

**From:** [Scott P. Malinowski](#)  
**To:** [Schmeltzer, John](#); [Spiese, Richard](#)  
**Subject:** Competent Bedrock and Town Water Line Decisions  
**Date:** Thursday, February 18, 2021 9:57:17 AM

---

**EXTERNAL SENDER: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.**

John and Richard

Thank you for your continued efforts with the PFOA in Bennington.

I read the draft proposed well drilling rules and I have concerns that will affect my wells. I have also forwarded those draft rules to my well driller (Frost wells of Dorset, for their opinion.)

In all of my 3 drilled wells (632 Rocky, 712 Rocky and 518 Sugar Maple) I do not think I ever hit "competent bedrock" by definition. The well at 518 Sugar Maple has 250 feet of steel casing and an additional 150 feet to the bottom (400 ft) of 4" slotted PVC sleeve to protect the well from collapse. I want to know how the definition of competent bedrock will be applied. In all my wells I was getting access to water at 200-250 ft.

I would also like to know what town water line extension plans may have been proposed to service Rocky Lane and Sugar Maple Lane but rejected and why.

Please let me know you have received this email even if you cannot reply immediately. I may request more time to understand the proposed changes and how they will affect my access to water.

-Scott

**From:** [Lora Block](#)  
**To:** [Schmeltzer, John](#); [Spiese, Richard](#)  
**Subject:** Proposed Groundwater Reclassification Petition comments  
**Date:** Saturday, February 20, 2021 4:33:43 PM

---

EXTERNAL SENDER: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.

After reading the documents online and seeing the map, we agree that this reclassification should be done. We live within the zone and are very pleased and relieved we are hooked up to municipal water. We think it would be very dangerous to allow any future development to install drinking water wells due to the ground water contamination. All future developers or home builders or well diggers need to be notified about the contamination so no one in the future drinks contaminated water as we did unwittingly for so many years.

Lora and Rober Block  
34 McIntosh Lane  
Bennington VT 05201

**From:** [Al Bashevkin](#)  
**To:** [Spiese, Richard](#); [Schmeltzer, John](#)  
**Cc:** [Nancy Pearlman](#); [Hurd, Stuart](#)  
**Subject:** Tried Calling but too late  
**Date:** Friday, March 5, 2021 4:44:17 PM

---

**EXTERNAL SENDER: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.**

Hi Richard and John...I'm following up on yesterday's public meeting. This likely would be better over the phone, but I'll start by getting it on paper.

I am still disappointed and puzzled by the low turnout. In light of the low turnout, I wonder if you might consider extending the date for responses to this classification change and use that opportunity to spread the word more widely about the proposed changes. A few things to keep in mind to perhaps bring in more people.

- Our postcard informing us of the meeting was not personally addressed and we wonder if people might have tossed it without looking at it. It was addressed to "Current Resident"
- Lots of people here use [front porch forum](#) as a means to inform others as to what is going on. That might be a good resource to get information out to the public. There is lots of information about public meetings on this site.
- For others (not me) facebook and in particular a managed site called [Bennington Blotter](#) is a popular place to see what is going on in the community.
- Taking an ad out in the Bennington Banner will certainly be seen by some
- And I wonder if your departments might use the local health department as a means to spread information as well.

I understand the bind that informing more about this change might mean for you and your colleagues. No one is going to be happy with this proposed change, but I fear they will be less happy if it happens without their knowing it was to happen.

I'm wondering now a bit harder than before why St Gobain is not extending the water lines into all the affected homes, whether we have PFOA in our drinking water or not. Might they be convinced down the road to change their stance on this, especially in light of the reclassification that is proposed? This is all due to their pollution.

All that said, both Nancy and I do appreciate the manner that you (the State) have approached this issue from the beginning. You offered lots of information, negotiations on the behalf of many neighbors, and found a solution to the problem for many households.

