

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION ONE
BOSTON MASSACHUSETTS

PUBLIC HEARING

ON

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

ON THE

UPGRADING OF THE
BOSTON METROPOLITAN AREA SEWERAGE SYSTEM

Faneuil Hall
Boston, Massachusetts

Monday, November 20, 1978
1:30 o'clock p.m.

CO-CHAIRMEN:

REBECCA HANMER, Deputy Regional Administrator,
Environmental Protection Agency, Boston

WILLIAM HICKS, Special Assistant,
Massachusetts Office of Environmental Affairs

PANEL:

LESTER SUTTON, Director,
Water Programs Division,
Environmental Protection Agency, Boston

WALLACE STICKENY, Director,
Environmental and Economic Impact Office,
Environmental Protection Agency, Boston

KENNETH JOHNSON, Special Assistant,
~~Environmental Protection Agency, Boston~~

B. P. A. REPORTING ASSOCIATES, INC.

STENOGRAPHIC REPORTERS

294 WASHINGTON ST. (SUITE 401)
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02108

(617) 426-1452

C O N T E N T S

<u>STATEMENT BY:</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
William Hicks, Special Assistant to Evelyn Murphy, Massachusetts Secretary of Environmental Affairs	10
Arthur H. Tobin, Mayor City of Quincy	12
Leo J. Kelly, Chairman, Environmental Control Commission, Quincy City Council	14
Edward A. Coyle, President, Quincy Central Business & Professional Association	19
Charles F. Grein, Co-Owner, Maxwells Parrot Restaurant, Quincy	20
Paul Harold, Quincy City Council	21
Alfred Saquesse, State Representative	23
Richard D. Dimes, President, Board of Selectment, Town of Winthrop	26
Margaret Riley, Concerned Citizens Committee of Winthrop	33
Alan Lupo, Member, Concerned Citizens Committee of Winthrop	42
Arthur Cummings, Winthrop	52
Jerome E. Falbo, Chairman, Winthrop Planning Board	56
Ronald H. Wayland, Chairman, Winthrop Conservation Commission	62

<u>STATEMENT BY (Continued):</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Dennis Kearney, Sheriff, Suffolk County	67
Thomas A. Maguire, Winthrop	71
George DiLorenzo, East Boston	73
Dr. Herbert Meyer, Chairman, Boston Harbor Citizens' Advisory Committee	79
Mrs. Eugene Beale, Boston Harbor Citizens' Advisory Committee	86
Bud Reece, Boston Harbor Citizens' Advisory Committee	89
Terry Colby, Boston Harbor Citizens' Advisory Committee	93
Thomas Brownell State Representative	95
Marian Ullman, League of Women Voters	99
Thomas J. Nutley, Director, Public Relations, Atlantic Neighborhood Association	108
Nancy Wrenn, Executive Secretary, Boston Harbor Associates	109
Lydia R. Goodhue, Charles River Watershed Association	114
Grace Saphir Save Our Shores, Inc.	119
Shirley M. Brown, Natick Representative on Citizens' Advisory Committee to EPA	122

<u>STATEMENT BY (Continued):</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Bill Schmidt, Legislative Assistant, to Congressman Edward Markey	131
Dorothy C. Kelly, Secretary, Quincy Citizens Association, Wollaston Park Association	138
Waldo Holcombe, Neponset Conservation Association	141
Jim Patui	147
Mary Gougian, President, Squantum Community Association, Inc.	152
John E. Murphy, Boston Harbor Pollution Committee	155
Gary P. Kosciusko, President, Save Our Shores, Inc.	161
Irene Burns	164
Thomas Conroy, Planner, Metropolitan Area Planning Council	166
EVENING SESSION	172
Arthur Chandler, President, Quincy Citizens' Association	176
Paul Kodad Quincy Citizens' Association	181
Joe Malay	187
Clair Plaud Greater Boston Group of the Sierra Club	190
Arthur Barnes, President Norumbega Association	196
Michael Morrissey State Representative	200

<u>STATEMENT BY (Continued):</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Diane Lindblad, Civic Committee, Squantum Community Association	204
Janet Bergermeister	206
John Conway, Winthrop	207
LIST OF WRITTEN STATEMENTS SUBMITTED	210

P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. HANMER: Good afternoon, if I could have your attention, please. We've got a very full afternoon. I was going to keep time by the clock up there, but it already says 5:18, so I'm going to have to use my watch.

My name is Rebecca Hanmer, and I'm the Deputy Regional Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency Office here in Boston. With me today Co-chairing this hearing is William Hicks, who is Special Assistant to Evelyn Murphy, Massachusetts' Secretary of Environmental Affairs.

We're going to have a hearing panel composed of Lester Sutton, who is the Director of the Water Programs Division at the EPA Region One Office; Wally Stickney, who heads the Environmental and Economic Impact Office for our Region; and Ken Johnson, who is the Special Assistant to the Regional Administrator.

This hearing is convened to receive public comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement on the Upgrading of the Boston Metropolitan Area Sewerage System. The Draft Impact Statement has been prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and to EPA's regulations.

The National Environmental Policy Act provides

that prior to commencing a major federal action which would have a significant impact on the environment, the responsible agency has to prepare an environmental impact statement which analyzes the potential environmental impacts of the action. The statement should discuss alternatives to the project and permit affected agencies and the public to make comments on the factual material and conclusions that are presented in the document. So we are here to receive comment and your views.

Copies of the impact statement have been available since September 29th, 1978. Copies were circulated to a number of federal, state and local agencies and concerned citizens.

At the time the impact statement was circulated, notice of this hearing was given and the news release announcing the hearing appeared in newspapers having circulation in this general area.

We are prepared to hear testimony today and to stay here as long as necessary to get a complete record of what citizens and concerned agencies wish to say.

The 60-day comment period on the Environmental Impact Statement closes on November 28, 1978.

This hearing is being stenographically recorded,

and the written transcript of the hearing will be available within the next several weeks. The hearing record will be maintained at least until November 28th so that persons who wish to make written comments to the record may do so.

Today if you have a written statement with you, I would appreciate it if you would give it directly to the stenographer, who is here on the first row. It's easier than trying to reach up here to get it to me.

We've asked that those who wish to testify call us in advance so that the schedule could be arranged, and we do have a full schedule this afternoon. We'll try to stay within that schedule even though we're starting off on the wrong foot, about 15 minutes late.

We will recess at 5:30 and reconvene at 7:00 p.m. this evening.

All those wishing to speak should have filled out or should fill out now a card at the receptionist's table in the back and indicate that you wish to speak, so that we can schedule you.

Because we have so many people who want to make statements, we have to ask that the presentation be limited to five minutes and that you summarize your

written statement and present the complete statement for the record.

I would like to clarify a bit how this Environmental Impact Statement fits into what's going on. EPA is not going to be laying any concrete any time soon. This Environmental Impact Statement is part of a continuing process in which we are trying to clarify the options and alternatives for a Boston Harbor Cleanup Program. The next step in the process which will start very soon is that the MDC will go into facilities planning. So part of the purpose of this hearing is not only to tell EPA how you feel about the Environmental Impact Statement which we have produced in draft form but to help us clarify the issues that must be resolved in the MDC facilities planning.

There will be further opportunity for public hearings during the facilities planning process. So I think that you can see that the Environmental Impact Statement, which represents the results of several years of work and consideration, is but a stage at this point in the process of planning.

I have asked the staff to give us a short slide presentation of about ten minutes which will summarize the project and our activities thus far, and then we'll

go right into the testimony.

While he's setting up, I might mention that the National Park Service has asked us not to eat, drink or smoke.

(A slide presentation was given.)

MS. HANMER: While people are getting seated, let me tell the first five speakers who they are. William Hicks is going to make the first presentation on behalf of the Massachusetts Office of Environmental Affairs followed by Mayor Arthur Tobin of Quincy, Leo Kelly of the Quincy City Council, Ed Coyle of the Quincy Businessmen's Association, and Charles Grëin. So those will be the first five speakers.

Since we have a full program, I would like to move right into it. I'm very, very pleased to see so many people here. We're going to move quickly. It's because we have all of our minutes filled up that I'm going to have to do this.

The first speaker, as I said, is Mr. Hicks.

STATEMENT BY WILLIAM HICKS, SPECIAL
ASSISTANT TO EVELYN MURPHY,
MASSACHUSETTS SECRETARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL
AFFAIRS

MR. HICKS: Ms. Hammer, thank you.

On behalf of Secretary Murphy, I'm very grateful to be able to be here today. My name is William Hicks.

I'm Assistant Secretary of Environmental Affairs.

The Executive Office of Environmental Affairs is particularly pleased to be able to Co-chair this hearing with the EPA because over the next several years, many of the decisions that need to be implemented will be implemented through agencies within the State's Executive Office of Environmental Affairs.

We will be submitting fairly detailed formal comments on the DEIS by the end on the hearing record, but I would like to briefly make a few points before this hearing gets underway.

First, we must recognize that the Draft EIS was undertaken and most of the work on it done before the more recent changes in the Federal Clean Waters Act which made it possible for municipal sewerage treatment plants that discharge in coastal waters to apply for and receive, if appropriate conditions are met, a waiver of the secondary treatment requirements.

Now, while a decision on the submission of such a waiver application has not yet been made and while clearly no decision on whether such a waiver would be granted can yet be made, and I would not wish to prejudge the merits of that particular issue, it does seem clear that if a waiver were granted, many of the

problems associated with the current proposals would be mitigated. I think we ought to keep our minds free as we both receive testimony today and continue the planning process to be alert to many of the dangers in the proposal that could come about as a result of that particular change in federal legal requirements.

I think for now I would like to get on with the hearing. There are a number of people who have come here to give their views to us, and as I said at the outset, we will be submitting some detailed comments by the end of the closing period. Thank you.

MS. HANMER: Thank you.

I'd like to call on Mayor Tobin at this time.

STATEMENT BY MAYOR ARTHUR H TOBIN,
CITY OF QUINCY

MAYOR TOBIN: Thank you very much, Madam Chairman.

Madam Chairman, I'd like to thank you and the members of the committee for this opportunity to address you to state the official position of our community. This is the second time that the plan of major proportion has come out to affect our community. Once before, the MDC through an EMMA study wanted to fill in 26 acres of Quincy Bay which we felt would be most destructive to our community, and now we find in the proposed plan

that approximately 70 acres of good, valuable waterfront property is also under consideration which we feel would be most destructive. And I'd like to read a brief, official statement and then hand it to the secretary with your permission. Thank you.

As Mayor of the City of Quincy, I am extremely familiar with the sewerage problems of the Metropolitan Boston area, and more specifically Quincy Bay. I look forward to the completion of a proposal to relieve the very serious pollution problems now confronting the people of Quincy and Greater Boston.

I look forward to a proposal which is both economically and environmentally sound.

Under the recommended plan, the outright loss of 70 acres of prime, ocean-front property in the City of Quincy and great negative impact on hundreds of acres of adjacent waterfront land which is potentially developable is of utmost concern to this administration.

After careful consideration and consultation of this matter with all concerned department heads, I strongly recommend that an alternative which proposes thorough primary treatment of all sewerage and the deep ocean outfall. I understand that among other positive

features, the deep ocean outfall concept when properly constructed can add beneficial nutrients in the ocean.

In view of the great value of all ocean front property in Massachusetts, and especially in the greater Boston area, I most strongly advise against the use of any proposed land area in Quincy and urge the use of deep ocean outfall.

Thank you very much, Madam Chairman.

MS. HANMER: Thank you very much. If you would leave your statement with the stenographer, I would appreciate it.

May I ask Leo Kelly to come forward?

STATEMENT BY LEO J. KELLY, CHAIRMAN,
ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL COMMITTEE,
QUINCY CITY COUNCIL

MR. KELLY: I want to thank you, Madam Chairman, for the opportunity to address you on behalf of the City Council, civic associations and business associations in the City of Quincy. And I'd like to read a resolve that will be submitted to the City Council tonight by myself and City Councillor Joanne Condon.

Whereas, the United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region One, has endorsed the continued centralized treatment of waste water at coastal facilities, and

Whereas, the United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region One, has recommended that the Deer Island treatment plant be expanded and upgraded to provide primary and secondary treatment for the waste water from the entire metropolitan sewerage district, and

Whereas, the recommended plan of the United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region One, calls for a proposed sewerage sludge and ash disposal area to be constructed on 70 acres of land at Squantum Point, and

Whereas, the United States Environmental Protection Agency has stated that if Deer Island is not available, it will be up to the Commonwealth to recommend alternative sites, and

Whereas, the Commonwealth is studying alternative site plans as follows:

an expanded Nut Island primary plant requiring the filling of up to three acres of Quincy Bay, and expanded new facilities to be located at either Broad Meadows or Squantum,

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Quincy City Council be recorded as opposed to the use of any Quincy land or water sites for the location or expansion of waste water treatment facilities or for the disposal

of sludge or incinerated ash.

This resolve has the support of the following civic and business associations throughout the entire length of the City of Quincy, and I intend to read them for the record. Each one of them has sent a letter of endorsement.

The Adams Shore Community Association.

Our Lady of Good Counsel Church, which has 700 families at that church which abuts one of these sites. Strongly opposes it.

The Houghs Neck Community Council.

The Baker Beach Improvement Association.

The South Quincy Civic Association.

The Wollaston Park Association.

Save Our Shores, Incorporated, one of the most outstanding environmental associations in the state of Massachusetts.

The Quincy Citizens Association.

The Ward 2 Civic Association.

The Merrymount Association.

The Squantum Yacht Club.

The Wollaston Yacht Club.

The Town River Yacht Club.

The Quincy Yacht Club.

The North Quincy Business & Professional Association.

The Squantum Community Association.

The Atlantic Neighborhood Association.

The Downtown Quincy Business & Professional Association, and

The South Shore Chamber of Commerce endorses this resolve that was read to you. This shows the strong support throughout the City of Quincy to stop Quincy from being any further used as a dumping ground for sewerage all the way to Framingham. I think we've had enough of it. We've been having it since, I think, the year 1920, I believe, when it first started.

I have two personal comments to make on the issue and on the Environmental Impact Statement that is before us; and that is, number one, I can't understand why you did not also study a compost facility in the inlands of the state of Massachusetts whereas the product, the compost, the fertilizer could then be shipped in a more easier, more centralized area. And I believe you could probably find an area that would not be residents like the Squantum site is. I just cant understand why you didn't study that further.

And I also cannot understand, seeing now that your recommended plan is Deer Island, why, as I had

sent you a letter, I think, on June 22nd addressed to Mr. Adams recommending or requesting that the EPA enter into publicly the court case that was then being heard in Judge Garrity's court, and that was a court case on the Charles Street Jail. Why you did not, after making the recommendation that you have today, did not enter into that publicly and stand firm in support of a combined jails at Charles Street and Deer Island. I cannot for the life of me understand why you didn't take a more public stand after you had made your environmental impact study. Thank you.

MS. HANMER: Mr. Kelly, one of our panel members would like to ask you a question.

MR. STICKNEY: Councillor Kelly, to clarify one thing you said. I believe your resolve said you were opposed to the use of Quincy land for expansion of treatment facilities. Does that include a limited expansion at Nut Island for primary treatment?

MR. KELLY: I think if you read the resolve, we say that the MDC is studying Nut Island for expansion of primary for up to three acres, and it certainly includes that.

We went through that about ten years ago when you expanded Nut Island for seven acres. It was a

horrendous disservice you did to the community I represent, and we certainly can't go through it again for three acres or for any acreage. Yes. Very clear.

MR. STICKNEY: Thank you.

MS. HANMER: Ed Coyle.

EDWARD A. COYLE, PRESIDENT, QUINCY CENTER
BUSINESS & PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION

MR. COYLE: Good afternoon. Madam Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to speak before you.

My name is Edward Coyle. I am President of the Quincy Center Businessmen's Association. I've come here today to speak in opposition to this proposal because it is our feeling that Quincy and every city in the Commonwealth should not be imposed upon in this manner.

If we can sent an astronaut to the moon, we certainly can do something with our sludge, our sewerage processing other than dumping it in the City of Quincy or in any other city in the Commonwealth. We are talking dollars.

In your proposal, which was very articulate and graphic, we talk about jobs. We'll have a lot more jobs if we do a deep ocean outfall. It will take longer. It will cost more money. There'll be more jobs. But the little man, the homeowners, the small

businessmen, his property won't be affected. His property won't be devalued. It's very cavalier to say there will be some impact. These people who build their homes and spend their lives paying for them should not be adversely affected for one dollar.

We don't want it in Quincy. We don't want it anywhere in Massachusetts. Let us use our technology to get us offshore into a deep ocean fill. Thank you for your time.

MS. HANMER: Do you have any questions?

(No response.)

MS. HANMER: Mr. Charles Grein.

While he's coming up, the next speakers will be Paul Harold of the Quincy City Council, State Senator Mike LoPresti, the Concerned Citizens' Committee of Winthrop, State Representative Al Sagesse, and Richard Dimes, Chairman of the Quincy Board of Selectmen.

Mr. Grein.

STATEMENT BY CHARLES F. GREIN,
CO-OWNER OF MAXWELLS PARROT, QUINCY

MR. GREIN: Madam Chairman, I'm Co-owner of Maxwells Parrot, a restaurant located in the City of Quincy. I am here today to state my opposition to the use of any Quincy land for sewerage treatment centers or dumping grounds of processed sewerage. I am, therefore,

endorsing Councillor Leo Kelly's resolution.

MS. HANMER: Thank you very much.

As the audience said, Mr. Dines is from Winthrop, not Quincy.

Paul Harold.

STATEMENT BY PAUL HAROLD,
QUINCY CITY COUNCIL.

MR. HAROLD: Thank you. My name is Paul Harold. I'm on the Quincy City Council, and I'm the Senator Elect from Quincy.

I wanted to speak briefly for the many people who are at work and couldn't take time to be here in opposition to any alternative plan which would include a facility at Broad Meadows and a proposed dumping site at Squantum Point.

The proposal for Deer Island was one that we had much hoped for, but with the problem of relocating the House of Correction, it's going to jeopardize the proposed sites in Quincy which might leave them to be the prime relocation for the sewerage treatment plant.

The City of Quincy like the Town of Winthrop has had the burden of having a facility in its jurisdiction for a number of years. When we appeared here three years ago, we asked that they consider not locating a giant facility in Quincy or in Winthrop but to spread

the facilities out through the system further upstream along the line. We've asked this proposal be considered. It hasn't been. It's been three years, and it seems like we're back where we started from.

Speaking for the people of the City of Quincy, we're opposed to any site in Quincy which would jeopardize these two prime areas that abut the prime residential areas of Quincy but also two areas that have been set aside generations ago to develop an open space in the City of Quincy.

So I want to be recorded in opposition to any alternative for location in the City of Quincy jurisdiction.

MS. HANMER: Thank you. Do you have a written statement?

MR. HAROLD: No, I don't.

MS. HANMER: Thank you.

Senator LoPresti.

MR. SAGESSE: Madam Chairlady, my name is Representative Al Sagesse from Winthrop. I understand that Senator LoPresti is detained and he will be here shortly. I also understand that I am the next scheduled speaker and would beg your permission to proceed at this time.

MS. HANMER: Yes. The people from Winthrop would hang me if I didn't.

(Laughter and applause.)

STATEMENT BY ALFRED SAGESSE,
STATE REPRESENTATIVE

MR. SAGESSE: Madam Chairlady and members of the Commission, my name is Representative Alfred Sagesse. I'm a life-long resident of the Town of Winthrop, and have served my Town in the State Legislature these past four years.

I come here today to record my unalterable opposition to the proposed sewerage system plan which you have before you, a plan that if implemented would drain the very life blood out of my community and tear at the hearts of those 21,000 people who call our pleasant water-front community their home.

I guess there are many reasons why this plan is so objectionable, but in my five allotted minutes, I can only touch upon those which I find particularly offensive. Perhaps in the final analysis, our position can be simply stated. The people of Winthrop love our Town dearly. We will no longer stand to see her dumped upon, spat upon and defecated upon with the bureaucratic irreverence that this plan suggests.

Let me quickly assess the problem and my objections. The Town of Winthrop is the most densely populated Town in the state of Massachusetts. Its rising congestion and consequential auto traffic have made a previously menacing situation into what is now a serious safety hazard. Its simple network of roads with only two means of egress cannot bear more cars, more trucks, more people as the proposed plan would demand.

And what of the increased number of chlorine trucks which must necessarily pass homes for the elderly and schools on their daily treks through our Town. I ask you that during your deliberations you can weigh the cost of a small child's life snuffed out in a chlorine disaster when you balance your search for cleaner water. And what of the environmental impact of those residents who live within 200 yards of this proposed incinerator and its 120 foot smoke stacks? Have you balanced the stench that these persons must endure? Have you asked yourself what their quality of living will become if this plan is implemented?

Winthrop's Deer Island is perhaps the most scenic, most beautiful, most attractive of all the harbor islands. How ironic, indeed how absurd is the thought to transform one of Nature's most resplendent

recreational sites into a treatment plant for sludge.

Madam Chairlady, make no mistake about it, the Town of Winthrop is a lovely place to live. It is not Gary, Indiana; it is Erie, Pennsylvania; it is not a Newark; and it's not a Buffalo. Please don't make it one.

In closing, may I state the most reprehensible aspect of the entire matter, and that is the process that has been followed to date. In four years of public life, I have learned much about democracy and the democratic way. We truly do live in an age of environmental impact studies, of open meetings, of public hearings. The voice of the everyday citizen has become important and well it should. But not with this plan, for this draft was written without the benefit of a public hearing, without the pulse of the affected residents being taken, without that all-important voice being heard until today. And that is why we are here today. And as I speak, I speak as a surrogate of the 21,000 people back home who want a chance to be heard and perhaps couldn't be here today, a chance to persuade you that this report is ill-conceived and ill-founded.

In his inaugural address in 1960, President

John F. Kennedy addressed the need to begin again. And that's the point I'm going to leave you with. Begin this process again. Give our community a chance to be heard, a chance to receive the input from an expert consultant's point of view, a chance to provide you with a better, more effective alternative. In essence, all we're asking you for is a chance to prove that we are deserving of the quality of life that I am sure your agency seeks, indeed demands, for all Americans. Thank you.

MS. HANMER: Thank you.

Is Senator LoPresti here now?

(No response.)

MS. HANMER: Mr. Dimes.

STATEMENT BY RICHARD D. DIMES,
CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF SELECTMEN,
TOWN OF WINTHROP.

MR. DIMES: Thank you, Madam Chairman and gentlemen.

My name is Richard Dimes. I'm Chairman of the Winthrop Board of Selectmen of the Town of Winthrop.

The Board of Selectmen of the Town of Winthrop have reviewed the EPA's Draft Environmental Impact Statement on the Upgrading of the Boston Metropolitan Area Sewerage System. And after giving careful

consideration to the affects that such a proposal would have on the Town of Winthrop, the Board, in speaking for the Town, must go on record as being strongly opposed to the recommended plan of an all Deer Island facility.

We feel that the proposed plan does not give adequate consideration to the adverse impacts that such a facility would have on the socio-economic character of the Town of Winthrop.

