

**TOWN OF STURBRIDGE, MA
BOARD OF HEALTH**

**Monday, February 13, 2017
Veteran's Memorial Hall, Town Hall, 2nd Floor**

Meeting Called to Order: 6:05 pm

Quorum Check: Confirmed

Members Present: Linda Cocalis (LC), Chairman
Bob Audet (BA)
Richard Volpe (RV)

Members Absent: None

Others Present:

Jamie Terry (JT), Interim BOH Agent
Cindy Sowa Forgit (CF), Interim BOH Administrative Assistant
MaryJude Pigsley (MJP), MA DEP Regional Director
Mark Baldie (MB), MA DEP
Andrea Briggs (AB), MA DEP Regional Director
David Foss (DF), Wilson & Barton, Environmental Hydrogeologist Consultant representing the BOH

Audience Members: David Barnicle, Carol Goodwin, Ed Goodwin, John Jordan, Brian Lee, Mark Widing Sr, Melissa Widing, F Bearegard, Claire Miller, James Tombedo, Doug Lizend, Lara DaRocer, Whitney Goodwin, Brad Goodwin, David Dumus, Penny Dumus, Chet Pretrzig, John Latino, Cheryl Reeve, Cheryl Wood Creek, Lindsay Goodwin, Ted Goodwin, Chris Olson, Walt Domozych, Debra Domozych, Kevin Weldon, Cynthia Weldon, James Philbrook, Nancy Ferreira Bixby, Shern Bredenberg Hostage, Wil Gallien, Wendy Gallien, Michelle Matte, Brian Galonek, Todd Cave, Lisa Cave, Mathew LaFond, Cynthia LaFond, Glenys Hackfeld, Klaus Hackfeld, Susan Kline, Marc Buidste, Jeff Stone, Lisa Stone, Christian Bousquet, Andrew Pelletier, Dan Matte, Chris Debre, Angela Lavoie, Dave Adams, Liz Sheldon, James Czeckin, Amy Galonek, Nancy McDevitt, Tom Hostage, Kenny V, Christine Tieri, Bailey Applegate, Laury Applegate, N Applegate, Matt Gagner, Elissa Gelfand, Greg Grita, Tommy Prvilt, Reed Hillman, Lisa Beaudin, Roy Bishop, Donna Brunelle, Robert Brunelle, Leon Gaumond TOS Town Administrator, Jacqueline Kumor, Stanley Kumor, Sue Cury, Tom Cury, David Williams, Judy Neilsen, Connie Montross, Louis Fazen, Carl Neilsen, Kevin Budrio, Tom Guyer, Anne Geyer, Ray Curry, Sandy Curry, Blake Dezel, Mary Blanchard, Steven Chidester, Polly Currier, Edward Currier, Christy Lavallee, Eric Lavallee, Jon Sandborn, Sara Sandborn, Kathy Zilaro, Joe Zilaro, Eugene Mattial, Marcia Mattioli, Robert Courtney, Mark Cignazella, Andrea Cignazrella, Marita Tasse, Stacey Valentine, Kevin Smith, LuEllen Smith, Steve Sexton, Dina Sexton, Brandon Goodwin, Sarah Goodwin, Amal Mandalaywala, Sarah Goodwin, MA Senator Anne Gobi, George DeBaske, Craig Moran, Kirstie Pecci, Tim Pecci and MA State Representative Todd Smola

Opening Statement (BA): The meeting is being taped in case anyone does not want to stay. This meeting is being held as per the request of citizens to understand the recent water quality findings. This group is concerned with the overall water quality. Recent testing on McGilpin Road, has showed some factors that need to be discussed further. Of note: there are Charlton residents concerned also. The Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protect (DEP) is investigating the source of contamination and/or contributing factors. The goal of the Sturbridge Board of Health (BOH) is to keep residents safe.

Introduction of panel guests: DEP members and David Foss

Rule of Necessity: The Sturbridge BOH is comprised of 3 Voting Members and 1 Agent. 2 Voting Members: Bob Audet & Linda Cocalis have a conflict of interest as they own property on McGilpin Road. In order to make a quorum; thus, allowing these members to speak, the Rule of Necessity is evoked by Bob Audet and The Rule of Necessity is evoked by Linda Cocalis.

