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CHAIRMAN PARKER: Good morning. I now call this session of the public hearing of the application by the State of Maine Bureau of General Services for a 9.35 million cubic yard expansion of the Juniper Ridge Landfill in Old Town and Alton. My name is Jim Parker, I'm from Veazie, I'm the chair of the Board of Environmental Protection and I'm the presiding officer for this hearing. Other members of the Board are Tom Eastler from Farmington, Kathleen Chase from Wells, Jonathan Mapes from Springvale, Alvin Ahlers from Yarmouth, Tom Dobbins from Scarborough and Mark Draper from Caribou. To my right is Mary Sauer, she's the assistant attorney general assigned as counsel for the Board. To my left is Cindy Bertocci, she's the Board's executive analyst and far to the left is Ruth Ann Burke, the Board's administrative assistant. DEP staff present today are Richard Behr, Steve Farrar, Kathy Tarbuck, David Burns, Jim Beyer and

Lynn Caron and Victoria Eleftheriou may be here.
I don't see her in her seat but she's here, I believe. This hearing is being recorded and transcribed by Joanne Alley from Alley \& Morrisette Reporting.

This is day two of the hearing and today we're going to begin with Mr. Spencer, who is an intervenor. If there are any members of the public here today that would like to ask a question of a witness, you may submit your questions to me in writing. Paper is available at the water station at the back of the room. Please leave your questions on the table and staff will collect them periodically. I will review the questions and make a determination as to their relevance and ask the questions as time permits.

At this time $I$ ask all persons testifying who have not already been sworn in to stand and raise their right hand. I think most of you were sworn in yesterday, $I$ believe, but thank you, and again, $I$ 'm going to ask the testimony -- to speak clearly and slowly so that Joanne can stay with us. Okay. Mr. Spencer, the floor is yours.

MR. SPENCER: Good morning.
CHAIRMAN PARKER: Make sure the mike is on.

MR. SPENCER: Can you hear me? Now?
CHAIRMAN PARKER: We got you.
MR. SPENCER: What $I$ plan on doing here is just summarizing my written testimony. I may pull a couple of paragraphs out of my rebuttal testimony as well, but $I$ plan on just sticking mostly with my pre-filed written testimony.

So let's start with Maine State Waste Hierarchy in regards to construction and demolition debris and oversize bulky waste. One of the primary issues we need to be concerned with as the State Bureau of General Services contemplates an expansion of our Juniper Ridge Landfill is how our State Waste Hierarchy is applied to waste entering JRL. The Department of Environmental Protection is charged with evaluating an expansion and in so doing, consults laws and rules that set regulatory procedures and standards for landfills. Only in the past several years has our waste hierarchy become a criteria governing how we handle waste in Maine and this expansion procedure is the first time DEP will fully implement the hierarchy as a rule of the State of Maine in regard to waste disposal
facilities.
According to MRS 2101, Maine Solid Waste Management Hierarchy mandates that from the -from most preferred to least preferred, we should first strive for waste reduction at the source, then reuse, recycling, composting, waste processing, then waste to energy and then land disposal. JRL is, therefore, the least desirable outcome for waste in Maine.

In addition, under recycling and source reduction determination rules set forth in 38 MRS 1310-N5A, it says that "an applicant for a new or expanded solid waste disposal facility shall demonstrate that, one, the proposed solid waste disposal facility will accept solid waste that is subject to recycling and source reduction programs voluntary or otherwise at least as effective as those imposed by this chapter and other provisions of state law."

Without identifying where the material coming into JRL actually became a waste, it is impossible for DEP, as regulator, to truly ascertain if that waste has been fully reduced at the source as well as being subjected to other requirements of our hierarchy before being
landfilled. It is absolutely vital that these provisions of state law be fully enforced given that permitted landfill space is extremely valuable. CDD and its derivatives have accounted for roughly half the waste coming into JRL from its beginning in 2003; in fact, for the last five years, 2011 through 2015, waste categorized as construction and demolition debris, oversize bulky waste and C\&D process fines have, when combined, accounted for over 57 percent of Juniper Ridge Landfill inputs.

In 2010 and 2011, OBW, that's oversize bulky waste, inputs to JRL are listed at 96,500 and 98,888 tons respectively. This may well be why DEP Commissioner Aho attached condition three to her public benefit determination partial approval in 2012. DEP could see that this category of JRL waste was increasing at an extremely rapid pace with volumes of OBW amounts from 2000 -- 2007 being 9, 649 tons, 2008 OBW being 21,405 tons, and 2008 OBW listed at 51,438 tons. Were this increase from 2007 to 2010 to have continued at this pace through 2015, just the OBW portion of waste entering JRL would have eclipsed the total tonnages into JRL by 2014. This had to
have been of major concern to regulators.
Also contained in the conclusions of the public benefit determination it directs the State Planning Office, now the Bureau of General

Services as owner, and Casella to amend their Operating Services Agreement. This was in response to her concerns that there were large amounts of $C D D$ and $C D D$ residues coming into JRL in 2013 -- oh, excuse me -- it should say CDD residues coming into JRL, including oversize bulky waste through Casella's KTI processing facility in Lewiston. This facility was sold to ReEnergy in 2013 and still accounts for most of the CDD imports into JRL. ReEnergy has made some progress in reducing the percentage of its waste inputs that are imported from out of state but still the vast majority of waste entering the Lewiston processor and continuing to Juniper Ridge were not discarded in Maine. The original justification for these imports was to provide fuel for the mill boiler in Old Town. Commissioner Aho noted in the PBD that the Old Town boiler was not functioning and this continues to be the case today.

November 2 nd, 2006 , second amendment to the OSA's fuel supply agreement allowed CDD
imports to be used for fuel for all boilers in Maine, whereas up until that time, imports were only allowed to provide fuel for the Old Town mill boiler. Despite these changes, there is little to no fuel from CDD being burned at any boilers in Maine. I believe that this is why Commissioner Aho mandated that the OSA be amended; however, Casella and BGS refused to comply with the PBD directive and their excuse is that, quote, it is not an enforceable obligation, end quote.

My opinion is that until the applicants comply with all the conditions and conclusions of the public benefit determination, that any expansion should be put on hold or denied until there is compliance. CDD in its various forms has been coming in to Juniper Ridge for almost 13 years without adequate assurance of source reduction and the public has had to rely on accounting (sic) for accounting -- to rely on Casella for accounting with no help from our state agencies discernible.

In the DECD letter of July 11th, 2016, which is our Exhibit \#3, Spencer 3, which was signed by Michael Barden of BGS and Jeremy Labbe of Casella, here is how they described oversize
bulky waste and its relationship to the economy. Quote, OBW generated by a CDD processing facility is a material that is generated as a result of recycling CDD. This is an activity that should be encouraged. As economic activity increases, CDD volumes increase, resulting in an increase in oversize bulky waste generation as evidenced in the volume shown on the attached chart. Applying an arbitrary limit on OBW acceptance in the JRL expansion could have the direct result of limiting CDD recycling or causing an increased financial burden for CDD processing facilities in Maine, end quote. They seem to be arguing that higher volumes of oversize bulky waste into JRL is a very positive thing for Maine's economy. If this were the case, then why were OBW inputs into JRL at their highest in 2010 and 2011 while the economies of the United States and Maine were struggling to pull out of the steepest recession since World War II. What's more, overall combined categories of CDD varied little during these years but OBW deliveries to Juniper Ridge were at their highest levels; therefore, oversize bulky waste volumes did not correspond with higher CDD outputs overall. Mr. Barden should be prepared to explain
his statements at the public hearing this fall, if not before. Furthermore, Barden and Labbe in that same letter say that landfilling of oversize bulky waste was the best way to handle OBW according to the Maine DEP Maine Materials Management Plan, January 2014, Appendix C.

It needs to be pointed out that rules on Maine's waste hierarchy have changed since that date. Most of the materials in mattresses can be recycled into metal, wood and fabric. Appliances have metal components and the copper linings in their motors are among the most valuable of recycled materials. Furniture, likewise, can be taken apart and largely recycled. So we need to know how much effort was actually put into recycling at the true source of the oversize bulky waste which may well be beyond Maine's borders. It is also possible that waste coming into Maine's CDD processors are sent there to avoid stricter rules on landfilling in the jurisdiction where they were discarded.

To fully understand construction and demolition debris waste volumes into Juniper Ridge in the past and predict them in the future, should JRL be expanded, it is necessary to develop an
overall comprehensive portrait of Casella's network of landfills throughout the northeastern United States. We have heard that Casella either owns or operates 13 landfills in their network. How many of these are licensed to accept CDD?

What are the volumes at those facilities? What are the volumes of oversize bulky waste at Casella's non-Juniper Ridge landfills? Do they also use CDD fines for daily cover and where do these fines come from? Where does the CDD that comes to Juniper Ridge actually become a waste? Where are the points of discard? What are the rules on source reduction and recycling where these materials are discarded and do they meet or exceed the standards and effectiveness of waste required in Maine?

The DEP needs a lot more information from Casella and BGS before they can confidently assure the public that our rules on waste hierarchy are being fully implemented both currently and in the future at the Juniper Ridge Landfill.

This is under my section design and operation of the proposed expansion. The standards for landfill construction -- the standard for landfill construction is that there
must be a six-year travel time to sensitive receptors. It sounds like that is how long it would take for any escaped toxins to get into an aquifer, etcetera. This does not inspire confidence. It is as if we are planning for a leak. If the liner system is breached, it is difficult or impossible to fix it with all the waste in place. From the beginning of a leak, it may take six years to get to drinking water sources but once that leak starts, it will leak basically forever. So while the Juniper Ridge Landfill is called a secure landfill, at the same time plans are in place that anticipate failure of the systems.

On April 10th, 2008, at a landfill site assessment hearing before the Board of Health in Southbridge, Massachusetts, David Bonnett, a civil engineer, landfill site professional and expert witness for Casella Waste testified under oath that, quote, all liners leak, end quote. That's my exhibit Spencer 5. This information is relevant to an expansion of Juniper Ridge landfill.

Stormwater management, the public and environmental systems may be at risk from
insufficient preparations for extreme precipitation events at $J R L$ after an expansion and at present. Not long after Casella started operating Juniper Ridge in 2003, there was a very heavy rain that washed out the stormwater control systems and spread sediment off the landfill footprint. There is a conflict in DEP regulations because the criteria only calls for building for a 25-year precipitation event. An event of this magnitude, $I^{\prime} m$ referencing to a large, you know, extreme rainfall event, an event of magnitude will surely happen at Juniper Ridge and it could be at any time. The earlier event at JRL must have violated at least some of the Natural Resource Protection Act NRPA standards. In the BEP handout from May 19th, 2016, that's exhibit Spencer 1 , some of the experts -- excerpts affected at that time and in a future storm would include soil erosion, harm to habitats and fisheries, and lower water quality. There is a conflict because rules only call for a 25-year flood threshold and at the same time, building for that lower standard will not adequately protect the environment and prevent harm to public welfare.

