1) Real emergency, fact or fiction
- (2) Tax incentives more important than health considerations -- a reason or excuse for quick action
- (3) Incineration is not better than landfilling--incinerators pollute in two ways
- (4) Vague permit assurances --not sufficient
- (5) Dioxin and problems with monitoring
- (6) Air quality to deteriorate
- (7) Ash disposal unacceptable
- (8) Moratorium in Sweden
- (9) The contract between CRRA and Wallingford - a bad deal:  
Contract for all waste; expansion by 1/3 built in; no insurance guaranteed; termination; Wallingford input on Policy Board;  
No adequate restrictions on costs.
- (10) Contract between town and CRRA in lieu of taxes - an outrage
- (11) YOU give us an alternative

To those who may be inclined to ask the Town Attorney, "is it too late?", I respectfully suggest they direct him to find a legal way to stop this madness. I honestly believe the plant can and should be stopped. OUR ELECTED OFFICIALS HAVE THE POWER.

#### CONCERNS AND CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING CRRA, INCINERATOR IN WALLINGFORD

##### 1. Real Emergency --Fact or Fiction

A representative of the Conn. DEP confirmed on January 13, 1986 that it NEVER ORDERED WALLINGFORD'S LANDFILL CLOSED but merely ordered Wallingford to submit a plan for closing which Wallingford has done and the town now has a capacity of "7-9 years". Meriden has applied for vertical and lateral expansion of its landfill. If approved, the result will be "32 years" of capacity.

COMMENT: In view of these numbers, Wallingford is not faced with an emergency situation which warrants commitment to an incinerator

in this town NOW. In view of Meriden's future capacity, why did not Wallingford approach Meriden to contract for Wallingford's waste disposal there? Do you think the state would order Meriden to accept Wallingford's waste if we run out of capacity? 47

Threats of urgency have been exaggerated. Other alternatives have not been adequately explored.

## 2. Tax Incentives --a Reason or Excuse for Quick Action

Has the town received written opinions from the U.S. Internal Revenue Service regarding the loss of certain tax advantages to investors or is this another myth? The federal government is presently considering legislation addressing funding of solid waste disposal. THIS IS A NATIONAL PROBLEM.

Governor O'Neill recently announced the proposed availability of loans at 2% to fund 100% of sewer plant projects to help clean up water in Connecticut. Surely, solid waste funding must be considered soon on the state level.

Of course, HEALTH CONSIDERATIONS SHOULD BE OF PRIMARY IMPORTANCE, NOT TAX BENEFITS TO A FEW.

## 3. Incineration is not better than landfilling: landfills pollute, incinerators pollute two ways.

"Presently the Department (Ct. DEP) does not expect the residue to have any worse effect than unprocessed municipal solid waste.... Operators are responsible for collecting and analyzing water samples at disposal areas and submitting them to the Department."

(Paul Dion, Sr. Air Pollution Control Engineer

: Memo. dated December 17, 1985 to Charles Kurker, Director, Solid Waste Unit, CT DEP)

Page Two

We have been told: "the present method of handling garbage--landfills--causes groundwater contamination by toxic chemicals all over Connecticut" (November 23, 1985 Memor from: Rep. Mary Mushinsky (D-Wallingford), Teresalee Bertinuson (D-East Windsor), Peggy Becket-Rinker (R-Branford), T.J. Casey (R-Milford)).

COMMENT: In view of the above statements, the ash deposited in the landfills will also pollute. Burning garbage means ground water pollution and deterioration of air quality. Incineration is not a better solution. Recycling and compacting (to reduce volume) can reduce the amount of waste for disposal.

## 4. Vague Permit Assurances

The DEP permit issued December 20, 1985 provides that: "the facility should ensure against pollution of the air and waters of the state if the facility is operated properly."