The Town of Winthrop is the second most densely populated town in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The Town houses a population in excess of 23,000 people on little over one square mile of land. The principal source of revenue for this community is its tax on residential property. And we question the impact that the proposed plan will have on the revenue generated by that tax. For instance, we have serious reservations on the future value of private property which is located only 700 feet from one of the largest sewerage treatment plants in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

We also question the burden that such a proposal places on the services provided by the Town of Winthrop to Deer Island at the expense of the taxpayers of Winthrop.

The Town of Winthrop is the only land area in the Commonwealth which is geographically and physically connected to Deer Island. As such, the Town of Winthrop provides and must maintain the only public access roads to Deer Island. Increased traffic on these roads places an additional burden on the services provided by the Winthrop Police Department, not to mention the strain that such a development places on the residents of the Point Shirley area of Winthrop, which is a highly developed residential area adjacent to Deer Island.

To some extent, the fears of the Town with regard to traffic volume have been placated by the EPA's recommendation to use barges to transport materials to the site. However, we cannot ignore the fact that the EPA can only make such assurances and enforce those assurances while it holds the purse strings. Once the construction phase has been completed, the Town of Winthrop has no guarantee that there will be any restrictions placed on the use of Town roads. Therefore, the Town is reluctant to accept any proposal that cannot guarantee the safety of its citizens.

Also, the Town of Winthrop Fire Department provides a first line, first response to Deer Island.

Expansion of the Deer Island facility and its subsequent increased use of chlorine gas and other combustibles raises a serious question on the potential threat that this facility poses to the property and personal safety of the residents of Winthrop as well as raising a serious question with regard to the added responsibilities which must be assumed by the Winthrop Fire Department.

In light of these questions, we do not feel that the EIS has taken the specific interests of the Town of Winthrop into consideration. The plan is, by far, more institutionally oriented than it is people oriented. And it is this lack of a concern for people over institutions which we feel will be most severely felt by the citizens of Winthrop due to their close proximity to Deer Island.

For instance, one of the areas in which the proposal fails to adequately convince the reader of its viability is that of air quality. The suggested incineration process is one which suggests a trade-off in which the residents of the Town of Winthrop and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts may be able to have clean water at the expense of clean air.

Incineration of sludge, whether used for primary

or secondary treatment purposes, seems to be one of those nebulous areas where answers are lacking. The EPA's own consultants for the so-called Boston Case Study, Environmental REsearch and Technology, Incorporated, have stated that there are too many uncertainties connected with the incineration process to guarantee either its economic value or its effectiveness as a sludge management alternative. More specifically, the ERT consultants have stated they feel that if secondary incineration is combined with primary incineration at Deer Island, then the air quality of the Boston area will be seriously affected.

Therefore, due to these technological uncertainties, the Town of Winthrop must be recorded as being opposed to any use of any incineration process at Deer Island.

Further, we question the aesthetic value of a plan which proposes, indeed, to level an entire island in the name of progress. It was our understanding that Deer Island was considered an integral part of the Boston Harbor Islands Comprehensive Plan which called for the southern tip of the Island to be used for recreational purposes. That plan was mandated by Chapter 742 of the Acts of 1970. Under that Act, the Massachusetts Legislature made a commitment to plan

and institute a program for recreation and conservation of the Boston Harbor Islands. The plan, as prepared and adopted by the MAPC, not only called for the development of a recreation site at Deer Island but also strongly recommended that the existing sewerage treatment plant be screened from public view in order to add to the aesthetic value of the Island.

It was our understanding that the MDC's acquisition of the southern tip of Deer Island was made expressly for the development of a recreational site. Although the MDC did make reference to limited expansion of the sewerage treatment plant, they did emphasize the important role that they felt the Island would play in the recreational development of Boston Harbor.

We, therefore, suggest that if the islands designated by the Boston Harbor Islands Comprehensive Plan are to be used for purposes other than recreation, then the EPA should consider locating part of the proposed facility on Long Island, and this option was considered very strongly in many of the alternatives discussed in the EIS. In eliminating the most viable Long Island alternatives, the EPA stressed two arguments: First, the recreational value of Long Island;

and second, the additional cost of such an alternative. We challenge the validity of these arguments. First, because we feel that Deer Island's role as a key recreational site is just as essential to the implementation of the Boston Harbor Islands Comprehensive Plan as the role of Long Island. And second, because we must question the use of a cost factor as the bottom line in the implementation of a proposal which will work to the detriment of an entire community.

Therefore, we respectfully petition the EPA to reconsider some use of Long Island so that both Deer and Long Island may retain a portion of their recreational potential.

In conclusion, we would like to state that we are opposed to the recommended plan in its present form. And we would also like to go on record as being in support of the MDC's application for a waiver from secondary treatment. We do so due to our uncertainty that secondary treatment will in any way unconditionally guarantee the improvement of air and water quality in Boston Harbor.

Respectfully submitted, the Winthrop Board of Selectment.

In closing, quickly a couple of personal notes.

Again, I would have to mention that the EPA did not mention in any great detail the complete removal of the House of Correction on Deer Island in their proposed plan which the Town had gone on record in the past and still is on record that in any type of expansion on Deer Island, we would want the removal of the prison facility. Thank you.

MS. HANMER: Thank you.

Is Senator LoPresti here?

(No response.)

MS. HANMER: Can someone keep an eye out for Senator LoPresti and tell me when he gets here?

Okay, the next five speakers are Peggy Riley, Alan Lupo, Arthur Cummings, Jerry Falbo, and Ron Wayland.

STATEMENT BY MARGARET RILEY,
CONCERNED CITIZENS COMMITTEE OF WINTHROP

MS. RILEY: Thank you, Madam Chairlady.

In reply to your invitation to present oral and written testimony on the upgrading of the Boston Metropolitan Area Sewerage System, the Concerned Citizens Committee of Winthrop, opposing the expansion of the present primary sewerage facility on Deer Island, submits the following testimony for your consideration.

While this committee realizes that it is the obligation of the Environmental Protection Agency to come up with the most environmentally sound and cost effective overall system for the upgrading of the Boston Metropolitan area sewerage system, it must be noted that the EPA failed grossly to consider the extreme effects on those residents who would be most adversely impacted by its recommendations.

It is our intention to show your agency why we feel your proposal is totally unreasonable.

Under public notice and participation, from the beginning of the EPA draft, the residents of Winthrop were not properly notified as to your intentions. As a member of the Metropolitan Sewerage District, the residents of Winthrop should have been notified by mail on any action taken to insure public awareness of alternatives and/or other information concerning our Town.

We oppose the EPA's proposal of this study, which lacked total citizen participation, and in its place we demand a new study with benefit of federal or state funds. With funds being made available, we can be assured of total participation and the availability of our own consultants.

The federal government, through its proposal, intends to obliterate the entire 210 acres of Deer Island and in turn replace it with a massive industrial complex. Deer Island will be permanently committed to waste water treatment, with a 150 foot stack for air pollutant emissions.

The Deer Island Peninsula is now presently owned by three landlords -- the federal government, the Metropolitan District Commission and the City of Boston. Although this is true, it is also a fact that the only land access is through our small streets. It should be noted that there is only one very narrow street, approximately one mile in length, which leads directly to the Island.

Winthrop is one of the most densely populated towns in the state. Any increase in traffic through our streets will cause a great deal of congestion and most certainly poses a safety hazard to the residents of Winthrop, as well as our neighbors in East Boston and Revere.

As your draft notes, this project will require 4,400 person years for construction. Two thousand potential vehicle trips per day for workers, not to mention the 4,000 trips per day during peak periods

of construction not noted in the summary of adverse effects.

Your recommendations for barging material and machinery is just that, only recommendations. Exceptions will undoubtedly be given. For example, in Volume 1 EIS, pipe will be delivered by truck. I note that this may only be six trucks a day, but what other exceptions will be made to go against the recommendations planned.

It is a definite fact that construction of this massive facility will make for severe disruption to our community. The only way this construction would not severely affect us is to reopen the land bridge which connects Winthrop and the Island.

We feel that operation and maintenance indeed will be a problem - a permanent staff of 384 persons, again traffic ongestion. There is no fire equipment on the Island to handle fires now. Winthrop must respond while waiting for Boston.

We have been told by EPA that once the secondary facility is constructed that if it is properly maintained, there should be no adverse effects to the residents. We were told this ten years ago when the primary facility was built. Now because this treatment procedure is not doing what it is supposed to, we need another facility.

For example, EIS Volume 1 1-9, because of seawater intrusion into the sewer system which increased flows, a decrease in treatment facility efficiencies arose. Both treatment plants are overloaded due to storm water runoff and infiltration and inflow into the sewerage system, resulting in less than efficient treatment. This inflow has created operation and maintenance problems.

No guarantee that these problems will not occur with yet another system. We will become an experiment for the massive treatment of waste.

Incineration and its unavoidable adverse effects. The proposed plan attempts to minimize air quality impacts through the use of alternate sludge disposal methods, thereby relying on sludge incineration to the least degree. However, air emissions from sludge incineration will be significant and will represent an unavoidable adverse effect. These are from your own volumes. Also, air emissions resulting from additional barge, truck and automobile traffic are unavoidable. All air quality standards are projected to be met except the secondary 24 hour particulate standard which will exacerbate a projected violation.

EIS Volume 1.

My question, will Winthrop, which is presently an attainment area, become a non-attainment area with the use of incineration? Indications are that air quality will certainly decrease in Winthrop and the surrounding communities.

Discharge of chlorinated secondary effluent into Boston Harbor can have significant water quality impact. In addition to toxicity effects, residual chlorine has been reported as impairing fish flavor. Chlorination of wastewater also results in formation of chlorinated organics.

Dredging operations will have temporary negative impact upon water quality, depending upon prevailing currents. It's not that I'm so knowledgeable in all these facts. These I take directly from your books.

Property value. In locating sites for new treatment facilities, the number of facility sites to be used is of great importance, especially in densely populated areas such as Boston. Waste water treatment facilities are, unfortunately -- and your quotes again -- though of as bad neighbors and are not generally welcome by nearby residents. While this is not true in all cases, there is no doubt that facilities of this magnitude under discussion will significantly and unavoidably

impact the settings in which they are located.

In addressing the issue of property valuation in Squantum, it was determined by EPA that there would be a definite devaluation of land in the area. At no time was I able to find one sentence which addressed the valuation of property in the adjacent area to the plant in Winthrop, when in fact the nearest resident is only 700 feet away.

This committee most certainly realizes the need for cleaning up the water. We also most certainly believe that there are viable alternatives to the recommended plan. For example, the secondary treatment of sewerage on Long Island or an uninhabited island or the inland treatment of sewerage in a non-residential area such as now serves the City of Lawrence.

In conclusion, the citizens of Winthrop most certainly want to accept their share in the responsibility of treatment of sewerage as a member community in the MSD and we feel that we are presently doing so by the treatment of primary sewerage for the Northern Service Area.

The Concerned Citizens of Winthrop feel that with the ever increasing noise and air pollution from Logan Airport, the potential of disaster with the on-going

trucking of shlorine through our streets, the threat from the prison facility and the upgrading of the primary sewerage facility, we can absorb no more.

We will not sit back an accept the secondary treatment of sewerage from 51 communities. We insist that you seriously review your recommended plan until such time as you consider the human factor as seriously as you say you have considered the environmental factor.

This summary is submitted by the Concerned Citizens Committee of Winthrop.

I'd like to add just one personal statement. I live in the Point Shirley area of Winthrop, which is directly adjacent to the Deer Island site. My husband and myself have four children whose safety and whose quality of life is of the utmost importance to us. Like so many of my neighbors who share in the everyday problems of all human beings, we feel that we are now being asked to take too much.

We are afraid of the chance of flooding, after living through the Flood of '78. We are tired of the air and noise pollution from Loqan, with living with decibal levels of over 95 on a daily level. We are afraid of the potential of disaster from the still on-going trucking of chlorine, not to mention the

alternatives of barging or storing or possibly the manufacturing of this chlorine. We have lived with the threat of the population at Deer Island. I had an inmate break into my home last year. Thank God he didn't hurt anybody. We had three inmates from Deer Island leave within the last 24 hours. They haven't been found. People say, "Well, we'll get rid of the prison." Well I don't want to have to make deals with anybody. No, the prison shouldn't be there, neither should the secondary treatment of sewerage.

One might say, why are you so disturbed with the proposed plan, and my answer is that I would rather live with the fear from the present problems than face the unknown, what I believe to be devastating effects that I honestly believe will be intolerable to cope with.

Your agency may indeed have the distinction of striking the final blow to an already battered community. Thank you.

MS. HANMER: Ms. Riley, we have a question for you.

MR. STICKNEY: I just wanted to say that I'm impressed that you'd gone through that statement with so much detail. I should have known you would after

we had talked before about it.

We did attempt public participation with all of the communities, including two early workshops in Winthrop and then the later workshops, of course, which were much better attended. Do you think that we've established lines of communication now, so that public participation will be more effective?

MS. RILEY: I believe that you followed the standards which you were told to follow for public participation. I believe, and you folks here -- and I must say, somebody asked me the other day at our press conference, "How was EPA?" I said, "They were the most courteous persons I've ever had to work with." And indeed, you have been. You are doing your job and I'm doing mine as a citizen.

What we're asking for, and I'll reiterate, is public participation with the benefit of consultants, and the only way we can do that is with a share of the millions of dollars that have been spent to prepare this draft. And that's what we're looking for.

STATEMENT BY ALAN LUPO, MEMBER OF
CONCERNED CITIZENS COMMITTEE OF WINTHROP

MR. LUPO: I don't believe Senator LoPresti is here. In his absence, we'll just continue with your list. Before I make my statement, there are a couple

of housekeeping details here.

First of all, I just want it noted that the Concerned Citizens Committee is supported fully by the Massachusetts Air Pollution and Noise Abatement Committee, by Mass Blast, by the East Boston Legislative Committee, by the East Boston Recreation and Land Use Advisory Council, by East Boston Fair Share, by Revere Fair Share, and by Neptune Road Adhoc Committee of East Boston.

The second detail is as follows: For those members of the media who do not, we have a press packet available with copies of the statements and a news release, and we'll be happy to provide them to you.

The third detail is this, and then I'll go into my statement. My profession normally is that of journalist. I want to make it very clear that I'm not here in that role today. I am not here to cover this story. That would be a conflict of interest.

My name is Alan Lupo. I live at 54 Johnson Avenue in Winthrop. I'm a member of the Concerned Citizens Committee of Winthrop. I come here fully aware of the complexities of this issue, and I'm equally well aware of the need to clean up Boston

Harbor, which after all is part of my backyard.

But I must say to you that despite my awareness of the difficulties of this task and with all due respect to the enormous amount of work that went into your report, we do not intend to allow that plan to be implemented. There will be no leveling of Deer Island, one of our few natural resources, for an industrial complex that one might expect to find off the New Jersey Turnpike. There will be no barging; there will be no filling; there will be no construction; there will be no trucking. There will be no shuttling by either car or bus of 2000 construction workers daily through the narrow residential streets of this most densely populated community.

There will be no incineration of sewerage sludge to pollute our air. There will be no haphazard introduction of additional chemicals into our air or water or into our neighborhoods.

Winthrop has taken on more than its share of Greater Boston's social responsibilities. We have seen part of our harbor filled in for Logan Airport, and we suffer daily the awesome noise and air pollution created by that facility. We have already on Deer Island an antiquated prison, harmful to its inmates,

to its correction officers, and to its neighbors in Point Shirley. We have already on Deer Island a primary treatment plant with its own history of bureaucratic bumbling and malfunctions.

We are treated hourly to deafening high decibel whines, groans, shrieks, roars of jets warming up, taking off, flying overhead, landing and reversing thrust. We are treated daily to tanker trucks full of deadly chlorine moving through densely populated streets.

We are treated sporadically to inmates trying to escape from that God forsaken excuse for a penal institution.

We are technically a suburb of Boston, but we are in fact an urban neighborhood, with all the virtues and problems that come with the territory. We are precisely the kind of urban neighborhood that the Carter Administration says it wants to insure remains alive and healthy. We agree with President Carter, and therefore, we say to you, no, no sewerage treatment expansion on Deer Island.

Instead, we demand true citizen participation as opposed to the tokenism displayed so far. To hold a few public meetings and invite some statements is a farce,

a further confirmation of a 3-year old New York Times article which said of your Water Pollution Control Act, and I quote: "One of the law's objectives of extensive public participation in the pollution abatement program has been almost completely fruitless."

Instead of a real community study where citizens enjoy equal access and clout with the federal, state and regional arms of government, we have some hernia-producing volumes of federalese -- a language that many educated Americans do not speak or easily comprehend. We have a so-called study that presumes Deer Island must be part of the solution and then proceeds to eliminate all alternatives in order to justify the original presumption.

Americans had enough of these kinds of studies. We thought the events of the 1960s and early 1970s meant an end to such studies, that from then on citizens would be part of the process in major decisions affecting their lives and their neighborhoods. How naive and how foolish we apparently were.

We are back to where we were in the bad old days of early urban renewal. Experts communicating in their own jargon hand us voluminous studies and expect us to respond with immediate and intelligent answers to such

statements as, and I quote:

"If SIP revisions are judged necessary by EPA to meet the NAAQS, no construction can be initiated..." et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

But despite all that, if one could struggle through this study with the limited time available to the average citizen, one could see a plan fraught with danger and destruction. Some examples:

The plan calls for the trucking and/or barging in of 7,135 tons of liquid chlorine a year. The EPA report acknowledges that chlorine can be harmful to water and marine life. I would add to that a reminder of what could happen, God forbid, if one of those chlorine tanks ruptured and the liquid turned to gas. The gas can burn the skin and eyes; the vapors if inhaled can kill. Early this year a freight train carrying chlorine was derailed in the Florida panhandle. I quote from Time magazine:

"Ambulance driver Doug Lister and his partner Marty Shipman were the first rescuers to reach the twisted wreckage. Said Shipman, 'Suddenly, I couldn't breathe. I started screaming at Doug to get the hell out of there.' Listed added, 'I was spitting up blood. I felt like I was breathing flames. I thought I was

going to die.' Lister managed to put the ambulance in reverse and rush away. Others were not so lucky. Eight did die, and 50 were injured."

That was a train accident, true; not a truck or a barge accident. Yet the federal government reports that rail, truck, plane and ship companies had 16,000 spills of dangerous cargo in 1977 alone, resulting in 32 deaths and 750 injuries. Trucks account for more than 80 percent of the spills.

Another example: Air pollution. The plan proposes that sewerage sludge will be incinerated at Deer Island. The EPA report itself says repeatedly, "Incineration of the sludge would add significant quantities of pollutants to the atmosphere."

But you have to travel down another little road in the bureaucracy to find this little tidbit from the General Accounting Office, and I quote again:

"Coping with rapidly increasing volumes of sewerage sludge, a potentially toxic substance, is a nationwide problem. Some disposal methods are being phased out; others are being increasingly restricted by governmental actions."

The General Accounting Office cited a "lack of scientific data on environmental and health effects of

sludge disposal, unproven technology and high costs."

In other words, what may seem beneficial today to clean up a harbor may prove devastating tomorrow and clean out a neighborhood, a town and a bunch of other communities.

I want to add an important footnote here. The EPA proposal seems contrary to the Carter Administration's hopes for urban neighborhoods. The EPA and the GAO, General Accounting Office, are at odds. The EPA proposal also rejects sewerage plans by the MDC. The MAPC, the Metropolitan Area Planning Council, was supposed to study the MDC's sewerage plan known as the EMMA, but it ran out of money. And meanwhile the OMB, Office of Management and Budget, says the EPA proposal is already useless because it doesn't deal with all the causes of sewerage pollution runoff in the harbor.

I don't know what the FBI, the CIA or the KGB say about it. But I know one local official has said privately that it's an administrative nightmare. On that one, you've got our sympathy.

Meanwhile, some communities with foresight and/or political clout have convinced the EPA that sewerage treatment facilities recommended for their neighborhoods are dangerous and unnecessary.

So it all comes back to good old dependable Winthrop and Deer Island. Lucky Winthrop, and its neighbor East Boston, will get 25 buses full of construction workers making round trips every day for four to six to ten years. Enough air and noise pollution to decrease property values, destroy public roads, and combined with the noise and pollution of Logan's jets and the construction activity at Deer Island create lots of physical and psychological trauma -- just enough to wipe our community.

When EPA in its report does acknowledge the disruptions, both temporary and permanent, that will occur, it suggests that measures be taken to alleviate them. What measures? By whom? Who will pay for these measures? Who will insure that they be carried out? Where is it written?

Finally in its report, EPA makes much of endangered species, some of whom allegedly live on the islands that were ruled out as sites for treatment plants. The EPA shows proper concern for the Northern Copperhead snake, the Ipswich Sparrow, and even the famous numenius borealis. But the EPA has shown less concern for what we call Urbanus Humanus, which may not be Latin but which we've just made up, and that means us, people

who live in an urban setting with precious few natural resources.

In fact, EPA has the audacity to dismiss the removal of 210 acres, all of Deer Island, as less than traumatic. It sees little ecological value, except for a glacial hill or two and no historic or educational significance. Well, maybe if you live in the country or a wealthier suburb, a Deer Island doesn't look like much, but it means a lot to us aesthetically. Don't write us off as cretins who can't appreciate the beauty of a drumlin with a view of the Atlantic. And make no mistake about the history of that place, often a sad history, but very real and very relevant nonetheless.

Old Urbanus Humanus has taken about enough. Our message to you is clear -- no further work on the sewerage treatment plant, primary or secondary. We want a new study, similar to the one sponsored by the state in the early 1970s after the insane interstate highways was stopped, a study where citizens are equal partners with government and can select their own planners and experts and technicians with federal and/or state funds.

It was civil disobedience that helped stop those highways and make that study possible. I hope and pray

such actions will not be forced upon us in this day and age. But rather than leave you with a warning, I would rather leave you with a plea for compassion and what I believe to be fairness.

In Fiddler on the Roof, Tevye, who is much like Winthrop, he looks to God and Heaven and he says, "God, I know you've made us the chosen people, but once in a while, couldn't you choose somebody else?"

Thank you.

MS. HANMER: The good news is that these have been very good statements. The bad news is now we're a half hour behind. So let's continue.

MR. CUMMINGS: Nice to start on a good note.

You're a tough act to follow, Al.

STATEMENT BY ARTHUR CUMMINGS, WINTHROP

MR. CUMMINGS: Madam Chairlady, my name is Arthur Cummings. I live at 51 Emerson Road, Winthrop, Mass. I wish to address my remarks to the alternatives, or lack of alternatives, available to the proposed expansion of the EPA sewerage system at Deer Island.

It should first be noted that the proposed program, as well as all alternative programs which were dismissed, did not include any meaningful citizen participation despite the impact on the communities and the lives of

their residents.

The preliminary screening draft of the Environmental Impact Statement is biased and in favor of, I quote, "large treatment plant sites...in the vicinity of Boston Harbor." Page 3-32. This bias then eliminates any serious consideration of a larger number of smaller size facilities which would result in the reduction in the cost for interceptor relief, since the demand would be lower. Furthermore, innovative sludge management plans may be possible since the quantities generated would be over a larger metropolitan area and would be smaller and more realistically handled.

