
that. The Department will hear testimony from the
copies. We will also address the applicant's objection related to pre-filed testimony prior to the proceedings today. Today's hearing will begin with the testimony from applicant Maine Bureau of General Services and its operator and agent for JRL, NEWSME Landfill Operations, LLC, followed by cross examination of the applicant's witnesses. Please note that counsel to the Department and DEP staff may ask clarifying questions at any time, although the Department will generally hold its questions until the completion of cross examination by the parties. Following questioning of the applicant by DEP staff presentations by the intervenors will generally follow the sequence outlined in the Fourth Procedural Order, allowing for minor adjustments as needed during the course of the proceedings.

I believe we have an updated schedule that we have put at the beginning of the room.

MR. PARKER: It hasn't been changed since yesterday.

HEARING OFFICER: But that has not been changed since yesterday. Following -- following questioning of the applicant by DEP staff, presentations by the intervenors -- we've discussed
general public tonight, April 9th, beginning at 6:30 p.m. here at the Governor Hill Mansion.

If there are any members of the public here today that would like to ask questions of the witnesses, you must submit your questions to me in writing. Paper can be made available to you and you would provide those questions to this table if you would like to have me review those questions. I will review those questions, make a determination as to their relevance and that they are not repetitive and I may ask the questions as time permits.

This hearing is being recorded and transcribed. All witnesses at this hearing will be sworn and all evidence already entered into the record will be available during the course of the hearing for inspection by anyone who wishes to do so. After the hearing, the project file will be available for public inspection during regular business hours at the DEP office in Augusta.

At the conclusion of the hearing, no further evidence or testimony will be allowed into the record except for matters specifically identified by the Hearing Officer. These matters will be identified before the close of the hearing on Wednesday, April 10th.

At this time I ask that all persons testifying to stand and raise their right hand so I can swear you in. Do you affirm that the testimony you are about to give is the whole truth and nothing but the truth?
(Witnesses Respond in the Affirmative)
HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any questions about the procedure we will be following during this hearing? Okay, in closing, the goal is a fair and productive hearing. Please be aware of time constraints and adhere to the time that has been allotted to you. Please be concise and keep the testimony relevant to the statutory and regulatory criteria. Please be aware that the Department has read the pre-filed direct and rebuttal testimony. The Department is here to listen to and consider all of the evidence placed before us. Thank you all for your participation.

For your information, we plan to break at approximately 1 p.m. for lunch and 5:00 p.m. for dinner. With that, before we get to the proceedings, we have two procedural issues that I had mentioned that we should address this morning and then we'll get started on the proceedings themselves.

With respect to the first procedural issue
we will address this morning, it deals with an objection that we received from the applicant yesterday with respect to an appeal to the Commissioner on the Third Procedural Order. Because the Commissioner has made her decision, I do not have the authority to rule on that particular decision or the process leading to that decision. There is an issue, however, as to whether the chart in that appeal is part of the hearing record. The chart is one that the citizen intervenors compiled based upon reports by Casella to the Department. I note that the information of this nature is part of the JRL licensing record and that these reports may be considered by the Department in its licensing decision. Recognizing that the Department can consider this information, are the citizen intervenors seeking to admit this chart as part of this hearing? I'm looking to the representative of the citizen intervenors to let me know.

MR. SANBORN: No.
HEARING OFFICER: That's a no?
MR. SANBORN: No.
HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Thank you very much.

THE REPORTER: May I have his name?

Michael T. Parker at the Department and state his or
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MR. PARKER: Harry Sanborn. HEARING OFFICER: That's a good point. Because we have a court reporter here today, if any of the parties are responding to me on anything, please identify your name so that we can have it as part of the record.

With respect to the second procedural issue, Old Town Fuel and Fiber has asked to withdraw as an intervenor and to withdraw its sworn pre-filed testimony. Chapter 3, Section 11-A-7 provides that "the presiding officer shall allow an intervenor to withdraw from the participation in a licensing proceeding. The presiding officer shall evaluate whether any testimony or evidence presented by the withdrawing party must be stricken from the record because a witness is no longer available for cross examination or inclusion of evidence would cause undue prejudice to remaining parties." Also, paragraph 4 of the Second Procedural Order states "if an intervenor believes that he or she is not capable of the level of participation expected of an intervenor or if an intervenor for any reason no longer desires to participate at the level of an intervenor, he or she may send an e-mail or letter to
her desire to participate as an interested person and/or a member of the public rather than as an intervenor. There is no time limit set to change participation from that of intervenor to that of interested person or a member of the public." As the pre-filed testimony has been withdrawn, no ruling is necessary with respect to that testimony. Old Town Fuel and Fiber is permitted to withdraw and as such, withdrawal together with the withdrawal of their testimony will not result in prejudice of any party to this proceeding. So that is with respect to the Old Town Fuel and Fiber request for withdrawal. That withdrawal has taken place.

We will now move on to the proceedings beginning with the applicant. The applicant has -- I apologize -- starting with a statement by the Department staff and then following the statement by the Department staff we will move on to the applicant.

MR. PARKER: Thank you, Heather. My name is Michael Parker. I'm the project manager for the proceeding before us today. The applicant, the Bureau of General Services, and its agent, NEWSME, LLC, submitted the application on September 12th, 2012. The application was accepted as complete for

processing on October 3rd, 2012. Subsequent to that, the applicant submitted and its agent submitted a revised application in December of 2012. Subsequent to that, included in the record right now before us, includes the application, the amended application, all the public comments that we've received to date, all the procedural orders that have been issued by the Department and the Hearing Officer. We have all the pre-filed testimony. Within the procedural orders there were certain documents that the Hearing Officer noted were commonly available to the public. Those have also been accepted in as part of the record today, and that record in its entirety is available today for all parties in these proceedings. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER: Before we get to the applicant, if any additional parties have entered the room who intend to testify today I can swear you in at this time if you have not already been sworn in. Are there any additional parties who have entered the room who have not been sworn in who plan to testify today?

Okay, applicant, you may proceed with your -- with your testimony. Please note that your testimony is limited to 120 minutes. Ladies and Gentlemen. My name is Tom Doyle. I represent NEWSME Landfill Operations, the operator of the Juniper Ridge Landfill. Bill Laubenstein is here today on behalf of the Bureau of General Services. This proceeding is about allowing additional municipal solid waste to be accepted at Juniper Ridge, a waste that has been accepted safely at the facility in bypass form since 2005. No one can seriously question whether Juniper Ridge was designed or built to be able to accept municipal solid waste or whether it has the proper practices in place to accept this waste safely and in an environmentally suitable way. The DEP staff know it and have already said as much in their review memos on this application.