COMMENT: This means it should meet present standards which are themselves somewhat arbitrary. We note that the language does not say "the facility will ensure" against pollution. Are you satisfied with this vague language when it comes to the health of Wallingford residents? Vicon, the proposed operator of Wallingford's Incinerator at its Pittsfield plant is depositing partly burned materials and plant maintenance is not up to snuff. Is that plant operating properly?

Does our DEP have the equipment to monitor Dioxin levels and other air emissions properly?

## 5. Dioxin and Problems of Monitoring

"Dioxin is also a product of incomplete combustion. In the dynamic environment of an incinerator combustion chamber some of the dioxin is

formed by the actual process of incineration. Much of the two sources of dioxin would be destroyed while exposed to the high temperatures in the combustion chamber or collected in the pollution control system while a minimal amount of the dioxin will survive to be released in the stack exhaust gas stream." 48

"The requirement to install and operate continuous emission monitoring systems is an attempt to ensure continual compliance but adherence to any regulation or law is similar to people holding to the speed limits posted on town or state roads."

(Memo to John Anderson, DEP Dep. Comm., December 18, 1985 from L. Bruckman, W. Simpson, J. Catalano.)

Page Three

"The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency calls dioxin the most perplexing and most toxic man-made chemical every made.... Dioxin causes cancer and the risk of cancer is greater with higher emission." (November, 1985 State Government News)

COMMENT: Dioxin will be formed by the incineration process; dioxin will be collected in the pollution control equipment with the flyash and some will be released into the air, according to experts.

MONITORING BY THE CT. DEP. IS LIKE ENFORCING THE SPEED LIMIT.

Are you satisfied with these findings and lack of safeguards and guarantees? Do you want flyash to be deposited in Yalesville just north of our municipal well field? Do you want Dioxin in the air?

#### 6. Air Quality to Deteriorate

"...it is true that the new facility will deteriorate the air quality in the area somewhat ...." (Memo to Brian J. Kenny, PAPCE for John Anderson Dep. Comm. DEP from Jude C. Catalano, SAPCE, dated December 17, 1985)

COMMENT: To those who say this is a better alternative than landfilling, we point out that air quality will also deteriorate in addition to ground water quality and dioxins will be emitted into the air and dumped with the ash according to the experts. Traces of chemicals in Wallingford air have already been measured at 2-40 times worse than the average U.S. city.

#### 7. Ash Disposal Unacceptable

"Both the Meriden and Wallingford will be used as disposal sites for the incinerator residue." (Memo to Charles Kurker, Dir. Solid Waste Management Unit dated December 17, 1985 from Paul Dion, Sr. Air Pollution Control Engineer.)

COMMENT: The site for ash disposal is unacceptable. If deposited in the Meriden landfill north of Wallingford's Oak Street wells, the risk of water pollution is increased.

Page Four

#### 8. Moratorium in Sweden

"In February 1985 the Board (Swedish Environmental Board) decided a moratorium on building new waste incinerators. The aim of the moratorium was to give time for evaluation of new technologies etc. and to demonstrate the seriousness of the situation...The main goal (of the moratorium) is to boost research and development...." (Letter to John O. Milliken, U.S. EPA dated October 28, 1985 from Olle Aslander, Dep. Director, Nat. Swedish Environmental Protection Board.)

COMMENT: Other countries are also researching the problems but they don't advocate using their citizens as guinea pigs in a great experiment. Time may ensure future safeguards.

9. The Contract Between CRRA (Connecticut Resource Recovery Authority) and the Town of Wallingford -- a bad deal - a few points to consider. 49  
(Citations are to the contract itself.)

Sec. 5.01. The municipality must take action to ensure that all acceptable solid waste generated within the municipality shall be delivered to the system.

COMMENT: Despite the guarantee of a minimum amount, the Town appears to have a contractual obligation to ensure that ALL acceptable waste is delivered. Does this mean eventual town garbage pick up and increased taxes?