Monitoring ground and surface water
leachate and landfill gas, if one reads through the Juniper Ridge annual reports and the comments of DEP personnel such as Richard Behr, there's a commonly repeated event, a monitoring well will show some abnormal results and the monitors will conclude that it is due to construction activity at the landfill. Landfills are always under construction. Juniper Ridge grows every day year-round. Why aren't there more objective measurements of water quality that are not influenced by construction activities? What if DEP staff was to go back and for every result where construction activity was blamed for unusual results, instead look at what could be happening to cause aberrations. Experts say that all landfills leak and any delay in tracking down possible breaches in the liner systems just reduces the opportunity to remedy the situation. Leachate disposal is especially troubling in regard to an expanded JRL. Casella and BGS has been extremely lax in reporting changes to leachate disposal agreements. In their July lith, 2016 letter to DEP, that's exhibit Spencer 3, Michael Barden and Jeremy Labbe revealed that Casella had signed a new leachate disposal
contract with the owner of the Old Town mill in April. So three months after the fact, they reveal this contract. During that period of time, there were meetings on expansion where Barden, Labbe, other Casella personnel and attorneys were present, along with DEP staff and never mentioned that the leachate disposal contract had changed. This reminds one of back in November of 2006 when Casella signed new contracts for fuel supply and leachate disposal and incorporated them into the second amendment to the Operating Services Agreement. They never disclosed these changes which drastically expanded CDD deliveries to Juniper Ridge. Only through citizen inquiry were these changes made public and not until 2008 .

The Old Town mill has not operated since last fall, 2015. At bankruptcy court it was sold to a group that tries to sell off individual mill assets and scraps the rest. Beginning last November, about 800,000 gallons of Juniper Ridge Landfill leachate per month were taken to the wastewater treatment plant at the Old Town mill. The new contract says that Casella will get the leachate pH between 5 and 9 before putting it into the mill system. This is a wide range of pH and
only tested twice a year.
Alternatives analysis, central to the NRPA application as well as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers application is something called an alternatives analysis. Sean Mahaney of the Corps explained to me that to them this is an attempt to determine if this activity, expanding room for waste at Juniper Ridge Landfill, is unavoidable and has any alternatives to disposal and its accompanying destruction of wetlands. Now, in Chapter 310 , wetlands and waterbodies protection, in Section 5, general standards, A, avoidance, quote, the activity will be considered to result in an unreasonable impact if the activity will cause a loss in wetland area functions or values and there is a practicable alternative to the activity that would be less damaging to the environment. That's in the BEP handout Spencer 1 exhibit. Obviously if there was less waste in need of disposal at Juniper Ridge there would be less pressure to expand and any expansion would last longer. During the period of time between the expansion application being submitted and accepted as complete for processing, DEP staff analyzed waste streams into Juniper Ridge. In a
letter from Michael Parker of DEP to Casella and BGS on January 22nd, 2016, that's exhibit Spencer 7, DEP staff presented Chapter 400.4.N, solid waste management hierarchy.

After looking at seven categories of waste into Juniper Ridge, they commented, quote, of these seven categories, front end process residue and municipal solid waste ash currently have no other viable management option, end quote. This was for 2014. Front end process residue, 57,000 tons and municipal solid waste ash, 54,000 tons comprised only 19.8 percent of the total from these seven waste streams, the total was 559,000 tons and once again this is for 2014 .

DEP staff did not say where else these wastes could go, but it sounds like at that point in time there was considered to be a, quote, practicable alternative to the activity, end quote, of bringing most waste to Juniper Ridge. In addition, the PERC incinerator in Orrington where the FEPR and ash come from is committed to burning one-third less municipal solid waste after March 2018. Remember also that DEP's stated goal is to reduce statewide waste by five percent every two years.

Summary, essential considerations before any expansion of Juniper Ridge should be -- any expansion of Juniper Ridge should be permitted should remember the basics. 38 MRS 1310-N1, licenses, this is Exhibit 1, page 11 , the Department shall issue a license for a waste facility whenever it finds that facility will not pollute any water of the state, contaminate the ambient air, constitute a hazard to our welfare or create a nuisance. Volume of the waste and the risks related to its handling and disposal have been reduced to the maximum practical extent by recycling and source reduction prior to disposal, and practices are consistent with the state's Solid Waste Management Hierarchy. Juniper Ridge Landfill should not be issued a permit for expansion until Casella and BGS have fully complied with the conclusions and conditions of the public benefit determination license from January of 2012, including placing a limit on oversize bulky waste deliveries, amending the Operating Services Agreement to reduce CDD imports from out of state and conducting independent third-party audits of large CDD processing facilities. All concerns of the public need to be
considered carefully and alternatives discussed.
I think I just want to add, if $I$ could, one paragraph on page 3 of my rebuttal testimony. This was in reference to Ms. Toni King's testimony. On page 6 of her testimony it says, quote, the ultimate decision on the waste management technique used by the generators is not within the control of either BGS or NEWSME, end quote. Instead of making sure that waste into Juniper Ridge Landfill are being fully reduced at the source before they get to Juniper Ridge, Casella and BGS rely on the generators of that waste to comply with provisions of our hierarchy. This has been the practice at JRL to date but moving forward and certainly at an expanded Juniper Ridge, the hierarchy should be strictly enforced and the true sources of waste need to be revealed so that the $D E P$ as regulator can ascertain whether source reduction and recycling has actually been, quote, at least as effective as those imposed by this chapter. Failure of waste generators to furnish Casella and BGS with information about the true source or point of discard of all waste should result in exclusion from JRL. It is no secret that a high percentage
of Juniper Ridge Landfill wastes were discarded out of state but have been admitted using seemingly legal but creative definitions and practices. Wastes discarded beyond our borders should not be exempt from our waste hierarchy. Thanks. I think I'll leave it at that.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Thank you, Mr. Spencer.
We'll open it up now for some cross. First will be the applicant.

MR. DOYLE: Good morning, Mr. Spencer.
MR. SPENCER: Good morning.

MR. DOYLE: Could you tell us where you
live in Old Town?

MR. SPENCER: I live on property bounded on one side by the Kirkland Road and the other side by Pushaw Stream approximately a mile and three-quarters from Juniper Ridge Landfill.

MR. DOYLE: So what is your address?

MR. SPENCER: 1140 Kirkland Road.

MR. DOYLE: Can you point out on the Exhibit 10 , which is a site map of the Juniper Ridge Landfill and the surrounding area, where you live on that map?

MR. SPENCER: This would be Pushaw Stream.

I think we might need another map. I can't tell
from this if -- actually $I$ think we would be right there.

MR. DOYLE: So off the map?
MR. SPENCER: Off this map.
MR. DOYLE: Okay, and I think you said about one and three-quarter miles away?

MR. SPENCER: I think so approximately.
MR. DOYLE: And the expansion is moving to the north of the landfill, of the current landfill, correct?

MR. SPENCER: Yes. Can you hear me okay?
CHAIRMAN PARKER: Go back to the --

MR. EASTLER: You're welcome to use this pointer right here if you'd like to.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: That's all right, go back to the table. I want you on the microphone.

MR. SPENCER: Yeah, sorry.

MR. DOYLE: And the question was, and the expansion is actually slightly further away from your -- from your house than existing JRL, correct?

MR. SPENCER: Not all of it but most of it, you're right.

MR. DOYLE: On page 2 of your direct testimony, you propose a way to interpret the

Waste Management Hierarchy. Isn't it true that DEP has adopted a rule, Chapter $400.4 N$, the rule Toni King highlighted yesterday in her testimony, that describes how it will apply the hierarchy to solid waste facilities, including landfills, incinerators and waste processing facilities?

MR. SPENCER: I don't have 400.4 in front of me, but is this the most recent addition to the hierarchy rules?

MR. DOYLE: Yes.
MR. SPENCER: Okay.
MR. DOYLE: Here is -- I'm handing you
Chapter 400.4N. Isn't it true that nowhere in Maine law does it state that the Waste Management Hierarchy must be applied at the, quote, point of discard, closed quote?

MR. SPENCER: I'm not a lawyer, okay, and I really can't afford legal advice so as far as your wanting to make me -- have me make a blanket statement, isn't this true, I -- I -- I'm kind of torn. I don't know that it is true and I don't know that it's false and I don't want to take your word for it, but we could proceed on that basis if you'd like to.

MR. DOYLE: Take a look at the rule. Do
you see the words "point of discard" anywhere in that rule?

MR. SPENCER: I'll say this, I use the word "point of discard" synonymously with source.

MR. DOYLE: On pages -- if they don't own or control the generators of waste, how can BGS or NEWSME control what generators do with the waste after it's been generated?

MR. SPENCER: That's kind of the crux of the matter. I think given the current way things are set up it's really hard for them to do but I also know that as part of the Operating Services Agreement, it does say that the state shall control the landfill. So you can't deny that there is a burden to control the waste coming in. There has to be some standards. For example, there's standards on hazardous waste.

MR. DOYLE: Yeah, you've made that statement a number of times that the OSA says that the state shall control the landfill. Where in the OSA does it say that?

MR. SPENCER: I'm not sure, but I'm very confident its in there.

MR. DOYLE: Isn't it true that you're not sure because it's not there?

MR. SPENCER: Actually, all right, can I make an amendment to my statement then? It's either in the Operating Services Agreement or it's in the request for proposals for an operator of the landfill.

MR. DOYLE: Doesn't the agreement control between two parties?

MR. SPENCER: With the understanding that everybody who replied to the request for proposals to operate the agreement (sic), that this is under one of the conditions that the state shall control the landfill.

MR. DOYLE: On pages 3 and 4 of your direct testimony you raise questions about the source of waste into Juniper Ridge. Jeremy, can we get up Exhibit 47? Could you enlarge the -enlarge it a little bit? So this is Exhibit 47 which you've seen since you've reviewed the pre-filed testimony I assume, correct?

MR. SPENCER: I -- I can barely read that from this point but yeah, I've looked at the waste streams.

MR. DOYLE: So here's a closer copy of Exhibit 47 .

MR. SPENCER: Okay, thank you.

MR. DOYLE: So I'm asking about your questions about the source of waste into Juniper Ridge.

MR. SPENCER: Right.
MR. DOYLE: Isn't it true that these monthly special waste activity reports provide information on date of delivery, manifest number, waste description, quantity delivered in tons, transporter name, generator name and waste origin by Maine county?

MR. SPENCER: Yes.

MR. DOYLE: Isn't it also true that these reports are sent to DEP, BGS, the Landfill Advisory Committee and the City of Old Town on a monthly basis and have been since 2005?

MR. SPENCER: Correct, I assume.

MR. DOYLE: I wanted to ask you about your testimony on oversize bulky waste. Mattresses and furniture make up a good component of oversize bulky waste, don't they?

MR. SPENCER: Yes. I think that's -that's in the -- in the industry definition, isn't it?

MR. DOYLE: On page 5 of your direct testimony, you state that most of the materials in
mattresses, furniture and appliances can be recycled into metal, wood and fabric, correct?

MR. SPENCER: Yes.

MR. DOYLE: Have you ever disassembled a mattress?

MR. SPENCER: I know what the inside of a mattress looks like, yes.

MR. DOYLE: Have you ever disassembled one?

MR. SPENCER: Sure.

MR. DOYLE: Can you identify any business in Maine that is currently disassembling mattresses on a large-scale economic basis?

MR. SPENCER: That's kind of a loaded question. Can you? I mean --

MR. DOYLE: No, this is my time to ask you questions.

MR. SPENCER: Okay, okay. I don't believe there is one. I should say during a discussion yesterday that someone in your group was talking about doing just that, disassembling mattresses as a recycling business.

MR. DOYLE: Isn't it true that ReEnergy last night commented that they are looking into the possibility of recycling mattresses?

MR. SPENCER: Yeah, I heard Mr. Geisser say that, sure.

MR. DOYLE: But they're not currently recycling mattresses?

MR. SPENCER: No, no.
MR. DOYLE: Are you aware of any business in Maine that is recycling mattresses on a small-scale basis and economic basis?

MR. SPENCER: I know of a business in Maine that at least until recently was reducing the size of mattresses and incinerating them and that would be at the PERC plant. There was discussion about that yesterday as well.

