4.6.3

ROD

FS Public ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY In the Matter of: Environmental Protection Agency (Town of Holbrook) Baird & McGuire Superfund Other Public Hearing September 3, 1986 Holbrook High School Holbrook, MA Auditorium The above-entitled hearing was convened, pursuant to notice, at 7:30 p.m. PANEL MEMBERS Patricia Meaney, Department Division Director R. Emmet Hayes, State Representative, Holbrook District Frank McGaughey, Chairman, Holbrook Board of Selectmen

2

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13 14 15

16

17

18

2

## INDEX

SPEAKERS	PAGE	
Frank McGaughey	5	
Representative R. Emmet Hayes	7	
Louise Schofield	13	
Dr. Conrad Jankowski	16	
Dr. Henry Cole	17	
Robert Powilatis	23	
Arthur Bleakney	25	
George Krim	. 28	
Thomas Cummings	29	
Anne Gordon	30	
Walter Fogg	31	
Leah Abbott	33	
Andy Prasnal	34	
Francis Condon	36	
Senator Paul Harold	38	
Amy Goldsmith	41	
JoAnne O'Donnell	44	
Paul Connors	46	
JoAnne Cole	48	
Jim Coleman	. 49	

23 24 25

## PROCEEDINGS

2

3

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

=

7:30 P.M.

MS. MEANEY: I'd like to call this to order. This is an informal public hearing on the -- to hear your comments on a draft feasibility study for the Baird-McGuire Superfund site here in Holbrook, Massachusetts. I am Patricia Meanev. I am Deputy Director of the Waste Management Division in the Environmental Protection Agency in Boston. I'd like to take and introduce to you the people that are here from the state and EPA today. Bob Shatten, who is Project Manager, many of you I think already know on this Baird-McGuire site; Richard Cavagnero, who is the Superfund, Massachusetts Superfund Section Chief. Sitting here in the second row is Mel Hohman, who put his hand up, he's the Director of the Waste Management Division at EPA, Region 1. Behind him is Kate Connolly, from our community relations office, that's EPA, and Jim Coleman, who is Director of the incident response division here in Massachusetts, and Dorothy Brownlee who is the Project Manager for the state at Baird-McGuire and Pat Mullan, who has been distributing some sign-up sheets also from the state.

I'd like to take a few minutes first of all to make some comments to you on how we will proceed with the public hearing. Right behind me you'll see that there is a stenographer who is preparing a record. The transcript of this record for this public hearing is available in our

offices in the JFK Building and also in the libraries in Holbrook, Randolph and Braintree. Now if you want a copy for your own purposes, you should contact the stenographer directly and his name is Steve Kallock and you can come and talk to him during the course of the evening. I am going to call people to read into the record in order. If you have any problems, need any special help, or if you have not as yet signed up to be able to read into the record tonight, it's Kate Connolly in the white dress in the third row who put her hand up once again, that you should see about being able to read into the record.

=

When you come to read into the record which you will do at the podium over here, I'm going to ask you to give your name and give your affiliation. I am also going to ask you to limit your comments to ten minutes only. Now that means you may have to summarize if necessary and you may need to submit other details in writing. And what Bob Shatten has asked me to announce here is that the full EPA address to which you should send your comments is in care of Robert Shatten, HAA, 1903, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Kennedy Building, Boston, 02203. Now there will be no questions and answer period during the course of the public hearing itself. Once the record is closed and providing there is time, we will all stay here in order to be able to answer your questions after the formal part of the

public hearing.

Now the public comment period lasts until close of business on September the 8th. That means that comments posted on or before that date will be considered a part of the public record. Once again, I'd like you to come to the front of the room and to speak up. I'm going to start this evening with representatives of the town and the task force. Together because there are two people, we will be giving them twenty minutes in total. So first of all, Frank McGaughey, who is Chairman of the Board of Selectmen.

MR. MCGAUGHEY: My name is Frank McGaughey, Chairman of the Holbrook Board of Selectmen. As we know this is a public hearing to accept comments on the safest and most permanent methods available for the clean-up at the Baird-McGuire hazardous waste site at 775 South Street in Holbrook. Since 1982 Holbrook town officials and those of surrounding communities have been acutely aware of the conditions existing at the Baird-McGuire site and on February 16th, 1982 so advised elected state and federal officials, as well as, state and federal agencies of the conditions. The Selectmen established a citizen's task force consisting of officials of the communities of Randolph, Holbrook and Braintree, and concerned citizens from throughout the district. This dedicated group has been meeting on a regular basis for more than a year monitoring the site and working closely in conjunction

with the United States Environmental Protection Agency, the (EPA) and the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Quality Engineering, (DEQE), other state agencies and officials from the three communities. The task force has been under the leadership of State Representative, Emmet Hayes in his capacity as Chairman. He has received the support and assistance of all the task force members, including, but not limited to, Assistant Chairman Dr. Conrad Jankowski of Holbrook, who also serves as Hazardous Waste Coordinator for the town; by Holbrook Fire Chief, William D. Marbel; State Senator Paul D. Harold; Holbrook Public Work Superintendent, Thomas Cummings, and Selectman Robert Andya. The Selectmen commend and thank the task force members for their extraordinary efforts and interest, with special thanks to Chairman Hayes and Assistant Chairman Jankowski.

The Selectmen have met frequently in recent days with Representative Hayes, Senator Harold, and Dr. Jankowski to discuss the position of the task force and the town of Holbrook on evaluating the options effectiveness and costs for cleaning up the site. The Selectmen insist that there be a continuing future role for the task force as long as clean-up work and monitoring is necessary at the Baird-McGuire site. We commend and thank the DEQE and the EPA personnel for their assistance during the past 48 months. We endorse strongly the remarks, suggestions, and requests that will be expressed

this evening by Representative Hayes, Senator Harold, Dr.
Jankowski and Superintendent Cummings. Dr. Jankowski of
Holbrook has been designated as spokesman for the Holbrook
Board of Selectmen and will also offer testimony this evening.
In addition, comments will be made by Superintendent Cummings
and Selectman Robert Powilatis, who also serves as a member
and Chairman of the Randolph-Holbrook, Joint Water Board. The
town of Holbrook, its residents and its neighbors must be at
all times protected from any dangers on or off the BairdMcGuire property, and the Selectmen will continue to insist
that this be guaranteed by the United States Environmental
Protection Agancy and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.
The Selectmen at this time defer the remaining time allotted
for our presentation to Chairman Hayes so that he may have
additional time to testify.

=

MS. MEANEY: Representative Haves?

MR. HAYES: Thank you. On behalf of the Baird-McGuire advisory task force, I would offer this evening the following comments and recommendations on the feasibility study presented to us a short while ago. The record of decision we believe should stress the use of technologies for the permanent destruction of contaminents over other alternatives which will cap or store the waste. Use of such destructive technologies must be accompanied by strict public safeguards, it must attain all appropriate, applicable and

relevant standards. The preferred alternative should, at a minimum, be characterized as a GHI category 3, which is referred to and described on pages 43 and 44 of the feasibility study which says that alternatives that attain or exceed applicable or relevant and appropriate federal and public health and environmental requirements.