For the inland plants, 29 sites were investigated. In the preliminary screening, twenty sites were eliminated for such reasons as:

Proximity to a golf course, a private one at that;

Distances from discharge points, three or more miles;

Heavily wooded areas;

Dedicated to open space;

Obvious better alternatives, whatever they might be;

Incompatible with residential areas, such as Wellesley;

Inhabited by birdlife and rookery populations.

The secondary screening investigated sixteen coastal area plant configurations. Eight with inland satellite plants; eight without. Nut Island was eliminated simply due to cost. The plan would cost one percent more to build. This one piece of faulty logic actually eliminates from consideration six of the sixteen alternatives. And the beat goes on.

No community effects and affects were allowed to enter the decision making process.

Winthrop has had enough of this type of alternative -- the alternative without choice. We have an alternative prison -- Deer Island. We have an alternative airport -- Logan -- which when we complain to Massport of the noise pollution from the takeoffs, the landings and the revving up concoct alternative flight patterns, such as the loop that strangles Winthrop, and the teardrop that is squeezed from Winthrop, and the infamous corkscrew and we all know what that did for good old Winthrop.

Serious consideration must be given to the people of Winthrop and the surrounding communities. Once the sewerage plant has been constructed, our opposition is academic -- the danger and damage is irrevocable. The

reports of different agencies are contradictory. The MDC for one is opposed to the EIS. Furthermore, the EIS report is full of maybe's and should's. This is not good enough when we are talking about human life and environmental resources, the destruction of which is irrevocable. These specific problems have been or will be discussed by other speakers.

It is very possible that the problems created by an expanded sewerage plant at Deer Island will have as adverse effect on the residents of Winthrop and adjacent communities as the insidious consequences of those people who worked closely with asbestos. Despite warnings as early as 1930 that asbestos was harmful, little or nothing was done to correct it because a few people wanted to save a few dollars. We can clearly see now the cost in human suffering as well as the dollar cost because of this short-sightedness.

Deer Island and Winthrop are the gateway to Boston Harbor. We wish to maintain it as a natural and human resource. Viable alternatives to the proposed EIS plan have been too easily dismissed. The citizens of Winthrop want to control their own destiny. This can be accomplished only if the EIS plan is stopped and citizen participation becomes an integral part of the decision

making process.

MR. HICKS: The next five speakers are Jerry Falbo, Ron Wayland, Sheriff Kearney, and then Thomas Maguire and C. E. McDonald.

Mr. Falbo.

STATEMENT BY JEROME E. FALBO, CHAIRMAN
WINTROP PLANNING BOARD

MR. FALBO: Ladies and gentlemen and fellow citizens, my name is Jerome Falbo, and I'm Chairman of the Winthrop Planning Board.

I'd like to preface my remarks at this time by stating that we consider this problem as part of the totalitarian picture, the total picture in regards to all of the other forces that have affected residential zoning in Winthrop. And this is the mind in which the statement was presented, prepared and presented to you this evening.

Historically, the development of the Town of Winthrop has been characterized by massive population growth followed closely by intervening forces of private and governmental agencies under the color and guise of progress. These forces have been awesome and disruptive to residential quality of the Town of Winthrop.

We are a small town surrounded by a large city and

the Atlantic Ocean. The community, while constantly fighting off the threat of urbanization and its evils, cannot ever hope to expand its residential capacity. The Town is small and overcrowded. There are approximately 22,000 human beings attempting to enjoy the benefits of suburban living in an area of one and a half square miles. There are over 13,000 of these human beings living in one square mile.

The task of attempting to enjoy living in this community becomes increasingly difficult by its mere geographical location, lack of tax generating conditions, and shortage of usable land. But now, as so often in the past, we face additional outside forces with awesome plans to further infringe on the residential quality of the Town of Winthrop.

I'd like for a moment to quote in part from the zoning by-laws of the Town of Winthrop, Section 13.03, entitled Purpose, and again I state in part. "The purpose of this By-Law is to promote health, safety, convenience, morals and welfare of the inhabitants of the Town of Winthrop; lessen congestion in the streets; to conserve health; to secure safety from fire, panic and other dangers; to provide adequate light and air..."

The Planning Board, as you may well know, is charged by law with the duty to carry out these stated purposes. But through the years the various changes in land uses involuntarily placed on our community has made this mandate difficult if not impossible to carry out by this Planning Board or predecessor boards. Let us consider the facts of the past, and some you have heard today from other citizens, where private and governmental and quasi private and quasi governmental agencies have forced upon us, the Community of Winthrop, programs of progress and development which have brought to our community a state of lower residential standards.

First, many years ago the construction of Deer Island as a minimal penal institution for the benefit of Suffolk County and connected by a strip of land to the Town of Winthrop. Not much can be said about the development as it predated this Board as well as the early concept of zoning and land planning.

The second, however, we saw the creation of the Mass. Port Authority. During the years of its early development, 1960 through 1971 or thereabouts, in which we watched a phenomenal growth. While the Port is to be commended for such growth and significant contribution to the economic growth of the City of

Boston and possibly the Commonwealth, it must bear an equally significant blame for the decline of Winthrop as a residential community. During this period and against the vociferous opposition of the Planning Board and the community as a whole, this growth phenomena adversely affected the life style and quality of living in Winthrop. It was at this time that people started to question the desirability of buying homes and living in Winthrop.

True, there was no significant decrease in population. Why? Because as native Winthropites moved out, their position was taken over and their homes by people who had previously enjoyed living in areas closer to the airport but by then were eager to escape the threat of expansion and the new noise experiences.

Ironically, ladies and gentlemen, a few years ago this Board, in fact I appeared before your agency to protest the construction of the proposed parallel Runway 15-33. Fortunately, the community prevailed and a further decline in residential standards was averted.

Next, what do we have? In 1968 we experienced the construction of the first sewerage plant at Deer

Island. There is no doubt that this plant was necessary to fight the existing sewerage problems. But can anyone question that the plant, although located at the edge of the Town and not on the Town's property, contributed further to discourage people from living in Winthrop? Again, the desirability of establishing a residency in the community declined.

To this very day, as you have heard and again I'll repeat, the residents are apprehensive about the daily chlorine gas truck which passes through our residential streets. This truck constantly and unnecessarily looms as a threat to the safety and peace of the residents. Yet, has there been any attempts to find an alternate viable method of transporting the chlorine?

During this same period of time in Winthrop's history, a decision was made that drastically curtailed even the potential to broaden the tax base. The Boston Transportation Task Force and other state agencies eliminated consideration of construction of a third road to Winthrop. The experts gave many reasons for this adverse opinion. Strongly, one of these reasons was that the Town of Winthrop was residential in nature and would not be supportive of

industry and commerce, commercial interests that would expected to be attracted to Winthrop if there was a third access road. Clearly, as we view it, members of the Planning Board consider the community as locked in, locked in in its capacity to increase tax revenue and the accompanying added services which in turn generates further residential development.

And now, as you have heard and are aware, we have been chosen as the site of yet further non-residential construction effects. Will the proposed construction adversely affect the Town of Winthrop? Will the community continue to experience irreversible setbacks and irretrievable losses?

We believe that the construction of a secondary treatment plant at Deer Island -- that is, we on the Planning Board -- will have an adverse affect on the residential desirability of the Town of Winthrop. The initial construction activity at the site, the increased use of our roads by traffic generated by this construction, the air emission from the incinerary process, elimination of Deer Island for recreational use, and the possible land taking, easements, for relief sewers will cause a devaluation of the value of the adjacent property at Point Shirley; in addition,

this construction will cause a further decline in the residential value of the Town.

The necessity of the proposal to affectively deal with the sewerage problem is not in doubt. That is a necessity. But we are of the opinion that the Town of Winthrop cannot survive another residentially disruptive project such as the proposed construction. We gladly welcome some of the technological benefits but not if we must bear all of the technological burdens.

Therefore, we urge you to recommend the elimination of the Deer Island site for the construction of a secondary sewerage plant or as a site for any additional non-residential or non-recreational use.

We would prefer, the members of the Planning Board, to be allowed to continue -- again, I quote within the words of the purpose of the zoning by-laws of the Town of Winthrop -- "making of Winthrop a more viable and more pleasing place to live, work and play."

Respectfully submitted by the Winthrop Planning Board. Thank you.

MR. HICKS: Mr. Wayland.

STATEMENT BY RONALD H. WAYLAND,
CHAIRMAN, WINTHROP CONSERVATION
COMMISSION

MR. WAYLAND: Madam Chairman, gentlemen, my name

is Ronald Wayland. I am the Chairman of the Winthrop Conservation Commission.

Because I am actively involved in the task of protecting Winthrop's endangered wetlands and other environmental interests, I can appreciate your concern for and commitment to improving water quality standards in the area of Boston Harbor. I can also, in some measure, appreciate and understand those elements which should be considered in reaching an objective conclusion on this very important environmental issue.

After studying the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, which is the subject of this Public Hearing, and after having had the opportunity of discussing its recommendations with Mr. Johnson of the Environmental Protection Agency and others, I have come to the conclusion that this impact statement is most obviously incomplete in its analysis of all the pertinent facts. Its conclusions therefore should be considered to be totally premature.

Perhaps the most serious flaw in this statement is its almost total silence on the question of what impact the recommended proposal will have on the over 20,000 inhabitants of the Town of Winthrop, on the people of East Boston, but especially on the residents

of Point Shirley. The Environmental Impact Statement leaves unanswered such questions as:

What impact will this project have on the health and safety of the people of Winthrop?

What impact will this project have on property values in the Town of Winthrop?

How will this project effect economic growth in Winthrop?

And how will this project impact on the recreational needs of the people of Winthrop, East Boston, Chelsea and Revere?

The answers to these questions become meaningful when you ask the same questions or similar questions with respect to alternative sites, and then make a comparison between the two. This process has not been followed.

Secondly, what credibility can be given to an environmental impact statement concerning a project of the magnitude suggested by the Environmental Protection Agency that does not mention, not one word is mentioned of the negative environmental impact of Logan Airport. It does not seem right that after you have reached your conclusions you must now rely on the concerned citizens of Winthrop to provide you with this

most significant information.

Again, this leaves important questions still unanswered. Does the Environmental Protection Agency know what the recommended proposal, what impact the recommended proposal will have on the citizens of Winthrop when the environmentally damaging elements of this project are added to the already existing pollutants of all kinds that impact upon this community? And how do these findings necessarily compare when applied to alternative sites?

Thirdly, and I suspect at the heart of your decision to destroy Deer Island, is the Boston Harbor Island Comprehensive Plan which was prepared initially, I think, by the Massachusetts Department of Natural Resources and by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council. When your Draft Environmental Impact Statement dealt with alternative sites, the Boston Harbor Islands' Plan was given seemingly as the only reason necessary for rejecting that site. This apparently fool proof defense, however, failed with respect to Deer Island. In effect, it was decided that Deer Island and the interests of the people of Winthrop and the North Shore would be sacrificed for the sake of the rest of that plan.

This effectively makes the Boston Harbor Plan

primarily a program for South Shore communities and tourists; that is, unless you happen to be able to afford a boat. We in Winthrop wait with great anticipation to see if the authors of this Boston Harbor Island Plan are as quick as you are to cut Winthrop loose.

So what has the Environmental Protection Agency done to Winthrop with their proposed recommendation? We think they have taken the Boston Harbor Island Plan, which in many ways was Winthrop's hope for the future, hope for growth, hope for development, and have converted that plan into a blueprint for future decay and degeneration of Winthrop.

We feel that the Environmental Protection Agency's recommendations, based upon incomplete information, are at the very least unfair to the people of Winthrop. We hope you will recognize this and will reconsider your recommendations. We suggest that other ways can and must be found that will enable you to achieve high water quality standards without destroying Deer Island, without destroying the Boston Harbor Islands Plan and without destroying the Town of Winthrop. Thank you.

MR. HICKS: Thank you, Mr. Wayland.

Sheriff Kearney.

DENNIS KEARNEY, SHERIFF,
SUFFOLK COUNTY

MR. KEARNEY: Thank you, Madam Chairlady, and members of the Commission, for giving me this opportunity to speak here this afternoon.

I am here as Sheriff Dennis Kierney, Sheriff of Suffolk County. I reside at 35 West Eagle Street in East Boston.

My interest in this issue was piqued by the inter-relationship of the controversy surrounding the Charles Street Jail issue and the Deer Island House of Correction. It was a topic of great debate during the past year as to what the best long range physical and correctional public policy of the City and County would be in addressing the problems that exist at both the Charles Street Jail and the Deer Island House of Correction.

It was hoped that a combined jail and house of correction could be constructed on a Downtown Boston site that would have the following effect:

Number One, remove the House of Correction from Deer Island in Winthrop; secondly, save the City operating costs in combining services through a combined facility; thirdly, returning to the County \$15 million in federal funds for the swap of land at Dear Island; and fourth, the construction of a new

sewerage treatment plant to further clean up Boston Harbor waters.

However, as I stand here today, I recognize two problems with that scenario. First and foremost is the recent action of the Boston City Council. Rather than construct a combined facility on a Downtown Boston site to instead renovate or rehabilitate the Charles Street Jail where it is at Charles Street.

That means that the Deer Island House of Correction will remain at Deer Island. It also means, given new state minimum standards from the Department of Correction, the Deer Island House of Correction itself will have to be renovated at Deer Island. That renovation and rehabilitation and reconstruction process in and of itself I am sure will have some impact in terms of construction vehicles on this very impacted area where you intend to build a secondary sewerage treatment plant.

I think that it is unfair to the people of Winthrop for government or bureaucracy in general to place both a renovated House of Correction and a secondary sewerage treatment plant at Deer Island.

My original support of that scenario was based on the removal of the House of Correction from Deer

Island.

A second problem experienced by all of us, I'm sure, was an unfamiliarity with the scope, the size and the impact of the proposed secondary sewerage treatment plant at the time of these jail discussions. And I do feel that the timeliness of this issue was a problem. It would have been helpful to all of us if this issue had come to a head a year ago. But given the outcome of the jail construction issue and given the serious questions raised about the construction of the secondary sewerage treatment plant, I urge a new study, as the people of Winthrop have also urged, with maximum feasible citizen participation to give the people of Winthrop greater impact and control of the quality of life in their community.

Thank you for the opportunity. I'd be happy to answer any of your questions.

MR. JOHNSON: I have just one question, Sheriff Kearney. In the Clean Water Act of 1977, the Congress did authorize several millions of dollars for the construction, toward the construction of a prison facility away from Deer Island if the secondary treatment plant was to be built there. Are you saying now in your testimony that there is no chance of a prison anywhere

away from Deer Island?

MR. KEARNEY: That was the topic of discussion surrounding the recent jail issue. Several defendants in the case -- myself, the City of Boston, and the State's Correction Commissioner -- advocated the construction of a dual correctional facility for Suffolk County, consisting of both a jail and a house of correction.

Given the City Council's actions just to renovate the jail and the inability to locate a site in a downtown area for a combined facility, it is, I think, almost a mute issue at this point that the Deer Island House of Correction will ever be removed from Deer Island.

MR. JOHNSON: Even though there may be federal monies for the construction of a jail, you're saying that's not possible?

MR. KEARNEY: Unfortunately, that was my argument during the entire debate, that here we have a golden opportunity on a county-wide level on a long range correctional basis, also on a fiscal basis, to build a combined facility and receive \$15 million in federal funds. And the construction of such facilities was contingent upon a combined facility. Yet the City Council

by their action voted just to renovate the jail. And it was hoped that an action to build a combined facility would have completed a scenario of the federal money being returned to the City and the County and the removal of Deer Island from Winthrop.

But again, that was the first basis for my support, and I fear that that will never happen, given the City Council's actions.

In addition, as I said, I think at the time of those debates, of that debate, it would have been helpful if this issue had come to a head in terms of trying to determine what would indeed be the best policy for the City and the County. But I'm here today, also, to stress that I think a lot of the support for a combined facility was also based on an unfamiliarity with the magnitude of this issue.

I look forward to working with the people of Winthrop and this committee to see that the people of Winthrop are adequately represented. Thank you.

MR. HICKS: Mr. Maguire.

STATEMENT BY THOMAS A MAGUIRE, WINTHROP

MR. MAGUIRE: My name is Thomas A. Maguire. I live at Point Shirley in Winthrop.

I've been very close to this problem over many

years. I wish to note at this time just one thing which has not been said, because I concur with everything to this point. And that is, I believe the civil rights of those prisoners at Deer Island will be a matter of issue in the coming days if this thing is pursued by the environmental impact commission.

As a retired person, sometimes they label us as those who could use their neckties to tie up tomato plants. Well, we as a group of retired citizens do not intend to bequeath apathy to the people of Winthrop. We do want you to know that where there is strength, and there is strength in Winthrop and there is fight, and where there is strength, we will take care of it. But where there is weakness, no words of ours can do anything.

I want you to know that that does not exist.
Thank you.

MR. HICKS: Mr. McDonald is next.

MR. MCDONALD: Thank you for the opportunity to speak, but I have no further comments.

MR. HICKS: Thank you.

The next three speakers are Mr. DiLorenzo, the Boston Harbor Citizens Advisory Committee, Dr. Meyer, and Mrs. Beale. Mr. DiLorenzo.

STATEMENT BY GEORGE DILORENZO, EAST BOSTON

MR. DILORENZO: Mr. Chairman, George DiLorenzo, former Representative of East Boston. My greatest claim to joy is that I'm a grandfather of two grandchildren who live in Winthrop. I still live in East Boston.

I'd just like to tell you that I'm not going to continue on the facts that have been presented before you on the pros and cons of whether this is right or wrong. Men with greater ability have presented their case. But I'm forced to remind this committee and the people here of a community once East Boston who allowed and listened and went through the process of pleading. "No, no," we said, "we don't want a tunnel." They gave us a tunnel. "No, no, a second tunnel? That's impossible." They said, "Just do this. Appear at meetings. Let them know how you feel. Go before the group and plead with them." We did. They gave us a second tunnel.

"My God, you want to take Wood Island Park? That's impossible. Ridiculous. What shall we do?" "Go before the Governor." We did. But quietly like you're doing, Winthrop. Are you going to learn. And they said, "Go before the Mayor." We did. We lost Wood Island Park.

Then a legislator was elected named George DiLorenzo. There was a thing called an airport. We said, "Please, don't disturb our children." They said, "We won't." And they did. "Please, please, don't grow inward. Grow outward." They said, "We won't." They did.

In the meantime we were told, told by our priests and by our elderly, "Behave yourself. Do what's right. Don't do that. Just plead." And we pled and we lost. However, one day on Maverick Street, it was about only 150 trucks every ten minutes going by, starting at 6:30 in the morning, and I got there and made a speech and we stopped it. They stopped it how? We stopped 50 trucks in one hour, had a confrontation with the State Police, sat on the street, refused them to go. There are no trucks on Maverick Street today.

But, ladies and gentlemen on Winthrop, plead, beg, continue. We only started in 1955. We learned in 1972.

Now, I'll give you one more occasion that happened and again I was slapped on the hand for that controntation. The Globe carried a story showing the State Policemen, the poor State Policemen who removed their

badges and dragged the women on the street as they sang, "Mine eyes have seen the glory of the..." you know, the usual democratic -- no greater place than this auditorium, this Faneuil Hall to make a speech as I'm about to say when we say, "Are we really disturbing the tranquillity of democracy?" Well, let me tell you, very peacefully and under full control, do you realize what happens if a chlorine truck were to strike a hole that was over a storm and it leaked or exploded? Now, don't get nervous because it only means about three or five hundred lives. Not much. Behave yourself. Don't you dare get rambunctious. Don't you dare display some animosity towards those who are leading you on.

But let me tell you something. East Boston will not allow you to bring the chlorine trucks through it. You cannot get into Winthrop without getting through East Boston, and we won't let you.

Take this back. May I remind you, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, I have a Master's degree, an Honorary Degree in what was work as a legislator. I have two Bachelor's Degrees, thirteen years of college so I'm a professional man. I don't like to behave like this. I, too, control the vocabulary that I can appeal and beg, but I did. But Winthrop hasn't learned

yet, but they will slowly get there.

I wonder if you realize what is meant by 4,000 trucks. Have you any idea? Mothers, sand in the sheets. You know when you put a poached egg, give it to your baby; sand in the poached egg.

Can you believe it if I told you when you crack an egg, sand is in the center of the egg. How did it get there, trucks going through East Boston streets every three minutes, and what happens? The streets -- well, forget that.

I'm going to close, and when I close, I want to appeal to you. Don't put East Boston on the front page of the Globe or on TV again. Don't make our disobedience appear as though we are very unrestful and very undeserving people. We've been very tolerable. We've tolerated all these abuses that Winthrop is about to start. And I was very interested to see my friend Tobin of Quincy who, when he was a legislator with me, didn't dream that the progress and the growth of the airport would ever interfere with Winthrop, so he voted for the progress of aviation, but it came back to haunt him.

And I'm telling you now, Winthrop, don't paint your houses. It's not worth it. The value of your

house will drop five percent per month. I've always wanted to live in Winthrop. You have no idea how I love Winthrop. You can have it. I'll stay where I am. Right in Maverick Square, across a project, across the ocean, a town of a million stinks, oil trucks, airport, noises. But at least it's tolerable. You're not. God, be aware what this is going to do to your children. You know how softly they speak? Listen to them soon. When they just ask for a glass of water and you say, "You don't have to shout." You're not aware of this environmental impact, are you?

Let me just close by saying, in 1968 we passed a law. It was to give the community the desire for input. That's a federal term, you know. As a matter of fact, it's even in your basis. I got it from you, that word "input." That you were established as the Environmental Protection Agency to create a vehicle of what they call citizen input. This is what you're doing. Input on what? Do eight years, ten years, of \$177 million -- oh, I've got to remind you, oh, if you only knew how many times they said, you know those 355 jobs, they all go to Winthrop. Ha, ha, ha. You know that \$700 million, do you know what that's going to do to your economy in Winthrop? Everybody is going to be a

millionaire. We heard that. You know something else? You know what kind of an input this is going to be on the economy of the businessmen in Winthrop? They're going to get so rich that they'll take over the problems in Winthrop. We heard that. And you want to know something? I couldn't even get a job, and I was a legislator, at the airport and I live there. I can't even get a job in the tunnel as one who is collecting money. We've got to make way for the veterans and the minorities, majority and the seniority groups.

So I'd just like to say, Winthrop, beware, don't be tricked. Fight, you're fighting for your life. You don't believe this, do you? Because I didn't believe it ten years ago. You're fighting for education. The moment this happens, your process of education goes down. The child starts to slur instead of speak. He's in special class, and you're going to say, "How did this happen?" It happened in East Boston. It's happening in Boston. And I know, I'm an educator and I see it every day.

Something else, fair ladies, and for your information, why is it that a woman has a change of life between the ages of 35 and 40? It's more predominant in East Boston and Winthrop. Could it be

because of the noise and sound? Could it be for this frustration that comes because of the frustrating sound and noise? So ladies and gentlemen, I'm appealing again, please don't accept it.

Once more, how can you sit there and plan to compound an environment with one pollution on top of another? Your job is to dissipate it and isolate it. What you're doing is putting more effluents, more environment problems on top of another. What do you want, noise pollution? We have it. What do you want, more pollution?