MR. DOYLE: So they're burning mattresses?
MR. SPENCER: Correct.
MR. DOYLE: Okay. That's what they do at PERC, they burn things?

MR. SPENCER: They -- they pull the metal out and they burn the rest.

MR. DOYLE: Are you aware of any business in New Hampshire that is currently disassembling mattresses on a large-scale economic basis?

MR. SPENCER: No.
CHAIRMAN PARKER: Excuse me, stop asking compound questions. Ask a question and then a
second question if you choose to so we understand really what you're asking.

MR. DOYLE: Have you ever disassembled a sofa or a recliner?

MR. SPENCER: You know, I have.
MR. DOYLE: You have?

MR. SPENCER: Sure. In fact, I was
thinking about using the metal inside of an easy chair. It's kind of in the shape -- I was thinking about using that metal to make an outside place to cook, like an outdoor barbecue, you know, like, you know, so use masonry and use the metal as a -- as reinforcement for doing something like that.

MR. DOYLE: Can you identify any business in Maine that is disassembling used furniture such as a sofa or a recliner on a large-scale economic basis?

MR. SPENCER: I cannot identify any. That doesn't mean that they don't exist, and $I$ don't understand why large-scale has to be part of the conversation.

MR. DOYLE: Isn't it true to handle the sort of wastes that are involved in OBW at Juniper Ridge recycling of OBW has to be done on a
large-scale basis?

MR. SPENCER: Ideally it would be but wasn't there discussion yesterday that if there were collection points and if you could keep the material from being commingled with other waste then the materials contained in the mattresses would have enough value perhaps to make a business of it?

MR. DOYLE: On page 9 of your direct testimony and page 5 of your rebuttal testimony, you claim that the DEP and the state's stated goal is to reduce statewide waste by five percent every two years, don't you?

MR. SPENCER: Can you repeat those pages please?

MR. DOYLE: Page 9 of your direct
testimony and page 5 of your rebuttal testimony.

MR. SPENCER: Yeah, I think I did say that.

MR. DOYLE: What's the basis of this assertion?

MR. SPENCER: I've seen that in print. I've seen that in writing. In fact, we had a discussion about that at one of the -- one of our -- I can't remember just what it was but I think
there was a Board member -- the topic of five percent reduction every two years came up and $I$ think there was a Board member who was -obviously with some background in numbers like this. I think he was talking about to be aware of the compounding effects of every five years and every -- you know, for not just the two-year period but beyond that.

MR. DOYLE: I'm going to show you the statute which is Title 38, Section 2132, Subsection 1 A. Could you read that, please?

MR. SPENCER: When was this last changed?
MR. DOYLE: Well, that's --

MR. SPENCER: Is this current in other words?

MR. DOYLE: Well, we'll get to that in a second. That was the law in effect at the time you wrote your testimony. Could you read the Subsection 1A?

MR. SPENCER: I'm reading it. Do you want me to read it out loud?

MR. DOYLE: Out loud please.

MR. SPENCER: Okay. State reduction -"state waste reduction goal, it is the goal of the state to reduce the biennial generation of
municipal solid waste tonnage by five percent beginning on January 1st, 2009 , and by an additional five percent every subsequent two years."

MR. DOYLE: So it says reduce municipal solid waste by five percent?

MR. SPENCER: Correct.

MR. DOYLE: It doesn't say all solid waste, does it?

MR. SPENCER: No, but I think there are -do you have a copy of the current waste reduction goal?

MR. DOYLE: As a matter of fact, I do.
MR. SPENCER: I know I'm not supposed to ask you questions.

MR. DOYLE: So could you read what was adopted this legislative session?

MR. SPENCER: Why don't you go sit over there, all right?

MR. DOYLE: I will.

MR. SPENCER: This is --

MR. DOYLE: Go ahead, Subsection 1 .

MR. SPENCER: "State recycling goal, it is
the goal of the state to recycle or compost by January 1st, 202150 percent of the municipal
solid waste tonnage generated each year within the state."

MR. DOYLE: That's the recycling goal.
MR. SPENCER: 1B, "state waste disposal reduction goal, it is the goal of the state to reduce the statewide per capita disposal rate of municipal solid waste tonnage to . 55 tons disposed per capita by January 1st, 2019 and to further reduce the statewide per capita disposal rate by an additional five percent every five years thereafter."

MR. DOYLE: And so, again, in this recent legislative change this session, that reduction goal only applies to municipal solid waste, correct?

MR. SPENCER: So my statement may be wrong but if it's wrong, by how much of a factor would it be wrong? That's what I'm trying to think of. The statistic $I$ would need for that would be what percentage of total waste tonnages in Maine is MSW and what the total waste is; in other words, this is -- and I admit that I may have misspoke about -- I may have confused municipal solid waste with total waste, but without -- I can't really apologize until -- unless $I$ knew what percentage
of the waste stream is MSW of the total.
MR. DOYLE: Juniper Ridge expansion isn't proposing to take anything other than MSW bypass, correct?

MR. SPENCER: And MSW for soft layer.
MR. DOYLE: Which has to be MSW bypass, correct?

MR. SPENCER: That's the proposal.

MR. DOYLE: On page 3 of your rebuttal testimony you suggest that NEWSME and BGS are not complying with the recycling and source reduction provision standard in Section 1310-N5A which states that, quote, the proposed solid waste disposal facility will accept solid waste that is subject to recycling and source reduction programs, voluntary or otherwise, at least as effective as those imposed by this chapter and other provisions of state law, closed quote. What recycling and source reduction provisions imposed by state law do you believe are not being followed?

MR. SPENCER: I believe the requirement for the material the first order of priority, the highest level of our waste hierarchy, is reduction at the source.

MR. DOYLE: Yeah, I understand your argument about point of origin. Isn't it true that the only recycling and source reduction provision imposed by state law are the ones we just reviewed with respect to MSW tonnage?

MR. SPENCER: Like I said, I'm not familiar enough with the entirety of Maine law to make that statement.

MR. DOYLE: On page 4 of your rebuttal testimony, you suggest comparing the annual oversize bulky waste deliveries into Juniper Ridge with the annual amounts into Juniper Ridge from the PERC/MRC communities as the relevant metric for oversize bulky waste with respect to the Waste Management Hierarchy. Isn't Juniper Ridge Landfill and the expansion a landfill for the entire State of Maine not just a landfill for the PERC/MRC communities?

MR. SPENCER: Yes.

MR. DOYLE: On page 8 of your pre-filed testimony, you state that 800,000 gallons of leachate per month are sent to the Old Town mill wastewater treatment plant?

MR. SPENCER: That's my understanding.
MR. DOYLE: Isn't it true that that
wastewater treatment plant was designed to accept 24.4 million gallons per day?

MR. SPENCER: I will -- I don't think it's right to comment on that without breaking down what those numbers mean but yeah, basically the paper mill when it was functioning had this license to dispose of 20-plus million gallons per day, right.

MR. DOYLE: You raise questions about Mr.

Booth's testimony on stormwater management
leachate collection and liner leakage. Are you aware that Mike has over 35 years of engineering experience?

MR. SPENCER: No. Where did I raise this question? Was it in questioning yesterday?

MR. DOYLE: It was in your testimony, your pre-filed testimony.

MR. SPENCER: Where?

MR. DOYLE: Stormwater management, page 7
of your direct --
MR. SPENCER: Excuse me one second, I'm getting dry. Okay.

MR. DOYLE: Stormwater management was on page 7 of your direct testimony, leachate is also on page 7, you also raise questions about what he
said in your rebuttal testimony on pages 5 and 6 . So my question is, are you aware that Mike has over 35 years of engineering experience?

MR. SPENCER: I know that he is -- he's been -- yeah, I wouldn't know about 35 years but yeah, I read his resume and $I$ have no issue about Mr. Booth's qualifications.

MR. DOYLE: You're not a licensed professional engineer, are you?

MR. SPENCER: I'm a father of a licensed professional engineer, $I$ was admitted to the University of Virginia Engineering School, which is very -- not easy to get into at the time and I elected to pursue a different avenue of study but not to mention my father-in-law, now deceased, was a professional engineer, my daughter's boyfriend is a professional engineer, a lot of my friends are professional engineers, so but I -- am I licensed? No.

MR. DOYLE: You raise concerns about subsidence?

MR. SPENCER: Yes, I did.

MR. DOYLE: Settlement?
MR. SPENCER: Yes.

MR. DOYLE: And groundwater movement?

MR. SPENCER: Um-hum.

MR. DOYLE: Did you review Mr. Sevee's testimony on these topics?

MR. SPENCER: I may -- you know, I did, I did; in fact, that's probably why I didn't just mention it because -- but yeah, go ahead.

MR. DOYLE: You're not a geologist, are you?

MR. SPENCER: No, no, I'm not.
MR. DOYLE: I have no further questions. CHAIRMAN PARKER: Next will be Mr. Katsiaficas.

MR. KATSIAFICAS: The City has no questions for Mr. Spencer.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Okay, Mr. Snowman?

MR. SNOWMAN: No questions.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Mr. Laite?

MR. LAITE: No.
CHAIRMAN PARKER: Board members? No questions? How about the staff?

MS. ELEFTHERIOU: Mr. Spencer, in your direct testimony you expressed frustration with JRL's odor complaint management and response plan. Do you have any recommendations for improvements that could be made to the plan by JRL?

MR. SPENCER: I would -- if I was them, I would invite the Old Town Police Department -- oh, excuse me -- okay, can you hear me now? If I was the owner and operator of Juniper Ridge Landfill I would take the high road on this and $I$ would invite the Old Town Police Department, which is a full-time department, I would invite the Penobscot County Sheriff's Department, which covers Alton and may be in that area as much as Old Town personnel, and $I$ would invite the Maine state Police to during the course of their duties, not as a requirement, just during the course of their duties, to make a note of the time and location of any offensive smells in that area in the same manner that if there was a dead animal in the road smelling that they would just write down time, location and that there is an odor and $I$ think that might help develop a pattern which would help them as DEP has requested, that when we smell it, to please call in because in a way we're -- you know, we're the boots on the ground and people that are there the most. So that's -- I guess that's my response.

MS. TARBUCK: I have a quick question. You talked about public benefit determination
condition three which is the oversize bulky waste limit.

MR. SPENCER: Right.
MS. TARBUCK: If the expansion project moves forward and a limit is to be established in a license for oversize bulky waste, what would you propose as the oversize bulky waste tonnage limit and why?

MR. SPENCER: I would need to know what the OBW inputs are to the other waste disposal facilities in Maine, including EcoMaine, South Portland, which serves a lot of that part of the state, the MMWAC incinerator, Lewiston/Auburn area, the landfill in Fort Fairfield, yeah, that serves northern Maine and maybe the smaller disposal -- you know, the municipal, Augusta, Bath, and I would try to get a relative amount of what is being produced by all these and make some kind of a determination based on that on what the total OBW output would be for a population the size of Maine, 1.3 million, and $I$ would take that total and $I$ would subtract all the totals. So I would first gather the information, understand their population base, and then based on that, use their population they're serving as a basis for
determining typical oBW output as a measure, you know, by per capita in the state of Maine and $I$ would make the difference between the measurements at the other waste disposal facilities in Maine and what the -- you know, the projected output of all the population, 1.3 some million, and the difference in that $I$ would put as a limit at Juniper Ridge. Am I making sense?

MR. FARRAR: I have just one question. MR. SPENCER: Sure.

MR. FARRAR: All right, is it just me or is it -- okay, just one question for you, Mr. Spencer. You expressed concern with the potential for extreme precipitation events and possible inadequacies of the 25-year/24-hour design storm as published by NRCS. How would you recommend going out and establishing what you would consider an appropriate design storm for the proposed expansion?