1

2

3

4 5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The feasibility study identified several category 3 alternatives. We believe any modifications of the alternatives presented in the feasibility study should also reach that level of clean-up. Category 4 alternatives that do not attain applicable or relevant appropriate federal help and environmental requirements are clearly unacceptable for the residents of the affected community. Permanent destruction technology selected at the site must be given adequate testing in advance of the long design phase to demonstrate effectiveness, applicability, and the public health safeguard. Incineration, as an example, should be shown to work at the site before a multi-year design process begins. The selected technology at the site should be reviewed periodically to insure its effectiveness. Flexibility must be included in the record of decision to allow such a review. Given the rapid pace of technological advancement in the field of hazardous waste clean-up, the remedial action technology selected for Baird-McGuire must be reviewed periodically. We're suggesting every three years. To insure it as

effective and to guide against the implementation of an outdated and less viable alternative when better alternatives
become available. As technologies improve, the EPA needs to
be able to take advantage of such technological improvements.
The record of decision must provide the flexibility for such
a review. A mechanism must be established to provide for
this review and must be one which avoids the need for a
lengthy, exhaustive feasibility type study. The review
should be prepared by EPA and distributed to the DEQE, the
Department of Environmental Quality Engineering and the state
as well as task force members for review and comment.

The task force is not adverse or opposed to innovative technologies. For instance, biodegradation to be used at the site, provided that adequate public input and proper public health safeguards are considered. Recognizing the rapid changes in technology, the task force cautions the EPA against placing all of their eggs in one technological basket While we understand that one major technology must be selected and implemented, we also recommend that the site should serve as a vehicle for the exploration of other emerging innovative technologies such as biodegradation. The suggested clean-up schedules of all of the alternatives presented in the feasibility study suggest that portions of the site could be used for innovative projects. Before this can occur, it is essential that the public be given ample

notice and that strict public health issues are identified and addressed. We support the use of innovative technologies at this site if they offer a faster and safer clean-up, but only if the public is informed and that they meet strict public health guidelines.

2

3

5

7

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The task force believes that the record of decision must address and insure a process of public participation, not just the process of public notification. This should include an active, not a passive public role in the decision making process. The record of decision must include a formalized process for continued public participation at the site. The role of the current Baird-McGuire advisory task force should be clearly established, allowing for review of site decisions, including design documents, public health issues, work progress and worker safety. Adequate resources to guarantee technical review by the Baird-McGuire task force should be provided. We formally request that the sum of \$50,000 per year be made available to the task force for consultants and support personnel. Such appropriation should continue at a minimum throughout the design construction and initial implementation phases of the project. The EPA should also establish and maintain a memorandum of understanding with the public schools in Holbrook, Braintree and Randolph to educate school children as to the dangers of the site and as to the progress of the clean-up efforts. The site must

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS

not be used for the destruction, treatment, storage of any off-site waste. With two-thirds of the area occupied by a flood plain the site is simply too small for such use. We strongly request that the record of decision must explicitly forbid additional waste from coming onto the site and complicating the problems that we already have there. The record of decision must contain language to insure the constant state-of-the-art monitoring of air quality, ground water and surface water contaminants. Since the contamination of this site was discovered, the quality and safety of drinking water has been the paramount concern of the citizens of the area. As clean-up activity increases at the site, questions will undoubtedly arise concerning the quality of surface and ground water, as well as ambient air purity. It is essential that the record of decision include a comprehensive testing program to monitor air quality, water quality, and ground water contaminants. The record of decision should define the roles and allocate responsibilities between the federal and state agencies.

The alternatives involving incineration raise significant air quality and public health concerns. Documentation must be provided by the EPA to conclusively demonstrate that no adverse public health impacts will occur due to stack gas emissions. Monitoring systems must be state-of-the-art and continuous. More importantly, these decisions involving

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS
(301) 363-0064

1 2 3

4 5

7 8

9

11

13

15

17

19

21

22 23 24

the public's health should not be compromised by future financial constraints within the agency. Given the necessity of such rigorous monitoring, it is suggested that it may be cost effective for the EPA to design and construct an on-site acute toxics testing facility to detect the presence of low levels of toxics chemicals. It must be noted that this site has all but 27 of EPA's 129 priority pollutants. It will be necessary to monitor and test for these pollutants well into the next century. Such a facility should include the capability to test for dioxin and for air emissions, as well as extremely low levels of other toxics. It is recommended that state authorities be given the responsibility of staffing and maintaining such a facility upon completion of the construction phase. Water supply issues. During the remedial investigation and feasibility studies, there were uncovered numerous related water supply issues which we believe require further investigation. It is requested that the EPA conduct a comprehensive study to investigate those issues. Such issues should include but are not limited to the restoration of the South Street wells. The possibility of restoring the Donna Road well field, and the monitoring and improving the water quality in Lake Holbrook, Sylvan Lake and the Richardi Reservoir. The advisability and practicality of diverting or relocating the Cochato River must be reviewed by the EPA. Finally we believe that it is imperative that if alternative

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS
(301) 363-0064

6 7 8

10

13

15

17 18

20 21 22

4M is the final clean-up alternative selected in the record of decision, or of any of the other alternatives, that they must be given a thorough risk assessment. Since it appears that the alternative selected may include many separate components selected from other alternatives, we believe it's necessary to completely review the overall public health issues surrounding the selected alternative. A DTL public health assessment must be conducted prior to the implementation of any alternatives. Finally in closing, I wish to thank EPA for working so closely with our organization. We ask that you look very closely at our recommendations. We believe they're absolutely necessary for a safe and speedy clean-up at the Baird-McGuire site. Thank you.

MS. MEANEY: Thank you very much. The next speaker is Louise Schofield.

MS. SCHOFIELD: I thought I was going to follow -- it's pretty hard to follow --

MS. MEANEY: Excuse me, Louise, could I just ask
you to come down and speak here so that we can get your
comments recorded. Sorry, but -- Go ahead, thank you. Would
you identify yourself? The center one.

MS. SCHOFIELD: The center one?

MS. MEANEY: Could you wait just once, Louise, we're just having a -- okey, it's fine.

