

Summary - Town Council Meeting

February 25, 1986

- Roll Call and Pledge of Allegiance 1
- Public Question and Answer Period 1
- Approved the following transfers for the Electric Division:
 - \$56,000 from A/C 512-2 to A/C 923-2
 - \$94,000 from A/C 512-2 to A/c 923-3 1-2
- Approved the following Merit Increases:
 - Louise Genovese, Henry McCully, Glen S. Klocko, and James Kirkland. 3
- Accepted the following roads as requested by Linda A. Bush:
 - Fairfield Boulevard in Centract Business Park.
 - Ice Pond and Catlin Roads in Catlin Estates.
 - Research Parkway and improvements to Carpenter Lane. 3-4
- Approved a transfer of \$1,000 from A/C 805-319 to A/C 701-410. 4
- Approved an ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 306 AS AMENDED BY ORDINANCE NO. 321 TO INCREASE THE APPROPRIATION FROM \$1,693,000 TO \$1,880,000 TO FINANCE THE COST OF REDESIGN, CONSTRUCTION AND OTHER RELATED WORK IN CONNECXTION WITH THE RENOVATION OF THE MACKENZIE DAM LOCATED ON NORTHFORD ROAD, WALLINGFORD, CONNECTICUT AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS AND NOTES TO DEFRA Y SAID APPROPRIATION. 4-7
- Moved Addendum Item up on the agenda. 7
- APPROVED waiving the bidding procedure for emergency repair on Jacking gear on #2 turbine- Electric Division. 7-8
- APPROVED the appropriation of \$8,500 from Unappropriated Cash Balance to A/C 504-458. 8
- RESOURCE RECOVERY PLANT DISCUSSION. 8-31
- Adjourn.

TOWN COUNCIL MEETING

February 25, 1986

7:30 p.m.

- (1) Roll call and pledge of allegiance to the flag
- (2) Public Question and answer period.
- (3) Consider and approve the following transfer as requested by Raymond F. Smith. Director. Electric Division:
 - (a) Transfer of \$56,000 from A/C 512-2 to A/C 923-2.
 - (b) Transfer of \$94,000 from A/C 512-2 to A/C 923-3.
- (4) Consider and approve the following anniversary/merit increases:
 - (a) Louis Genovese, Building Dept.
 - (b) Henry McCully, Public Works Dept.
 - (c) Glen S. Klocko, Comptroller's Office
 - (d) James Kirkland, Water & Sewer Dept.
- (5) PUBLIC HEARING, 8:00 p.m. on AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 306 AS AMENDED BY ORDINANCE NO. 321 TO INCREASE THE APPROPRIATION FROM \$1,693,000 TO \$1,880,000 TO FINANCE THE COST OF REDESIGN, CONSTRUCTION AND OTHER RELATED WORK IN CONNECTION WITH THE RENOVATION OF THE MACKENZIE DAM LOCATED ON NORTHFORD ROAD, WALLINGFORD, CONNECTICUT, AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS AND NOTES TO DEFRA Y SAID APPROPRIATION.
- (6) Consider and approve acceptance of the following roads as requested by Linda A. Bush. Town Planner:
 - (a) Fairfield Boulevard in Centract Business Park.
 - (b) Ice Pond and Catlin Roads in Catlin Estates.
 - (c) Research Parkway and improvements to Carpenter Lane.

- (7) Consider and approve the transfer of \$1,000 from A/C 805-319 to A/C 701-410 as requested by Linda A. Bush, Town Planner. 129
- (8) Consider and approve the following appropriations as requested by Steven L. Deak, Director of Public Works:
- (a) \$8,500 from Unappropriated Cash Balance to A/C 504-458.
 - (b) \$8,000 from Unappropriated Cash Balance to A/C 509-510.
- (8) Revote action pertaining to the Resource Recovery Trash Plant as requested by Councilman Edward L. Diana.

2/19/86/lmb

ADDENDUM TO TOWN COUNCIL AGENDA - TUESDAY, FEBRUARY, 25, 1986

CONSIDER WAIVING OF BIDDING PROCEDURE FOR EMERGENCY REPAIR ON JACKING GEAR ON #2 TURBINE - ELECTRIC DIVISION.

Town Council Meeting

February 25, 1986

7:30 p.m.

Sheehan High School Auditorium

A regular meeting of the Wallingford Town Council was held on this date. The meeting was held at the Sheehan High School Auditorium. The meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m. by Chairman Gessert. Answering present to the roll called by Town Clerk Rascati were Council members Bergamini, Diana, Gessert, Gouveia, Holmes, Papale, Polanski and Rys. It was noted that Councilman Killen was on vacation and would not be present for the meeting. Also present for the meeting were Mayor William W. Dickinson, Jr., Town Attorney Vincent T. McManus, Jr., and Comptroller Thomas A. Myers. The pledge of allegiance was then given to the flag.

Chairman Gessert then explains the procedures for the meeting. He then explains it is a regular meeting and they have a 15 minute public question and answer period to discuss items that are not on the agenda. Resource Recovery is on the agenda. They also have some other town business to get to before they get to Resource Recovery. Transfers, a public hearing etc.

PUBLIC QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

Edward Musso, 56 Dibble Edge Road, then congratulates the new Water Superintendent for coming up with an idea that will save the taxpayers a lot of money.

Salvatore Falconeri, 281 Grieb Road comments that there has been many statements made that in regards to recall, if they recall over 6 Councilmen it won't work. He feels now is the time for the Council to start a Charter Revision Commission. He then says if 4 or 5 of the Council should demise, they have to keep 38,000 people going. He feels they should consider this issue very seriously.

Councilwoman Papale then comments that they did have this item, Charter Revision, on a previous agenda but they decided to look at this issue more carefully and bring it up again. She says they have been very busy with Resource Recovery and this agenda was cut short, but they are aware of the issue and they will be bringing it back up. Mr. Falconeri says he is well aware of what they started a few years ago and it was all motivated politics. He says lets leave politics out of the Charter. It is for the people and it is up to the Council to start a Charter Revision Commission.

Item 3 is then up for discussion. Mrs. Bergamini then moved the transfer of \$56,000 from A/C 512-2, Furnaces & Boilers to A/C 923-2, Outside Services-Legal and a transfer of \$94,000 from A/C 512-2, Furnaces and Boilers to A/C 923-3, Outside Services-Consultation; seconded by Mr. Rys.

Mr. Smith then explains that as a result of the expensive rate case they are now involved in in Washington D.C., additional legal

expenses are being incurred. He then says Northeast Utilities on April 30, 1985 filed for a 35% wholesale rate increase and the 130 wholesale case is tried under a much different form than the retail case in Hartford. Their plan is to try and settle but if not, continue with the legal process. It is their estimate that the additional \$150,000 will be expended in consulting and legal fees to carry the case through June 30th. This was brought up at a previous meeting to be taken from Net Income and the Council wanted them to find other sources to take the money. He then explains this is what they did.

Mr. Rys then asks what is the condition of the boiler and can the Pierce Plant operate if called on by Northeast Utilities? Mr. Smith then explains it did run for a couple of days in January. The tubes are old and he explains about them. Mr. Rys then questions if the tubes did go and Northeast wanted to put us on line, what would happen? Mr. Smith says if the tubes went on any particular boiler, they would lose that capacity. Under the writer it says they are in a stand by position and if possible be able to run when called upon. Mr. Smith goes on to say they probably won't be scheduled to run again until the fall. Mr. Rys then says would there be a problem if the tubes failed and Mr. Smith said they would cut out the bad section and the capacity might be off a little

Mr. Holmes then comments that the most important asset in town is the asset that keeps the electric rates the best in the area. This is important to keep up to snuff.

Peter Gouveia then questions the money being spent to fight this case and Mr. Smith says we are talking about a \$13 million a year rate increase.

Mr. Polanski then asks what that increase would mean to the average user in Wallingford. Mr. Smith says a 30-35% rate increase. Mr. Polanski then says that is if we don't fight it. This is why we are spending the money to fight it.

Mrs. Bergamini then says this is a 35% increase for not just Wallingford correct? Mr. Smith explains about the phase-in for the retail customers of CL&P. The State Statute as it exists does not cover us Mrs. Bergamini then says is there a way to phase-in for Wallingford? Mr. Smith says they have an attorney preparing a statute that hopefully will get into legislature to prevent us from rate shock.

Mr. Holmes then asks what kind of savings we hope to gain by fighting this increase. Mr. Smith says it is his belief that the rate phase could be cut by 40%. Northeast Utilities applied for the rate to be come effective October 30th. Because of the action taken by the consultant and the attorney we have a 5 month extension.

Mr. Gouveia comments when Millstone III was being build it was said it would generate so much electricity that it would be too cheap to meet it. Now that it has been built, we are being asked to foot the bill.

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

Item 4 is then up for discussion and Mr. Rys moved approval of the following Merit Increases:

Louis Genovese, Building Department
Henry McCully, Public Works Department
Glen S. Klocko, Comptroller's Office
James Kirkland, Water & Sewer Department

The motion was seconded by Mrs. Bergamini.

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

Item 5 cannot be started until 8:00 p.m. as it is a public hearing and they then move on to Item 6.

Chairman Gessert then reads the letter from Linda A. Bush regarding the acceptance of Fairfield Boulevard in Centract Business Park and Ice Pond and Catlin Roads in Catlin Estates.

Mrs. Bergamini then moves acceptance of Ice Pond and Catlin Roads in Catlin Estates for discussion; seconded by Mr. Holmes.

Linda Bush then explains that Mr. Costello has his official sign-off on the Catlin Estates. She then explains she sent her letter because she wanted the Council to have something on this item and she had not had Mr. Costello's sign off on this yet. 131

Mrs. Bergamini then reads the letter from Steven L. Deak and John Costello saying they certify the work on Catlin Road and Ice Pond Road has been completed in accordance with the approved subdivision plan.

Mrs. Bergamini questions a problem on Catlin Road and Mr. Costello says that road was finished about 4 years ago. It has taken this long to get the paperwork straightened out. Mr. Costello then explains that all the problems have been corrected.

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

Mr. Holmes then moved to accept Fairfield Boulevard in Centract Business Park; seconded by Mr. Rys.

Mr. Costello says this is the Industrial Park on the North side of Barnes. We are at the point where the town can accept it. We will keep the bond until spring to cover any details.

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

Mr. Holmes then moved the acceptance of Research Parkway and improvements to Carpenter Lane; seconded by Mr. Polanski.

Mr. Costello explains where this is and Chairman Gessert says we also discussed with the PUC improvement of the lighting on Research Parkway. Mrs. Bergamini then asks the Mayor if he is satisfied with this and he replies yes. There was a question of the lighting, it has been resolved. There was another question of improvements to Carpenter Lane and the Town is being protected under an agreement drafted by the Town Attorney which has been signed by FIP and MedWay. We are satisfied that they should be accepted.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes with the exceptions of Mr. Diana who voted no and Mr. Killen was not present; motion duly carried.

Item 7 is then up for discussion and Mr. Rys moved the transfer of \$1,000 from A/C 805-319, Contingency Reserve for Emergency to A/C 701-410, Advertising, seconded by Mrs. Bergamini.

Chairman Gesert explains that Linda Bush's letter states that due to the number of legal notices we have been required to publish this year, the account is almost depleted.

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

Item 5 is then up for discussion and Mrs. Bergamini then reads the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 306 AS AMENDED BY ORDINANCE NO. 321 TO INCREASE THE APPROPRIATION FROM \$1,693,000 TO \$1,880,000 TO FINANCE THE COST OF REDESIGN, CONSTRUCTION AND OTHER RELATED WORK IN CONNECTION WITH THE RENOVATION OF THE MACKENZIE DAM LOCATED ON NORTHFORD ROAD, WALLINGFORD, CONNECTICUT, AND AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS AND NOTES TO DEFRAY SAID APPROPRIATION.