The evidence will show that the Maine waste management infrastructure dramatically changed at the end of 2012. Maine Energy, one of our four incinerators, closed. The ash and FEPR for Maine Energy will no longer be generated and, thus, does not need to be disposed at Juniper Ridge. Much of

1 the in-state municipal solid waste that was delivered 2 to Maine Energy is under contract to Casella and a disposal location that is environmentally and economically suitable is now needed for this in-state municipal solid waste. Juniper Ridge fits this need.

Casella reached agreement with PERC to send it at least 30,000 tons annually of in-state municipal solid waste that used to go to Maine Energy. The evidence will show that if this application is approved, this will mean an additional $\$ 450,000$ annually for PERC and indirectly to MRC communities because of the out-of-state waste it will displace. That leaves up to 93,000 tons of in-state MSW that BGS and NEWSME seek acceptance -- seek approval for acceptance to Juniper Ridge.

The evidence will also show that Casella offered to send a portion of this MSW volume to both ecomaine and MMWAC but they were either not able to agree on price in the case of ecomaine or not interested in the case of MMWAC. Ecomaine and MMWAC see the closure of Maine Energy and the 93,000 tons of municipal solid waste that needs a disposal home as a potential windfall for them. They suggest that they are somehow entitled to this MSW, claiming the Maine Waste Management Hierarchy requires that it be
sent to an incinerator like theirs, but the hierarchy was never intended to be applied and has never been applied in such a forced or rigid fashion nor in an individual facility licensing process like this to accept an additional volume of waste already accepted at a facility. In effect, what ecomaine and MMWAC want is not to have to compete for this MSW in an open marketplace but for the State to subsidize them by artificially shutting off an environmentally sound disposal site, Juniper Ridge, so they can seek to charge higher prices for this MSW volume, but the evidence will show that they didn't rely on this volume of MSW from Maine Energy when Maine Energy was operating. They didn't have contracts with these Maine Energy communities or customers and they now compete for this MSW in an open marketplace and they now can compete for this MSW in an open marketplace if they so choose. It is inappropriate for MMWAC and ecomaine or any of the other member communities to suggest that disposal options of other Maine municipalities outside of their service areas should be limited or somehow forced to use and, in effect, subsidize their facilities at a higher cost.

The evidence will show that this application meets all applicable DEP review standards and is
consistent with the Waste Management Hierarchy, even if that State policy has no standards that can lawfully be applied to an application of this type.

The evidence will show that there are significant benefits to many parties and the State if this application is approved. First, there will be an environmentally acceptable disposal location for up to 93,000 tons of in-state MSW for Maine communities and businesses; second, approximately 200,000 tons of out-of-state waste will no longer need to be brought in to Maine; third, enhanced recycling opportunities will now exist for Biddeford, Old Town, all of the other 187 MRC communities and other Maine municipalities; fourth, PERC and indirectly the MRC communities will receive an additional \$450,000 annually from Casella delivering 30 tons of in-state municipal solid waste to PERC and displacing the same amount of lower priced out-of-state MSW; fifth, Old Town will benefit from increased host fees from this additional MSW volume; sixth, the life of Juniper Ridge will be extended slightly compared to when Maine Energy was operating; seventh, traffic to Juniper Ridge will be reduced; eighth and finally, ecomaine and MMWAC will be able to compete on an open and level playing field for the
very same waste stream once the existing contracts expire and today for any MSW that is not currently under contract.

In summary, the evidence will show that this application meets all applicable licensing standards and is consistent with the Waste Management Hierarchy; therefore the Commissioner should approve it.

With that, let me give you a little roadmap of the rest of our presentation this morning. We have six witnesses. I'm not sure we're going to take the entire two hours. If we have time left over, I'd like to reserve that time for some additional cross examination for BGS and NEWSME. We're going to do this as efficiently and as focused as possible.

With that, let me introduce our first witness. Mike Barden is the manager of state-owned landfills, a position within the Department of Economic and Community Development. He has held this position since September of 2012. Previously Mike had been employed as the senior planner in the Governor's Energy Office, grants administrator for Efficiency Maine Trust and the Public Utilities Commission, environmental affairs director with the Maine Pulp and Paper Association and as a division
director with the Maine DEP. Mike holds a bachelor of science -- holds bachelor of science degrees in chemistry and microbiology and a master of science degree in regional resource planning. Mike.

MR. BARDEN: Thank you, Mr. Doyle. Again, my name is Mike Barden. I'm assuming this is on. Is this better?

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.
MR. BARDEN: As Tom noted, my effective date of hire in this position was September 24th, 2012. Juniper Ridge Landfill is one of three state-owned landfills in the state. We have Juniper Ridge, which obviously is an active landfill, Dolby Landfill in Millinocket is also an active landfill, Carpenter Ridge is a permitted but undeveloped site in an unorganized territory near Lincoln, Maine. Ownership of the state-owned landfills resides with the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, the Bureau of General Services.

HEARING OFFICER: If I can interrupt you, can you please speak into the microphone so that the people behind you can hear you? Thank you.

MR. BARDEN: The management oversight resides with the Department of Economic and Community Development and the duties, roles and
responsibilities of the respective agencies are implemented through an interagency MOU which we've included in our pre-filed testimony as Exhibit 1.

In regards to the Juniper Ridge Landfill, I
have reviewed the 2011 Annual Report, the Operating
Services Agreement which was signed between the State and Casella in 2004, the 2011 Water Quality Monitoring Reports, Cell 8 Construction Reports, I've conducted one site visit to the facility, attended two Juniper Ridge Landfill Advisory Committee meetings, and in addition, NEWSME or Casella provides me with monthly activity reports on landfill activities which I in turn provide copies to the Juniper Ridge Advisory Committee as well as interested parties, including municipal offices in Old Town, Alton and Orono.

The State, myself and the Assistant Attorney General reviewed this application, the pending application before us as well as the December 2012 modification which was prepared by Casella which included insertion of minor editorial changes as well as what we felt was appropriate to put a cap on the municipal solid waste that was coming to the landfill which reflected the three-year average of MSW that was going from in-state waste to the Maine Energy

Recovery facility in-state communities as well as the soft layer and bypass which came to 123,000 tons. That was subsequently amended by the contract between PERC and Casella which is diverting 30,000 of that tonnage to the PERC facility leaving a cap at the Juniper Ridge Landfill for MSW of 93,000 tons which includes soft layer as well as bypass. So that would be the cap on the landfill.

Based on our review of the Operating
Services Agreement as well as all applicable DEP and federal requirements, we believe the pending application is consistent with these provisions and we recommend that the DEP approve the application as submitted. Thank you.