MS. SCHOFIELD: I'm Louise Schofield, I'm a

Braintree resident who has been a member of Pure, the People United to Restore the Environment. I really thought I was going to speak after everybody else was heard who had some authority here, and after hearing Representative Hayes, I rather think we're in pretty good shape, because they certainly are to be commended by the task force for what they have prepared as far as protecting our interest. Two things come to my mind which he touched on. One is the protection of the Richardi Reservoir. Now my feeling, and again, I'm just a resident who has no scientific or environmental knowledge, but my feeling is that we should have some provision in there that the Cochato River would never be tied in again to our drinking water, the Richardi Reservoir. And as I understood in some of the earlier studies that were done. they had indicated that the contaminants from the Cochato River had just reached the border of where they would have contaminated Richardi Reservoir, so if we open that river again, the Cochato River again, I can't see that we have much guarantee that we're not going to be involved in polluting our drinking water. This brings up another topic that no one ever seems to want to address, and that is, we talk about this whole area being a flood plain, and that the multiple contaminants that we know are already in this area; we, for whatever reason, never consider the feasibility which is a possibility of joining the MDC. Now we know that statewide

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS
(301) 363-0064

5

7

=

9 10 11

12

15

17 18 19

20

22 23 24

practically 50% of our drinking water is contaminated. Braintree and Holbrook and Randolph are among the communities that were in the initial group that formed the MDC group, and back as early as 1971 the state put out a proposal for us to join the MDC and, for whatever reason, I guess maybe they weren't as aware then of the hazardous wastes that were coming into our drinking water, they turned down a proposal from the MDC. Now I understand from Senator Harold and some of the other political figures, that that option could still be open, and I see other towns that aren't even contingent to Boston, which is the original group, are joining MDC. Now if our Great Pond is an adequate source of some water, then why not use that without pumping out this water from Richardi Reservoir that has been fed by the Cochato Brook or River, whatever you call it, for the last 72 years. So that would be my concern and I don't know why no one will ever consider that feasibility, we keep talking about what we're going to do about the contaminants when we have an alternative. So that was one of the things.

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

14

15

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

The other, again as I say I speak not from any knowledge or scientific knowledge or any kind of knowledge except just off the top of my head, this business of burning some of these pollutants I think I agree with Representative Hayes, this should never be done unless we have some kind of an experimental testing place, preferably not in Holbrook.

I mean, they ought to take it out to some desert to test it, because after all, this is a pretty densely populated area, and if these contaminants get into the air, no telling where the wind is going to carry them. So I appreciate what our task force has done, but it said that the apathy of people in general is so great that if it weren't for these dedicated people there would be nothing really concrete done to protect our interests. So I thank them, and hopefully we'll pursue the right line. Thank you.

MS. MEANEY: The next speaker is Conrad Jankowski. DR. JANKOWSKI: I am Dr. Conrad Jankowski, I am the Holbrook Hazardous Waste Coordinator. I am also the liaison person for the Holbrook Board of Selectmen, and Vice Chairman of the Baird-McGuire task force. And Representative Hayes has covered most of the area that the Selectmen and I agree with. The only thing I can do is echo his statements and strongly reinforce his statements that we want a permanent clean-up, not a temporary capping, not a temporary storage. We want the most rigorous safety tests to be made that can possibly be made, and we want the best technology that's available not only in 1986, but 1988, 1990, 1992, because we're still going to be cleaning up, as was said before, well into the next century. And to echo Mrs. Schofield, who just spoke here a moment ago, we want to be sure that any technique that we use out on the hazardous waste site is thoroughly

> EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS (301) 363-0064

1 2 3

5 6

7 9

10 11 12

13 14 15

> 16 17

18 20

> 21 22 23

tested before it goes into operation on that hazardous waste site. Thank you.

MS. MEANEY: Thank you very much. Henry Cole? DR. COLE: My name is Dr. Henry Cole. I am the Senior Scientist for the Clean Water Action Project, and before I start my statement, I would like to say that the task force that's been established as a result of. I think the tremendous citizen response at a hearing more than a year ago, is something very unique around this country. I have, in my job, I get to visit many communities dealing with Superfund sites, and I would have to say that the task force that we have here seems to have promoted the best information flow and the best process that I've seen around the country. And I've heard other people within the agency say the same thing. Now having said that, I want to say that it's essential that the process continue. And this is particularly important right now because I understand that the EPA wants to come out with a record of decision prior to the close of the fiscal year, September 30th, and frankly the information that's been presented so far in the feasibility study and several other addendums is not really sufficient to make a detailed decision about which technology or which approach to take. And I think it would be absolutely wrong to come out with a record of decision which chose a particular approach in great detail and did not remain open and flexible so that

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS
(301) 363-0064

1 2 3

3 4

6

8

=

10

13 14 15

16

18

20

22

25

the task force could continue to play an active role and the community as well. Now let me get to some specific comments on the feasibility study.

First of all we believe that the goals set forth for remedial action in the feasibility study are too narrow. We would like to see some additional goals. And let me just read what we think at Clean Water Action Project, the goals of clean-up should be. Number one, the clean-up must protect public health and the environment on a permanent basis. We think this echoes the statement that's been heard over and over again in the community. And by protecting public health and the environment, we mean that standards have to be met. The clean-up must be conducted in a way that does not impose new and substantial risks to the community, and should minimize disruption of natural resources. Three, contaminated ground water in the area must be restored as a potential drinking water source in a reasonable period of time. This goal is not addressed nor even given in the feasibility study And the clean-up should allow the site to be used once again in the future as a normal and productive part of the community. That means, that precludes certain types of out of sight, out of mind clean-ups. To meet these goals, the contaminated zones at the site must be treated using technologies which permanently destroy or detoxify toxic chemicals. Methods that rely primarily on containment, such as clay caps,

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS
(301) 363-0064

4 5 6

7 8 9

10

13

16

18

20

23

25

hydrodynamic barriers, slurry walls are not acceptable. We similarly reject on-site landfilling or long term storage of hazardous wastes and contaminated debris and soils.

Let me comment on alternative 4M. We are pleased that this was added at the last moment. It is certainly a step in the right direction in that it does consider a method to permanently destroy much of the waste at the site. And it has an advantage over previous alternatives such as 3B and 4 that would use a landfill to temporarily store hazardous waste. So that 4M would eliminate some of the risks and costs associated with temporary landfilling.

However, we cannot at this time endorse 4M because we have a number of serious concerns that have not been addressed in the record. We note that 4M is not actually presented in the feasibility study. It was released in an ad hoc manner by EPA and lacks the detailed assessment that citizens, the task force and the agency itself will need to fully understand the alternative and its implications. We also think that the agency should examine some other permanent treatment methods, methods other than incineration. For example, perhaps at part of the site, chemical destruction methods and biodegradation can be used. We believe that the rod should be flexible with regard to the choice of permanent treatment and EPA should maximize opportunities for citizens to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of the alternatives.

Some more comments on incineration. Incineration offers the benefit of permanently destroying organic substances at the site. However, the feasibility study and the addendum to it presents very little information on the risks of incineration We note that there are a variety of thermal destruction processes, infrared destruction, pyrolysis, fluidized bed combustion, circulating bed combustion, rotary kilns, et cetera. Each of those technologies is different with regard to public health risks, availability, side effects, such as noise levels pre-treatment requirements, demonstrated destruction efficiencies, the length of time that the treatment will have to last and on and on. Now, EPA needs to evaluate all of those questions, and needs to involve the citizens of the community and the task force in that kind of assessment.