MR. SPENCER: Well, I notice that -excuse me if I think out loud here.

MR. FARRAR: That's fine.

MR. SPENCER: I notice that part of the system design for Juniper Ridge, the expansion, parts of that $I$ think we heard yesterday are being
designed for a 100-year flood. I would -- I'd probably start with that and $I$ would try to talk with reputable, independent weather people. I would consult the -- I think NOAA does a lot of work on that, does a lot of work on projecting changes with climate change, and $I$ think $I$ would just consult with them as to what -- what we should really be preparing for and if you could -but I'm not even sure if -- you know, it's hard because you don't want to say it should be for what just happened in Louisiana, for example, necessarily, and you don't want to say it's just for the worst event, you know, in the last 100 years in New England but $I$ think we'd be getting closer there but $I$ think there's just so -- and there's always uncertainty about the weather but I think moving forward there's just -- I mean, I've experienced personally in the last 20 years some, you know, 20 inches in 24 hours, you know, amongst friends and family. My son's location in Lyons, Colorado, three years and a month ago was devastated by -- and that's where I got the question about the slopes because they're at the foothills, you know, north of Boulder, northwest of Denver, and, you know, they had -- and they
said that was, A, a 500 -year flood and B, it could happen again. So that's -- I think you'd have to just -- do our homework and -- but if -- you've got to remember, $I$ don't want it to be expanded anyhow, but I'm not sure if we said -- like I wouldn't want to bet that building for a $100-y e a r$ flood would get it done, you know.

MR. FARRAR: All right, thank you.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Kathy.
MS. CHASE: Thank you. Can you hear me? MR. SPENCER: Yes.

MS. CHASE: All right, thank you, Mr.
Spencer. I have a question. There seems to be -you've brought it up a number of times in your testimony and I've read your -- the ones that you've given us for submission, and the overall theme in a lot of the people that were concerned at the public hearing yesterday is all about the out-of-state waste that comes in.

MR. SPENCER: Right.

MS. CHASE: So my question to you is it seems like there's a disconnect. We've been told over and over again that the law says it comes -if it comes from the person not -- it's the generator and if they recycle it, it's them.

MR. SPENCER: Right.

MS. CHASE: So my question to you would be what would be the solution for that? Do you have a solution for that and do we need to have better communication on what the law actually says so some of the people that are so concerned can have an understanding?

MR. SPENCER: Thanks, that's a good question. And I apologize because I should have mentioned this. The law -- the definition they're going by now I believe became law in 2007. The state request for proposals happened in 2003 , the state took ownership in 2004 , the Operating Services Amendment was changed without notice to DEP or anyone else in 2006 and the definition was changed in 2007. So for starters, I think there needs to be a discussion of that, and $I$ think the understanding that was in place when this plan was presented to the public in 2000 -- late 2003 and 2004 and the first thing they said was there will be no out-of-state waste, there will be no out-of-state waste, even though they actually had -- there was some permission to bring enough CDD from out of state to pull burnable wood from that for the Old Town mill exclusively, and that
was an agreement that casella had with -- and the State Planning Office had -- had signed, so they were allowed to import even though we weren't told that at time, but the whole idea -- the whole premise of this was that we -- the mill -- the Old Town mill was in trouble, there were 600 employees, it was a large part of the tax base, and what can we do to help them. The solution seemed to be the state will take ownership of the landfill and somebody, it turned out to be Casella, would furnish the mill with low-cost fuel derived from construction and demo debris sources. So did I -- is this an answer? So things have changed since 2003 and 2004 as far as -- I'm not sure there really was a definition of in-state waste prior to that point.

MS. CHASE: Okay.
CHAIRMAN PARKER: I've got a couple questions for you.

MR. SPENCER: Sure.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Apparently the way the state law is interpreted, and perhaps not by you the same way, is the argument is being made that municipal solid waste reduction only applies to MSW. Do you interpret it as applying to the total
waste stream or just to the MSW portion, the state's goals?

MR. SPENCER: I think they do have a goal of reducing the overall amount of waste and -- but I know they have a goal of reducing, you know, basic citizen output, you know, non-industrial output.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Okay. Another thing you commented on, and $I$ just want to see what your opinion of it is, you commented on the modified services agreement and apparently in your interpretation there's a failure in that agreement of directing the CDD to boilers other than Old Town and that apparently the only argument to not take it to the landfill is -- or take it to the landfill is if Old Town doesn't function. Is it your opinion that that agreement could be modified to direct more of that waste to other boilers?

MR. SPENCER: Well, I think -- I think they already can. Did this go off? It's showing red. Have we got -- can you hear me now?

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Yup.
MR. SPENCER: Okay, I'm sorry. I think in the Operating Services Agreement now that the -any wood clean enough to be burned can go to any
boiler in Maine. I think that's the way it is now already.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Okay, I sort of misunderstood what you were saying.

MR. SPENCER: Right.
CHAIRMAN PARKER: One more question that's sort of come up is the -- I guess sort of what your argument was that -- or I guess in the testimony I've heard somewhere that Casella claims they can't really control the waste that's coming to them.

MR. SPENCER: Right.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: And you suggested in your testimony that some way some third-party inspection be involved. What do you really -what are your thoughts along that line?

MR. SPENCER: I think at the landfill, for one thing, there should be auditors present not full-time but third-party just, you know, kind of observing and comparing the information that the regulators -- I don't know why, I'm not doing anything.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: It just shut off.
MR. SPENCER: It just shut off. Is this better? I think there's a gap in information and
once again, like if $I$ was -- and there's no reason
-- I think like Old Town can send someone out there to observe if they want and do some accounting. I just think as a society citizens are looking for transparency and some of that is just independent accounting and as far as the CDD waste streams, $I$ really think at some level in Maine we need to develop an idea of what -- where really this stuff is coming from and what really state policy should be towards it. In other words, we don't want to become the repository for every mattress or old sofa from the states beyond our borders. I think -- even though it may be legal, I don't think we want to do that because space is just too precious.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Would you extend the third-party inspections to the other processors; in other words, people who are receiving the waste to process?

MR. SPENCER: Absolutely.
CHAIRMAN PARKER: Okay, that's all my questions. Any others? Yes.

MR. AHLERS: Mr. Spencer, would you categorize oversize bulky waste as a separate category from municipal solid waste or a subset
of?

MR. SPENCER: I think it should be a subset because, you know, it's basically furniture, appliances, count mattresses as the most likely.

MR. AHLERS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Further questions?

Thank you. Any recross -- oh, sorry.

MR. SNOWMAN: Can I ask a quick question?
I forgot during my time.
CHAIRMAN PARKER: Are you all set?
MR. SNOWMAN: Yes, thank you. Yeah, I just wondered, while we have Ed here, he's done a lot of work on this over the years and he's one of the very few people $I$ know that have ever put pen to paper and tried to figure out -- figure this out, how much out-of-state garbage, and Ed, you talked about the point of discard concept, and I was wondering with your knowledge, you're the most knowledgeable -- one of the most knowledgeable guys I know about out-of-state garbage, that aspect of it. What would you say if someone came up to you and said how much of that pile up there originated out of state or was discarded out of state, what percentage of that seven million or so
cubic yards that are currently in there originated out of state and according to a lot of people shouldn't be in there? Anyway, you understand what I'm saying.

MR. SPENCER: Yeah, I do. I think what I would do is, you know, look at the sources, the primary generators, and $I$ don't mean to pick on ReEnergy here or the Lewiston facility because there's others, $I$ would look at what their sources are and total CDD is -- has been running 55 or 57 percent of what comes in here, and so I would take that -- what that number is and if the -- the number from ReEnergy is what, 85 percent out of state, I would take 85 percent of 57 percent but that would assume that they are the only one. So in other words, I would -- I would look at all of them and if $I$ had to put a number based on the information, $I$-- you know, that we have, I think confidently 40 percent.

MR. SNOWMAN: Okay.
CHAIRMAN PARKER: Redirect?

MR. DOYLE: Recross.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Recross, I'm sorry, recross. How's that?

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Spencer, isn't it true
that for over 25 years Maine DEP has interpreted in-state waste to include out-of-state waste brought to a Maine processing facility such as PERC, MMWAC, EcoMaine, and the resulting ash and residues from that process as in-state waste?

MR. SPENCER: I don't know for -- for 25 years and you said processing facilities in reference to the waste-to-energy plants. I -- it appears to have been the practice and I'll be neutral on that, that the -- once the materials come into PERC or MMWAC that the byproducts of that should become Maine waste and the -- the -my qualifying -- you know, you could debate whether -- yeah, I -- I think that has -- your statement may not be specifically true but $I$ think generally that's from the incinerators but not from the processing facilities because I think the processing facility rules and practices have probably changed a whole lot in that 25-year period.

MR. DOYLE: But this rule and this policy of the Department has existed long before Juniper Ridge Landfill, correct?

MR. SPENCER: I think -- this thing just died.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: I think when you turn that one on, it turns this one off.

MR. SPENCER: Oh. Excuse me, could you ask that again?

MR. DOYLE: The policy -- the Department's policy about treating the residues of processing facilities, including incinerators, as in-state waste has existed for over 25 years, long before the Juniper Ridge Landfill?

MR. SPENCER: I don't accept the part you said about processing facilities. I -- I accept the part about incinerators, waste to energy.

MR. DOYLE: No further questions.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Thank you, Mr. Spencer.
MR. SPENCER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Now we'll turn the floor over to the City of Old Town. Why don't we take a five-minute break just to rest up our -- and then we'll start with Old Town.

## (OFF RECORD)

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Okay, the floor now belongs to the City of Old Town.

MR. KATSIAFICAS: Chair Parker, Members of the Board, good morning. My name is Jim Katsiaficas, I'm counsel for the City of Old Town
and we're here to present our testimony this morning. We have two witnesses and if you indulge us, we'll just have each witness speak first and then we could open it up to cross examination of the panel if that's the most efficient way to do that.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: That's the way we'd like to do it.

MR. KATSIAFICAS: Thank you. Our first witness will be --

CHAIRMAN PARKER: The only exception would be if something really critical came up and somebody wanted to ask a question but $I$ have encouraged the Board to wait and ask questions.

MR. KATSIAFICAS: I have no doubt that it would be appropriate if it were critical and that's not a problem. City Manager Bill Mayo will speak first and then Denis St. Peter, president of CES, our review engineer, will speak and you have their pre-filed testimony and their exhibits and I'll turn this over then to our witnesses.

MR. MAYO: Good morning, Board members, Chairman Parker. My name is William Mayo.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Pull that a little closer.

MR. MAYO: Can you hear me now?

CHAIRMAN PARKER: I can if everybody else can.

MR. MAYO: I'm the duly appointed city manager for the City of Old Town. Among my duties as city manager is monitoring issues regarding the operation at Juniper Ridge Landfill, operator NEWSME Landfill Operations, LLC, compliance with municipal ordinances and reporting requirements and JRL's use of municipal infrastructure and advising the Old Town City Council on those issues.

The City of Old Town, Maine, is the host community for Juniper Ridge Landfill. As the host community for JRL, the City primarily is concerned with the health, safety and welfare of its residents and any impacts, positive or negative, that $J R L$ and its proposed expansion have on its residents; therefore, the City offers the following comments in the matter of the application for Maine Hazardous Waste, septage and Solid Waste Management Act and Natural Resources Protection Act permits and water quality certification filed by NEWSME and the Maine Bureau of General Services.

