



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114

Charles D. Baker
GOVERNOR

Karyn E. Polito
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Kathleen A. Theoharides
SECRETARY

Tel: (617) 626-1000
Fax: (617) 626-1081
<http://www.mass.gov/cea>

May 15, 2019

FINAL RECORD OF DECISION

PROJECT NAME : Parallel Products of New England
PROJECT MUNICIPALITY : New Bedford
PROJECT WATERSHED : Buzzards Bay
EEA NUMBER : 15990
PROJECT PROPONENT : Parallel Products of New England, LLC
DATE NOTICED IN MONITOR : April 24, 2019

Pursuant to the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA, M.G.L.c.30, ss. 61-62I) and Section 11.11 of the MEPA regulations (301 CMR 11.00), I have reviewed the Expanded Environmental Notification Form (EENF) and hereby **grant** a Phase 1 Waiver that will allow the first phase of development, as described in the EENF, to proceed to permitting prior to completion of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) and Final EIR (FEIR) for the remaining development.

I received comment letters on the Draft Record of Decision from the City of New Bedford (City) and residents which identify concerns with the project. Comments from the City and City Councilor Brad Markey identify concerns with the noise, odor, traffic, and other cumulative impacts associated with full-build of the project. Comments from the City also request that I deny the Phase 1 Waiver request. I have weighed these concerns and considered the environmental impacts of Phase 1. I note that Phase 1, on its own, would not require MEPA review as it does not meet or exceed any MEPA review thresholds. Additionally, Phase 1 is an allowed use under the Proponent's existing General Permit for recycling operations. The Proponent will prepare Draft and Final EIRs which will provide additional opportunities for public review of the cumulative environmental impacts of the full-build project. Subsequent state and local permitting processes will also include additional meaningful opportunities for

review and refinement of potential environmental impacts and measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate environmental impacts.

Project Description

As described in the EENF, the project includes the phased construction of a glass recycling/processing facility; a solid waste handling and processing facility that will accept 1,500 tons per day (tpd) of municipal solid waste (MSW) and construction & demolition (C&D) waste; and a biosolids drying facility that will accept 50 dry tpd of biosolids.

Phase 1 includes construction of a glass recycling/processing facility within a 27,500-square foot (sf) building, construction of a railroad (RR) sidetrack from the main RR line to the glass processing facility, and installation of a 1.9 megawatt (MW) solar photovoltaic (PV) array. The glass recycling/processing facility will recycle glass collected through the Massachusetts bottle deposit system. Glass processing will include crushing, sizing and separation of the glass by color. Processed glass will be stored in bunkers until it is loaded into rail cars or trucks to shipment for bottle manufacturers. Phase 1 is proposed to meet an immediate regional need for glass processing in the region by providing an alternative market for glass that would otherwise be disposed.

Phase 2 includes construction of the MSW and C&D transfer station and the biosolids drying facility and extension of the RR sidetrack to service these facilities. Phase 2 will construct a 50,000-sf waste handling building which will be connected to an existing 103,000-sf building. The larger building will house processing equipment which will remove waste ban items and separate out recyclable materials. It also includes construction of a stand-alone 30,000-sf building to house the biosolids processing equipment. Biosolids processing will consist of drying the biosolids to reduce the volume and tonnage of the material prior to off-site disposal. Shipment of all outbound material will primarily occur via rail car.

Project Site

The 71-acre project site is located within the New Bedford Industrial Park at 100 Duchaine Boulevard in New Bedford. The site is generally bounded by industrial properties and Samuel Bernet Boulevard to the north, Phillips Road to the east, undeveloped land to the south, and a rail line and the Acushnet Cedar Swamp State Reservation to the west. The site was previously developed by the Polaroid Corporation and contains access roads, parking areas, stormwater management infrastructure and numerous buildings. The Proponent purchased the site in 2016 and has relocated a portion of its processing and recycling operations from 969 Shawmut Avenue to the project site. The site also contains 1.5 MW of solar PV mounted on a series of carport canopies. Access to the site is provided from Duchaine Boulevard, via an internal one-way loop roadway surrounding the proposed facility. The site has adequate area to support truck movement and access and is easily accessible from Route 140 (Alfred M Bessette Memorial Highway) via Braley Road or Phillips Road.

