

Paul P. Parisi, Chm.; Eric G. Lowry, Vice-Chm.; Cos Giuffrida, Secy.; Walter J. Dreaher; Seb J. Passanesi; Rose Sbalcio; Alt. Louis Carta	MEMBERS PRESENT
Stephen T. Gionfriddo; Mary C. Woods; George L. Augustine; Anthony Gaunichaux	MEMBERS ABSENT
Chm. Paul P. Parisi, disqualified himself from participating on Item 1 of the Public Hearing and Vice-Chm. Eric G. Lowry acted in his place. Alt. Louis Carta was appointed to sit in Chm. Paul P. Parisi's place.	ACTING MEMBERS
George A. Reif, Dir.; Althea Rinaldi; Mary Lee Dorflinger	STAFF
Philip G. Bauer, Engr., Public Works Dept.; Robert Frank, Building Official; approx. 24 people in the audience	OTHERS

NOTE: THIS IS A PARTIAL SUMMARY OF THE PUBLIC HEARING OF AUGUST 12, 1981, DUE TO MALFUNCTION OF THE PUBLIC ADDRESS SYSTEM IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER COMPILED FROM A SERIES OF NOTES OF TRANSCRIBING SECRETARY, ALTHEA RINALDI. THIS IS NOT A VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT, ON ITEM # 1 RE: PRATT & WHITNEY APPLICATION. ANOTHER RECORDER WAS PROVIDED AND THE TRANSCRIPT WAS CONTINUED AND IS COMPLETED BY TRANSCRIBING SECRETARY MARY LEE DORFLINGER.

NOTE:
RE: TRAN-
SCRIBING

The following will be able to vote on the Pratt & Whitney Item I that is on the Public Hearing. Comms. Lowry, Guiffrida, Dreaher, Passanesi, Sbalcio, and Carta.

CHM. PARISI:

Announced that the Zoning Board of Appeals were holding their meeting up stairs. Appointed Comm. Carta to act for him because of his disqualification to participate on the Pratt & Whitney Application. Comm. Parisi is an employee of Pratt & Whitney. Vice-Chm. Lowry acted as Chairman in his place on this particular item.

VICE-CHM. LOWRY:

Asks the Secretary to read the legal notice.

SEC'Y. GIUFFRIDA:

THE MIDDLETOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION WILL HOLD A PUBLIC HEARING AUGUST 12, 1981, STARTING AT 7:00 P.M., IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, MUNICIPAL BUILDING, DEKOVEN DRIVE, MIDDLETOWN, CONNECTICUT, to consider the following:

1. Continued from previous meetings proposed Special Exception to expand landfill to provide for disposal of metal hydroxide sludge and filter cake for United Technologies Corp./Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Group Mfg. Div. located off Aircraft Road, in the I-3 Zone. Applicant/Agent A.E. Wegner, Ex. Vice-Pres.

VICE-CHM. LOWRY:

The legal notice appeared in the Middletown Press Friday, July 31, 1981, and Friday, August 7, 1981.

Atty. Robert Wise represented United Technologies Corp./Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Group Mfg. Div. located off Aircraft Road for its proposal to expand their landfill for disposal of metal hydroxide sludge and filter cake elaborated on their previous presentation. He answered some questions that were presented by MRE, Consultants for the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Mr. Norman May, an abutting property owner raised several questions about dredging, red oxide substances, dredging of wet lands. He wanted to know if anyone had analyzed these materials.

THE FOLLOWING TRANSCRIPTION IS BY MARY LEE DORFLINGER, RECORDING SECRETARY

ATTY. WISE:

Are we all set? O.k. Thank you. What we were talking about was the report itself. As I said there are very many positive factors and features in this report. The disappointment of the report is that no recommendations made. As a matter of fact, there is four options outlined and I'd just like to discuss for a few moments those with you. As you know, the Special Exception provision of your regulations says that the solid waste shall not be allowed over an aquifer or at a location where the solid waste might adversely affect an aquifer. And it would appear to us therefore that the significant question is whether the proposed landfill is going to be over an aquifer or significantly or adversely affect an, an aquifer. And I believe, one of the questions we submitted to MRE was, do they concur with all the other reports that say that there will be no impact on this northern aquifer by the expansion? I have been told orally by them that they do concur with that conclusion. Therefore, clearly, all the evidence submitted to date indicates that the expansion down here will have no impact whatsoever on the northern aquifer. The MRE report raises a question about a well in the southern portion down in here of the property. And in a moment I'd like to have the Vice-President from Geraghty & Miller, Mr. Vanderliden respond to that. But the, the concern that I have is that the options outlined, the first two options outlined in the MRE Report are number one to deny it without prejudice. And here they talk about, in no way is the denial based on the fact that an aquifer will be impacted except for one statement where they say that there should be some pump testing of any permeable units. And apparently, this 1944 well that they have located in the southern portion of the property, they believe maybe an aquifer. But there is no evidence that we know of that it is an aquifer. They have listed four other things that they believe should be done that would justify the denial. None of these are justifiable in our opinion under the regulations cited. But as to the first one, the southern aquifer, allegedly the southern well, the 1944 well, I'd like to call on Mr. Vanderliden to discuss the whole question of that particular well.

MR. FRITZ VANDERLIDEN:

Fine. My name is Fritz Vanderliden. I'm a, Vice-President of Geraghty & Miller, Groundwater Consultants. And I'd just like to take you briefly back through history of the groundwater exploration at the Pratt & Whitney site. As you recall the original site was, was called the Canal site and a groundwater study was carried out by the U.S. Geological Survey in the 1950's and the 1960's. This was documented in so called Canal Report that say, Bulletin by the U.S. Geological Survey which made a very good analysis of groundwater conditions at the site including compilation of well logs and geologic cross sections, etc. In the following years and when Pratt & Whitney took over the site, we became involved and did a considerable amount of groundwater exploration including test drilling and pumping tests which is still continuing to date. A year ago,