Be it Enacted by the Town Council in Session:

I.

Ordinance No. 306, as previously amended by Ordinance No. 321, concerning the design, construction and renovation of the Mackenzie Dam, as more fully set forth in Ordinance Nos. 306 and 321. and appropriating \$1,693,000 for such purposes, and

authorizing the issuance of bonds and notes to defray said appropriation is hereby amended by increasing the appropriation for the purposes contained therein from \$1,693,000 to \$1,880,000. (32)

II.

That the Town of Wallingford increase the amount of bonds and notes authorized to be issued under Ordinance No. 306, as amended by Ordinance No. 321, from One Million Six Hundred Ninety-three Thousand Dollars (\$1,693,000) to One Million Eight Hundred Eighty Thousand Dollars (\$1,880,000) to defray the additional One Hundred Eighty-seven Thousand Dollars (\$187,000) appropriated in Paragraph I.

III.

To meet said appropriation, not more than One Million Eight Hundred Eighty Thousand Dollars (\$1,880,000) of bonds of the Town of Wallingford may be issued pursuant to Chapter XV of the Town Charter, as amended, and Section 7-369 of the General Statutes of the State of Connecticut, Revision of 1958, as amended.

IV.

The Mayor, the Comptroller, and the Treasurer, or any two of them, are hereby authorized to sell the bonds, either all at one time, or from time to time, in series, at public sale, either as a separate issue or combined with other authorized but unissued bonds of the Town of Wallingford, at not less than par and accrued interest, an advertisement of which shall be published at least seven days before the date of sale in The Bond Buyer. They shall determine the rate of interest of such bonds, and shall determine the amount of each issue of such bonds, their form, their date, the dates of principal and interest payments, the manner of issuing such bonds, and by whom and how such bonds shall be signed or countersigned, and all other particulars thereof. The Town Treasurer shall deliver the bonds and receive the proceeds thereof. The Connecticut Bank and Trust Company, N.A., of

Hartford, Connecticut, shall be the certifying and paying agent. Adinolfi, O'Brien & Hayes, P.C., Attorneys-at-Law, of Hartford, Connecticut, shall render an opinion approving the legality of such particular issue. Such bonds shall be general obligations of the Town of Wallingford and the full faith and credit of the Town shall be pledged to the punctual payment of principal and interest of the bonds in accordance with their terms.

V.

The Mayor, the Comptroller, and the Treasurer, or any two of them, are hereby authorized to sell temporary notes of the Town, from time to time, in an amount not to exceed One Million Eight Hundred Eighty Thousand Dollars (\$1,880,000), under and pursuant to the provisions of Section 7-378 of the General Statutes of Connecticut, Revision of 1958, as amended, in anticipation of the receipt of the proceeds from the sale of bonds hereby authorized, and are authorized to comply with the provisions of Section 7-378a as amended, if the maturity of such notes shall extend beyond the time permitted by Section 7-378; the Mayor, the Comptroller, and the Treasurer, or any two of them, are hereby authorized to determine the rate of interest of such notes, determine the amount of each issue of notes, their form, their date, the dates of principal and interest payments, the manner of issuing such notes, and by whom and how such notes shall be signed or countersigned, and all other particulars thereof. Such notes shall be general obligations of the Town of Wallingford and the full faith and credit of the Town shall be pledged to the punctual payment of principal and interest of the notes in accordance with their terms.

VI.

The Town of Wallingford covenants to the holders of the obligations herein authorized that the town will perform all acts necessary to refund to the United States such sums as may be required by law in order to ensure the interest on its obligations remains exempt from federal income taxation. The Comptroller is

hereby authorized to establish separate reserve accounts within which to deposit and hold such yield sums obtained from the issuance of obligations authorized herein and as are defined in H.R. 3838 S701, subpart B, S147(e), entitled "Required Rebate to the United States," or such other federal legislation requiring such rebate as may be enacted, to timely rebate such sums to the United States and to expend sums from the appropriation herein for such rebate. 133

VI.

Nothing herein shall be interpreted as prohibiting the appropriations from the general fund, if available, for the present appropriation purposes.

The above Ordinance was then moved by Mrs. Bergamini and seconded by Mr. Rys.

Mrs. Papale then asks Mr. Smith to bring them up to date on what has happened. Mr. Smith explains that back in the late 70's, the Army Corps of Engineers undertook a program nationwide to inspect all dams. The Town of Wallingford maintains three dams. One at MacKenzie Reservoir where the number of problems were seen. As a result of the study, a follow up study was required and the dam was then determined to be in fair condition. There were some problems especially with piping under the dam. In April, 1982, the State DEP issued an Order to the Town of Wallingford to take direct action or whatever measures necessary to repair the dam. A study was done at that time and they came up with a proposed method of correcting the seepage problem which would require extensive repairs. Another study was done and they came up with another idea. A contract was bid in June, 1984. The proposals were received. The cost of the project at that time was \$1,189,000. This came in over what was anticipated to be the project costs. At that point, the PUC rejected the bids and suggested they consider rephasing the project. The contract was issued in June of 84 and this is the first phase. That project was completed and a second phase was initiated. They feel at this point they have gotten the lowest bid available and they feel the Council should approve. In order to award the contract they have to amend the ordinance for the funds.

Sal Falconeri, 281 Grieb Road, comments the initial bond was for \$1,693,000. The first bid for the complete project in 1984 was \$1,188,988. This was a surplus of \$504,012. He assumes this \$504,000 was for engineering, design, etc. correct? Mr. Smith says yes. There were other costs such as legal fees, supervision, etc. Mr. Falconeri then asks why wasn't the bid awarded in 1984? Mr. Smith says that at the time the bid was received, it was felt there was not good response to those proposals. The PUC felt it was necessary to have the contractors bid on the areas of expertise rather than the whole project. Mr. Falconeri says the first bid covered that. Mr. Smith says it has been 2 years since those original bids were received and the difference in price on this project is about 10%. In two years they estimated 5% for inflation. This type of work is in high demand right now. Back in August when they originally bid this project they only received 1 bid. 2 bidders were actually interested. Mr. Falconeri says the estimate comes to the Council and bond is issued and then 2-3 years later the project goes to bid. In the future the PUC should recalculate their estimates before going out to bid.

Edward Musso, 56 Dibble Edge Road, says this was discussed time and time again and he was present for this discussion. There is so much work around that the contractors aren't doing it cheap anymore. He feels Mr. Falconeri is dragging this along.

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

Chairman Gessert then notes we have an item on the agenda to consider a request to consider waiving the bidding procedure for emergency repair on jacking gear on #2 turbine for the Electric Division. He feels they should take care of this item while Mr. Smith is at the table.

Mrs. Papale then moved to move this item up on the agenda; seconded by Mrs. Bergamini.

134

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

Mrs. Bergamini then moved to consider waiving the bidding procedure for emergency repair on jacking gear on #2 turbine; seconded by Mr. Polanski.

Mr. Walters then explains that back in January the jacking gear for the #2 turbine generator failed. It was taken to the General Electric repair shop who determined what was wrong and they found that several of the gears are worn and need to be replaced. Their estimate for this work is \$6,256.00 and they estimate 4-5 months to get the parts to be custom made. He would ask that they act favorably on this to get the jacking gear back in place and get the turbine back in service before the summer.

Mr. Polanski then asks how old this turbine is and Mr. Walters says 32 years old. Mr. Polanski asks if some of the others may do this same thing and Mr. Walters says he would expect they have these inspected in an attempt to catch it.

Chairman Gessert then questions the amount and the account it is coming from. Mr. Walters says \$6,256.00 and it is coming from A/C 513-1.

Mr. Gouveia then asks how long it would take to put this out to bid and Mr. Walters explains the assembly is torn apart in the one firm spot and they cannot operate the turbine without this.

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

Item 8a is then up for discussion and Mr. Rys moved the appropriation of \$8,500 from Unappropriated Cash Balance to A/C 504-458, Snow removal, ice control & sand pickup; seconded by Mr. Holmes.

Mrs. Bergamini then asks Mr. Deak if we have no other place to get this money. We haven't had a bad winter. Mr. Deak replies we are almost out of sand.

Mr. Rys asks if this is the same grade sand that they always purchase and says he has received complaints about this becoming muddy. Mr. Deak says they purchase it through the State and they get it from someone in Southington. Mr. Deak says they are paying \$5.90 per yard. For yellow sand they would pay \$15.00.

Mrs. Papale then asks what Mr. Deak is purchasing now, how long will this last. Mr. Deak replies 2 storms.

VOTE: Unanimous ayes with the exceptions of Mr. Rys who voted no and Mr. Killen was not present; motion duly carried.

It is then noted that Item 8b has been withdrawn. Chairman Gessert then notes for the record that he has received a number of letters with comments on the Resource Recovery and he will include these letters along with these minutes and they will become part of the record. Chairman Gessert then says there are a lot of people here to speak on this issue and he would like them to stick to the issue, try to avoid personalities, and state your comments. He then says they have to have a motion on the floor before they can start discussion. He will start with the Council table and then open it up to the public.

Mr. Diana then says several months back he had the opportunity to vote on the Resource Recovery Plant that they thought would be the answer to Wallingford's landfill problem. Although he had some misgivings about the project, he voted favorably because of the time restraints and the lack of alternatives. He felt comfortable with his vote until some safety concerns were raised by the PAGB. After personal investigation he started to sense the Council did not ask all the necessary questions. After the public meeting at Dag and hearing the multitude of questions by PAGB and the lack of answers by State experts and officials he became convinced more information was needed. The plant, the principle is needed. Burning or recycling is what we will wind up with. We must act quickly to solve our trash problems. He will no longer, in good conscience allow Wallingford to be the testing ground for this plant. Putting

the emotionalism aside from January 16th meeting, many questions have not been answered properly. The state admits our water supply in Yalesville is already contaminated and given the small amount of leachate from the ash of this plant, it could have long range effects in this area for years to come. Yet, the State will allow this site for use of the trash plant. The state admits to higher than average readings pertaining to air quality standards in the American Cyanamid area, yet they persist on building a plant that if it only emitted slightly over the state's acceptable level, could be catastrophic to the Wallingford community. These are 2 problems occurring on two different Wallingford borders. These must be addressed before we continue support of the plant that could have irreversible health side effects to every one in town. Even if the risks of contamination were very slight, our resources in Wallingford do not allow for a margin of error. It has been said that no one has ever died from trash plants and until recently no one ever died in a nuclear plant accident either. How many times have we seen immediate legislation, the result of a death or personal tragedy. How long will it take for us to learn from our mistakes and not allow history to repeat itself. There are many health and safety issues that must be addressed and carefully considered. This is not a question of fixing potholes or removing the Taber House. This is an issue that has far reached implications and health concerns that will affect the entire town. He cannot and will not jeopardize the health of 40,000 people. He has a responsibility to serve the needs of the people as a Councilman and manage good government. He is not in good conscience serving the need of the people if he allows the plant to be built here at this time and under these conditions. This should not be a case of defending an administration, an issue of republican vs. democrat. This is clearly an issue of; are we doing what is best for our citizens and is it what they want. Only very few of the safety questions now being raised were addressed during Council meetings prior to the final vote yet this Council stands divided strongly defending a plant and contract that is thoroughly questionable and against our constituents wishes. There are those that are joining the question of personalities rather than the substance of the issues but the concern of the public, especially those in the immediate vicinity of the proposed plant, must be addressed and they must never be allowed to lose their voice. He urges his colleagues to rescind their vote and to address the needs and concerns of their constituents. He then says he was issued an opinion from the Town Attorney tonight pertaining to this. In essence, what it says is that they do not have the right to revote. The reason is because there already has been action. The motion that he had prepared will not be legal by the Council rules and would be in direct violation. What he would like to do to reaffirm everyone's position so that they all get the benefit of what we are here for tonight and that is:

The Council make known by individual voice vote, concern/support of the proposed Resource Recovery Plant in Wallingford. It is accepted that this vote is for informational purposes only and does not encourage or support a breach of contract.

