

APPENDIX B-4

Summary of Written Comments from Private Citizens and Organizations

Appendix B-4 Summary of Written Comments from Private Citizens and Organizations

Date	From	Comments
July 22, 2004	Jose S.N. Chargualaf, Malojloj	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation stated the solution to landfill leaks is simply to cover the area of the leak and move on to the next cell. This solution is simply unacceptable to all of us. • Placing the landfill in Dandan will forever forfeit positive developments such as expansion of our surface groundwater, residential and tourist related activities, because plastic liners leak. • Commented that several farmers have invested money for farm equipment and water from Guam Waterworks Authority to farm in the Dandan area. Some are farming 20 or more acres of land. • Dandan has vast natural resources. Trash can never equal or surpass the values and profits of any wetlands, rivers, streams, springs or water wells. Dandan should be preserved at all cost because of its past and present pristine environment. • Concerned that Tinaga and Fensu Rivers and wetlands will be affected by siting a landfill in Dandan. • Concerned that landfill will cause population of rodents and insects to increase and that infected animals could contaminate groundwater. • Tinaga, Fensu and Finatasa Rivers are 2 miles or less from the proposed landfill site at Dandan. Known and unknown toxins will escape and eventually all landfills leak. • Concern that once the landfill is built, Finatasa, Tinaga and Fensu Rivers will be eliminated from consideration for future GWA master plan development. • Because of the proximity between the super landfill and the Ugum watershed, leakage from this super landfill from an earthquake, faulty structure of the plastic liner (pinholes), deterioration from strong chemical decomposition will cause tremendous health hazards to our drinking water. • Presently several farmers are drawing water from the wetland Tinaga River for their crops. What kind of an option do these farmers have when they cannot continue farming because of a leaking landfill nearby? • Attached a petition with 221 signatures of residents opposed to Dandan site.
July 22, 2004	Lolita B. Chargualaf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application of your screening criteria on the six PALs is highly questionable. The Dandan site has major surface water features and it appears such considerations were not properly applied. • Why in the world did you select Dandan as the #1 site in your Preliminary Site Listing? Only a few days ago your agency started drilling and boring on the Dandan site. Before a selection was made, you should have done your field work and research. Dandan is where our drinking water source comes from. Farmers depend on many streams, rivers and waterfalls for their irrigation systems. • The plastic liners leak, as reported in a study by Geoservices on behalf of U.S. EPA. • The cultural significance of the Chamorro past and present relies on these rivers and wetlands (trapping shrimps, fishing, catching eels, and hunting indigenous birds). • While the super landfill is funded through a federal grant, is it 90% federal and 10% local? What will be the estimated cost for the reconstruction or construction and improvement of the road from the highway leading to the proposed landfill in Dandan? The proposed landfill in Dandan will have a direct impact on the roads and bridges going to the south. • According to brochure, Dandan landfill site will cover Tinaga and Fensu Rivers. The Malojloj water well (located 1 mile east of the proposed landfill) and the Inarajan water tank (located 1.5 miles to the southeast of landfill site) will be at risk. The Ugum watershed is about 700 yards or less from the footprint of the proposed landfill. It will definitely jeopardize our drinking water!