Let me give some specifics. First of all, if incineration or other type of treatment is used at the site, I want to echo what Mr. Hayes said, that the EPA and the state must sign an agreement or institute some type of legal procedure that insures that no material from off the site, such as currently generated hazardous wastes, comes onto this site. That would be an absolute travesty of justice in this community where citizens have faced, without their choice, the risks of hazardous wastes that have been illegally dumped all over this site for 70 years. EPA must assure that adequate demonstrations are conducted using samples from

> EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS (301) 365-0064

1 2 3

4 5 6

7

8 9 10

11 12 13

> 18 19 20

21 22 23

24

Baird and McGuire before commitment is made to specific technology. EPA must require comprehensive test burns once the facility is installed at the site. The test burns must assure near zero discharges of dangerous substances, including organic and inorganic substances and a destruction of organic compounds with a state-of-the-art efficiency. We're talking six, seven, eight or nine nines. And another concern is the metals. Some of the metals that are in the soil may have volatilized and perhaps formed submicron particles in this incineration unit, or in any incineration. It's imperative that the type of testing that can capture those particles and gases be done. Otherwise, you may give the facility a clean bill of health when, in fact, you haven't had the proper instrumentation or methods to see what's really there in terms of the metals. We're going to be giving more detail about that question in the future.

Now let me talk about excavation of the soils. We are concerned that 4M as it stands may leave substantial quantities of contaminated soil in place. EPA's memo of August 20th describing alternative 4M, states that the excavation of hot spots only, 190,000 cubic yards, will remove 95% of the total mass of contaminants from the soil. However, there is little evidence to back this claim. The 95% figure is apparently based on the unsubstantiated assumption that average contaminant levels in soils to be excavated

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS
(301) 363-0064

1 2 3

5 6

7

=

9 10

12

14

16

18

20

have a concentration that is a hundred times higher than soil: that would not be excavated. We don't feel that there's been much documentation for that assumption.

The effectiveness of the clean-up, the time necessary for ground water treatment, depends on the portion of contaminant mass that is actually removed. Unless the 95% contaminant mass removal can be objectively and quantitatively related to the 190,000 cubic yard figure, we believe that EPA must err on the side of safety. Now one alternative would be to do extensive soil sampling during the excavation. So that if you find as you remove material that there is more contamination than you thought, higher concentrations that you would have a contingency to remove additional materials.

MS. MEANEY: Excuse me, Dr. Cole, your ten minute period is up. If you would summarize.

DR. COLE: Summarize?

MS. MEANEY: Summarize and come to conclusion, thank you.

DR. COLE: And the final point that I'd like to make is that the feasibility study really doesn't do justice to the whole subject of the ground water circulation system and in closing I'd like to say that you have to assure that an adequate portion of the ground water that's moving through the site is recovered. We have not seen much documentation

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS
(301) 363-0064

9

11

1

2

3

5

12

15 16

19

21 22 23

for a 95% figure or a 90% figure. It is critical that the system be designed with much greater knowledge of what's really going on at the site. And we hope that that will be part of the studies to come. So thank you very much for the opportunity to speak and let's hope we get an excellent cleanup of this site. Thank you.

MS. MEANEY: Thank you, Dr. Cole. The next speaker will be Robert Powilatis.

MR. POWILATIS: Thank you. That's all it was, was a switch, huh? My name is Bob Powilatis, and I'm a Selectman in Holbrook, and I'm also Chairman of the Joint, Randolph-Holbrook Water District. The remarks I'll make tonight represent the position in the judgment collectively of the Randolph-Holbrook Joint Water Board and relate specifically to the effect Baird-McGuire has had on the loss of water due to the shutdown of the South Street wells and also in relation to the diversion of the Cochato River. The Baird-McGuire Chemical Facility has placed a severe burden on the joint water works of the Randolph-Holbrook Water Treatment Plant and its distribution system. Baird-McGuire caused the shutting off of the three South Street wells in Holbrook which were an excellent water source providing up to 2.3 million gallons of water a day. The South Street wells served both Southern Holbrook and backfed into Randolph and thus created less demand on the joint water treatment plant at Pond Street

> **EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS** (301) 363-0064

1 3

8

10 11

12 13 14

> 15 16

> 17 18 19

20 21

> 22 23

24

in Randolph which services the remaining population of the three communities of Braintree, Randolph and Holbrook. Since 1983, the water treatment system has been overtaxed to provide all the water that serves the three towns. As a result of the effect Baird-McGuire has had on the South Street wells, we require a supplemental water supply to replace that which was lost from the South Street wells. We want the EPA to treat the ground waters of the South Street wells so that some day, whenever that might be, the ground water will be again a usable water source to the system. We also want the EPA to study and place back into service the Donna Road well field to provide an immediate replacement of our lost South Street wells. To initial testings conducted so far at Donna Road, there appears to be ample and excellent water quality supplied free of any pollutants other than iron and manganese, which can be simply removed by current state-of-the-art treatment methods at the well head. We also want EPA to divert the Cochato River as it passes through the Baird-McGuire site. The Cochato River is a viable water source for the Richardi River, which is the back-up of the towns water supply for the towns of Randolph, Braintree and Holbrook. Since 1983, the Cochato has been diverted to drain directly into the ocean. We cannot tolerate this waste of the Cochato to continue. No known technology is available or reliable enough to assure no hazardous pollutants will flow into our

2

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

water supply if the Cochato River is utilized again. The Cochato, therefore, must be diverted around the Baird-McGuire site. In conclusion, the members of the Braintree, I mean the Randolph-Holbrook water district request that EPA take the necessary steps to supplement our water supply by placing the Donna Road well field back into service and to divert the Cochato River around the Baird-McGuire site and to include these combined actions under the recommended alternative for remedial action for the Baird-McGuire site. Thank you.

MS. MEANEY: Thank you very much. Is Senator Paul Howard here? Harold, excuse me. Arthur Bleakney?

MR. BLEAKNEY: I'm Arthur Bleakney, I'm representing nobody but myself, I'm just a resident. I have a lot of concerns about this whole thing, I've looked through the proposals and I really don't like any of them. I think it's just a shame that it can't just be taken out of here, everything is on site, and it just goes to show what a terrible problem pollution is once it's in the ground. And I would like to see the EPA broaden its goals and not just take care of this one site, but I'd like to see them prevent this sort of thing from happening again, look at every business in this town and the surrounding towns, see if anything is going on. Your goal is supposed to be to protect the environment and thereby protect our health. I think they should do everything to accomplish that goal. This -- there's a lot of

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS
(301) 363-0064

1 2 3

4 5 6

6 7 8

9

11

13

15

16 17 18

19

21 22

23 24 26

things about this Holbrook, this Baird and McGuire site that disturbs me, the fact that these wells were drilled so close to that site. I think one of them is within 700 feet, after a while they found some pollution, but I think they continued to use the others. It took them a long time before they finally checked the water for all the different chemicals, and even after they discovered this site, they told us that our water is being checked every week, and everything. What they didn't tell us is our water was being checked every week for things like bacteria count and stuff like that, and it was not being checked for all these contaminants, and if you don't check directly, specifically for arsenic or whatever, you're not going to find it. I think I'd like to see a lot more being done to prosecute the people that made the big profits out of this, I don't know how they just get away. They seem to get away with just walking away from it. It seems like the EPA can't even get a list from them of former employees. They can't get a list of what chemicals they used. They just seem to thumb their nose at the whole thing.