MR. FRITZ VANDERLIDEN: (Continued from previous page)

we were asked that Pratt & Whitney to study the total aquifer again, in view of the additional data that had become available since the original Canal report was written. And we convinced Pratt & Whitney that the best way to look at this whole situation was to construct a digital aquifer model incorporating all the information that we had which would give us a good idea of what conditions would be under pumping conditions and would also tell us how much additional water could be obtained from this aquifer. We then went through a period of several months where we compiled again all the information on plotted series of base maps with all this information including the thickness of the aquifer material, the depths of bedrock, permeability of the deposits, the water table contours and pumping test information and aquifer parameters. We then constructed the model and there was a report which was handed in to the group describing this whole model. I won't go into the technical details except I'd like to show you one map, two maps here that supply the results of this investigation. If I could stick down for it. The first map as shown on this board is a, is a map of the water table configuration of the aquifer. This is the property and these square lines indicate the grade that was used for the computer analysis. And we have shown here the configuration the water table under the present day conditions of pumping at the total rate of 3.2 million gallons per day. And the contour lines, these black lines here, indicate the configuration of water table. The dash lines, these here, indicate the direction of ground water flow and the vertical component. And as you can see, there are some cones of depression that have been formed by pumping the Pratt & Whitney wells. There's one here. There's one here and there's another one here at the HELCO facility where's a small amount of ground water pump. And if you look closely at this map, you see that the the water, the ground water in this area flows towards the the pumping wells as you would expect. However, if you go down to the southern part of the property, you see that the flow lines are these dashed arrow lines here, continue unabated directly to the Connecticut River which is the ultimate discharge point of this flow system. And this indicates that there is no effect at the present time. There is no ground water being diverted from the southern portion to the pumping wells at the present time. Comparing this with the second map which shows the maximum capacity can be obtained. And this map was constructed from the computer model and stressing them all to the utmost, in other words we, we pumped as much as we could without demoting the aquifer. If you pump to much, of course, the water levels would fall. And it wouldn't be wise to pump that much. So, we've brought it back to a reasonable maximum pumping rate and we have, we could add another, approximately nine million gallons per day at the northern portion off the aquifer leaving this pumping at this steady rate, what's pumping at the present time. And this again indicates what would happen under these pumping conditions again, the groundwater flow is towards the pumping wells as you can see. But we do have a groundwater divide between the well thirteen and the southern portion of the property. And there is no flow from this area towards these pumping wells. The flow is again directly to the Connecticut River. So, we feel pretty confident about this, that this shows a reasonable picture of what we can expect under these conditions. The, there's a question in the report by Middletown's Consultants about one particular well which is in that southern area. We did, in 1967, drill approximately a dozen or fifteen test wells in that property along the, along the river. We never found any aquifer material. There is some thin sand and most, most of it is pretty fine grained. But it's not adequate for Municipal supply or an industrial supply. You could pump small quantities of water out of it if you wish, domestic type quantities, a few gallons per minute but we don't consider it a an aquifer of interest. And this test well drilling did not show anything. And there was one well which, I won't show this map. A copy of this map was given to Middle-

MR. FRITZ VANDERLIDEN: (Continued from previous page)

town's Consultants. This is a, a base line, a base map showing contours on the bedrock based on all available information. And it can be seen that in this area, south of the, approximately 500 feet southeast of the existing ECM Site, is, is an old well which was drilled in 1944 for the Middletown Yacht Club. The record of this well is listed in the U.S.G.S. Bulletin and it's was constructed by private drilling consultant, was not constructed or installed by Geraghty & Miller, although it's stated that way in the report to the Middletown, to the Commission. That's an error. We, Geraghty & Miller wasn't in existence at the time. So, I can't take credit for that. Anyway, that well encountered a very deep bedrock at approximately 155 feet below sea level. However, the, the geologic log on that well is in question. It was compiled by driller. And driller's logs are mostly quite unreliable. And there is a notation on that log that said, there is 30 feet of gravel at the bottom of this hole. And this was, you know, there's a remark in your report to your, from your Consultants about this possible aquifer which might be there. We feel that, that is quite questionable. As you can see by these bedrock contours, there is a little deepening, a deep spot right on that edge is indicated by that well and on record. But the other records do not support that. And we do not find an extensive deep bedrock valley along that site. And here we've got the other control points. In addition, we also carried out in 1967, a size mix survey along the, at right angles to the Connecticut River underneath that ECM site, the proposed site at the time. That size mix survey checked out extremely well with the wells that were drilled at the time at the ECM area. And we feel quite confident that the, that the wells to be put in did go to bedrock and did not refuse on any other material. It's the (Inaudible)..agrees completely. So, we know this (Inaudible) situation exists but we don't feel that that is a, a situation where you could expect a large aquifer to be present as we have up to the north here and of course, also in the City of Middletown area. The, let's see, the plan is to install a series of monitoring wells below down-grading from the ECM landfill and the proposed extension to monitor groundwater fluctuation, groundwater levels and groundwater quality which I think would be adequate to monitor the, the effluent and any kind of water level fluctuation to see what would happen with time. I think that sort of summarizes the, my, the remarks I wanted to make. The main thing that your Consultants agree upon is that the modeling study is, is correct and they have no real problem with it. And we feel also confident that that is the situation. That about concludes my remarks. I'd be happy to answer any questions that anybody might have.

ATTY. WISE:

Thank you Mr. Vanderliden. One of the other things that the MRE people have stated is that there is additional field and laboratory work that could be done to give confirmation to certain data. However, I think it's noteworthy that they also say that in quotes, "Using a different methodology" our analysis, that is, MRE's analysis has confirmed that conclusions reached by P & W A. Well, with respect to the data that's been used, Dr. Clarence Welty did a great deal of the testing of the metal hydroxide material of the soil, permeability of the soil and other factors. And he is here with us to discuss some of the assumptions that were made and some of the tests that were done. Dr. Welty.

CHM. LOWRY:

Would you please come up here to the microphone?

DR. CLARENCE WELTY:

Thank you. I'm Clarence Welty, Consulting Engineer in Soils and Foundations.

DR. CLARENCE WELTI: (Continued from previous page)

I'm just going to discuss briefly the, the variables that, that effect the groundwater stream. In this case, they are the quality of the leachate which has been discussed, the amount of flow in the groundwater stream and what I believe was not mentioned in the report by your consultant that the amount of leachate. In reviewing first the, the, the amount of flow and the permeability of the ground, I think there is some question on this. I would say that we had laboratory testing and there is always a question of whether laboratory tests are representative. But I would say that every, every test that we did was corroborated by a valuation of the groundwater flow, namely the amount of storm water infiltration. And reviewing that with the thickness of the saturated stratum to see that if we were in the right ball park and in every instance, our laboratory values were corroborated. A third corroboration is my personal experience in running perhaps a thousand or more of these permeability tests under different conditions and under different types of soil. The soils that we ran based on their grain size closely matched the permeability of a number of tests that we had previously. So, they, they were, there was corroboration. As I said, I think an, an earlier, at an earlier hearing, that, there is a plus or minus 25% which is considered good by most soils engineers. The other item, the leachate testing, there's some mention in the report about leachate testing and to its representativity. I would say this, the leachate test which I did was a back up to tests performed in accordance with DEP and EPA standard which is required for the application. My test was, as I said, a back up. However, it does fit into the band of test results from Minges laboratory. It does, it's not exactly the same nor would it ever be exactly the same. These are, these kind of tests fall in, in, in bands and if you fall within the band of that test, it's considered acceptable. The third item is a quantity of, of leachate in which I believe were very conservative. We assumed that 10% of the total precipitation penetrates the ground and penetrates the layer of, of filter cake and sand. In other words, it normally on a flat piece of ground 40 to 50% of the, of the infil- or water that comes down infiltrates, we assume in this case, that 20 to 25% of that would fall on a three to one slope through a **layer** of hard pan and then through a layer of clay which is very conservative. I only say this because in, in the report there is mention of a, a sensitivity analysis in which we, you look at variables and if these, these variables and see how they can change and see how it effects the analysis. And I would just cite an example of this and go through an analysis of the permeability, for example, which would alter the results. Basically, if there, if this was reduced by 50% which is far in excess of all the corroborating analysis. And if looked at the leachate and said that the leachate would go to the maximum, we, we still have a factor of safety of 1.5 excluding an, this factor of safety, is relating to the quality of water as we go in, into the groundwater stream. In other words, does it become potable or at least level to the base quality of water. And what I am saying is that we have such a conservative factor and the amount of leachate that the probable factor of safety is in fact three or more. The only other item I have is the, is the question of adequacy of borings and requirements for additional boring which I mentioned in the consultant's report. But I believe that on page, I think it's 5 dash 2, they indicate in fact that the borings take a more adequate for the local geo-hydrological evaluation. Are there any questions?