Wetland resource areas in the vicinity of the project include Bank, Bordering Vegetated Wetlands (BVW), Land under Water (LUW), and Riverfront Area. The project site is not located in Priority and/or Estimated Habitat as mapped by the Division of Fisheries and Wildlife's (DFW) Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program (NHESP) or an Area of Critical Environmental Concern

(ACEC). The site does not contain any structures listed in the State Register of Historic Places or the Massachusetts Historical Commission's (MHC) Inventory of Historic and Archaeological Assets of the Commonwealth.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation

According to the EENF, potential environmental impacts of Phase 1 include alteration of 4.6 acres of land, creation of 21,780 sf of impervious area, generation of 108 new average daily trips (adt), consumption of 150 gallons per day (gpd) of potable water, and generation of 150 gpd of wastewater. Phase 1 will impact BVW (4,087 sf), Bank (36 linear feet (lf), and Riverfront Area (900 sf).

The following commitments are proposed to avoid, minimize and mitigate environmental impacts associated with Phase 1 including: limiting all glass processing to an enclosed building; designing the RR crossing to reduce impacts to BVW and RFA; wetland replication; constructing the project on a previously altered site; use of rail to ship glass off-site; construction period erosion and sedimentation control measures; and generating renewable energy with solar PV systems.

Jurisdiction and Permitting

The project is undergoing MEPA review and requires the preparation of a mandatory EIR pursuant to Sections 11.03(5)(a)(6) and 11.03(9)(a) of the MEPA regulations because it requires State Agency Actions and will result in: New Capacity for storage, treatment, processing, combustion or disposal of 150 or more wet tpd of sewage sludge and New Capacity of 150 or more tpd for storage, treatment, processing, or disposal of solid waste (respectively). Because it requires an EIR, the project is subject to review in accordance with the MEPA Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions Policy and Protocol. The project is also subject to the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs' Environmental Justice (EJ) Policy.

The Proponent consulted with the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) and the MEPA Office regarding the enhanced outreach requirements of the EJ Policy. The Proponent published Spanish and Portuguese language versions of the MEPA Public Notice in El Planeta and the Portuguese Times (respectively) in addition to the New Bedford Times. The Proponent also notified the following organizations of the project and MEPA scoping session and provided them with a copy of the EENF: Coalition for Social Justice, Alternatives for Community & Environment, Hands Across the River Coalition, and Old Bedford Village. These were identified as EJ leaders based on consultation with MassDEP. The comment period was extended for two-weeks at the Proponent's request to provide additional time to review and comment on the EENF. The comment period commenced on February 20, 2019 and concluded on April 5, 2019. I accepted all late comments as allowed in accordance with 301 CMR 11.06(3). A MEPA site visit and scoping session was held on March 7, 2019. Spanish and Portuguese translation services were provided at the MEPA scoping session.

Phase 1 of the project will receive Financial Assistance from the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) Industrial Rail Access Program (IRAP) in the amount of \$500,000. Phase 1 will require an Order of Conditions from the New Bedford Conservation Commission (or in the case of

an appeal, a Superseding Order of Conditions from MassDEP). It may require an amended Site Plan Approval from the New Bedford Planning Board.

Because the Proponent is seeking Financial Assistance, MEPA jurisdiction is broad in scope and extends to all aspects of the project that may cause Damage to the Environment, as defined in the MEPA regulations.

Phase 1 Waiver Request

The Proponent submitted an EENF in support of its request for a Phase 1 Waiver. Consistent with this request, the EENF was subject to an extended 30-day public comment period. At the Proponent's request, the comment period was extended for an additional two-weeks and closed on April 12, 2019.

On April 12, 2019, I issued a Draft Record of Decision (DROD) proposing to grant a Phase 1 Waiver, provided that the Proponent hold a public meeting prior to the close of the comment period on the DROD. This provided the community with an additional opportunity to learn about and comment on the project. The DROD was published in the Environmental Monitor on April 24, 2019, commencing the 14-day public comment period, which concluded on May 8, 2019. The Proponent held a public meeting on the project on April 29, 2019 at 6:00 PM in the auditorium of the Pulaski Elementary School in New Bedford. The Proponent created and distributed a fact sheet for the project which provided a summary of the project and identified required permits and opportunities for public comment. Spanish and Portuguese translation services were also provided at the public meeting. The Proponent notified the following organizations of the meeting: Coalition for Social Justice, Alternatives for Community & Environment, Hands Across the River Coalition, Old Bedford Village, Conservation Law Foundation, and Toxics Action Center. Notice of the public meeting was also provided on the radio (1420 WBSM), through a Facebook campaign via New Bedford Guide, and published in the Standard Times on April 24th and 26-28th. The Proponent has committed to hold additional public meetings approximately every 30 days. I acknowledge the Proponent's outreach efforts and encourage the Proponent to continue this productive dialogue with stakeholders.