I've just lived through the BBD, the noise thing. We're going through it now in East Boston, and they're telling us now that the sound intensity is so bad, it's interfering with education.

Please, I appeal to you, don't let us behave what the papers will call us uncouth and rough. Give this to somewhere else. Spread it out. It can be done. Spread it out in Pittsfield. Spread it out in Southboro.. Put it out in Worcester. Spread it out. Put it out. That's your job. Thank you very much.

MR. HICKS: Dr. Meyer.

STATEMENT OF DR. HERBERT MEYER, Chairman
BOSTON HARBOR CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DR. MEYER: Ladies and gentlemen of the panel,

fellow citizens, my name is Herbert Meyer. I'm the Chairman of the Boston Harbor Citizens' Advisory Committee for the EPA.

Let me start with a personal remark which I have not prepared. The members of such Citizens' Advisory Committee for the EPA are impressed by the emotional and passionate testimony we have heard from the citizens from Quincy and Winthrop. We are not less concerned than they are.

The difference is that possibly we are committed to a certain staying power. We have been around for two and a half years and have met regularly, monthly and when necessary more often, not because there was a crisis in our backyard but out of a certain responsibility which transgresses the loyalty to our neighborhood.

We have at heart the good and the healthy future of the Boston region, and we consider ourselves citizens of Greater Boston whose greatest asset perhaps is the Boston Harbor, the Boston Harbor which has been neglected for so long and which has been poisoned by the sewer overflows from all those nice communities including Quincy and Winthrop.

It is a fact of life that not only animals but

also human beings have and produce waste, and that for generations not only Greater Boston and our whole country have neglected to care of the waste, dumping it into a nearby ocean and hoping it would go away. We now begin to realize that human waste doesn't go away and that we have to do something about it.

Some of the speakers have complained that there is no participation. I would like to differ with them. The Citizens' Advisory Committee and others of that sort in which I have been involved for the last twenty years of my life, and by now I am 81, are the beginning of a trend which for the future maybe constructive.

On our Committee we have a member each from Winthrop and from Quincy. If there are more of them willing to participate, I as the Chairman would welcome them. Then they could help us to patiently search for a compromise which will find or try to find solutions for nasty problems which nobody wants to solve in his backyard. We would welcome any more participants from Winthrop and from Quincy and from wherever they are to help us find a solution for something we all are responsible for and a solution from which all of us will profit. The whole region will have a better future for it.

And now let me read my prepared statement.

The Boston Harbor Citizens' Advisory Committee is a group of more than 30 citizens and agency people formed to advise the EPA and the State Office of Environmental Affairs on Boston Harbor related projects. Formed in early '76, we have met monthly, sometimes more frequently. In addition to its function as a citizen forum and action group, the committee also is an arena where agency people can interact not only with citizens but with each other.

One of our tasks has been to consider the EIS which is before us. We understand that the EMMA Report needed updating. EMMA recommended, among other things, satellite treatment plants in the mid-Charles and mid-Neponset; upgrading of the Nut and Deer Island plants to secondary treatment; and enlargement of the area served.

EMMA's recommendations were, on the whole, not acceptable partly because of changing situations and laws and partly because of an evolutionary process in the thinking of us all.

Because this is an on-going process, there are problems also with the present EIS:

The writing and research for the EIS ended a year

ago. New situations and reports have emerged since then.

The EIS is only a segment of the problem of water quality management of Boston Harbor and its three tributaries. Other important segments are under study by other agencies and they are all interrelated. Work on them should be coordinated. The more important of them are combined sewer overflows; inflow infiltration control, primary sludge management, upkeep and upgrading of local sewers and plants, urban run-off, groundwater pollution.

The intended waiver application from secondary treatment is another step, and possibly I regret all our nice fellow citizens from Winthrop and Quincy have left before they would have heard that pleasant surprise. The intended waiver application from secondary treatment is another step in the evolving process. There will be an 18 month to two year wait for the waiver decision. Meantime much needed research will have to be done.

This is not meant as a criticism of the EIS, but we realize in our Committee, and you on the panel certainly do realize to, that options should not be frozen during this on-going process. EPA and its

consultants did research and looked at alternatives, but new questions come up, old questions remain.

The recent Boston Case Study by the Office of Management and Budget, the National Science Foundation, and CEQ reinforced many of the questions which our Committee has been asking for years, and it added some new ones. This report and the Draft EIS were unfortunately issued at about the same time, so that the EIS could neither take into account the OMB questions nor answer them.

What is good about the EIS? First, EMMA needed redoing if for not other reason than because of new situations, new techniques, new laws, and new public awareness. Therefore the EIS presents a wealth of research and reference material for those willing to dig into the many thick volumes.

Its approach to conservation is strong and helpful. So helpful, in fact, that it should be made available apart from the voluminous format of the rest of the report. Furthermore, its suggestions for conservation should be put into effect. The effort to include composting of sludge is a small step towards what we hope is a widespread future reuse of the fertilizing elements of sewage.

The Committee appreciates the thoughtful efforts of public participation. There were workshops, a satellite site evaluation committee worked hard on the matter of mid-Charles sites. There was continuous cooperation and participation in our Committee deliberations. We also appreciate the effective media coverage, including an advertisement in the general section of the newspaper to stimulate interest in this hearing. We would have appreciated more openness with our Committee regarding the EPA-MDC relationships during the whole procedure. We were all feeling our way, and frankly, we still are, about the role of citizen advisory committees. We would like greater involvement of our Committee in the on-going work of the EIS consultants.

We should be aware that this is a draft. The final draft of the EIS is scheduled for early '81. Let us take advantage of the times until then.

Finally, we think the suggestions at the end of the EIS summary regarding mitigating actions are good. The section on treatment chlorination and its effects seems to suggest mitigating procedures.

At the end I would like to introduce my various speakers for the Committee. First Eugene Beale from

the Boston Conservation Commission who will speak of some of our questions we have; then Bud Reece, a citizen who will speak on the more important concerns we have; and Terry Colby, a citizen who will summarize the conclusions of the Committee.

I would like to express my thanks for the opportunity to testify here before you.

MR. HICKS: Thank you, Dr. Meyer.

STATEMENT OF MRS. EUGENE BEALE
BOSTON HARBOR CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MRS. BEALE: We have some questions which are mainly unanswered, and we want to acknowledge that we know that not all the answers can come from EPA. Some may come from other agencies, but we want to list them in the interest of trying to put everybody's information together and make some sense out of this shall I call it a hodge-podge.

Why is there no Boston Harbor Basin plan with water quality goals and with a ranked ordered list of projects and actions to be taken to clean up Boston Harbor and its tributaries? The 208 Report which was required by the Memorandum of Understanding to accept the EMMA Report is not a Boston Harbor Basin Plan and doesn't provide a basis for what to do to get an implementable plan.

How is this Environmental Impact Statement integrated with all other water quality plans for the harbor and tributaries?

Indeed, what is the impact of the proposed EIS project on the water quality of the harbor and tributaries?

Does the EIS reflect a bias towards what is there, thus memorializing a centralized system and putting concrete upon concrete, so to speak?

In fact, does the proposed centralized system go in the opposite direction from new ideas and the new Clean Water Act which encourages so-called innovative and alternative solutions such as on-site disposal, small-scale package systems of treatment, waterless toilets, and the like? Does the centralized proposal also go counter to the new Act's emphasis on dispersement of the systems especially in the fringes of urban areas? In other words, are we still locked in that we can't turn around even to some degree?

Are the satellites really put away? Are the water quality restrictions out of reach? If so, how can EPA grant funding to other treatment plants on the tributaries in the Commonwealth? What is, in fact, the state of the art?

Allied to that question is one about operations. Are operational hazards really a governing factor? Cannot a system be run safely? If not, how can the EPA make grants for plants anywhere on streams in New England.

What's the situation regarding the use of Deer Island in view of the recent Boston City Council vote on the Charles Street Jail?

The EIS says a significant reduction in wastewater volume could be realized with reduction of infiltration and inflow into the system from groundwater and sea water. How can we go into Step 1 facilities planning and design a system for a certain volume until the I/I reduction is known? How are we going to impose best practicable control technology on communities until we decide what can be done with I/I and what is cost effective, especially in view of the fact that water is an increasingly valuable commodity?

Why discuss secondary sludge management in the EIS when there are important obstacles regarding primary sludge management, the EIS for which has not been issued because it can't be completed?

What's the significance of sewage pollution as against the other known and unknown sources of harbor

and tributary pollution? How do areas of the harbor differ as to the sources and degree of pollution?

Why doesn't the EIS include as givens that there will be correction of combined sewer overflows and that there will be an MDC pretreatment program so that there can be more specific evaluation of treatment needs? In long-range corrections, what about a step-by-step approach?

STATEMENT BY BUD REECE, BOSTON HARBOR
CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MR. REECE: I'm just going to address briefly a few concerns which are interrelated to the EIS but go beyond this, the specifics of the report.

One, water quality management. The EIS does not include analysis of impacts on water quality of the harbor and tributaries, but is primarily concerned with the quality of the effluent being discharged from the treatment plant or plants. If we had a Basin Plan, adequate and sufficient data, and some form of comprehensive framework, it would be possible to do such an analysis.

As the OMB/NSF Study noted, we continue to deal with wastewater management rather than water quality management. The whole 201 construction grant process should be done in synch with a true priority list which evolves from areawide planning using water quality

goals as the basis and not merely federally mandated effluent standards.

Two, water supply. Many elements go into consideration of water quality besides treatment of sewerage, and particularly we need a management program which relates water quality management to water supply management as well.

And related to that, export of water. We're concerned about the export of potable fresh water from areas which need it, such as the Sudbury-Concord area and the Charles River area, and the discharge of it into the ocean and with no return to the original water supply sources.

Four, sludge incineration. We have no position at this time on the sludge incineration process, but we are deeply concerned not only about the losses of resources but also about air quality. We wonder why there should be a plan to pollute the area's only clean air zone? We also wonder why actions about air pollution were not included among mitigating actions.

Conservation of useable resources. We are concerned that there is not enough emphasis on reducing the volume of water used which would also result in a reduction in the sewerage having to be treated. This

should be both voluntary and regulatory. We are concerned that there be maximum reuse of the good elements in sewerage by properly managed composting or other uses of sludge, by ocean dispersal or by other means. We are interested in an in-depth sludge management study with pilot projects. We look forward to the studies which would be necessary should a waiver application be made. In order to make the best use of reusable resources, we look forward to a workable program to remove harmful metals and toxics from the sewerage.

Six, expanding the area served. We are dealing with a sewerage system in trouble, and yet there are many on-going plans to expand the system. These proposals involve adding new towns as proposed by both EMMA and this particular EIS or else adding new sections within user towns. We realize that urban areas are more obviously tied to the need for pipes and other new facilities, but the fringes of the system have other options such as on-site septic systems, small package systems, and waterless toilets. And surely all should clean up their act as far as infiltration and inflow goes before the system is expanded any further.

Centralization. We are concerned about

institutionalizing structures which are already there; for instance, that incineration of primary sludge would institutionalize the structure and make it more likely that incineration of secondary sludge is chosen simply because the structure is already there. By the same token, we fear that the all-Deer Island solution is found the most cost effective principally because the structure is there, further institutionalizing it.

Eight, the full costs. We hope the towns and cities will come to know the full cost of the operation and maintenance phase of this proposal, as well as know how the user charge system will operate. We hope that cities and towns along the interceptor lines will come to know the full cost of enlargement of those interceptors which lead to Deer and Nut Island.

Nine, enforcement and permits. We are wondering how much of the problem outlined in the EIS could be handled by better enforcement and better permitting, another example of how other programs tie in with water quality management.

Ten, conflicting information. Finally, we are concerned about some of the conflicting information we receive -- conflicts between the OMB and the NSF Report and the EIS; conflicts between officials reacting

to the same data; and conflicts in actual data. For example, there was the matter of the two mathematical models and what they told us about the possibility of a satellite plant. Also, the consultant's preliminary data collected for the waiver application this past summer suggests that there is serious disagreement with the bacterial and metals pollution projections of the current EIS. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF TERRY COLBY, BOSTON HARBOR
CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MR COLBY: Madam Chairwoman, gentlemen, this process is not over, not by any means. There is a long way to go, and in the opinion of the Boston Harbor Citizens' Advisory Committee, it is not too late to do something good, not too late for building upon what we have, not too late to have a Basin Plan, and not too late to gear the work to water quality and not effluent quality.

We are encouraged by some things -- greater public participation in decisions as called for by the Clean Water Act and its regulations. We're encouraged by the greater consideration of alternative and innovative solutions as called for by the Act. We are encouraged by the possibility of flexibility and of a variety of

solutions as pilot projects across the nation come to fruition.

We subscribe to the swimmable-fishable water quality goals for our rivers and lakes and we subscribe to the concern about our wetlands and our groundwater. While we have an eye on the tax dollars, we also have the other eye on a better harbor, better rivers, better and more water, better recreation, cleaner air, and more recycled resources.

We plan, as the Boston Harbor Citizens' Advisory Committee, to continue with our broad concerns. We look forward to a stronger, more recognized and better supported and funded role when the new public participation regulations are put into effect. And we hope to stay involved not only during the planning phase of nonstructural and structural solutions but also we hope to be involved as an advisory committee with the design, construction, and operation phases as well. Thank you.

MR. HICKS: Thank you.

MR. STICKNEY: Mr. Chairman, just one comment really. The Advisory Committee has worked hard and long over the past couple of years, and I must say that public participation is difficult to even attempt

let alone achieve, but the Committee has worked hard and worked objectively. In many aspects I'm sure we've not been able to be responsive, but we certainly appreciate the efforts that the Committee has bent toward making this a better project.

MR. HICKS: Is Representative Tom Brownell here? He would be the next speaker.

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS BROWNELL

MR. BROWNELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

For the record, I'm Representative Thomas F. Brownell. I represent the Second Norfolk District, which now comprises Houghs Neck, Germantown, Adams Shore, Merrymount and the downtown central business district.

This coming January 1st, I'll be representing a good part of Wollaston, but I'm here today to make a few comments relative to your plans.

First of all, I'd like to start off on a positive note. Obviously we in Quincy are very pleased that we are not once again the focal point of a plan to build a secondary treatment plant in the City of Quincy. You have had before you the so-called Broad Meadow site and also the Nut Island site.

These particular parcels of land in the view point

of our citizens have a higher and better use than what has been considered for them in the past. As you well know, our citizens are adamantly against any kind of development of these two sites for sewerage treatment plants.

The City of Quincy has a declining tax base. We have a City that is growing, and the sites that have been considered by your Committee are sites, frankly, that we need for other uses other than sewerage treatment plants.

We feel that over the years that we have more than our contribution to the Metropolitan District Sewerage System, and we feel that it is about time that some of the other communities in the District take on part of their fair share.

With respect to your recommended plan, we note that you have designated a section of Quincy, the Squantum Point area, as an area for a possible land-filled composting-type development. Again, although this area I do not represent, I can tell you that the citizens of Quincy are adamantly against the development of this site. Since this is a water-front site, as you well know, a water-front site is unique and we feel that this is not appropriate to the highest

and best use.

We are also deeply concerned about the safety aspects of that plan. That plan proposes that trucks be utilized on roads, over 125 trucks a day. I can tell you we're deeply concerned about that aspect of the plan. So, although we can somehow endorse your plan, I also have some reservations about centralizing such a massive secondary sewerage treatment plant in one place. We also recognize that Deer Island is one of the few remaining sites that is now available.

I also would like to suggest to this Committee that I personally feel that of all the options that have been considered that I frankly at this point in time, with a change in the corner office and also a change in our Congressional delegation and some changes in Washington, that I intend to sit down right after the first of the year when our new Governor gets organized and form a committee to take a positive step in the direction of coming about to a consensus of opinion as to what our citizens should do.

I personally think that the modified no action plan is the one plan that I can endorse now, at this moment in time. I frankly feel that secondary sewerage treatment plants are far too expensive and take up far

too much land in urban centers located on the ocean. I frankly feel that we ought to go back to basics and once again consider primary treatment plants with deep rock ocean tunnels. I know that this has been a consideration by the MDC and other engineers. I know that it has some unfavorable, what some consider unfavorable environmental impacts; but I do think that in the long run, it's less expensive, easier to operate, easier to maintain, and I think that it's a plan that most everyone that I know will be able to accept.

And so, members of the Committee, I would like to leave you with those comments and I would like to confer with you in the future, and I'd like to advise you too that I'm also filing legislation which will, in effect, state that the City of Quincy shall no longer be eligible for sewerage treatment plant facilities, land fill operations, composting operations without a vote of our citizens. And I think that this is a step that I must take in order to protect citizens that I represent so that we have some sort of leverage in dealing with the massive EPA agency which I, to this day after working six years, fail to comprehend the process. It seems to be spending a lot of time and a

lot of money on processes and coming up with solutions that everyone detests or everyone rejects.

So with those comments, members of the panel, I want to thank you for taking me out of turn, and I hope to meet with you in the future.

MS. HANMER: Representative, Brownell, I just hope you will keep us advised of the status of that committee. Thank you.

MR. BROWNELL: Yes.

MS. HANMER: The next five speakers are Marian Ullman of the Boston League of Women Voters; Joanne Condon of the Quincy City Council; and Tom Nutley. I don't know whether that's together or one after the other; Nany Wrenn of the Boston Harbor Associates; and Lydia Goodhue of the Charles River Watershed Association.

STATEMENT OF MARIAN ULLMAN,
LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF BOSTON

MS. ULLMAN: Madam Chairman, gentlemen, my name is Marian Ullman. I am Chairman of the Committee on Boston Harbor of the League of Women Voters of Boston.

In the past Boston Harbor was an important resource for the pursuit of commerce, fishing and for recreation. More recently it has been used to house institutions which the community wished to put out of sight, such

as a prison or a rendering plant and to dispose of its waste waters which became, as industry grew and the automobile proliferated, more and more polluted. But the Boston League considers that Boston Harbor is still a great resource today.

The League has long stood for abatement of pollution of the waters of the harbor in order that, among other reasons, recreational activities such as sailing and swimming could be carried on with pleasure and without danger to health. The League also has a position that the harbor islands should be used only for recreation and/or education. Therefore, now that EPA calls for the use of all Deer Island for a secondary sewerage treatment plant in addition to the primary plant, the League finds itself between a rock and a hard place. Though we acknowledge the need for new pollution control measures, we would not want to sacrifice the southern part of the island, which has been scheduled for recreation as part of the Harbor Islands State Park, to a use which is a continuation and extension of old practices. And we are not convinced that the partial use of Nut Island for recreation is a fair trade off for the loss of the beautiful end of Deer Island, inaccessible though it

be at the present time.

The design of the proposed secondary treatment plant in Boston's front yard is as large as it is because of a combination of factors: a large centralized sewerage system covering 54 communities and extending geographically to most of the communities within Route 495, the elimination of the proposed satellite plants within the system, a lack of incentives to conserve water and the excessive and as yet unmeasured infiltration and inflow of water into the system.

We also suspect that some controls on size and centralization might have resulted if the 208 planning process of the Clean Waters Act had not lagged so far behind the 201 construction grants program and more though given thereby to overall water management and water supply. As the Boston Case Study points out, EPA's consultants, whose proposed solutions are recommended in the EIR, are after all construction engineers, and it is only natural for them to think in terms of building much as a surgeon thinks of healing in terms of the knife.

There are questions that need to be asked: Could a different treatment and disposal method at the satellite plants which were recommended in the EMMA Report have

alleviated the reasons for which they were abandoned and preserve the reduction of flow to the system? Are the satellite plants entirely out now?

What happens in the event of a breakdown or a power failure at Deer Island? Is the resulting pass through a serious threat to the ocean?

MDC's waste waters have been flowing to the harbor for primary treatment for years. In view of the projected increase in flow from a larger population and addition of seven communities to the system, will there come a time when some agency will say "enough" or have we grown so accustomed to the pattern that we take for granted that ever-increasing flows will continue to come in the direction of Boston, while at the same time we're asked to curtail the use of water in order to lessen the flow to Deer Island? And what about the communities which depend on wells and ground water for their supply, can they afford to export water to the ocean?

And finally, granted that a treatment plant has to be located somewhere, why is there no compensation for the host community?

Water quality goals. It appears to us that in planning for upgraded sewerage treatment, construction

of secondary treatment facilities and incineration of sludge for both primary and secondary treatment have been emphasized and the goal of fishable/swimmable water quality has been somewhat overlooked. In 1975 the Boston League and other organizations, believing that elimination of the combined sewer overflows into the harbor would do the most to improve water quality, pushed for immediate attention to this problem, but only now is a feasibility study underway. Tied to this problem is the one of continually breaking tide gates and admission of salt water into the system.

We know that water quality in the harbor will be significantly better once the overflows have been eliminated, but we're not sure that it will be significantly better, other than from the removal of sludge, or meet water quality standards any better as a result of secondary treatment. As a result of the anticipated heavy schedule of chlorination, we may even be buying additional problems. We would like to know more about the degree of success in reaching water quality standards as a result of secondary treatment so that we can judge whether it is worth the tremendous cost in dollars and in energy. We would have preferred an approach to water pollution control

that tailored the solution to the problem rather than the federal government mandate to proceed to secondary treatment with its extensive and expensive facilities and no certainty that the results will justify the commitment.

We would like to see a reappraisal of the methods for achievement of water quality standards with emphasis on the goal rather than the process and a serious consideration of the cost in terms of dollars and energy.

Sludge. It is difficult to comment on treatment of secondary sludge until more is known about the plans for primary sludge treatment.

Although the impact of sludge incineration is discussed at length in the EIR, nowhere is there mention of the most obvious impact of all, namely, the replacement of the view of a drumlin with the sight of eight tall stacks standing on one small island emitting their plumes of smoke and pollutants from the incineration of sludge. From every point on the waterfront, from the John Hancock Tower and every building, we are expected to substitute these eight scarring interruptions of a beautiful view without so much as a mention that this is indeed an impact and an important one.

We are gravely concerned about the incineration process itself. Although we are far from being expert on air pollution, we wonder if we are not simply exchanging one form of pollution, the twice-daily discharge of sludge to the harbor which, to the best of our knowledge, has not caused any epidemic nor threat to the health of the community, for a different form which may affect the health of thousands of people in the metropolitan area. This is a windy city; the east winds in spring and summer are an ameliorating influence on the rigors of our climate. We would not want to see the time when we might fear the wind from the east.

Although we are certainly pleased with the composting solution for part of the sludge in the southern district, we point out the obvious fact that some of the sludge from the northern district could also be composted were it not mixed with the wastes from industrial and heavily-trafficked communities because of the centralized system. We would like to see sludge regarded as a resource to the greatest possible extent and more use made of the composting process.

We would like to see more research on pretreatment of industrial waste, more attention to enforcement of

pretreatment and more research on control of urban runoff with postponement of incineration until we are more certain that this is the only way to go. It does not fill us with confidence to learn that other cities have already tried and abandoned this method. We should profit as much as possible from their experience.

Management. Along with better enforcement procedures on the Boston and MDC permits, we would like to see financial support for better maintenance of existing facilities and more concern for maintenance of projected facilities.