CHM. LOWRY:

Yes. You just mentioned the, the water entry forming the leachate. (Inaudible) ...of clay. Is this a natural clay or is this intended to be the barrier? Where does the clay come from?

DR. CLARENCE WELTI:

Basically, let me, let me explain that a little more clearly. I thought I was sliding through that. The, the plan calls for slopes of approximately three to one. And on these slopes, and I don't have the detail in front of me, I believe it's called for two feet of hard pan soil to be compacted on these slopes. But then beneath that hard pan would be the filter cake sand mix which I think I may have called clay. That is the material through which when water flows, you produce the leachate.

CHM. LOWRY:

(Inaudible)...use clay at all.

DR. WELTI:

No, it's not clay. I'm, I, the material if you looked at it and you test it, I, I keep referring to this clay because I'm, it feels like clay when you work with it. Any other questions?

CHM. LOWRY:

Is there any questions? Thank you very much.

DR. WELTI:

Thank you.

ATTY. WISE:

The second option provided by the MRE people is to deny, just flat out to deny and they state that there could be several reasons for this, insufficient data which Dr. Welty has just responded to. The possible presence of a deep aquifer in the south which Mr. Vanderliden has disapproved. And then the third element is the unacceptable design basis. The design of the expansion area has been provided in a report submitted by the Loureiro Engineering Associates. And to discuss this aspect of the MRE Report is Dr. or is Julio Loureiro, who is the President of that organization.

MR. JULIO LOUREIRO:

My name is Julio Loureiro. I'm President of Loureiro Engineering Associates. In terms of the, the program of disposal that was proposed at this site, we've previously made the point to the Commission that the details of development of the site in terms of the way the material was, was to be put on the site and how it was to be handled was based on our prior experiences with very similiar material in the present ECM disposal area as well as detailed discussions with the Department of Environmental Protection from the standpoint of the significance of having a controlled leachate discharge into the Connecticut River as opposed to taking the approach of having a leachate collection and handling facility. It was the opinion of the, the State which we concurred with fully, that because of the the very specific nature of of this site, the fact that this site has hydrologically been shown to be of relatively low permeability and to be of a nature that that flows consistently to the Connecticut River where we get extensive dilution of any leachate that may occur. It was the feeling that it was far superior to have a controlled leachate discharge at at trace levels of contaminant in the groundwater flow than to rely on having a leachate collection system which would have to be implemented. A collection system would have to be installed. The leachate would then have to be collected because it would physically be produced. And then it would have to be taken up to the waste treatment plant which exists at the Middletown site, run through the waste treatment plant for further treatment. And then discharge, there's a point source to exactly the same location. Basically as a points source discharge to the Connecticut River.

MR. JULIO LOUREIRO: (Continued from previous page)

So that we feel very confident that the approach of having a controlled leachate underflow is a far superior means of handling the disposal of this material as this particular site. And this is a very site specific situation. It applies here because of the conditions at the site where it might not apply anywhere else in the state. As part of the report that your Consultant prepared for you, they did address a question of the monitoring proposed at the site and the contingency planning related to what would occur should there be any problems when the site is in operation. First of all, I would, I would like to make the point that in developing this site and developing both the site parameters themselves as well as the hydraulic assumptions related to the site, a number of assumptions have been made. You've heard some of it discussed earlier. Your consultant has made the point in his report to you that a number of assumptions have been made. This is a normal procedure with this type of a facility and these type of conditions. You have to make assumptions. They have to be valid assumptions based on experience and similar conditions. The idea of a monitoring program effectively is to demonstrate on a on going and long term basis that your assumptions that you have made to start with are correct. And to provide you with a means of being able to tract what is happening to relate those to the assumptions to confirm your operation. And then if there is any problem provide you with the lead time necessary to make any alterations or modifications that maybe necessary as a result of monitoring data. The monitoring program that we've proposed to you was a monitoring program that has been developed in concert with the Department of Environmental Protection. The location of the monitoring wells has been reviewed with them. And the extent of the monitoring has been approved by the Department. However, your consultant has raised a point that has previously been raised at discussions with the Planning and Zoning Commission. And this is the local input and the local concern in terms of what is happening. From, from the standpoint of assuring all parties as to the adequacy of, of the leachate dilution that's actually occurring and the groundwater quality levels, what we do propose to you is is that the monitoring program as presently proposed be effectively tripled in terms of the number of wells, the number of monitoring wells that are proposed. We propose that the additional wells be implemented in concert and in accordance with the basic program that's been developed and approved by the Department Of Environmental Protection with the additional well development to occur so that you will have full coverage to satisfy yourself that you do have full coverage throughout the area, downgrading of the proposed landfill. We have no problem with with the concept of of providing the additional monitoring well program. In terms of the contingency planning, the consultant to the Commission has made the point that the contingency planning question was raised to them during the preparation of their report. They asked us as part of your roughly 35 questions specifically what the contingency plan would be in the event of adverse monitoring well data. We responded to your consultant, which you have a copy of our response which outlined the steps and procedures that we would take in the event of adverse monitoring data results. The comment made by the consultant was that while they did not disagree with the steps that we have proposed in terms of contingency planning, their feeling was that in the event of an adverse monitoring result that disposal at the site should be stopped immediately and then steps taken to ascertain the degree and extent of the problem. In terms of this activity which is a very highly regulated activity, through the permeating process that is already in place, we have the mechanism to trigger contingency action in the event of of any adverse monitoring results. The, the key to implementing any kind of a contingency program would be the first step which we have proposed as part of a contingency plan of increasing the sampling frequency and the density of the

