

ATTACHMENT A

RIDEM/ OFFICE OF WASTE MANAGEMENT REFERENCE GUIDE TO DEPARTMENT RESPONSES AND SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED REGARDING THE REMEDIAL ACTION WORK PLAN AND 50% DESIGN DRAWINGS

FORMER JAMESTOWN LANDFILL

JANUARY 2006

Prepared June 7, 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>General Introduction</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>Public Comment Summary</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>Form Letter # 1: Pump Tests</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>Form Letter # 2: Support for the Project</u>	<u>6</u>
<u>Form letter #3: Hydrogeologic Study of the Island</u>	<u>9</u>
<u>Form letter #4: Jamestown is Unique</u>	<u>11</u>
<u>Form Letter # 5: Viera Farms</u>	<u>13</u>
<u>Form letter # 6: Urging the Department to Stand Up to Pressure.....</u>	<u>16</u>
<u>Letter #7: David B. Van Slyke (Preti, Flaherty, Beliveau, Pachios & Haley LLP, 2/10/2006)</u>	<u>18</u>
<u>Letter # 8: Jeff McCrady and Stephen H. Mitchell, P.E. (MACTEC, 2/10/2006)</u>	<u>18</u>
<u>Letter # 9 Patrick K. Bolger (2/7/2006) :.....</u>	<u>18</u>
<u>Letter # 10: Richard L. Amirault (RIDOH, 2/8/2006):</u>	<u>19</u>
<u>Letter # 11: Rosemary Woodside (2/8/2006):.....</u>	<u>19</u>
<u>Letter #12: Louise Brendlinger (2/8/2006).....</u>	<u>21</u>
<u>Letter #13: Andrew Justin Nicoletta (2/10/2006):.....</u>	<u>21</u>
<u>Letter #14: Andrew Yates (2/10/2006):.....</u>	<u>22</u>
<u>Letter #15: Anthony N. Lush (2/9/2006):.....</u>	<u>22</u>
<u>Letter #16: Victor V. Calabretta, P.E. (2/9/2006):.....</u>	<u>22</u>
<u>Letter #17: Stacey and Michael Martin (2/10/2006)</u>	<u>22</u>
<u>Letter #18: Dee Bates (2/3/2006):.....</u>	<u>22</u>
<u>Letter #19: C. Richard and Jane W. Koster (2/8/2006):</u>	<u>22</u>

<u>Letter #20: Richard Smith (2/8/2006):</u>	<u>23</u>
<u>Letter #21: Kathleen Fitzgerald and Keith Stavely (2/8/2006):.....</u>	<u>23</u>
<u>Letter #22: Mike S?? (2/8/2006):</u>	<u>23</u>
<u>Letter #23: David A. King (2/8/2006):.....</u>	<u>23</u>
<u>Letter # 24: Donna Kane (2/7/2006):.....</u>	<u>24</u>
<u>Letter #25: Nancy L. and Robert W. Halstead (2/7/2006).....</u>	<u>24</u>
<u>Letter #26: Dwight S. Smith (2/7/2006).....</u>	<u>24</u>
<u>Letter #27: David Bolger and Mark Lancaster (2/6/2006).....</u>	<u>24</u>
<u>Letter #28: Steven W. Jepson (2/9/2006).....</u>	<u>25</u>
<u>Letter #29: Susan and Abbott Gregerman (2/9/2006):.....</u>	<u>25</u>
<u>Letter #30: Richard Kingsley, PhD. (2/10/2006):.....</u>	<u>25</u>
<u>Letter #31: David Coppe, M.D. (2/10/2006):</u>	<u>25</u>
<u>Letter # 32: Ellen M. Winsor (2/10/2006):.....</u>	<u>25</u>
<u>Letter #33: Norma Willis (2/7/2006):</u>	<u>26</u>
<u>Letter #34: Lee Tuthill, PE (2/9/2006).....</u>	<u>26</u>
<u>Letter #35: Karen and Don Easton (2/8/2006)</u>	<u>27</u>
<u>Letter #36: J. Christopher Powell, Jamestown Conservation Commission (e-mail 2/10/2006, hard copy 2/16/2006).....</u>	<u>27</u>
<u>Letter #37: Kurt D. Musselman (2/10/2006).....</u>	<u>27</u>
<u>Letter #38: Franklin Julian (2/10/2006).....</u>	<u>28</u>
<u>Letter #39: John Mccray (2/10/2006)</u>	<u>28</u>
<u>Letter #40: Carol Nelson-Lee (2/11/2006).....</u>	<u>28</u>
<u>Letter #41: James K. Cardi M.D. (2/10/2006)</u>	<u>29</u>
<u>Letter #42: Dennis H. Webster (2/9/2006)</u>	<u>29</u>
<u>Letter #43: Quentin Anthony (2/9/2006).....</u>	<u>29</u>

<u>Letter # 44: Susan and Abbott Gregerman (2/10/2006)</u>	<u>29</u>
<u>Letter #45: Holly Turton (2/10/2006)</u>	<u>29</u>
<u>Letter #46: Marcie Lindsay (2/8/2006)</u>	<u>30</u>
<u>Letter #47: Daniel O’Neill (2/10/2006)</u>	<u>30</u>
<u>Letter # 48: Joe S. Loitherstein, P.E., Loitherstein Environmental (2/9/2006)</u>	<u>30</u>
<u>Letter #49: Saverio and Cheryl Rebecchi (2/9/2006)</u>	<u>30</u>
<u>Letter #50: W. Bruce Turner (2/10/2006)</u>	<u>31</u>
<u>Letter #51: Darcy Magratten (2/9/2006)\</u>	<u>31</u>
<u>Letter #52: James Estes (2/10/2006)</u>	<u>31</u>
<u>Letter #53: William W. Karl (2/10/2006)</u>	<u>31</u>
<u>Letter #54: Kathleen Karl (2/10/2006)</u>	<u>32</u>
<u>Letter #55: Gloria J. Kurz (2/10/2006)</u>	<u>32</u>
<u>Letter #56: Susan R. Little (2/10/2006)</u>	<u>32</u>
<u>Letter #57: Alexandra Hope and Francis J. Darigan Jr. (2/7/2006)</u>	<u>32</u>
<u>Letter #58: Richard Eannarino (2/7/2006)</u>	<u>33</u>
<u>Letter #59: Barbara Infantolino (2/8/2006)</u>	<u>33</u>
<u>Letter #60: Sarah Baines (2/10/2006)</u>	<u>33</u>
<u>Letter #61: Donna P. O’Neill (2/10/2006)</u>	<u>33</u>
<u>Letter #62: Melissa Mastrostefano (2/9/2006)</u>	<u>33</u>
<u>Letter #63: Linda A. Scott (2/9/2006)</u>	<u>34</u>
<u>Letter #64: John G. Shannon (2/9/2006)</u>	<u>34</u>
<u>Letter #65: Joan E. Jordan (2/9/2006)</u>	<u>34</u>
<u>Letter #66: Raymond Iannetta (2/9/2006)</u>	<u>34</u>
<u>Letter #67: Barbara Noel Tuthill (2/13/2006)</u>	<u>35</u>
<u>Letter #68: Bob Dolan (2/8/2006)</u>	<u>35</u>

General Introduction

On February 1, 2006, Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management (the Department) Office of Waste Management (OWM) personnel attended a public workshop on the above referenced document at the request of the Town of Jamestown. Although not required by the Regulations, the Town officials offered to conduct a workshop at the 50% design phase of the Remedial Action Work Plan in order to solicit additional public input into the Remedy Design. The Town made this commitment during earlier public meeting held in 2004. The three and one half hour workshop included presentations from RIDEM and GZA, as well as, questions from Jamestown residents. The Department solicited public comments for a period ending on February 10, 2006. This response summary was prepared after a complete review of all submitted materials to provide a Department response to all substantive comments.