Introduction of other guests: Ty Lolet, representing MA Senator, Anne Gobi

Todd Smola, MA State Representative
Anne Gobi, MA Senator (arrived late due to another meeting)

Overview of Agenda: JT developed questions on behalf of the BOH for DEP to respond to. The meeting will then be opened for the public audience to ask any additional questions. Everyone will be allowed to speak. Thank you in advance for your cooperation and respect of others while speaking.

Backstory: Residents in the Town of Charlton received a grant which they used a portion of for two private residents to use to test their wells on McGilpin Road, in the middle of January. January 10th the results were received by DEP. One of these residential wells had no detection of 1,4 Dioxane. The other residential well water test showed an element of 1,4 Dioxane, which was found at a detected level but not in exceedance. Due to these results, MA DEP conducted their own tests. Levels of Lead were found to be in exceedance in some cases of the sampling.

Current DEP Process: MJP describes the process at McGilpin Road as follows:

- DEP protocol falls under the 21 E program.
- Any detection in private wells, will prompt further investigation. There is a 500' radius around any well that shows a hit.
- To eliminate any further exposure to possible contaminates, we have provided bottled water for those residents. As of today, 19 homes are currently receiving water.
- We have ramped up very quickly since the initial detection was learned of. DEP will continue to test and will move out 500' at every detection.

Audience Questions (LC): BOH can take written questions on paper, if anyone feels uncomfortable speaking in public.

BOH Questions: The following were asked on behalf of the BOH. MJP answered the following on behalf of DEP, unless otherwise stated.

- ***(JT): DEP is set to render a decision on the Southbridge/Casella Landfill Expansion Proposal on February 15th. How can MA DEP make this decision while currently investigating water concerns in Sturbridge?*** MJP: DEP can't speak to site suitability which is the first step in a landfill proposal. Yes, the DEP decision is due this Wednesday. We have no control over who files application. We make decision based on criteria stated in our regulations. The local Southbridge BOH assigns the site suitability for landfill. The first step goes to DEP to see if the site is suitable. It needs to meet a 16-point criteria for landfills, then an additional 11 point criteria are added (for ex, wetlands, wells etc.) onto the application. This is not a design or technical review. The DEP then permits based on a very detailed review of all the criteria. This decision is based on that land. This is all that DEP is looking at this time, which is Wed.
- ***(JT): Does the 16 point criteria take into account, any of the surrounding areas?*** No, the 11 point criteria is what it falls under.
- ***(JT): Is there a possibly of extending the decision, at this time?*** The DEP regulations state we must make decision and can't extend unless the applicant agrees. Coincidentally, we did already request an extension for 2 additional weeks which brings us to the deadline of this Wednesday. The applicant needed a few rounds of additional paperwork required by DEP.
- ***(JT): The 3rd round of testing was conducted on 2/8/17. Were the original houses repeat tested a 3rd time?*** DEP acted quickly. We are in the process of figuring out the next steps. We now have lead and 1,4 Dioxane. DEP's next step is to make sure every originally tested house is tested twice. We then sit and figure out what houses show results. Some houses have tested with lead in one round, but not in the 2nd round. We then have to look further into ... how deep is well, how is the pump designed then figure out next steps. We have only been doing this testing for a month.
- ***(JT): If a homeowner needs additional information and would like to provide to DEP, please contact the BOH as we may have a properties' well and septic information.***
- ***(BA): Does this sampling information effect the DEP decision on the 15th?*** We don't have enough information yet. Unlike the neighborhood in Charlton, we are not seeing any other the contaminates here in Sturbridge, like we are in Charlton. Most houses here were built after 1986, so the lead should not be from the pipes. Water runs for 30 mins before the samples taken. DEP knows it in the ground water not in the pipes. Therefore, we know lead is coming in from groundwater. However, we don't have enough information to conclude either way if it's coming from the landfill or not.
- ***(LC): Is DEP considering a particular neighborhood in Charlton, that maybe impacted from the landfill?*** MJP: Yes, we are considering that. I want to be clear we are considering data in Charlton.