--

***Al Bashevkin***  
*213 Settlers Road*  
*Bennington, VT 05201*  
[abashevkin@gmail.com](mailto:abashevkin@gmail.com)  
[www.albashevkin.com](http://www.albashevkin.com)  
802 447-2486

**From:** [Robin Outwater](#)  
**To:** [Schmeltzer, John](#); [Spiese, Richard](#)  
**Subject:** Proposed Groundwater Reclassification within North Bennington and Bennington  
**Date:** Saturday, March 6, 2021 9:36:22 AM

---

**EXTERNAL SENDER: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.**

John/Richard:

Our home address is 340 Springhill Road in Bennington, VT. From the start, our water has never tested positive for contamination and, hopefully, that will continue to be the case. However, a neighbor to the north and one a couple of doors to the south were not as fortunate. I completely understand the overarching intent of the reclassification but I must voice my concern of the potential impact this reclassification may have on our property value down the road; especially since the new water line was not extended down Springhill Road. Might there be a way of identifying properties like ours within the reclassification; subject to change as/if the testing process continues? Some sort of distinction that indicates actual history within the zone?

Thank you for any consideration you may give this line of thought and/or any further guidance you may share.

Coardially,  
Robin Outwater

VT Agency of Natural Resources  
Department of Environmental Conservation, Waste Management and Prevention Division  
1 National Life Drive – Davis 1  
Montpelier, VT 05620-3704

March 12, 2021

213 Settlers Road  
Bennington, VT 05201

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the petition and draft decision to reclassify groundwater from potable to non-potable for portions of Bennington, Shaftsbury, and North Bennington. We understand the need to reclassify portions of our community that were hardest hit and provided solutions to their unhealthy water supply. Given the current situation, we believe that including our home at 213 Settlers Road in Bennington (and others around us) in the reclassified area, without providing access to town water is in error for the following reasons:

As stated in a letter from Richard Spiese (attached), our first sampling of our well water on June 7, 2016 resulted in a very high measurement of PFOA contamination (381ng/l). Subsequent testing of the water coming into our home (x7) has seen a safe level of PFOA coming into our home (<2ng/l). The homes around our property all have negligible amounts of PFOA in their water systems. The blood tests for my wife and myself had levels of PFOA in our bloodstreams that are below the average level for people who are drinking clean water. With all these factors taken together, Mr. Spiese offers his professional judgement within the letter that the initial results were incorrect and may have resulted from samples being switched or improperly labeled.

Under the Consent Order and Final Judgement with St Gobain, the town of Bennington installed water lines throughout parts of the community to rectify the damaged water sources. Under this agreement with St Gobain, the water line that extends into our neighborhood stops four houses from ours. We were not allowed access to the town water line, and thus have only the POET system to rely on if needed. The settlement agreement with St Gobain did not include many homes within our neighborhood as they did not fall within the guidelines established in negotiations between the State and St Gobain.

Given the above circumstances, it seems unfair to classify our home to be within the class IV portion in the Town of Bennington (indicating our groundwater well is non-potable). Our well-driven drinking water (measured before the POET System) has repeatedly been deemed non-detectable for PFOA by its measurements by CT Male Associates. The designation of our drinking water as non-potable may have an impact on the resale of our property as well as our capacity to redrill our well if needed. Without access to a public water supply and with no knowledge of how long our POET system will be supported by the State or St Gobain, we believe this classification is unfair. If the settlement with St Gobain

did not include our home or others for town water, why are we included in the property re-classification?

We ask that either the classification map for non-potable drinking water be re-drawn to exclude the homes in our neighborhood as well as others that do not have access to the public water supply, or that town water lines be extended to all homes impacted by this new classification, hopefully through re-negotiation with St. Gobain.

Sincerely,

Al Bashevkin

Nancy Pearlman

**From:** [Scott P. Malinowski](#)  
**To:** [Schmeltzer, John](#); [Spiese, Richard](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment Bennington  
**Date:** Monday, March 29, 2021 8:23:10 PM

---

**EXTERNAL SENDER: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.**

The reclassification makes the town of Bennington's water source Morgan Spring classify as non potable. Does this mean that the town can no longer sell that water to Vermont Pure for use in their bottled water?