Sec. 5.01. CRRA can expand the capacity of the plant from 420 tons to 560 tons without the approval of the Policy Board. This is an increase of 1/3.

COMMENT: DEP has indicated that once the plant is built, by 1987, by law it will be able to order other towns to bring their garbage to Wallingford so that the clause allowing expansion over 560 tons with unanimous consent of the Policy Board is rendered meaningless?

Sec. 7.03(b) CRRA can cancel or not obtain insurance if costs are not "deemed reasonable" by CRRA.

COMMENT: Wallingford knows full well the problems with insurance. Will this mean no insurance for the incinerator or excessive costs passed onto residents? Has this contract by failing to require certain minimum insurance provided any protection to Wallingford citizens? What are CRRA's assets besides incinerators on which they owe money?

PAGE FIVE

Sec. 8.01. After bonds are issued, it appears that the agreement may still be terminated by "mutual agreement."

COMMENT: IT'S NOT TOO LATE TO RECONSIDER.

Sec. 9.15. Each participating municipality shall have one representative on a Policy Board.

COMMENT: Shouldn't Wallingford as the host town been given additional representation? Does this mean that if other towns are ordered or are permitted to participate, Wallingford's impact when voting will be minimized?

SPECIAL NOTE: Is there a ceiling or method to adequately restrict system costs or is the sky the limit? Is there any provision requiring certain reduction in volume to promote efficient burning and to ensure landfill disposal capacity?

10. The Contract Between CRRA and the Town of Wallingford in lieu of taxes executed December 23, 1985. - an outrage in its timing and its benefits.

COMMENT: Wasn't this designed to help lessen financial impact to Wallingford as the host town as to its infrastructure, i.e. roads, etc.? Why shouldn't CRRA pay taxes plus for such impact? All participating towns should be expected to share costs of impact to the host town. An outrage!

11. YOU Give Us an Alternative!

COMMENT: This is the statement offered by those supporting construction of the plant. But this statement does not address the real issues. The issues are:

- (1) Are we required to have this plant in Wallingford NOW?
- (2) Is this plant really safe?
- (3) Is it any safer than landfilling?

Clearly the answers to all three questions based on available documents is in the negative.

CONCLUSION: To those officials who ask US for an alternative, I say, YOU find us an acceptable safe alternative. Don't pass the buck! That's why you were elected. Meanwhile, reject this project with the confidence that you cared enough for the people of Wallingford to take the required action. BE PROUD OF THE LEGACY YOU LEAVE. 50

Chairman Gessert then explains that at the beginning of the meeting he said he would be extending the courtesy to the people from out of town to go first as they requested 15 minutes time and they had requested to go first. Also, Mr. Gregory stated that the vote on the contract took place after election. The vote on this took place October 21st. He then says the next card he has is from Sal Falconeri.