The application proposes the addition of a total of 9.35 million cubic yards of solid waste disposal capacity to JRL, which will extend its useful life approximately until 2030. My comments concern the public health, safety and welfare issues that the expansion and the continued operation of JRL raise and how the applicants have addressed those issues. The issues raised by the City during the course of this proceeding include the use of and payment for construction and demolition debris fines, the use of and payment for soft layer waste, road and traffic impacts and general compliance with solid waste statutes and regulations.

As of the date of the filing of this pre-filed testimony, the applicants have satisfactorily addressed the City's issues and on one issue the City will take additional steps to help ensure that the applicants will operate without harm to the public health, safety and welfare.

Approximately 20 percent of the projected waste volume for the expansion consists of CDD fines, the residue from the processing of CDD waste at KTI facility in Lewiston, which is now
owned by ReEnergy. The City's Solid Waste Facility Review Committee and the City Council had raised the concern that NEWSME/Casella Waste Systems uses CDD fines as alternate daily cover in the operation of JRL as an alternate to soil that it otherwise must purchase and yet, does not pay the City for disposal of $C D D$ fines under the host community compensation and facility oversight agreement.

We have resolved this concern with the applicants. At a meeting with Casella we explored the situation and after discussion and review, the City and Casella concluded that under state law and the host community agreement the use of CDD fines as alternate daily cover is permitted and encouraged. State law requires a solid waste processing facility that generates residue for disposal to recycle or process into fuel at least 50 percent of that waste and recycling includes use as ADC. Section 3.1A of the host community agreement exempts from the per ton fees charged for solid waste disposed of at JRL other materials that Casella accepts for beneficial use and for tipping fee of $\$ 5$ per ton or less. Casella's use of CDD fines is for beneficial use, does not
require a written determination of beneficial use from DEP and Casella represents that it receives $\$ 4$ per ton for this material. Casella also
demonstrated that it uses less CDD fine, 20 percent, than comparable landfills at 24 percent so that it is not taking undue advantage of free disposal of this material at JRL.

The City's Solid Waste Facilities Review Committee and the City Council had also raised the concern that NEWSME/Casella was not paying the City under the host community agreement for municipal solid waste disposed of at JRL as part of the soft layer. NEWSME and BGS sought and obtained from DEP a license amendment to permit the use of municipal solid waste as a soft layer on the bottom of new landfill cells at JRL to protect the landfill liners. A concern for the City was whether Casella has been paying the City under the host community agreement for disposal of that soft layer MSW. Casella followed up with me and has explained that Casella has been paying the City for the disposal of the soft layer MSW.

The City also raised concerns regarding the impact of JRL-related truck traffic following the expansion of JRL and the condition of the

Bennoch Road, State Route 16 . These concerns go to the ability of the roads in the vicinity to safely and conveniently handle traffic attributable to the solid waste facility as required by Chapter $400(\mathrm{D})(1)$ and (2) of the Department's rules. Although Casella strongly encourages the use of Route 95 to access JRL, there's been a tendency for truck drivers to avoid the weigh stations on that road when it is open by using the Bennoch Road between Exits 193 and 199. The Bennoch Road is a state highway, Route 16, and the southerly portion of this road is within the City's urban compact area, and so it is maintained by the City. The northern portion is maintained by the Maine Department of Transportation. The City's concern is that the tractor-trailer traffic, particularly swinging empty trailers on vehicles leaving JRL, is causing deterioration of the Bennoch Road. The City is aware that other trucks use Bennoch Road but dump truck use does not appear to have the same degree of road impact as the landfill-related tractor-trailer use.

Although MDOT installed a one-inch overlay over part of the road, the overlay is insufficient to repair the state portion, and while the City
receives an annual host community payment of $\$ 50,000$ for several purposes, including roads, emergency response, staff training for monitoring, consulting monitoring and an offset for City revenue loss due to effects on property values, neither the City's annual host community payment nor the state road maintenance reimbursement is sufficient to finance repairs to the City portion of road.

The City asked BGS to discuss with MDOT actions it can take on the northern part of the Bennoch Road to improve it as part of this expansion. BGS has done so and tells us that MDOT's work plan for 2016 included in Alton and Old Town preservation paving work on Route 16 beginning 3.2 miles south of the Alton/Lagrange town line and extending southeasterly 5.89 miles, and for 2017/18, includes in Old Town highway rehabilitation work on Route 16 beginning at the Interstate 95 northbound off ramp and extending southerly 4.63 miles . This does not improve additional monies -- this does not provide additional monies for the City to use in its repair of the southern portion but does improve the northern half.

An additional City concern is that once MDOT repairs the northern half of Bennoch Road and the City addresses the southern half, something be done to discourage tractor-trailer use on that road so the current state of the road disrepair does not reoccur. The City understands that Casella is doing what it reasonably can to discourage such use and appreciates Casella's efforts which include the recent installation of two signs, one at the weigh station at JRL and another plainly visible from the exit road instructing drivers to use Interstate 95 to leave JRL.

In addition, BGS has approached MDOT about this concern and MDOT has agreed to install two signs in the area of the JRL exit road directing exiting trucks to use Interstate 95 only. Thus, the City, applicants, Casella and MDOT have reached agreement as to how to address the truck traffic impacts of the proposed JRL expansion and the City understands that MDOT will implement that agreement.

With their application, NEWSME and BGS has offered a Declaration of Covenants and Restrictions as part of the wetlands compensation
package. This Declaration places protections on 266 acres of the JRL parcel which effectively is the same as a conservation easement intended to keep the protected property in its natural state. Under that Declaration, the City would be the third party with third-party rights of administration and enforcement. The City had raised concerns about the potential cost of its administrative and enforcement responsibilities under the Declaration; subsequently, Casella and the City negotiated an agreement regarding allocation of costs for implementation of the Declaration of Covenants and Restrictions to address those concerns. On July 28, 2016, the City Council approved both the Declaration and the allocation of cost agreement.

The City has hired the firm of CES, Incorporated, to review the application for compliance with state and federal regulations, particularly with regard to the Natural Resources Act, Title 38, Section 480-A through 480-JJ, Maine Hazardous Waste, Septage and Solid Waste Management Act, Title 38, Section 1301 through 1310-AA, as applicable, Title 38, 2101 and DEP Rules Chapters $300,305,310,315,335,400,401$
and 405, which is traffic, odor, noise, air quality, vectors, litter, leachate management, stormwater and groundwater, in order to protect the health, safety and welfare of the City's residents. As to these regulatory compliance concerns, the City is presenting testimony of Denis St. Peter, PE, of CES, Inc., and written materials prepared by him and issued by CES to the Board as part of this proceeding.

Mr. St. Peter's report contains two basic
recommendations regarding hydrogen sulfide generated by MSW and CDD fines at JRL. One recommendation is that NEWSME/Casella institute the use of acute exposure action level for concentrations exceeding the 15 and 30 parts per billion levels, with the Old Town code enforcement officer to be contacted if hydrogen sulfide concentrations exceed the 30 pp.b level. The applicants have agreed to incorporate these action levels and the notification protocol into the Operations Manual, Appendix $K$, Odor Control Plan for JRL.

The other recommendation is that because the City remains concerned with the effects of possible chronic exposure to hydrogen sulfide, but
the Maine Department of Environmental Protection has yet to adopt a chronic exposure standard, the City may implement its own evaluation protocol on an annual basis; therefore, the City will use a portion of the host community funding supplied to it each year to hire a consultant to evaluate the NEWSME/Casella hydrogen sulfide data to evaluate the chronic exposure, which is a one-year duration scenario. If analysis determines this data demonstrates the presence of hydrogen sulfide levels that exceed typical health-based guidance levels and so pose a potential health or safety risk to members of the public, including abutters, the City will report those findings to NEWSME/Casella and to DEP.

The City does not object to and does not oppose the application. Applicants have listened to the City and its concerns and issues and have satisfactorily addressed those concerns and issues. Applicant NEWSME/Casella has been responsible when issues and questions have arisen regarding landfill operation and has been a responsible community business contributing to civic organizations and events in Old Town. Applicant BGS has assisted in the resolution of
the City's roads and traffic concerns. Thank you. MR. ST. PETER: So far it sounds like it's still on. Good morning, Chairman and Board members. My name is Denis St. Peter. I'm a licensed professional engineer in the State of Maine, approximately 26 years of experience. I'm going to summarize my testimony. I understand the testimony has been provided as well as our backup comments.

As Bill said, we reviewed the application, response to comments, the DEP comments as it relates to the solid waste management regulations and statutes as well as Natural Resource Protection. CES was asked to advise the City on issues related to compliance with the technical standards outlined in the applicable statutes and regulations. The application was reviewed by a team of scientists, geologists and engineers at CES, we talked about whether or not to have the whole team attend but based on our filed testimony, felt just $I$ could represent the team. As of the date of the pre-filed testimony, CES believes the applicant has satisfactorily addressed the City's concerns and on one issue we recommended to the City to take additional steps
to help ensure the applicants operate without harm to public health, safety and welfare.

In general, CES finds the applicant's
application and responses adequately meet or exceed the referenced state statute and regulations. Of particular note, the proposed expansion design includes the leak detection and secondary liner system that was discussed and the graphics are up here. This design will greatly enhance its performance in containing leachate and minimizing releases to the environment.

Our final two recommendations are related to the offsite monitoring, reporting and evaluation of hydrogen sulfide. Due to the type of waste and in general the CDD fines and how they're used, the concentration of hydrogen sulfide within the landfill gas is relatively high. Hydrogen sulfide can be harmful to human health above certain concentrations as well as emit offensive odors. The applicant's proposed landfill gas collection and treatment system, as well as the monitoring equipment, appear to be very robust and adequate to prevent human health hazards and nuisance odors as long as it's implemented, operated and reported as proposed.

The first recommendation is to put an additional gas action level to coincide with offsite acute exposure and odor prevention. Reporting requirements would be instituted for concentrations exceeding both 15 and 30 parts per billion and the Old Town code enforcement officer would be contacted if hydrogen sulfide concentrations exceed the 30 ppb action level.

As we understand, the applicants have agreed to incorporate these action levels and notification protocol within their Operations Manual, Appendix $K$, Odor Control Plan. The other recommendation is based on concerns with the effects of possible chronic exposure of hydrogen sulfide. We have recommended to the City that they implement their own evaluation protocol on an annual basis by hiring a qualified consultant to evaluate the operator's hydrogen sulfide data for chronic exposure, one year duration scenario. The evaluation would include reviewing the hydrogen sulfide monitoring data, performing statistical analysis of the data, establishing proper procedures for analysis of non-detect values, performing comparison of relevant acute and chronic exposure guidelines and
providing conclusions and recommendations based on this evaluation.

If the evaluation determines that this data demonstrates the presence of hydrogen sulfide levels that exceed typical health-based guidance levels and so pose a public health or safety risk to members of the public, the City will report these findings to the applicant and the DEP.

In conclusion, CES generally finds the applicant's application and responses adequately meet or exceed the referenced state statutes and regulations.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Are you all set?

MR. KATSIAFICAS: We are.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Okay. We'll open it up for cross by the applicant.

MR. DOYLE: No questions.
CHAIRMAN PARKER: Mr. Spencer?
MR. SPENCER: Thank you. This is for Mr. Mayo. So the -- there's basically three categories of CDD coming into Juniper Ridge which is kind of straight CDD, oversize bulky waste and fines for daily cover. So I think you just said that the -- the fines for daily cover are exempt from the tip fee but the other two types -- the
other two subsets of CDD are -- do pay the City?
MR. MAYO: Correct, yup.
MR. SPENCER: And the basis for being exempt is at least in part due to the fact that Casella gets $\$ 5$ or less to dispose of it? MR. MAYO: Yes.