Public Comment Summary

During the public comment period, the Department received a number of technical and general comments from public officials, area residents, and other interested parties. Below is a listing of those citizens who provided comments with a summary of the issues raised by each. Copies of the actual comments can be viewed at the Department's Office of Waste Management, 235 Promenade Street, Providence, RI by appointment or on the Department's website at www.dem.ri.gov.

In preparation of the response to each comment, the Department grouped/categorized related comments according to the regulatory issues raised to provide a concise detailed response. Below each citizen's name, therefore, is a summary of the regulatory issues raised in the comment and a reference to the prepared responses. Form letters are listed with the names of the individuals who submitted them. The comment letters were assigned numbers randomly. For clarity in the summation, the assertions are generally listed without qualifiers such as "the commenters assert...", this is not meant to imply that the Department believes or does not believe these assertions to be factual, simply that these things were stated in the letter.

Form Letter # 1: Pump Tests

Table 1: Form Letter 1 was submitted by the following people:

#	Last Name	First Name	Additional Comments
1	Almeida	Kathleen	
2	Banks	Kathleen	I live in a neighborhood about 1/2 mile from this site. I'm frightened for all of us.
3	Del Buono	Vincent	The mistaken placement of the DPW Highway barn could possibly cause a catastrophe to our drinking water that would be impossible to rectify!
4	Gamble	Charlene	
5	Hamilton	Bruce	This area should not be disturbed-I have been coming to Jamestown for over 50 years (living here since 1978) I saw what went into the old site. Please leave it alone.
6	Harvey	Susan	Please do not allow risks to be taken with our water supply-thanks
7	Holland	Virginia	

8	Hull	Tim & Rita	We are deeply concerned for ourselves and the future of our children in regards to this matter. Please take this seriously.
9	Jepson	Steven	
10	Karon	Richard & Linda	If the DEM acts responsibly, it must guarantee and insure potable water if the project is approved.
11	Leibhauser	Maria	Chris- Please do not take risks with our much needed water supply.
12	Lepre	Marie	Please do not take risks with our water supply!
13	MacMillan	Jean	
14	Martin	David & Janice	We own Lots 248 and 249 next to the landfill & plan to build on these 2 lots.
15	Murray	Karin	We are anxiously watching and appeal to you to protect our water. We have no other water!
16	Oates	Tom & Christina	Please keep this beautiful island safe!
17	Olsen	Scott & Cindy	
18	Pennine	Andrea	We have children who drink this water! Please don't take any risks with our water supply. We depend on our clean healthy wells!
19	Petersen	Paul & Linnea	The testing is essential in ensuring our water supply would not be compromised by the proposed construction on the landfill site. Anything less would be irresponsible.
20	Pritchard	David	
21	Roony	Chris	The risk/reward of not taking the poll test is dramatic. I would expect that the risk at "water" supply to an island community warrants the added expenditure to safe guard.
22	Smith	Larry & Janet	
23	Toselli	Alfred & Anne	Please help to stop the building of the highway barn over...
24	Totten	Laura	Please protect us and our children's health!
25	Weibust	Lloyd & Beth	Please do not jeopardize our only source of water with this ill-conceived idea. It is not worth the risk.
26	Lemke	Karen & Arthur	

This letter opposes the project.

- A. Why were pump tests never done on the testing wells?
See response #7.
- B. Well sampling should only be done by pumping with conventional pumps as one does for supply wells.
See response #14.
- C. Groundwater is the only source of water in Jamestown and cleaning it up will be very costly.
See response #2.
- D. Concerned about risk of excavating this “EPA registered CERCLIS contaminated landfill”.
See response #5 and 12.
- E. Additional handwritten comments nearly all address the importance of groundwater.
See response #2

Form Letter # 2: Support for the Project

Table 2: Form Letter 2 was submitted by the following people:

#	Last Name	First Name	Additional Comments
1	Amerigian	Craig	

2	Arnold	George	
3	Baker	Glone	
4	Bakios	Mary	
5	Barraette	Gerard	
6	Bellion	Gwenda	
7	Bellion	John	
8	Berglund	Virginia	
9	Blythe	Dorothy	
10	Brennan	Mary	
11	Brown	Dorothy	
12	Brownell	Katherine	
13	Bryer	Dureen	
14	Burns	Eileen	
15	Cabral	Emeline	
16	Caswell	Caroline	
17	Caswell	James	
18	Clarke	Linda	
19	Clarke	Arthur	
20	Clarke	Marian	
21	Clarke	Russell	
22	Conn	Gretchen	
23	Couture	Philip	
24	Crawford	Chris	I grew up delivering newspapers daily on the north end & live there now. The dump was perpetually on fire & I believe 90% of what was put in there was incinerated. Also, I think it hypocritical for East & West estates who have built hundreds of garages & oiled & sealed driveways to be pointing the fingers at others. Stop with the chem-something and realize that any well pollution starts at home.
25	Cunha	Helen	
26	Dolan	Andrea	
27	Dolce	Jill	
28	Dolce	David	
29	Drury	Peter	
30	Drury	Anne	
31	Dunn	Alice	
32	Dwyer	Timothy	
33	Easton	Don & Karen	
34	Feigelman	Mary	
35	Fresh	Nancy	
36	Greene	Mary	

37	Greene	Chester	
38	Greene	David	
39	Greiser	Arthur	
40	Greiser	Mary	
41	Hellewell	Victoria	
42	Hellewell	Martin	
43	Hellewell	Dolores	
44	Herud-Greene	Gay	
45	Jawor	Mary	
46	Kuhn-Hines	Anne	
47	Kurtz	Edwin	
48	Kurtz	Leslie	
49	LaFazia	Isobel	
50	Larson	Philip	
51	Lathan	James	
52	Lathan	Pauline	
53	Lathan	Robin	
54	Lathan	Sara	
55	Lathan	Kevin	
56	Lathan	Susan	
57	Longo	Tony	
58	Lush	Nancy	
59	Mackie	Thomas	
60	Marioenzi	Grace	
61	Marioenzi	Louis	
62	Messinger	Norman	
63	Milot	Arthur	
64	Milot	Martha	
65	Minto	Don	
66	Neale	Martha	
67	Neale	George	
68	Neronha	Manuel	
69	Newman	Ken	
70	Perry	Mary	
71	Quattromani	Denise	
72	Quattromani	David	
73	Quattromani	Shirley	
74	Reppe	William	
75	Reppe	Cinthia	
76	Richardson	Victor	

77	Richardson	Charlotte	
78	Robertson	Susan	
79	Robertson	Paul	
80	Robertson	Nick	
81	Rushworth	Florence	
82	Saulino	Alfred	
83	Saulino	Madonna	
84	Smith	Frances	
85	StGermain	Shirley	
86	Sutton	Robert	
87	Taft	Amy	
88	Templeton-cotill	Anna	
89	Thomas	Roberta	
90	Tiexiera	Joseph	
91	Todd	Carol	
92	Turillo	Laura	
93	Tyre	Richard & Lisa	
94	Vietri	Amanda	
95	Whitaker	Melvin	

This letter is in support of the project.

- A. Most people want it built there.
See response #3.
- B. The Department should use valid science and not to be swayed by politics.
No response needed.
- C. The uproar is a stalling tactic by a vocal minority of the town.
See response #3.
- D. An additional handwritten comment relates to the actions of residents that may contaminate private wells.
No response needed.