Standards for All Waivers

The MEPA regulations at 301 CMR 11.11(1) state that I may waive any provision or requirement in 301 CMR 11.00 not specifically required by MEPA and may impose appropriate and relevant conditions or restrictions, provided that I find that strict compliance with the provision or requirement would:

- (a) result in an undue hardship for the Proponent, unless based on delay in compliance by the Proponent; and
- (b) not serve to avoid or minimize Damage to the Environment.

Determinations for a Phase 1 Waiver

The MEPA regulations at 301 CMR 11.11(4) state that, in the case of a partial waiver of a mandatory EIR review threshold that will allow the proponent to proceed with Phase 1 of the project

prior to preparing an EIR, I shall base the finding required in accordance with 301 CMR 11.11(1)(b) on a determination that:

- (a) the potential environmental impacts of Phase 1, taken alone, are insignificant;
- (b) ample and unconstrained infrastructure facilities and services exist to support Phase 1;
- (c) the project is severable, such that Phase 1 does not require the implementation of any other future phase of the project or restrict the means by which potential environmental impacts from any other phase of the project may be avoided, minimized or mitigated; and
- (d) the agency action on Phase 1 will contain terms such as a condition or restriction, so as to ensure due compliance with MEPA and 301 CMR 11.00 prior to commencement of any other phase of the project.

Findings

Based upon review of the EENF, consultation with State Agencies, and review of public comments, I find that the Waiver Request has merit and that the Proponent has demonstrated that Phase 1 meets the standards for all waivers at 301 CMR 11.11(1). The EENF provided sufficient information regarding potential impacts for the purpose of MEPA review, it demonstrated that environmental impacts associated with Phase 1 are not significant and it identified measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate potential impacts.

As noted in the EENF and confirmed by MassDEP's comments on the EENF, there are limited outlets for recycling container glass within the Commonwealth and New England since the last glass bottle production facility in the region closed in 2018. This has resulted in increased shipping distances to bottle production facilities, which combined with a nationwide trucking shortage, has increased costs for recycling programs. Phase 1 will provide a new outlet for processing of glass bottles and will facilitate reliable and economical shipment of the glass to recycling markets and bottle manufacturers via rail car. Comments from MassDEP on the EENF confirm that Phase 1 will enhance glass processing in the region by offering alternative markets for those collecting and diverting container glass from landfills. Phase 1 includes construction of a building and installation of solar PV within previously altered and impervious areas and extension of a RR line using funds from MassDOT's IRAP grant program.

In light of the regional benefits and limited impacts associated with Phase 1, strict compliance with the requirement to prepare a Mandatory EIR for the project prior to Phase 1 would result in undue hardship and would delay the regional benefits to the glass recycling market identified in MassDEP's comment letter on the EENF. The Proponent will redevelop a previously altered site within an industrial park, which has adequate vehicular access and is easily accessible from Route 140 (Alfred M Bessette Memorial Highway). In addition, the Proponent has committed to implement adequate measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate Phase 1 impacts. Comments from MassDEP and MassDOT on the EENF indicate support for the Waiver. I find that strict compliance with the requirement to submit an EIR prior to completion of Phase 1 of the project would result in an undue hardship and would not serve to avoid or minimize Damage to the Environment.

In accordance with 301 CMR 11.11(4), the latter finding is based on my determination that:

1. The potential environmental impacts of Phase 1, taken alone, are insignificant.

Potential impacts associated with Phase 1 do not exceed ENF thresholds. The majority of development is located within previously altered and impervious areas. Potential environmental impacts of Phase 1 are primarily associated with construction of the RR side track which will alter wetland resource areas. The New Bedford Conservation Commission will review Phase 1 to determine its consistency with the Wetlands Protection Act (WPA), the Wetlands Regulations (310 CMR 10.00), and associated performance standards, including the Stormwater Management Standards (SMS). The Proponent will provide wetland replication and design the crossing to comply with MassDEP's Stream Crossing Standards.