Appendix B-4 Summary of Written Comments from Private Citizens and Organizations

Date	From	Comments
July 22, 2004	Lolita B. Chargualaf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I differ with your description of Dandan as largely savannah grassland to the south of the NASA Tracking Station; instead there are wetlands stretching for more than a quarter mile feeding the Tinaga River and Fensu River, and there is a waterfall along the Siput River. • Do you realize how many rivers, wetlands, streams, springs, waterfalls, critical habitats for endangered species of some indigenous birds, and historical sites have already been identified by researchers in their field studies of Dandan? • It is far better that the Dandan site be preserved for future residential development, more positive commercial development, and other beneficial enterprises that will promote economic growth for the people in the south. The vastness of the Dandan landscape for a superlandfill is not compatible for future residential, commercial development, and tourist related activities in the south.
July 22, 2004	Kaechelle C.C. Chargualaf, Malojloj, Inarajan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I do not want landfill near streams, rivers or water wells because when it leaks it will pollute all the rivers and waters near it. It will make all the people of Inarajan sick.
July 22, 2004	Jaylene Rose Chargualaf, Malojloj, Inarajan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I do not want the landfill near the rivers, streams, swamps, or near water wells. The landfill will leak and pollute the rivers, streams, and any waters near it. Many living things live in the rivers, swamps or streams, like shrimps, eels, fish and other animals. I get all my drinking water from Dandan. When the landfill leaks and the chemicals go into the ground, it will make the waters not safe for me and the people of my village.
July 22, 2004	BettyJo Q. Camacho, Malojloj	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our resource that we count on the most is our water supply. Our water supply will be contaminated and we will all be sick. I want my children and grandchildren and so forth to have a safe drinking and usable water system. Ugum serves people from Malojloj all the way down to Umatac. So think before you decide. Whether you have decided for not, think of these children and the future of these children that you are going to affect. • There are also farmers that are making a valuable living growing vegetable and fruits to sell for their living.
July 22, 2004	Christine Chargualaf, Maloloj/Chalan Pago	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guam Waterworks Authority shuts down Ugum pump whenever it rains severely. By adding this landfill at Dandan, you will worsen our water situation when it should be resolved. • My children are the future residents of this village (Inarajan) and maybe elsewhere if they have to wake up in the morning and smell the stench of the landfill and see the landfill eyesore. • This is only an easy way out for EPA not to find other solutions but to resort to a landfill in Dandan.
July 22, 2004	Evelyn M. Mantanona, Dandan, Malojloj	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the justifications by agencies to identify the 3 areas for landfill proposal over all others? • What happened to offer by Mr. Albert Topasna to donate his property at Mt. Lamlam for landfill? Shouldn't that count as economically sound versus leasing privately owned land (Calvo & Lee) at Dandan?
July 23, 2004	Guam Boonie Stompers: David T. Lotz, President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EIS should include source of clay for new landfill. • Regarding officials' presentations at Asan public meeting, purpose of scoping meeting was not adequately described to the public. • EIS should include secondary impacts of transfer stations' impacts, road congestion, source of clay, closure of Ordot Dump, etc. Include construction and operating costs for new landfill. • Should site landfill in previously degraded areas and clearly avoid peaceful communities and our island's pristine environmental resources. • Particularly concerned with impact on current uses of undeveloped lands and resources, such as hiking trails and destinations at Dandan and Lonfit. Provided copy of <i>The Best Tracks on Guam</i> to project team for reference so hiking resources can be avoided.

Appendix B-4 Summary of Written Comments from Private Citizens and Organizations

Date	From	Comments
July 23, 2004	Guam Boonie Stompers: David T. Lotz, President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EIS should include secondary impacts of transfer stations' impacts, road congestion, source of clay, closure of Ordod Dump, etc. Include construction and operating costs for new landfill. • Concerned that public only being allowed to comment on 3 landfill sites. People should have opportunity to comment on all 12 sites and nominate others. Proposes sites at Harmon Field, Tiyan, and Fadian. Recommends that current process be halted and commenced again with a review of all sites for public scoping input. There is a provision in Consent Decree for amendments to allow for sufficient time. • EIS process clouded by public's lack of confidence in Government to handle trash. Implementation of tipping fee has increased illegal dumping and yielded insufficient income. Privatization of trash collection will increase illegal dumping. Government of Guam needs to take immediate corrective action to change this course and regain public's confidence.
July 29, 2004	Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence C. Portela, Maloijloj	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All landfills will eventually fail and leak leachate into ground and surface water. Plastics are not inert. State-of-the-art plastic (HDPE) landfill liners and plastic pipes will allow chemicals and gases to pass through their membranes and break down. • Concerned about water contamination to water wells nearby. Dandan is not savannah. It is a water tableland. It has 8 rivers, fresh water springs and wetlands. These rivers and springs provide Ugum reservoir fresh water supplied to Ipan, Maloijloj, Inarajan, Merizo, Umatac and parts of Santa Rita. If you put this landfill in Dandan, sooner or later (minimum of 10 years) there will be leaks in plastic liners. • Landfills are located next to large bodies of water, in our case wetlands, making leakage detection and remediation extremely difficult. • What about the roads coming down south? The roads are not wide enough to accommodate all the traffic from dump trucks. Widen the roads, make more lanes, more money. • This is a farming community. Watermelons watered with contaminated water from Ugum will have TCE, a volatile, cancer-causing toxic material typically found in landfills. • Concerned about air pollution and health issues (increase in birth defects, cancer, pulmonary infections, asthma, heart problems, spontaneous abortions, etc.) for schools and nearby residential areas. • How would you like to attend a fiesta or barbecue with the smell of the dump and not the barbecue? • How many tourists will visit Talofof Falls when flies and rodents will be all over the place? How much money spent on advertising to sell Guam? When tourists come they will see a big dump. Tourism is a major industry on this island. • Federal government allows household and industrial hazardous waste into municipal landfills; therefore, leachate leaking from municipal and hazardous waste landfills into ground and surface water can have the same toxicity.
August 2, 2004	Texas A&M Foundation: Eddie J. Davis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Texas A&M Foundation owns property in the footprint of the Sabanan Batea, Yona proposed location for the new landfill. Regrettably, the regional economy has delayed the profitable sale of the property by the Foundation. The value of our property in addition to that of the surrounding areas will be severely diminished by location of a landfill on the property. As the developable portion of the property is limited by the natural terrain, the further reduction in area with potential for development by location of the landfill on our property would be devastating. Location of the proposed landfill in proximity to an attraction such as Leo Palace could impact the future economy of the area, and location in the region of the island already experienced with the negative effects of the Ordod dumpsite would be unfair.