Peter Gouveia then says he was elected after this plant had been sealed, signed and delivered. The easiest thing for him to do would have been no comment on this. He did not vote on it. However, he finds that politics is not a spectator sport. He owes the people who elected him, how he stands on this extremely important issue. He then says some of them have accused him of playing politics, but he is taking a stand. He is taking this stand based on the environmental impact this plant is going to have on the people of Wallingford. For those of you who feel he is playing politics, if you are truly convinced that the people of Wallingford are in favor of this plant, he then says what did Mr. Diana and himself have to lose in supporting the plant, they had nothing to gain by it if you really believe that the majority of the people are in favor of the plant. He does not know if the majority is in favor or not but he is convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that this plant will be a travesty to the Town of Wallingford. The proponents of the plant, fellow Council members, no one has ever died from dioxin but the fact remains that both proponents and opponents do agree that these incinerators do emit dioxin and other chemicals. This is a threat, dioxins even in small amounts can be dangerous. They have been reported to cause birth defects and severe skin rashes and illness. Proponents of the plant agree that they have no reason to believe there are health hazards if these facilities are properly managed. The fact remains that there are only about a dozen of these plants in the U.S. There

are about 2-3 times as many on the drawing boards and that is where they remain because there is too much fear for our safety. Sweden 136 as well as other European countries, has placed a moratorium on these plants because of safety. He then talks about the report of New York City and concerns about trash to energy plants and the health concerns. Proponents are saying they are not happy with the incinerators but they are safer than the landfills. While it is said that landfills are bad, it has not been proven that incinerators are better. In a report by Mary Mushinsky on December 6, 1985, by the office of the Legislative research it says "there are no studies continuing the two, both present risks to your health and environment". The same report says incinerators produce ground water contamination on ash filled landfills. It goes on to say that landfills are indeed an acceptable disposal method. Proponents say we can be assured these plants can and will be properly monitored. The fact remains that the DEP does not have the staff to monitor the laws that are already on the books much less new ones. They don't have the funds to buy equipment to monitor these laws already on the books much less new ones. The Attorney General in Louisiana and the Baton Rouge District Attorney have obtained search warrants and seized locked books and public records belonging to a waste plant in Baton Rouge which had been accused of multiplying the instruments so that they will not stop automatically and let the incinerator work even under adverse operative conditions. This could happen in Wallingford. In Louisiana, this has caused a number of pollutants in the air, these shrouds occur mainly at night. The proponents argue that this is the only way we can go now yet the fact remains that we do not have to go this way right now. Wallingford still has 6-8 years on the landfill. Somebody mentioned about the Monday morning quarterback and everyone hopes they can look into the future, he proposes that Wallingford does have the opportunity to look into the future, it does have the opportunity to be a Monday morning quarterback. There are 5 plants proposed for the state, some of them, such as the one in Hartford, are already under construction, let us wait 3 years and see how well they operate. The very least that could happen is in 3 years we will build the facility. This is the worst that could happen. Meanwhile, maybe another solution will come along.

The proponents of the plant have said time and again that the concept of CRRA mutually benefits all five towns but the fact remains that the contract is grossly unfair where Wallingford is concerned. \$1.50 to get rid of other peoples garbage. We are being asked to put up with so much for a lousy buck and a half. (applause) We are being asked to commit so much garbage. We are being asked to put our people through so much anxiety and fear and that can not be measured in dollars and cents. The proponents are asking where were the opponents when this was being discussed. But, the fact remains that the town officials did not go out of their way to give out information. We should have involved people every inch of the way. People should be respected as a valuable resource. It seems to him that when we so often seem to create committees, committees to close schools, committees to reopen schools, committees for everything. We go out of town to pay consultants to do studies for us. Yet, on this so important issue, we did not ask for a study or a Committee. Meriden did, but they are not going to have an incinerator in their back yard. CRRA ability to deliver successful projects is obviously suspected. The background technology proposals is not conclusively proven as measured by scientific standards. The report quotes some engineers as saying that at the present the lifetime of these units is highly suspected, but it is felt that 10 years can be a reasonable projection. We are committed for 20 years. This is CRRA's most negative and serious drawback. CRRA has been in existence since 1973. It has formed only one complete project, the Bridgeport facility which left some \$35 million in unpaid bills which were eventually assumed by Occidental Petroleum. More importantly, it left a sour taste in those municipalities CRRA was trying to collect. He then says with this said, and he does not want to ever be accused of trying to teach morality, based on those facts, and they are facts and not fiction, he believes it is not only his civic obligation but also his moral duty to say he does not want this plant. He then says he takes a great deal of pride to second Ed Diana's motion.

Ed Diana then repeats his motion: The Council make known by individual voice vote it's current support of the proposed Resource Recovery Plant in Wallinford. It is accepted that this vote is for informational purposes only and does not encourage or support a breach of contract.

He then asks the Town Attorney if there is any problem with this and the Town Attorney says probably not but he would have to check with the rules.

Mrs. Bergamini then asks what is the purpose of Mr. Diana's motion and Mr. Diana replies he was hoping that there might be some members of the Council that might have changed their opinion. By the poll taken this morning by the Record Journal it looks as if it is 7-2. He then says he is concerned that the way this is written, the opinion of the Town Attorney, he will not allow himself because his feelings are so strong, he would rather forego any kind of a motion on this tonight than compromise his position as a Councilman. He takes his position very seriously and he will not allow himself to be put into a position that by taking a vote he will be violating any Council, Town, Statewide, National etc. Whatever type of rules may be imposed. He will not put himself in that position or breach any of the Council rules. 137

Mrs. Bergamini then says that he knew full well before this meeting that the only way to get a vote on this table is to vote do you wish to breach the contract. Mr. Diana says that has never been mentioned. Mrs. Bergamini says if he knows how to read he knew it. Mr. Diana has as much file on this subject as she has. Approximately 4" thick. Her point is she can quote chapter and verse of the previous minutes where Mr. Diana has congratulated Mr. Hamel on enacting the contract, on working so hard, this is the only way to go, he was very pleased Wallingford is taking a stand and he voted for it. Why didn't he change his mind before. Why didn't he worry about you last October, because he had an election coming up.

Mr. Diana then says on July 11th on minutes pages 8,9, 12, November 12th page 14, April 9th, May 14th, this Council over the course of the last year has asked 101 questions. Many hours have been spent on CRRA. Of the 101 questions asked and many hours researched, he voted for it but he also asked 24 questions that he thought were important. He asked why is Hamden now in it when they weren't in it before. He asked about the pilot program. He asked about the benefits to Wallingford. Of those 101 questions, Dave Gessert asked 24, Bert Killen asked 24, Ed Diana 24, Marie Bergamini asked 8, Ray Rys asked 2 questions. This is in the minutes. He then says he will not undermine the efforts of the PAGB and he will not make a mockery out of this nor allow himself to be entrapped and he withdraws his motion.

Mr. Holmes then says by withdrawing the motion, does that mean we can not discuss this further. Chairman Gessert says technically if we don't have a motion to discuss, discussion is ended.

Mr. Holmes then makes a motion to discuss this further; seconded by Mr. Polanski.

Mr. Gouveia then comments he has not withdrawn his second. Chairman Gessert then says a second can not stand without a motion and a motion can not stand without a second. Mr. Gouveia then says it bothers him that they came to this meeting tonight thinking that some kind of action was going to be taken and then find out, it was about a week ago that Ed Diana and himself asked the Town Attorney to look into to see if CRRA required statutory provisions, and he did not hear anything until he sat down in this chair and saw that they indeed did not. This information and the legality of another motion, this should have been known before simply because these people could have stayed home. We should not continue to play havoc with our citizens and their emotions.

Mr. Polanski then says he would like to make a few comments. He then reads a speech he has prepared and is continually stopped by the people in the audience shouting out. He does eventually continue to read his speech.

The speech by Mr. Polanski is as follows:

When I was a youngster growing up in Wallingford, there was a big hole at the end of our street, just south of the Wallingford Airport. This was called the "dump." Every day there was a fire at this dump and the stinking smoke would come over our houses. Later on, the town put out the fire and started covering the dump with dirt. The smell and fire were no longer a problem.

Now the Wallingford Airport is gone, and the hole in the ground is a hill that is growing every day. During those years, we did not know that the things going into the dump would cause us problems in the future. In the late 50's I helped to obtain more land to dump our garbage on. This also got filled up and finally the State told us that we would have to stop dumping our garbage in the land fill. Insurance companies told us we were a bad risk and would not give us insurance.

The Republicans came into office and the first thing we found out was that suddenly we had a methane problem at the dump. This caused us to close the dog pound and to dig a deep trench around the dump to stop the flow of methane gas to the surrounding area. Luckily no one was hurt from a methane explosion. This problem did not suddenly appear, it had been brewing for years from decomposing garbage and it will continue to discharge pollutants for many more years. But no one had done anything about it.

For over 10 years we have been searching for a better way to dispose of the trash and not to contaminate the ground water and also to help clean up the Quinnipiac River. The town hired a person to look into the matter and all avenues were explored. The final selection was the trash to energy plant we voted on last October, before the election. After many discussions were published in the local newspapers.

I too am against garbage, but it keeps coming every day and our hill is starting to look like a mountain. The state has told us to close the landfill and seek an alternative method, by 1987. As of this date, the only way to dispose of trash is by burning. Even the experts brought in by the PAGB group admit to this. We can reduce the amount of garbage by recycling, but there is still the remainder. Some of the PAGB group suggested we dump our garbage in Meriden, when our landfill is closed, this will allow more pollution into our wells and streams.

Some people forget the economics of trash. It has never been a free dump, we paid for it, hidden in our taxes. It will never be free, in fact it will be more expensive to get rid of as time goes by. The trash-energy plant was the most economical and would have the least effect on the health of the community. Wallingford was chosen for the plant because it has a market for the energy to be produced by the plant. It will also keep the cost of garbage disposal lower than those of the surrounding towns, which will have to pay additional charges for transportation, from 5 to 10 dollars a ton. A fact conveniently disregarded by the PAGB group; who don't seem to care what garbage disposal will cost all the taxpayers.

. From all experts in the area, this was the only way to go with the present technology. In a survey conducted in 1985 there were 109 resource recovery facilities in the United States that are operating, in shakedown, under construction, or in advanced planning. Of these plants, only 2 are not of the trash burning variety.

If the PAGB group has a better solution, they will not only have the gratitude of the people of Wallingford, of the United States, but of the World. Because most of the world is using burning to get rid of their trash. All the experts have not found a more economical and practical way to dispose of the trash that the people are making. With the price of land in the center of Paris, I think they would like to get rid of their plant which is located there.

If such a practical and economically feasible alternative is available, we do not know of it. We looked at ORFA, liked the concept, but found that all that was available was a pilot plant. There was no financial backing, or firm market for its products. If the people in the PAGB group know of other ones, why were they not brought to our attention? Why did they wait until the contract was signed by 5 towns to come forth with their comments. If there are flaws in the contract, why did the attorneys from the 5 towns not find them? As far as we know, most of the questions are covered in the contract. I believe the people in the town are intelligent enough to ignore the half-truths and bias information, such as was shown in the video tape presented at the January meeting, presented by members of the PAGB group.

The PAGB group used scare tactics, like dioxin, cancer, health hazards, to get a large number of people to the January meeting. When these concerns were answered by health and scientific evidence, the PAGB tried to drown out the answers. Even their own experts conceded that the majority of the waste had to be burned.