2. Ample and unconstrained infrastructure facilities and services exist to support Phase 1.

The site provides infrastructure necessary to support Phase 1, including access roads, water and sewer, and electricity. Phase 1 will construct a RR extension to facilitate shipment of outbound material via rail car. Existing roadway infrastructure can accommodate traffic generation associated with the project. Based on the foregoing, I find that ample and unconstrained infrastructure exists to support Phase 1.

3. The project is severable, such that Phase 1 does not require the implementation of any other future phase of the project or restrict the means by which potential environmental impacts from any other phase of the project may be avoided, minimized or mitigated.

The Phase 1 project can function independently without the remaining development. Phase 1 does not require the implementation of remaining development phases or restrict the means by which potential environmental impacts from remaining development may be avoided, minimized, or mitigated.

4. The Agency Action(s) on Phase 1 will contain terms such as a condition or restriction, so as to ensure due compliance with MEPA and 301 CMR 11.00 prior to commencement of any other phase of the project.

The Proponent is seeking Financial Assistance from MassDOT for Phase 1. I hereby direct MassDOT to include a condition in their funding agreement that requires compliance with MEPA and 301 CMR 11.00 prior to commencement of Phase 2. Based on the foregoing, I find that Phase 1 of the project can commence prior to the completion of the MEPA review process.

Given the foregoing, and subject to the conditions included herein, I find that a requirement to complete MEPA review prior to Phase 1 is not necessary to demonstrate that it will avoid, minimize, and mitigate potential Damage to the Environment to the maximum extent practicable, and that a requirement to do so would therefore cause undue hardship and would not serve to minimize Damage to the Environment.

Conclusion

Based on these findings, I have determined that this waiver request has merit. A DROD was issued on April 12, 2019 and was published in the Environmental Monitor on April 24, 2019 in accordance with 301 CMR 11.15(2), which began the public comment period. The public comment

period lasted for 14 days and concluded on May 8, 2019. Accordingly, I hereby **grant** a Phase 1 Waiver to allow the Proponent to proceed with Phase 1 of the project prior to completing the EIR process.

May 15, 2019
Date

K. Theoharides
Kathleen A. Theoharides

Comments received on the DROD:

- 05/02/2019 City Councilor Brad Markey
 - 05/05/2019 Ron Cabral
 - 05/10/2019 Jonathan F. Mitchell, Mayor, City of New Bedford
 - 05/15/2019 Donna Poyant
- Form letter beginning "I am strongly opposed to the..." (1 received)

KAT/PRC/prc



City of New Bedford

Office of City Council

133 William Street • New Bedford, Massachusetts 02740
(508) 979-1455 • Fax: 508-979-1451

Brad Markey
Councillor Ward One

RECEIVED

MAY 10 2019

MEPA

May 2, 2019

RE: EEA 15990 Parallel Products

Dear Ms. Czepiga

I am writing you regarding my concerns and the concerns of the residents in the surrounding areas on the Parallel Products project which is a proposed expansion at 100 Duchaine Blvd. in the New Bedford Industrial Park. The Industrial Park as well as the proposed expansion abuts heavily populated neighborhoods and we are concerned that this expansion can have a detrimental effect on these neighborhoods.

There are many concerns with the processing at this facility, health concerns of toxins being emitted into the air, odor, as well as issues with the proximity to wet lands.

Other issues effecting the quality of life in the area from this project would be noise, air pollution from the processing and, with the increase of truck traffic going into this facility every day, air quality from the diesel emissions.

While air quality is a major concern there is also traffic issues. With the many trucks making their way into the facility this is adding more traffic congestion into an already high traffic area.

I ask you to carefully review this project and to consider the neighborhood's concerns which are stated above and to their quality of living.