- **JT: Lead levels show a difference in one test and another test in the same house. Why?** MJP: We don't know yet, currently doing research as to why this is occurring. We sampled 20 houses. 15 houses have been sampled twice. There are some wide variations, so why? Is it in home? We are looking at other data. Other studies show that it's not uncommon to see variations in what we have found. Maybe it's in the aquifer, the home etc. We will be going back to do 3rd round once all homes have been tested twice. We take 3 samples, at the same time, which are then sent to 3 different labs. DEP uses Microlab, which is the same lab that Charlton used. (DF): TOS BOH put comments to the DEP with respect to the site assignment. Two compounds that have been detected are 1,4 Dioxane and lead in Charlton and now we are finding here. 1,4 Dioxane will flow easily through water. A pattern of 1,4 Dioxane is consistent with transport of those compounds. That same assessment discusses, ground water flow in bedrock fractures, flows in a northwest fashion. That's why Casella is claiming that contamination can't be causing the contamination in Charlton as the water flows from the other direction in Charlton and therefore can't be from landfill. With DEP starting with a 500' radius on McGilpin is a great first step since this road is closest to the Southbridge landfill. A known source of contamination, but in an analysis, their wasn't good bedrock in those monitoring wells on the downgraded side of the landfill. MJP: DEP staff found this contamination in shallow ground water, but private drinking wells are mixed with shallow wells and deeper bedrock wells. Ranging in depth of 400'-700' in Charlton means that fracture is a depth. We don't know depths in Sturbridge yet. (JT): The well depths on McGilpin ranges 480' – 605' with 1 well at 1000' deep. (DF): DEP has found contaminates in Charlton shallow well and now seeing in deeper fracture wells in Sturbridge. Therefore, we have source, we have detections but DEP can't connect the dots between these two. Maybe we ask the landfill operators to get better well network results to test better bedrock deep wells and shallow wells. MJP: One correction in your summary, the DEP hydrogeologist report which was part of a 21E evaluation, not the site assignment.
- **(DF): There is no filter when you have deep fracture flows. How can we approve this, when it's not properly evaluated?** MJP: Mark Baldi's team and the state geologist, approached, USGS and EPA colleagues. Many reasons that ground water flows towards Charlton. We agree on the groundwater testing. We need to focus on the risk first and then DEP is continuing to do sampling and bottled water plus whole house treatment system. Ground water monitoring, discussed with the landfill operator, haven't focused on contamination, rather, working more proactively on getting bottled water out. DEP will install deep wells if Casella won't do it on the Sturbridge side. (DF): Can you recover costs of wells? (MJP): Yes, legally we can.
- **(BA): How much contamination will it take to prompt any action by DEP? What type of action will DEP take?** (MJP): Not sure how we can do this. They can operate the landfill. But they need to look at where the contamination is coming from and correct it perhaps, an interceptor trench, ground water treatment. (DF): One community recently put in a treatment system before it hits your house. Another community, put in municipal water due to size of issue. 1,4 Dioxane can be taken out of your water, at a costly expense.
- **(LC):** I have been monitoring activity since 2008 due to lawsuit. I went through 18 quarterly reports, which describe lead exceedances, in every report in the monitoring wells. I brought my concern to DEP 5 years ago. For the record, all DEP personnel tonight were not with DEP at the time. (LC): I asked at what point do you start to monitor this? You won't know until it hits a residential well. Federal regulations look for a plume which is expensive. Maybe the EPA will help the State work on this. DEP didn't realize that a monitoring well had been replaced. Two years went by and then DEP finally found a well 1000' feet away from the original well. Ground water is flowing towards Sturbridge. An exceedance of lead was indicated in every report. I recommend that DEP put this information on an excel spreadsheet to get landfill folks to do this.
- **(JT):** In Charlton 1,4 Dioxane was shown as one of the first contaminates as DF stated. However, it didn't come with any other VOC's. The concern for Sturbridge, is this first finding going to follow the pattern as Charlton has shown. And are we at the beginning of that pattern.

Audience Questions: The following questions were asked by the following audience members. No written questions were presented at this meeting. MJP answered the following on behalf of DEP, unless otherwise stated.