At the public Television session, out of 106 questions submitted by the PAGB Group, only half a dozen questions were asked about the health hazard. With the help of some councilmen the subject was changed to the language of the contract, traffic, personalities, etc. When most of the concerns were shown to be covered by the contract, certain small modifications were asked. Answers by the Mayor showed that these concerns could be acted upon.

The bottom line is, we have a continuous supply of garbage coming. And the only way to get rid of it is by burning and creating energy. The plant has been voted on, by a council concerned with the community. It is

time that the majority of intelligent citizens in town look at the facts, and not be swayed by theory or "lets wait" attitude. They should examine the scare tactics used, and what was the result of open discussion on the part of State, Local, Health and open-minded concerned citizens.

139

All of us are interested in finding the best way to get rid of this problem. As of this time, we know of one solution, the one we voted for. I will not change my vote until I am shown an economical, safe, and practical alternative to the trash problem, based on facts and not "chicken-little mentality."

Edward G. Polanski
Councilman

Mrs. Papale then says that as a Councilperson for 10 years, this is her 11th year, she feels she should say why she voted the way she did. She doesn't expect to get claps but she would appreciate it if they would listen and give her a chance to say what she wants to say and then clap or boo or whatever. All weekend she has received calls and she put an article in the press. She feels that all the people are not against this facility. People who are for something do not always come out as the people who are against something. She then goes over what she has written in the paper. She is tired of the scare tactics going on in Wallingford. Papers have been put in people's mailboxes and she feels the people who put these out do not have the true facts. These are half truths, untruths and tactics used to scare people. She did some checking. The PAGB say that agent orange is made of dioxin. To her, that is nonsense. Dioxin is in agent orange. A tiny percentage as an impurity but not as a component. They say garbage costs will increase from \$200-\$400 per year. That is also nonsense. She was told her rates would go up \$1,000 a year and this came from someone who she really listens to and she checked it out and the actual amount is more on the line of \$20 per family per year. The people say they will lose on property values. In Pittsfield where a Vicon plant has been operating for 5 years, real estate companies report that the values of homes near the plant have increased at the same rate as other Pittsfield properties which have had rapid appreciation. She checked with 2 real estate people in Pittsfield. They say Wallingford residents will be responsible for \$30 million debt. It is not true. Vicon says we will be responsible for sending our garbage to the CT Resource Recovery Authority after paying for disposal of that garbage. They say all kinds of health dangers for air born ash pollutants. Experts have testified time and again this is not true. There will be no health dangers and air & ash from the plant will be regularly monitored and tested to be sure there are no dangers to health and if a danger is found she will say she is wrong. They say there is no danger to health so she does not feel it will happen. The people are saying CRRA gets untold profits. CRRA can not by law make profits. They say Cyanamid gets cheap electrical rates. Cyanamid gets no electricity from the Resource Recovery plant. The PUC will certainly tell you they will not reduce Cyanamids rates because of the plant. The statement that bothered her the most was the article that came said that Cyanamid gets elimination of past taxes due to the Town of Wallingford. She went to the Town Hall and checked it and Cyanamid has always paid taxes on time and owes no past taxes to the Town of Wallingford. She feels the Council people have investigated this plant and feel this is the best option for the Town of Wallingford. This is why she will not change her vote. She then says as far as ORFA, Dave Gessert wanted them to go with this. After full evaluation of ORFA, she felt it was wrong for Wallingford. It did not have a full scale plant anywhere in the world. She is doing what she feels is best for the Town of Wallingford. She is supporting this Resource Recovery Plant.

Edward Musso, 56 Dibble Edge Road, says to have everyone please keep their mouths away from the microphone and don't speak right into them and this will allow them to hear better.

Jim Cox, 34 Ridgecrest Road, apologizes for being out of order earlier and hopes this meeting can be continued.

Mr. Holmes then says the safest way to go is always to wait. That is not always the responsible thing to do. Mr. Hubbard did point out that there is construction going on in Massachusetts. Mr. Roe then says they did put up a shell and part of the transfer station but there is no working facility. There is some thinking that they are going to take down what they put up in order to accomodate any future construction. Mr. Hubard then says the Chairman of the Board for ORFA did say he will come here and speak. Mr. Holmes then says it would be approximately 2 years to put up a plant. He then says it would be proper to then wait and see if this plant will meet the

140
day to day operations. This would be an additional 3-4 years. Mr. Holmes then says seeing that ORFA does not have a day-to-day large facility, don't you feel it would be a fair decision to wait and see what that facility does would be proper. Would you feel comfortable jumping into a \$40 million dollar business without knowing results? He then says 2 years to build the facility, 5 years to see if it will pan out, a year or a year and one half to get through town government and public hearings. That is 10 years and the landfill would be closed for 3 years. We can wait and wait and the trash is just going to pile up. He then says he has some literature sent by Ed Bradley. One article talks of total destruction of dioxins. "dioxin is quite stable. For example, some destruction requires temperatures of more than 700°C" The incinerator will be operating well above that. It goes on to say "although dioxins are chemically stable, they certainly can be destroyed with high efficiency and high temperature incineration systems used to destroy other organic wastes." While it has been talked about the dioxin leaching from the ash he quotes from two articles about fly ash. "Dioxin is very tightly bound to fly ash as it is to soil. To remove dioxin from fly ash, one has to do exhaustive benzene or toluene extractions. It is very tightly held." From the other report--"Physical properties. Dioxins do not dissolve in water. They bind very tightly to soil particles and to principles of incinerator ash. In laboratory experiments, dioxin can be destroyed at sufficiently high operating temperatures. Above 1400°F" of which we will be operating. This is testimony from your own experts. In the Town Beach area there is an area infested with Dioxin and the river they feared was going to flood did and they were worried about dioxin traveling but tests showed the dioxin did not go through the flood waters. Both sides are saying what we have essentially been saying. As far as recall, he has been honest and he hasn't attempted to hide anything. If they want to recall them for being honest, for conducting meetings in the open, not doing anything behind their backs, fine. If you want to recall for doing something illegal or embezzling that is another matter. If you want to play Monday morning quarterback that is fine also. We are trying to do the best job we can for the town and if you want to recall us for that, that is certainly your prerogative.

Mr. Rys then comments that it is good to see all the people here. It just shows how healthy Wallingford is. There has been some reference to meetings, fly ash, pollution to the wells in Yalesville etc. He has also looked through the minutes of 1985. He doesn't hold anything against these people. Sometimes you go to the newspaper and you don't see everything. We have had 6 occasions prior to the vote of October 8th vote and after the October 8th vote, we had discussion also.

There was a comment about the ash being dumped in the Meriden landfill and this may cause more health problems. Mr. Diana says he did say the state has agreed that that well water is contaminated. Mr. Rys says the fact of the matter is that when the fly ash is mixed with the bottom ash, and mixed with the lime solution it does create an alkaline basis which means that it doesn't leach into the ground. Right now you have a situation out there where the acidity base from the mixture of deposits at the dump is getting into the well water. Actually this would improve that problem. There was a comment made from the audience about New Haven and Bridgeport. His opinion is that the New Haven plant basis for withdrawal was politics. He feels that also has somewhat of an effect on us here. He publicly came out in the newspaper and he accused people of playing politics. You don't have to agree with him, nobody does but right after the January 16th meeting he met with a certain individual and this individual came up to him and said don't be too surprised tomorrow if you see it in the paper that I am going to ask for this to be brought back up for a revote. Mr. Rys then says he said why would you want to do that? The comment was put yourself in my position, put yourself in the minority, it is the right thing to do.

Mr. Diana then stands up and says that is an absolute lie. He then says these people have been badgering about politics. Every time he talks he talks about issues. He will give specifics and he does not give generalities. He tells you why this plant is not going to work and why it is going to be damaging to the people of Wallingford. He says to Mr. Rys that that is the most disgusting thing he has ever heard anybody say. He then says he will be happy to take a polygraph test. Is he doing this for political reasons, by God he is not!!! Mr. Diana then walks out of the meeting.

Mr. Rys then comments the fact of the matter is that he never brought up Ed Diana's name. How does he know he was talking about him. Mr. Rys says he is not a liar.

The meeting then gets out of hand and Chairman Gessert suggests that they all sit down and they will resume the meeting and let the people have an opportunity to ask some questions. 141

Jim Cox, 34 Ridgecrest Road then says he stood up and apologized earlier for getting out of order. He says it is now because of the accusations between councilmen that this meeting has gotten out of order and he then wishes to thank Mr. Diana, Mr. Gouveia and Mr. Holmes for coming down to the PAGB meetings and listening to the people. They were all invited and only those 3 showed up.

Chairman Gessert then says he was invited to 1 meeting directly of the PAGB group. He recieved a call at 9:30 on a Wednesday night for the meeting on Thursday and he had plans. He is often out at one meeting or another.

A man from the audience then speaks and asks the audience to have courtesy to both the chairman and the Town Council and sit down and listen.

Chairman Gessert then says about potential health risks. They did a health risk analysis by a study done and they said that heart attacks as the highest and it worked down to cancer and it worked down to the last item on the list was eating one charcoal broiled steak per week. The health risk of that was 3/10ths of one person per million in a lifetime. The next item listed in the study was the Resource Recovery at .7/10ths of one person per million. That was based on a person standing outside 24 hours a day, 365 days a years for 70 years at the maximum area where those emissions were dropped. The doctor that did those studies stated that based on that assessment said he could see the increase in health hazard as one death per 2,330yrs. This is a little longer between the distance of now and the time Christ was born. He could say 1 additional death from that type of hazard. He then says we will go out to the public.

Peter Gouveia then says it was said earlier that the other towns are paying \$5 more per ton than Wallingford. If they are paying more per ton than Wallingford, it is not to get rid of their garbage. It is because they are fortunate enough to be further away from the plant than Wallingford is and somebody has to pay for transportation costs. He also says he is no one's person. His wife and children do own him a little bit but he is no one's person. He is his own person. Since this issue is pretty much dead, he would like to encourage those that were involved, and he commends them for their efforts and says their efforts were not in vain. They have accomplished a great deal. Because of their efforts the trucks will not drive down South Cherry Street. Also, efforts have been made to test the plant more often and thanks to them the contract has been looked at to see if it can be altered. They have taken their first step in obtaining ownership of the problem. There are many other problems facing Wallingford. He hopes they take ownership. Look at the Phillipines and what the people did there.

Mike Doyle, 59 Heritage Woods, then says he has read that nothing the Council has seen or heard will change their minds on the vote they took. He feels this issue has generated so much opposition and if nothing they have seen changes their minds, maybe they are not looking over the interests of this town. They seem to think the majority favors this plant. If they feel this way he feels they should put this out to a referendum where the people can have their say.