MR. DOYLE: Thank you, Mike. I'm just going to do this next introduction from here rather than keep popping up to save time. Our next witness is Brian Oliver. Brian is the regional vice president for Casella Waste Systems and vice president of NEWSME Landfill Operations, LLC, the operator of Juniper Ridge. Brian has worked with Casella since 1996. He earned his bachelor's degree in business administration from Bryant College and his master's of science in administration from St. Michaels College. He will discuss the events that led to the
submittal of this application, how it was consistent with the State's Waste Management Hierarchy and the multiple benefits that result from this application. He will also present his rebuttal testimony to certain aspects of the testimony of the Sanborns, MMWAC, ecomaine and Mr. Spencer. Brian.

MR. OLIVER: Thank you, Tom. Can everybody hear me okay? My responsibilities as vice president include oversight of all Casella facilities and operations in the state of Maine. I'm extremely proud of Casella as a company and of the 350 hard-working Casella employees in the state of Maine who work every day to provide cost effective, comprehensive solid waste management solutions to the communities and businesses in the state of Maine.

This application asks that the bypass-only conditions in the current license that limit MSW disposal at JRL be modified to allow disposal of up to 93,000 tons of in-state MSW each year. This would provide the Maine communities and businesses that use the Maine Energy facility an environmentally and economically sound option to handle the part of their waste streams that cannot be reused or recycled. The JRL is a state-owned asset and the municipalities and businesses in Maine should be provided the ability to
utilize that asset. This amendment application is not proposing a new waste stream or a condition that was not anticipated in the granting of the facility license in April of 2004. In our application and as exhibits to my testimony, we've provided very clear documentation that accepting MSW at JRL has been anticipated throughout Casella's involvement with the state-owned landfill.

One event in particular that was contemplated was the potential shut down of one of the incinerators. With the closure of Maine Energy at the end of last year, we saw just such an event. In my pre-filed testimony, I explained the long process in which Casella and Biddeford have worked cooperatively to find a mutually-agreeable strategic approach for Maine Energy, including the possibility of it being closed. This closure of Maine Energy means that the in-state MSW that the plant was incinerating needs another disposal site. These are Casella customers and we have a responsibility to take their MSW to a disposal facility licensed to accept their material.

In our initial application, we agreed with the Bureau of General Services to limit the amount of MSW that would be sent to JRL to 123,000 tons per
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year from in-state customers. This tonnage number was based on the three-year average of in-state MSW accepted at Maine Energy combined with bypass and soft layer MSW from Maine Energy sent to JRL. This tonnage cap would ensure that these in-state customers have a disposal option for their waste. All contracted out-of-state waste that previously was sent to Maine Energy would be diverted to facilities outside the state of Maine.

We amended the application and reduced the tonnage cap to 93,000 tons per year because we've recently executed an agreement with the Penobscot Energy Recovery Company that reduces the amount of MSW we were asking to be disposed of at JRL. If this application is approved, Casella will deliver at least 30,000 tons of in-state MSW to PERC each year until 2018. This provision will help stabilize PERC's MSW supply base which is necessary to keep electricity generation at full capacity, will allow PERC to displace out-of-state MSW currently being combusted at PERC and will generate approximately $\$ 450,000$ annually of additional tipping fees for PERC.

The Casella/PERC Agreement also contains a section providing for a very robust recycling
.
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opportunity for the PERC communities. Currently communities using PERC run the risk of significant financial penalties if recycling causes the tonnage they deliver to PERC to go down. In the future, for any of PERC's charter municipalities that join Casella's Zero Sort Recycling Program, Casella will replace delivery shortfalls to PERC resulting from this recycling with additional MSW. Our intent is to source this with in-state MSW; therefore, there will be no financial penalty for these charter municipalities as a result of increased recycling with Casella and the PERC facility will receive the necessary fuel.

Multiple parties argue, in essence, that the application should be denied simply because the MSW in question could be incinerated instead of landfilled. As explained in the application and my prior testimony, this is a cramped view of the solid waste hierarchy which was never intended to be applied as a permitting standard to an individual applicant but rather as a guide to inform the State in adopting legislation and rules regulating solid waste.

This application is entirely consistent with Maine's Waste Management Hierarchy for multiple
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tons per year of in-state waste that Casella will deliver to PERC that I mentioned earlier will displace approximately the same amount of out-of-state MSW that was previously being combusted at PERC. In total, this represents a reduction of approximately 200,000 tons of out-of-state waste coming to Maine.

I'm going to look to Jeremy. I'd like to further clarify this topic by discussing a table that's Exhibit 15. There's confusion regarding the 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste that's being pushed back out of state, the 30,000 tons of in-state waste that we've agreed to provide to PERC and the 50,000 tons of category 4 and category 5 MSW in the PERC agreement. So hopefully this clarifies things.

1 If you look at 2011, the state brought in 264,137 2 tons of out-of-state MSW. PERC brought in 91,162.
3 Now, of this, 17,500 tons is committed to PERC -- has
4 been committed to PERC since 2001 per an agreement
5 and it will continue to be provided to PERC per the 6 existing agreement. So it's been going there for the 7 last 12 years and it will continue to go there per 8 the existing agreement. So third parties brought in 9 73,662 tons to PERC, MMWAC brought in 118 tons,

1 tons. So PERC will bring in 30,000 tons less of out-of-state waste. Maine Energy will not bring in the 170,000 . There is absolutely no linkage of the 50,000 tons of category 4 and 5 waste to the 200,000 tons that will not be coming in. Those 200,000 tons will not come into the state of Maine and that's a fact. It's a 76 percent reduction of out-of-state waste coming in. Thank you, Jeremy.

The second is recycling. Expanding zero sort recycling by Casella will significantly increase recycling. Casella's zero sort system allows residents and businesses to commingle all recyclable materials into one container requiring no source separation. When you make recycling easier, as zero sort does, more volume is recycled, more people recycle and much less waste is disposed. Biddeford and the 13 tri-county communities that used to use Maine Energy for waste disposal all have recycling programs. These programs reduce the amount of MSW that will be disposed at JRL. The acceptance of these communities' residual MSW at the JRL will not affect these programs and there is no contract language in their agreements with Casella that limits their ability to continue to expand their recycling programs. Casella has met with the tri-county
communities and offered to work cooperatively with them in an effort to enhance their recycling efforts. Casella will also be initiating its Zero Sort Curbside Recycling Program in Biddeford in July 2013 which will dramatically increase the recycling rate in that city. Casella has also amended the Residential Refuse and Collection Agreement with Old Town to extend the agreement for an additional five years subject to approval of this application. The Old Town amendment would provide 64-gallon recycling toters at Casella's expense to every household in Old Town in an effort to further increase this recycling percentage.

Lastly, as another example of its efforts to expand recycling, Casella has just executed an agreement with the city of Lewiston to construct a zero sort processing facility. This facility will handle the in-state recyclable materials currently sent to Charlestown, Mass, and be the catalyst to expand recycling efforts in the state of Maine and further assist the state in achieving its recycling goals.