MR. JULIO LOUREIRO: (Continued from previous page)

sampling. This then will serve to define the extent and the magnitude of the problem. It will basically provide the the means to determine whether or not you, in fact, have a trend of contamination as opposed to a single bad result or or possibly one or two bad results. It prevents the possibility of taking extreme action at such time that there really is not a valid basis upon which to take the action nor a valid basis upon which to conclude what the order of magnitude of the action maybe. So that our, our position is that rather than a succession of operations at such time that there is any kind of an indication of an adverse monitoring result which should be done is that the monitoring program should be stepped up, the sampling stepped up and a much better definition of what maybe developing established. I would like to make the point that we have proposed the development of this site in stages. The first stage of the site, the, the first preparation of the site and the first landfilling operation will take approximately four years to conclude. During that time, you will be monitoring continuously with the monitoring wells that would be in place. The permit that we receive from the State and Federal Government is a five year permit. So, that effectively, the, only the first stage of this site which is proposed as a very term operation would be effectively being carried out to any great degree over the initial life of the permit. During this situation, if adverse monitoring results should occur, we have the capability of correcting anything that maybe done at this stage in time, to the extent, if necessary, of going through a wide gamut of opportunities such as providing a, an impermeable ground cover and then leachate collection for any further disposed material to the the very worst extreme which would be simply to remove the material that has been put in place and totally cease operations in terms of a contributing contaminant at that site. We do not anticipate that this is likely to happen but we certainly have the capability and we have the the range of capabilities starting from an increased sampling program all the way through the the ultimate possibility of having to remove the material. And this certainly can be done, at least well beyond the first stage of operation just because of the nature of the way the site is being developed. In terms of local input, once again, in terms of both contingency planning as well as the the previous question of monitoring, we have had discussion with with your Health Director, Mr. Vinci, who has been concerned that although we are regulated by the the State and the Federal Government and we are reporting to the State and Federal Government, locally, you, you do not get the input in in a time frame that allows you to provide any kind of input to anything that is occurring. What Pratt and Whitney does propose and has previously discussed with Mr. Vinci is that all monitoring results and data that is produced would be provided to the City as the results are generated. On this basis, you'll be fully abreast of what's happening. You'll be cognizant of of the significant data that's being produced. And if there is a reason for implementation of any contingency actions, you would have the opportunity to provide very early input at the time that anything was being done. As a, as a general reaction to your consultant's report, one aspect of the report that, that did disturb me a little bit was that while the report legitimately addresses a number of possible adverse eventualities in regard to the expansion site that we are requesting, we feel that the report did not acknowledge and we feel/you should not lose sight of the fact that this facility as proposed at the expansion site can be favorably compared to the positive operating and disposal results which we have produced and have seen at the existing ECM Site. We have approximately 8 years of monitoring data at the existing site under conditions which are extremely similiar to what is being presently proposed in the expansion area. And we have no indication with this eight years of monitoring data of inadequate leachate dilution or any ground water quality degradation. The materials to be disposed of at the expansion

MR. JULIO LOUREIRO: (Continued from previous page)
site are extremely similiar in nature to what is presently being disposed of. And with the handling that is being proposed, we feel there, there really is is a very very slim lik lihood that the site will react in any way significant-ly different from what you are already consistently dealing with at the exist- ing site. With that, I'd be glad to any, answer any questions you may have.

CHM. LOWRY:
Any questions?

COMM. DREAHER:
Yes, I have a few. You said something about when you (Inaudible)... adverse monitoring, you're going to keep it, the operation (Inaudible)...

MR. LOUREIRO:
That's correct.

COMM. DREAHER:
And when you do monitor, who does the monitoring down there and on the property that the record goes to the City?

MR. LOUREIRO:
The, the monitoring will be done by an independent laboratory. What, what Pratt and Whitney has done at the existing ECM Site and what is proposed at the site is that the monitoring program which is which is a frequency that has already been agreed upon in terms of quarterly sampling, that this would be done and the parameters to be tested would be performed by an independent outside laboratory. The results from the laboratory are submitted to Pratt and Whitney Aircraft. Pratt and Whitney Aircraft takes those results and turns them over to the State to satisfy the monitoring requirements. We are proposing that concurrently with that the same results will also be turned over to the City.

COMM. DREAHER:
The people that do this work for you. Will they have to have permission from the company to turn the reports over to the City?

MR. LOUREIRO:
The, the normal procedure that has been followed in the past is that the re- ports when they are produced are are sent in to Pratt and Whitney Aircraft. They are are then transmitted by Pratt and Whitney Aircraft to the regulatory agencies. And that is what we would propose to do with the City. Effectively, you would end out with copies of the lab results.

COMM. DREAHER:
And you talked about your ECM disposal site. That is about how large in comparison to the site that you're seeking now?

MR. LOUREIRO:
In, in terms of the overall area of the site, it is very comparable. It is probably, I would guess maybe it's 25% larger than the the site that we are talking of down below. So, that in terms of the the relative configuration and the relative impact on the area, you're talking about a very similar situation between the two sites.

COMM. DREAHER:
And is the disposal, the, very much the same?

MR. LOURIERO:

Yes. In fact, that's a point I probably didn't make strongly enough. The ECM landfill, the disposal that is, that is carried out at the ECM landfill now is effectively exactly the same type of handling and disposal operation as we are proposing at the new site. The reason for that is the operating experience that has occurred as a result of the 8 years of disposal. When we started with that site, roughly 8 years ago, we started out on the basis that that we would handle this material a variety of different ways including for example, which your consultant may have mentioned to you off and on, a, a cell method of disposal. Basically, excavating a series of cells, placing this material in the cells, covering it and continuing to develop cells both horizontally and vertically. We found that the material, when disposed of in that manner, was, was difficult to handle and could not be handled in a continuously reliable manner. By continuous experimentation with the material, we found that mixing this material on a one to one basis with the native material, resulted in a mix that could be handled basically as a fill material that has some structural qualities to it and can be placed in layers, can be laid out and compacted and built upon so that you have very close control over the site as you develop. Now the, the point I want to make with that is that the ECM material while being very similar to the metal hydroxide material we're proposing at the expanded site is somewhat less easy to handle physically than the new material will be. So that in fact this same handling of material being proposed at the expansion site will be easier to handle than the material we are now handling at the ECM site. So that we anticipate absolutely no difficulty with the handling of the material and we have been able to demonstrate through evolution over the 8 years of operation that this is far in a way the best way to handle this kind of a material.

COMM. DREAHER:

And going on once more, instead of ECM, are EDM sludge also going to be included in this electrical discharge disposal site?

MR. LOUREIRO:

Not to my knowledge, no.

COMM. DREAHER:

No EDM at all.