Ken Hubbard, 43 Spice Hill Drive then says he has a statement he would like to read that was prepared by the People Against Garbage Burning. In order to save time they have prepared this statement. He says it does include many comments and he says the People Against Garbage Burning do not want a garbage burning incinerator in Wallingford. He does say this for many reasns and he reads the following statement:

STATEMENT OF PAGB* - Town Council Meeting - February 25, 1986
Sheehan High School, Wallingford, Connecticut

WE DO NOT WANT A GARBAGE BURNING INCINERATOR IN WALLINGFORD FOR MANY REASONS: -

- 142
- 1.- There is no landfill crisis here. Our landfill has 6 - 8 years left and the possibility of expansion.
 - 2.- State and local officials have not proven the incineration process safe. Most scientific evidence states it is hazardous.
 - 3.- Ash disposal in Yalesville poses a threat to our water supplies. The theory of slow leaching of pollutants does not impress us.
 - 4.- Over 100 garbage trucks per day going to and from the proposed incinerator will have an adverse affect on roads and neighborhoods because of air polution, noise and congestion. No restricted routes 'are required for ash trucks leaving the plant going to the Yalesville landfill.
 - 5.- The Federal EPA has stated that Wallingford's air has concentrations of toxic chemicals 2 to 40 times greater than the average U.S. city. Further deterioration of air quality is not acceptable from a health standpoint.
 - 6.- Our state Dept. of Environmental Protection has no power to close down an incinerator that is polluting. There are no laws presently in effect which will guarantee our safety.
 - 7.- Our State DEP admits to having inadequate staff and equipment even to enforce and administer current laws.
 - 8.- Technology relating to incineration, pollution control equipment, and non-burning processes is changing rapidly. Since we don't have a present crisis in Wallingford, the town would benefit by waiting for newer technology and experience.
 - 9.- The projected 44,000 gallons of water scheduled to be used every day to cool hot ash, can be better used by our citizens especially during drought periods, instead of for garbage disposal.
 - 10.- The effects of nocturnal inversion (the stagnation of air) in Wallingford due to its bowl shape, will be intensified by pollutants from an incinerator.
 - 11.- We know there will be a negitive impact to real estate values and to Wallingford's image.
 - 12.- We do not want four other towns to dump their garbage here!

Before the Council voted on this plant, they were told that CRRA was a "proven, cost effective technology" and that Vicon's Pittsfield incinerator is "an efficient type operation" and is a "cost effective system." - We know of no successful plant operated by CRRA. On the contrary, the Bridgeport plant suffered a \$45 million dollar loss. Vicon representatives admit they are losing money in Pittsfield. WE BELIEVE THAT MATERIAL MISREPRESENTATIONS WERE MADE ON WHICH THE COUNCIL RELIED, BEFORE THEY VOTED ON THE CONTRACTS!

The Wallingford Council appears to have relied on representations made by CRRA and Phil Hamel without any advice from independent consultants. They acted on representations made by persons with financial interests.

* People Against Garbage Burning

A Meriden Report states that the lifetime of the Wallingford project is ten years, although the contract relates to a twenty year commitment. Furthermore, it concludes: CRRA's "ability to deliver a successful project is obviously suspect and the Vicon technology it proposes is also not conclusively proven as measured by applicable scientific standards."

The Council was entrusted with a major decision affecting all of the people of Wallingford and it relied on limited information and did not seek independent consultation in this vital mater. The Council has failed to make public any negitive information on this project. WE DON'T WANT TO BE GUINEA PIGS OR MAKE WALLINGFORD A TEST SITE!

We have only to consider the recent tragedy of the Space Shuttle. With all its safety precautions, testing and monitoring equipment, it resulted in disaster perhaps contributed by the PRESSURE for a launch.

We honestly believe that pressure was placed on the council in 1985 to make a formal commitment to a garbage burning incinerator. We believe that some misrepresentations were made to the Council at that time. The Council has an opportunity tonight to recind the authorization for these contracts and stop the construction of a garbage burning plant in Wallingford.

WE ASK THE COUNCIL TO ADOPT A MORATORIUM ON THE CONSTRUCTION ANY GARBAGE BURNING INCINERATOR IN WALLINGFORD, UNTIL SUCH TIME THE TECHNOLOGY IS PROVEN SAFE BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT, AND TIL ADEQUATE LAWS HAVE BEEN PASSED WHICH GUARANTEE PROTECTION OF THE HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT OF OUR CITIZENS.

143

Lets stop this plant before its too late!

Sincerely,

PEOPLE AGAINST GARBAGE BURNING

Bob Jacunski, 291 Ivy Street, asks if they are aware of the story that appeared in Baron's Magazine January 20, 1986 and has to do with ORFA. He then gives the title of the article and the Council replies that they spent an entire day last summer discussing with officials from ORFA. Mrs. Bergamini then comments that air fair money was even put into the Council budget because at the time ORFA only had a plant in Switzerland and they were determined to go there and view the plant and not take their word for it. She then says they found out that while their theory was great, it just didn't work. Mr. Jacunski goes on to say this magazine is the bible of the financial industry and they have a story about ORFA. It says ORFA really is a paper empire. They have \$90 billion dollars invested but their net worth and net assests are meaningless and worthless. The princípal directing ORFA, it says dealing in stock comes easily for ORFA's president Harvey K., who in the early 1970's was in the business of buying and selling stock for Delphi Capital Corp., a Cherry Hill New Jersey Broker dealer that ultimately ran into trouble with the Security Exchange Commission. In March of 1974 the SEC charged Delphi and its two principals, Harvey K and Abraham Sullivan with fraud, stock manipulation and mismanagement of the written house fund. A small mutual fund. A federal district court in Philadelphia forced the two principals to make restitution to the fund and the SEC revoked the companies broker dealer license and has barred both K. and Sullivan from the security business for 3 years. In May 1978, U.S. District Court Judge Clarence Newcomer, of Philadelphia sentenced both men to 3 years probation and fined \$1,000 and \$5,000 respectively for offenses arising out of the manipulation of the common stock of Magic Marker Corp. in 1971 & 1972. A Philadelphia grand jury in Sept. of 1977 indicted 14 people of manipulating the price of Magic Marker Stock from a command post in a Miami Beach hotel. One Man subsequently went to prison. He suggests that they research ORFA more carefully and maybe go to the library and find this article. This substantiates the opinion that the Town Council has very thoroughly researched this to his satisfaction and it enforces that the leaders of the PAGB really have not done their homework. They have not thoroughly researched the alternatives. He then says it is a very good democratic process for a lot of people to get involved. He would suggest that the PAGB take a closer look at how this plant is going to be operated. If they are worried about toxic chemicals, he says one of the things he understands is that they will be doing a lot of recycling before they get into the final process. If they are concerned about what is going into the plant, get involved and make sure these materials don't go in and preserve the fears they may have.

Chairman Gessert then comments that the plant in Bridgeport is very much like the one ORFA presented in that they don't incinerate the garbage. They crunch, purify, separate and sell the biproduct. He then goes on to comment about the plant in Somerville also. He has serious reservsations about ORFA also.

Peter Doyle, 41 Hill Avenue, Yalesville comments that he has a letter from the Deputy Director of the National Swedish Environmental Protection Board which is equivalent to our Federal U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. The letter is dated October 28, 1985. It states "lat in 1984 it became clear that dioxin levels of samples of baltic fish, milk and dairy products were in conflict with proposed standards for

maximum daily intake. In some samples by two orders of magnitude. Waste incineration is known to be a significant source of dioxins but there is no current relation between this source and the levels of dioxin measured in fish and milk etc. The dioxin issue triggers a policy decision by this board. That policy decision was a moratorium on these facilities. That we should aim for better emission control in regards to toxic and biologically active organic compounds such as dioxin. Waste Incineration plants would then become a first and important sector for research action." In short, this board was unable to suggest an acceptable technological proposal that would grant waste incinerations emissions down significantly. He then says Sweden is an advanced country in waste incineration not because they have a landfill problem but because they use this as a source of energy. He then says this information was contained in the hearing which DEP granted the permits. 144

Phil Hamel then says he knows one of the doctors talked to one of our State Legislators recently and indicated trash burning was the way to go and dioxins did not seem to be a problem. Also, when the Vicon Plant in Pittsfield was tested, there were no dioxins measurable using the most modern instrument and that was tested at the stack. He then says he has quoted in the past from an independent study, that Meriden Commission about Landfill Ash. Tonight two people quoted from a study and he thinks the implication was that was the independent study done by consultants, it was not. The study they quoted from was an in-house staff report that was written by someone who had very little familiarity with Resource Recovery. Chairman Gessert then asks Mr. Hamel if he knows if the Sweden plants have the baghouse or scrubbers and Mr. Hamel replies many of their plants are older plants and they don't use current type technology. There are a number of things being done in this plant to control dioxin and one is that there will be automatically controlled temperatures in the combustion chamber. Above 1800°F. If they go below that, they will have an automatic oil burner go on. Also, we have the acid-gas scrubbers and the baghouse which will help. EPA feels there will be no dioxin problem. An article in Meriden says there is very little proof of any serious health problems from dioxin anyway. There will be very little dioxin emission from this plant if any. It shows in Pitts-

Peter Doyle asks who did the test in Pittsfield, who paid for the test and was the documentation from that test ever published and reviewed in a scientific journal. Mr. Hamel says the test was done by Roy F. Weston, a nationally recognized testing firm, it was paid for by Vicon. A professional consultant has to maintain a professional reputation in the community and they have to do a good job and they are not going to go out and lie. Mr. Hamel says he is not sure at this point whether the test results have been published. We have information from Dr. Kay Jones. He was at several of our meetings and testified at the DEP hearing. He was the one responsible for doing the test and he is an expert in this area. He is employed by Roy F. Weston. These tests were done according to recognized standards of EPA. The report will be here when published and we will have copies for anyone who wants to see it. He then says Dr. Jones did testify under oath at a public hearing at DEP that the levels of dioxin were below the detectable limits of the state of the art instrumentation.

Mr. Doyle then says this document by Roy F. Weston was submitted as evidence for the hearings and he feels the DEP relied heavily on it

He feels DEP should have had an independent objective study. He feels the Council should have been aware of how DEP went about granting these permits. He feels they didn't do a good job and they relied heavily on the industry they were supposed to regulate.

Dennis Martin then says the DEP did not rely heavily on the test data done in Pittsfield. They relied upon the controls they were putting on the plant to control dioxin.

Robert Avery, 70 Masonic Avenue, says the test done in Pittsfield was a 3 hour test. How can anyone test what is coming out of an incinerator for 3 hours only? He feels a problem of the Council is they get some information from the Hartford Legislators and they swallow it hook, line and sinker. He heard the same story about

Auburn, Maine not having a leachate lagoon. He called and talked to the engineering Department and they told him absolutely they have a leachate because they tested the leachate and there is heavy metals coming from the ash. The fly ash is considered hazardous waste and they ship it to Ohio. Mr. Polanski said when we showed that film it was not true. The legislators obviously didn't do their homework. Chairman Gessert says he saw the film. A gentlemen with sick cows and a gentlemen with sores on his arms. He will take the word on the cows and he saw traces of sores on the mans arms but he doesn't know how he got the sores. There was no doctor involved in the film. They could be from the plant or from the cows but there was no proof to guarantee that that was from the plant. Mr. Avery continues and says there is an incinerator in Windham and Windham has a baghouse. Baghouses are not new technology. They have been here for 30-40 years. That baghouse was put on that plant and Mary Mushinsky said the reason they don't use it is because they can't afford to have somebody go up there and shake the baghouse down. That is ludicrous. He called and talked to the operator and he was told that they have a baghouse and the reason they don't use it is it doesn't work and has never worked. He then asked if they were required by DEP to have a baghouse, Mary Mushinsky told him no but the operator of the incinerator told him absolutely. He then said why are you running if the DEP doesn't allow you too and she said "The DEP are jerks" How can they shut us down? What are they going to do with the garbage. They have been pumping garbage into the air of Windham since 1981 and the DEP says OK. How can you tell me you won't do the same thing in Wallingford.

Mrs. Bergamini coments that she visited Windham. The baghouse was in operation and they saw how it worked. They talked with people in the vacinity and asked about soot and they got a very favorable reaction. They even went to another plant in Windsor. It was pointed out that she only asked 8 questions and that is because she had asked 88 when Mayor Vumbaco started this. This is how long she has been in it. This is what she objects to. Don't accuse us of not doing our homework. She saw that baghouse working when she visited it before. What they are doing today she does not know. Mr. Avery then says ask the people of that plant how they keep toxic waste out of the plant and if they are honest they will say there is no way. If it goes in there it is being burned. He asked if the people were trained as to what to look for and they said yes they were trained by the DEP through the volunteer Fire Department.