Casella will also undertake commercially reasonable efforts to dispose of non-recyclable residue generated from the processing of these
recyclable materials in the Lewiston facility at the Mid-Maine Waste Action Corporation incinerator located in Auburn, Maine, unless that facility is unable or unwilling to accept such material.

Third is incineration. As discussed earlier and described more fully in our application, Casella is providing a wide range of fuel supply stabilization to PERC that also allows the communities using PERC to recycle without suffering a financial penalty if their deliveries to PERC go down as a result of recycling. Two incinerators, MMWAC and ecomaine, present nearly identical direct testimony on the economic constraints of operating an incinerator, arguing that the DEP should deny the application to prevent them from having to compete with JRL for MSW, both, therefore, want DEP to artificially increase the supply of MSW to them by denying the application in hopes that this new guaranteed revenue source will offset their loss of power sales revenue and thus allow them to stay competitive with other facilities. They essentially want the DEP to exercise state-wide flow control. The JRL amendment application does not propose to serve as a disposal site for MSW from any Maine municipality under current contract to any of the

1 three remaining incinerators. In fact, one of those 2 three, PERC, has submitted testimony in support of 3 the JRL application. It is inappropriate and, indeed, presumptive for MMWAC, ecomaine or any of their member municipalities to suggest that the disposal options of other Maine municipalities outside of their service areas should be limited to somehow force them to utilize and, in effect, subsidize MMWAC or ecomaine at potentially a higher cost.

They both also ignore the fact that other Maine landfills, Tri-Community, Presque Isle, Hatch Hill, Crossroads, Bath and Brunswick are currently licensed to and do accept MSW from Maine communities; in other words, what is being proposed for JRL is already the norm at other landfills across the state. Neither MMWAC or ecomaine has claimed in its testimony that disposal of MSW at these landfills is jeopardizing the economic viability of their facilities. All this application asks is for JRL to be regulated the same way as other Maine landfills that are licensed to accept municipal solid waste. They are not limited to only what is bypassed from Maine incinerators and they have no annual tonnage limit on the MSW they can accept for disposal.

In conclusion, there are many benefits to several parties involved in this proceeding from the decision to sell and close Maine Energy and the approval of this application. PERC and its partners, including the MRC communities, will get at least 30,000 tons per year of additional in-state MSW that will generate approximately $\$ 450,000$ of additional revenue annually because it will displace out-of-state sources that pay significantly lower disposal fees. The city of Old Town will get additional host community revenue on this material under the provisions in Casella's 2005 Host Community Agreement with the city which specifically contemplated MSW from the closure of Maine Energy being permitted for disposal at JRL. If this application is approved, Old Town will also begin benefiting from an escalator on the $\$ 2.50$ per ton fee on this MSW.

Although approval of this application is no longer a precondition of the sale of Maine Energy, Casella's commitment to its relationship with Biddeford in proceeding with that transaction allows the city to fulfill a decade-long goal of closing Maine Energy, thereby unleashing opportunities for economic development in Biddeford. Approximately

200,000 tons of out-of-state waste previously or currently delivered to Maine will get pushed back out-of-state; opportunities for robust recycling opportunities will be pursued to help Maine reach its recycling goals and to further reduce waste disposal; fewer tons will be delivered annually to the JRL as a result of this transaction saving valuable land space; a transfer station has been constructed in Westbrook to handle material that used to go to Maine Energy, providing additional revenue and job creation opportunities in that community.

Lastly, a state of Maine asset, JRL, will be utilized for Maine communities and businesses. Thank you.

MR. DOYLE: Thank you, Brian. Our next witness is Michael Booth. Mike is a licensed professional engineer in the state of Maine and is employed as a senior project manager at Sevee and Mahar engineers. Mike has over 30 years of environmental engineering experience and his principal area of focus has been solid waste management with an emphasis on landfill design and operations. Mike was involved with the Juniper Ridge Landfill since its inception in 1993 when he assisted with the siting and design of the facility for James

River. He also directed the design and preparation of the permit application for the vertical increase and the additional waste streams amendment at Juniper Ridge that was approved by the Department in 2004. He is familiar with the standards of practice relating to landfill design, the DEP's landfill licensing standards and disposal of MSW in secure landfills like Juniper Ridge. Mike will testify on various issues addressed in the application, including liner design, leachate quantity and quality, landfill capacity, landfill gas generation and traffic. He will also present his rebuttal testimony to certain aspects of the testimony of the Sanborns. Mike.

MR. BOOTH: Thanks, Tom. Can you hear -- I was wondering if that was --

HEARING OFFICER: Please use the microphone at the table.

MR. BOOTH: Good morning. My testimony will address the technical aspects of the application describing a process undertaken to quantify the effects of the proposal on various design related issues. I will describe and summarize the various conclusions I reached in this application associated with these items. Finally, I will be rebutting
several points made in the Sanborns' pre-filed testimony.

The starting point for this process was to quantify what will change in the waste mix as a result of this application. I did this by comparing the types and amount of waste taken to the landfill in 2011, including the Maine Energy residuals, to what the values would be with Maine Energy closed and the residuals no longer taken to the landfill and replaced with the in-state MSW proposed in this application. I completed a similar analysis using three years of data from Maine Energy from the periods between 2009 and 2011. I then evaluated whether those changes made material changes in the assumptions used to permit the landfill back in 2004 or the current site operation. I looked at items such as liner configuration, leachate and landfill gas generation and collection system design and operational considerations such as traffic, cell layout and cell capacity. From an engineering standpoint, there are two items that most influence the outcomes of this evaluation. They are, will the proposal change the amount of material disposed of at the landfill? The answer to this is no. Will this proposal change the overall physical and chemical
properties of the landfill mass? Again, the answer to this is no. Let me explain in a little more detail. The proposal will reduce the total tonnage accepted at the facility by about five percent as shown in the initial tables in the application. As an example, using 2011 data, the landfill took in 704,000 tons of material that was placed in the landfill. With this proposal, that amount would be 669,600 tons. This affects issues such as truck traffic, development capacity and landfill life.

Secondly, the proposal will only affect about 30 percent of the materials placed in the landfill. The remaining 70 percent of the materials will remain the same. Again, this affects things such as leachate quality, landfill life.

And, finally, the percentage of MSW type materials will only increase by about three percent as a result of this application from 20 to 23 percent. When I speak of MSW materials, I include FEPR in that number as well as the MSW which is bypassed as part of this application. This affects things such as leachate quality. I'd like to review and kind of give a basic overview of some of these specific items and what the effects are. As far as leachate quantity, the proposed change will have no
impact on leachate quantity. This was a conclusion that was also reached by DEP staff in an independent review. The reason for this is the amount of leachate a facility will generate is based on a number of variables such as the physical properties of the waste, the amount of open operational area, precipitation and the facility's cover practice. Our estimates back in 2004, which is a basis for the leachate design for this system and the agreement with the Old Town mill to treat the leachate from the facility, have proven to be conservative. We estimated the annual leachate generation back in 2004 to range between 13 and 15 million gallons. Over the last few years, the site has generated in the range of 9 to 11 million gallons, principally because of the aggressive covering practices the facility follows. Since none of these items described above will change, I anticipate the leachate generation rates will stay similar to the current rates with this application.