A lot of people don't believe there's a real problem in Massachusetts, but there is. They'll tell you that Holbrook's cancer rate is no greater than the rest of Massachusetts, and a lot of people relax, but what people don't realize is that Massachusetts has a cancer rate that's 15% above the national average. This is a state that is a

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS
(501) 563-0064

1 2 3

5

8

10

12

14

16

17

18

20

22

23

state that is a leader in medical and educational areas, these figures should be the opposite. It would be a wonderful thing if you could walk into a cancer ward and let one-third of the patients just go home.

There's so much, things I think are wrong in this state. I think there's an awful lot of corruption in this state, a lot of incompetence. I think wherever you get a high amount of corruption, you will have a high cancer rate. I think the corruption stretches all the way from the meat inspector in Braintree that was found a few years ago taking bribes, all the way to these people that are throwing this pollution right in the ground, getting away with it and officials that seem to look the other way, and I think it goes all the way to a medical system that the Board of Registration that won't even police themselves and get rid of some of these doctors that are doing so many unnecessary operations and no doubt probably telling some people they have cancer when they really don't even have it. I'm disturbed about all these sort of things. I would like to see an investigation, I would like to see the EPA really do their job, I know it's tough under this, especially under the Reagan administration. I know you've got big business really fighting you, but I'd like to see the people support the EPA more, insist that they do their job more, and then back them up. I think any politician that's on our side, that will

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS
(301) 363-0064

1

2

3

6

7

8

Q

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

=

stand up to business and not let them come out with all the phony public relations schemes, it seems like they'll spend more money on that than they will cleaning up the mess and protecting people's health. Sometimes I even think the EPA ought to change their name to Industrial Public Relations.

In conclusion, we have a constitutional right to life in this country and no business has the right to take it away from us. Thank you.

MS. MEANEY: Thank you, Mr. Bleakney. The next speaker will be George Krim.

MR. KRIM: Good evening, everybody. I'd like to make a statement for the record, please.

MS. MEANEY: Would you give your name and affiliation, please?

MR. KRIM: Yes. My name is George Krim and I am a resident of Holbrook, having resided here for over twentythree years. I am also President of Adolf Bauer, Inc., which occupies the property adjacent to Baird and McGuire. Our company employs about fifty-five people. On behalf of Adolf Bauer, it's employees and local residents, I would like to extend my concern about the method of disposal of industrial waste at the site. I would like assurances that the methods employed to dispose of the industrial waste will not be harmful or injurious to the health of our employees and local residents. I am skeptical of alternate 4M because it says,

> **EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS** (301) 363-0064

2 3

5

7

=

9 10

11 12

> 13 14

> > 15 16

> > 18

19 20

21 22

"It is designed to minimize present or future threats." I want to be sure that it eliminates any threat, present or in the future. We are afraid that the methods employed have not been tested as to their effect on human beings. Basically, we do not want our employees and local neighbors to be guinea pigs. I strongly recommend and advocate that all decisions relevant to proposed methods of removal are duly cleared through the Holbrook task force, and that the task force provide ongoing input to our company and local residents about these decisions. May I also take this opportunity to thank this committee for allowing me time to make this statement.

MS. MEANEY: Thank you very much. The next speaker will be Thomas Cummings.

MR. CUMMINGS: Thomas R. Cummings, Superintendent of Public Works in the town of Holbrook. Some of the comments I'll make tonight were spoken of previously by Representative Hayes and members of the Board of Selectmen. It concerns my official address, a total commitment by Federal and State agencies to implement a total clean-up program that will insure the protection of health in the environment for the citizens of the town of Holbrook and the surrounding communities. This commitment, not only shall serve on a basis of the ongoing work, but will extend to the future years with the necessary funds, personnel and expertise to

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS
(301) 363-0064

3 4

monitor, and continue whatever long range plan may be necessary for a final closure.

I have a concern of the Lake Holbrook's sewer interceptor, which flows directly alongside the Cochato River and Sylvan Lake. The interceptor should be considered at all times to be a leeching program with the contamination which it may have infiltrated it, and which has a direct bearing on the Cochato River and the downstream waterways. In the relationship to our water supply, the towns of Randolph and Holbrook have lost a water source capable of producing over two million gallons per day. Resources and monies to obtain other supplies for reopening of the Donna Road well field, with a new state-of-the-art treatment facility shall be necessary for the future demands of both the towns of Randolph and Holbrook. Thank you.

MS. MEANEY: Thank you, Mr. Cummings. Anne Gordon?

MS. GORDON: I didn't think I'd have to get up here
at first, but I've been very concerned about the chemical
content and have asked about it at least ten years ago. And
I think in order to prevent another Baird-McGuire, the EPA
should require at least monthly tests of the chemicals in
the waters and what parts per million or whatever chemicals
are dangerous to the population, and I think that would
prevent future Baird-McGuires.

MS. MEANEY: Thank you very much. The next speaker

will be Walter Fogg.

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. FOGG: Good evening. My comments, I am Walter Fogg, a resident of Braintree. My comments tonight are really about participation. And, first of all, let me say all of us appreciate, I think most of us anyhow, your efforts, the EPA's efforts, the task force efforts, to clean up the environment and to minimize the health risks of this toxic site.

But I find it very difficult as a citizen to have something in form and concrete to say about the alternatives for cleaning up the site. I appreciate being asked tonight, but at this stage in our deliberations, the alternatives are just abstract design possibilities, some of which are based upon theories and data that are themselves subject to some controversy. I think we would perhaps get more public participation and more informed debate if we would allow public review meetings after the decision of alternative modes of cleaning up the site was made. Then we could possibly find too, whatever decision was made by the EPA if need be and do this before the decision is etched in stone and is difficult to backtrack. This way, it seems to me, to allow public participation after the decision would make the process much more rational and certainly make citizens like myself more comfortable with making comments. It would also make the EPA and the government more accountable to the public.

As I understand it, the implementation of the cleanup of Love Canal involved very inadequate coordination and
cooperation between government agencies, and it took much
longer than what they expected with a great deal of confusion
and people stepping over each other. And I just want to make
sure that does not happen in this particular case and the only
way to prevent that, it seems to me, is to not simply have a
task force, but make sure the task force holds open meetings
and everybody stays well informed.