Sincerely,

Brad Markey

City Councilor Ward 1



CITY OF NEW BEDFORD
JONATHAN F. MITCHELL, MAYOR

May 10, 2012

Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (EEA)
Attention: MEPA Office
Paige Czepiga: EEA No. 15990
100 Cambridge St, Suite 900
Boston MA 02114

RE: EEA 15990: Parallel Products

Dear Ms. Czepiga,

I write in strong opposition to the establishment of a glass/solid waste/biosolids processing facility to be operated by Parallel Products at 100 Duchaine Boulevard in New Bedford. In addition, I strongly urge MEPA to deny a Phase I Waiver to allow Parallel Products to proceed with the first phase of development as described in the April 12, 2019 Draft Record of Decision.

The company has operated a glass bottle recycling operation at the location for some time in compliance with local zoning, site plan conditions, and conservation restrictions. However, the site as newly conceived, would be an entirely different creature--especially with the inclusion of a biosolids processing facility as detailed in the company's MEPA filing in February.

On March 29 I submitted comments to MEPA regarding the proposed project. The concerns and objections I raised on behalf of the City all remain valid. (I refer you to items 1-7 contained in the letter.) Most important, I made clear then, as well as in several subsequent public remarks, that the burden was on the company to demonstrate that its project would not pose a threat to the quality of life in surrounding neighborhoods.

Since that time, concerns regarding the potential odor, noise, and traffic impacts of the Parallel Products proposal have grown significantly among both neighborhood residents and municipal departments. Based on what we have learned in recent weeks regarding potential odor, noise, and traffic impacts, there is ample evidence to conclude that this project is wrong for New Bedford.

With respect to the company's Waiver request, I believe it important for MEPA to consider the request in the full context of the development proposed at the site. The first development phase is now a part of a much larger, more impactful, multi-faceted project. It is therefore imperative that permitting authorities revise their approach accordingly. For example, at least one component in the first phase (rail access) now also has a direct connection to uses (including biosolid processing) that are being contemplated in future phases. In this broader context, it does not make sense to treat any Phase I component in isolation.

It is therefore wrong and irresponsible to provide a Waiver for certain aspects of the proposed expansion and allow the facility to be effectively approved piecemeal by the state, without adequate analysis and an understanding of the cumulative impact of the project as a whole. On behalf of local residents and businesses, I urge MEPA to refrain from approving any Waivers and instead mandate a full Environmental Impact Report be completed before any state decisions are made on any aspect of development at the site.

Thank you for this opportunity to express my opposition to the Waiver and the project more generally.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jon Mitchell', written over a large, stylized scribble.

Jon Mitchell

CC: Energy & Environmental Affairs Secretary Kathleen Theoharides
MassDEP Commissioner Martin Suuberg
Senator Mark Montigny
Representative Paul Schmid
Representative Christopher Hendricks
New Bedford City Council
New Bedford Planning Board

Czepiga, Page (EEA)

From: Buckley, Deirdre (EEA)
Sent: Wednesday, May 15, 2019 1:05 PM
To: Czepiga, Page (EEA)
Subject: FW: Parallel products of New Bedford

-----Original Message-----

From: Schwalbert, Nick (EEA) <nick.schwalbert@mass.gov> On Behalf Of internet, env (EEA)
Sent: Wednesday, May 15, 2019 1:01 PM
To: Buckley, Deirdre (EEA) <deirdre.buckley@mass.gov>
Subject: FW: Parallel products of New Bedford

Sending your way per Sarah's request.

Nicholas Schwalbert
617-626-1022

-----Original Message-----

From: Donna [<mailto:dmpeko@comcast.net>]
Sent: Wednesday, May 15, 2019 11:07 AM
To: internet, env (EEA)
Subject: Parallel products of New Bedford

I am writing as I believe the site description in EEA #15990 is deceiving. It does not reflect the hundreds of single family home east of Phillips road. It describes a site surrounded by industrial sites.

It also states that glass processing is limited to enclosed building. Glass processing is occurring under a canopy and residents whose home are only a few hundred feet away are already noting odors and noise issues.

I am writing to request your agency review this decision as well as deny phase 2 which would have a great affect on the adjacent neighborhoods.

Donna Poyant
39 Ridgewood Rd New Bedford MA 02745

Sent from my iPhone

Secretary of Energy & Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114
Attn: MEPA Office

RECEIVED

MAY 02 2019

MEPA

RE: Parallel Products of New England, LLC

I am **strongly opposed** to the Parallel Products of New England, LLC Waste Transfer Station project at 100 Duchaine Boulevard, New Bedford, MA. We do not need this horrendous project in our neighborhood.