Leachate quality. Leachate quality will also not change in any appreciable manner due to this application. Again, this is a similar conclusion. It has also been reached by the DEP staff in their independent review. I base this assessment on a
comparison of JRL's current leachate with leachate from MSW landfills and the small changes in the amount of MSW that will be received at the site. Based on this conclusion, the leachates will be very similar.

Gas management. As part of this application, we had Sanborn, Head Associates, Casella's landfill gas consultant, evaluate the peak landfill gas generation rates associated with this proposal and compare them with the projections that were done as part of the 2004 permit. This analysis basically indicated that the original analysis was conservative and the peak amount of leachate gas generated from this proposal would be less than what was used to permit the facility back in 2004. It is also less than what was the basis for the recently issued MDEP permit.

Landfill capacity consumption. The proposed change in the additional MSW will not have a significant impact on the in-place density and with the reduced amount of overall waste received at the landfill capacity consumption, in fact, the landfill life will be slightly extended. I reach this conclusion looking at the weighted average densities before and after this proposal and the overall amount
of waste received at the site. As explained in the application, the weighted average density is not the actual in-place waste density, which is -- it would be higher because of issues such as commingling, consolidation and secondary decompositions of the waste placed in the landfill.

Typically what the application showed in table 3.1 was that the average waste density before and after this proposal was the same at .53 tons per cubic yard. The actual in-place waste density that we measure in the active area of the landfill is .91 tons per cubic yard after placement, and after years of placement, looking at yearly compaction rates, we are seeing compaction rates -- long-term compaction rates of over a ton per cubic yard; therefore, as indicated, I project the landfill life will be slightly greater than proposed because of the reduced amount of material as part of this proposal and similar in-place waste densities.

With respect to traffic, the proposal will actually result in fewer truck trips to JRL. This analysis was done starting with the actual waste truck trips to the facility in 2011 to determine the tons per load of the various types of materials taken to the landfill and then applying the various
tonnages of the material associated with this proposal using those truck loads of tons. Although the MSW will be delivered to the facility, less incinerator residual will be taken and when you compare the truck size to handle these different materials, you actually end up with fewer truck trips.

So in conclusion, based on the analysis
we've completed on this proposal, I have determined that there are no changes in the technical basis for the findings of facts related to the design of the Juniper Ridge Landfill back in 2004.

My rebuttal testimony is associated with two portions of the Sanborns' direct testimony. They suggested that a compromise solution where the in-state MSW could and should be directed to one of the three remaining in-state incinerators to replace the out-of-state waste which is currently going to these facilities, and they're suggesting that somehow this application is related to the grade of C minus assigned by the American Society of Civil Engineers to the solid waste infrastructure in the state. As far as a compromise solution, they failed in their testimony to consider a number of practical considerations, not the least of which is the
contractual issues associated with implementing their solution. The state is not a party to these contracts and it's a fallacy to assume that all parties that would be involved in the implementation of their solution could reach an agreement to implement their compromise solution. They appear also not to consider the seasonal patterns in waste generation in the state. There is nothing in their testimony that demonstrates that the waste is generated when it would be needed and the last thing we need is excessive MSW sitting on a tipping floor during the hot periods of the summer months when the majority of -- the higher volumes of waste are generated in the state.

They also suggest that the hierarchy supports their proposal over what is proposed; yet, I've reviewed permitting activities for guidance on how MDEP has evaluated landfill conformance with a hierarchy and as Brian indicated, there are currently six landfills in the state that accept MSW and none of them have been required to demonstrate that they've exhausted all management options higher on the hierarchy to accept MSW. As an example, I've included in my rebuttal testimony a copy of Crossroads Phase 6 landfill expansion application, a
facility that's very similar to JRL in that they accept a number of different types of waste and they accept MSW, however, without the current limitations that are on the JRL permit. The Crossroads permits contain findings of facts regarding the facility's compliance with the hierarchy, identifying that all MSW in the state of Maine is subject to voluntary and mandatory recycling and resource reduction provisions and goals. Compliance with these goals and the requirements of the hierarchy is under the direction of the state and not the disposal facility. There are no requirements that solid waste disposal facilities demonstrate or assume responsibility for compliance of the generators with the hierarchy.

The Crossroads permits also relied on evidence in that application similar to what's included in our application as far as the applicant reducing the amount of solid waste requiring disposal. That information is contained in Section 2.6 of our application and Brian reiterated some of those activities that are in there; namely, the applicant is doing -- namely, what the applicant is doing to promote the reuse, reduce and recycling activities in the state and nothing in the contract limits the user of that facility from expanding its
recycling and reuse programming. Again, Brian reiterated that.

Section 2.6 of the application contains detailed descriptions of these activities that Brian previously described to expand the main focus of the hierarchy; namely, the reduction and reuse -- reuse and recycling program expansion and nothing in their contracts would limit the ability of the customers to recycle. As Brian identified, Casella encourages recycling as demonstrated by the activities he summarized.

The Sanborns suggest that the reason the American Society of Civil Engineering assigned a grade of $C$ minus to the state's solid waste hierarchy was the state's inability to reach the 50 percent recycling goal in 2009. First, it's just illogical to suggest the reason the state did not reach a goal in 2009 has anything to do with an application submitted in 2012. More important, if you look at the study's recommendations, they have nothing to do with Sanborn's direct outcome -- desired outcome for this application.

I'd just like to review the state's recommendations and challenge anyone to match what Casella has put forth in the state to meet these

## goals.

First, enhancing local/state solid waste management programming; second, promote waste reduction, recycling and beneficial use programming; third, update the state's solid waste policies to reflect advancements in the industry; fourth, respond to the need for additional capacity and recognize the need and time period required for this; and, fifth, ensure that changes in the state's solid waste management planning at the state, which have changed from the State Planning Office to the DEP, do not result in lost momentum. Thank you.

MR. DOYLE: Thank you, Mike. Our next witness this morning is Jeremy Labbe. Jeremy is the environmental manager for NEWSME Landfill Operations, the operator of Juniper Ridge. He's a licensed professional engineer in the state of Maine and a Solid Waste Association of North America certified manager of landfill operations. Do I have some feedback here?