Form letter #3: Hydrogeologic Study of the Island

Table 3: Form Letter 3 was submitted by the following people:

#	Last Name	First Name	Additional Comments
1	Aresti	Ralph	How can any reasonable, intelligent, and morally upright person act in such a way that a precious resource--drinking water--would be irrevocably destroyed?
2	Atamian	Robert & Marian	
3	Aubin	Russel	Over 55% of the home owners on the island depend on private wells for their water, with no other facilities should our wells be contaminated.
4	Bobola	Sara & Steve	It would be a real black eye to the STATE to loose Jamestown as a

			place that people wish to live. This is our only water supply and this project is not worth the risk!
5	Boucher	Nelson	Please protect our only source of water.
6	Brazil	Liz & Phil	
7	Carnevale	Mark	
8	Clark	Gregory & Lisa	
9	Cotsoridis	Susan	Please be diligent in assessing before proceeding.
10	Darigan	Alexandra	These letters amplify specific aspects of the concerns expressed in our previous handwritten letters.
11	Deffley	Bill & Ann	Please do not jeopardize our only source of water. There are so many other sites! And, if the highway barn is built and we end up with contaminated water,... What is the back up plan???
12	Deffnere	Charles	
13	DeMolli	Alex	
14	Dutton	Janice	I am very concerned about disturbing contaminants in the landfill as I live in close proximity to it!
15	Forest	Donald	Please don't take the chance of contaminating my well water.
16	Giso	Fred	
17	Goodrich	Carolyn	
18	Halliday	June	Why on earth anyone would jeopardize that only water source we have on an ISLAND I'll never understand.
19	Hardy	George	
20	Infantoleno	Michael & Barbara	If you can't be absolutely sure that this project will not harm the wells and water supply of Jamestown don't you think it would be wiser to find another location for the barn?
21	Jacobson & Myers	Linda & Jon	Please don't risk our water supply.
22	Johnstone	William	
23	Knudsen	Rolf	It is only reasonable to be cautious when it comes to our water supply.
24	LaMartia	Janet	Do you really want to take a chance with the health and safety of our children's health? Why do we need to roll the dice when adequate study can provide the answers we need.
25	Laprey	Bob & Pat	When we voted against the barn at Taylor PT-It was because of the cost, not location. Within 240 the site was changed & approved & now we are frightened!
26	Magarian	Jana	
27	Martin	Stacy	Are you willing to help pipe in a fresh, uncontaminated water supply when my well becomes polluted? We would like some answers!!
28	McNeil	Sharon & Vernon	Please do not jeopardize our water supply.
29	Monaghan	Janet	Too much money has been spent on the design for the barn not enough testing has been done to protect our wells,.
30	Munafo	Dominic	We need answers to these questions and concerns!
31	Murphy	Greg & Dorothy	
32	Murray	Karin	Please stop this needless threat to my well!
33	Normand	Lynn & Charlie	We can't and the town doesn't care.
34	O'Duyer	Denise	Until the well/Farm is tested do not put up the highway barn.
35	O'Neill	Phil & Janet	This project presents a very serious possibility of severe health risks to residents! The site involved has been declared a TOXIC WASTE SITE by the Federal government. The risks involved certainly outweigh any benefits in proceeding without full certainty!
36	Leprih	Pamela	This issue is too important to allow unnecessary risks to be taken.

37	Perry	Wendy	
38	Pesare	Nina	Please don't take risks with our water supply. Thanks.
39	Poirier-Green	Jean	
40	Rafanelli	Josephine	It is imperative that all necessary precautions are taken in respect to water contamination!
41	Rainone	Keri & Richard	Do not take risks with our only water supply!!! Who do you think you are? We have small children here!
42	Reinan	Kirstin	Our water supply is a concern to us.
43	Reynolds	Sandra	Please do not take risks with our water supply. It's all we have.
44	Ritacco	Patricia	Please do what you can to protect our water supply!
45	Roche	Jane	We are very concerned!
46	Ruggiero	Deborah	Chris- Thanks for your help with our only water supply here.
47	Ryng	Ronald	
48	Sakovits	Carl & Suzanne	
49	Seidler	Harry	We ask that you please address these questions before moving ahead with this project.
50	Sheppard	George	
51	Smith	Helene	Please do it once and for all
52	Supron	Nicholas	I have 2 small children who drink and bath in this H2O.
53	Tinker	Thomas & Roslyn	I would think all _____ would want this study.
54	Turley	Hazel	Member Sierra Club of Rhode Island "Keep Our Bay Blue!"
55	Tuttle	William & Lisa	This highway barn does NOT need to go in a place where known contaminants could be released into residents' well water. This is our only source of drinking water. Please help!
56	Vigneault	Roland & Martha	
57	White	Peter	Please don't risk our health!
58	Johnson	Shelly	Please be careful with our water supply.
59	Kennedy	Kristin Dr.	
60	Hansen	Peter and Rita	We live 1 mile from the Jamestown landfill. We have 4 children. Our children cannot understand why anyone would take risks with well water that people drink, bath in and cook with. Please complete the bedrock studies before anyone is allowed to build on the old landfill site.

This letter opposes the project. It makes the following points:

- A. Why was a hydrogeologic study of the islands water supply never done?
See response #8.
- B. No one knows where the fractures are. Fractures, if disturbed, will move contaminants from the landfill into these “water pockets.”
See response # 2 and 16.
- C. Other communities have used sonar and x-ray viewing ahead of time to complete these studies.
See response #29.
- D. As with form letter 1, additional handwritten comments nearly all address the importance of groundwater. Some of the comments indicate the federal government has declared the site to be a toxic waste site.
See responses #2 and #5.

Form letter #4: Jamestown is Unique

Table 4: Form Letter 4 was submitted by the following people:

#	Last Name	First Name	Additional Comments
1	Banks	Kathleen	Please help us keep our children disease free! We live so close to that site.
2	Del Buono	Vincent	Please act with prudence regarding this matter. A mistake could ruin the livability of our beautiful island.
3	Gamble	Edward	
4	Hamilton	Bruce	Please take all necessary precaution and effort to protect our drinking supply.
5	Harvey	Susan	Please do not take risks with our water supply.
6	Hull	Tim & Lisa	
7	Jepson	Steven	
8	Karon	Richard and Linda	Is the DEM Prepared to insure potable water for us if you allow the proposed excavation? If not then you cannot approve the project!
9	Lepre	Marie	Please do not allow this.
10	Lindsay	Philip	
11	Lynch	Pamela	I am extremely concerned for our water supply. Please do not allow risks to be taken regarding it.
12	MacMillian	Jean	
13	Malles	Alex	
14	Martin	David	We own Lots 248 and 249 next to the landfill & plan to build on these 2 lots.
15	Murray	Teresa	Without clean water we will be sick. We want safe drinking water standards.
16	Oates	Tom & Christina	Please keep this beautiful island safe!
17	Olsen	Scott & Cindy	
18	Pennine	Andrea	Please don't risk our water supply!
19	Petersen	Paul & Linnea	Our well is our only source of water. Please do not take risks with our water supply.
20	Pritchard	David	Please look into this. This is not just a NIMBY problem. This is real.
21	Ranaldi	Mike	We would like definitive information.
22	Smith	Larry & Janet	Please look into the risks of our wells being contaminated. It's our drinking water!
23	Toselli	Alfred	Please help us to protect our health and the water supply for future generations (our children).
24	Totten	Laura	Please do not threaten our water supply and our children's health!
25	Weibust	Lloyd & Beth	
26	Lemke	Karen and Arthur	

This letter opposes the project. It makes the following points:

- A. Jamestown is unique.
See response #11
- B. It is an island and a sole source aquifer underlain by highly fractured bedrock.
See responses #11 and 4
- C. Most residents rely on groundwater and should receive the highest level of protection.
See response #2
- D. Additional comments stress the importance of groundwater to the community.
See response #2.