MR. LOUREIRO:

No. To go back to one of your questions earlier, I, I answered in the affirmative but I didn't expand on it. It might be appropriate to. I indicated that in the event of adverse monitoring results we proposed to continue disposing of land, of this material at the site while we analyze what was happening. I, I just might quickly run down what we proposed as contingency action so you see that isn't operating all by itself in in space. We do have a an indicated program of action. The first step that we would take would be to increase the frequency of monitoring and if appropriate increase the parameters being tested and increase the number of sampling points. This by the way was based on the monitoring, number of monitoring test wells we had originally proposed. With the additional test wells that we have now indicated we would be willing to provide, it is very unlikely that we would have to increase the number of sampling points but if necessary we would do that. We would then obtain additional subsurface data such as boring logs and additional ground water level observations. We would then reexamine the hydrogeologic conditions by detailed study of the past monitoring data and history of the deposited fill materials. Then depending on the findings of the detailed investigations,

MR. LOUREIRO: (Continued from previous page)

we still have several courses of action available to us. These would include temporary or permanent succession of dumping after we've had at least had an opportunity to establish what orders of magnitude we're dealing with. They would also include placing an impervious cover over the existing deposits that have been placed up to that point and then the installation of a liner material and a leachate collection system for all future deposits. In other words, if it, if it became apparent that we could not live with the the leachate, the control of leachate discharge, we could terminate it at that point, seal off what has been put in the ground and from that point on provide a collection system so there would be no transmission of leachate into the, into the groundwater. I, beyond that if the problem is severe enough, we can install groundwater intercepting wells and pump the leachate to a treatment system. In other words, cut off the groundwater flow going to the Connecticut River. And the final and the the worse case situation would be the removal of any offending material that has been placed on the site up to that point. And as I indicated, we would anticipate that long before you had progressed into the the later stages of development, stages two through five, you will, will have already accumulated several years of groundwater monitoring data. We don't expect to be operating in a vacuum and we would anticipate that by the time you are well into a long term filling of this site, you will have created a large back log of of good monitoring data upon which to base your continued activities.

CHM. LOWRY:

I have a question. I didn't know whether to bring it up it up, maybe it's the time. John Housman in his blueprints for metal hydroxide landfills (Inaudible) or recommendations. And one of them is the P H to keep the metal hydroxide (Inaudible) sludge from the alkaline site because acidity of gravity makes it worse. Now, I don't think anywhere, I don't recall it, this thing has been addressed.

MR. LOUREIRO:

Yes.

CHM. LOWRY:

(Inaudible)...do with it? Does it help?

MR. LOUREIRO:

It is a, it is a key factor in in the reason that we feel that this installation is not a problem. The, as Housman has pointed out, as, as the literature explicitly covers and in fact, the EPA extraction procedure is based on this this fact. When you have an acid condition or a low P H condition, this is when you have the the a condition whereby you can now redissolve metals that are already in the sludge and then produce a leachate which contains these metals in greater concentration. The leachate extraction procedure that EPA requires be done is done under an acid condition which produces the worse possible situation. This would be the maximum production of metal concentration you could get. In terms of what Housman has said and what is being proposed here, the fact that we are segregating this landfill from organic materials or in other words from a conventional municipal landfill which has refuse in it with organic material means that this segregation will maintain the P H at the ambient level that the material is being placed so that we will be significantly higher....

CHM. LOWRY:

Which is what? Which is what?

MR. LOUREIRO:

... The, the material, the material will be placed at P H anywhere from nine to eleven. The ambient condition with your groundwater will probably slowly bring this P H down into a range of about seven which is well above the conditions upon which you would expect to redissolve the metals and begin to have a problem. So that the, the real criteria to this is that the segregation alone is a major factor in preventing this type of a material from becoming a problem in terms of redissolution of of the metal. In fact we just received this week, a a current study which was initiated by EPA and carried out by the American (Inaudible) Institute in which they they analyzed land disposal as we are proposing here from from a dozen installations, a dozen sources of sludge and subjected these sludges to a variety of adverse conditions varying from extremely low P H conditions to mixed with with other materials as well as segregated. The conclusion of that study by by the government was again that as long as this material was handled as a separate material and was not indiscriminately mixed with organic materials that could tend to lower the P H, there was very very little likelihood of any significant quantities of redissolution of metals and that generally the leachate produced from the material even before dissolution was within the range of drinking water standards. So that, our work has indicated that to be the case and the government has has even as recently as this past week been producing materials that tend to support that position.

CHM. LOWRY:

Thank you very much.

COMM. DREAHER:

Since you're talking about the process and I'm aware of a new process and I'm sure you are to of a of the cutting of metal hydroxide sludge down when you cook it and it's not hazardous anymore. Because I know about the process, I'm sure your company does.

MR. LOUREIRO:

I, we have heard of it, yes.

COMM. DREAHER:

And it's, it can be used as a landfill. It's just spread over any landfill area and it's not hazardous anymore.

MR. LOUREIRO:

Yes. Again, we have heard of the the process. It's a, it's a proposed means of handling this type of material that essentially takes you away from the the likelihood of having to have an established area such as this to dispose of it. At the present time, I, I would not say that it has been heavily used, number one. Number two, from a practical standpoint, it's our feeling that if you are handling the material and you are going to address the material as a specific material and dispose of it as a specific material, you don't have to go through that because you have now taken it away from the conditions under which it can be a problem. And you've put it into a a situation that you have every reason to expect will not be a problem in and of itself. So that we have not proposed this as an alternative with this material. One of the reasons is we're talking about large volumes from a multitude of of areas throughout the state and we feel that central disposal as we are proposing here is a, is a viable and very realistic approach in todays situation. What we know of today, we can handle it. If it turns out that as we go down the road, it becomes much more desirable to take the kind of steps that you have indicated. There's

MR. LOUREIRO: (Continued from previous page)

nothing to, to prevent the company from exploring those alternatives at any time and then diverting these materials to other disposal areas if it then becomes a simple matter of disposal. At the present time, however, they have the problem of having to dispose of it, being obligated to dispose of it while they are generating it throughout the state. And this is a, a viable and a known method of disposal which we are very comfortable with.

CHM. LOWRY:

Thank you very much. Any more questions from the Commission?

MR. LOUREIRO:

Thank you.

CHM. LOWRY:

Thank you. Attorney Wise.

ATTY. WISE:

Thank you Julio. Let us quickly wrap or tie this whole thing and finish it and first may we say, we appreciate very much the time that you've given and the attention that you've given. The final or or the third option is the approval option and the MRE people suggested the third option is to grant the Special Exception. And they go on to say and allow for what is likely to be a safe, regulated disposal hazardous waste. They see some disadvantages in this because of the uncertainty. We believe we've answered that. And I also raise the question of the monitoring and contingency planning provisions. Now, what Mr. Loureiro has just said is that the State has required four monitoring wells. He has proposed, in light of the concern of MRE for additional monitoring wells that that be traveled or up to as many as twelve monitoring wells, in places to be mutually established. He's also proposed that the, all of the reports come into the Town of Middletown for your review. So in conclusion, it would be our simple request that you consider all the materials that have been submitted. And one additional thought, Julio, that EPA study, I was looking for it. I'd like to submit that for the record, the study that he was talking about, Mr. Lowry. And we would simply hope that you would consider all of the materials. Each of the consultants has submitted tonight through my letter to Mr. Reif, a supplemental comment, so, he has in effect put in writing what he has just told you. So that after you have reviewed the MRE report, if you would like to review our consultants' comments to it, they will be available there for you. And we would simply ask for your consideration and your approval of this Special Exception. Thank you.