HEARING OFFICER: A little bit.
MR. DOYLE: Among Jeremy's responsibilities
at Juniper Ridge are the oversight of landfill
design, compliance and operations. He received his bachelor's degree in civil engineering from the

University of Maine and will shortly be defending his thesis as he pursues the last step toward his master's degree in geotechnical engineering from UMO. Jeremy will address the technical aspects of the site operations associated with the application. He will also present his rebuttal testimony to certain aspects of the testimony of Mr. Spencer. Jeremy.

MR. LABBE: Thank you, Mr. Doyle. I guess this is good preparation for my thesis defense. My testimony, as Mr. Doyle stated, will address site operations at the Juniper Ridge Landfill with respect to this proposal. As I go through this presentation, there are a few key points to keep in mind, some of which have been discussed by Mr. Booth already.

The first is that JRL does currently handle municipal solid waste, which we know in the industry as MSW, on a regular basis. In fact, in 2011 we accepted over 125,000 tons of FEPR and bypass and soft layer MSW from Maine incinerators. Our operations staff is very familiar with the properties of MSW and the procedures to successfully handle this material.

During the application with regard to operations we evaluated two different things; first was our current in-place operational procedures
relating to MSW, and second was to identify which additional procedures, if necessary, should be implemented. I will discuss both these items in my testimony.

We currently operate the facility to minimize the generation of odors, to control vectors and wind-blown litter, to limit noise and to control air emissions. We will continue these efforts in the future.

I first want to discuss odor control. To manage the potential for landfill odors, JRL currently uses the following practices; first, we use deodorizers and direct application odor neutralizers on the waste; second, we use two types of cover as part of landfill operations, they're intermediate and daily and I'll explain those later; third, we utilize an active gas management system that collects and flares landfill gas generated by the decomposition of landfilled waste; and, fourth, we have preventative odor and gas protection surveys and monitoring that we complete on a regular basis. Additionally, JRL has an extensive odor complaint management and response plan in place. These practices have been effective in controlling landfill odor and we plan to continue utilizing these same practices in the

1 future.

To preface a discussion on odors, it's helpful to consider there are two main types of odors; first is waste related or what we call daily odors and the second is landfill gas related or decomposition related odors. I first want to discuss waste-related odors. From the time a truck arrives at JRL, odor control is a very high priority for all of our landfill staff. One of the preventative measures we take is spray application of odor neutralizer on both full and empty trailers of odorous waste during warm weather, and there's a picture here of one of our trailers we can use to apply neutralizer to the waste. We also utilize daily cover materials extensively to cover odorous wastes and employ a mobile deodorizing spray system on the working face of the landfill and a stationary deodorizing spray system along the landfill perimeter to further reduce the potential, and we only use this as weather permits. Here's a picture of one of our mobilizer -- mobile spraying units, excuse me. Lastly -- excuse me -- I don't want to forget this. We also have equipment that directly apply odor neutralizers onto the waste as it is unloaded on the working face if odors are detected in that waste.

And here's a picture of that being done.
Lastly we have direct application of deodorizers and enzymes that we can apply in odorous areas with manpower, and you can see that here. MSW materials are currently handled this way successfully at JRL and will continue to be done so in the future.

The second type of landfill gas related -landfill odor is landfill gas related odor, and one of the primary measures to contain and control landfill gas related odors at the JRL is the use of intermediate cover materials. There's a picture there of intermediate cover materials with the black synthetic material. Our intermediate cover material is typically installed multiple times during the year, and we typically use synthetic materials on the side slope which comprise approximately 90 percent of all of our intermediate cover and have found this material to be very effective.

Soil is typically utilized on the remaining top surface which is approximately 10 percent where grade is reached and where it is less subject to erosion, cracking and movement. In addition to intermediate cover and equally important in collecting and controlling landfill gas is early and extensive gas collection which we install in every
cell built at Juniper Ridge.
The system employed by JRL goes above and beyond industry standards and places horizontal gas collection in the waste as the cell is being filled, typically monthly, not just when the filling of a cell has been completed. You can see here installation of a horizontal trench. This infrastructure and placement of intermediate cover allows us to collect landfill gas from the active cell soon after waste is placed, reducing landfill gas odor potential. Additionally, vertical gas collection infrastructure is placed once waste reaches final grade. You can see us installing a vertical well here. Each gas collection location can be individually monitored and is individually monitored as seen with what we call a wellhead here. The collection infrastructure is connected to a vacuum system which delivers the gas to a flare for combustion. Combustion destroys odor causing compounds such as hydrogen sulfide.

Now, as discussed by Mr. Booth, our current landfill gas collection and treatment system is adequately sized to handle the landfill gas generated as a result of this proposal. These same procedures will be used in the future. Additionally, our staff
are trained and certified to install landfill gas collection infrastructure which gives us the ability to install and repair our own gas collection piping very rapidly and responsibly. Also, daily odor surveys are typically performed around the active landfill areas. These surveys include monitoring for gas migration and landfill related odors. Also additionally, quarterly methane emission surface scans are typically completed on the inactive or intermediate cover areas measuring methane emissions from the landfill surface to assure the effectiveness in containing, collecting and combusting landfill gas.

We have worked very hard to control odor at JRL. The effectiveness of our odor management practices is evidenced by the decreasing trend in odor complaints since we have implemented these procedures. In the first few years of operation at JRL odor was a significant concern. In 2007, we received 241 odor-related complaints via our 24-hour landfill complaint hotline. We have reduced these complaints substantially year after year since 2007. Here's a landfill complaint record form that's filled out for every complaint that is received at the Juniper Ridge landfill.

In 2012, we received only seven odor-related complaints, only one of which was confirmed to be from a landfill-related odor. You can see the trend here.

The next topics I will cover are vectors and wind-blown litter. The use of daily cover is our primary operational practice to control vectors and wind-blown litter. We make every effort to utilize waste products as daily cover. In the industry we know this as ADC, alternate daily cover, saving virgin soil materials and conserving resources. We have adequate waste materials that can be used as alternate daily cover for this proposal. If we do have temporary shortages of ADC, we also have sources of soil that can be utilized as daily cover material as is an industry practice.

Currently the vectors, which are typically seagulls, are being controlled effectively. In fact, NEWSME has received only one vector-related complaint since 2007. JRL currently monitors vectors and manages vector control closely and will continue to do so in the future. Should vectors increase, we would implement additional techniques, including fencing, overhead wires and outside third-party control techniques.

Now, in addition to daily cover, litter is also effectively managed using, one, compaction of waste material as it is offloaded; and, two, litter control fencing that is placed at the perimeter of each cell and regular litter patrols. To date, wind-blown litter at JRL has been effectively controlled with these procedures described. There have been no landfill litter-related complaints since 2007. We are prepared to address the potential for increased wind-blown litter associated with this additional MSW by using either portable or fixed litter control fencing directly in the vicinity of the working landfill face, if necessary. We have utilized this technology at JRL and at other sites, including the Pine Tree Landfill in Hampden prior to its closure, and are very familiar with the proper techniques for utilization.