MR. SPENCER: Okay, and yesterday we heard -- or in testimony there was a statistic about the revenues that Casella pays to Old Town. It was something -- something on the order of about a million dollars a year, and I'm just curious, $I$ don't mean to put you on the spot and $I$ know I'm enough of a pain in the neck the rest of the year, but as a percentage of, you know, what the City gets from Casella, would you venture any guess of a percentage of what the -- of that -what the costs are associated with having a landfill within our borders as compared to, you know, a town that didn't have a landfill? MR. MAYO: I really don't. It -- it certainly has an impact. I mean, you know, there's been some discussion here about possibly having the police departments invited up there. Casella does do that. They bring our public safety departments up there, fire and police
departments, our code enforcement officer is invited up there. We certainly have a very open working relationship with them, but as $I$ said in my testimony, a lot of -- a lot of the impact for us would be more related to roads and followup for, you know, any type of noise complaint or odor complaint if there are any.

MR. SPENCER: Right. So part of that is money out of pocket for like roads and part of it is just a portion of the already salaried or already being paid Old Town personnel, right? MR. MAYO: Correct.

MR. SPENCER: Okay, thank you. For Mr. St. Peter, the -- there is a difference in opinion between your firm CES and Sevee and Maher on the groundwater divide as it relates to just where this line would be in relation to the landfill. Could you comment some on that? MR. ST. PETER: Yes. I think you're referring to page 2 of our general comments, and this comment was made by our team of hydrogeologists and hydrologists. I've gone over it with them. I'm not the expert that is the source of this comment but I've gone over it with them and in general it speaks to the uncertainty
in geology subsurface conditions. It was a very definitive statement that we identified in the application, specifically in quotes, there is not a direct hydraulic connection under existing conditions between the shallow and deep groundwaters beneath the expansion and the water supply wells along Route 43. Now, we don't -- in our opinion, it doesn't relate to whether or not they've met the permitting conditions, we believe they do, it just relates to our recommendation that the statement shouldn't be used to prevent monitoring in this area; and as $I$ understand it from Mr. Sevee's testimony yesterday, he agreed with that conclusion as well.

MR. SPENCER: So as a follow-up, and this is -- this may be a little too general of a question, you know, just considering the limited amount of time your firm had to spend on this, but do you agree with the or concur with the remainder of the applicant's conclusions as far as water movements in regard to the landfill?

MR. ST. PETER: Yeah, we did spend quite a bit of time with the application. We -- the team -- the part of the team that did review this part of application stated to me that they did agree
that they met the conditions of the permit requirements.

MR. SPENCER: Okay, thank you. Excuse me, one thing $I$ forgot to ask. This is for Mr. Mayo again, and $I$ think $I$ know the answer. The City's municipal ordinances in relation to Juniper Ridge, are they in effect now?

MR. MAYO: With this application -- with the approval of this -- if -- if this application is approved, it would go into effect.

MR. SPENCER: So they aren't in effect now you don't think?

MR. MAYO: Correct.

MR. SPENCER: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Mr. Snowman?

MR. SNOWMAN: No.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Board members? I've got a couple questions and this would go I guess to Mr. Mayo. My understanding is that under the current tipping fee arrangement you get a percentage of the tipping fees for municipal solid waste going in, and $I$ would assume that in your definition of municipal solid waste it would include everything except commercial and industrial, which would include OBW and stuff from
the community or communities from the towns themselves. Am I correct in your thoughts on that?

MR. MAYO: I believe that's accurate.
CHAIRMAN PARKER: Okay. The second item, in the opinion of the City, you're speaking somewhat for yourself but for the City as well, is it your opinion that each cubic yard of space up there has value and wouldn't it be appropriate for the City to get some return for the space that's being utilized for $I$ guess you'd say the fines, the daily cover? There's a -- I understand there's a $\$ 5$ fee. It's just sort of surprising to me that it only costs $\$ 4$ to get rid of it.

There's trucking and everything else involved in it so I'm sure that there's some cash flow that's generating for the haulers out of there. Wouldn't it be appropriate for the City to get some reimbursement for that space that's being used which could be worth a lot of dollars a yard and now it's being given up for $\$ 4$ a yard?

MR. MAYO: We've asked that question multiple times. Yes, $I$ agree with that, but the other side of that is in our Operating Services Agreement it's pretty clear in there how that's --
how that's been written in.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Okay, so -- because it appears to me the space is being used, money is being made, the City of Old Town should share. In the land that's been set aside for mitigation purposes, which is $200-\mathrm{plus}$ acres, which is going to be retained by the City of Old Town, is the City receiving anything in lieu of taxes which it would be losing from that property?

MR. MAYO: We do receive a payment in lieu of taxes on the entire landfill itself. It's a fairly complicated income approach to value, so all that land is also included within that. I guess without getting into all the details of that, in simple terms, the landfill -- I would compare it to the same thing as appraising a gravel pit. It's a diminishing asset. You know, if you go out and appraise a gravel pit day one, that's when it's at its most valuable. It's the same thing with the landfill. If you looked at our payment in lieu of taxes when it first opened up, I believe the payment in lieu of taxes was around $\$ 250,000$ a year, but it also had all that capacity sitting there and as it fills up over time, then the value of the landfill drops and so
now at this time that payment in lieu of taxes is down to about $\$ 50,000$ a year, which $I$ don't dispute the value.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Okay. What I'm getting at, $I$ understand the complexity of that and it's a tough thing to deal with, but prior to the mitigation, the City had 2, 300 acres or a couple hundred acres of maybe only forest land under tree growth protection; you received benefits from that.

MR. MAYO: Yup.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Are those going to abate with this or were you still getting something in lieu of taxes?

MR. MAYO: No, that excess acreage is still going to be assessed.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Okay. That's all my questions.

MS. BERTOCCI: I have a question.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Cindy?

MS. BERTOCCI: I have a question about the hydrogen sulfide monitoring, and has the City assessed the number and the placement of those monitors and are you comfortable if they're -that they're providing adequate monitoring of
hydrogen sulfide emissions?
MR. ST. PETER: Yes, we have assessed
that. As part of our review, we went out to the site and met with Jeremy and got a tour of those locations and we're satisfied with both the equipment and the locations.

MS. BERTOCCI: Okay, and I have one more question and this is with respect to residential wells along Route 16,43 and the Old Stagecoach Road. Was there baseline monitoring done of a portion of those wells or all of those wells so that you would know what the current state of the water quality is at those residences?

MR. ST. PETER: That would have been reviewed by someone else on our team so 1 can't recall. I believe the answer is yes, but I just can't -- can't speak definitively about it. MS. BERTOCCI: Thank you. CHAIRMAN PARKER: Anymore questions from staff?

MR. FARRAR: I don't know if this is going to work, but I'll try. Am I on? I just had a couple questions for Denis St. Peter. I initially had several more about hydrogen sulfide but they've been answered I think already at this
point. You noted at one point that CES had concerns about the way Juniper Ridge Landfill was calculating the non-detects, and did you get that resolved and if so, how?

MR. ST. PETER: Yeah, we did work with the applicant on our concerns about that. That's part of our recommendation that the City hire someone independent to do that evaluation. It speaks to the use of non-detects and what -- what would be a statistically valid approach to how to handle those non-detects.

MR. FARRAR: Okay, so it really hasn't been resolved yet but it's on the table to be resolved?

MR. ST. PETER: In my opinion it hasn't been resolved yet.

MR. FARRAR: Okay. Another point in your written testimony, you talked about cost estimates for potential remediation and/or corrective actions during the post-closure period. What sort of remediation corrective actions were you envisioning?

MR. ST. PETER: Our comment was in general to make sure that there was enough remediation funds and post-closure funds set aside for the
future, and we reviewed that and felt that it was adequate. I think that's in general what we were --

MR. FARRAR: Did you have any particular types of remediation that you had in mind?

MR. ST. PETER: I think some of the things we talked about was the -- the potential for the hydrogen sulfide long-term and we talked -- talked that over with the applicant and became satisfied that the funds were adequate to address those situations. I can't remember the specifics about what types of remediation but it was just a long-term -- the long-term left over situation of hydrogen sulfide.

MR. FARRAR: Okay, thank you.
MR. BEHR: I want to ask another question regarding the regional groundwater flow and this would be for Mr. St. Peter. Just to clarify the advice in your testimony that you've given the town, you suggest that in the event there is a release of leachate at the facility that would it be reasonable to sample the wells on Route 43 and given that recommendation, do you think that it's necessary to complete baseline monitoring sooner than later and should it perhaps be done
periodically?
MR. ST. PETER: All right. So this is a question for maybe one of our technical reviewers in this area. So I -- I don't recall what the baseline monitoring has been so far on those residential wells. With the -- with the leak detection system that they're proposing and the secondary liner system, I think that's something to consider in that decision of when that happens and how much of it is required, but essentially for the expansion area, was what we reviewed this for, was you're going to have an early warning system with the leak detection system, and I'd have to kind of kick the can to the other experts in my company if there's more detailed questions about that.

MR. BEHR: Thank you.
MS. TARBUCK: So this question will sound
very familiar and this can be for anyone on the panel, but oversize bulky waste, if the expansion project moves forward and a limit is to be established in the license for oversize bulky waste, do you have suggestions or an opinion on a proposed oversize bulky waste tonnage limit?

MR. KATSIAFICAS: Do you want a legal
answer or -- I don't mean this as testimony. All I'm going to say is what's in our host community agreement, acceptable waste is what the town receives a tip fee for, a portion of the tip fee. An acceptable waste includes in its definition oversize bulky waste. That's in the appendix to the host community agreement. The City receives revenues for this oversize bulky waste and really whatever the Department determines is appropriate the City is prepared to live with. The City has no position on this, as $I$ understand it, and $I$ will be kicked under the table by the manager if $I$ have that wrong, but the City has no position and will abide by the Department's determination on this, but it is something for which it does receive revenues under the host community agreement. I hope I haven't overstepped my bounds in answering that.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Any questions?
MS. ELEFTHERIOU: I have two questions for
Mr. Mayo. In your direct testimony you stated that Casella demonstrated that it uses less CDD fines as alternate daily cover at 20 percent than comparable landfills at 24 percent?

MR. MAYO: Yup.

MS. ELEFTHERIOU: Would you please clarify the origin of the 24 percent?

MR. MAYO: The 20 percent I got from -from the table 5-1 from Casella's report, which it was actually 19.7.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: You're not on right now. MR. MAYO: Am I on now?

CHAIRMAN PARKER: It's a little better but still not good.

MR. MAYO: Okay, sorry about that. The 20
percent came from table 5-1 from Casella's information they submitted. It was actually 19.7, around the 20 percent value on fines.

MR. KATSIAFICAS: That's BGS Exhibit \#4.

MR. MAYO: And I'm trying to find here
where I had my 24 percent.
MR. KATSIAFICAS: It's included in the application materials.

MR. MAYO: That too came out of the application. I don't have that page number right in front of me though.

MS. ELEFTHERIOU: Okay, thank you. In
your direct testimony you stated that Maine DOT will be performing some paving work in Alton and Old Town during 2016. If known, would you please
give us a status update on that work?
MR. MAYO: Yup, that's basically -- I
drive that road every day so I can tell you it's been completed.

MR. BURNS: Mr. St. Peter, I have one question for you regarding utilities. In your testimony you reference that you looked at the leachate outlets being the Expera Specialty Solution Mill in Old Town or the Brewer Wastewater Treatment Plant. Did you carry that analysis through to look at the effluent and compliance with treatment standards and specifically at the Old Town facility?

MR. ST. PETER: No, we did not. We just looked at the licenses and saw that they were licensed.

MR. BURNS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Any other questions from the Board? Recross?