- **Matt Laflanc 106 McGilpin Rd, Sturbridge Resident: While the State is perusing the plume and rounds of testing, what is Sturbridge BOH doing to provide feasibility for public water?** (LC): We are working on it. The Board of Selectmen (BOS) discussed this issue at their last meeting. They will review at their next meeting. Mary Dowling, Wedgwood Road, resident but speaking as BOS member: We have received several emails, for which I personally answered, to get this topic on the

agenda for the next meeting. In order for the issue to be raised and discuss any feasibly to bring to public water to your neighborhood, it must be requested to be on agenda.

- **Mary Dowling, 9 Wedgewood Rd, Sturbridge Resident:** *To follow up on that question ... how many containments, how many towns effected, how many houses need to be effected ... what does it take to close the Southbridge Landfill? Does DEP have the authority to close it or does it go to judge? What will it take to determine when it's posing too much of a risk? Do you have the authority, the jurisdiction?* (MJP): It's a legal issue. If they (Casella) comply with permit and monitor wells, ect. Then we (DEP) have no jurisdiction to shut it down. When it's drinking water, and if we have information from monitoring wells that conclude it's a danger to the environment, we can require sampling. I'm not sure we can shut them down. The Attorney General can go to court on behalf of the Commonwealth.
- **Claire Miller, Boston, MA State Director, Toxics Action Center:** We are a non-profit company that works with communities to prevent pollution. We have seen landfills contaminate communities. Who has the authority? The Southbridge BOH can shut down Casella and has authority to do so.
- **Todd Smola, MA State Representative:** Obviously there are issues and they need to be answered. We Guarantee safety of residents. This issue is just newly brought to our office. The process of speaking with local residents can help. Our office is prepared to file anything required to move forward. We must do this collectively with residents, the TOS, and the Sturbridge BOH, not individually.
- **Marita Tasse, 112 South Shore Dr, Sturbridge Resident:** *If there was evidence of lead in the monitoring wells, why was no action taken?* LC: The Sturbridge BOH can't take action. Our board gets copied of this information. These reports go to DEP, for which I brought it to their (DEP) to attention. These are not Sturbridge wells. The monitoring wells are located along the perimeter of the landfill in Southbridge. Our residential wells are just being tested now in Jan 2017.
- **Ted Goodwin, 58 McGilpin Road, Sturbridge Resident:** The point is to mitigate risk ... the Wednesday decision is already made by you (DEP). My family has been drinking and bathing in this water and then now to discuss mitigation? DEP must say "no" on Wednesday. You (DEP) have no teeth to shut them down; so your decision has already been made.
- **Kirsti Pecci, Atty at the Conservation Law Foundation & McGilpin Road, Sturbridge, Resident:** The DEP has jumped all over this and BOH has been working hard to do so as well. It's only because a citizen in Charlton got this going. In 2008, water was found flowing towards Sturbridge. To say DEP doesn't have the power to shut down is wrong. MaryJude, this has potential to cause danger to health and safety. The 52-acre landfill, all those contaminates, are already released into the environment. This expansion purposes to handle 4 million more tons that it handles now. It is not fair to put on the Town of Southbridge, that currently has financial problems. The DEP needs to say "no" on Wednesday and close this landfill. This is the largest landfill in the state. We need to start funding our recycling programs. I applaud Smola to vote, but it must come from entire state, and will require a lot of work. DEP can stop this.
- **Stan Kumar, 107 McGilpin Road, Sturbridge Resident:** I want to extend my thanks to the Senator, the DEP, the BOH. I'm a veteran. I have one kidney due to contamination from water while serving in the Marine Corps. We can't mess around with this contamination. We need the Town to provide public drinking water down McGilpin Road, as wells are contaminated. My well was the first well in the grant which found 1,4 Dioxane. I understand I can't get it out. (DF): Yes, you can filter out but it's very expensive. Kumar: Now it's been on the news and my address was identified. I have lost value on my house and I'm taxpayer, paying on a house with little value. I have copies of a few well tests from the past when purchasing my house, then in 2015 when I refinanced. There was no lead then, but now there is. (LC): In 2008, during a site assignment, it came up as McGilpin and Fiske Hill with private wells. There is a public daycare on McGilpin which is a public water supply (DF): It's not a public water supply but an actually mapped public well. (DF): The 11-acre unlined of the landfill is the concern. Our two town wells are just outside 15,000' regulation.
- **Ed Goodwin, 90 Orchard Road, Sturbridge Resident:** I have 14 grandchildren living on McGilpin Road. Being bathed in 1,4 Dioxine water. The aquafer replenishes itself very slowly. Goodwin: DEP is great at studying things, but it is a toothless organization. Every Governor has taken money out of DEP budget. We need actions and DEP isn't giving us what we need. (MJP): DEP ramped up very quickly and is working with residents getting sampling, driving to labs, and proving bottled water. We are here tonight to help further understand citizens concern. I'm sorry for this situation, but I take exception to that comment.
- **Sarah Goodwin, 111 McGilpin & building at 109A McGilpin Road, Sturbridge Resident:** Is it hazardous bathing kids in 1,4 dioxane (MJP): Strictly speaking the answer is "no" but I know you don't want to hear that. All 1,4 Dioxane levels found were found below the guideline. Your question was based on risk. If the level is beneath .3 then there is no established long term risk as per the EPA. (LC): Lead levels are in exceedance which is established a risk by EPA and our State regs. There will be new contaminates that will be looked at in the future.