Scott Malinowski

--

-Scott

**From:** [Edd Lyon](#)  
**To:** [Schmeltzer, John](#)  
**Subject:** Ground water reclassification  
**Date:** Monday, March 29, 2021 5:57:00 PM

---

**EXTERNAL SENDER: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.**

Hello Mr. Schmeltzer:

Comments with regard to the proposed ground water reclassification of our neighborhood:

1. Why is it not possible to classify each residence in this area which does not meet current state requirements for levels of PFOAs rather than the whole area. Any prospective buyer for our house would likely not consider our home just on the face value of the reclassification rather than diving into the specifics available.
2. What reassurance do we have that if St. Gobain were sold to another entity in the future that the same stipulations regarding the handling of residences in this area would be adhered to?
3. Should our residence fall outside current safe PFOA levels, which it currently does not, what would be the solution? Install water filtration? Connect us to the public water line? We also question the decision not to run the water line by our residence.

Thank you, Edd Lyon and Heather Hamilton. 1068 Vail Rd. Bennington

**From:** [Scott McEnaney](#)  
**To:** [Schmeltzer, John](#); [Spiese, Richard](#)  
**Cc:** [selectmanart@yahoo.com](mailto:selectmanart@yahoo.com)  
**Subject:** Shaftsbury Reclassification  
**Date:** Monday, March 29, 2021 3:34:39 PM

---

**EXTERNAL SENDER: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.**

John & Richard,

Good Afternoon. I am hoping I can talk to you about the groundwater reclassification for the Bennington Area, which I recently learned of in a VT Digger Article. I was surprised to have not been given any notice of this reclassification.

I live in the reclass area (599 Town Line Road, Shaftsbury) and to date my water has not tested above the minimum PFOA level (even though my neighbor across the road has along with my other neighbor up the hill) and therefore we have no filtration system in our home. Now I read we are about to have our water designated as not drinkable? Is that correct? If that is the case, I would like to know what course of action I have for the state or Saint Gobain to make it so my water is drinkable? We have a considerable amount of \$ invested in our property and did not do any of this polluting. If this is going to make it so we have plummeting property values it will be devastating.

Any insight you might have? Any course of action you would suggest I take?

Thank you in advance,  
Scott McEnaney



**Scott McEnaney**  
**Director – Orvis Adventures**  
The Orvis Company  
178 Conservation Way  
Sunderland, VT 05250  
direct – (802) 362-8598  
cell – (802) 345-3966  
[mcananeys@orvis.com](mailto:mcananeys@orvis.com)  
[orvis.com](http://orvis.com)

**The Orvis Commitment**

Orvis commits 5% of pre-tax profits to protecting nature, supporting communities and advancing canine health and well-being.

**From:** [Ashley Conway](#)  
**To:** [Schmeltzer, John](#)  
**Cc:** [Sue Schurman](#)  
**Subject:** Comment on draft reclassification  
**Date:** Monday, April 5, 2021 3:57:49 PM

---

EXTERNAL SENDER: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.

Good afternoon, Mr. Schmeltzer,

My comment is that in light of the proposed reclassification, the agreement brokered between Saint-Gobain and the state should be reconsidered.

I live on Harrington Road in North Bennington, a road with both contaminated and non-contaminated wells. It defies logic that my house, that is a stone's throw from the Bennington municipal waste-water treatment plant and fire hydrants has been "orphaned" by the remediation agreement.

If the potability of our wells are being rethought, it seems to me, that so too should the expectation that homeowners will assume the risk of the firm's unfortunate industrialization practices.

Respectfully submitted,

Ashley Conway

843 Harrington Road  
North Bennington  
301/648-2222

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Scott P. Malinowski](#)  
**To:** [Schmeltzer, John](#); [Spiese, Richard](#)  
**Subject:** Bennington Reclass Public Comment  
**Date:** Monday, April 12, 2021 9:43:03 AM

---

**EXTERNAL SENDER: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.**

Richard and John

I do not agree with the use of the word "Non-Potable". There needs to be a new classification that does not include this word.

I do not agree with the written word "Competent Bedrock" there needs to be a better choice of words here.