Mr. Falconeri says he did not make the Town Council but he told the people he would come back again and again and have his questions answered. Tonight he is going to get some answers. He says some of the residents think the town is going to own and operate the plant. He is assuming it is going to be built. He wants to make it clear that ViCon is the owner and the operator and they are going to receive the profits from this plant. He has seen machinery and the operation run to the ground for profit. It is a write off. This is what is going to happen. He knows this by being the sewer Superintendent for 24 years. On December 12, 1985, at the Air Compliance meeting, it was said that 42,000 gallons of water was needed by the plant for scrubbers and so forth. The scrubbers would yield about 50 parts per million of Hydrogen chloride plus sulfuric acid and other acids. Is he correct? He is told he is right. He then asks what they will neutralize this acid with. Calcium hydrozide or sodium hydrozide. He then says calcium hydrozide correct?--and is told yes. The neutralization of an acid with calcium hydrozide causes a sludge, correct? He is told yes. The separate quantities, the 50 parts per million of hydrogen chloride sulfuric acid and 50 parts of something else. Let us assume it is 50 parts of sulfuric acid only. By his calculations you generate 18 lbs of acid a day in quantity of water and adding calcium hydrozide to it so that doubles the weight and you come up with 36lbs of calcium sulfate sludge. What are you going to do with this sludge? Charles Kurker then says it will be mixed with the fly ash and buried. Mr. Falconeri then says the Town of Wallingford had an industrial treatment plant and they neutralized waste from Wallingford International Silver, etc. and they generated tons of tons of calcium sulphate sludge and they stored it at the landfill above ground. The State DEP forbid us to bury it. By burying it would regenerate the acids and the material would go through the ground and contaminate your water worse than it is now. Am I correct? Again Charles Kurker says he is not sure he is correct as they do allow sludges to be deposited in the ground as long as it is upstream. Mr. Falconeri then asks the Mayor what it cost us to get rid of the calcium sulphate sludge in the landfill. Mayor Dickinson says they had to be covered to seal out rain or other moisture to get in there. They are still there but they have been covered with clay. Mr. Falconeri then says they have deemed it permeate. Mr. Kirker says he doesn't feel it necessary to deem it permeate. The idea is to keep out liquids that may be acidic in nature from reaction. Whatever cover is used is to minimize acid rain or whatever from infiltration. Mr. Falconeri then says Linda Smith brought up that they would burn sludge in some incinerators. What about Cyanamid, UpJohn's, and other industrial sludge in the area. What are we going to do with that? Is that going to our incinerator? He is then told that is not burnable sludge. Mr. Falconeri then says Cyanamid is burning it now. He then tells the Council to listen because these questions are going to bother their conscience too. He says Meriden, Cheshire, Southington and Wallingford have sewage treatment plants. Hamden sends their to New Haven. These plants will produce sludge, grit, grime, scum. This was suppose to be buried in the landfill with the rest of the garbage. Now they can't hold it any longer so it will come to Wallingford to the incinerator. Mr. Kurker says New Haven takes care of their own sludge and Hamden's. He is not sure what each of the other towns do. He believes if they have a treatment plant, they are taking care of their sludges. Mr. Hamel then says there are contractual provisions under which CRRA will take the sludge from Wallingford and the landfill and take Meriden's sludge from the Meriden Landfill. North Haven and Cheshire will have to make their own arrangements. Meriden & Wallingfords' will be buried. Mr. Falconeri then says the best dewatering equipment that you can dry sludge to is 20-30% dry solids. If you get 20% you are lucky. If you produce 10 tons of sludge, you will have 8 tons of water to dry before you can incinerate. If you are allowed to burn this you will have 8 tons of water to dry before burning. You are going to be paying

for 8 tons of water in the tipping fee. He knows they are going to have to burn this sludge because they are going to run out of landfill. If they are going to dry this sludge they have to use flash drying or kiln drying and you are right back to making acid again. Think real close. Take another look at this incinerator and with all the facts that you have seen today. You have some problems coming up. 51

Steven Mann is the next card Chairman Gessert has and Steven Mann comes up. He says he is from the American Standard Gauge Association and he has a memo for Mr. Bradley which he then gives to Mr. Bradley. He then explains that he wrote a memo to Edward O'Neil who is the Town Manager of Cheshire, on an alternate proposal. He then reads the memo which says "Attached to this memo you will find a copy of a proposal I had Mailed off to the legislators in Hartford. Through the channels of government I have been able to bring this up to a committee hearing in the Environmental Committee.

If you would, please read this proposal. If it has merit, would you pass a copy of it along to the towns that are involved in your solid waste project.

The meeting in Hartford will be in the near future and if you wish to attend, please contact me at either---of the two numbers.

Your input and response could help to solve the Solid Waste Problem in our area and also the states for years to come."