Please allow me to remind people of something which I think might get lost. Namely, that the judgment of the extent of the risks involved in each clean-up plan we have before us, the judgment of the risks involved is a technical judgment, made by competent engineers and decision theorists. That is really a technical judgment. But, whether a certain risk level is acceptable, is the public's decision. It's my decision and your decision, that should be made through the continuous political process and open meetings.

Whether the engineers at General Motors can build a car with these kinds of specifications with this kind of safety and so forth is, of course, a technical engineering decision, but whether I buy the car is my decision, my value judgment. So, likewise, whether we buy this, whatever this is by way of alternative to clean up the site is really our decision and ought to be made through a continuous political

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS
(301) 363-0064

1 2 3

10 11

13 14 15

16

18

19 20 21

22 23 24

process. The decision that balances the risks to life and health against economic costs is really again, as I say, a value judgment not a technical one. Given the costs, only we, the people in this area, should decide how much safety we want. Thank you.

MS. MEANEY: Thank you, Mr. Fogg. Leah Abbott?

MS. ABBOTT: Good evening, my name is Leah Abbott.

I am a resident of Holbrook, a member of the task force and
a member of PURE. Tonight I am speaking to you on behalf of
PURE. PURE would like to advocate the following:

- A permanent, that permanent clean-up technologies that will eliminate the source of contamination and low risk to the public's health and safety.
- That innovative up to date and proven technology should be used with public approval.
- That new testing and evaluations of the site should be done when new technologies are available.
- 4. Treatment and temporary storage only for Baird-McGuire waste.
- Public participation and decision making roles throughout the entire cleaning process.
- 6. Flexibility in the final clean-up option, the record of decision in order to allow for better design and clean-up plans that become available and meet with community approval.

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS
(301) 363-0064

1

6

9

=

11 12 13

14

17

19

21 22 23

24

7. Constant monitoring of the contamination levels and clean-up with a citizen participation role to direct any change deemed necessary during clean-up. And number

8. The importance of public education should be addressed in all our school systems. Our children need the education related to the dangers of this site. By educating our children perhaps we'll render intelligent adults capable of taking charge of their future. Thank you.

MS. MEANEY: Thank you, Leah. Andy Prasnal?

MR. PRASNAL: Good evening, my name is Andy Prasnal, I am a Holbrook delegate at large on the Baird-McGuire task force. And while I am in complete agreement with the task force recommendations, my three or four comments tonight represent my own independent thoughts as a Holbrook resident and in representing my immediate families living in Holbrook and Randolph. First, I think that the R.O.D. should address pre-plan procedures concerned with the flexibility of changing long-term clean-up directions based on either spending pre-test failures or proven innovative technology that comes down the way as we get into the actual implementation process.

The second thing, the R.O.D. should look at developing some sort of financial control mechanism to make the monies awarded in this project intact, for the entire time of the implementation, excuse me, either the including I should say, the design and implementation of this process.

> EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS (301) 363-0064

2 3 4

5 6

7

10 11

12 13 14

> 15 16

17 18

19 20

> 21 22

> 23 24

We don't want a consideration, or we don't want a situation happening. We're seven years into this process, there are no more monies for the project.

Thirdly, in an effort to continue this communication process, I'd like to be able to have the R.O.D. address quarterly the updates given via cable TV or various newspapers on an ongoing basis.

Fourth, the technologies that we're talking about in terms of alternatives, are talking at this point about neutralizing soils. If the alternative, if the R.O.D. should go with this type of a process, based on my readings and involvement, I would like to go for extra monies with respect to heat excavation as opposed to surface excavation in order to speed up the ground water purification process and also to prevent the long term migration of pollutants through the cracked bed rock.

And finally, the environmental clean-up projects that are ongoing throughout the United States is becoming a very, very big business here in the United States. And, in light of that fact, I think that the R.O.D. should address the possibility at some point of delegating this project to big business in terms of a private enterprise managing the process if five or ten years from now, with the agreement of Holbrook, Randolph, Braintree and the state it becomes more efficient to do so. Thank you very much.

> EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS (301) 363-0064

1 2 3

5

10

> 15 16 17

18 19

20 21 22

23 24

MS. MEANEY: Thank you very much. The next speaker will be Francis Condon.

MR. CONDON: I am going to time myself. My comments are for myself, my wife and my children, including my son,
David. I have to admit to you that I am not a member of PURE the Holbrook task force, or any other group that I should be a member of because I don't believe I have the patience to control my temper when red tape is thrown at me when it concerns the safety of my children.

My son, David, is two. The fact that he will see his third birthday is through the grace of God and the work of his doctors and nurses. He has a cancer called acute lymphositic leukemia. It may be debated for many years how he got that disease. I request that you consider it as a possibility that the hazardous waste dump up the street from my house is a contributing factor. It is a quirk of fate that one of his treatments occurred today.

Today one of his treatments, excuse me, today his treatment consisted of two needles into his spine, to remove fluid and to inject poisons into his system. Another needle, approximately an eighth of an inch wide was injected into his hip forcefully enough to break the bone and remove bone marrow. These items have to be tested. As I said, one of the items injected into his spine is a poison. The only way that the doctors can assure me that my son will live is to

control, is for a controlled poisoning of his system. The side effect of that is that he is at home right now. One of his treatments have a side effect of increasing his hunger. Another drug causes him to vomit. I am sorry that I have to bring these items to your attention, but my son has been robbed of one month of his life while he stayed in a hospital. The pain, the suffereing that he endured as an innocent child, the swings of his mood as a result of his chemotherapy are something that I cannot adequately describe to you. I ask you to imagine them happening to your children. I think God that it has not happened to your children. I think God that he has given his doctors the intelligence to deal with it.

7 8

Thankfully he has a type of cancer that if the percentages are with him he will live. The problem is that they don't know how long. His treatments are so radically new that no one has lived. I don't mean to be misconstruing the situation, but fifteen years ago if my son had been a victim of this disease, he would not have lived. Through the American Cancer Society, the Leukemia Foundation and other charities, the doctors have been able to come up with these treatments, giving us hope as parents that our boy will live a normal and healthy life. In short, what I am asking you, after giving you my background as a parent, may be outrageous to some, I am simply asking that the clean-up of this site be thorough and conducted as safely as possible, regardless of

cost. I have trouble justifying costs in other areas when it comes to the life and safety of my children. Not to do this would condemn adults and children of this community to the fate of my son and their possible death.

I thank you, those members who have been able to bring these items to the consideration of the EPA and the Federal government. I do not have the intelligence to do so adequately. I have only my heart. Thank you very much for your time and attention.

MS. MEANEY: Thank you very much, Mr. Condon. Senator Harold, I believe is here.

SENATOR HAROLD: I, first of all, want to thank the EPA and the State DEQE for the resources, both in personnel and time and otherwise, in helping to identify what for many of us has been an unknown hazard here in town, and now trying to find out indeed how we can clean up that hazard. I would like to reiterate the recommendations of the task force led by Representative Hayes and too, along with both the town officials and the residents, both of Holbrook, Braintree and Randolph; specifically as regards the continued public participation. I think this has certainly been highlighted, the need to continue this task force, both as an involved and fully participatory group, but also one that has the necessary funds to participate both with the technology and the personnel that may be required.