Next we evaluated noise. Noise due to truck traffic to and from JRL is exempt from regulation under DEP's rules; nevertheless, as Mr. Booth stated, trailer truck traffic to and from the site will be reduced from when MERC was operating. In addition, the material accepted will not require additional landfill-related industrial equipment other than what is currently used on site and that equipment is not
expected to operate in a materially different manner; therefore, increased noise associated with the landfill operations will not occur.

A site compliance noise study was completed by Warren Brown of EnRad Consulting during cell three operation in 2006 and hourly sound levels from all sources that were measured during the study, including ambient and exempt sources, were well below the regulatory limits contained in the DEP's Solid Waste Management Rules. Because no increased sound levels are expected from landfill sources regulated under DEP's rules and as a result of this additional MSW contemplated in this amendment application, we will continue to be in full compliance with DEP's rules.

In response to testimony regarding certain aspects of air emissions, I presented in my rebuttal testimony our newly-issued air license for the following reasons; one, JRL air emissions, including greenhouse gases or in the industry known as GHGs, were quantified and evaluated in JRL's recent air emissions license application and then approved by the Department as part of this new air license; and, two, the proposed MSW amendment was considered by both NEWSME and the DEP as part of this air licensing
process. The emissions estimates in this application demonstrated that emissions of greenhouse gases from JRL would be below regulatory thresholds established by the EPA and DEP air permitting regulations. The model results demonstrate that JRL's emissions will meet federal and state ambient air quality guidelines, including EPA's new, more stringent standards for nitrogen oxides, NOx, sulfur dioxides, SO2, and carbon monoxide, which is CO, at and beyond JRL's fence line, something that cannot be said of other facilities within the state.

Much time was given for public comment during this process. Although some members of the public asked questions of NEWSME during the pre-filed public hearing prior to the application being submitted, JRL understands that the DEP did not receive any formal comments from the public during any of the three public comment periods nor any requests for additional public meetings or hearings on the air license application or draft air license. The new air license was not appealed and is now final.

To summarize this, greenhouse gas emissions are regulated by the DEP Bureau of Air Quality and have already been determined to meet applicable DEP to.
requirements as part of the recent air emissions license process. Changes in landfill air emissions associated with this proposed MSW amendment were addressed in JRL's air license application and the public had ample opportunity to comment but chose not

So my conclusions would be as follows; first off, our staff is very experienced in handling MSW materials and has successfully handled these materials, including the handling of over 125,000 tons of MSW materials in 2011; second, we recognize that MSW does have the potential to generate odor, wind-blown litter and to attract vectors, and we have procedures in place to effectively control these items; third, should additional items become necessary, our staff is qualified and prepared to implement them as necessary; and, fourth, the DEP has determined that emissions from JRL will meet all DEP air quality and air permitting requirements, including the new EPA ambient air quality standards as modeled using EPA's most up-to-date model. Thank you.

MR. DOYLE: My lapel mike appears to be on the fritz so I'm back at the podium. Our next witness is Don Meagher. Don is the manager of
planning and development for the eastern division of Casella. He has worked in the field of solid waste management for approximately 27 years, including eight years as vice president of planning at the Eastern Maine Development Corporation, and for the past 19 has worked in the private sector including with Sawyer Environmental and Casella. Don holds a bachelor of arts degree in biology from Beloit College and a master's in regional planning from the University of Pennsylvania. Don will be rebutting certain aspects of the testimony of Mr. Kazar and Mr. Roche related to the initial RFP for JRL and that of Mr. Spencer regarding the Operating Services Agreement. Don.

MR. MEAGHER: Good morning. Is the volume good?

HEARING OFFICER: It is, thank you.
MR. MEAGHER: Ed Spencer, ecomaine and MMWAC argue that the Operating Services Agreement or OSA between the state and Casella prohibits the disposal of MSW at JRL. This is incorrect. The types of waste that are allowed under the OSA are determined by the definitions of acceptable waste and excluded waste in the OSA. Acceptable waste according to the OSA is, and I quote, "such material as may from time
to time be legally accepted at the landfill in accordance with applicable DEP permits and other applicable laws and regulations excluding, however, all excluded waste. MSW is currently an acceptable waste at JRL approved by the DEP in 2004. This application is simply to have the bypass only conditions removed. The definition of excluded waste in the OSA only prohibits two specific categories of waste, waste generated outside Maine and hazardous waste. No other waste types, including MSW, are listed as excluded waste in the OSA. This application does not propose disposal of out-of-state waste or hazardous waste at JRL; therefore, the proposed application is not prohibited in any way by the OSA. Thank you.

MR. DOYLE: Our final witness this morning is Abbey Webb. Abbey is a senior environmental analyst at Casella Waste Systems where she manages Casella's company-wide greenhouse gas emission reporting and reduction projects. She holds a bachelor's degree in environmental geography from Colgate University and a master's degree in regional and environmental planning from Cornell. Abbey is addressing the greenhouse gas related comments provided by Mr. Spencer in his pre-filed testimony.

## Abbey.

MS. WEBB: Can you hear me okay? HEARING OFFICER: Yes, thank you.
MS. WEBB: So in his testimony, Mr. Spencer suggests two things, first that we have underestimated greenhouse gas emissions from the Juniper Ridge Landfill; and, second, that incineration necessarily produces less greenhouse gas emissions than landfilling. In support of these arguments he references four papers on the topic of greenhouse gas emissions from incinerators and landfills. I'm very familiar with each of these papers as well as the greenhouse gas calculations at Juniper Ridge. I will explain that the papers are irrelevant to Juniper Ridge and that Mr. Spencer's concerns are, in fact, unfounded.

So first I'd like to talk about these papers and why they are not applicable. One of the papers is a report from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the IPCC. The report is written by a well-respected international panel of scientists coordinated by lead author Jeanne Bogner. It describes climate change mitigation strategies for the waste management sector and is referenced by all three of the other reports.
going to stop there for a second. What they're

1 saying is that lifetime recovery efficiencies may be
The Bogner chapter is often cited by groups who advocate incineration over landfilling. Specifically they commonly reference a specific passage on page 600 which discusses landfill gas recovery efficiencies, and it states -- and I'm quoting now -- "lifetime recovery efficiencies may be as low as 20 percent," end quote. This is an important statement given that recovery efficiency is the most important factor in determining greenhouse gas emissions from landfills, but I'd like to show you the full context of the statement. That's not it. There we go. I'm going to put it up here because it's a little dense and dry. So it says "intensive field studies of the methane mass balance at cells with a variety of design and management practices have shown that over 90 percent recovery can be achieved at cells with final cover and an efficient gas extraction system. Some sites may have less efficient or only partial gas extraction systems and there are fugitive emissions from landfill waste prior to and after the implementation of active gas extraction; thus, estimates of lifetime recovery efficiencies may be as low as 20 percent which argues for early implementation of gas recovery." So I'm as low as 20 percent at certain poorly designed and operated landfills but that this can be remedied through best practices. The quote goes on to describe some of these best practices, quoting again, "some measures that can be implemented to improve overall gas collection are installation of horizontal gas collection systems concurrent with filling, frequent monitoring and remediation of edge and piping leakages, installation of secondary perimeter extraction systems for gas migration and emissions control and frequent inspection and maintenance of cover materials."

