

Dear Mr Casolo:

Thank you for taking the time to talk about the Bartlett Arboretum Phase II proposal last Thursday evening, before the Board of Finance meeting. I wanted to share some of my specific comments on the Phase I, and how the Phase II might be improved. I had hoped to comment before the Phase II proposal was submitted to the Board of Finance for approval, but for some reason, the proposal itself was not available for public review or comment until 75 minutes before the Board of Finance meeting.

If you have any specific questions about these comments or my documented sources, most of which were published by the Bartlett Tree Research Laboratories, please don't hesitate to ask. My intent is to improve, if possible, on the good work done in the Phase I, and to help make the Phase II study as productive, efficient and cost effective as possible – and to help make sure that there are no lingering unaddressed questions.

The current 64-acre Arboretum site was once part of a research facility that boasted of “200 acres of experimental grounds”; I also hope that a complete Phase II study of the Arboretum will also help inform decisions made by the current institutional and residential owners of the remaining 130+ acres – a secondary public benefit.

The below list includes items that may have been forgotten, overlooked, or dismissed during the Phase I ESA. I am not challenging the competent work done by TRC, but am merely hoping to add to it.

1. On March 9, 2010, the Stamford Advocate ran a news story that mentioned an old dump site at the Arboretum, containing burned and buried trash. The pit is near the intersection of an access road and the “Azalea Road” trail, just north of the Maintenance Building in the northwest corner of the property. Arboretum board president Ken DellaRocco suggested to me that some of the specimen bottles found in that pit may be remnants from the UConn master gardener program.
2. Immediately west of the Educational Building site, across the driveway, was an “Insectarium” building constructed in 1929 and demolished in the mid-1980s by UConn. Perhaps the best description of the physical location can be found on Map # 6475 in the Town Clerk's office – it is labeled as a 1-Story Frame Building. As a building devoted to the study of Insects, it might be a good place to look for possible pesticide releases, and to study with GPR for underground storage tanks.
3. Near the Poorhouse Brook bridge on Brookdale Road, almost equidistant from the Brook and the small pond, was a “Tree Surgery School” building constructed in the 1930s and also demolished in the mid-1980s by UConn. In an

issue of "Tree Talk" dated Spring 1927, page 13, Bartlett discussed a disinfecting solution made with mercuric chlorine and mercuric cyanide. You might consider focusing on this site for metals and pesticides, and also study with GPR for underground storage tanks.

4. Three patents suggest the possibility of research with asbestos for use in living trees – Patent 1,606,051 filed by Dr Bartlett, Patent 1,652,222 filed by Albert Vick, an employee of Bartlett, and Patent 1,545,999 filed by Dr Bartlett. These may all relate to a trademarked filler called NuWud that was used by Bartlett's dendricians. Old maps of the Tree Research Laboratory show "training grounds for dendricians" on the eastern side of Poorhouse Brook, outside the AOC-1 identified in TRC's Phase I report.

5. On the southern side of Brookdale Road, there is a one-acre parcel that is part of the Arboretum. A 1947 "visitor map" of the Tree Research Laboratory mentions ongoing spray research conducted in that parcel, to control a boxwood nematode. The specific pesticide(s) were not mentioned.

6. An April 1965 issue of "Tree Topics" discusses disposal methods for Bidrin, a systemic insecticide, and first suggests "burying them in a swamp or some wild area that contains moisture." There is a swamp at the Arboretum, along High Ridge Road.

7. Finally, I wanted to call attention to the old, hand-dug, partially abandoned well immediately to the west of the Visitor's Center, which might be used very inexpensively to monitor groundwater, without the need to drill a mini-well.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Phase I report and the Phase II proposal. I hope these comments can be of some help as the City moves forward with these empirical studies.

Best regards,