- **Will Gallon, 74 H Foote Road, Charlton Resident:** In 2015, my well was found to be contaminated. All contaminate levels will run up, then down, then back up and then down then up again. This is because the contaminates are moving through the aquifer. Filtering system is located at the point of entry, preliminary section and midsection and then a secondary system. The First filter has been collecting via charcoal. Now 1.4 dioxane, found the contaminant slipping off the charcoal. (Mark, DEP): Your correct. The only way to filter out is via ultra violet technology. This needs to stop. (LC): How often do you test? For the last 3 yrs., every month and we test for metals.
- **Brian Gallonik, 112 McGilpin Road, Sturbridge Resident:** *Mitigation will take a long time. I have 2 sons. I have been writing letters due to the site of mountain and the smell. I then call DEP. Gobi has floated bills, but we don't want expansion. Shut it down and clean up the mess. We need public water to run down this street. We want to protect our lives, our property values. How do we help Sturbridge financially? How can the State help? Help Southbridge out?* (Smola): Southbridge has different opinions about this. We have been pushing this to happen. Relative to water, we will work with the State and need direction from you, the town. (LC): Yes, we need some direction and guidance from the Town. For any financial ramification from the landfill, we will need guidance from collective towns. Municipal water is great but we need a long-term plan to solve this issue and a larger plan. We are ready to move forward. (LC): BOH requests DEP include Sturbridge with Charlton and Southbridge.
- **Senator Anne Gobi, Massachusetts:** Thank you all for work. Todd is right. We need to know how much money a municipal water line will cost to make request into the State. For example, 10 million is the estimated cost for a water line in Charlton. Todd mentioned, this is a bigger issue. The landfill in Southbridge is major issue. Our office wants an oversite meeting on landfills. These issues are state wide. It effects everyone. To use bottle water is crazy. A municipal water line only takes care of one thing. It's in the air, the ground. It will continue to leach into the ground. We will approach the Baker administration. We will do what we need to do.
- **Marsha Mattioli, 84 McGilpin Road, Sturbridge Resident:** *My concern is when will non-tested wells be tested? Do we need to buy water?* (LC): Will testing be expanded? Can we get DEP to test the entire street? The BOH will help DEP pull samples if you (DEP) have no funding/personnel to do it. (MJP): Currently we have 8 detections of lead. The circles will continue in the 500' radius. (LC): How do we change 500' radius? (MJP): We need to do this incrementally due to the science. (JT): Is the 3rd round of testing included in the 500' radius? (JT): Found the date received today, and it included houses 81,96,125 & 138 (LC): Can the TOS pay for test and get reimbursed by DEP if something is found? (DF): A budget is limited resource and state has to do this step wise ... volatiles include: 1,4 Dioxane and metals panel which is less expensive. If a homeowner wants to run metals test, approximate cost is \$125. At 1,4 Dioxane test is around \$250-\$300 per sample. The labs must be MA certified. A homeowner can speak to BOH office on how to do this. (MJP): DEP is doing follow up analysis where needed. We are at a month's duration for the 1st round of testing. DEP is quickly moving along in this process. (JT): If a homeowner tested on their own, and found lead, through a certified lab, would that create the 500'. (MJP): Yes.
- **Stacy Valentine, 105 McGilpin Road, Sturbridge Resident and Pediatrician.** *Lead is a neurological toxin. What are we doing to give information on exposing children, pregnant woman etc?* Its effects are irreversible. We need to get word to daycares, pediatricians. (MJP): DEP contacted the State Department, they have childhood lead unit, and can help. They are a great resource. (JT): I have contacted them and I sent info in mailings to folks on McGilpin. Other folks are not tested. Question for DEP and DPH, how far do we go in alerting the overall public? (BA): As there is a concern about lead, the info is great but it doesn't help her question or solve the problem. Should we alert local pediatricians? **George Debusk, 105 McGilpin Road, Sturbridge Resident and Doctor:** Everyone needs to know. Just because we haven't found it. We need to notify the town. If site is a concern, can we get funding.
- **Angela Lavoie, 78 McGilpin Road, Sturbridge Resident:** I only heard about this in the news. I didn't know about the lead, my kids have been bathing, drinking etc. in this water. Do I test my water every day? So, what's the point if it shows up one day, and not the next day. (JT): The state recommends to test 1 – 3 years, and everyone should so (LC): I would recommend spending the \$125 and test for lead. (JT): This is all new data for Sturbridge obtained within the last month.
- **Day Care on McGilpin Road:** (LC) They have been notified. (MJP) The daycare center is a public water supply. Every 3 yrs. they are required to test. This was the year they had to sample. They recently tested and have a non-detect for lead and very minor copper which is considered a non-detect. DEP sampled for 1,4 Dioxane but results are not available yet. Recently tested and showed a non-detect. (DF): A daycare with 25 users, they are considered public water supply well much like a Dunkin Donuts. The area is a small house. The 15,000 feet is considered Zone 2 is to a specific types of water supply mapped municipally. Zone 2 is a protective radius for very large water supplies. (MJP): A small house is a default of a ½ mile