We would also like to see at least one person devoting full time to this billion dollar water quality upgrading program instead of the fragmented responsibility that now exists. We would also recommend the formation of a technical task force on water, including supply, waste water and achievement of water quality standards, to include representatives from the city, state and the EPA.

MDC waiver application. We are, of course, interested in the MDC's application for a waiver to secondary treatment. We take no position at this time, but it does not escape us that ocean dispersal of primary sewage would remove many of the elements of secondary treatment which

are objectionable to us. On the other hand, we are aware of and nervous about the possible connection between sewerage and red tide and other implications. During the time that data is being collected, the League of Women Voters, and EPA, should keep an open mind not only on this possible solution but on any innovative technology which will make the process more acceptable and less expensive. We urge full use of available grants for the study of alternative and unconventional techniques such as an experimental sewer flushing program. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF JOANNE CONDON,
QUINCY CITY COUNCIL

MS. CONDON: My name is Joanne Condon, and I am the City Councillor from Ward 6 in Quincy. Ward 6 is the area known at Atlantic and Squantum. I have with me from the Squantum Community Association and the Atlantic Neighborhood Association and the North Quincy Business and Professional Association as well as a number of petitions the feeling of the residents in Ward 6 and the north end of the City. They are unanimously opposed to any new or enlargement of existing sewerage treatment facilities in the City of Quincy.

Some of the negative factors regarding the Squantum

site and the area that I represent brought out in the Environmental Impact Statement are: the economic impact on Squantum; a disruption of traffic already a problem; the air quality would be affected by open transportation; a removal of 70 acres of land from the tax rolls; loss of future taxes could be greater at the time when the community is struggling and asking for tax relief; a loss of a small salt marsh around the perimeter of the Squantum site termed insignificant in your report; property devaluations; road closures; again the loss of 70 acres of land; removal of roadside vegetation; 125 trucks a week, which is the corrected statement, one every 15 minutes on already overburdened streets.

With all these negative factors, as the representative of the area, I would suggest you're looking into an alternative, more positive plan.

Thank you.

STATEMENT BY THOMAS J. NUTLEY,
DIRECTOR, PUBLIC RELATIONS,
ATLANTIC NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

MR. NUTLEY: My name is Thomas Nutley. I'm the Acting President of the Atlantic Neighborhood Association. I thank you for the opportunity to appear here today. I wish to make only a very brief

statement prepared by the officers and executive board of the Atlantic Neighborhood Association.

I speak today on behalf of the Atlantic Neighborhood Association, a community civic association representing three thousand families and approximately thirteen thousand residents of the North Quincy area.

At our November 8, 1978 general membership meeting, the subject of the proposed recommendations to upgrade the existing MDC sewerage system was discussed at length.

At that time the membership voted unanimously to oppose the proposed recommendations regarding the additions to or the expansion of the existing sewerage treatment facilities of the City of Quincy. We also strongly oppose the utilization of the Quincy area or adjacent areas for storage of sewerage by-products.

We trust that this brief statement will convey the concern and unanimous opinion of the thirteen thousand residents of the North Quincy area.

Thank you.

MS. HANMER: Thank you.

Nancy Wrenn.

STATEMENT BY NANCY WRENN,
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY,
BOSTON HARBOR ASSOCIATES

MS. WRENN: I'm Nancy Wrenn, Executive Secretary of the Boston Harbor Associates, a citizen advocacy group of men and women from civic groups, businesses related to the harbor, public agencies with jurisdiction in the harbor and people who enjoy living near the harbor, who are committed to improving this great natural and economic resource. We want to be able to swim in beaches we trust. There are thousands of people who depend on Constitution, Malibu, Tenean and Wollaston Beaches for summer relief and recreation.

We see a growing desire for waterfront living and boating and we want to believe that our health is not endangered if we should flip our sailboat. And we look back to a time when shellfishing was a hobby. Now only the professions can reap the questionable bounty.

The questions before us relate to people. How much is it worth to us to renew this resource? And how are we going to do it?

Treatment is the focus of this environmental impact statement -- \$770 million worth -- but I would suggest that one of the best investments we could make is in prevention. The more water we waste, the more wastewater we'll have. Just as we have learned to turn down our thermostats and put on extra sweaters to save

energy, we can learn the tricks to saving water.

And just as we have learned to insulate our homes against heat loss, we can find ways to mend our leaky pipes and faulty tidegates so that unmeasured and unwanted water doesn't go to our treatment plant. Infiltration and inflow may be expensive to correct but we are told that by doing so we could reduce the flows to our treatment plants by 30 to 50 percent.

Now is the time before we commit ourselves irrevocably to a giant disposal to give the non-sewered communities time to evaluate all reasonable alternatives to joining the big metropolitan sewer system. We hope EPA will participate with the Division of Water Pollution Control to help local planning move forward expeditiously. The state priority list for projects to be funded should reflect a preference for development in existing developed areas, in concert with state growth policy. Prevention, or reduction of flows, must be our first order of business if our goal is to keep our wastewater and our sludge from overwhelming us.

The second order of business is quality control. Metals and toxics going into our sewers do immeasurable harm to the end product. Whether we burn it, compost it or send it to the forests or to the fish in the ocean,

we cannot afford the unknown health cost of chemical introductions into the food chain. Sludge is the chief reason for going to secondary treatment. We have a case of what the scientists describe as "black mayonnaise" building up in our harbor. Not only must we hit the problem at its source -- pretreatment may be able to reduce the metals and toxics by 20 percent -- but also during the treatment process where more efficient reduction may be possible.

We must clean our streets regularly and efficiently and sewer flushing, perhaps the most critical treatment we can administer, can limit the pollution load from combined sewers at an estimated cost of \$50 per acre per year. It is the quality of the water in the harbor toward which treatment must be aimed. Building a \$770 million sewerage treatment plant should be one of the last decisions we make after all other remedial measures are assigned costs and values.

It is because we have not yet understood all the pieces which can bring health to our harbor that it is impossible to make a firm judgment about the all-Deer Island recommended plan. A major component of this health program will be the correction of combined sewer overflows.

There is impressive reasoning in the upgrading EIS regarding the decision to forget satellite treatment plants and to convert Nut Island into a headworks with accompanying interceptor repair and installation of pipes. But until we have the decision to waive or not waive secondary treatment and until the projections of flows are more accurate, it is impossible to make such a judgment.

Incineration of sludge is the least desirable solution to the disposal problem for several reasons. Within the new air quality program there will be serious economic growth questions to be addressed. We do not yet have a dependable technology for pollutant-free incineration.

The question of a single centralized facility is political, as well as logistical. No one wants to be the host community for the sewerage from over a million homes and industries. We must find ways to make this host role more palatable. The suggestions made by the writers of the EIS are helpful. We support the seasonal use of chlorine to relieve the problem of transporting this hazardous material and reduce the danger of over-chlorination. And we believe in the potential of Deer Island as part of the public water transportation system

of the harbor. A multi-purpose dock to serve passenger ferries, as well as barges for chlorine and construction vehicles, should be included in the basic costs.

Deer Island is in center stage of nearly all of the harbor views from Nahant to Dorchester. We would like to see a minimal impact on the community and the landscape. We would regret the loss of its tip as a piece of the island park network. Its unappreciated beach lies waiting, its views are outstanding. We urge every possible measure to reduce the scale of the facility if the central plant approach is chosen.

The most critical task ahead for all of us, citizens and public agencies, is to see that this billion-dollar cleanup program does not continue to be managed in a piecemeal manner. There must be a system created whereby all the treatment measures can be evaluated in a single conceptual framework. Once decisions are made, progress in changing the quality of our harbor water should be reported. We want to participate and to know that we have chosen well.

MS. HANMER: Thank you.

STATEMENT BY LYDIA R. GOODHUE,
CHARLES RIVER WATERSHED ASSOCIATION

MS. GOODHUE: I am Lydia R. Goodhue of Wellesley, and I am a member of the Board of Directors of the

Charles River Watershed Association, which I represent today. Our Association, established in 1965, is to protect the resources of the Charles River, a tributary of Boston Harbor.

I want to say first, something about the design flow. The facility design is based on flow information produced in the EMMA Report. These figures were based on populations estimates several years ago that have now been somewhat discredited. Design flow should reflect full control of inflow and infiltration into the MSD system as well as into the local systems, and it is our understanding that possibly up to 50 percent of treated flow is either groundwater or seawater and given the value of water today, this can hardly be cost effective.

Also the export of 57.5 million gallons a day from the originating watershed to the harbor is unacceptable, especially in view of present and impending shortages of water and is inconsistent, moreover, with the Massachusetts water resources policy, which is at this very moment developing. Draft regulations for this policy call for municipal, watershed, and statewide water resource management plans with emphasis on conservation, metering and rehabilitation. Public

attitudes toward water use and interbasin transfers have changed since EMMA. And in the light of all this, we feel the plant may be overdesigned.

As to the area served, this is an allied concern, and we are concerned about the EIS's inclusion of eight more communities to be served in the future, most of those proposed added communities being in the Charles watershed. Again, the old EMMA projections were used, and since then, attitudes have changed.

Public Law 95-217 requires consideration of alternative and innovative techniques that don't include building and extending sewers. Now the 208 study was responsive to this expressed wishes of these towns which didn't want to sewer, and this study did recommend nonstructural alternatives or small structures onsite, and we hope that the EIS would do the same.

The Charles River Watershed Association doesn't believe that any additions to the present system should be allowed until the system is cured of its often-surcharged condition, regardless of the time required for corrections. It's inconsistent to permit system expansion in Ashland, for example, while there are still overflows at Nut Island and in Wellesley, to just pick some.

We support consideration of water conservation, recognizing the indisputable relationship between water supply and the flow through sewer systems. A strong case should be made for mandatory conservation through regulation, pricing and sanctions directed equitably at industrial, commercial, institutional, municipal and residential users. The true cost of water reflects treatment and reclamation of it as well as its delivery. Reuse of effluent for suitable purposes should be encouraged.

Now as to the satellite plant, we have long supported a satellite treatment plant in the area of the midwatershed of the Charles. We believe that if possible we should not export our sewerage problems to Quincy or to Winthrop, but we should cope with them where they are generated. Neither should we export our precious water if it can be used here to augment our streams. This is socially and environmentally responsible, we believe. The level of treatment required to meet the Class B standard in the mid-Charles and its specific cost should be stated. We asked this in our reaction to the preliminary EIS and this information still hasn't been provided. This cost should be compared then with the cost of harbor

discharge of the disruptive sewer relief work and the interceptors and of the loss of water. Without this information, we can't withdraw our support for a mid-Chalres satellite plant.

It has been stated that a plant cannot be built because of dissolved oxygen problems, but surely plants are being built all over the country to discharge into streams with dissolved oxygen problems. We can't believe that imagination and modern technology cannot produce a solution, given determination and funding.

Also we are told that the possibility of plant failure would endanger the river, and again, we suggest that complete system redundancy and really qualified personnel with good supervision and monitoring should be assumed for any new treatment.

And finally, as to interceptor relief. If a satellite plant is built in the mid-Charles, the southern system interceptors presumably will not require enlargement but possibly will require replacement. This will be cost saving when consideration is given to the social and environmental costs not currently included in the table, which is on page 4-27, about the southern interceptor costs.

Whatever the case, proposed relief work includes

56 miles of interceptors. Much of that work will be done along the Charles River. Shoreline disruption should be minimized during and after construction. And consistent with the purpose of the Memorandum of Agreement between the EPA and the old BOR, Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service, the interceptor route should provide public access as an element of the Charles River Corridor for open space and recreation. This commitment should be included in the facilities planning. Thank you.

MS. HANMER: Thank you.

Any questions?

(No response.)

MS. HANMER: The next speakers are Grace Saphir, Shirley Brown, Bill Schmitz of Congressman Marckey's office, and Dorothy Kelly of the Quincy Citizen's Association.

STATEMENT BY GRACE SAPHIR,
SAVE OUR SHORES

MS. SAPHIR: Thank you, Madam Chairman. My name is Grace Saphir from East Sandwich, formerly of Quincy, the founder and a member of SOS, Inc., Save Our Shores.

Thank you for holding this meeting to allow us to express our views and concerns as to the future of the greatest natural resource left in Massachusetts. The harbor is money to Massachusetts, and what happens to

it through its use can be an asset or a cesspool. Misuse of the shorelines such as alterations for unrelated water use and filling of the waterways must cease.

The MDC's projected interest and promise of separation of storm sewers is a very good step in the right direction. We must recognize and realize that what we are wasting is a precious commodity known as water and that by processing rain water and the by-product of sewage known as the liquids will make some sense to the sewage problem. Sewage must be treated at the source of the sewage.

There are two end products of sewage treatment -- water and solids. The water is very much needed in the ground, and I mean in the cities and towns. This water should get into the water table instead of being shot to the Atlantic Ocean where it is not needed. Therefore, gentlemen, I recommend the following:

One, only the cities and towns bordering the harbor or ocean should utilize the treatment plants now in existence;

Two, that the pipelines in existence be reversed so that each city and town in the Commonwealth must process its own sewage through satellite plants,

emptying the water into the ground, not the nearest river or ocean;

Three, the sludge from these plants be utilized as fertilizer through proper methods or if burned, the final ash should be used as landfill where hills of sand have been removed for construction through the Commonwealth;

And four, legislation should be enforced prohibiting any fill in the waterways of Boston Harbor, that no pipelines be laid on the mudflats or in the waterways and no further expansion of the existing plants located along the shores. Expansion will not be necessary but good maintenance of the existing plants is a must. Since storm runoff should not go to these plants for processing, there will be room for expansion of population and growth.

In my opinion, this is simply a good housekeeping problem. Yes, it will put the people to work, and yes, we will spend money doing it, but how sad we didn't do it many years ago. To throw all of eastern Massachusetts sewage into the tides of Boston Harbor will only come back to us as it has with the first big wave. And I thank you for hearing me out.

MS. HANMER: Thank you, Ms. Saphir.

STATEMENT BY SHIRLEY M. BROWN
NATICK REPRESENTATIVE ON THE
CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE EPA

MR. BROWN: I'm Shirley Brown of Natick. I represent Natick on the Citizens' Advisory Committee. I represented Natick on both the MDC and EPA Mid-Charles River Satellite Plant Site Selection Committees. I live beside Lake Cochituate, a founder of the Lake Cochituate Watershed Association, and I'd like to keep Sudbury water at home. I speak as a citizen today.

I take issue with the premise of discharging more fresh water to the harbor. That's what my disagreement with the EIS is in the main. I have a few further contentions and proposals:

Challenging the adequacy of the conventional sewer system and advocacy of its expansion;

Taking issues with the figures on the flow contribution of the Sudbury Watershed and hydrologic budgets as set out;

Questioning the cost effectiveness of re-engineering natural support systems;

Disagreeing with the plan to incinerate sludge.

I recognize that we need an organized planning process system which will integrate all the water quality

plans for the harbor and is necessary to save fresh water, to develop water conservation, to spend money on infiltration/inflow, to develop pretreatment of toxics and heavy metals from point and nonpoint sources, to evaluate new plants and pipelines, centralized and satellite systems, to implement sludge management without transferring pollution from water to the air when more biological means are available, such as composting which will utilize nutrients, and deep ocean disposal.

I hope to show that a basin plan for Boston Harbor and its tributaries should provide a detailed analysis of the potential impact on areas of groundwater favorability and recharge areas, and that minimum stream-flow standards to assure existing use capacities and requirements for downstream water supplies must be established before planning further diversion projects as recommended by the New England River Basins Commission.

The inflow/infiltration which discharges water vastly exceeding sewage flows suggests that waterless toilets and onsite disposal systems could provide solutions whenever and wherever possible. Alternative systems must be fully utilized.

We know engineering can accomplish marvelous works but the expense must be logical. Shall we spend millions of dollars to pipe water out and millions of dollars to pipe in more fresh water? Or should we use naturally arranged self-supporting systems right where they exist allowing for the use of our financial resources elsewhere?

Does EPA have the necessary jurisdiction and will it be exercised? Must 25 percent of funding be spent on pipes?

There is a broad failure of the EIS to mitigate increased and enlarged use of fresh water sources in the preferred plan. The recommended plan increasing and enlarging the sewer system fails to adequately address the problem of discharging more fresh water to the harbor. And I document some material on the inflow/infiltration figures with the newer studies that have shown increased inflor/infiltration greater than what has been used in the EIS.

A sewage system which draws in the extraneous dry weather flows of nontreatment water much greater than the transported sewage must be rated inadequate and unsatisfactory. Such sewer system deserves to be called an underground highway. These nonsewage flows

must be excluded from the sewers. Visualize, if you will, our sewer system as one giant septic system with a leach lane reaching all the way to Boston Harbor. Then, before the sewer system reaches the harbor, it is joined at the coastline by influent seawater totalling all together three-quarters more than the original sewage flows.

According to the Engineering Report on the Boston Case Study submitted to the Federal Interagency Study Team, National Science Foundation, OMB, fully 90 plus percent of MSC member communities have deficiencies such as combined sewer overflows, raw sewage discharges, excess infiltration and inflow which at present cost levels would exceed \$3 billion to correct. Certainly corrective work on the present system would provide jobs enough and work projects to lay pipe into the foreseeable future. The Metropolitan Sewerage District should not be expanded as advocated before fully serving existing communities.

High standards of performance for projects within existing communities should be met. Major inflow/infiltration areas should be identified and reduced. Significant savings can be made. Save costs of water transport, design capacity and costs for

treatment by this means of flow and wastewater reduction. The side benefit is keeping water in the watershed. Communities will get a message that extraneous flow costs are insupportable in future. Placing pipes and pumps in wetlands and floodplains will no longer appear to be advantageous and more prudent construction will be encouraged.

Although the EIS recommends water conservation as a means of significant flow reduction, it is unlikely that water conservation measures will be implemented until and unless money is withheld from upgrading and expanding plants and pipes. As long as money is being spent on sewers, why would reason prevail? To spur serious water conservation development, as a first priority money should be directed towards research and development in water conservation. When a plan has been selected, then evaluation for not expanding trunklines can proceed.

Other cost effective, cost-reducing measures unmentioned by the EIS are:

The ban on phosphate detergents as the states of New York, Indiana, and Michigan have done. According to an EPA funded local publication -- Your Detergents and Your Lake by the Lake Cochituate Watershed

Association -- eliminating phosphate from detergents would result in an immediate 50 percent reduction of phosphate in virtually all municipal wastes. It would result in a substantial reduction of treatment costs at sewage treatment plants.

Eliminate garbage disposals. Discourage use of garbage disposals in new and rehabilitated construction. City-wide use of these appliances can increase suspended solids in sewage by 55 percent, BOD by 30 percent, principal concerns in the design of sewage treatment plants.

The Sudbury Watershed. I disagree with the EIS flow figures contribution from the Sudbury Watershed and dispute the projected flows from that watershed.

The figure used, one quarter of the projected flow coming from the Sudbury River Basin can be disputed. Natick's present water -- well, Natick takes its water from the Sudbury. It's projected flow will remain with the Sudbury. Framingham is presently considering a water purification plant which will allow them to reactivate the Sudbury Reservoir system. Upstream communities are looking to the river at the present time for water supply. And I have documented it in my report.

It is well known that MDC cannot increase its supply to current customers from the Quabbin Reservoir.

There is a declining supply in the flow in the Sudbury, although the 97-year average discharge has been high as noted in the EIS. There is an accelerating decline in the Sudbury flow. During the drouth of the late '60s, 1960 that is, the Quabbin Reservoir was dangerously low and discharge from this Framingham Reservoir system very nearly ceased. Quabbin could not supplement this supply.

Where will future supplies come from when more water will be taken for water supply and more water will be diverted out as sewage? Facilities planning for the Framingham Extension Sewer has begun outside this EIS as part of an MDC/EPA agreement. The premise for expansion of this MDC area interceptor is the water quality problem experienced by Framingham and Ashland, but it can be seen to have the greatest impact on ground and surface water resources within the Sudbury River watershed because of the increased withdrawals from the Sudbury River as previously noted. Nonetheless facilities planning for the Framingham Extension Sewer is about to proceed. Not only Ashland and Hopkinton as stated but also Framingham and Natick would transfer their wastewaters from the Sudbury River basin of origin to the adjacent Charles River,

Mid-Charles satellite plant or to Boston Harbor in an all-Deer Island concept.

According to the New England River Basins Commission in the Merrimack River Basin Overview, any diversion of the Sudbury River is significant.

Water conservation, onsite disposal, maintenance management systems for onsite disposal systems, drastic reduction of inflow/infiltration and waterless toilets are alternatives to be used now. If not, EPA should probably be consistent and recycle water using satellite plants as is required of upstream communities on the Charles and Sudbury Rivers.

I hope that the Framingham Extension Sewer facilities planning will receive detailed analysis with special attention to the planned extensions to Hopkinton and Southborough, two new and additional Sudbury River communities posed for transfers and transport of water and sewage to Boston Harbor.

Indeed, as g-eater flows will emanate from the Sudbury River Basin, export figures probably are greatly underestimated and should be revised.

An analysis of demand reduction methods by the Corps of Engineers concluded that water conservation efforts could make significant contributions to the

area's water supply picture. As well as a study, the water policy study by the Mass. Executive Office of Environmental Affairs. Maintenance of basin integrity is recommended as a statewide priority. The study makes extensive recommendations for water conservation efforts.

MS. HANMER: Ms. Brown, could you summarize your statement?

MS. BROWN: Yes. I believe that exporting additional water from the Sudbury basin will have a significant effect on the Sudbury River low flow, is linked to future water quality in the Sudbury River and will necessitate low flow augmentation from increased out-of-basin diversions. In turn, Quabbin and the Boston system must receive additional supply.

Facilities planning is not the method of choice for alternatives but rather the hydraulic design.

If we forego treatment in the outlying communities around Boston, will we predestine Boston to a tunnel system like Chicago and Rochester? That would be the most expensive of all, and I think that the unbroken sequence in the history of the Metropolitan Sewerage District since 1833 of repeating the same structural mistakes -- facilities planning without any water

quality benefits, increasing and enlarging the sewerage system -- must not continue. The need for water quality management to balance water budgets must prevail. And I hope the EIS will provide better answers to the burden of treating nontreatment water.

MS. HANMER: Thank you.

Bill Schmidt.

STATEMENT BY BILL SCHMIDT
LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT TO
CONGRESSMAN EDWARD MARKEY

MR. SCHMIDT: The Congressman originally planned to be here to make this statement, but he is in Washington, so I will read it for him.

I appreciate this opportunity to offer my comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement on the upgrading of the Boston Metropolitan Area Sewage Systems prepared for the EPA Region One by Greeley & Hansom and the Environmental Assessment Council, Incorporated

In reading over the report and additional information obtained from concerned parties in this matter, several questions are raised and few comprehensive answers are given. I would like to express several of my concerns to you now, and I hope that answers to these questions will be forthcoming

in the very near future.

As the Congressman representing the Town of Wintthrop, I'm concerned as to the impact this facility will have on that community and its people. Also, as the Congressman representing the Metropolitan Area, I'm aware of the need to improve the quality of the water in the Metropolitan Boston area.

My interest is to see that this goal is achieved in the most desirable manner that will have the least adverse affect upon the people residing in the surrounding communities to any treatment facility. I am not sure that this present plan meets this test.

