Understanding Dry-Cleaning Brownfields & PERC Contamination

- 1. What level of toxicity does PERC (tetrachloroethylene) and other VOCs (volatile organic compounds) rank on the EPA's hazardous substance list, and how does it compare to known deadly contaminants like arsenic, PCBs, and lead?
- 2. How does the widespread use of PERC in dry-cleaning—where people wear clothes cleaned with it daily—compare to its presence in the soil at 714 Baldwin Street?
- 3. If PERC is as dangerous as some claim, why has it been used in consumer products for decades,(E.g. Brake cleaner) and why is there no record of mass illnesses from exposure to dry-cleaned clothing?
- 4. Since PERC is a volatile organic compound (VOC), isn't it true that much of it evaporates rather than remaining in the soil long-term?
- 5. Can the DEC present any case studies proving that small amounts of residual PERC in soil (without active exposure to high concentrations) have caused serious health effects in humans?
- 6. Since PERC has an unmistakable smell, why have there been no recorded complaints of PERC odors from the community around 714 Baldwin Street?

714 Baldwin Street: A Decades-Old "Threat" That's Never Been a Public Emergency

- 7. Why has it taken the DEC nearly 20 years to address 714 Baldwin Street if it is an imminent public health hazard?
- 8. Wouldn't any real danger have required immediate action, including public warnings, evacuations, and health advisories?
- 9. If 714 Baldwin Street is contaminated enough to justify a cleanup, why have I, Julian Raven, who used the building as my art studio for a decade and lived in it for a year during COVID, shown no negative health effects?
- 10. Are the DEC or any public health officials willing to acknowledge that my personal experience living and working at 714 Baldwin Street, combined with medical tests showing no traces of PERC in my system, indicate that the site does not pose an imminent threat?
- 11. If PERC exposure is so dangerous, why has no one—including past or present tenants, employees, or neighbors—reported health problems linked to 714 Baldwin Street?

The Lack of Evidence That 714 Baldwin Street Was Ever a Dry Cleaner

12. What definitive evidence does the DEC have that 714 Baldwin Street was ever a dry-cleaning facility, rather than a uniform storage and distribution center?

- 13. How does the fact that the building never had a three-phase electrical power system (which dry-cleaning machines require) contradict claims that PERC contamination originated from inside the property?
- 14. Why is there no historical record, business registration, or local listing of any dry-cleaning business ever operating at 714 Baldwin Street?
- 15. Given that Diamond Cleaners, a confirmed dry-cleaning business located across the street, underwent cleanup for PERC contamination, what proof exists that their contamination did not migrate to 714 Baldwin Street?

Scientific & Geological Factors Affecting Contamination

- 16. Since underground aquifers were originally mapped as flowing southwest from the Diamond Cleaners site towards Baldwin St., how can the DEC now claim they flow conveniently in the opposite direction?
- 17. Given that high static water pressure and artesian well conditions exist at the site, making water gush from wellheads during heavy rains, how can the DEC be certain that PERC didn't migrate to the site from elsewhere?
- 18. Are DEC officials willing to admit that PERC migration through soil and groundwater over decades makes it nearly impossible to determine the exact source of contamination?
- 19. Have any independent environmental experts outside of the DEC been consulted to verify their findings about PERC contamination at 714 Baldwin Street?

Accountability & Transparency

20. Why was Julian Raven, the property owner who has cooperated and assisted the DEC for years, not notified by email as he requested and was promised about the April 10th public meeting, but instead had to hear about it through a friend who saw it on the news?