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS
(301) 563-0064

1 2 3

4

6 7 8

10

11 12 13

14

15

17

20

22

BAIRD & MCGUIRE
ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

BAI 001

BSEZ

I might point out the necessity for public participation is pointed out in two ways. First of all we want to benefit from the continuing technology that develops in this whole clean-up area, because as we know there's no replication of the Baird-McGuire site in the country. I would think that some of the things that will be done here in Holbrook will indeed be innovative. And as this whole process continues there may be even further innovations. So as the clean-up alternative is evolved and modified there will be a necessity for continued public participation. But also, even as a result of the recommendations that were made to us, specifically option 4M. This was put together, I think in some ways to meet a deadline, and as such did not have the necessary engineering back-up and indeed did not even address the resolution of the wetlands issue. So I think if we're going to have an actual resolution, it should be one that has both the engineering and conclusion on all issues involved. And, if not, it's going to necessitate a continued public participation.

On the issue of a realistic schedule, I think all of us when we saw schedules that would recommend as long as 40 to 50 years, I think that anyone with any common sense would tell you this would surely not be of benefit to the town of Holbrook. Because right now we benefit from the fact that we are a national priority, and we have the national

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS
(301) 363-0064

1 2 3

4 5 6

7

=

10

12

14

16

18 19 20

21

attention and that any clean-up that would go on for an extended period of time would really force us to on a constant basis reiterate and to try to continue that priority, which we know in politics is not always that easy and particularly with the funding sources that sometimes are reallocated might not be possible. As was mentioned earlier, there is necessity for continued monitoring because right now we do not know, I don't think anyone here, either the consultants or the EPA or DEQE can tell with any certainty what the results will be for the neighbors at South Street, what will be the results for the neighbors of Cochato River, or the unnamed brook or even those people further downstream. I think that again points out the necessity of continued monitoring to let people know as we clean up various sites, what the impact will be for the neighbors and indeed for the town. As regards the incineration site, I know that Representative Hayes has already mentioned that this is an option that we think is worth further consideration, but in any event, there should be no off-site waste disposed of at the South Street Baird-McGuire site.

And finally, I think it's been reiterated, that probably as the first priority that any clean-up has to be indeed a clean-up. A final destruction of the waste on the site and not just a storage. So we hope that while without recommending one of the named alternatives that these elements will continue to be part of the resolution of the Baird-McGuire

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS
(301) 363-0064

1 2 3

4 5

7

9 10 11

12

14

16 17 18

19 20 21

22 23 24

clean-up. And again I want to thank the EPA for their continued attention to the site and particularly to Winston who was down here just last week at the request of Representative Hayes and Congressman Donnelly to know first hand the issues involved here and the struggle we have in trying to recommend a clean-up proposal. Thank you.

MS. MEANY: Thank you very much. The next speaker will be Amy Goldsmith.

MS. GOLDSMITH: My name is Amy Goldsmith. I'm the Boston Director of Clean Water Action Project and a member of the Citizen's Advisory Task Force and I'd like to make a couple of statements. Some of it reiterating what the task force has worked so hard on in the past year and the goals that we want to achieve, but also to make some other points relative to the public participation. I think everybody's made a clear point that we want a permanent clean-up technology, but we don't want the slap-the-cat technologies here, if you want to call it that. We want something that's a permanent clean-up, but also doesn't transfer the problem from one community to another, or use a technology that, in fact, instead of putting it into our ground water, in fact puts it up into the air, which an incinerator or other options may pose that. And that's why we need, and it's very important that we have a public participation mechanism from the beginning to the very end. This task force, it's here for a

> EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS (301) 565-0064

2 3

1

4 5

7

8

10 11

12 13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23 24

BAIRD & MCGUIRE
ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

purpose. It wants to work together with the EPA and with the state, and it can't do that if the EPA or the state shuts the door on us after September 8th. We realize on one level there's not a legal avenue for us to force you to open that door other than going to the courts, but it would be a very big mistake for the EPA to not include the task force and the community in the design phase of the construction phase and the monitoring, not just of whether there are emissions coming out as a result of the clean-ups being done, but also an ability to say, "stop", we've had enough of this kind of technology, it's not working here, we have to sit down, reevaluate and relook at what we're doing here at the site. It's unclear to me from the discussions that have happened between the task force and the EPA and the state where that door is opening. And I just want to make sure that when the record of decision comes out, there's not just a flexibility in the technology that's chosen, but a flexibility in terms of how the public participation mechanism works out. And we realize that we're all learning at this stage, but I think that the Baird-McGuire task force is a model for us here, but also around the country.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

Something else that's really important in terms of the work that needs to be done here at the site, as I mentioned in terms of the monitoring in terms of the technologies, but also there's been a lot of discussion about the water, and

it's sort of inherent in Clean Water Action Project's name, is to make sure that we protect the water, and whether it was this man's son who drank water that was still contaminated or whether there was something that as parents had picked up and transferred to their sons and daughters. There are a lot of people in this audience from the stories that I've been told, time and time again, about family or personal health problems you don't know where they come from. And it may not all be the Baird-McGuire site. But these are personal stories that everybody carries and really need to be told in order to make sure that we work for the permanent clean-up. And I think we all have not just in our heart, but in our minds, the ability to get the right kind of clean-up here at this site. And I think as reflected in the kinds of long term efforts that the task force has made, that PURE has made, that Clean Water Action Project has made through our canvass staff, through the fliers that have come out, on everybody. There have been lots of volunteers, lots of people coming out, not just to hearings but involved in the day to day things that have been going on And that really reflects the long term commitment that we've made here toward getting a clean-up and we're just hoping, in fact, we want guarantees that the EPA and the state will make that same long-term commitment for the clean-up that we want to have here, and it has to be the community's decision as to the clean-up technologies, not just the EPA behind the

1

2

3

4

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

door that is opened later, after the decision has been made. We need access all through the process, and that is really the most critical point, because as was stated before, if that dialogue and cooperation doesn't happen now, the clean-up will slow down and, in fact, be ineffective and may be the wrong choice, and we don't want to have to backtrack on that.

So that's the statement I'd like to make, and I really thank the opportunity to speak, but also I very much appreciate Bob Shatten and all the other people at the EPA for all those endless meetings that we've all had to bear through, and the task force has just been wonderful, and I really appreciate being able to serve on that task force and work together in a cooperative effort. Thank you.

MS. MEANEY: Thank you, Amy. The next speaker is Johnne O'Donnell.

MS. O'DONNELL: My name is JoAnne O'Donnell, I'm a member of PURE and I am an alternate member of the task force. I have no prepared text -- as a public citizen. But as a public citizen, I have sat with the task force for over a year. I have listened to people who asked questions at the public meeting two weeks ago, questions about responsibilities, questions about whoever gave permission to open wells -- already permeated with a filthy lake and chemical companies -- there are no answers to these questions -- the fact that they are questions, I'd still like to have the answer.