-Scott

**From:** [flyh2o@comcast.net](mailto:flyh2o@comcast.net)  
**To:** [Walke, Peter](#)  
**Cc:** [Schmeltzer, John](#); [richard.spies@vermont.gov](mailto:richard.spies@vermont.gov); [Schwer, Chuck](#)  
**Subject:** Groundwater designation in Shaftsbury  
**Date:** Monday, April 19, 2021 6:08:55 PM

---

**EXTERNAL SENDER: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.**

Dear Commissioner Walke:

This letter may have been remitted earlier but we send it again as I was unable to see it my sent folder. Our apologies if it is redundant.

We are Diana and Barry Mayer. We live at 743 Town Line Road in Shaftsbury. We have had our well tested for PFOA and PFAS since St. Gobain began the program. It has never exceeded 10.4 PPT and that was only once since 2016. It has mostly been below 6.6 PPT.

The proposal to identify water sources in an area that includes our home is understandable from a public health viewpoint. It will however affect the value of our property in spite of some claims by state officials to the contrary. Imagine if any of you were shopping for a home for your family and found that the well had been declared non-potable. I believe anyone would consider that an important negative in your consideration.

We believe the area proposed should have exceptions for tested water sources that are below the stated maximum of 20 PPT. It is our understanding that St. Gobain is responsible for drilling a new well and/or providing homeowners with a functioning filtration system if their wells exceed the maximum considered safe. We also feel that all wells in the area that are to be labeled non-potable should have remediation by St. Gobain so that our properties don't have that designation hanging over them.

Thank you for your consideration,

Diana and Barry Mayer

**From:** [Scott P. Malinowski](#)  
**To:** [Schmeltzer, John](#); [Spiese, Richard](#)  
**Subject:** Public comment. Cistern in lieu of well  
**Date:** Saturday, April 24, 2021 7:50:18 AM

---

**EXTERNAL SENDER: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.**

John and Richard

Given well challenges in my area and the forced reclass of groundwater to non potable.

Because the ground water is not potable. What if we put in a cistern in lieu of a drilled well and SG fills it with potable water in perpetuity?

Scott

--

-Scott

**From:** [Scott P. Malinowski](#)  
**To:** [Schmeltzer, John](#); [Spiese, Richard](#)  
**Subject:** Reclass comments  
**Date:** Thursday, May 13, 2021 9:03:48 AM

---

**EXTERNAL SENDER: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.**

John and Richard

I like the modifications to the reclass order, The wording is much more palatable or should I say (potable).

-Scott

**From:** [Al Bashevkin](#)  
**To:** [Schmeltzer, John](#); [Spiese, Richard](#)  
**Cc:** [Robin Outwater](#); [John Poggi](#); [Lincoln Coderre](#); [Dane Whitman](#); [Nancy Pearlman](#); [Richard Sears](#); [Brian Campion](#); [Tim Corcoran](#); [Hurd, Stuart](#); [Jeannie Jenkins](#); [Jeanne Conner](#); [Bruce Lee Clark](#); [Chad Gordon](#)  
**Subject:** Mapping the Reclassification area  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 25, 2021 10:21:29 AM

---

**EXTERNAL SENDER: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.**

John and Richard. The language for reclassification of the Bennington PFOA contaminated zone has evolved to something I can live with. I appreciate your efforts to have St Gobain continuously test our waters for PFAS compounds. I hope that someday funds will be available to extend the public water lines when appropriate to homes within this zone.

Next step is in communicating changes for the reclassification to the public. I would like to see the reclassification language clearly articulated to all who may do research of the zone. I believe that most will look at the map for information and lacking clarity on the map, people might not get the language for homes that have tested below the PFAS standard. The map ought to indicate the homes that have wells that have continuously tested below the PFOS regulatory standard and that this be clearly indicated. Otherwise, I fear that future home buyers might not be aware that wells exist in this area that are clean to drink from and meet the state standards, thus leaving those homes out of the reclassification zone.

A link on the map to another document indicating these changes, may not get the follow through to ensure people have the proper information.

Thanks for your attention to this comment.

--

***Al Bashevkin***  
*213 Settlers Road*  
*Bennington, VT 05201*  
[\*abashevkin@gmail.com\*](mailto:abashevkin@gmail.com)  
[\*www.albashevkin.com\*](http://www.albashevkin.com)  
*802 447-2486*