Form Letter # 5: Viera Farms

Table 5: Form Letter 5 was submitted by the following people:

#	Last Name	First Name	Additional Comments
1	Abbood	Michael & Teresa	Please do not take risks with our water supply.
2	Almeida	Kathleen	It seems to me that it is only common sense not to take the risk of contaminating the water supply when there are apparently other sites that could be used.
3	Aresti	Ralph	To do construction in an area where ecological harm will most likely result, when other construction sites are available is -- well, dumb!
4	Atamian	Robert & Mariam	
5	Aubin	Russell	Please help to protect our only source of water. There are many other places on the island where a town barn could more safely be placed.
6	Barlan	Ron	Resolving the cause of these well's "problems" would prove DEM and all the assessments right or wrong and make this disagreement go away. For good or bad. Please determine what & how these wells problems fit into the picture.
7	Bobola	Sara & Steve	
8	Brazil	Liz & Phil	
9	Brendlinsen	Richard	The Jamestown incidents of cancer seem excessive to start with. Thanks.
10	Bricher	Carol	Please help everyone in this area keep their drinking water safe. Thank you.
11	Carnevale	Mark	
12	Clark	Gregory & Lisa	Please - do not take risks with our water supply!
13	Cotsoridis	Susan	Seems a reasonable path. Why not be cautious & check this out? My family would appreciate it.
14	Darigan	Alexandra	
15	Deffley	Bill & Ann	Please do not jeopardize our only source of water. There are so many other sites. And, if the Highway Barn is built on the landfill, and we end up with contaminated water, what is the backup plan???
16	Dobbins	Deborah	Please help clean up our water in Jamestown!
17	Dourado	John	Please do not risk our drinking water.
18	Dourado	Beverly	Please protect our water supply. Our wells are the only water source we have. Thank you.
19	Dutton	Janice	
20	Eunis	Rabecca	Please do not take risks with our water supply!
21	Eunis	Eric	I am quite disgusted with the risk the town is willing to take in this regard!
22	Forest	Donald	I ask you - If my well water becomes contaminated is the town going to provide me with municipal water?
23	Gagne	Denise & Gary	Please help protect our water supply.
24	Giso	Virginia	
25	Goodrich	Carolyn	
26	Halliday	June	We need to know.
27	Hansen	Peter & Rita & Family	We live one mile from the Jamestown landfill. We have four children. Peter and I and our children wonder why anyone would want to risk the contamination of our well water.

28	Hardy	George	
29	Henry	Joseph	Please do not take risks with our water supply
30	Hohenleiten	Andrea	Taking chances with Jamestown's water supply seems extremely short sighted.
31	Infantoleno	Michael & Barbara	Please use common sense when considering this barn proposal. You know that the land is contaminated. You know what can happen from disturbing this contaminated land. Why take the risk?
32	Johnstone	William	It was stated at meeting that two wells have failed on the Vieira Farm. The frailty of the water situation if caution is not used, the whole area will fail.
33	Knudsen	Rolf	Please have these wells tested We need assurances that our water will be safe to drink.
34	LaMantia	Kenneth & Janet	We consider this of utmost importance. Please act quickly.
35	Lepre	Bob & Pat	We have a well and are very concerned about the highway barn location and the disruption it will cause with our water supply.
36	Martin	Stacey	See comment #70
37	Magarian	Jana	Please do not jeopardize our water supply!
38	McCaffrey	William & Glenne	Just to let your department know; It was required that we catch all rainwater into a self contained system for a 20' x 10' addition we just completed. We own just under an acre of land and it cost us \$10,000. Why hasn't run off from this large building been required to do the same?
39	McNeil	Sharon & Vernon	Our water is a precious commodity. We respect it and so should you because it is all we have.
40	Monaghan	Janet	Please act quickly so our water is not contaminated.
41	Munafo	Patricia	Please don't risk the health of my family, neighbors, and community. Thank you.
42	Murphy	Dorothy & Greg	
43	Murray	Teresa	How can we wash our hands or take showers or drink water if it is pollutant? We don't want dirty water.
44	Myers	Jim	Water is a most precious commodity. Don't spoil it. How do you live without it? Thank you.
45	Nadeau	Joseph	
46	Normand	Lynn & Charlie	Please take the time to call so that we can minimize the risks to our water supply.
47	O'Duyer	Denise	
48	O'Neill	Phil	The Federal government has recognized the former landfill as a toxic waste site! Why consider a public works garage to house town equipment and employees at this site with even a remote possibility of creating a "Love Canal" threatening health and financial consequences to residents?
49	O'Neill	Janet	The DEM has the responsibility to protect people and the environment. It should have demanded extensive testing in this area years ago. Private citizens should not have to fight this hard for the right thing to be done. The history of this site is well known, and documented. For this department to allow a municipality to act recklessly with the health and well being of its citizens is beyond irresponsible. Do not allow this process to

			continue without guarantees the there is without a doubt no risks to me and my family's health. I appreciate your attention to this matter.
50	Pasquale	Thomas	
51	Perry	Ray	
52	Pesare	Nina	Please do not take risks with our water supply.
53	Poirier-Green	Jean	Please help protect our water supply!
54	Rafanelli	Josephine	I respectfully request that you disregard any previous "highway barn" correspondence bearing my signature because at that time I was not aware of the above facts. Kindly, do not take risks with our water supply.
55	Rainone	Richard & Keri	Do not take risks with our water supply...
56	Reviron	Kirstin	This a concern to our family. Thank you for your consideration.
57	Reynolds	Sandra	Please do not take risks with our water supply. Its all we have.
58	Ritacco	Patricia	Our drinking water is at risk-please make the effort to test it.
59	Roche	Jane	Please take note. Our water supply is vital.
60	Ruggiero	Deb	Chris-- Time is of the essence. This is our only water supply on island.
61	Ryng	Ron	This is our only drinking water. Please don't take risk with our water supply.
62	Sakovitz	Carl & Suzanne	Please do not take risks with our North End H2O Supply-do not build the Highway barn on an existing toxic site.
63	Seidler	Susan & Harold	After attending the open forum last week, these questions remain unanswered. Please do not take chances with our water supply.
64	Sheppard	Julie	Please do not take risks with our water supply!
65	Smith	Joseph	It isn't too much to ask that nothing be spared to avoid poisoning our water.
66	Smith	Helene	Please Mr. Walusiak, please do not let this just slide
67	Supron	Nicholas	Please don't let the town railroad this process! Thanks.
68	Tinker	Thomas & Roslyn	Err on the side of caution here. We have no other source of drinking water.
69	Turley	Hazel	
70	Tuttle	William & Lisa	Please do not take any risks with our drinking water supply! I have 2 year old and 4 year old children, and we rely on our well water.
71	Vigneault	Roland & Martha	Please reconsider this!
72	White	Sandra	Please don't risk our health.
73	Williamson	John & Mary Ann	Please retest the wells! The quality of our water is important to my health!
74	Johnson	Shelly	Please keep out water safe. There's no second chance.
75	Kenndy	Dr. Kristin	
76	Turley	Emmet	As a member of the Jamestown Planning Board in the 90's, I was instrumental in the vote the Planning Board in denying the use of the land, identified as Viera Farm, for the development of house lots. This denial was based on adequate Health reports of contamination of soil in a test well and mound of discarded asphalt and

			highway debris. In addition there was a restriction on building within 1000' of the town's transfer station due to leaching of contaminated waters. This information may need to be reviewed in the minutes of the planning board.
77	Mikolay	Michael	Please test the water. I have small children.

This letter opposes the project. It makes the following points:

- A. Why was the Viera Farms well not tested?
See response #1 and 28.
- B. These wells showed contamination and the NECC have asked the wells be retested.
See response #1 and 28
- C. Groundwater is their only source of water.
See response #2
- D. There were many additional comments regarding the importance of groundwater to the community.
See response #2.
- E. Some additional comment make reference to Love Canal and known contamination.
See response #5.
- F. One comment discusses why a smaller project was required to catch rainwater.
The Department does not have enough information to respond.