Mr. Mann then explains his qualifications. He says what needs to be done is incineration. The stack is not pretty but he has taken the ash, fly ash, and what he has done is taken a double furnace. One runs on natural gas and the other runs on trash. What happens is the trash comes in, is helped to be ignited by the natural gas burner, there is venting involved to keep the temperature constant and close as possible to a halo, 1800 degrees. After you get through, you don't throw it in the ground. He lives in CT and he is sick and tired of this. You have to give something to get something. To try and get everyone to be angels and recycle and not burn in their fireplaces, try and regulate it. His own brother-in-law said at the cost of taking the trash gets too much, he will burn in the fireplace and bury everything in the ground that won't burn. This will cause mini-dumps all over the state of CT.

This will not solve any environmental problems. We can't keep dumping in the ground. If we are going to put something in the air we want the minimum amounts with the maximum amount of safety. The audience then shouts out to Mr. Mann and will not allow him to speak. Chairman Gessert tells them to let him have his chance to speak. Mr. Mann's final comments are that these people are not willing to look at his alternative and he says God Bless all of them.

Michael Haas then gets up to speak and says he lives in Yalesville and near Prageman. He is not running for political office. He is embarrassed that he comes from Wallingford and all the people have come here because they agree or disagree with something but they have all come to only listen to what they want to hear and anyone who is not in favor of what they agree with, instead of listening to them, everyone is just screaming at them. Someone said they had this meeting to educate ourselves. Maybe you should listen to the points. It is everyone's prerogative to a point. Just listen and maybe by the end of the night you will be better informed. He then says the woman who talked about Barry Cominer said dioxins are a problem. If anyone goes to the library and reads Barry Cominer's closing circle, he has some other comments to make. There are some things people like, such as a radio made from plastic and other things from plastic and you buy all this and then throw it out. You can recycle all you want, burn it or bury it, but in the long run that everyone needs to consider is that you need to consider what you are doing with your lives. You can't keep doing this forever. We are the first people to run into the problem so they are suggesting the problem with burning it. Everyone here is saying maybe it is a good idea but they don't want it in their backyards. Nobody does but why are we buying all this stuff. (Again the audience then shouts out at Mr. Haas and he then sits down).

Mr. Killen then says he doesn't know the young gentleman who spoke he is one of the younger generation and as they say "out of the mouths of babes." He was one of the people who asked for this particular meeting. You don't have to like both sides, he doesn't like a lot of things he is hearing but at least they could be polite. That

is not asking for much. He then says his final thought is they could have the safest town in the world but if they have a bunch of people who can't live together simply because they disagree, what have they gained. 52

Chairman Gessert then says Mr. Phil Hamel would like to comment on some of the questions on the contract. Chairman Gessert says the public portion is completed and as he had said in the beginning of the meeting, after initial comments they would have an hour of public input, 15 minutes of questions and then another hour of public input and now he would give about 10 minutes for response to some of the questions raised.

Phil Hamel then says there were some comments made. He says he works for the Town of Wallingford, he is an employee of the Town of Wallingford, and he is paid through a grant from the DEP, which is a grant under state statute authorizing a grant to be made for the development for the Resource Recovery Project.

Phil Hamel then says he lives in New Haven. He also says he is very unhappy with Mayor Delito. He is going to cause the taxpayers a lot of money.