The present proposal calls for the complete takeover of Deer Island for the construction of a massive treatment facility that will handle all the sewage treatment needs of the Metropolitan area. A major harbor pipeline to carry material from the South Shore to the facility is also part of this plan, this being the Nut Island facility in Quincy.

One question that arises here, at Deer Island, is the need for the leveling of the drumlin on the island and the takeover of the prison facility. As Sheriff Kearney stated earlier, and unfortunately it's

not included in this report, there is no answers as to how this will occur and obviously there is a need for a correction facility. The recent actions by the Boston City Council, which the Sheriff explained, went into this in some detail.

The people of Winthrop through their local representatives and concerned citizens have expressed a number of fears over the potential and real affects of this facility. The Town of Winthrop is presently severely affected by Logan Airport, the existing prioson, and the present sewage facility. So the quality of life in Winthrop has deteriorated in the past 20 years. Any new construction will most likely add to this problem. Even now trucks carrying chlorine through the streets of Winthrop pose an ever increasing sanger to the Town's citizens. A larger facility would enhance this problem and lead to decreased property values in the Town and possible water contamination and air pollution as a result of the facility.

This proposal has taken into account potential effects on the environment but nowhere has it taken into account the effects upon the people living in the area. The time for construction of the facility has been estimated at being six years, and the impact of

the construction vehicles and those of the workers on the Town's streets and the only road leading to Deer Island as well as Winthrop's only two access roads will be severe. Nowhere is there any mention of any compensation to the Town of Winthrop or its people for having to put up with these hardships and the inconveniences. Nowhere is there any evidence of citizen participation within this study.

This all-Deer Island plan is the recommended site as proposed by those conducting the study. However, the Metropolitan District Commission who handles the present facility and will operate the new facility has some different ideas. Their study, known as the EMMA study, proposes to renovate and improve the primary treatment plants at Deer Island and Nut Island and to construct additional ones on the Neponset and Charles Rivers. They will seek a waiver for this alternative system which is allowed under an amendment to the Clean Water Act passed in 1977.

The Winthrop Conservation Committee also favors this waiver.

The MDC study in another portion says that the secondary treatment will not significantly improve the water quality of the harbor. And this current

proposal also seems to be at odds with the Boston Harbor Islands Study which calls for open recreational space at the end of Deer Island.

Within the study itself, I'm quite interested in the relative tradeoffs of the Deer Island plan and the one including the facility at Broad Meadows. I'm also concerned as to other options studied, if they were at all, utilizing other islands in Boston Harbor, most notably Long Island.

It seems that if the MDC improves the water quality of the Neponset and the Charles Rivers by modifying the original EMMA study, then we must consider the relative tradeoffs of the Deer Island plan and the EMMA study. We must debate the partial filling of Quincy Bay and the area off Deer Island versus the complete taking of Deer Island and the major pipeline crossing under Boston Harbor.

The people conducting this Environmental Impact statement found the EMMA proposal unacceptable, but that is their opinion. It does not seem to be the opinion of the people affected in Winthrop or possibly the MDC.

At the end of this statement I am still left with these questions unanswered. I hope that answers will

be forthcoming before anything is done to drastically alter the situation as we know it today. Thank you.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Schmidt, when the Clean Water Act was passed in 1977, it included a provision requiring secondary treatment for all municipal wastewater treatment authorities but, as you indicated, provided for an application for a waiver for those treatment authorities discharging into marine waters. I assume that Congressman Markey voted in favor of the Clean Water Act with both those provisions in it.

The question I have for you is, is it the position of Congressman Markey that the Metropolitan District Commission should be granted a waiver provided that they meet the criteria that the Congress set into the Act, and only upon that basis?

MR. SCHMIDT: I think, first of all, unfortunately the Congressman nor I, a member of his staff, have the available expertise in terms of evaluating those criteria that you mentioned. I think basically what has happened in this occurrence and what has happened through the statement here today is that much of this information has only reached us at a very late date. We couldn't fully evaluate this whole statement. I think the people of Winthrop were not fully aware

of the land at Deer Island. When the original plans for the construction of a combined facility in downtown Boston which would provide the House of Correction site for \$15 million was passed in an amendment, again that was not contemplated as to the extent of the Deer Island facility. So that many of those items that were possibly going to be considered in an overall proposal were not known at that time.

I think basically what we're trying to find out is some answers to these questions. If those proposals are made and a waiver is sought, then we can evaluate what the MDC has proposed as well as this plan, and then maybe we can make a determination at that time. I don't see how I could answer that right now.

MR. JOHNSON: One final question I have, when Congressman Markey voted, as I assume he did, on the Clean Water Act, did he at that time support the eight criteria that are in the law for a waiver?

MR. SCHMIDT: I'm not exactly sure on that whole issue. I could check it for you.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

MR. HICKS: Before we go on, I'd just like to point out that we have ten more people scheduled to speak in the next 25 minutes or so. Certainly we will

hear everybody out, but to the extent that people do have written statements and can summarize them briefly and hand in the written statement, I think that would be appreciated particularly by those people who have waited a very long time to speak.

The next person is Dorothy Kelly, and following her will be Waldo Holcombe, Jim Patui, Mary Gougian, if I pronounced that name right.

STATEMENT BY DOROTHY KELLY, SECRETARY
QUINCY CITIZENS ASSOCIATION AND THE
WOLLASTON PARK ASSOCIATION, INC.

MS. KELLY: My name is Dorothy Kelly, and I'm Secretary of the Quincy Citizens Association and the Wollaston Park Association, which I represent. These associations feel that the satellite sewerage plants inland from Boston Harbor were dismissed too lightly and not given adequate consideration in the Impact Statement on the Upgrading of the Metropolitan Area Sewerage System, Volume I. We feel further that Boston Harbor cannot ecologically stand the disaster that a proposed enlarged one-plant sewerage system at Deer Island or Quincy Bay would engender.

Why do we say this? I'll give you one personal example. One warm July Saturday afternoon a year ago, my sister and I took our sailboat out of the Boston

Harbor Marina, anticipating a lovely sail around the harbor, a leisurely lunch and plenty of blue sky and sun. We got none of these because only a few yards out into Dorchester Bay we became aware of a sea of red-brown sewerage surrounding our boat. We couldn't even see through it, it was so deep. So we put on the motor, and no matter where we went, out to Thompson's Island, down to Spectacle Island, Long Island, over to Rainsford in Quincy Bay, and as far out as our eyes could see, to Boston Light and beyond, there was nothing but brown sewerage on the surface of the ocean.

We had to cover our faces with handkerchiefs and we couldn't eat our lunch, and so we put on the motor quick and went back to the marina to get out of that awful sight. And that wasn't the first time that we've seen something like that in Boston Harbor as the yachtsmen in the audience will tell you. We learned later that there was a mechanical breakdown on that weekend at Deer Island, and with the light easterly wind blowing, the sewage just sat there and contaminated the whole of Boston Bay for the entire weekend. And in the papers there was no mention of this, but the ecological loss must have been tremendous. And I hope that you gentlemen and lady will take note

of this because this is a common occurrence in Boston Harbor.

That is why we insist that the EPA build satellite plants to handle the sewerage produced in the communities of Wellesley, Framingham and other suburbs and not brought down to Quincy or Deer Island for disposal. Deer Island and Nut Island should be improved to properly handle the sewerage currently directed there, but no additional load should be added to these plants or dumped in Boston Harbor.

As for the proposal to make Squantum Point a composting area for Deer Island's residue sludge and incinerator ash, this plan is totally unacceptable to the community. Such an operation would ruin the waterfront potential of the Boston Harbor Marina and be detrimental to the University of Massachusetts, the Savin Hill Yacht Club and the new Kennedy Library that under construction only a few thousand yards across the channel.

We wonder what kind of environmental planning would even suggest putting this pig in the parlor of Dorchester Bay. To ruin Boston Harbor's prime yachting anchorage, the Boston Harbor Marina, by putting a sewerage composting dump adjacent to it would be

criminal.

When the Environmental Protection Agency was set up by Congress, the people of America felt that for the first time that at last the value of our precious environment and natural resources was going to be recognized and saved from manmade ruin. We felt the EPA would recognize this sacred trust and would heed the admonition in the Bible even, according to John, "Harm not the land or the Sea." But we are here today because we feel that the Impact Statement presented here is an environmental and engineering nightmare, a matter of expediency, not a sacred trust.

We urge the EPA to rethink this entire sewerage project and come up with alternative proposals that utilize the latest technological advances but are sensitive to the protection of our invaluable ocean environment and natural resources -- proposals that will be acceptable to the residents of the communities involved. Thank you very much.

MR. HICKS: Thank you.

STATEMENT BY WALDO HOLCOMBE,
NEPONSET CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION

MR. HOLCOMBE: I'm Waldo Holcombe of the Neponset Conservation Association. I've also been associated with the Citizens' Advisory Committee, with the EMMA

Study, the 208 Study, as well as the Boston Harbor Study.

Before passing judgment on this Environmental Impact Statement, we must understand clearly what it is intended to do and how it fits in with other related studies both recent and now going on.

The EMMA study¹ issued jointly by the Corps of Engineers and the MDC in 1975 was concerned with the main sewage collection and treatment system for the EMMA area. It presented for general consideration a fairly wide range of alternatives for the relief of overburdened interceptors, pumping stations and the Nut and Deer Island treatment plants. The latter were to be greatly enlarged to permit advanced secondary treatment as required by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, PL 92-500. Satellite treatment plants on the Charles and Neponset Rivers were proposed to ease the burden on the harbor treatment plants and to increase the low river flow during the summer months.

Also included in this study were a number of alternatives for setting up a system of user charges and for a regional or state agency to manage the implementation and operation of whatever plans would be forthcoming. The resolution of the choice among

these alternatives is intended by PL 92-500 to be by an environmental impact statement as part of a continuing updating and study process.

By 1977 it had become clearly evident that many circumstances had changed and much new information was available as well as some serious gaps in the available information regarding the factors affecting the water quality in Boston Harbor:

The Legislature restricted any significant increase in the size of Nut Island;

The Boston City Council refused to abandon the prison on Deer Island;

There was strong objection to the discharge of treatment plants' effluents in the residential areas of Wellesley along the Charles or among the existing municipal water system well fields in the Neponset aquifer;

There is a major amount of seawater inflow into the sewage collection and transportation system, 30 to 50 percent it is estimated;

It became increasingly clear that the major sources of pollution in Boston Harbor include combined sewer overflows and the stormwater runoff from the city streets, not just the sewage treatment plants'

effluents.

It was soon realized that there was insufficient data to permit any system recommendation to be unquestioned, more information was essential to ensure the cost effectiveness of any program. The 208 study for the waste management guidelines for the 101 towns and cities of the metropolitan area could not make comprehensive recommendations without knowing what kind of treatment plant would be developed.

The MDC which provides waste treatment facilities for 42 of these 101 cities and towns in the area started new studies for which the need had become evident:

One, the extent of the combined sewer overflow problem, including stormwater runoff, and their impact on the Boston Harbor water quality;

And two, an evaluation of a proposal for an off-shore discharge of primary treated effluent in order to get beneficial recycling of organic matter incidentally enriching the coastal fisheries.

The EPA which must make the final determination among the alternatives proposed started this present study in the light of the information available in 1977. It serves the very valuable purpose of helping us focus clearly on the information we now have and also on the information we still lack:

The combined sewer overflow study must be completed since this seems to be the single most serious source of pollution in the inner harbor and along the Dorchester beaches;

The stormwater runoff from the streets may well be the second most serious source of pollution to the inner harbor and the Dorchester Bay region which is heavily used for boating and swimming;

A comprehensive study of the relative effects of the various pollution inputs to Boston Harbor. A positively needed study since it is the effect, pollutants' effect on the receiving waters rather than the detail of what's being put into them. that we must focus our attention on.

The upgrading of the treatment plant may well accomplish little that is beneficial in the inner harbor or in the Dorchester Bay region unless the other problems are corrected. To answer these questions a study of the harbor as an entity is needed, such a study does not now exist. And there will be a need for more information and better understanding as the implementation of this program proceeds. We are beginning to see the meaning of planning must be a continuing process.

The popular objective of PL 92-500 is to make the nation's waters swimmable and fishable. But much more important in the Neponset aquifer area and not properly addressed in this study is the problem of keeping highway runoff pollution, both salt and toxic chemicals, out of the local groundwater used by a number of municipal water systems and near which a number of major highways pass. Highway drainage design and construction need an attention they have not yet received.

The law specifies that in each region a system of user charges must be worked out so that there will be an equitable sharing of the burden of maintenance and operation costs between residential, commercial and industrial users. While the federal government is willing to pay 75 percent of the capital costs for system construction and up to a hundred percent of the cost for the original planning, it is largely up to the state and local municipalities to pay for all of the maintenance and operation costs, also the planning costs after the first three years. User charges based on quantity alone throw an unequal burden on the residential user compared to the industrial user.

There is still a great deal of investigation to

be done, much of it controversial or not yet well understood, before we are ready to propose a viable plan that must be regional in concept and before it is ready to sell to the voters of this area who must implement much of it and pay for its operation on a local municipality basis. A properly designed system does not need to be objectionable to the communities at the receiving end in order to serve the rest of the region without damage to the environment we are trying to protect. But it is going to require some more rational planning on a regional basis.

MR. HICKS: Thank you.

STATEMENT BY JIM PATUI

MR. PATUI: Thank you. I don't have any really prepared statements here, but more or less observations. I'd like to thank everyone here for their presence here rather than for the words I am going to say.

To continue here, I would say again, do not applaud my words, rather the fact of your concerned presence. You should also be thankful for the ability to speak and listen and hear to what others think. Word for word, that is one thing, and I believe that when the deed has been done and the action has been taken, that will be another.

My observations after having been in Europe for a year or so are quite different than the way people or their attitude as displayed here, rather they use water a bit differently. They don't have toilets like we have toilets. They have what might be considered a water troth, a simple wall system where people have a full wall and a troth at the bottom and there is a water pipe along about five feet high and it keeps the water usage down. And I think that's a consideration rather than people playing Captain Torpedo with the urinals like they do here. For instance, Sohaefer Stadium there is a habit of people being intoxicated there on occasion, going into the men's room and tearing the urinals out. And if such is their sports attitude, I don't know.

There are other considerations. There is the Waltham Reservoir. There's the western side of that reservoir, I believe Winter Street, on the top of that hill, the western ridge, there is a pig farm with open piles of garbage with, I believe, rat holes, I believe sea gulls flying out from the Boston Harbor area consuming that garbage, flying down to the Waltham Reservoir, washing it down with water and perhaps regurgitating it such as the habit of some

sea birds to carry food in their gullet. Of course, this doesn't concern me. I don't drink the Waltham Reservoir water. I drink the water from Quabbin, so that's your problem.

Among other things, there are others also. I believe the marathon, the Boston marathon, the largest marathon in America, about the time Bill Rogers was running behind a diesel bus blowing smoke or exhaust smoke all over the place such as a lot of the vehicles in Massachusetts are doing, blowing a lot of smoke, they need mechanical work. The Registry doesn't seem to be jumping in their case, and I hope there is no one from the Registry present because I'm parked right outside. Thanks of that nature. I believe at the time Bill Rogers was crossing the finish line, I was going over the North Beacon Street Bridge in Watertown, which is where I'm from. I do not represent any organization. Perhaps you could start one right now, call it the Watertown Improvement Society or the Charles River Society, cause that's what it is, a river, not so much the fact that it's a watershed but how it got that way, which is to say I can't swim in it nor in my life time have I gone swimming in it, but I've heard stories or perhaps legends to the effect

that people once upon a time, which is another fable, to have gone swimming in the Charles River.

These are very fragmented notes here.

The Environmental Protection Agency, this is our environment. There are other things to say to the effect that tomorrow would be cancelled due to lack of interest. There doesn't seem to be any politicians here or any people from the notable news agencies with their cameras and blinding lights and all the other microphones that are put in your face when you don't want them there.

Essentially I would like to paint you a picture but the way things are going now it would turn out more like a silhouette. I go up on the John Hancock at times with binoculars and this camera right here, and it would be just more simple to show you a picture and say, "This is what I saw. This is what you can see for yourself," rather than stand here and expound on the English language and words thereof. Essentially to paint a picture would centered on the broken glass or beer cans in the drainage ditches. I've been lobbying certain people to keep these streets clean because the water tends to flow through the gutters and that's another aspect of the sewers.

Containerization. I believe the Port of Boston would benefit from that. It would maintain materials in a single area, and it would restrict the sewerage and the environment.

I meant to say upon the time that Bill Rogers was crossing the finish line or during the Marathon anyway, I was going over the Beacon Street Bridge and there was an oil slick coming from the upper northern tributary of the Charles River or western tributary, and I do not know where that came from. It didn't have a name on it. Essentially things to that effect.

I have photographs of certain power companies pushing black smoke. I was over in Winthrop on the 10th of November this month, and I have some very ugly pictures of the chimneys on the Boston Harbor skyline and I don't know who they belong to, and at the moment they can go unnamed but I would be willing to submit a written statement to all of this, so the people at present would know who I am and wouldn't have any instant enemies, not to be afraid of that fact. But I don't believe it's a legal possibility at the moment to be sued by making some form of slander or libel to people who are otherwise polluting our environment. Thank you.

MR. HICKS: Thank you.

Mary Gougian. I'm not sure I pronounced your name properly.

STATEMENT BY MARY GOUGIAN, PRESIDENT
SQUANTUM COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION, INC.

MS. GOUGIAN: Hello. My name is Mary Gougian. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to speak here today.

September 1974 was the first meeting concerning sewerage problems in Quincy that I ever attended, but I have attended many meetings since. That first meeting I referred to was held in Quincy City Hall with the MDC because the beaches were closed on the Labor Day weekend because of raw sewerage on the beaches.

At the various meetings I have attended there is always a new or partially new plan unveiled as to where to treat or where to release the MDC sewerage. But some how and sadly, all the great minds and researchers all come back to the same solution -- dump it in the harbor. They might suggest a longer fallout drain or treat it more or burn it more, but somehow it always comes back to "dump it in the harbor."

We are running short of water and it really is ludicrous to continue to dump our stormdrain water

and the water collected in the MDC sewerage pipes into the harbor. This water should be returned to the ground to help the water table.

Jacques Cousteau, the world famous pioneer of underwater exploration, speaks from an impressive array of experiences. He probably has more first-hand experience of life in the seas than any other man alive, and I quote him: "The sea is threatened. We are facing distruction of the ocean by pollution and by other causes...We believe that the damage done to the ocean from pollution in the last 20 years is somewhere in the vicinity of 20 to 50 percent which is a frightening figure...I passionately believe that the perceptive few who have the opportunity to see the ultimate disaster ahead must band together now to warn the slumbering many. Pioneering research and exploration to help us better understand the sea and its creatures must be undertaken without delay. If the oceans should die, by which I mean that all life in the sea would finally cease, then this would signal the end not only for all marine life but for all animals and plants of this earth, including mankind." End of quote.

I cannot urge you enough to, please, first, go back to your technology and your research departments

and come up with better proposals for sewerage treatment inland;

Two, return the water to the soil to help the water table;

Three, build regional sewerage treatment plants and keep them well maintained;

And four, please, stop the 19th Century mentality of dumping what people no longer want or need into the harbor.

Finally, I would like to mention we collected over 400 signatures in less than a week on a petition against the location of any new or any enlargement of any sewerage treatment facilities for sludge deposits anywhere in Quincy.

Thank you very much for listening.

MR. SUTTON: Just one question, please. I was interested in the quote that you indicated. Some of the proposals that we've heard today as an alternative to the plan are to merely extend the outfall further out so that the inadequately treated effluent, which is presently discharging over 400,000 pounds per day of pollutants, would not enter the harbor but would go further out into the coastal area. Would you favor that type of solution?

MS. GOUGIAN: No. I think Quincy where we do----
I met somebody yesterday who made an interesting quote.
He said a hundred years ago they made a mistake when
they put in the combined sewers and the drains, the
storm drains and we're still living with them, and
we just keep compounding it. We enlarge plants to cover
an area that has already been made. I would like to
see an end to that.

If we have to keep the one in Nut Island for
Quincy and Weymouth, I think the people in Quincy would
probably live with that, but they really would like most
of the trunk lines removed off our sewerage treatment
plant.

MR. HICKS: The next scheduled speaker is John
Murphy, then Gary Kosciusko, then Irene Burns, then
Joseph Quirk. Mr. Murphy.

STATEMENT BY JOHN E. MURPHY
BOSTON HARBOR POLLUTION COMMITTEE

MR. MURPHY: I'm John E. Murphy, representing the
Boston Harbor Pollution Committee.

Now, I realize that we're listening to the report
on the EIS. That is an overall proposition which
probably will take five to twenty years before it is
completed, but there must be a first step before we

go into that long-range proposition, because the area of Boston Harbor can't wait much longer. Five years would be too much. So I want to thank you for the opportunity to make my remarks today, and I hope that they are along the lines that will bring about some results.

The intended purpose of this statement is to derive, to obtain the highest quality clean air and pure water as is possible by locating the sources of the contamination of the air and the water in Boston Harbor area and suggesting the means that can be pursued to eliminate the sources of this pollution.

The Quincy Bay area - Nut Island Flat. The outflow from the Nut Island Flat, about 35 million gallons a day, is a great source of pollution contributing to the pollution of the water in that area under normal operating conditions, and that has increased due to the breakdowns and the malfunctions of the plant.

The first corrective measure is to provide adequate routine servicing and preventive maintenance to eliminate operating failures. The long-range plan of development is to control the outflow by constructing a pipeline and/or a tunnel to carry the waste out to deeper water, three to five miles beyond Graves Light,

to be combined with the outfall from Deer Island sewerage where it can be readily ingested in the greater area of deeper water.

The Winthrop area Deer Island Plant. The tremendous amount of outfall from this plant into Boston Harbor, approximately 415 million gallons per day or more certainly cannot continue without grave consequences to human health and the contamination of marine matter to gill fish and to shell fish.

Secondary sewerage treatment plants will not be the answer to clean water. They may ameliorate the conditions but will not eliminate the contamination. The outflow from Deer Island must be piped out, tunneled out to deeper water and combined with the outflow from Nut Island Flat to accomplish what is humanly desired and required in order to obtain the objective of clean water in Boston Harbor. Otherwise the beaches, both on the mainland and the islands, will be destroyed. Swimming as a sport and recreation will not be available in the Boston Harbor area.

Boston Harbor is a congested area because of its many islands. The ebb of the tide does not carry the sewerage out to the ocean, thereby causing the floor of the tide to carry the pollutants back to the inner

harbor.

Now, let me quote a distinguished person on this particular point. Organic nutrients resulting from the discharge of either primary or secondary effluents should not be released in any semi-enclosed body of water such as Boston Harbor or Quincy Bay in which the nutrient concentration can increase to the point of using up the normally existing dissolved oxygen content of the water.

Boston Harbor drainage area. This is the area beyond what we call the outflows of these particular places, overflow drains and other means of outflowing sewage into the area. There is occasional and periodical permission of sewerage discharge into Boston Harbor and into Dorchester Bay from the pumping station at Columbia Point. This discharge however slight or often should not and must not be allowed to continue. Clean water and the health of the people should and must be the first consideration.