CHM. LOWRY:

Any questions from the Commission, at this point? I want to thank Attorney Wise and his associates for a comprehensive and very educational presentation. (Inaudible) Now, this is a Public Hearing. Is there anybody in the public who wants to speak in favor of this operation? Is there anybody who wants to speak in oppositon? Please come forward.

DIANE M. KEEFE:

I am Diane Keefe from the American Association of University of Women, Greater Middletown Branch.

CHM. LOWRY:

Excuse me, you pick it up. Why don't you bring it over here.

(Inaudible) Too much static in microphone.

DIANE KEEFE:

I'm Diane Keefe from the Greater Middletown, American Association of University of Women. I have commented before on this. I've read Pratt and Whitney's responses to the 34 questions and the the one that struck me as most important was the reply to question two which, where Pratt & Whitney states, Quote, " Several actions would be, would be available to us including temporary or permanent succession of dumping." And all the other measures down the line that they could take if they determined through monitoring that there were these adverse monitoring results. I think what's missing here is commitment to define exactly what levels of degradation in the water quality will cause them to take these actions. And I think it's incumbent upon the Commission in order to protect the water supply that that they define more clearly a contingency plan that must be taken so that we don't end up with a lawsuit later in order to ensure that the water supply is protected. They, the statements that Pratt & Whitney has made makes us realize that they know what measures can be taken but they never state that they will take them if they find, say three wells are contaminated or five wells are contaminated, and monitoring is important. And I'm glad they're going to increase the number of wells but I think that assumptions are made in this and I notice that the consultant mentioned that that the monitoring is done in order to demonstrate that the assumptions were correct. And I think that they're, that the objective answer is that the monitoring is done to test whether the assumptions are correct. And experience does give people a good idea of what's going to happen but you never know. There are, there are many strange situations that come up in time and I think that we, we should just make sure that that we take all the precautions that are necessary. So..

CHM. LOWRY:

Thank you very much. Is there anybody else wishing to speak in opposition?

DAINE KEEFE:

I'd like to submit this for the record.

CHM. LOWRY:

If not, (Inaudible). Too much noise, static...

Would somebody tell the Chairman to come back in?

SECRETARY GIUFFRIDA:

Item 2. Continued from previous meetings proposed Subdivision of 70 lots to be known as Royal Oak Park II, to be located on Route 17, Middletown/Durham Town Line. The developer is PHS Development Corp. Applicant/Agent A. Thomas White, Attorney.

ITEM 2
ROYAL OAK PARK
II- 70 LOTS
PROPOSED SUB-
DIVISION

ATTY. WHITE:

Good evening, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen...

DIR. REIF:

Tom, the microphone doesn't work....

ATTY. WHITE:

Oh, that microphone doesn't work. All right. Good evening Ladies and Gentlemen, Mr. Chairman, Attorney Tom White. I've been with you now, I think this is my third visit. And I've talked to George Reif and I also briefly touched base with your Chairman while some of the proceedings were going on in the former public hearing. We are diligently working and it's the same thing as I reported to you at the last session that I was at. I think it was two weeks

ATTY. WHITE: (Continued from previous page)

maybe. The Environmental Protection report has come in, the drainage computations with regard to the holding or retention basins from the U-Conn computers have come in. They differed slightly with what the Engineer for PHS had and also the review by the Midstate Engineer with the PHS Engineer, Bob Pfanner, has recently occurred. Our problem is on all of the technical data and I'm talking about the size of the basins and some of the other data with regard to drainage and stuff, has had to be upgraded to meet some of the questions that are being posed by Environmental Protection, by Midstate and by our own Public Works. At this point in time, I would ask that the Public Hearing again be continued because of the fact that we are still awaiting final written reports from these people and giving us an chance or an opportunity to address them. And I don't want to foreclose the opportunity to do that. Phil Bauer's here from Public Works. We've had meetings with those Commissioners and gotten some input but I think rightly, they've asked that the PHS Engineer resolve the Environmental Protection report questions and the Midstate Engineer questions before we even go back. I do have some updated maps but they're all not completed. If they were I would gladly go forward and ask you to close it tonight. What I might do is leave these with you. Again, I would report that, as last time, the subdivision application contained an application for 70 lots as we tested it with the Health Department and Leon Vinci and his people. And it was extensively tested in mid and late May. The lots now are down to 53 and the engineering on the overlay maps has been completed but not all of the technical revisions that are being requested by Environmental Protection and the, as I say Midstate. So, I would leave these with you if you would so accept them and answer any questions to this point and ask for a one final continuance, I think so that we have an opportunity to address.

COMM. GIUFFRIDA:

I move to allow a continuance.

COMM. SBALCIO:

Second.

CHM. PARISI:

Any discussion on allowing continuance? George, you see any problem, Tom White.

DIR. REIF:

You're allowed to have a, extended for another 30 days.

ATTY. WHITE:

I think a total of 30, maximum.

DIR. REIF:

We haven't calculated. Have you that the previous days...

ATTY. WHITE:

I haven't. I think we, I think the maximum, it can go a total of 60 if I'm not mistaken.

DIR. REIF:

Yes, two 30 day periods.

ATTY. WHITE:

Yes, two 30 day periods and there are some holidays in there and as I...

DIR. REIF:

You count the holidays too.

ATTY. WHITE:

O.k. Well, I think your next public session would be September.

DIR. REIF:

There's one now and it's two weeks from tonight. It's the 26th.

ATTY. WHITE:

Oh boy. I was, I was going to be away that week...

DIR. REIF:

...You're not going to be there...

ATTY. WHITE:

...I was going to be away that week. That's my vacation that week.

CHM. PARISI:

Well, what's the next one, the September 9th, after that?

ATTY. WHITE:

Well, if, if there were any difficulty on that, I would waive it on the record and so give you a writing.

DIR. REIF:

Yes but we're not, that's not an option. That's the state law...

ATTY. WHITE:

O.k., that's mandatory.

DIR. REIF:

...from the extended, the length of time...

ATTY. WHITE:

...When did we start? Have you got a calendar there?

DIR. REIF:

...(Inaudible) ...When did we start this ...

ATTY. WHITE:

...Your mid July meeting. July 12th, 8th...

DIR. REIF:

...July the 8th....

CHM. PARISI:

Well, the only other option then if the the 60 days is beyond would be to withdraw it, then to, to re-do it on September 8th. Just readvertise it again.

DIR. REIF:

Yes, that was my recommendation...

(Inaudible) More than one person speaking.

DIR. REIF:

(Inaudible)....We're back to where we were a long time ago. You got more work

ATTY. WHITE:

Well, the engineer, I talked to him at length again today. He assures me that all of the technical engineering input will be done in the next five to ten days because all of the outside data is in and a.....

DIR. REIF:

...Yes and then we're going to start over again in reviewing this. And...