not 3 miles. (RV): We need to get water on street and to work with the BOS. We can keep testing and bottled water continues to be used.

- **Mary Dowling, Wedgewood Dr:** This question is directed to Smola/Gobi ... what guidance are you waiting for? Our town is to take the initiative but in what form ... a letter, a vote, a town meeting? (Smola): A motion, a vote and a letter. No town meeting required. If the majority of the BOS is advocating for town water brought to this neighborhood, then we will pursue every rouse.
- **Craig Moran, 45 Seneca Lane, Sturbridge Resident and BOS member:** We understand it's an immediate concern. As LC stated, lead is exceeding levels. What has DEP done to fix this? We've had problems with lead. Wells into the center of town will have larger problems than what we think we have. A town near Buffalo, NY is now almost a ghost town due to Casella. If tanker truck falls over, DEP is there immediately cleaning it up... why not here?
- **George DeBusk, 105 McGilpin Road, Sturbridge Resident:** I suggest a proposal, that we notify the entire town. To allow them the opportunity to test themselves. Sooner DEP gets results, the better. Allows people to empower themselves. Children need to be tested. We are aware of this but others in town don't know. We need to let them know.
- **Chris Terrari, 176 Fiske Hill Road, Sturbridge Resident:** There is a stretch on my street, that has no public water near the old Faroni house. Please don't forget about us in the 500' radius as the well next to me is 1300' away. We are getting our wells tested and will get BOH the results.
- **Penny Dumas, 136 Walker Pond Road, Sturbridge Resident:** I'm here tonight as this effects the whole town. From a humanity and financial standpoint, I ask that on Wed when you (DEP) decide on the expansion, you have to consciously think would you agree with an expansion. Please find criteria to think about everyone in Charlton, Southbridge and Sturbridge. Please think about us.
- **Tom Guyer, 203 Podunk Road, Sturbridge Resident:** **With all the testing of wells can we negotiate a better fee?** (LC): I have tried this with Charlton when they were going through it. TOS can try to get better pricing.
- (LC): Communication will put water/lead info on our Town website. Along with labs of where to get wells tested. Can broadcast on our cable channel. (JT): Is there a connect ed. LG: Yes, but it's regional. Lisa Munier, is the elementary school nurse who would be a good contact to start with.
- **Polly Curroir, 13 McGilpin Road, Sturbridge Resident:** **Can you put flyers in our mailboxes again or how can I get more communication on this?** (Gaumond): We have Town blog, for which we can easily place this information. We can also provide a link on website, however you need to agree to subscribe to news. BOS can use this way to get the info out but you need to sign up. Twitter will only allow so many characters.
- **Todd McCabe, 99 McGilpin Rd, Sturbridge Resident:** I'm upset that there is no a means of how to get a cost from DPW. (Gaumond): We won't have a formal estimate, we need to hire an engineer first. However, we had a meeting scheduled but due to storms we had to delay meeting. We will have a rough estimate by next Tues night at the BOS meeting. (McCabe): A feasibility study doesn't mean anything. It will continue to hit the town wells. Don't let Southbridge dictate our outcome. Let's get pricing to the State. DEP feels its ok to allow this, they have let me down. Wednesday, we should have no other answer than "non-feasible".