Mr. Holmes says they are commenting that they are swallowing information that was given to them and he says he submits the report by Karen Shapiro who spoke on their behalf. You are calling your own people you had testify on your behalf liars also. Again, in leaching of the ash, Dioxin does not dissolve in water but binds very tightly to soil particles and particles in incinerator ash. They can be destroyed at sufficiently high temperatures. In dioxin in industrial waste, these can be made harmless by a number of methods including incineration.

Sal Falconeri, 281 Grieb Road says he has a copy of the contract signed by the Mayor and the Council. He goes back to Section 1.02D The first State goal set out in the plan is to reduce the volume of municipal solid waste that must be disposed of to the lands. They are going to reduce the garbage going to the landfills. They are not going to eliminate landfills. Your have leased the landfill to CRRA. When the incinerator is down it will go to the landfill. Chairman Gessert then comments what do you do with the ash. A comment is made go with ORFA and Chairman Gessert comments that ORFA only processes 50% and the rest goes into the landfill. Mr. Falconeri then comments we have to guarantee "X" number of tons of garbage. If we go into deficit we get penalized for not giving them enough garbage, and they have the authority to bring in enough garbage to make up the difference. You can't exceed the number and you can't go below it. If you go over the maximum 420 tons per day, they can't accept it. If you go the minimum they can bring in more garbage. He feels this is the worst contract he has ever seen.

Peter Doyle, 41 Hill Avenue, Yalesville then says there was a question about bottom ash and fly ash and he got his information from Dr. Robert Steven who is the Chief of Hazardous Material from the California Dept. of Health. He is an objective participant in evaluating Resource Recovery. He then says this doctor is not crusading for any side of this issue. He says the proposition he proposed in the State of CT to mix the bottom ash with the fly ash which is 90%-10%

mixed is under CT law an illegal practice because when the fly ash is analyzed, in most cases it is classified as a hazardous waste. There is no site currently in CT where you can put hazardous waste. Most of it generated by industry is shipped out of State. It is considered a hazardous waste and we are dumping it into the landfill. California considers it to be illegal yet we don't. There is a huge gray area here. 146

James Heilman, High Hill Road says there seems to be a gray area of the Town of Wallingford. We also seem to be a victim of circumstance. We are the victims of having an I91 go right through our water shed. He then complains about the traffic, etc around this water shed. Then we have the incineration problem. He does know that the State level is pushing incineration and he does not believe they are pushing any other Resource Recovery except the incineration process. He believes there has been a lot of impetus on the town by the state for incineration. He finally last night got to listen to the taping at the library and the answers of DEP. He found it interesting that in reference to such things as low wind modeling they can't do that. He feels many of the questions were paraphrased. He wanted to know from DEP what they would extrapolate as values for very low wind conditions. He was disturbed this was never asked nor answered. He was disturbed that DEP officials say possibly, maybe probably under inversion conditions the velocity of emissions may plunge through the atmosphere into the atmosphere. They only said possibly, they did not say it would. They compared the topography of Wallingford to Bradley Field and he doesn't feel that is so. He is not so concerned about the dioxin controversy here. He does feel a lot of dioxin will be trapped in the fly ash in baghouse filters, which will substantially lower the velocity of which gases are emitted from the stack thus creating a very serious condition with inversions. You don't have high temperature gases leaving so the velocity and buoyancy will be quite low. At the last meeting he showed pictures of the Pierce Plant and the stack where the plume was coming out and plunging down at a 10° angle. Nowhere in DEP's modeling will they demonstrate that fact like they cannot model for 0 wind conditions. The people here tonight are here because they are very concerned, not so much with the politics but with their health and it is affecting them directly. The people in that area for a long time have talked about symptoms of the air quality down there, there is already a problem. By throwing away the fears of dioxin lets look at carbon dioxide, carbon monoxide, nitrous oxide which are being brought to the levels of maximum power under modeling. That is why they had to raise the stack up for that facility. They are exagerrating the conditions by modeling. He doesn't like the modeling. Show him any model you want but show him something really happening and he is more apt to believe what is there in front of him and is existent rather than a computer created model which can be created to do anything you want it to do. It can be created to allow for conditions of development and he feels the economics of that has been weighed very strongly against health concerns which these people are already experiencing in that area. The modeling does not include all the trucks or the traffic. It is only averaged in as a state average and not an immediate local condition. The same thing was done on the the side of town with Bristol Myers. The modeling for a complex terrain that they use shows a plume that goes out and extends up and in the worse case situation parellels terrain. He has very little confidence in an agency that goes down to an area where people are experiencing symptoms and he can't find anything. The people are much more sensitive than the instruments. Do you suppose all the people with the symtoms are crazy? Either they are crazy or the modeling and the analysis DEP does does not work. When you don't account for the true real sources, put 100 deisel trucks ideling waiting to dump daily and tell me that you don't account for that in modeling. All the traffic on Route 5 and 15, tell him that is not real because that is what DEP is saying. DEP across this state is receiving unbelievable resistence by people. They are experiencing the symtoms and DEP can not come up with the answers. They don't have the equipment, the technology or the manpower. You have to look at what is really happening to the people. You look for alternatives. Why did Wallingford have to have the plant here? Because Cyanamid is here we have to have the plant here? If Cyanamid didn't exist, this whole thing wouldn't be here tonight. He feels he would pay the \$10 more to have his garbage shipped to a desolate area where people are not living along side of the incinerator.

Mike Doyle, 59 Heritage Woods, again says he feels the only way the people will be able to speak on this issue is to put it to a vote as a referendum.

Mr. Doyle then wants to know the Council's feelings on referendum.

Chairman Gessert then says if someone brings that up as an item they will take it up at that time and discuss it. 147

Mike Whitelit, 815 Terrace Gardens says 1800° is the temperature the trash will be burned at. Is there state legislation that says they have to burn at that? If there is a problem at Vicon how do we know they are burning it at 1800°? Chairman Gessert says they will have continuous monitoring temperature controls that will locate second by second readings of the flame in every furnace unit. If the temperature drops below 1800° an automatic oil fired burners are required to come on to bring it up to 1800°.

Mr. Whitelit says who will be there to monitor Vicon when they know they can burn at 1400° and save a lot of money? Chairman Gessert says we will have people monitoring that. Mr. Hamel says there is a regulation by the State in the air permit that they must maintain the temperature of 1800°. Also, the carbon dioxide that comes out, the carbon monoxide, the amount of oxygen, the amount of steam that is produced, the ash is tested for the amount of unburned carbon and all of these things are monitored and will tell us whether that plant is operating properly. All that monitoring together will tell an engineer how that plant is operating. These are 24 hour a day graphs that are being made up. They will be monitored and watched.

John Sattler, South Cherry Street, says he hears they will burn 420 tons per day. 2 million per week and over a years time over a billion ton. Chairman Gessert then points out 420 tons per day x 7 days comes out to less than 3,000 per week. Mr. Sattler says multiply that by 365 days and will the plant be able to handle all that and how many tons of ash is going to come out of there. What percentage? Mr. Hamel says the ash weight with water in it will be around 50%. By volume, and this is what we are concerned about in the landfill, it will be about 10%. Mr. Sattler then says in a couple of years they will load Wallingford and Meriden Landfills right up to the hill. Mr. Hamel says Meriden and Wallingford Landfills will last about 25 years with this system. Mr. Sattler says why build the plant then. If they don't meet the 420 per day tonage they will put another unit on and get more garbage and ash out of there plus you will use 40,000 gallons of water a day. Who is going to pay for that and where will the water go. Chairman Gessert says the 40,000 gallons a day is recycable water and it doesn't mean they will use this daily. Any water that Vicon uses they will pay for as any other customer in the Wallingford Water Dept. Mr. Sattler then asks how long the scrubbers are going to last? Chairman Gessert says the contract is for 20 years. If they break down and can't be fixed it will be shut down.

Ed Bradley, 2 Hampton Trail, says he would like Mr. Holmes present for this as he had used statements from Mr. Bradley's reports earlier. Mr. Holmes is not at the table and Mr. Bradley continues on. He says he did send a document to the Council, Chemical & Engineering News on Dioxin dated 1983. He feels this is a good document on the issue. The issue here is that you can make a good case for this plant with this document if you are for it. You can make a good case against this plant if you are against it. He didn't want to address dioxin and fly ash tonight but since these questions were raised he must.

Mr. Bradley says Mr. Holmes did state correctly that with temperatures above 1000°C or 1800°F formation of dioxin is minimized and destruction is maximized. The question there is how much are they minimized and how much are they destructed. Mr. Holmes also mentioned about fly ash being tightly bound. It is and it does take extensive benzine or toluene extractions but Mr. Holmes forgot to tell you that Dow Chemical did a study on municipal fly ash. They placed it in a controlled environment with bottom feeders and the result was after a period of time they were analyzed and 84% of what was found on the fish was 2378 TCDD--dioxin. Mr. Bradley says he has talked to the man who conducted this study which was just concluded and the results of this are available. He then talks about an editorial in the Record Journal about dioxin prepared by Mr. Mordarsky. He is sure Mr. Mordarsky did a lot of research and he believes one of his sources of information was the Scientific America. He states a U.S. Air Force study called Ranch Hand found no cases of soft tissue sarcoma among 1200 military personnel who sprayed agent orange on Vietnam. He doesn't know where he got his information from but the same statement is in the Chemical & Engineering News. It reads "One of the first is the Ranch Hand Study by the Air Force of which 1200 military personnel who worked spraying agent orange on South Vietnamese forests. A mortality study of these individuals has shown no evidence of a problem one way or another, but the sample is far too small to mean

anything." Another comment made is why didn't the use of large quantities of TCDD contaminated agent orange in Vietnam result in much higher levels of soil contamination than what you have heard? It goes on to say when it was exposed to leaves on soil, and sunlight, the TCDD lost most of its strength. This is true but just think the forests of CT are nothing like the forests of Vietnam. The reason it never did reach the ground is because of the canopy and the denseness of the jungle. Also the purpose of that was foliage destruction and it was never intended to reach the ground. Again, he says you can make a good case either way. Mr. Bradley then says Mr. Polanski addressed some of the questions that did come up at the hearing. There were 4 questions on postcards put in there on purpose. Of those 3 were asked. How persuasive is dioxin? At what concentration is it present in the environment and what are safe levels? The other was are they bioaccumulative. There was a lot of talk about those and they consumed an awful lot of time and everyone had answers for it and the problem is they don't have answers and they are unanswerable at the time. The bottom line is we already have a problem where Cyanamid is and to place the plant there would jeopardize the health and well being of the people. The people of Wallingford do have a right to a clean and healthy environment.

Walter Mordarsky, 46 High Hill Road says in reference to Mr. Bradley's comments, he used at least 50 Primary references and over 500 secondary references from various journals. It was not based on Scientific America. He then explains he used many articles to get the prospective of a very large number of studies.

Vincent Avallone, 1 Ashford Court, then asks when they will get the answers to the other questions submitted by PAGB. Chairman Gessert says they went out in today's mail. He then asks why the Town Attorney rendered a decision so late which was disturbing everyone in this room concerning the revote. Chairman Gessert says he was asked yesterday. Mr. Avallone says it was publicized for 2 weeks and why submitted so late. Chairman Gessert says he is the one who posed the question. He said as Chairman of the Town Council they have certain rules and procedures to follow and when they have a motion to rescind or reconsider there are certain things that have to take place. First of all, if you voted in the minority and not in the affirmative and the affirmative vote carried, if you are in the minority vote on that then you cannot make a motion to reconsider. He then explains that there was no problem with Mr. Diana making a motion this evening that said the Wallingford Town Council hereby votes against the Resource Recovery plant. Mr. Avallone then says this was known about for weeks and why didn't they find out a few weeks ago the validity of the vote. Chairman Gessert says the question just came up. It was the soonest he thought of the question. Chairman Gessert then says Mr. Diana could have made a motion. Mr. Avallone again asks if there was any way the people could have known before this meeting that they were not going to revote. Chairman Gessert then says he did not have a copy of the motion Mr. Diana was going to make tonight and rather than have him make an illegal or improper motion, he was advised that there were two types of motions he could not make. There are about 3,000 others he could have made. Chairman Gessert again explains all Mr. Diana had to do was make the right motion.