Form letter # 6: Urging the Department to Stand Up to Pressure

Table 6: Form Letter 6 was submitted by the following people:

#	Last Name	First Name	Additional Comments
1	Barrette	Gerard	
2	Barter	Clara	
3	Barthold	Fred & Joyce	
4	Boyle	Ken	
5	Brennan	William	
6	Bryer	James	
7	Buckley	Pat	
8	Bunkley	Jeanne	
9	Carlisle	Lisa	
10	Christman	Arthur	
11	Christman	D.M.	
12	Clarke	William	
13	Congdon-Pinto	Elizabeth	
14	Coyle	Isabel	
15	Defusco	Donna	
16	Delmonica	Ann	
17	Dwyer	Alyce	
18	Gallo	Barbara & Michael	
19	Garnett	James	
20	Garnett	Sally	
21	Gladding	Wendy	
22	Goode	Frances	
23	Gouveia	Alan	
24	Graham	E. W. Sterling	

25	Greig	T	
26	Harpool	Harry	
27	Hunt	Elaine	
28	Hutchinson	Richard	
29	Hutchinson	Ann	
30	Jamison	Lillian	
31	Jamison	Bonnie	
32	Katz	Jeffrey	
33	Lavallee	Mary Jane	
34	Lavallee	Roger	
35	Lee	Philip	
36	Lee	Robin	
37	Littlefield	Elizabeth	
38	Long	Shirley	
39	Lopes	Alfred	
40	Luth	Diana	
41	MacKabee	Frances	
42	Matoes	Marie	
43	McLoughlin	James	
44	Messinger	Karein	
45	Milot	Arthur	
46	Milot	Martha	
47	Murphy	Mary Beth	
48	Neronha	Veronika	
49	Netten	Elizabeth	
50	Norton	Dorothy	
51	Ouellette	Douglas	
52	Owens	Dennis	
53	Owens	Deborah-Ann	
54	Pearson	Brad	
55	Peckham	Donna	
56	Peckham	Robert	
57	Pemantell	James	
58	Quinn	John	
59	Quinn	Sylvia	
60	Rafonelli	Josephine	
61	Richardson	Donald	
62	Robertson	Paul	
63	Ronchie	Mary	
64	Ronchie	Arthur	
65	Safford	Susan	
66	Salt	Robert	
67	Smith	Albert	
68	Soukup	Margaret	
69	Southern	Mattie	
70	Stahl	Erich	
71	Todd	Thomas	
72	Vessello	Vincent	
73	Vieira	Mary Louise	
74	Vietri	Alfred	
75	Webster	Mary	
76	Webster	Dennis	

77	Welty	Robert	
78	Welty	Marcia	
79	Whitaker	Barbara	
80	Wilkie	Dena	
81	Wood	Nancy	
82	Wright	Ellicott	
83	Wright	Harrison	
84	Wright	Josephine	
85	Wright	Jane	
86	Wright	Daniel	
87	Wright	James	
88	Wright	Catherine	
89	Yates	Martha	
90	Young	Lucille	
91	Berglund	Virginia	
92	Sarois	Gary	
93	Couture	Philip	
	Twombly	Peter	

This letter supports the project. It makes the following points:

- A. The opposition is a vocal minority.
See response #3.
- B. The citizens of the Town have made this decision.
See response #3.
- C. There is no evidence the project will hurt the groundwater.
See response #2.

DEPARTMENT RESPONSES TO OTHER COMMENTS

In addition to the six form letters, the following comments were received. They were randomly assigned numbers beginning with #7.

Letter #7: David B. Van Slyke (Preti, Flaherty, Beliveau, Pachios & Haley LLP, 2/10/2006)

Comments opposing the project.

This correspondence also contains a 19 page attached letter from MACTEC (listed as letter #8) and is written on behalf of the NECC. Due to the length of the discussion of technical and legal issues, a separate summary of these two letters and the Department’s responses are contained in Attachment C.

Letter # 8: Jeff McCrady and Stephen H. Mitchell, P.E. (MACTEC, 2/10/2006)

Comments opposing the project.

See above and Attachment C.

Letter # 9 Patrick K. Bolger (2/7/2006) :

Comments opposing the project.

- A. The plan is a significant deviation from the original closure plan.
See response #1.
- B. The area is a sole source aquifer under RIDEM regulations.

- See response #4.*
- C. Previous studies show contamination at Viera Farms.
See responses #28 and 15.
- D. More testing is mandatory.
See responses #1.
- E. The proposal contains disclaimers about the limitations of the data .
See response #6

Letter # 10: Richard L. Amirault (RIDOH, 2/8/2006):

Comments neutral regarding the project.

- A. Suggestion that the town may wish to address concerns by developing a contingency plan and incorporate it into the process.
See response #20.

Letter # 11: Rosemary Woodside (2/8/2006):

Comments opposing the project.

- A. In 1988 the town passed an emergency ordinance stopping residential development within 1000 feet of the landfill noting there was little or no control over quantity and types of material disposed. The ordinance also mentioned the lack of municipal water or sewer lines near the area. What has changed?
As explained in response #3, the Department is not considering zoning or local ordinance issues. See response #2 relative to the significance of groundwater.
- B. In 1987 monitoring wells at Viera Farms were found to be contaminated.
See response #28.
- C. Monitoring well network is based on 6 shallow wells. Why are there no cluster wells?
See also response #14
- D. Why are the Viera Farms wells not being tested?
See response #28.
- E. Why has the number of wells decreased from 13 to 6?
See response #1.
- F. Well EA-1B along with GZ-2 is the most down-gradient well and the most contaminated yet testing was discontinued in 2004.
See response #1 and 14.
- G. The deep well routinely showed hits of metals as recently as September 2004 but testing was discontinued in December of 2004.-
See response #1
- H. Why are there no well pairs?
See response #14.
- I. Why is there no pump testing?
See response #7
- J. Why are there no cluster wells?
See response #14.
- K. Why aren't wells tested more frequently?
See response #1.
- L. GZA reports have disclaimers.

- See response #6*
- M. Why has there been no hydrogeological study of the island?
See response #8
- N. How many violations of DEM and EPA regulations has Jamestown received in the past 15 years?
See response #3.
- O. The EPA is the governing agency of DEM and the Town. All EPA regulations should be enforced.
See response #9
- P. Where is the citizens group to oversee the closure?
See response #3.
- Q. Storm water catch basins are installed in a way that introduces surface water upgradient and directly into the landfill that will increase leachate production. This design will funnel runoff from the site onto an abutter's wetland over a GA aquifer. How will these wetlands be monitored?
See response #36.
- R. Will a permit from CRMC be required for the project given that runoff will eventually be through a salt marsh?
See response #30.
- S. The landfill is perhaps the most toxic piece of property in Jamestown
It is unclear what the comparison is based on, see response #5.
- T. Is there another landfill with an industrial facility on it that is both:
i On a highly fractured bedrock aquifer
ii Surrounded by private wells
iii In an area without an alternate source of drinking water.
See response #23.
- U. Will contamination occur when trash is moved to locate the DPW facility?
See response #12
- V. Why isn't the minimum standard for landfill closure being met?
See response #1
- W. Why isn't pavement on the road required as per RIDEM's comment on the 30% design.
See response #13
- X. Why isn't a methane mitigation system being proposed?
See response #1.
- Y. How will floor drain discharges be regulated?
See response #10.
- Z. RI Regulations indicate fracture trace analysis and tracer studies may be required.
See responses #1 and 8.
- AA. How will alterations to groundwater flow be studied?
See response #1.
- BB. No overburden wells have been installed. Will more wells be required?
See response #14
- CC. RI regulations require the installation of more monitoring wells.
See response #1

- DD. How will monitoring of reclassified aquifer be done? Will it ensure no exceedances of GA standards?
See response #1 regarding EMP.
- EE. Will 30 years of monitoring be required?
See response #1.
- FF. Excavated waste should be tested with more than PID.
See response #12
- GG. Is sampling of 1 soil sample/ 500 cu. yds sufficient?
See response 12
- HH. GZA letter of July 8, 2005 says no contaminants have been found in drinking water since 1984 but bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate was reported in 2002.
See response #15.
- II. GZA's 1992 assessment of Viera Farms says it was downgradient of the landfill, now they say it is not.
See response #15 and 28.
- JJ. In 1999, GZA said a well on Lot 47 would affect groundwater, in 2005 they said it will not impact groundwater flow patterns, which is correct?
See response #15
- KK. GZA in 2005 said sewage sludge was accepted until 1985. EA in 1991 indicates there was sludge disposal after that.
See response #15
- LL. GZA should be removed because of past involvement with the Town and the engineering firm that closed Block Island landfill should be hired.
See responses #31 and 21.