There is no good reason to impose a facility like this on a community that has plenty of capacity for the disposal of waste. We do not want to be the dumping ground of Southeastern Massachusetts. As a group we will use whatever means necessary to make sure our neighborhood is not dumped on!!

Sincerely,

Signature Robert E Charon

Name ROBERT E CHARON

Address 3913 ACUSHNET AVE
NEW BEDFORD MA

Czepiga, Page (EEA)

From: Ron <rrcrt@aol.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 05, 2019 11:55 PM
To: antonio.cabral@mahouse.gov; chris.hendricks@mahouse.gov; christopher.markey@mahouse.gov; paul.schmid@mahouse.gov; william.straus@mahouse.gov; michael.moynihan@masenate.gov; mark.montigny@masenate.gov; Ian.Abreu@newbedford-ma.gov; Naomi.Carney@newbedford-ma.gov; Debora.Coelho@newbedford-ma.gov; Hugh.Dunn@newbedford-ma.gov; Brian.Gomes@newbedford-ma.gov; Dana.Rebeiro@newbedford-ma.gov; Linda.Morad@newbedford-ma.gov; Joseph.Lopes@newbedford-ma.gov; Brad.Markey@newbedford-ma.gov; Maria.Giesta@newbedford-ma.gov; Scott.Lima@newbedford-ma.gov; Jon.Mitchell@newbedford-ma.gov; kristine.arsenault@newbedfordma.gov
Cc: Buckley, Deirdre (EEA); Schluter, Eve (EEA); Wixon, Josephine (EEA); Canaday, Anne (EEA); Patel, Purvi (EEA); Czepiga, Page (EEA); Strysky, Alexander (EEA); Flaherty, Erin (EEA); MEPA (ENV); TimC@parallelproducts.com; newbedford@parallelproducts.com
Subject: Fwd: Attached letter ref Parallel Products, Inc.
Attachments: Draft-Record-of-Decision-April-12-2019.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Good morning

Please read the attached letter regarding Parallel Products and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Environment and Energy. I was quite surprised when I read the letter in particular Page 3 Paragraph 2 which is copied below.

The Proponent consulted with MassDEP and the MEPA Office regarding the enhanced outreach requirements of the EJ Policy. The Proponent published Spanish and Portuguese language versions of the MEPA Public Notice in El Planeta and the Portuguese Times (respectively) in addition to the New Bedford Standard Times. The Proponent also notified the following organizations of the project and MEPA scoping session and provided them with a copy of the EENF: Coalition for Social Justice, Alternatives for Community & Environment, Hands Across the River Coalition, and Old Bedford Village. These were identified as EJ leaders based on consultation with MassDEP. The comment period was extended for two-weeks at the Proponent's request to provide additional time to review and comment on the EENF. The comment period commenced on February 20, 2019 and concluded on April 5, 2019. I accepted all late comments as allowed in accordance with 301 CMR 11.06(3). A MEPA site visit and scoping session was held on March 7, 2019. Spanish and Portuguese translation services were provided at the MEPA scoping session.

Just wondering if any of the City and State Officials knew about this meeting? If so, why wasn't the residents in the area invited or made aware of this meeting?

Why were the Coalition for Social Justice, Alternatives of Community & Environment, Hands Across the River Coalition, and Old Bedford Village invited?

Also read that the company wants the state to give \$500,000 for a side rail line to the property. This company is privately owned, why should we the taxpayers pay for a side rail line for the Parallel Products, Inc.? We are unable to get a commuter rail line from New Bedford to Boston although the state is working on it, lol.

We the residents/taxpayers, which I have been in contact with many, in the area deserve another meeting to be held at the Pulaski School, Parallel Products, Inc. should post at their expense in all news media a notice of such meeting, and being in large print. Hopefully Mayor Mitchel would be able to attend this meeting, sadly he was unable to attend the April 29th meeting.

Again, I would like to know if anyone of the City Officials, or State Officials knew about this meeting, I would like to hear from City and State Officials, that is if anyone is willing to respond.

My E-mail address is: RRCRT@aol.com

Respectfully,

***Ron R. Cabral
67 Blaze Road
New Bedford, MA 02745***