Whatever reason there may be for the discharge from this plant, it must be thoroughly surveyed and corrective measures taken to control the sewage at this location to eliminate the discharge immediately.

Combined sewage overflows, storm drains,

water runoffs and industrial outflows into Boston Harbor contribute to a great degree to the constant pollution of the shore lines in many sections of the harbor. Steps should be taken to get at these sources and remedying them by correcting the damaging influence of these that are contributing to the polluted condition.

Tide Gates. There are several of these located in and around the shores of Boston Harbor, and it is known that many of these are in very poor working operating condition. Because of faulty operating conditions, seawater flows back into the sewage system causing damage to the equipment often resulting in breakdowns to the main plant.

It would seem imperative that tide gates should be eliminated from the sewage system without any further delay. For one who has observed the outflow from some of these tide gates, no time should be further delayed in eliminating that by rerouting the sewage into the mainstream of the sewage system.

Air quality. We are all aware that much progress has been made in controlling the filtration of smoke from industrial plants. Similarly, automobile emissions have been under scrutiny and much has been accomplished and progress toward clean air. This is true in those

autos using gasoline. But from observation, it appears that not much is being done to supervise and control emissions from autos, trucks and vessels equipped with motors using diesel fuel. These also contribute to poor air quality.

Closer scrutiny should be exercised in those areas where diesel fuel is used in motors.

Incineration of sewage waste. This form of disposal of sludge should not be permitted in the Boston Harbor area, since its process could and would be a source of great danger to the health of the immediate population. The fly ash that is produced from the burning and the residue that will result must be carted away for disposal as land fill, but this creates problems difficult to solve.

The prevailing winds over Boston Harbor are north to northeast, east by southeast and southwest which are usually damp and heavy with moisture which would cause the smoke from the incinerator to lay low over the inhabited area, thereby being a menace to health, particularly to those with breathing ailments.

Then there is the danger from fly ash which is produced from the smoke in the smoke stacks, the chimneys, which must be removed and it is very difficult

to handle and transport.

Incineration should not and must not be adopted as a means of disposing of sludge or any other waste from sewage filtration in the Boston Harbor area. Incineration should not be recommended for the destruction of sludge until we are certain whether or not there are means of treatment whereby the product can be successfully used as fertilizer. Thank you very much.

MR. HICKS: Thank you.

STATEMENT BY GARY P. KOSCIUSKO,
PRESIDENT, SAVE OUR SHORES, INC.

MR. KOSCIUSKO: Good evening. My name is Gary Kosciusko, and I'm President of Save Our Shores, Incorporated. I appreciate this opportunity to talk on a matter of great importance to all of us.

Save Our Shores is committed to the preservation and restoration of the waterways, islands, and foreshores of Boston Harbor. We believe this area is a unique resource for Boston, the Commonwealth, and the Country, because nowhere else in the United States is there such a rich concentration of history and natural features so close to an urban environment.

The harbor's proximity to the city has subjected the islands and waterways to high levels of use and

abuse over the years. It is the aim of Save Our Shores to stop the abuse and to promote the area as a National Recreation and Historic Site for the benefit of all citizens.

As such, we object to the provisions of any plan which would allow:

One, the filling of any marshland or waterway;

Two, the permanent damage or destruction to natural features, both living and non-living;

Three, the damage or destruction to human historic or prehistoric sites; and

Four, any processes which would contribute to a noticeable reduction in long-term air or water quality in the Boston Harbor area.

Save Our Shores encourages provisions which would:

One, significantly improve water and air quality for the enhancement of recreation and fisheries;

Two, provide for a vigorous program of water conservation; and

Three, preserve or enhance the natural beauty of the area. A reforestation program would be a welcome move in this direction. However, tall incinerator stacks would tend to negate the effect.

We feel the recommended plan of the EIS comes

closer than the EMMA Study recommendations in satisfying the provisions above. Nevertheless, we have the following reservations about the recommended plan.

One, It provides for the use of the entire expanse of Deer Island. It indicates the facility could be expanded through at least the year 2050. But to expect the plant to continue for that long without a certain amount of landfill seems overly optimistic;

Two, the plan needs to assess the realistic impact of increased odors and air pollution in a virtually clean-air zone used for recreational purposes;

Three, the plan should provide for the complete recording of the selected sites, for historical purposes, before actual construction begins;

Four, and finally, the plan does not adequately deal with the problem of water conservation. What impact, in particular, would a drought have on upstream ground water levels? This issue is highlighted by the current water shortages being experienced by some communities in Massachusetts. How can water levels be maintained upstream when much of the flow is being diverted directly to the harbor? We see this as the greatest potential problem and worthy of far more attention than has been given it by the recommended

plan. Thank you.

MR. HICKS: Thank you.

Irene Burns.

STATEMENT OF IRENE BURNS

MS. BURNS: For the record, and by the way my address is South Cove Project R-92, a 92-acre urban renewal project for Tufts New England Medical Center, composed of Chinese, Puerto Ricans, Blacks, Combat Zone and me. I am here, they are not.

I am here because you put an ad in the newspaper, and it says, "Question: Does it have to be this way? No. Are you responsible? Yes, meaning personally every day. What do you want done for a clean Boston Harbor?"

Number two, I have another notice from the newspaper in my hand. It is a notice of a public hearing to be held at the Boston Water and Sewer Commission concerning its proposed capital improvement program. They are not here.

I read the new program because the new law, Public Law 92-500, demands at this point that the plans be available for those of us who cannot buy them. So I went up to read the capital improvement plans, and I hope you realize they have already devised a capital

improvement plan to relign the pipes we have. Also they expect the Governor to come forth with 15 percent of the cost.

So now I see me at the bottom, a \$770 million water pollution control project, I'm sitting in a \$500 million Park Plaza project with a brand new transportation building, and now I am going to have a new capital improvement for my Boston water.

My real estate tax for less than 1/64th of an acrea is climbing, has climbed since urban renewal from \$500 to the \$3,000 bracket before 100 percent. Now I will add my quarterly water bill and sewer bill, and I've already paid one and it comes in a beautiful IBM form like the brand new AT&T bill, and it tells you what your credit is and what your balance is and what you owe. I hope the Internal Revenue starts producing a bill like that. I'd love to see the credit go up there.

Now, for the record, in this room when I arrived today at most I'd say there were 121 people to my left and 120 on my right, or 120 on each side, at most 50 on either end. At no time did anybody lack space to sit here. No one was standing. The complexion of the audience was 100 percent white up until about

5 o'clock when one black woman stepped into the room for a second. Also the complexion of the population in the room was elderly, male and female. At least this time it wasn't like urban renewal, all women. At least 50 percent of the women -- that is against, 50 percent of the men appeared, 50 percent were women. I realize they have to leave because of crime, and I too will be apprehensive going home except that it is a shopping night.

I'd rather not talk any more, but I do hope you send someone next, November 30th at 2 o'clock to the New England Life Hall for my Boston Sewer and Water Meeting. Thank you.

MR. HICKS: Thank you.

Mr. Quirk.

(No response.)

MR. HICKS: The next person then is Mr. Conroy, Thomas Conroy.

STATEMENT BY THOMAS CONROY, PLANNER,
METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COUNCIL

MR. CONROY: I'll try to keep it brief. My name is Tom Conroy. I'm a planner with the Metropolitan Area Planning Council, which has recently produced the area-wide water quality plan, the 208 study, that several of the previous speakers have mentioned.

The plan includes a set of structural and on-structural solutions to both point and nonpoint sources of water pollution throughout 92 of MAPC's 101 member communities, including all 43 of the Metropolitan Sewerage District communities.

The 208 planning process was intended to be the key to the release of federal and state funds for the construction of treatment facilities once the 208 plan is certified as part of the state's water quality plan.

With that as background, well, first let me say that the plan was adopted by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council on November 12th, but that the Council recognizes that the final answers are not yet available to us. So the Council will shortly submit the plan to the state and EPA for partial certification only. That is the wording of the Council's resolution on the 208 plan.

The most significant portion of the 208 plan which cannot and should not be certified in its present form is the portion dealing with the Boston Harbor. The MAPC 208 plan had intended to produce a Boston Harbor Basin Report based on the original Boston Harbor EMMA study. That study's conclusions were thrown into doubt by the initiation of the EIS which was not itself

completed when the MAPC draft area-wide plan was completed. So with that as background, we make the following recommendations:

Number One, the MAPC is concerned that the massive and costly facilities proposed in the EMMA Study and the EIS are not related to specific improvements in water quality. In other words, we know a good deal about the cost in economic and human terms of the facilities construction but we can't say yet whether the result in terms of water quality will be worth it to the Metropolitan area.

These water quality improvements are the stated purpose for the appropriation of over \$40 billion by the U. S. Congress. A major effort must be made to assess the water quality benefits to the harbor before the facilities are built and before the EMMA EIS results are certified by MAPC as part of the area's 208 plan.

The EPA and MDC should publicly commit themselves to such an evaluation as the facilities planning proceeds. It should include an evaluation of the comparative benefits of the efforts to improve wastewater treatment and efforts to eliminate combined sewer overflows and storm water runoff pollution. The facilities which don't contribute to the achievement

of the water quality goals should not be built.

Point Two, the MAPC supports the filing of an application by the MDC to seek a waiver from the requirements to provide secondary treatment at Boston Harbor. We call for the evaluation of the likely water quality impacts of both secondary and primary treatment in the application process.

Three, in the location of regionally needed facilities, some communities have always been asked or told to bear a larger share of the costs while all communities share the benefits. The EPA and MDC needs to do more than assess the impacts. The means of mitigating these impacts should be sought and defined in the coming facilities plans.

Four, if the continuing planning to answer the questions I have raised is to take place, the funds must be made available. It is impossible to miss the irony of the dollar amounts shown in the EIS -- that is, \$770 million dollars for construction alone. Please contrast that \$770 million figure with the mere \$40,000 to be made available next year to the regional planning agency which will be responsible for integrating all of the decisions affecting the harbor and adopting a coordinated set of actions to protect the harbor.

And fifth and finally, the massive costs of treatment facilities to correct water quality problems should point out the obvious need to apply our resources to prevent problems before they occur whenever possible, to correct infiltration/inflow to the ancient sewer system to the metropolitan area and to aggressively promote water conservation and the protection of existing ground water supplies.

Thank you.

MR. SUTTON: Excuse me, could I ask just one question. You indicated your concern with not proceeding with these expensive facilities, perhaps until it can be proven what benefit there would be to water quality or the necessity. Would you also recommend that that same provision be made to the industrial discharges in New England? As you know, under the law the industry must apply the best practicable treatment technology to their effluent regardless of the quality of the water it's discharging to. Would you recommend that we apply waivers to industrial dischargers also?

MR. CONROY: I'm not aware of Council policy regarding industrial discharges, so I can only make a personal statement on that. I would say that all discharge requirements should be related to the quality

of the receiving waters and the likelihood of damage of the discharge.

MR. SUTTON: Thank you.

MR. HICKS: Mr. Milton Fistel.

(No response.)

MR. HICKS: Is there anybody else who would want to speak at this time? We're a little bit over our afternoon session, but it will be reconvening at 7 o'clock, I believe, promptly.

Thank you all for being here this afternoon.

(Whereupon, at 6:00 o'clock p.m., the above-entitled matter was adjourned, to reconvene at 7:00 o'clock p.m. the same day.)

EVENING SESSION

(7:00 o'clock p.m.)

MS. HANMER: Good evening. My name is Rebecca Hanmer. I am the Deputy Regional Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency Office here in Boston.

With me today co-chairing the hearing is William Hicks who is the Assistant Secretary for Environmental Affairs of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. We have a hearing panel which is over there on my right, composed of Lester Sutton, who is the head of our Water Programs Division, Wally Stickney, who is the Director of our Environmental and Economic Impact Office, and Ken Johnson, who is Special Assistant to the Regional Administrator. These are all members of the Region One EPA staff.

This hearing has been convened to receive public comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Upgrading of the Boston Metropolitan Area Sewerage System. The Draft Impact Statement has been prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1961 and EPA's regulations for implementing that law.

The National Environmental Policy Act provides that prior to commencing a major federal action which

might have a significant impact on the environment, the responsible agency has to prepare an environmental impact statement which analyzes the potential impact of the action. That statement must discuss alternatives to that project and permit affected agencies and the public to make comments to the agency on the factual material and the conclusions presented in the document.

Copies of our environmental impact statement have been available since September 29, 1978. Copies were circulated to a number of agencies, both federal, state and local, and to concerned citizens. At the time the impact statement was circulated, notices of this hearing were given and a news release announcing the hearing appeared in newspapers having circulation in the general area.

We are prepared to hear testimony tonight and we are prepared to stay here as long as necessary to get a complete record of what citizens and concerned agencies have to say about the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The 60-day comment period on the Draft Impact Statement closes on November 28th, 1978.

This hearing is being stenographically recorded and a written transcript of the hearing will be available

within the next several weeks. The hearing record will be open until at least November 28th so that persons who wish to make written statements to the record may do so.

We asked those wishing to testify to call our office so that a schedule could be arranged, and we have a schedule for this evening which we're going to try to stay within.

All those wishing to speak should have filled out a card at our receptionist desk at the back of the auditorium indicating that the wish to speak. We have asked that each presentation be limited to about five minutes and asked that people summarize their written statements and present the complete statement for the record to the stenographer who is located up here in front.

I'd like to clarify where the Environmental Impact Statement process fits into the overall planning process for Boston Harbor cleanup. The next stage after receiving comments on this Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be for the Metropolitan District Commission to begin facilities planning. The purpose of the impact statement comments is to present to the public the information that we've gathered in the last

several years of study and also help us clarify the issues that have to be dealt with in the facilities planning. There will be a further opportunity for public involvement in the facility planning process.

We're now going to give you, if you want, a short slide presentation that summarizes the project and our activities thus far and then go right on with the testimony.

There are some people here who were here this afternoon, so if I hear a lot of boos and hisses, we can dispense with the slide presentation. Can I have some feeling that you'd like to see the slide presentation? It will take about ten minutes.

We have a few people, so let's go ahead with it. It won't take long. Thank you.

(Slide presentation.)

MS. HANMER: Thank you. For those of you who were with us this afternoon and are back again, thank you for your steadfastness, and for those of you who have just come, welcome.

To help you in your planning, at this time we only have eight speakers scheduled for this evening, which means that we stand a chance of completing the hearing by about 8:15.

I'd like to ask my Co-chairman, Bill Hicks, if he'd like to say anything at this time.

MR. HICKS: Well, I'd just like to express again the appreciation of the State's Executive Office of Environmental Affairs to be able to be here and listen with the EPA to many of the concerns, to all of the concerns that have been expressed today. Our office will be submitting formal comments on the EIS back to the EPA by the end of the month, and it has been very valuable to me in part of that process to have been here and to have heard what transpired this afternoon and I look forward to hearing your comments this evening. Thank you.

MS. HANMER: Our first four speakers this evening are Arthur Chandler of the Quincy Citizens' Association, Paul Kodad of the Quincy Citizens' Association, Joe Malay and Claire Plaud of the Sierra Club. Is Mr. Chandler here? Would you care to come forward?

STATEMENT BY ARTHUR CHANDLER,
QUINCY CITIZENS' ASSOCIATION

MR. CHANDLER: My name is Arthur Chandler and I live at 320 Belmont Street in Wollaston, Mass., and I'm speaking as President of the Quincy Citizens' Association.

We have joined forces with many political offices

of city government, the business, civic and recreational groups from the City to oppose the use of Quincy lands and waters for the location or expansion of wastewater treatment facilities or for the disposal of sludge or incinerated ash. This union has united the entire city as a whole in opposition to these proposals.

In plain words, Quincy does not want to become the toilet bowl or outhouse for the entire MDC system, and we plan to continually oppose these plans because other alternatives are possible.

The use of Broad Meadows or Squantum as a secondary treatment facility is not acceptable to the city because of the effects to the environment and the surrounding residential area due to the expansion and construction or truck traffic. Squantum is not acceptable for the use of sludge disposal either. Supposedly in disposing of the sludge there will be 125 roundtrips a week or 250 single runs. On a 5-day work basis, this amounts to about 50 trucks per day. For an 8-hour day, this is about 6 runs per hour or one every ten minutes and this is for 20 years.

The location adjacent to residential or potential residential areas is detrimental to the present tax base or expansion of the tax base through development

because of odor and sight especially to highrise apartments overlooking the site. These are also listed as adverse effects in the executive summary, and they are also on the film we saw just a few minutes ago.

In winter storms it's doubtful that full compost work can be continued due to icing. The Expressway actually is not that handy when you consider that to go south, you would have to use Morrissey Boulevard which is for pleasure vehicles or Gallivan Boulevard. And if Jordan Marsh does not approve the use of their private road, then more residential streets in Squantum will have to be used.

At present the real problem on the southern portion of the MDC sewerage system is that peak flows of about 180 million gallons a day are put through a plant designed for around and 112 million gallons a day. This necessitates the difference being dumped into Quincy Bay as overflow or bypass. This condition is aggravated or increased when each town along the MDC system increases in size or is added and contributes more sewage to the system.

The existing MDC interceptor lines in Quincy, Milton, Hyde Park, Dedham, Norwood, Canton, Westwood and Stoughton now surcharged sometimes coming out of

the manholes themselves. This then is an indication that the complete system itself is overloaded or undersized, not just the Nut Island Treatment Plant.

Therefore, it makes sense to get at the source of the trouble itself and not use stopgap measures. The first most logical solution is to reduce the groundwater leakage which is estimated to be about half the total flow. Elimination of this leakage will drastically reduce the total volume so that flow at Nut Island will be contained and not have to be overflowed. This in itself will clean up the harbor. The same would be true for Deer Island.

Satellite plants must be built in the suburbs and then these communities should be cut loose from the present MDC system. With proper treatment, secondary or tertiary and/or washing of nutrients, the effluent could be discharged into the adjacent rivers or be returned to the groundwater table. This also would reduce the total flow to Nut Island. And when hearings were held in the suburb, there did not appear to be much opposition or concern at the meeting, and I understand that they had about a dozen at the meeting or workshop.

Each community should be responsible for its own

treatment and not push it along to the end of the line at the harbor.

I would like to quote MDC Commissioner John Snedecker from his statement made here February 18th, 1976: "That today there is no evidence that secondary treatment will benefit the marine environment of Boston Harbor. It had been established for some time that the major source of pollution in Boston Harbor are the combined sewer overflows. The construction of combined sewer facilities and expansion of primary treatment with extended outfalls in our judgment provide ample water quality in the harbor for at least the next two or three decades."

In summary, we recommend:

One, that groundwater leakage be reduced;

Two, updating the existing primary treatment facilities and extend the outfalls;

Three, building satellite plants in the suburb and cut these communities loose from the present MDC system;

And four, elimination of the combined sewage system;

And five, working to have the law waived requiring secondary treatment facilities for coastal areas.

I thank you.

MS. HANMER: Thank you, Mr. Chandler.

Any questions?

(No response.)

STATEMENT BY PAUL KODAD,
QUINCY CITIZENS' ASSOCIATION

MR. KODAD: For the record, my name is Paul Kodad. I'm also a member of the Quincy Citizens' Association. I live at 256 Sea Street in Quincy in the Merrymount section. I live directly across the street from the Broad Meadows marsh.

The government and all its agencies and all their employees and all those who are under contract to the government have a responsibility, a moral and legal obligation to treat each citizen, each community fairly, honestly and ethically. A proposal such as this under consideration here this evening should have considered far more alternatives than were presented in the report. Instead it appears that the decision was made to unfairly concentrate on the City of Quincy.

One earlier proposal would have adversely affected Nut Island in the Houghs Neck area of Quincy. Another proposal would have coupled adverse effects with Nut Island and Broad Meadows. And still another adverse

effects with the Broad Meadows and the Squantum Point marsh. And still another with the Squantum Point and Broad Meadows and reverse. And still another, the Deer Island proposal coupled with Broad Meadows. And lastly, the proposal under discussion here this evening, the Deer Island proposal with a Squantum Point site used as the sludge disposal area.

Most reasonable people who review this study reach the same conclusion. The study is biased against the City of Quincy and that it is an example of the age-old technique of dividing and conquering. First you threaten Houghs Neck and then you threaten Broad Meadows, and they will both be quiet when only Squantum is concerned. Let the Squantum proposal be defeated, and then their area is rethreatened.

I say that if this is true, then it is a government by intimidation, government by extortion, and it is therefore despicable. Certainly somewhere within the 43 communities there must have been at least one other site which could have been considered for a sludge disposal area. Certainly there must be somewhere on the shoreline an area more remote from the residential areas of either Squantum or Broad Meadows.

Further, I say that for the Environmental Protection

Agency to have even seriously considered destroying either the shoreline of Squantum or the marshy open area of the Broad Meadow Marsh is in conflict with every federal act which created their agency. For surely it was the intent of the Congress of the United States to preserve and enhance the value of our shoreline and open spaces. Time and time again we read in the paper where the federal government has appropriated money to take land from the private domain and return to the public domain either on the shoreline or in other open space areas.

Turning briefly to the report itself, in many ways the impact statement appears to be insufficient, particularly in the area of considering the adverse effects on the animal, vegetable and aquatic life in the Squantum area or the Broad Meadows area marsh. A rather vague, not to specific general conclusion is reached that there will be minimum negative impact affects on the vegetable, the animal life of the marsh involved.

I would strong suggest that a previous impact statement relative to the Broad Meadows marsh in 1974 which treated with the proposal to build a college on Broad Meadows be contrasted with the impact report here

this evening. Then you will readily see how insufficient this present report is in that area. The previous impact report on Broad Meadows detailed the catalog of all of the animal, vegetable and aquatic life that lived there and showed how each and every incident, how the project would have affected this life.

I say the report under consideration tonight is very, very insufficient, and therefore, if it is insufficient, it's conclusions must be questioned, and questioned enough to be reviewed.

The appropriateness of the Squantum site. In some of the reports that have been given out at the workshop hearings, they treat four other sludge disposal plants. One of them is in Maryland, one of them in Los Angeles which they did admit the Los Angeles plant did have a problem of odors but it was of a different type of system. The plant in Maryland is in the South and certainly suffers far less from the weather than we do up here in the North.

The other two systems which were considered were at Durham, New Hampshire, and at Bangor, Maine. And these were included in the report, I believe, to demonstrate the fact that it would be possible in a northern climate to efficiently operate a sludge

disposal system. But that is not necessarily true. For in both areas they are far more removed from the dense residential area as is the Squantum site, and we all realize that in a small operation like Bangor, Maine, or Durham, New Hampshire, problems which are created are much more easily remedied than would be the case in a large facility such as Squantum.

Let me just give you one example. The sludge which is treated at Bangor is brought in by a truck. Should that truck overturn, it is a rather simple process to send out a frontend loader and repack the sludge onto a new truck. But would happen if a barge load of sludge was to overturn in Quincy Bay or split its bottom? You certainly wouldn't be able to send a frontend loader and pick it out of the water.