Letter #12: Louise Brendlinger (2/8/2006)

Comments opposing the project.

Comments were identical to previous letter from Rosemary Woodside above.

Letter #13: Andrew Justin Nicoletta (2/10/2006):

Comments opposing the project.

- A. Groundwater is very significant to the quality of life with no alternate source available.
See response #2
- B. The bedrock is fractured with a large lake under the ground.
See responses #11 and 16.
- C. The landfill is a toxic waste site.
See response #5.
- D. The storm water management will dump contaminated water on lot 47.
See response #36.
- E. The 200 gallons/day assumed for a water intake is not reflective of actual projected use.
See response #17.

Letter #14: Andrew Yates (2/10/2006):

Comments supporting the project.

- A. A vocal minority is using fear and smear to distract from science.
See response #3.
- B. The ongoing process will reduce water safety risks.
See response #2.
- C. North road is the best location for the barn, no other site is as good.
See response #3.

Letter #15: Anthony N. Lush (2/9/2006):

Comments supporting the project.

- A. The Department should use good science and not be swayed by political pressure.
See response #3
- B. Most Jamestown residents want the barn put at that location.
See response #3

Letter #16: Victor V. Calabretta, P.E. (2/9/2006):

Comments supporting the project.

- A. The NECC is a vocal minority, most people want it built there.
See response #3.
- B. The project will improve existing conditions and is what brownfields is meant to do.
See response #1 and 18.

Letter #17: Stacey and Michael Martin (2/10/2006)

Comments opposing the project. (These comments were attached to Form Letter 5 but are included as a separate comment due to their length.)

- A. Water supplies are in danger. Many human lives are at stake. Commenters have young children. Bureaucracy should be ignored and the Department should protect groundwater.
See response #2.

Letter #18: Dee Bates (2/3/2006):

Comments opposing the project.

- A. There has been massive dumping of chemicals some known and some unknown. The potential for ground water contamination is overwhelming.
The Department does not know the basis for either of these statements. See also response #5 and 2.

Letter #19: C. Richard and Jane W. Koster (2/8/2006):

Comments opposing the project.

- A. There is documented proof the Lot 47 well will enhance the risks of groundwater migration.
See response #15
- B. There is documented proof that sewage was transported to the landfill for disposal.
See response #15

- C. There is documented proof that the landfill was performing sludge composting up to 1999.
See response #15
- D. There is a documented statement from Dr. Robert Vanderslice of RIDOH that it is not a question of if but when wells become contaminated.
See response # 20

Letter #20: Richard Smith (2/8/2006):

Comments opposing the project.

- A. There was a discrepancy regarding GZA's statements on Viera Farms from 1992 to the present.
See responses #15 and 28.
- B. The Viera Farms wells have been contaminated.
See response #28.
- C. It is not proven that Brownfielding works.
See response # 18
- D. The environment should be the primary concern.
See response #2

Letter #21: Kathleen Fitzgerald and Keith Stavely (2/8/2006):

Comments opposing the project.

- A. There are other available sites and it should be placed there.
See response #3
- B. GZA cannot be sure there won't be contamination from the project, so why take a chance of contaminating groundwater.
See response # 2

Letter #22: Mike S?? (2/8/2006):

Comments opposing the project.

- A. The landfill has already contaminated private wells.
See also response #1 and 28.
- B. There may be accidents at the highway barn.
See response #19
- C. Why reuse contaminated soil at the landfill?
See response #12
- D. The water supply is threatened and cannot be replaced.
See response #2

Letter #23: David A. King (2/8/2006):

Comments opposing the project.

- A. GZA was the firm that said there should never be development on the abutting parcel.
*The Department reviewed the GZA Viera Farms report and finds no such conclusion.
See also response #15 and 28.*
- B. The commenter lives within 100 yards of the landfill and is concerned about groundwater.

- See response #2.*
- C. An expert from EPA and Director Sullivan have both been quoted as saying it is not a matter of “if” but a matter of “when” disturbing the old landfill would create a problem of contaminants leaching off the site.
See response #20
- D. Someone other than GZA should do the analysis.
See response #21

Letter # 24: Donna Kane (2/7/2006):

Comments opposing the project.

- A. Groundwater is the only source of water and trucks will pollute it.
See responses #19.
- B. GZA found contamination on the Viera Farms property and has reversed themselves.
See response #15 and 28.
- C. No other town in RI has built on a superfund site like this one.
See response #5 and 23.

Letter #25: Nancy L. and Robert W. Halstead (2/7/2006)

Comments opposing the project.

- A. Jamestown has been cited over the years by DEM for numerous violations that were documented by the NECC and not disputed by DEM.
See response 3.
- B. The town and GZA have lied about the site.
See response 15.
- C. Groundwater is threatened by the project.
See response #2.

Letter #26: Dwight S. Smith (2/7/2006)

Comments opposing the project.

- A. The area is a sole source aquifer.
See response #4.
- B. Excavation may have risks.
See response #12.
- C. GZA will reroute surface water.
See response #33.

Letter #27: David Bolger and Mark Lancaster (2/6/2006)

Comments opposing the project.

- A. Possible contamination of private wells.
See responses # 2.
- B. Possible contamination from the highway barn.
See response #19.
- C. There is no alternative for water supply.
See response #2.
- D. The town does not maintain things properly and is a bad neighbor.

- See response #3.*
- E. The town has not explored all available sites.
See response #3.
 - F. The landfill should be closed, capped and monitored.
See response #1.

Letter #28: Steven W. Jepson (2/9/2006)

Comments opposing the project.

- A. GZA previously indicated the landfill was the source of contamination on the Viera Farms Property.
See responses # 15.
- B. The Viera Farms property should be retested.
See response #28.

Letter #29: Susan and Abbott Gregerman (2/9/2006):

Comments opposing the project.

- A. The landfill should be capped.
See responses # 1.
- B. Residents depend on the groundwater with no alternate source.
See response #2.

Letter #30: Richard Kingsley, PhD. (2/10/2006):

Comments supporting the project.

- A. Respondent is a geologist by profession.
No response needed.
- B. Siting of Highway barn and hazard mitigation are separate.
See response #1.
- C. Concerns are without merit and issues are easily addressed by proper construction and storage practices.
No response needed.
- D. The voters approved the highway barn and that is where it should go.
See response #3.

Letter #31: David Coppe, M.D. (2/10/2006):

Comments opposing the project.

- A. Potential contamination of the ground water, private wells and reservoir could lead to health concerns.
See response #2.
- B. Toxic substances in small amounts could lead to health concerns.
See response #2.

Letter # 32: Ellen M. Winsor (2/10/2006):

Comments opposing the project.