As far as the contract goes, it does say that we will provide all of our waste to the extent that we can control it. We have to provide it. However, it does make provisions that say we can recycle if we would like to. However that is the decision of the town. There is nothing in there that would ever require us to get into municipal collection. The question of 1/3 expansion of the plant came up. It is true that the vendor can, if all permits can be granted, expand the plant by one module. This is currently a 3 module plant. This is all it can be expanded. It is one module. Mr. Gregory said that the authority can cancel insurance. That is not the case. They can only cancel, if the towns approve it. The Mayors have the input and it is not strictly the authorities decision. Mr. Hamel says there will be some liability on the plant, they are not sure of all the insurance right now. There was a comment on payment-in-lieu of taxes and they said we ought to get full taxes. In fact, by State statute, this plant is exempt from taxation so we don't get any taxes except for the payment-in-lieu of taxes. Someone said the Council is selling the Town down the river, that is not the case. The Council is getting money to cover expenses but by State Statute, that plant is exempt from taxation. It is owned by the authority and funded by the authority and by state statute that plant is tax exempt. The authority is paying for the bond. If the plant doesn't work for any reason and the vendor can't make it work, the vendor has to pay off the bond. We are not liable for or responsible for those bonds. The likelihood of the plant not working is very slim. There is a plant working. The video you saw was not a ViCon plant. Those were from Auburn, Mass., a different process. There are times when something will come through that will not be burned, but they are guaranteed and there will be tests done on that ash regularly. Mr. Hamel then says there was a question about volume reduction. Some people said it was only to be about 70%. That is true by weight but what we are concerned about is volume. The volume reduction is probably between 80-90 and we are probably only going to use about 10% of the landfill space. Phil Hamel then introduces Dennis Martin from CRRA.

Dennis Martin, CRRA, says he is project manager for this project. There was a question about inversions and whether or not they were model. The model that is used is not a generic, it is a model which take into account site specific information, it takes into account nocturnal and inversion breakups, and it takes into account the topographical data from the site. There was a question about toxic metals. We addressed those from the permit application. We gave estimates for emission. We told you what the ground level concentrations were and they were compared against proposed toxic air standards. We were well below. There is no problem with the toxic metals. In terms of the testing treatment to the plant. The plant will be tested for any esoteric elements and dioxin and then the plant becomes operational. Thereafter, it will be tested as per DEP's direction. Probably once every two years. The Authority has made a commitment prior to this that they will make sure the plant is tested for the esoteric elements at least once a year. All the actions pursuant to the obtaining the contracts of this plant were well advertised and publicized. The public hearings for the permits were advertised in October. They were available for review for a period of 30 days. He wanted to bring that up because he feels they did the Council an

injustice. Someone pointed out they feel there is a problem putting the ash in the landfills in Meriden and Wallingford. There is no one environmentalist around who could tell you that ash is worse than what you are putting in there now by putting garbage in there. The ash is almost 99.99% inert. It is ash. Someone from the audience then questions why other areas are considering abandoning the ash. Mr. Martin says they are considering it but they have not done it yet. They may never do it. He then says the Authority owns the land, it has the deed from American Cyanamid. He then says someone brought up the fact that what was Vicon's profitability from this venture, he can only say without jeopardizing future negotiations, that their financial consultant who has been involved in about 15 resource recovery process at the present time, has run a return on investment. He has a letter from the consultant saying it is well within the range for these types of facilities. He cannot jeopardize negotiations by saying anymore.

53

A man from the audience then says they should contact their officials, at their homes and business, at their public offices, and demand a right to vote on this.

Mr. Kurker then says Mr. Gregory made mention on that additional modules could be added and that the commissioner after January '87 can order whomever he wishes into this plant. He then says he believes the Statute he is referring to addresses the fact "that municipalities, prior to January 1, 1987, may prepare a plan and submit it to the commissioner and if it is approved, they may then adopt that plan, if they don't do that, then the commissioner may then implement the state plan (which has been distributed to all the officials of the State of CT), if the adopted plan does not include any more than 5 towns in this project, he does not have any right to order this project to take any more than those 5 towns. He has the authority to implement the adopted plan only.

A woman from the audience then raises a question if there is anyone from the health department here that could answer the questions of the people about the health concerns. Chairman Gessert says they can direct those questions to the State Health Department. There is no one here from the Health Department.

Chairman Gessert then thanks everyone for coming and the meeting is adjourned at 11:07 p.m.

Lisa M. Bousquet  
Council Secretary

Approved: David A. Gessert  
David A. Gessert, Chairman

2-11-86  
Date  
Rosemary A. Rascati  
Rosemary A. Rascati / 2-13-86