ATTY. WHITE:

...Well, o.k.....

DIR. REIF:

...the results of the review information in the same time. Because we're going to be looking at a completely different subdivision.

ATTY. WHITE:

Well, it's different from one point of view. It's, it's the same roads. It's just lesser, fewer lots because of the Health testing. Everything else is basically the....

DIR. REIF:

...(Inaudible)...are going to get back again so they can reevaluate it.

ATTY. WHITE:

Well, this would be true, I think of the upgrade with regard to the PHS engineer, that he's doing right now, addressing the outside reports of Environment Protection and Midstate....

DIR. REIF:

...Yes but those people all get an opportunity

ATTY. WHITE:

...Oh, I'm aware of that. I want them to have that. I, matter of fact, I think

DIR. REIF:

...So, what you're almost doing is starting over again and so the idea of withdrawing is (Inaudible).

ATTY. WHITE:

Would we be in the position of, would we, see we've, what I want to be careful of is we've already deposited \$17- \$1900 and I...

DIR. REIF:

...You want to make sure that you don't have to pay the fee again.

ATTY. WHITE:

...I don't have any problem with the newspapers fees but I I wouldn't want to have to go back on a new lot fee...

DIR. REIF:

...(Inaudible)...for the newspaper fee. You pay a fee for (Inaudible)...

ATTY. WHITE:

...I know...

DIR. REIF:

...You paid on 70 lots...

ATTY. WHITE:

...We've already paid that.

CHM. PARISI:

Yes, but why, they wouldn't have to pay that again would they?

ATTY. WHITE:

Well, I think that...

DIR. REIF:

I think that's the almost, the least important thing. The biggest, significant thing is what you're going to see next. What the results of the redesign based on all the problems. And you still haven't touched on some of the issues that I suggested that you touched on, that you know things that people have waived or talked about waiving...

ATTY. WHITE:

...O.k....

DIR. REIF:

...Look, it's 31 days in August. There's no question (Inaudible).

ATTY. WHITE:

Well, the only other possibility would be post this in August. I'll cancel my vacation, I guess. It's mid-week. I just...

DIR. REIF:

64 days.

CHM. PARISI:

So, continue it to the 26th then.

DIR. REIF:

But again, it's going to come before you and no-one will have had a chance to review it...

ATTY. WHITE:

...Well...

DIR. REIF:

...and you're going to be asked to (Inaudible) More than one person speaking.

ATTY. WHITE:

We, we will, we would have Midstate's report, I'm sure. And Environmental Protection, all of those issues will have been addressed. Public Work's will have seen the final product as it's been reviewed by Environmental Protection and Midstate. And the Health Department has already done everything that they're going to do.

DIR. REIF:

Yes but when they see, when you turn in a completely different set of plans, they're going to, they should get a chance to look at it again.

ATTY. WHITE:

Oh absolutely, but I mean, you keep saying different. All it's, there are just fewer lots on the same subdivision.

DIR. REIF:

All right but you still haven't addressed the things that have been waived or (Inaudible).

ATTY. WHITE:

O.k. The major issue that the Public Work's Commission has, I think Mr. Bauer can confirm that. I met twice with them at public meeting and at the last session, there was an affirmative review and I was told by the Chairman that there was going to be a written or an affirmative recommendation to this Commission to consider that road grade problem, relief or exemption for that 13% that's two or three hundred feet long. And there has to, we had to take some position. I told the Engineer to go forward on that basis. I can't keep saying wait. There are too many things that, you know, that was one thing. The other things are purely technical things. And he has to meet them engineering wise or that's, then it's our problem if he can't.

CHM. PARISI:

Well, o.k....

ATTY. WHITE:

...Yes, I....

CHM. PARISI:

...The motion is is to continue and obviously, you know, we'll take a look at the 26th and you know,...

ATTY. WHITE:

...I'll just have to juggle, yes, I'll have to juggle. O.k.

CHM. PARISI:

Any other discussion on the motion? All in favor of continuing to the 26th? Opposed? So voted.

(Motion made and second by Comms. Giuffrida and Sbalcio that this item be continued to the August 26, 1981 public hearing. Vote was unanimous.)

CHM. PARISI:

Before we go on to the next item, I know that there are people in the audience who may have been interested in this and I, anyone wishing to speak on this proposal from the audience before we close the public hearing.

GLORIA RENNA:

I'd like to ask a few questions if I might? (Inaudible) Too faint.

DIR. REIF:

The only microphone that'll pick up is the one right here. So, you too are going to have to come up and sit down there and (Inaudible) Noise.

GLORIA RENNA:

O.k. My name is Gloria Renna. I'm one of the residents that borders at the property in question here. The fact that they're cutting the lot size down would indicate to me that they're having problems with water which we've been

GLORIA RENNA: (Continued from previous page)

stipulating all along. It's hard to follow because of all the paperwork as exactly what's been going on it. If he could give us a little insight as to what maybe some of the problems are and someone view one of the maps. I guess that, the sites were on and (Inaudible)..they indicated that they didn't see some of the new houses that have gone up around there. And I was just wondering, do we have access to these maps so that we could see if they've got these new houses on there and if so then, like I say, they've never answered any specific questions as to where this run off is going and how they're going to take care of it. And that's all our concern is that we don't want our water supply contaminated, certainly. And we want to know where the sewerage is going to go. And if they can rectify those problems, then they won't hear from us anymore. But we've been here for ten meetings or so it seems. And nobody's ever answered these questions. Nobody's even directed point to these questions. And nobody's ever seen these maps either that, you know, with the new housing sort of things. And, well it might be nice to answer some of these questions for us. It would get these problems off our mind and we don't have to keep coming to these meetings.

CHM. PARISI:

O.k. Well, the maps are on file and and you can see them up at the Planning Office.

DIR. REIF:

There there on the wall. However, that's what you've been hearing. They've been changing all around.

MS. RENNA:

That's right.

DIR. REIF:

They turned in one set and they've been changing.

ATTY. WHITE:

We reduced lot sizes. We've increased lot sizes. We haven't, I, I don't like the word change.

DIR. REIF:

Then...(Inaudible) Noise....work on assumptions. You haven't been...
(Inaudible) More than one person speaking.

MS. RENNA:

Do these new plans show where the houses are?

(Inaudible) More than one person speaking.

ATTY. WHITE:

I would be happy, I would be happy to help you. I didn't know there was, we've, I've been to three public hearings and I think the Hutching's family is the only one that's ever given me a name or spoken to (Inaudible) Too faint.

MS. RENNA:

O.k....

ATTY. WHITE;

...(Inaudible) Too faint.....I'd be more than happy and I'm going to have the engineer meet with you.

MS. RENNA:

Do these new plans show where our houses are so to speak because we border the parameters of that?

ATTY. WHITE:

Come out in the hall and I'll show you where it's at....

MS. RENNA:

...O.k....