I do not think, also, that any real consideration has been given to the atmospheric effects of Squantum Point relative to the wind chill factor which would occur there in the wintertime. Last year we had a tremendous snow storm. I do not know for how many weeks during the winter a facility like Squantum Point would be out of operation due to adverse weather, and I do not know what would happen then. I don't think it was fairly treated in the report.

There is one last area in the report which causes me some serious concern and that is the question of truck volume. I don't think it is detailed enough. In the report itself, they talk about 125 truck loads per day, and I know it's been corrected to a week. Now, we're not sure. Does that mean it's 250 roundtrips a week? And again the question arises, how did they arrive at the 250 roundtrips? Is that a yearly figure of 5,000 roundtrips divided by weeks so that they arrive at the figure of 125? We don't know.

But I can tell you one thing, that if you're talking about composting operations, then the truck volume traffic would only occur in the Spring and the Fall. Only at both those times of the year do you normally use compost in an agricultural operation. And so the question remains there, what would be the volume of truck traffic during those times of the year when the composting operation would occur?

So in conclusion, I would say there are many, many points in that report that are incomplete. So we must question the validity of the conclusion that the proper posture is to place the sludge disposal point at Squantum point. Thank you very much.

MS. HANMER: Thank you.

Are there any questions?

(No response.)

MS. HANMER: Joe Malay.

STATEMENT BY JOE MALAY

MR. MALAY: My name is Joe Malay, and I live at 227 North Beacon Street in Watertown which is one block from the Charles River and within a half a mile of about seven of the 150 combined sewer outfalls which I feel are not adequately dealt with in the report.

I understand in the City of Boston alone there are 125 such outlets, and in the system, over 150.

On page 20 of the executive summary of the report, it states that the all-Deer Island plan, which I feel is the best alternative, isn't going to do anything to improve the water quality in the rivers going into it, and this is my concern, because if the water quality in the rivers leading into the harbor is poor, the water ends up in the harbor eventually.

I understand that there are a number of the flood gates now at the end of the end of some of these outfalls which are presently being fixed, but this does not help us who live near the river itself and not near the outer harbor or inner harbor.

It seems that in the report the sewer relief projects are stated sort of vaguely as to be happening in the future, and I think that with regard to the sewage system impact on human beings, the parts of it which should be dealt first should be the parts that are closest where human beings live. Very few people live near President's Roads but a lot of people live along the Neponset and Charles and Mystic Rivers and would like to see this problem addressed earlier, I feel.

I feel the report also has some highly commendable parts, the decision to compost some of the sludge is a very good idea, and the decision to scrap the present plan on Nut Island is also a very good idea. However, I think that some investigation should be made to perhaps try and extend the outfall. There has to be a new outfall built anyway, to see how far it could possibly be extended out beyond the present President's Roads location.

And then -- I'm sorry if this seems a little bit rambling, but I only found out about this meeting yesterday, but I would like to close with a report by the general counsel to the U.S. EPA, Mr. G. William Frick, which was dated the 30th of June 1976 with

regard to the MDC's discharge permits. And in summary, the permits in question, and I quote, "In summary, the permits in question are deficient in that they do not impose effluent limitations consistent with the Regional Administrators determination of best practicable control technology currently available on discharges from (a) storm sewer system outfalls and (b) the overflow outfalls from combined sewer systems."

I think these are the areas where we should be looking to perhaps look at trying to fix up first and not years in the future and an undefined term of years.

Thank you.

MS. HANMER: Thank you.

MR. JOHNSON: Just for the record, Mr. Malay, combined sewer overflows are being addressed right now in a separate planning exercise by the Metropolitan District Commission. It's unfortunate that we, EPA, have not stressed that enough in the Environmental Impact Statement, and it's a valid point you make, but the work is going on right now. And it can be expected that that will be taken before the expanding and upgrading of the treatment facilities.

MR. MALAY: Wonderful.

MS. HANMER: Thank you.

Claire Plaud of the Sierra Club.

STATEMENT BY CLAIRE PLAUD,
GREATER BOSTON GROUP OF THE SIERRA CLUB

MS. PLAUD: My name is Claire Plaud, and I'm representing the Greater Boston Group of the Sierra Club. And we wanted to take this opportunity to make some suggestions to this facilities planning based on the recommendations in the EIS.

One of our main concerns is reducing the estimated flows, and one of the ways we see of doing this is to have a moratorium on the cities and towns that are joining the Metropolitan Sewer District, and particularly ones which were not recommended in the 208 Basin Plan to be included.

We'd also like to see, of course, a reduction in infiltration and inflow. And if this is one half of the current flows, then this is a great loss in groundwater to the cities in the river basins.

And the third thing we'd like to see is an economic incentive for some of the water conservation methods that were mentioned in the report, such as metering, and we just don't think the conservation section goes far enough. And we want the MDC to take responsibility for a serious water conservation effort.

Our comments on the location of facilities, right

now we do not support the centralization of all treatment facilities on Deer Island. We don't see that a sufficient case has been used for using all of the island, so that its use for recreation is completely eliminated.

We also at this point don't see a strong enough case for eliminating satellite treatment plants from consideration. We certainly don't support satellite treatment plants if it really is shown that the dissolved oxygen cannot be met, the standards, but we just think it's an important decision, and some more sites can be looked at, some more discharge points maybe, land application of the effluent. But that can be looked into more before they are completely eliminated from consideration.

In regard to the sludge disposal, we don't support locating an incinerator on Deer Island, and we really hope that the EIS on the primary sludge will have some other recommendations.

We are pleased with the acknowledgement of composting as an economically feasible and suitable way of disposing of sludge. And we'd like to see a more serious marketing effort by the MDC.

So in summary, we would like to see the reduction of estimated flows in the facilities plan based on a

serious water conservation and infiltration/inflow reduction effort, less centralization of sewage treatment plants, and further investigation of satellite treatment plants.

We also wanted to take this opportunity to make a comment about the request for a waiver from secondary treatment. The National Sierra Club is strongly opposed to all waivers to secondary treatment, particularly on the East Coast. But the Greater Boston Group realizes that there would be environmental advantages in the case of Boston. For doing so, that there would be less land requirement for treatment facilities, there would be no need for disposing of secondary sludge, and the ocean dumping that would occur would be further from the coast. There would be more time and money to spend on the problems of combined sewer overflows, industrial pretreatment if the secondary requirement were postponed.

But we are also very much aware that there are disadvantages to postponing it, including the higher biological oxygen demand in suspended solids that would go into the ocean. And we're very concerned about what the regulations for a secondary waiver would be, what chemicals would be monitored, by whom, how often,

and what the penalties would be if state and federal standards for toxicity particularly are not met. And if the waiver is granted, that we want it to be kept in mind that it is only a temporary alternative and that the ocean shouldn't be used indefinitely for waste disposal.

MR. HICKS: Thank you very much. There is a question for you.

MR. SUTTON: I'm always particularly interested in the comments and recommendations of the Sierra Club because of their high standards of protection of the environment, but I'd like to clarify what I thought you said. For one thing you said the National Group generally does not favor the waiver on secondary treatment, but you indicated that the Boston Group does favor it?

MS. PLAUD: Not that they do but they do see why, they see the advantages to it. I'm not saying that we favor it. We see that there are advantages to it.

MR. SUTTON: You mentioned among the advantages that less land would be required for the secondary facilities?

MR. PLAUD: Yes. Wouldn't that be true, that on Deer Island that there would be no need for, say,

you wouldn't have to build an incinerator on Deer Island. If the primary sludge is pretreated, then the recommendations for the secondary sludge -- such as composting and land filling -- could be taken care of or could take care of the primary sludge.

MR. SUTTON: I don't think that's quite true. In fact, the document today really talks more about the primary sludge, not the secondary.

Well, I believe that the study on the primary sludge particularly has indicated that incineration would be the intermediate method to be used at the present time because of the presence of other materials in there that would prevent it from being recycled and used as compost. So even if they don't go to secondary treatment, I think the recommendation still would be the same, unfortunately.

I wanted to ask though, you realize where the sludge is going now? As was indicated earlier, 100,000 pounds a day of sludge are now being deposited in Boston Harbor, which is one of the reasons for this impact statement to see how we can get rid of this violation of the Water Pollution Control Act.

Has the Sierra Club taken a position on the present method of discharge of the sludge?

MS. PLAUD: On the method that's----

MR. SUTTON: Putting it in the harbor? At the present time the sludge is disposed of by putting it into Boston Harbor.

MS. PLAUD: Oh, yes. We're opposed to that. What we would like to see, we want to see more on composting; we want to see more on the land fill; and also we want to see, we can't really say we want to see the EIS on the primary sludge disposal before we could say what we want to do with it. We don't want to dump it in the harbor.

And the same on the statements on the secondary waiver, we're saying that through rumors we hear this, so we haven't really formulated what we want. We just wanted to make a comment based on rumors that we've heard and would like to hear more about what is happening.

MR. SUTTON: Well, there is a provision for a waiver in the new legislation and MDC has applied for a waiver.

MS. PLAUD: What we want to see is what kind of regulations there would be for the waiver before we would make a statement on it.

MR. SUTTON: Well, they would be out, what, in

two months? In about a month.

MR. HICKS: Thank you.

The next scheduled speaker is Arthur Barnes.

STATEMENT BY ARTHUR BARNES,
PRESIDENT OF THE NORUMBEGA ASSOCIATION

MR. BARNES: I'm Arthur Barnes, President of the Norumbega Association. I've been involved as our organization has in previous Citizens' Advisory Committees on the CENE Study, EMMA Study, the 208 Study. I've testified at previous public hearings, and Robert Mendoza of the EPA has copies of comments I've made at past times. But tonight I'll expand on the previous testimony which recommended that secondary treatment not go forward but that the primary treatment of effluents and sludge be upgraded, using new technology.

Regional experts in the Boston area want to cooperate in the use of the MDC sewer district and the harbor as a demonstration case study of their effectiveness, as the effectiveness of some new technology.

I want to assume that there will be vigorous attention to the following actions as a basis for my recommendation, not that it be continued as primary treatment alone in the style of the past five years.

First, to locate and intercept and treat sources of industrial waste, heavy metals, biodegradable organics, etc., at their source. I think Boston is a digestible size area for preventing these kinds of things getting into sanitary sewers.

Second, the minimization of point sources of pollution. Many of them are already well known and being worked at.

Third, to continue work of further separation of storm and sanitary sewers in the MDC District.

Fourth, that the final treatment of the present MDC system will be consolidated at Deer Island, eliminating the occasional, more than occasional problems of Nut Island that show up in the harbor.

And Fifth, that a 6-mile outfall pipe be installed promptly to insure a more acceptable location for the occasional necessity to dump and disperse inadequately treated sewage into the inner harbor.

Tonight I wish to speak as a taxpayer. I haven't heard anybody who has spoken as a taxpayer at previous hearings. They've all been environmentalists. I also want to speak as a recreational user of the harbor with a personal appreciation of the rich fishing resources, and as one concerned about land use policy

for the harbor islands, remembering that the tip half of Deer Island should be a public recreation area.

First, as a taxpayer, the costs of the project as described in the October Environmental News are understated, and I'm glad that tonight's TV report of what's gone on today has boosted that capital cost up to a billion dollars, which of course is what it's going to surpass by the time the capital is spent.

In addition, the MDC sewer assessments, which I pay, I also pay state and federal taxes, and most people in Massachusetts seem to think that state and federal money comes free. The billion dollar cost by completion time, five years hence if we hurry, and the annual real cost of operation and amortization which will be a hundred million dollars not the \$25 million that is mentioned in the Environmental News as the operating cost. If you take the \$84 million of annual cost, including the cost of paying two taxes back our debt, it's a hundred million dollars a year for the 40 some towns -- not for the towns themselves but for us individuals.

These costs can be substantially cut if we accept the judgment that Boston Harbor can digest effluent and sludge not as presently dumped into it but

from a properly managed, carefully controlled, 1980's style primary treatment plant.

Now, as a recreation, open-space buff, I recommend the development of the tip of Deer Island as a part of the harbor islands recreational system of Metropolitan Boston. I don't know how many of you have walked around it, looked at it, tried to use imagination, but by extending the Winthrop bus line in the summer, this island will become easily accessible by public transit especially for citizens of East Boston and Revere and Winthrop.

Fishing piers, picnic grounds and indore recreation use of the old MDC pumping station are easy to visualize if you have walked on it.

Most important of all, however, is my perception that Mother Nature and her marine, plant, animal ecological system will benefit from the nutrients flowing to the harbor from properly operated upgraded primary treatment plants. I can give first hand testimony from a beautiful clear, blue sky, late morning last Thursday. My friend Larry and I launched our outboard at the Winthrop ramp, went to a favorite spot not far away, and brought home 50 fat flounder for two hours in the sun and fresh air.

My summary then, 1978 technology applied to primary treatment, a six mile pipe as insurance, better control and management by the MDC, and I would like to underline that but I don't think this is the forum, and we want to catch the exotic pollutants at their source, trust Mother Nature. Mother Nature never lived on distilled water. Don't strive for that kind of purity. Save the tax dollars. Save land for conservation use and enjoy fishing.

MR. HICKS: Thank you.

The next scheduled speaker is Michael Morrissey, State Representative.

STATEMENT BY MICHAEL W. MORRISSEY,
STATE REPRESENTATIVE

MR. MORRISSEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

For the record, my name is Michael Morrissey. I'm a State Representative from Quincy, from the North Quincy-Squantum section. And I would like to be recorded in opposition to plans that would expand sewerage treatment facilities in the City of Quincy. For too many years, the City of Quincy has had to endure the brunt of sewerage treatment for a large part of the Metropolitan Boston area.

The Nut Island plant has often caused a lot of problems over the years for Quincy residents and

property owners not only in Quincy but the South Shore in general. I agree that there is a need to upgrade the facilities, but the question comes as to what areas and where they should be upgraded.

It would seem to make more sense and it's getting down to that point now where you look at those alternatives to have upstream treatment facilities, and it seems you have rejected those ideas. But in all fairness, it would have seemed to have made sense to take the brunt off those communities. There is more than Quincy that have been dumping grounds for a number of years and have some of those other cities and towns that are in the system do some of their own treatment. And I would definitely oppose any new treatment or waste facility in the City, and I would especially like to be recorded in opposition to a sludge deposit area slated for the Squantum section of Quincy.

I understand some of the implications as far as the sludge area in the Squantum section, but one of the problems, and I don't know whether it's been looked into yet, is that Squantum is only reached by one road. The other road is a private entrance, the Jordan Marsh roadway is private. They own that. They

built that at a cost of a million dollars, and it's an unaccepted city street. The only other access is East Squantum Street. And right now we, meaning the City Council and the State Legislature, are having our problems convincing the MDC to allow trucks on a portion of Quincy Shore Drive. Quincy Shore Drive is an MDC parkway, and under the law they are not allowed to have truck traffic. So as a result, you will be bringing in -- I don't mean you per se but the sludge has to get down to Squantum some way and that East Squantum Street is the main artery for four different schools in the North Quincy area -- the high school, there are two elementary schools and the junior high school, and that right now when you get a bus or two busses on that narrow street and the number of children who walk to the schools which probably numbers about 4,000, between three and four thousand kids a day who use that road, and with the volume of traffic, we have problems now. And there are a number of dangerous curves and intersections.

So by putting it in the Squantum area, I don't think you've fully looked at the impact of traffic that it will have on the North Quincy area.

I'd be happy to answer any questions.

MR. JOHNSON: Representative Morrissey, the question I have has to do with traffic at Squantum or expected traffic. We have been apprised, the EPA has been apprised that there have been plans to develop greatly that Squantum area with something like 2100 residential units and industrial units. Have you or has the City of Quincy taken a position on that development with its increased traffic?

MR. MORRISSEY: I believe there have been a number of different traffic studies done on the proposal you're talking about, and it was by a Connecticut developer and it was 3,000 units of apartments. It was mixed housing. There was some elderly housing. There were both townhouse, mid-range and highrise apartments, and it was a self-contained city within a city. And we had problems with it for a number of reasons, and one of the basic problems that we had was the increase in the volume of traffic, and that was, we had asked that the engineers on the project do studies, and I know that they are available right now.

But I think what we in the City had wanted was the City to go into that land where it is already zoned

PUD and industrial, we were looking more for a technical nature industry, light industry with low volume traffic employing like skilled technicians or light factory work, and that is what it is zoned for. A good portion of that parcel is zoned for that right now.

They are in the process, and I don't know whether it is true or not, I haven't seen any plans, but I know they are in the process of revising the number of units and putting a proposal before the planning board as to what they would like to do with the property out there.

I know Edison at one point owned a portion of land and I've been talking with their lobbyist about the fence that borders the property, and he had said they had sold a lot of the options. So that led me to believe that a developer has bought a good portion of the property.

And the traffic studies, if you would like to look at them, I'm not sure who the engineer is, but maybe the City Planning Department would have at least the consulting engineer for the traffic studies on it.

MR. HICKS: Thank you.

The next scheduled speaker is Diane Lindblad.

STATEMENT BY DIANE LINDBLAD, CIVIC COMMITTEE
OF THE SQUANTUM COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION

MS. LINDBLAD: Good evening. For the record, my name is Diane Lindblad, and I'm here to represent Michael Kelly of the Civic Committee of the Squantum Community Association. Good evening.

I welcome the opportunity to speak. The residents of Squantum are strictly opposed to the plans of the sludge and fly ash being dumped in Squantum. We have such a very high flood plain level as is, especially due to the storm of February 1978.

Most of the statements or comments that I have this evening were summed up pretty well by Mike Morrissey as well one of my fellow workers, Mary Gougian, this afternoon regarding, again, one of the big factors the trucks, 250 single trips or 125 roundtrips weekly. And we also came up with over 400 signatures in less than a week in opposition to this plan. It would devalue property. We would have the problem with the roads, and there is quite a problem with the groundwater leakage right now, and that also would have to be reduced.

We do have several proposals and we are working on them, and we would take into consideration other proposals made by the EPA. But at this time, the plan is completely unacceptable.

MR. HICKS: Thank you.

The next speaker I have scheduled is Alan Bruno. I may be misreading the handwriting, it could be Mr. Brusso. Is there a Mr. Bruno or Brusso?

(No response.)

MR. HICKS: In that case, the last scheduled speaker that we have is Janet Bergermeister.

STATEMENT BY JANET BERGERMEISTER

MR. BERGERMEISTER: I'm glad to receive this opportunity to express my opinion. This will be a small statement. But I suggest that every community assume the responsibility of erecting a plant in their own area to dispose of their waste properly. I feel that Quincy, Winthrop or any other area on the seashore shouldn't have the responsibility of taking care of the situation alone. It's too much of a burden. I'm opposed to any expansion of any of the areas.

I suggest a place in Boston, a particular place in Boston where Boston can erect the place, and I suggest under the Expressway, Route 93. There is a whole barren site that I would consider an excellent place to erect a sewerage plant for the City of Boston.

Winthrop, their place should only be advanced

to assist their own area. In Quincy, likewise.

But I believe every place, such as Randolph, Braintree, any other area, they should find a solution within their own town, not subject us to sewage and destroy the view of our harbor because the view of our harbor not only assists us but it helps us financially by bring tourism to the state. And if our harbor is destroyed, I believe the whole state can be destroyed because that's one of the necessities of Massachusetts. So I am against the proposal of advancing any sewerage system for Quincy or Winthrop or any area, and I hope they can settle the situation, and I hope they come up with some advanced technology to make sewerage systems in their own area, such as laser rays. If that's too expensive, find some other solution. But I think each town should find their own solution of handling the waste.

Thank you very much for your time.

MR. HICKS: Thank you.

I have no other names of scheduled speakers. Is there anyone else who would like to make a statement at this time?

STATEMENT BY JOHN CONWAY, WINTHROP

MR. CONWAY: My name is John Conway. I'm from

Winthrop. I was not able to be here this afternoon. I don't have anything prepared, and I did not expect to speak. However, I felt that I would be hurting my own cause if I did not get up and say what I've been thinking of in the last couple of weeks since we came into this problem.

I was born and brought up in Winthrop. I've lived there close to 43 years. I don't understand how the Environmental Protection Agency can come up with a study such as they have if they looked into the history of Winthrop and what we have put up with in the last 30 to 40 years. We have been beaten to death by an airport; we have been beaten to death by the primary treatment plant; we have been beaten to death by the City of Boston dumping its jail on us; and now you want to dump another sewerage treatment plant on us.

It doesn't make any sense in a small town of one and three-quarters square miles with 22,000 people and two access roads, you're going to dump this thing on top of us again. You certainly have not taken into consideration all the time, money and effort the people of Winthrop have put into their town when you start to bring chlorine trucks through, 285 or 485

people a day in cars, and more sewage for our harbor, more environmental pollution with your smoke stacks.

I have eight children and I plan to bring them up for the rest of their lives in that town, and I hope they stay there, but you're doing everything possible to drive people out. It doesn't make any sense at all. You should be called the Environmental Pollution Agency. It doesn't make any sense at all. Thank you.

MR. HICKS: Is there anyone else who would like to make a statement who hasn't signed in?

(No response.)

MR. HICKS: On behalf of the State's Executive Office, I do want to thank you for coming this evening, and now let me turn it back to the EPA people.

MS HANMER: Thank you very much for staying with us. We've learned a lot today.

I want to remind you that the record will be open until November 28th for written statements. Thank you very much. Good night.

(Whereupon, at 8:10 p.m. the above-entitled matter was concluded.)

WRITTEN STATEMENTS SUBMITTED BY:

Arthur H. Tobin, Mayor, City of Quincy

Leo J. Kelly, Chairman, Environmental Control
Committee, Quincy City Council

Ronald E. Zooleck, Executive Vice President,
South Shore Chamber of Commerce, Inc.

Edward A. Coyle, President,
Quincy Center Business & Professional Association

Charles F. Grein, Co-Owner, Maxwells Parrot Restaurant

Richard D. Dimes, Chairman,
Winthrop Board of Selectmen

Arthur Cummings, Concerned Citizens Committee
of Winthrop

Peggy Riley, Concerned Citizens Committee of Winthrop

Alan Lupo, Concerned Citizens Committee on Winthrop

Jerome E. Falbo, Chairman, Winthrop Planning Board

Ronald H. Wayland, Chairman,
Winthrop Conservation Commission

Dr. Herbert Meyer, Chairman,
Boston Harbor Citizens' Advisory Committee

Marian Ullman, League of Women Voters of Boston

Thomas J. Nutley, Director, Public Relations,
Atlantic Neighborhood Association

Nancy Wrenn, Executive Secretary,
Boston Harbor Associates

Lydia R. Goodhue, Charles River Watershed Association

Grace Saphir, Save Our Shores, Inc.

Shirley M. Brown, Natick Representative,
Citizens' Advisory Committee to the EPA

Dorothy C. Kelly, Quincy Citizens Association

Waldo H. Holcombe, Neponset Conservation Association

Mrs. Mary Gougian, President,
Squantum Community Association

John E. Murphy, Boston Harbor Pollution Committee

Gary P. Kosciusko, President, Save our Shores, Inc.

Claire Plaud, Greater Boston Group of the Sierra Club

Michael W. Morrissey, State Representative

Milton S. Fistel, P.E., Winthrop

Roland N. Fluet, Chairman,
Winthrop School Committee