- **Claire Miller, Boston, MA Director Toxics Action Center:** We are working with MA on a matter for which, I can now inform you that we are sending formal notice of intent to sue the Town of Southbridge and Casella for violating the Clean Water Act and Resource Conservation Recovery Act. If you want to hear more about lawsuit, please contact me. This is just one tool in the toolbox.
- **(BA): Can DEP require additional monitoring wells at the landfill?** Yes, we can. (DF) Are their sufficient monitoring wells around the landfills? (MJP): No, we don't feel that there are. It's not adequate for testing now. (BA): Are there plans to do this? (MJP): We need additional wells that are really deep in order to put in more wells. (MJP): I'm not sure we have the authority to make Casella do it. (LC): DEP is going ahead and testing wells, even though Casella was asked to do it and they declined.
- **Ed Goodwin, 90 Orchard Rd, Sturbridge Resident:** Do we have monitoring wells? (MJP): We know there is contamination on Sturbridge side, so want the next set of monitoring wells on the Sturbridge side of landfill, next to the contamination area. There is no data at that depth yet, as we are dealing with bedrock and can't see underground.
- **(DF): Although we discussed different tools, we need a hole in the ground.** When a driller drills into ground, it's just to get water to your house. When we do this for this purpose of a monitoring well, we look at how to seal off the well and can test water in portions of the well.
- **(LC): First solution, we need clean water on the street.** Then we need to figure out where the contamination is coming from. We need evidence.

- **Craig Moran, 45 Seneca Lane, Sturbridge Resident: We have failed cells on the Sturbridge side. How much pressure is put on these bad cells?** (DF): I know of others than can speak to that but, it's not my expertise. (LC): Casella just got a recent permit and when it was decided to do the berming, it would take out some of the monitoring wells. (MJP): multiple permit applications are pending. Recent one issued for the modification to move the leache collection, relocated the gas engine away from triangle area and put near a new building. The berm construction permit is pending. It involves building MSE. Which holds dirt in place around a 60' height, parts are already site assigned. We issued today a notice of technical deficiencies. There is another pending permit but can't remember the details right now. Casella will have to replace wells so they are looking at the same things/findings. Now, near the triangle parcel, the wells are seeing different things/findings. Casella is preparing for stage 2. We find many problems with most our applications, it's not just Casella, thus the request for more specific technical data. We think the equipment should be moved to a better place. (LC): Although we are talking about Casella, we have well issues. We need to enforce better monitoring and DEP should have an office there. We need to shut down the landfill and need our water before we go bankrupt. (BA): The BOH is very concerned for our residents. I can't make sense of how we can expand something that is causing contamination. (LC): We will continue to fight no matter who we have to go to. Thank you Rep Smola, Senator Gobi, TOS BOS, residents and concerned citizens for coming out tonight.

Motion to adjourn (LC): RV 2nd motion Vote: All in Favor
Meeting Adjourned: 8:39 pm