Appendix B-4 Summary of Written Comments from Private Citizens and Organizations

Date	From	Comments
August 2, 2004	Texas A&M Foundation: Eddie J. Davis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The beauty of the natural surroundings would never be enjoyed to the fullest potential with the landfill nearby.
August 3, 2004	Senator Antoinette Sanford, 27 th Guam Legislature	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the present day importance of the Ugum water source, Guam Waterworks Authority's (GWA) desire for Ugum to serve as the main water source for all southern residents and GWA's major capital improvement plans for the Ugum water system, it appears that the need to protect this valuable and irreplaceable water resource would be more than obvious. It is, therefore, quite puzzling that the northern area of our island has been excluded as a potential landfill site due to "water aquifer concerns" yet none of these concerns have been applied to the main water aquifer serving the southern area of our island.
August 3, 2004	Leo Palace Resort: Yutaka Maruyama, General Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are also archaeological excavations being done at the Sabanan Batea site. It does not make sense to disturb an archaeological site by constructing a landfill at the same place if there is an option of putting the landfill at another location. Burial grounds should not be disturbed if at all possible. But if one is found, work will have to be stopped and the remains excavated and moved to another place. This will not only halt the project, but will also be an added expense. Both Sabanan Batea and Lonfit sites are located near the road to Leopalace. The only access for vehicles is either through the villages of Ordot or Yona. Trucks and heavy equipment will have to go through the residential areas of one of these villages during construction. This will create a safety hazard for children and a nuisance for residents. After construction, trucks to the site will have to go through one of the villages unless a bypass road is constructed. Construction of a bypass would obviously be very expensive. A site with easier road access would make much more sense. Obviously, no one wants to have the landfill in their area, but the people who live in the villages around the Ordot Dump have had to deal with many problems created by the dump for many, many years now. Like them, we feel it is time to locate the landfill in a different part of the island. Having a landfill near Leopalace would be inconsistent with the current use of the area. Leopalace is not only a tourist destination, but an area where all of the people of Guam can go for recreational activities such as golf, baseball, and other sports. In fact, there are several other developments still in their planning stages that are supposed to be located near Leopalace. These developments may never get off the ground if the new landfill is placed in Sabanan Batea or Lonfit. Leopalace is proud of its contribution to Guam's economy and its people. Over the past decade, Leopalace has invested more money on Guam than any single private company in Guam's history. It did so partly in reliance on government representations that the Ordot Dump was soon to be closed. It was disappointing to learn, then, that two of the three proposed sites for the new landfill are just as close to Leopalace as the Ordot Dump. The jobs and revenues that Leopalace has brought into Guam over the last ten years has already been of enormous benefit to Guam's residents. The potential for even more jobs and more revenue in the upcoming years is just as significant. But, it will be very hard for us to reach these goals if the new landfill is to be once again located in our back yard. It has been hard enough to bring in visitors due to the long-awaited closure of the Ordot dump. In truth, if the landfill is to be located in either Sabanan Batea or Lonfit, it may be very hard for us to even justify any effort to increase visitor arrivals..

Appendix B-4 Summary of Written Comments from Private Citizens and Organizations

Date	From	Comments
August 3, 2004	Oxford Properties and Facilities, Ltd.: Attorney Mark Cowan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of the landfill on Dandan would significantly and negatively impact road safety due to additional heavy traffic impact. • Development of the landfill on Dandan would significantly and negatively impact natural beauty of the site and wildlife. • Based on Guam EPA hydrogeologic reconnaissance surveys of 3 sites, Dandan is geologically unstable for landfill site. In contrast, the reports as to Asan and Sabanan Batea each state these sites are generally suitable for construction of a subtitle D landfill. • Development of the landfill on Dandan would significantly and negatively impact wetlands and rivers. There are multiple rivers and streams through the property. Dandan is in part bordered by the Ugum River, the Ugum River and its watershed is one of the sources of Guam's water supply. The Ugum River is also the site of Talofoto Falls and has other actual or potential use for recreational purposes. • Development of the landfill on Dandan would significantly and negatively impact condition of roads. • The existing road systems that could potentially be used for access are unsuitable for the type of traffic that would result from selection of Dandan. The road system through Talofoto Village should not be considered as a major thru way for heavy duty traffic. The least unsuitable through Yona, is dependent on bridges subject to damage and blockage in floods, storms or earthquakes. • Of the 3 sites, Dandan is the most distant from the major developed areas which generate most of Guam's trash. • Dandan is unique in that it is possibly the largest privately owned and essentially undeveloped tract of real property within Guam, yet close to existing roadways and infrastructure systems. It is pristine and in a natural state with little development, other than the Talofoto Falls development, which is one of Guam's principal tourist attractions, the former NASA tracking station, and portions of the original tract that have been developed into low impact single family residential development. • Development of the landfill on Dandan would significantly and negatively impact agricultural activities on site or on adjacent areas. • Future uses, e.g., low impact residential development or recreational use development will be adversely impacted by the landfill if Dandan is selected. Impact will be heightened by the need to configure the landfill (if it is possible to find an acceptable site in Dandan) so as to take into account the at best limited suitability of Dandan on a hydrogeologic basis for the landfill site, which may result in an irregular or inconvenient configuration increasing impact on the remainder of the parcel. • The preference for Dandan may be based upon political considerations that may be unfounded, such as the perceptions that because of its perceived distance from existing development, the large size, or ownership by a relatively few mainly institutional investors, acquisition costs and issues may be more easily dealt with and be less controversial at Dandan with respect to the other sites.