- A. Cape Cod and another superfund site in Ashland Massachusetts have shown severe contamination.

- See response #5.*
- B. The sole source aquifer is at risk and the site should be held to the highest regulatory standard.
See responses #1, 2 and 4.
- C. Concerns about Nyanza and Rose Hill were not addressed. Unlike these sites NECC was not allowed to have a citizens advisory group.
See responses #3 and 5.
- D. RIDEM should acknowledge the “Weingand Principle” that when an activity raises threats of harm to human health or the environment, precautionary measures should be taken even if some cause and effect relationships are not fully established scientifically.
The Department does not believe the chosen remedy threatens human health or the environment, see response #1.
- E. Environmental justice is not being achieved here.
See also response #27.
- F. To date the EPA has provided alternate drinking water to 615,000 people, we do not want to be added to this list.
See responses #2 and 5.

Letter #33: Norma Willis (2/7/2006):

Comments opposing the project.

- A. Fact- Jamestown is unique and Jamestown is an Island.
Agreed per response #11.
- B. Fact- Jamestown is a sole source aquifer.
See response #4.
- C. Fact- Jamestown’s landfill is surrounded by private wells.
Agreed per response #2.
- D. Fact-Jamestown has a highly fractured bedrock aquifer.
See response #11.
- E. Fact- Jamestown’s landfill has seeped toxic VOC’s off the landfill in the past.
See response #28.
- F. Fact- GZA cannot guarantee that pollutants will not contaminate private wells.
See response #2.
- G. Fact- 57% of Jamestown residents rely on private wells.
The Department has not verified this information but does not dispute it.
- H. If the bedrock aquifer becomes contaminated those on private wells will have no recourse.
See response #2.
- I. Attached article where a “lightly contaminated” soil is used to recap a landfill in Worcester. The article draws a contrast to Woonsocket where clean soil is placed are part of an engineered cap.
See response #32.

Letter #34: Lee Tuthill, PE (2/9/2006)

Comments supporting the project.

- A. Project will improve the groundwater while providing a much needed facility.
See response #1 and 2.
- B. Most Jamestown residents want it built there.
See response #3.
- C. Commenter drinks from this aquifer and believes it to be safe.
No response needed.

Letter #35: Karen and Don Easton (2/8/2006)

Comments supporting the project.

- A. Forces opposing the barn have more financial resources than those supporting it.
No response needed.
- B. RIDEM should use good science and ignore the “background noise” regarding this project.
See response #3.
- C. There is no evidence that the barn will cause a problem.
See response #2.
- D. Most residents of Jamestown voted to put it there.
See response #3.

Letter #36: J. Christopher Powell, Jamestown Conservation Commission (e-mail 2/10/2006, hard copy 2/16/2006).

(This comment was subsequently withdrawn after the comment period).

Comments supporting the project.

- A. The Conservation Commission is on record as supporting the project.
No response needed.
- B. Locating the project here would prevent another greenfield from conversion to industrial use.
See response #18.
- C. The location of the DPW facility on the landfill is an integral part of the remediation.
See response #3.

Letter #37: Kurt D. Musselman (2/10/2006)

Comments opposing the project.

- A. Commenter includes an explanation of his background that includes:
 - Mother works at RIDEM and father works for FDA.
 - Former intern in environmental law at the RI Attorney General’s Office
 - Certified brew master (described as a food scientist and an engineer that brews beer)*No response needed.*
- B. Fact- the landfill is not properly closed.
See response #1.
- C. Fact- EPA exempted the site from the NPL list due to funds making the site a state (RI) responsibility.
See response #5.

- D. Fact- DEM desires to use an EPA exemption to circumvent normal CERCLIS landfill closure.
See response #5.
- E. Fact- Contaminants have been found on monitoring wells at the site.
No response needed.
- F. Fact- The current plan involves disturbing CONTAMINATED soil.
See response #12.
- G. Fact- The current plan involves changing the surface water FLOW and groundwater RECHARGE.
See response #33.
- H. Fact- The current plan involves NO CONTINGENCY FOR backup water supply to citizens using private wells.
See response #2 and 20.
- I. Fact- Current “brown-field” procedures involve finding uses for sites that have been PROPERLY REMEDIATED.
See response #18.
- J. Fact, There is at least one well immediately adjacent to the site that has a contaminated well.
See response #28.

Letter #38: Franklin Julian (2/10/2006)

Comments opposing the project.

- A. Studies have been done that indicate the proposal will contaminate wells in the area.
The Department is not aware of such a study, see response #2.
- B. 57% of residents rely on groundwater
The Department has not verified this information but does not dispute it.
- C. The barn should be located at Fort Getty.
See Response #3.

Letter #39: John Mecray (2/10/2006)

Comments opposing the project.

- A. A hydrogeologic study has not been done and should be.
See comments #8.
- B. Contamination has been found on an adjacent property.
See response #28.
- C. Site is a known hazardous waste site.
See response #5.

Letter #40: Carol Nelson-Lee (2/11/2006)

Comments supporting the project.

- A. The closure plan is well thought out and will result in a cleaner site. The plan includes the following items:
 - i Excavate and evaluate material buried at the landfill.
 - ii Change grade of land so excess runoff will be diverted from the landfill
 - iii Improve drainage with vortex separators to keep gasoline out of storm water

- iv Improve entrance roads
 - v Build the highway barn.
- The understanding of the plan is correct, except that the excavation of waste will be only for very limited areas (under the barn and under some drainage areas).*
- B. Segments of the videotapes have been edited and distributed in such a way as to inaccurately characterize the meeting and ridicule the speakers.
See response #24.

Letter #41: James K. Cardi M.D. (2/10/2006)

Comments opposing the project.

- A. How many landfills have been closed in this manner (i.e. excavated).
See response #23.
- B. How many landfills have industrial facilities in areas only served by private wells?
See response #23.
- C. What is the basis of the statement at the meeting by Laurie Grandchamp that the landfill is fairly benign?
See response #34.
- D. Who will pay for monitoring of private wells? Who will pay for investigations?
See response #1 and 20.
- E. Private wells are very important and impact both health and financial well being of the residents.
See response #2.

Letter #42: Dennis H. Webster (2/9/2006)

Comments supporting the project.

- A. The project is of reasonable cost and will improve the groundwater.
See responses #1 and 2.
- B. There is the same level of effort for the landfill whether the garage is built or not.
See response #1.
- C. Much of the fear is unfounded.
See response #2.

Letter #43: Quentin Anthony (2/9/2006)

Comments supporting the project.

- A. There is no scientific reason that the project should not go forward.
See response #2.

Letter # 44: Susan and Abbott Gregerman (2/10/2006)

Comments opposing the project.

- A. We should err on the side of caution and not threaten the groundwater.
See response #2.

Letter #45: Holly Turton (2/10/2006)

Comments supporting the project.

- A. The concerns regarding groundwater are without merit and the highway barn should be built there.
See response #3.

Letter #46: Marcie Lindsay (2/8/2006)

Comments opposing the project.

- A. We should err on the side of caution and not threaten the groundwater.
See response #2.

Letter #47: Daniel O'Neill (2/10/2006)

Comments opposing the project.

- A. Groundwater is very important for drinking and bathing.
See response #2.
- B. Fractured bedrock underlies the site and may flow in a different direction.
See response #11.
- C. Jamestown has a long history of environmental violations.
See response #3.
- D. No variances to solid waste regulations should be permitted.
See response #1 and 22.
- E. Wells within the waste must be sampled.
See response #14.
- F. The landfill is a geologically unstable waste pile over toxic chemicals.
There is no data to support this characterization.
- G. Why are Lot 47 and Summit Ave part of the plan when Laurie Grandchamp said they are not jurisdictional?
See response #26.