Mr. Avallone then continues and asks if the Council was aware of the letter sent to the Town Attorney on the whether or not CRRA had followed the proper steps. Has a decision been rendered by Attorney McManus. He is told yes. Mr. Gouveia then says they received it tonight at the meeting. He then says that is a concern because this question was raised a while ago and just answered tonight. Mr. Avallone also says some people are calling this a loophole and that they are grasping at straws, we feel this is a legitimate way out of this and a possibility. They have notified the governor and the attorney for the town of this statute. It says when the directors of CRRA make a determination that a proposed Resource Recovery Facility becomes feasible, at that point, the governor is to appoint two ad hoc members of the municipality or municipalities with regards to the proposed facility. That appointment should be made by the governor with advice and consent of the General Assembly. Mr. Martin interprets proposed and feasibility to mean when the ground is broken for this particular facility. He then asks Mr. Martin to explain that interpretation.

Mr. Martin says in terms of the interpretation of feasibility, it is our self sufficiency determination for each project. He says it is true that they must take action as to the feasibility. You don't take it when you think a project is feasible, you take it after the bonding is in place and you are ready to release the permit.

Mr. Avallone then says why didn't the attorney's render their opinions rather than Mr. Martin and if this is correct, you ought to say it, in the paper it says CRRA usually determines that. It doesn't say we always make that interpretation. What part of the statement in the paper was incorrect and would you explain what feasible means to you? 149

Mr. Martin then says you shouldn't go to the newspaper and extract a story on a legal opinion. Again Mr. Avallone says he stated in the paper "CRRA usually determines that to mean when ground is broken and funds are withdrawn from the bank." Mr. Martin says that is correct. Chairman Gessert and Mr. Avallone then get into a discussion about interrogation and Mr. Avallone says if Mr. Martin doesn't want to answer his question that is fine.

Mr. Martin says he did say part of that statement and he also said other things. When the project is determined feasible when the consulting engineer who has a little bit to do with the bonding venture and the official statement issues a feasibility study. When the feasibility study is accepted by the Board and they make a determination of feasibility, that is when the notification goes over to the governor's office.

Chairman Gessert then says if they have legal questions they should send a letter to the attorney's for CRRA. Mr. Avallone then says it has been sent to the Governor and they requested an interpretation from Attorney McManus 2 weeks ago and they just got it tonight. They haven't gone to the papers and he got no call from Attorney McManus.

Mr. Martin then says if they have a question concerning the authority statutes, then the question should be asked to the authority.

Marybeth Applegate, 1 Perkins Drive says she is familiar with the subject of Resource Recovery not over the last few months but from attending Council meetings for the last 8 years. She has watched first hand the amount of time and research that has gone into the project. Despite attending the meetings she still had some questions. She was very interested in the cable television program. It has been said that this program was orchestrated because participants had the questions in advance. Logically, this was the only way to get a reply on dates, facts and figures, and test results on these questions. These experts responded fully to every question. Of course there is no 100% guarantee. If that is what everyone is looking for then everyone should stop taking medication because of the Tylenol scare. We should also stop using baby foods or even driving on public roads. But instead we rely on the FDA to control our medication and food, and the police to control DWI's on the road. At some point we must listen to experts. We could argue indefinitely as to which experts we prefer to listen to but either way, the Resource Recovery Plant in Wallingford is an absolute fact, whether or not Wallingford participates. If we do not participate, Branford and East Haven are waiting in the wings to take our place. In that case, we lose all control over the operation. It would behoove the PAGB group to rechannel their efforts for the legislation in controls of the plant since it is going to be here. Earlier tonight, Mr. Jacunski mentioned general methods in which they could help, and there were numerous comments like what can we do and how can we live with hazardous waste. Specifically, you can organize a recycling program and hope it is more successful than the last attempt in Wallingford. Also, there is a need for a household hazardous waste collection program. It is easy to criticize but a lot more difficult to make positive contributions toward the program.

Jim Cox, 34 Ridgecrest Road, says if this plant is built and there are proven sickness from this plant, who pays the bill? Chairman Gessert says the Authority and the operator of the plant must have liability insurance. Chairman Gessert then explains he is not related to Marybeth Applegate. Mr. Cox then says what is the price they are willing to put on the health of the people. Is \$34 million worth one life? Mr. Cox then says Marybeth Applegate said East Haven and Branford are waiting in the wings. Then let them have it.

Chairman Gessert then says if Wallingford elected not to participate and the other four towns didn't change their minds, the plant would be built in Wallingford and there are other towns that would be willing to use our capacity. This is what he feels Marybeth meant.

Mr. Cox then says let this go to the people of Wallingford and let them decide. Let it go to referendum. If they want it, build. If not, get it out of here. Chairman Gessert says if a letter is

sent they will put it on the agenda but they can only have an advisory referendum because the Town of Wallingford is not funding the money.

150

Mr. Cox then asks if the majority of the people do not want this plant, will they rescind their vote and say no? Chairman Gessert says he would like to know first of all what the consequences of that vote would be and we don't have a solution other than this and he would like to know the consequences of this and #3 if they don't burn it, what are we suppose to do with it? Mr. Cox repeats his questions and Chairman Gessert says give me another solution that works. We are required by law to come up with a solution.

Mayor Dickinson then says a vote on the issue would not change anything for the reasons that the plant is a private construction. It is like any private business coming into Wallingford. If we are concerned about any health risks, right now the Town would put a moratorium on construction of any structure anywhere within our community. Every single family home pollutes the air, every vehicle pollutes the air, every new commercial establishment pollutes the environment. Every one of them contributes to what we breathe and what we see. A referendum would be a nice exercise but that is all it would be because the ability of private parties, with the permits they now have in place, through regulatory bodies is beyond the control of Wallingford. Permits are issued through State Government and those are beyond our jurisdiction. There is nothing the Council could do in a change of vote to alter that situation. Mayor Dickinson then says the State of CT is facing a problem. It has 2.2 million tons of garbage created a year and the estimates are that by 1988 there will not be space, with the current methods of disposal within the State to dispose of garbage, hence the State policy of reducing the volume and allow the use of present landfill space to continue longer. Wallingford is first with 2 of the landfills along its borders. Most of the expansion of the landfill is within the Town of Wallingford's borders. At the point we do not have a plan for what we will do, if we do not enter into a plan for disposal of garbage and we sit here thinking that we are an island and no one can tread within the boundaries of Wallingford and we have a landfill that no one else can use, we will use it for 7 years and hope that something else comes along, in 1988 when there is not space and we have a community that needs space, as sure as he is standing here, they will be able to come into the boundaries of Wallingford. Be it the Meriden landfill or the Wallingford landfill because at that point it will be a State concern. He saw on television concern in New York City on the very same issue. We don't want the incinerator with us. New York now dumps their garbage at sea and it ends up on the beaches in New Jersey. If you talk to the people of New Jersey and found out how they feel about this and they don't like it. It is true we are getting garbage from the other towns but if we do not proceed with a controlled project with 5 towns and we know how large the plant is and what is going to happen with it, we are going to get that garbage anyway and instead it will be raw refuse put in our landfill under far lesser controls. There is no magic or wonderful solution that will come from the clouds. In Europe for decades they have been burning garbage. Why? Because they don't have the luxury the United States has for adequate empty land space to dump garbage. They have no plans other than burning. Someone then shouts out ORFA.

Mr. Cox then comments that Forbes Magazine says Flur Corporation is backing ORFA all the way. Mayor Dickinson then says ORFA is a technology that came out of Europe. Why is it that there are not ORFA plants being built in Europe. What is it in ORFA that has stopped it from catching on and being the solution.

Mr. Cox then says one should be on line in Philadelphia in a year. Mr. Cox then says this meeting was a little unruly on both sides and he hopes the press has the courtesy to give both sides a fair shot at the way they look at this.

Mayor Dickinson then comments that the plant in Philadelphia is on a site with a current transfer station. The transfer station is the location that receives garbage and then moves it elsewhere. ORFA is building a plant on a transfer station site. They will continue to operate the transfer station and if the plant fails they have right there the means to move the raw garbage elsewhere. Secondly, that transfer station deals with a fraction of Philadelphia's garbage. Most is handled in other places. Wallingford is talking about a plant that deals 100% of our refuse. If that plant does not work. We are presented with 100% of the problem. There are big differences. In Somerville it is the same situation. Wallingford does not have a transfer station. If it doesn't work here, it stays here.

Mr. Cox then again comments that Mr. Diana, Mr. Gouveia and Mr. Holmes came to their meetings on Thursday nights. Where were the rest of them? He then question Mrs. Bergamini and she explains where she has been. 151

Chairman Gessert then adjourns the meetng at 11:25 p.m.

Lisa M. Bousquet
Council Secretary

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

March 11, 1986
Date

Rosemary A. Rascati
Rosemary A. Rascati, Town Clerk

March 11, 1986
Date

ATTACHMENT 1

4 Surrey Drive
Wallingford, Ct. 06492
February 18, 1986

Mr David Gessert
C/O Wallingford Town Council
Municipal Building
350 Center Street
Wallingford, Ct. 06492

Re: Trash Burning in Wallingford

Dear Mr. Gessert;

For months now my wife and I have been following the shameful antics of the group opposed to the proposed solution of our trash problem in town.

We are at a loss to understand why there has not been more local rebutal of this group, who seem intent on creating another "Shoreham" in town which we certainly don't need. Thus we are addressing this letter to the Town Council through you.

When the technical experts of the State and environmentalists like Mary Mushinsky, are in favor of this project, we think the uninformed citizenry should listen for a change.

What is especially galling is the vote-seeking of some council members, who lack the fortitude to stand by their original vote, thus indicating they didn't know what they were voting on, or being so venal in seeking re-election votes that they really think the noise makers and rabble-rousers represent the will of the people.

Sure, address the details of the project as the traffic routing, the inspection of the trash to be burned, the monitoring of the chimney gases, the proper disposal of the ash, etc. but for God sake, lets get on with it.

The project has been studied for too long now and futher delays and court challenges can only result in additional costs to the Wallingford taxpayers. From what we have read, no one has suggested a more viable alternative.

We trust your bringing this letter to the attention of the council will indicate that not everyone in town is being swayed by the antics of a small minority.

Very truly yours,

Harry Subkowsky
Alberta Subkowsky
Mr. & Mrs. Harry Subkowsky

New
England
Life

Killam & Sperry
New England Mutual Life Insurance Company
179 North Main Street, Post Office Box 486
Wallingford, Connecticut 06492
203-265-2025

FREDERICK M. KILLAM
EDSON L. SPERRY, CLU, MFS
Chartered Financial Consultant

February 21, 1986

Mr: David A. Gessert
90 Seiter Hill Rd
Wallingford, CT 06492

Dear Dave:

Just wanted to let you know that I am in complete agreement with you and other members of the town council who are supporting the trash-to energy plant in Wallingford.

In my judgement, this has become an emotional issue, and some people appear not to be willing to accept information which is contrary to what they want to hear. People who expect absolute guarantees about everything are not being realistic.

Good luck in your efforts to have reason win out over emotion.