Appendix B-4 Summary of Written Comments from Private Citizens and Organizations

Date	From	Comments
August 3, 2004	Oxford Properties and Facilities, Ltd.: Attorney Mark Cowan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Government totally lacks funding to acquire the site, and to construct the facility and operate it in accordance with applicable laws and regulations and in an appropriate and sound manner. • Concerned that a bias has been established in favor of Dandan without clear determination of its environmental suitability. Remainder of the selection and evaluation process will be impaired by this bias that has flawed the process from its outset.
August 3, 2004	Andrew Manglona	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the proposed landfill location considered, as per siting criteria (Department of Natural Resources NR 504 landfill location, performance, design and construction criteria)? (refers to minimum distance siting criteria) • Concern with proximity of water resources and land use activities within municipality of Inarajan surrounding landfill site that were not identified in the Preliminary Landfill Site Suitability Report (March 2004). • Dandan area is home to several indigenous and endangered wildlife species. Navy Wildlife Refuge overlay boundary is nearby and species may migrate between these areas. • Concern with highway safety and inadequate road conditions in south. • The proposed landfill will in fact have adverse impacts to the surface and groundwater surrounding the proposed landfill in Dandan. Provide actual plot location on suitable and provide distances referencing all environmental impact on such location. Provide information on boring logs, locations and field investigation in regard to groundwater profiles and the Ugum River. • Concerned with groundwater contamination, and water quality for drinking, recreation, fishing, transportation and commerce. • During the public scoping meetings the location of the Ugum watershed boundary was incorrectly plotted on the map used to accompany the Environmental Impact Statement. Though only a minor error in itself, it undermines confidence in the remainder of the document to a significant extent. What other errors does the Environmental Impact Statement contain? Is it an error or is it a strategy to deceive the public to gain more distance from the proposed landfill and the Ugum watershed boundary? • Attached petition with 1,019 signatures of eligible and non-eligible voters of Guam who are opposed to Dandan site, and petition Government of Guam to comply with Public Law 23-95, an act that designates Guatali as the new landfill site.
August 3, 2004	Marlene N. Manglona, Malojloj	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the backup if both Northern Aquifer and the Ugum watershed are both contaminated? • Is the Clean Water Act of Guam not being looked at when making selections on the ranking of potential sites for the landfill? Is it that the Inarajan watershed on a category 1 and has no priority ranking not at all potential water resource for Guam maybe not today but in the future? • Did scientists study the Inarajan watersheds' potential for Guam instead of contaminating it and its environment first? • Did this scientist ever make a study that the groundwater at the Inarajan watershed, tie in with the Ugum watershed? Or is this a science lab test to wait and see if contamination should hit and flow from the Inarajan watershed to the Ugum watershed and then get the final answer?
August 3, 2004	Ester Manglona, Malojloj	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that drinking water at Dandan will be contaminated and affect health of schoolchildren. • Ugum and Inarajan watersheds should be considered as important as northern aquifer. • Have you watched the movie "Erin Brockovich"? It's based on a true story, and a catastrophic disaster not made by God but by choices of scientist. • Are scientists going to ensure children a better future with the design of the landfill near our drinking water?

Appendix B-4 Summary of Written Comments from Private Citizens and Organizations

Date	From	Comments
August 3, 2004	Ester Manglona, Malojloj	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cited Wetlands Conservation Plan by Guam EPA, that school age children and young adults will eventually become the stewards of island wetlands and other natural areas. Questioned why stewardship important if landfill in Dandan could impact wetlands.• How much million dollars is this scientist getting for making the choices of my future and the other children?• Isn't there another way to solve this issue of where to put the landfill?