Letter # 48: Joe S. Loitherstein, P.E., Loitherstein Environmental (2/9/2006)

Comments opposing the project.

- A. Further assessment of chlorinated volatile organic compounds is needed. Letter includes a proposal for Loitherstein Environmental to do the work for \$35,000 not including the cost of wells.
See response #35.

Letter #49: Saverio and Cheryl Rebecchi (2/9/2006)

Comments opposing the project.

- A. The bedrock aquifer supplies water to the entire island and must be protected.
See response #2.
- B. Forbidding industrial activity at the landfill is the best way to delay the release of unknown contaminants.
See response #1.
- C. In 1987 to town issued an emergency ordinance forbidding new development within 1000 feet of the landfill.
See response #3.

- D. GZA has found contamination at the Viera Farms wells. The comment also includes reference to materials on the www.northendcc.org site.
See comments #15, 28 and 24.
- E. Laurie Grandchamp should not make characterizations of the landfill as benign as it shows lack of objectivity.
See response #34.
- F. Filters will not protect human health unless the wells are tested every day.
See response #20.
- G. Onsite activity may cause chemical at the landfill to explode and release poisons miles away.
See response#5.
- H. The Town has a poor history of maintenance at the site.
See response #3.
- I. There are many other sites where the barn can be located.
See response #3.
- J. The area is a sole source aquifer.
See response #4.

Letter #50: W. Bruce Turner (2/10/2006)

Comments opposing the project.

- A. The site has been inadequately studied.
See response #1.
- B. Groundwater in Jamestown is a precious resource that needs to be protected.
See response #2.

Letter #51: Darcy Magratten (2/9/2006)

Comments supporting the project.

- A. The site has been adequately studied.
See response #1.
- B. Concerns for groundwater from the project are not warranted.
See responses #2 and 5.

Letter #52: James Estes (2/10/2006)

Comments supporting the project.

- A. Most residents of Jamestown want to see the garage constructed at that location.
See response #3.

Letter #53: William W. Karl (2/10/2006)

Comments opposing the project.

- A. Movement and vibrations from the project will contaminate hundreds of wells. Lawsuits will result. Residents will have to rely on store bought water. Property values will plummet. Water will have to be provided by the town that will tax the system.
See response #2.
- B. Cancer rates in Jamestown are already very high (the commenter was diagnosed with prostate cancer).

See response #25.

Letter #54: Kathleen Karl (2/10/2006)

Comments opposing the project.

- A. The project will harm groundwater causing lawsuit and health problems.
See response #2.
- B. Another location should be chosen.
See response #3.
- C. Cancer in Jamestown is the highest in the state.
See response #25.

Letter #55: Gloria J. Kurz (2/10/2006)

Comments opposing the project.

- A. The project threatens groundwater.
See response #2.
- B. A hydrogeologic study is needed.
See response #8.

Letter #56: Susan R. Little (2/10/2006)

Comments opposing the project. (An identical letter was also submitted with Susan Little's name at the top and John G. Shannon [commenter #64] at the bottom)

- A. The project threatens groundwater.
See response #2.
- B. The island is a sole source aquifer.
See response #4.
- C. No variances should be granted. More study is necessary.
See response #1.
- D. An impermeable cap is needed.
See response #1.
- E. High levels of heavy metals have frequently been detected at the site.
See response #2 and 5.
- F. Truck traffic on the landfill may expose waste.
See response #13.
- G. Storm water discharges will dump contaminated water into wetlands.
See response #36.
- H. More groundwater monitoring is required.
See response #1.

Letter #57: Alexandra Hope and Francis J. Darigan Jr. (2/7/2006)

Comments opposing the project.

- A. The project threatens groundwater.
See response #2.
- B. A non-toxic site should be found for the barn.
See responses #3 and 19.

Letter #58: Richard Eannarino (2/7/2006)

Comments opposing the project.

- A. What was the cost of the cleanup of the Davis Dump? What were its impacts?
See response #5 and 3.
- B. What is the cost to the town to maintain and monitor the garage for the next 10 years? What is the cost to remove all the waste in the area of construction?
See response #3.
- C. William Munger testified waste ranging from thermometers to paint cans have been disposed of at the site. What is the cost of heavy equipment transversing pavement covering with such waste.
The Department does not believe that mercury thermometers, if they are present in the landfill will impact paving procedures and costs. See also response #3.

Letter #59: Barbara Infantolino (2/8/2006)

Comments opposing the project.

- A. The project threatens groundwater.
See response #2.

Letter #60: Sarah Baines (2/10/2006)

Comments opposing the project.

- A. The project threatens groundwater.
See response #2.
- B. A firm other than GZA should do the work.
See response #21.
- C. The “flume” from a superfund site on Cape Cod caused extensive damage and was very expensive to remediate.
See response #5.
- D. Residents will have to pay for water filter if the landfill contaminates wells.
See response #20.

Letter #61: Donna P. O’Neill (2/10/2006)

Comments opposing the project.

- A. The project threatens groundwater.
See response #2.
- B. Any building on the site must include mandatory provisions for alternate water supplies to the residents.
See response #3.

Letter #62: Melissa Mastrostefano (2/9/2006)

Comments opposing the project.

- A. The project threatens groundwater.
See response #2.
- B. Cancer rates in Jamestown are very high.
See response #25.
- C. Arsenic at the site poses a danger to the groundwater.

- Recent groundwater sampling results do not show arsenic to be a problem at the site.*
- D. Contamination has been found at Viera Farms.
See response #15 and 28.
 - E. The bedrock at the site is fractured.
See response #11.

Letter #63: Linda A. Scott (2/9/2006)

Comments supporting the project.

- A. The project will improve groundwater.
See response #2.
- B. The Department should use sound judgment and not be swayed by a vocal minority.
See response #3.

Letter #64: John G. Shannon (2/9/2006)

Comments opposing the project.

- A. The project threatens groundwater.
See response #2.
- B. The proposal is to excavate and rebury the waste.
See response #12.

Letter #65: Joan E. Jordan (2/9/2006)

Comments opposing the project.

- A. The site will probably contaminate the aquifer.
See response #2.
- B. The testing was not properly done at the site.
See response #1.
- C. Another site should be used.
See response #3.

Letter #66: Raymond Iannetta (2/9/2006)

Comments opposing the project.

- A. Jamestown is unique.
See response #11.
- B. Exeter and Hopkinton are able to bring municipal water to residents if the wells become contaminated.
See response #23.
- C. The plan does not call for paving the road over the landfill.
See response #13.
- D. The reduction in the test wells was allowed because GZA showed a statistical analysis that showed level or downtrend in MCL's. The statistics are misleading because EPA does not have MCL's for some VOC's, cobalt. Also chromium levels have risen.
As discussed in response #1, the EMP has already been approved. There seems to be confusion here between MCL's and statistical analysis of contaminants trends. As

part of the EMP, there is a requirement to analyze statistically significant increases of analytes that are above MCL's or above background. See also response #27.

- E. The Department should not rely on MCL's as drinking water standards.
See response #27.
- F. There should be no expansion because the site sits on a sole source aquifer.
See response #4.
- G. The Town should post a bond to connect all residences to public water.
See response #3.

Letter #67: Barbara Noel Tuthill (2/13/2006)

Comments supporting the project.

- A. DEM should stand up to the vocal minority opposing the project and approve it.
See responses #1 and 3.
- B. There is no evidence the project will damage groundwater.
See response #2
- C. The current controls and monitoring are adequate to ensure safety of the aquifer.
See response #2

Letter #68: Bob Dolan (2/8/2006)

Comments supporting the project.

- A. The small group that dominated the Town meeting on the site does not represent most of the residents. No site will be without community opposition.
See response #3.
- B. The site was approved overwhelmingly at the financial town meeting.
See response #3