Sincerely,

Fred

Frederick M. Killam

FMK/mr

ATTACHMENT 3

1-18-86

To David Gessert,

My husband & I have been proud citizens of Wlfd for 17 years having moved here from New Haven in 1968.

We have been attending all the meetings on the Trash to Energy Plant & as of now, none of our fears for health & pollution have been answered.

We both feel that we, as taxpayers, should have a vote in the plans to build a Trash Plant in our town.

We feel that a Trash Plant here would be devastating to our town.

Please think again very carefully on voting for this plant again.

We put council people in office thinking they will work for the good of the people

but it doesn't seem that way anymore,
We both feel that should this plant ¹⁵³
be built here, like many of our friends, will
be forced to move else were.

There still is time to look to other
alternatives that will allow us to
remain proud citizens of the Town of W. Hd.

Betty & Phil Amore
10 Birch Dr, W. Hd.

ATTACHMENT 4

331 South Main Street
Wallingford, Connecticut 06492

February 19, 1986

Mr. David Gessert
Chairman, Town Council
90 Seiter Hill Road
Wallingford, Connecticut 06492

Dear Mr. Gessert:

As a resident and taxpayer of the Town of Wallingford, I
would like to make known to you as a member of our Town
Council, my strong opposition to the garbage disposal plant
which you have voted for. I look to you and all other Council
members on Tuesday, February 25th, to vote AGAINST this proposed
plant and therefore PROTECT the people who elected you.

Very truly yours,

Judith R. Gallagher

JRG/ljc

cc: Mayor William Dickinson
Town Hall
Wallingford, Connecticut 06492

FEBURARY 25, 1985

DEAR MAYOR AND TOWN COUNCIL MEMBERS:

*DISPOSED
Peter Doyle*

TRASH INCINERATION IS NOT A POLITICAL ISSUE. IT IS A HEALTH ISSUE AND SHOULD BE JUDGED ON THAT BASIS. FOR THE TWENTY YEARS THAT I HAVE LIVED IN WALLINGFORD ANY WHISPER OF PROTEST OR DISCONTENT HAS BEEN LABELED AS "POLITICAL" BY THE MAJORITY RULING PARTY IN AN ATTEMPT TO DISCREDIT THE PROTEST. DAVE GESSERT, ABOVE ALL OTHERS, KNOWS THAT TO BE TRUE. THE PROTEST GROUP SHARE THE BLAME FOR "POLITICIZING" BECAUSE THEY FAILED TO MAINTAIN A IMAGE OF "NON-PARTISANSHIP". WE MUST FOCUS OUR ATTENTION ON THE HEALTH RISKS OF TRASH INCINERATION. THAT IS THE REAL ISSUE AND WE MUST NOT FALL VICTIM AT EFFORTS TO DISTRACT US. EVERYTIME AN EXAMPLE OF A FAILED INCINERATION PROJECT IS GIVEN, THE PROPONENTS OF INCINERATION COUNTER BY STATING "THAT FACILITY WASN'T OPERATED PROPERLY", AS IF TO SUGGEST THAT ALL THESE OTHER FACILITIES HAD SOME ULTERIOR MOTIVE FOR RUNNING IMPROPERLY. IF YOU ASK THEM TO GIVE YOU ONE PROVEN EXAMPLE OF SAFE OPERATION THEY CAN'T DO IT. THEY ASK YOU TO HAVE FAITH. THE NEXT ONE WILL BE SAFE. THE SIMPLE TRUTH IS THAT GARBAGE IS NOT A GOOD FUEL. IT IS NOT CLEAN, IT IS NOT EFFICIENT, AND IN TERMS OF THE HUMAN CONDITION IT MAY NOT EVEN BE CHEAP. TRASH INCERINATION DOES REDUCE THE VOLUME OF GARBAGE AND THUS EXTENDS, ONLY EXTENDS, THE USABLE LIFE OF LANDFILLS. IT IS A VERY PROFITABLE BUSINESS FOR THE FIRMS DOING THE BURNING AND THEY ACQUIRE THE STATURE OF A "PUBLIC UTILITY". WHEN YOU ATTEMPT TO BURN SOPHISTICATED HYDROCARBONS, PLASTICS, ETC., YOU CREATE NEW AND MORE SOPHISTICATED BY-PRODUCTS. WE DON'T FULLY UNDERSTAND THEM AND WE CANNOT EFFECTIVELY CONTROL THEM. WE DO KNOW THAT THEY ARE HARMFUL. HOW DID WALLINGFORD COME TO BE IN THIS SITUATION? THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION IS WRESTLING WITH A SERIOUS LANDFILL PROBLEM, AND HAS HAD LITTLE SUCCESS.


THE CONNECTICUT RESOURCE RECOVERY AUTHORITY IS IN A CRITICAL FINANCIAL SITUATION AND LACKS A PROVEN TRACK RECORD. THEIR VERY EXISTENCE IS IN JEOPARDY. WITH FEW ALTERNATIVES AVAILABLE, TRASH INCINERATION IS SELECTED AS THE FUTURE DIRECTION FOR THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT. THE CRRA SEES NEW LIFE IN THIS APPROACH AND BEGINS TO ACT AS AGENT, SALESMAN, AND NEGOTIATOR BETWEEN ALL THE PARTIES. RIGHT FROM THE START THEIR MOTIVES ARE SUSPECT. THE SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT GROUP OF THE DEP SEES INCINERATION AS A WAY OUT, IF ONLY IN THE SHORT TERM, OF THE LANDFILL PROBLEM. KEEP IN MIND THAT THIS GROUP'S CREDIBILITY IS

SUFFERING BECAUSE THEY ARE UNABLE TO CLOSE EVEN THE WORST OF THE HAZARDOUS WASTE SITES. THE COMMISSIONER OF THE DEP GRANTS PERMITS BASED ON ASSURANCES FROM THE AIR COMPLIANCE GROUP THAT THESE FACILITIES WILL BE OPERATED SAFELY. THE AIR COMPLIANCE GROUP BASES THEIR ASSUMPTIONS, IN LARGE MEASURE, ON INFORMATION SUPPLIED TO THEM FROM THE CONTRACTORS THEMSELVES. A PROCEDURE WHICH COULD NOT BE CONSIDERED PRUDENT BY ANY MEASURE. WHAT WE HAVE IS A GRAND BUREAUCRATIC CONSPIRACY OR TOTAL INEPTITUDE OR BOTH. IT IS IRONIC THAT THE DEP, WHICH EXISTS TO PROTECT US, HAS CREATED AN ENVIRONMENTAL MONSTER WHICH WILL, I BELIEVE, HAVE LONG TERM NEGATIVE EFFECTS ON THE STATE'S AIR QUALITY. THIS ALTERNATIVE IS NO ALTERNATIVE AT ALL, AND IT IS DEFINITELY NOT A SOLUTION. THE FRIGHTENING PROSPECT IS THAT THE DEP WILL BE RELUCTANT TO ADMIT ANY MISTAKE AND AS HISTORY HAS SHOWN THEY WILL BE INEFFECTIVE IN CORRECTING PROBLEMS.

THE MAYOR AND TOWN COUNCIL OF WALLINGFORD ARE VICTIMS IN A MUCH BIGGER GAME. THEY MADE THEIR DECISION, IN GOOD FAITH, BASED PRIMARILY ON ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS, AND PERCEIVED ASSURANCES FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION.

UNLIKE MANY OTHER ISSUES, AS A POLITICAL AND HEALTH ISSUE, THIS PARTICULAR ISSUE WILL NEVER GO AWAY. THOSE IN THE DECISION MAKING PROCESS CAN'T HIDE BEHIND IGNORANCE AND SAY THEY DIDN'T KNOW ANY BETTER. THEY DID KNOW, THEY WERE TOLD. IT IS TIME FOR US TO OBJECTIVELY EVALUATE THE HISTORY AND PERFORMANCE OF TRASH INCINERATION. THIS IS NOT A GAME AND THE GAMBLE TAKEN BY SO FEW IS TOO GREAT FOR SO MANY. I WOULD HOPE THAT THE COUNCIL MEMBERS CAN PUT PERSONAL AND POLITICAL PRIDE ASIDE, AND WORK WITH THE MAYOR AND THE PEOPLE IN A UNIFIED EFFORT TO STOP THE CONSTRUCTION OF THESE FACILITIES. AS A REAL COMMUNITY, WALLINGFORD CAN AND SHOULD TAKE A LEADERSHIP ROLL IN REVERSING THE STATE'S CURRENT IMPRUDENT COURSE OF ACTION.

SINCERELY,


 PETER A. DOYLE

SPARROW

SPARROW REQUEST FOR MORATORIUM ON
TRASH TO ENERGY PLANT

Based on present status of environmental
health research in Wallingford

A) SUSPECT PROBLEM

1. Recurrent population exposure to irritant toxins evoking aberrant physiological and neurological response
 - a. Several years of documentation illustrates a connection among odors, meteorology and health effects.

B) SOURCE

1. Quinnipiac River area
 - a. Problem areas- in Wallingford
Toelles' Road to Merritt Parkway
Old Colony Road area

C) STATE INVOLVEMENT

1. Toxic Hazard Section of the State Health Department
 - a. Has verified identifiable patterns of illness in residents through computer analysis of health logs
 - b. Has requested an EPA assessment of logs in respect to meteorological conditions
 - c. Is in the process of coordination of all available data pertaining to Wallingford's situation
2. DEP
 - a. Conducting air testing
 - b. Odor Tracking

Both these state agencies are cognizant of a problem but will not publicly recognize it at this time due to lack of information.

D) LOCAL

1. Town funded blood work underway
2. Some local physicians are cognizant of a problem but will not acknowledge it at this time due to lack of information.

E) ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH FIELD

1. Yale University Occupational Health and Safety
 - a. Cognizant of problem, no statement due to lack of information

Support Preventive Air Regulation
Residents Of the World

2. Gessell Institute of Medicine, New Haven
 - a. has examined several involved children
 - b. Cognizant of problem, no statement due to lack of information

F) SPARROW

1. Will explore feasibility of publication of existing logs as a reference tool for town and physicians
2. Will continue to work closely with all involved agencies until some answers can be defined. SPARROW was invited to speak at Yale but has declined at this time because we feel this issue needs to be justified scientifically.
3. Will endeavor to translate Wallingford's situation into applicable science

Information: , , ,

State of Connecticut 1-800-842-2220

157

Toxic Hazard Section- Health Dept Dr. David Brown, Director
DEP- Air Compliance Stanley Pac, Commissioner
Jack Doolittle, Inspector Wild area

Town Health Department- Dr. Delbert Smith 269-2612 or 237-5531 (Memorial Hospital)
Gesell Institute- Dr. Robert McLellan 789-1911

Yale Occupational Health and Safety- Dr. Mark Cullen, Director
On the basis of the fact that Wallingford's environmental health issue is just beginning to be scientifically explored and researched, SPARKROW respectfully requests a moratorium on the proposed Resource Recovery plant

Janice A. Muzzo
Janice A. Muzzo
SPARKROW
265-3233

ATTACHMENT 7

COPY

FRANCES W. JONES
24 STRAWBERRY HILL
WALLINGFORD, CONNECTICUT 06492

2/18

To the Editor
Record Journal

We would like to give a vote of confidence to the Mayor and Town Council of Wallingford. We are one of the vast number of Wallingford citizens who realize that the Vicore Trash to Energy plant is going to be better for all of us than what we have now - a pile of garbage, etc from which liquids are seeping into our ground water and thence into the Quinnipiac River and poisonous gases are forming underground.

Our Mayor and most of the Councilmen have studied the main problem and shown the courage to face up to the fact that Wallingford must have an alternative to land fill and use it now.

And after all the Mayor and Councilmen since Wallingford, too.

The Town of Rutland, Vermont is building a Vicore Trash to Energy plant.

Frances W. Jones