MR. DOYLE: Just a couple. Mr. Mayo,

Chairman Parker asked you a question about PILOT, the payment in lieu of taxes, and you explained that it started out large and as capacity increases, it gets smaller. If the expansion is approved, doesn't the PILOT balloon up again?

MR. MAYO: Yes, it does, yup.
MR. DOYLE: And I believe it was Victoria asked you a question about the use of CDD fines at JRL versus at another facility and you were asked about the source of that 24 percent number in your testimony. Isn't it true that during the public benefit determination process the DEP itself did an analysis of CDD fines used at JRL and at Waste Management's Crossroads facility and that's the source of that comparison?

MR. MAYO: I believe that's correct.

MR. DOYLE: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN PARKER: Any recross? Mr.
Spencer?
MR. SPENCER: (Shakes head.)

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Mr. Snowman?

MR. SNOWMAN: (Shakes head.)

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Just a comment, my
comment didn't relate to the value of the
landfill. I know that's a negotiable item. I was
just concerned about more land being set aside that's totally tax free, okay, because the citizens pick up that cost. My understanding is that's not the case with the mitigation land. There's still going to be a tax acquired to it.

MR. DOYLE: Correct.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: I think we're all set
now. Let's take a five-minute break and then we've got a couple more things to clean up and then we'll --

## (OFF RECORD)

CHAIRMAN PARKER: We've got a couple of things that we want to clarify and get cleaned up a little bit. One of them, yesterday in the testimony it talked about the specs for the new sound equipment that Casella is using and we'd like to see those actually submitted into the record so everybody has them. So if we can get those submitted to the record and to the intervenors and whatever, then we'd appreciate that.

MR. DOYLE: This is Rob O'Neal from Epsilon. He's telling me that they're already in the record. They're in Appendix G of what -- so it's Appendix $G$, the sound level assessment report of Epsilon and within that report it's Appendix B in that sound report.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Okay, so the staff should have that.

MR. DOYLE: So it's probably in volume 1,
the Chapter 400 standards, and the Appendix $G$, the Epsilon report, and within that report the specs are Appendix $B$ as in boy.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Okay. So everyone should have that including the intervenors then, right? The next item is Monday, the 17 th, Monday of this week, a new wastewater treatment plant license was issued for the Old Town facility and I'd like to make sure that that with its letters or e-mails that came to the Department, along with compliance, are entered into the record and everybody receives a copy of that. So the Department has it but $I$ want to make sure everyone is aware of it so that the intervenors and the -the applicant probably has it by now, I'm not sure, and make sure everybody has that so that the actual application is being based on the current license, not on a prior license, okay?

And this is a question for the Board, okay, the applicant wanted to have one more individual present some information regarding the OBW limit. Is this something the Board wants to entertain or not?

MS. CHASE: Yes.
CHAIRMAN PARKER: Yes, yes, yes, yes, yes,
yes, it's a yes. So we're going to have the applicant present the information but I'm also going to open it up after the presentation so the intervenors can cross if they choose to.

MR. DOYLE: Thank you. Toni and Mike, would you come forward?

So yesterday morning $I$ think it was -afternoon -- afternoon during cross examination, Ms. King was asked principally by Assistant Attorney General Sauer about commenting on an OBW limit, and Toni commented to some length and she would like to -- she has some additional comments about the issue of an OBW limit.

MS. KING: Thank you, Tom. For the reasons stated in my pre-filed rebuttal and hearing testimony, we firmly believe a limit on oversize bulky waste received at Juniper Ridge Landfill is not required. It is inappropriate to attempt to regulate other facilities through landfill licenses but that is exactly what the public benefit determination attempted to do with both Maine Energy Recovery Company and KTI Biofuels, Inc., due to a common parent entity. It is even more inappropriate at this time as the circumstances have changed with the change in
ownership and compliance of ReEnergy Lewiston with the processing facility recycling rule standards. The OBW material is a recycling residual whose most appropriate end destination is landfill disposal. Limiting residual volumes results in limiting recycling initiatives themselves contrary to compliance with the Maine Solid Waste Hierarchy. Moreover, as stated yesterday, limitations reduce the flexibility of businesses to adjust to market changes and changes in technologies and processes as evidenced by the increase in OBW from PERC due to operational adjustments. Having said that, a review of the record, rather than having an arbitrary limit imposed upon us, we would offer our conclusions as to a potentially acceptable limitation that may tend to minimally disrupt Maine's solid waste management.

Our 2011 annual records indicate our greatest level of acceptance of OBW being approximately 99,000 tons per year. Utilizing a three percent CPI from 2011, this would result in a capacity need of 118,000 tons per year. We believe this would allow some breathing room that would serve to not hinder businesses and economic
growth and would allow for flexibility to meet the needs of potential changes in technology and market changes that might increase recycling residual disposal requirements. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Thank you. We'll take a couple minutes so they can digest what you said. MR. DOYLE: Mike may have something to add.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Stay at the table. We're not going to take that long.

MR. BARDEN: Thank you. Mr. Laubenstein and $I$ have been talking with Casella about this a little bit. We agree with Casella that -- I think it's okay.

MR. DOYLE: Is it? It says red.
(Referring to microphone).
MR. BARDEN: It's okay, right? So our position is that there should not be a limit and here's a couple reasons. First of all, this is kind of a zero sum game. So either processing facilities are going to reduce their capacities so they're not generating as much revenue, so that means that there probably would be a reduction in employment and there will probably be no new processing facilities coming on line if they don't
have an outlet for their residues. So it's going to have to go -- and if they keep their capacity the same, it's going to go to another facility. So you're just shifting it from a state-owned landfill that's licensed to take state waste and there's only probably one other facility that would agree to take that and it's going to be at a higher tipping fee than it is now because there was a reason the state in the Operating Service Agreement put a cap on tipping fees and that was because at some point the state recognized that there was probably only going to be one landfill in the state and that was going to be state owned. So there was going to be no competition, and if we have a contract operator, that contract operator could charge whatever they want for tipping fees at least in the state and that's going to redirect state -- either state waste out of state if they can sort of cover the transportation costs that that's going to be, it means a higher cost to municipalities, to businesses. So if there's a cap on Juniper Ridge and the processing facilities are still processing the same amount they are now, it's going to go to another commercial landfill until that commercial landfill's capacity has run
out and that commercial landfill is going to know that JRL can't take anymore of that waste so they can jack up their tipping fee to whatever they want it to be and Maine businesses and communities are going to have to pay that higher tipping fee and that's why we don't think it's justified to have a limit on OBW at JRL.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Mr. Spencer, do you have any comments or cross I guess you'd say?

MR. SPENCER: Thank you. What's the - this oversize bulky waste, it only comes through a couple of facilities to Juniper Ridge, so what's the approximate percentage of that OBW that originates beyond our borders?

MS. KING: Oversize bulky waste is a residual from a processing facility.

MR. SPENCER: Correct.
MS. KING: So the processing facilities that we accept OBW from are located in Maine and OBW is a Maine state waste.

MR. SPENCER: Okay. The waste inputs to this or these processing facilities, isn't it true that over 80 percent of that waste stream into, say, the former KTI originated from out of state?
MS. KING: I don't have their annual
report in front of me, but it's an exhibit to my testimony.

MR. SPENCER: Am I off by a large amount by saying at least 80 percent?

MS. KING: I don't know.

MR. SPENCER: So -- and also, when Casella owned KTI, was -- how did that work? Was there a sorting pile set aside like, you know, you pull the burnables out of it, so was there oversize bulky waste pile at the facility?

MS. KING: Yes. So ReEnergy has changed the processing techniques since they've taken over the facility from we used to do a positive pick and they do essentially a negative sort, and it's just a different way of obtaining the recyclable commodities from the waste stream. The oversize bulky waste, when we owned KTI Biofuels, it's -it's essentially a larger fraction of front-end process residue that PERC would generate. So it's things that are too big and too difficult to manage to put through the processing equipment that are picked out initially from the waste stream that is tipped.

MR. SPENCER: Okay, another thing is, you want to use for your baseline for a limit the

99,000 tons a year of OBW that came into Juniper Ridge in 2011, is that right?

MS. KING: Yes.

MR. SPENCER: What was the next highest year?

MS. KING: Again, I don't have that in front of me.

MR. SPENCER: It was 98,000 tons I think the year before. I think two consecutive years it was 98 and 99. Why do you choose the highest year for a baseline?

MS. KING: We're not choosing a baseline. We're choosing a cap, remember.

MR. SPENCER: Okay. We are using a cap but shouldn't the cap -- if a cap is in place, to set some kind of a limit, shouldn't the limit be somewhere between the all-time highest and the all-time lowest?

MS. KING: I don't believe so.

MR. SPENCER: So you think -- well,
obviously you -- so you think that's fair, that the --

MS. KING: Well, let's get this straight. We don't think that it's fair to have a cap at all; however, this is the cap that we think will
give us the most flexibility to meet the solid waste disposal needs of the State of Maine.

MR. SPENCER: Do you consider yourself to be -- not yourself -- casella and BGS to be in full compliance with the public benefit determination from 2012 at this point?

MS. KING: Yes.

MR. SPENCER: Okay, thank you.
CHAIRMAN PARKER: Mr. Snowman?

MR. SNOWMAN: Yes. I'd like to ask Ms.
King I guess. This 294 tons, I got -- I got with my math 294 tons were generated by PERC. I'll just let you go through my thinking here. In the four years 2010 , '11, '12 and '13 I got 294 tons. I was wondering what percentage in your estimation or how much more OBW was generated in the PERC communities that's not accounted for in that 294 tons?

MS. KING: So I think we're mixing the different waste types between PERC and KTI Biofuels. So PERC takes primarily municipal solid waste, MSW, and any OBW that comes in in a municipal solid waste load, you know, carpet rolls or couches or mattresses or appliances, are incidental to that load. People have managed to
stuff a roll of carpet into an MSW container or a load and it's not supposed to be there because PERC cannot process construction and demolition debris, they can only process municipal solid waste. Oversize bulky waste from a facility such as KTI Biofuels or ReEnergy Lewiston which processes construction and demolition debris, quite regularly they receive oversize bulky waste in a construction and demolition load. It is not just incidental to their process; it's a portion of their process.

MR. SNOWMAN: So where would the majority, say, of oversize bulky waste be processed for residents that live in these PERC communities? MS. KING: It's not processed.

MR. SNOWMAN: Or -- or -- okay, let me
rephrase that. Essentially I want to know how much oversize bulky waste in your estimation is -I believe there's about 200,000 people that live in the PERC communities, if I'm not mistaken, that was some number that $--I$ could be wrong about that. How much oversize bulky waste is generated by the residents just in -- I won't go to MERC because I think there was a lot more out-of-state garbage $I$ think that was admitted -- no, no,
excuse me -- point of discard out-of-state garbage generated at MERC than there was at PERC. I think there was less out-of-state garbage going into PERC. That's what I've been told anyway. So I'm just kind of, you know, looking at these PERC numbers and I'm seeing how low they are and I'm trying to figure out what -- what do these --

MS. KING: Again, the OBW that PERC reports is not representative of the construction and demolition material that is generated by those PERC communities because PERC does not take construction and demolition debris.

MR. SNOWMAN: Okay. So where is it going? Where is the oversize bulky --

MS. KING: It depends on the municipality. So, for instance, a couple weeks ago our Pine Tree Waste hauling companies did a curbside bulky waste collection in Orrington. That went through the Old Town transfer station, which we operate, and it went to -- I believe it went to Juniper Ridge as construction and demolition debris because that's what it is. It's not a processing residual. Being able to do that affords us the opportunity to source separate and recycle some of that material as well.