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS
(301) 363-0064

1 2 3

6

9

11 12 13

14

16 17 18

19

21 22 23

I've listened to people talk about the flow of the Cochato as it runs downstream. I've listened to the experts tell us that Mother Nature is taking care of impurities as they go downstream, as it's collected in the till. I've also listened, and in 1960 this river was dredged and there was no till collecting the impurities. So what I've heard is, anything that was running, any contamination in the water downstream, ran straight through to the Richardi. And people have asked questions, where are, why is there not levels of pollution in the Richardi? Perhaps, because we drink it. I don't have the answers to this, but there are many answers that still remain unanswered.

What I'd like to ask in concurring is that if the EPA do allot us money, to continue to allow us to have a private consultant, that they do consider entertaining proposals relocating the Cochato River so in a flood condition you never have to worry about any of the impurities going downstream. Something else that I have heard is that there are more impurities going down the Cochato than from the Baird-McGuire site. -- There's more pollution after Baird-McGuire coming approximately from the land site. We have to assure that this never touches our water system again.

And in concurrence I would like to ask that you insure us a flexible R.O.D. -- in concrete. That we are allowed the new technologies as they are developed. Thank you.

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS
(301) 363-0064

1 2

3 4 5

6 7 8

9

11

13

15 16

18

20

21

23

MS. MEANEY: Thank you very much, JoAnne. Paul Connors?

MR. CONNORS: Thank you very much. My name for the record is Paul Connors. I am a member of the Randolph Board of Selectmen. I am also a member of the Randolph Board of Health. I am here to offer the town's support of the task force recommendation as well as compliment the task force on the work that they did in bringing the report forward.

I have some concerns, and my concerns are based primarily on being a member of the Board of Health and knowing what has happened with the environment. The environment, and I would just like to make some comments that are going to be directed to the APA, EPA and the DEQE.

The problems that we're having now affect the quality of life, and the quality of life as it applies to you and I as citizens in the communities in which we reside. And we're finding some problems, and these problems have been caused by big business. Well, I can't be bothered with the problems of big business, that they're creating and ruining our lifestyle, while they reap the profits. I think that what we have to do is to fight that and come up with some additional funding, and I am sympathetic to the EPA and DEQE in that on two occasions in Randolph when we've had areas that have been affected in Randolph that we've had to call in the EPA and the DEQE, there's a shortage of help, it

takes a long time to get something done. It continually goes to study, to committee, to task force and the problem continues I think the previous speaker got up and said something about nothing should be cast in concrete. I would suggest that any funding done should be open ended funding and something should be undertaken soon to start this project. Because to not move forward now and at least do something is to be in danger of falling back.

If we open-end funding and get something started in the area, clean up the problem as technology produces more problems in the area that we haven't uncovered yet, you can continually address it. It's too bad that it takes so long to clean something up and whatever is said now in the task committee report does not necessarily mean the problem is going to be cleaned up. You're going to clean up what is addressed now, but if you don't open-end the funds and something else is uncovered later, and you're going to go through a continual series of events as you are going through now.

So I think the report is good. I think something should be done, but I really would stress open-ended funding so that the project can be started now and not delayed any further. Thank you very much.

MS. MEANEY: Thank you very much, Mr. Connors.

Those are the people who have signed up to talk.

However, is there anybody else right now who would

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS
(301) 363-0064

6 7 8

5

11 12 13

14

10

15 16

18

21 22 23

like to stand up to speak?

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Yes, please come on down. It's a long walk. MS. COLE: I'm JoAnne Cole, 74 South Street. I've watched Baird-McGuire since it guzzled up on that lot down there on South Street. I watched the Selectmen as they moved and got us the Superfund money and I watched until I was restricted to go down there because it was so bad. I agree with Mr. Connors, the Selectman from Randolph. I don't see any lawvers that are here that represent the legal aspects of where the liability comes down to. Certainly Baird-McGuire has been labeled as the villain in the plot, but they weren't alone in this. They had a partner, and the partners were those manufacturers of those deadly and those awful contaminants that have left us to be financially and emotionally responsible for them. The Selectmen did go before and get additional funding and that funding went for, you know, the quick things that had to be done. But in the long range who was really liable? I would like to see EPA and DEQE begin to lobby, begin to go after either some kind of a lobbying effect that affect big business to the degree that they couldn't just sit back and be smug with the profits. When they researched this material they knew that it couldn't break down, they knew it wasn't biodegradable. We just, we may have bought the products, but we did not have that knowledge. I agree with what Mr. Connors says. It's about

time that we begin to go financially to find out who is certainly liable and who was partners with Baird-McGuire in leaving this awful mess for Holbrook to pick up after. Thank you.

MS. MEANEY: Is there anybody else that would like to make a comment now? Or read something into the record? Well before closing this formal part of the hearing I want to tell all of you and thank all of you for the extremely thoughtful and careful comments that have been made in this public hearing tonight. We have a great debt of gratitude to Representative Hayes and the task force that people throughout the evening have talked about in working so very hard and long on this, as we've gone through the many public meetings that have come thus far. We also appreciate the members of the community that have taken the time to talk tonight, and other members of the town administration. So thank you enormously for that, and Jim Coleman you wanted to say something on behalf of the state?

MR. COLEMAN: Yes, I just also want to thank
Representative Hayes, the Holbrook and other town officials,
the task force members and all the citizens who came out
tonight, who have spent apparently hundreds and hundreds of
hours working and studying this problem. I am very pleased
and DEQE is very pleased at the participation effort. We
believe that the task force is a model, and we support it

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS
(301) 363-0064

5

9

11 12 13

14 15 16

17 18

21 22

23 24 25

)

and will continue to support it, and thank you all very much for your comments.

MS. MEANEY: Did you want to have one more comment?

DR. COLE: I have a question.

MS. MEANEY: We're not answering questions now.

Do you want to read something into the record?

8 9

DR. COLE: No thank you. I just have a procedural in that you made the statement that you were commenting on draft feasibilities. I'm wondering what your procedure is from here on in. I know you're not answering questions, but if its procedural, explain exactly how this, how the comments go into the decision making and what happens and whether you're still intending to have a record of decision by September 30, to clarify that would be very helpful to me.

MS. MEANEY: I would be very happy to, let me however at this point, close the public hearing part of this meeting and I will go on the answer your questions.

(Whereupon, the hearing was adjourned at 10:45 P.M.

## REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before ENVIORMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

in the matter of: EPA-(TOWN OF HOLBROOK) BAIRD & McGUIRE SUPERFUND

were held as herein appears and that this is the original transcript thereof for the file of the Department or Commission.

Stare Kallale
Official Reporter

DATE: SEPT.8,1986

2

4

6

7

9 10

12