ATTY. WHITE:

...and you show me where you live.

MS. RENNA:

O.k.

ATTY. WHITE:

And I'll take your name and address. And we'll have someone contact you.

MS. RENNA:

That's all, that's all we're interested in, thank you.

CHM. PARISI:

Anyone else? O.k. (Inaudible) Noise. Item three.

SECRETARY GIUFFRIDA:

Item 3. Proposed removal of sand and gravel on Preston Avenue.
Applicant/Agent Philip F. Karpel, Attorney.

ITEM 3
REMOVAL OF SAND
AND GRAVEL
PRESTON AVE.

DIR. REIF:

Give you a chance to show where it is..(Inaudible) Too much static.

ATTY. KARPEL:

I'm going to sit and let my engineer show you where the site is. I'm getting closer to the head of the table, you see. Maybe after the next election, I'll be on that side of the table.

CHM. PARISI:

Are you running?

ATTY. KARPEL:

No. I didn't know you got elected or you had to.

CHM. PARISI:

It's still not too late, you know, you have until Friday to get your petition.

DIR. REIF:

Everybody else is.

ATTY. KARPEL:

Thanks. My name is Philip Karpel. I'm an Attorney and I live in, practice law in the City of Middletown. I'm here this evening representing James Frederick, Jr. and Ralph Carbone, the owners of the property who are seated at the opposite end of the table. And also with us this evening is Bruce Soroka, the engineer who prepared the drawings which I believe had been previously

ATTY. KARPEL: (Continued from previous page)
distributed to you. He will be going through those drawings in, in greater detail. He'll also show you on various maps where the site is located. The nature of our application is, just as the legal notice states, for a permit to excavate sand and gravel. And the application is made pursuant to your Section 41, one of our zoning regulations. I, I won't go through and read, I, I'll hope that you all had an opportunity to read the application which was filed, 17 copies of which were filed with the Commission. But I will touch on some of the pertinent aspects of the application. The property is situated on the westerly side of Preston Avenue. Mr. Frederick and Mr. Carbone own a little over 15 acres but we're only seeking permission to excavate from slightly more than 3 acres on that site. And in accordance with the regulation that's the only portion of the land, if the permit is granted, that will be entitled to take sand and gravel from. They acquired this site about two years ago in September of 1979. We don't know for sure but the question was raised at the preliminary hearing that we appeared at as to whether or not sand and gravel was ever removed from this site. We've, we've heard from other people that there's a possibility that sand and gravel may have been removed back, oh gosh, must be 20 years ago or around there when Route 91 was being developed through Middletown. And there is some evidence on the site in the nature of those little seedlings that the State of Connecticut gives to land-owners to replant that there probably was some sand and gravel taken from the back of this portion of the site. But to our knowledge, there has been no activity in that nature for at least 20 years. This is not part of the Petrosky site. I know Mr. Reif has on several of the maps shown you and highlighted the Petrosky land which is on the other side of the railroad tracks which is behind our property.

DIR. REIF:

Phil, they haven't seen it. Hoping you're going to point it out.

ATTY. KARPEL:

No, I'm not.

DIR. REIF:

You're not.

ATTY. KARPEL:

No, the, the engineer's going to show you...

DIR. REIF:

O.k. Well, somebody's here..(Inaudible) Too faint.

ATTY. KARPEL:

That's right.

DIR. REIF:

I haven't seen these people since you saw them last...

ATTY. KARPEL:

Yes, but again, we did give you 17 copies of our map at your request two meetings ago so that you would have had the opportunity before tonight to look at them. And I, I know that most of you who were there then, got them and had the opportunity. However, we will be covering it in detail and then be answering any questions that either our our presentation presents or that you on your own have been able to fair it out. We're seeking a 2 year permit because that's the the maximum you can get any permit for. I, I can't honestly

ATTY. KARPEL: (Continued from previous page)

tell you that it'll take two years because I don't view this as a, as a large commercial operation. The, the owners did on their own perform some minor testing. I think there's about a dozen test holes were dug and that's not certainly the the finite way of determining how much sand and gravel is there but it does give some indication and roughly at best, they anticipate somewhere between 60 and 65 thousand cubic yards. They have not got contracts to supply it to any particular person at the present time. I think I mentioned to you at the last meeting and I've made reference to it in my written portion of the application that there was a subcontractor at the Aetna site who had some interest, may still have some interest in a small quantity of it. It will be removed from the site as we obtain contracts. Therefore, it may take two years because it's not going to be a, you know, a daily operation unless somebody comes along and says, give, give us all you can excavate and as quickly as it can be done. Mr. Soroka will go through the the four sheets of his plans. As we go through it, he'll be referring to sheets one, two, three and four and for the record that that will be referenced to sheet one which is simply the site location and a table of contents. Sheet two is a survey plan showing the boundary of the 15 acre site. Sheet three is the existing topography and sheet four shows the proposed topography and miscellaneous details that your regulations require. And it clearly shows that the work area is just slightly, I think, about a little over 3 acres in size. We will be maintaining as is required by your regulations, a buffer, a parameter area for 50 feet completely around the parameter of our property. And, at the present time, we don't know what the access routes, the specific access routes for trucks will be because we don't know who will buying it from us and where they'll be, they'll be hauling it to. One will presume however, that they'll be coming onto Preston Avenue and for the most part, at the present time, be heading northerly, I guess it would be on Preston to Country Club Road and then going either westerly towards Meriden or southerly back towards Route 91. When we do have access routes, we'd be perfectly willing to provide them to the Public Works Department for monitoring purposes. We will, of course, post a bond in the in the required amount of \$2000 per acre to be disturbed. And I think at this point, I'd prefer just to let Bruce Soroka walk you through the the plans. After that I might, depending upon what he's covered, want to run through to make sure that we point out to you that we have covered all of the criteria set forth in in Section 41.07, A through J, which are the criteria that we, we must agree to comply with. Most of them, as you, as you see or if you haven't, I'm sure you must have read them recently are things that, they're criteria that we have to comply with as we go along. So, really all we can show you is our intention in how we intend to to do it. And we are, obviously will supply with any additional information that perhaps you think should be supplied that has not. Bruce.

MR. BRUCE SOROKA:

Good evening. My name is Bruce Soroka. I'm the owner of Bruce P. Soroka, Associates. I'm a registered, professional engineer in the States of Connecticut and Colorado. And I'm a registered land surveyor in the State of Connecticut. This is a map of Middletown, north being on the upper portion of the map and Connecticut River running over in this side. We're in the downtown area here. The site is clear across town on the eastern boundary adjacent to Meriden. Here is Country Club Road going over on, this is I-91 going north and this is Country Club Road going around. This is Preston Avenue. Here's Preston Avenue, I'm sorry, and the site has been outlined in yellow here. Sheet one is, my drawings is the title sheet. It had the location plan on it. And I've just described the location. Again, this is Country Club Road going over I-91. The site is located in the, the 4,000 feet along,