MR. SNOWMAN: Yeah, I'm just trying -- I'm just trying to get a handle here. There's been no -- I've been at this for many years --

MS. KING: Again, I appreciate the question because $I$ think we're mixing waste streams and what oversize bulky waste exactly is, which is a processing residual from construction and demolition debris processing facilities.

MR. SNOWMAN: Okay, thank you. That's it for now.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: City of Old Town?
MR. KATSIAFICAS: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board, we weren't really prepared to talk about the public benefit determination seeing as how that was supposed to have been done and behind us. Page 20 of that has the commissioner's findings and it talks about the commissioner stating that if and when a license is issued for the construction and operation of an expansion, the Department will calculate such a limit. It also said that if they were shipping over 10,000 tons per year OBW to Juniper Ridge there will be an audit. My question would just be, has an audit occurred on the two-year cycle with regard to OBW as seen on page 20 of the commissioner's decision?

MS. KING: No, I don't believe so. It pertains to the expansion which has not yet been approved, one, and two, the audits are supposed to be initiated by DEP not by us. We have agreed to finance those audits as requested in the PBD but we have not received any word that the audits are going to be performed.

MR. KATSIAFICAS: Thank you. We have no position on the amount of the -- I just mentioned what was in the order. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: I've got a question. Maybe you can help me solve a conundrum, $I$ guess. When does municipal solid waste exempt itself from mattresses and from refrigerators and stuff that you're now determining basically are construction and demolition -- construction waste, because in the definition of municipal solid waste, basically municipal solid waste includes everything but the commercial and industrial waste which is produced in the community. If $I$ put a mattress out at the end of my driveway, $I$ think at that time it's a municipal waste, and when does it become nonmunicipal?

MS. KING: So that varies by regulatory subsets, so different states and different
communities have their own definitions and in the last few decades, those definitions have gotten tighter and whittled down. As things are able to be recycled and beneficially reused, they're taken out from the waste stream definitions. A perfect example is universal and electronic waste, which used to be a part of your trash bag, and now they're not able to be picked up in your trash bag. You're not supposed to put a car battery in your trash bag, for instance. That's a universal waste that needs to be handled differently. So I -- I'm not sure what community you reside in, but I would hazard a guess as to say that whoever picks up your curbside trash is not also going to pick up a mattress on the same day. Typically our communities in Maine have -- if they have curbside pickup, they have separate bulky waste cleanup days, they have separate leaf and yard waste pickup days and they have ordinarily a place to drop off source separated materials like universal and electronic waste, construction and demolition debris, another -- other various subsets of your waste stream.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: I hear what you're saying but my community may decide it's going to
have a time to pick up the large items which you can't put in a packer truck but that doesn't change its definition from being a municipal waste to a construction or demolition debris waste or to a commercial waste. It's still a municipal waste that's generated, and my community may choose not to put it in the same truck because it may not fit but that doesn't change the definition of it and that's what I'm trying to toy with is when a definition comes in to the OBD being something separate from municipal waste which $I$ don't think it is.

MR. DOYLE: I think if you look at the definitions in Chapter 400 of the Department's rules, there are separate definitions for municipal solid waste, construction and demolition debris and bulky waste. They are separately defined.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: I've been reading the definitions and $I$ will $I$ guess politely disagree with you, okay, in my interpretation of how it's worded but $I$ just wanted to see what your thoughts were on it as to how you define it, okay? Because that's something we're going to have to probably discuss of how we deal with the OBD and the OBD is
a nice acronym because it tells you basically what we're talking about but it's a different acronym if it comes from a municipality or it comes imported through a transfer facility where they're handing commercial products. It's -- it's -- in my opinion, and $I^{\prime} m$ only one person, okay? It says -- just to follow up a little, municipal solid waste means solid waste emanating from a household and normal commercial sources. I exempted commercial. I said my household. If I'm going to throw out a sofa that comes out of my household, it doesn't come out of an industrial processor. So at that point it's a municipal solid waste. How my municipality handles it, they may prohibit me from putting it in one truck and it has to go in another.

MR. DOYLE: I think the way it's -- I think the way it's been interpreted under the rules -- is this on -- believe the way it's been interpreted under those rules and the Department's historic interpretation is that the type of normal household waste that you put out on the curbside on a weekly basis, which is trash, and the type of waste that will be generated at this -- at this convention center today, does not include your
refrigerator, your couch or your mattress. That is oversize bulky waste which is a subset of construction and demolition debris.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: I will disagree with you and we'll move on because the definition doesn't say that. When my refrigerator comes out of my household, it's a municipal solid waste, okay?

MS. KING: I think that part of the confusion is the way you're looking at municipal and commercial. Just because it's not considered a municipal solid waste, construction and demolition debris is not always commercial or industrial. If we -- if we, you know, demo a house, a residential house, it's still construction and demolition debris. It's not necessarily commercial or industrial but it's not MSW.

MS. CHASE: Can I break in?

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Yes, please.
MS. CHASE: Right here $I$ have on page -it's number 5 and it's under the Maine Department of Environmental Protection under solid waste generation characterization, and the paragraph clearly says "Maine's solid waste management infrastructure includes municipal, commercial and
private industrial waste handling facilities," and in this it says waste "MSW is waste that is typically generated by household and commercial businesses," which would include mattresses, couches -MS. KING: No. MR. DOYLE: No. MS. CHASE: Because underneath construction and demolition is a completely different category.

MS. KING: That's right.
MS. CHASE: No, I mean, different from what they're saying is municipal solid waste.

MS. KING: That's right.
MR. DOYLE: They separate them.
MS. KING: So the commercial portion of

MSW would be essentially the -MR. EASTLER: Get closer. MS. KING: Is it on? So the commercial clause in that MSW would essentially be, you know when you go to a business, you know, a nail salon and they have -- they have a dumpster out back, and that's where they walk outside at the end of the day and throw their trash bag in. That's the commercial portion of the municipal solid waste
definition.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Any further questions
from the Board?

MS. CHASE: I would like a real
clarification on that because it doesn't read that way and $I$ think it -- you know, clearly $I$ think somewhere along the line household goods gets mixed in with demolition, and $I$ don't think that -- $I$ think that -- in order for us to continue, it's so confusing, I'm hearing two different things, that it would be nice if we have a really good clarification on that $I$ would think.

MR. DOYLE: If you -- if you --
CHAIRMAN PARKER: Any other questions?
MR. DOYLE: If you look at the -- if you look at the Maine Materials Management Plan, which is the state's solid waste management plan issued in 2014, on page 5 it gives a paragraph solid waste generation and characterization. Table 1, 2012 Maine solid waste types and amounts, first category, municipal solid waste, generation 1, 307,787, second category, construction and demolition debris, CDD, wood waste, land clearing debris, 438,133.

MS. CHASE: Right, $I$ have that.

MR. DOYLE: Two separate waste categories or two different types of wastes.

MS. CHASE: That's what I said.

MR. DOYLE: Well --
CHAIRMAN PARKER: I think at this time we'll stop the debate and we'll ask the Department to review the definitions because I'm certainly not going to be convinced by your argument and you're not going to be convinced by mine. So let's move on and $I$ think as Kathy said, let's try to get a better definition of what is -- I guess what is what, okay?

MR. DOYLE: Okay.
CHAIRMAN PARKER: Any further -- oh, Alvin, he had a question.

MR. AHLERS: I think you're --
CHAIRMAN PARKER: You're all set? Okay, he's all set. Staff?

MR. BURNS: I just want to ask a clarifying question so that $I$ can understand with all due respect to you not wanting a cap on this. You had proposed the 99,000 tons per year, and then the Consumer Price Index associated with that. Are you suggesting that that is an annual moving cap or did you suggest that it would be

118,000 tons per year as a final cap?
MS. KING: We're suggesting 118,000 final.

MR. BURNS: All right. One other -- here we go again. All right, here we go. My other question regarding the 118,000 ton per year cap, usually when $I$ think of things like this there's some sort of confidence interval or level of risk associated with establishing a numerical limit. Did you evaluate what the level of risk might be to businesses wanting to bring material that maybe puts you over the cap?

MS. KING: We did. I mean, we haven't had a long time to take a look at this in any great detail, but if you -- if you look at the propensity for actual construction and demolition debris recycling and other processing facilities in the State of Maine, we're fairly comfortable that we'll maintain enough flexibility underneath that cap to be able to serve the needs of the State of Maine.

MR. BURNS: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN PARKER: Any further questions?

No redirect, no recross or whatever?

MR. SPENCER: Thanks. We may be just going around and around here and we should
separate the issues somehow, but $I$ heard about a town pickup in Orrington or something of oversize bulky waste that comes then to the Old Town transfer station, if $I$ heard it right.

MS. KING: No, you didn't hear that right. It was a pickup of bulky waste.

MR. SPENCER: Bulky waste.
MS. KING: Yes.

MR. SPENCER: And what was the town again?

MS. KING: Orrington.

MR. SPENCER: Okay, Orrington. Bulky
waste and that goes to the Old Town transfer station and then to Juniper Ridge?

MS. KING: For consolidation, yes.

MR. SPENCER: Okay. So there isn't any processing done along the way? There's no waste reduction?

MS. KING: No, no, there's removal of recyclables at all of our transfer stations, yes.

MR. SPENCER: Right, but the -- but was anything removed from it with the bulky waste? Bulky waste comes in, does stuff come out of it?

MS. KING: So we obviously don't landfill things like appliances, for instance. So the appliances were removed from the bulky waste
loads, they were handled appropriately, that any CFCs were removed and then the metals were recycled, but that -- that's source separation. It's not processing.

MR. SPENCER: Right, and then you said something -- $I$ can't remember exactly what question prompted you but it was something about rules varying by state and $I$ think $I$ heard you say it has been tightened in some places, which has caused some changes?

MS. KING: I don't recall saying that but rules certainly do vary by state, yes.

MR. SPENCER: Okay, I'll get it off the transcript. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: I think that's all the questions. City of Old Town, do you have any?

MR. KATSIAFICAS: We have no questions.
CHAIRMAN PARKER: Well, I believe if
that's the case, we've pretty well concluded our business at this hearing.

First of all, $I$ want to compliment everybody for being professional and straightforward and expressing their opinions because we have a difficult job to deal with and being civil is a very, very important part of how
well your presentation is received, and $I$ want to thank you all for that. At this time $I$ would adjourn the -- yeah, adjourn the public hearing. MR. SPENCER: Were we going to set a date for -- were we going to set a date for final briefs? One question possibly related, about when will the transcript be available?

MS. BERTOCCI: I would respond that our intention was to set a date. I have not conferred regarding the time it's going to take to process the transcript so I think I will speak with Ms. Alley and the Chairman will then set a date for the submission of those briefs and we'll get back to you shortly on that.

MR. SPENCER: Would you hazard a guess if it's before or after Veterans Day weekend?

CHAIRMAN PARKER: We don't know.
MS. BERTOCCI: I will speak with Ms. Alley
after she has an opportunity to look at the work in front of her and we will get back to you promptly. I am assuming that the parties are interested in having the transcript available before you have to submit your brief, is that -is that a request or --

MR. SPENCER: Excuse me?

MS. BERTOCCI: Do the parties -- I'm asking whether or not the parties feel they need to have a transcript available to them before drafting and submitting your brief.

MR. SPENCER: Speaking for myself, yes.
CHAIRMAN PARKER: Okay.

MR. DOYLE: Sure.

MS. BERTOCCI: So the Chairman will take that all into consideration after we consult with Ms. Alley. Okay.

CHAIRMAN PARKER: Well, I think I've
already concluded the hearing, so thank you.
(HEARING CONCLUDED AT 12:00 P.M.)
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