So these best practices, early installation of gas collection infrastructure, the use of horizontal collectors and regular monitoring and maintenance of gas collection pipes and cover materials, all of these best practices are in place at Juniper Ridge Landfill; therefore, the 20 percent worst-case scenario mentioned in the Bogner report does not apply to Juniper Ridge.

The next report referenced by Mr. Spencer is a paper by Peter Anderson of the Center for a Competitive Waste Industry. His paper describes in more depth the argument mentioned by Bogner which is
that landfill collection efficiencies should be calculated on a lifetime basis rather than an instantaneous snapshot. I'm going to try to break that down a little bit starting -- so there's two approaches to calculating collection efficiency. I'm going to start with the instantaneous approach. So this represents the percent of gas being captured at a given point in time and it's based on the gas collection infrastructure in place across the landfill. So the way we calculate this is kind of imagine you're flying over the landfill, you're looking down, you can see that a portion of the landfill is under final cover with active gas collection and you can see that another portion is maybe under intermediate soil cover with gas collection and maybe another area has no collection at all. So you can kind of see that across the footprint. Based on that, you take an area weighted average and come up with a collection efficiency for that given point in time.

The other method, the lifetime method, the one that's advocated by Bogner and Anderson, to understand this one you have to picture a landfill gas -- I guess I'll just -- if you have kind of a chart with time on the $X$ axis and gas production on
the $Y$ axis, when waste is placed in a landfill, gas production starts to ramp up, it peaks and then it goes down kind of gradually. So it's kind of this -you end up with this lopsided triangle more or less.
The specific shape is going to vary based on the waste composition and the climate conditions but in general, it's going to be kind of this lopsided triangle with a long tail, and the area underneath that is going to be your total gas production from that given piece of waste.

So to understand what Bogner and Anderson's concern is you have to add a couple more things to my imaginary drawing up here, two vertical lines. The first line is the point in time where we start collecting the gas. The second line is the point in time when we stop collecting the gas. Bogner and Anderson point out, rightfully so, that the collection efficiency really only applies to between those two bars, those two lines. Outside of those, before the gas collection is installed and after it stops operating, the collection efficiency is essentially zero. So they say when you look at it averaged over time that the collection efficiency can be much lower and they want that taken into account. So, yeah, I mean, that pretty much sums up their

Using the lifetime approach and a series of assumptions that he thinks represent the average U.S. landfill, Mr. Anderson arrives at a calculated collection efficiency of only 19 percent, but it's important to understand the assumptions that he's using in that average scenario. First he says that no gas collection is installed for the first five years after waste placement. That's not true with Juniper Ridge. He assumes that collection efficiency is only 50 percent even upon closure of the landfill. Also not true at Juniper Ridge. He assumes that gas collection is shut off well before gas production has subsided. This is also untrue at Juniper Ridge. So in short, none of the assumptions that he used in his model are true in the specific case of the Juniper Ridge Landfill.

So the best practices that are in place at Juniper Ridge have been described in more detail specifically by Jeremy. Just to recap, Juniper Ridge aggressively installs horizontal gas collection piping as waste is placed in a cell; second, synthetic geomembrane material is used as the primary intermediate cover material; third, NEWSME conducts routine surface methane emissions scans to ensure the
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integrity and effectiveness of the landfill cover material and gas collection system. All of these practices are at the forefront of industry operating standards and ensure very high instantaneous and lifetime gas collection efficiencies. So for all of these reasons, the 19 percent number from Anderson simply does not apply to Juniper Ridge, and I'll get into our specific numbers in a moment. Mr. Spencer also referred to Ozge Kaplan's 2009 paper in environmental Science Technology and a Sierra Club report on landfill gas to energy. The Kaplan article is very similar to the Anderson paper in that it makes a bunch of assumptions that are not applicable to Juniper Ridge. The Sierra Club paper is specifically about landfills with landfill gas to energy power plants and since Juniper Ridge doesn't have a power plant, it's not relevant. So I've walked through those four papers and talked about why they're not applicable to Juniper Ridge.

Next I'd like to point out that it's not true that incineration universally produces less greenhouse gas emissions than landfilling. The Bogner report's primary finding is that, quote, existing waste management practices can provide effective mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions from
the waste sector. A wide range of mature environmentally effective technologies are available to mitigate emissions, end quote. The others go on to list some of these technologies which include landfill gas recovery and improved landfill practices. Importantly, on the next page the authors clearly state that the chapter does not prescribe to any one particular technology. This is important because if this well-respected panel of scientists believed that all incineration was clearly and universally preferable over landfilling, they would have clearly stated this in their report.

So last I'd like to talk specifically about the high collection efficiency at Juniper Ridge. Because of the best management practices we've been talking about, Juniper Ridge Landfill achieves a high landfill gas collection efficiency. We've talked about the two different methods, instantaneous versus lifetime for -- for determining collection efficiency, and I'm going to pull up on the screen BGS/NEWSME Exhibit \#21, and it's very tiny. I'll do my best to walk through this and read the numbers. So the top table there takes the instantaneous approach and then the second table uses the lifetime approach. So for the top table on the left, it
describes three different types of areas. So again, we're imagining we're flying over the landfill looking down upon it. The first area type is area without active gas collection. The next three are all areas with gas collection under different types of cover. There's daily cover, intermediate soil cover and then final and/or geomembrane cover is the fourth type. So I don't think you can read this but at Juniper Ridge 11 percent of the area is under daily cover, 7 percent is under intermediate soil cover and 82 percent is under final or geomembrane cover. None of the area is without gas collection. We then take the EPA standard assumptions for collection efficiency under each of these cover scenarios and so multiply the numbers across and then add them up down below and you end up with an instantaneous collection efficiency of 89.8 percent and that's as of December 31st, 2012. The -- I'll move to the second table as the lifetime collection efficiency. So again we're talking about that lopsided triangle that we were imagining before just here represented quantitatively in a graph or in a table. So we divide the time period into four different categories, the time when that piece of waste is under daily cover, the time when it's under
percent you get 4, 40 times 95 percent you get 38 and
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1 so on. Out of those numbers you get 86.9. So in short, using the lifetime collection efficiency approach we come to about 86.9 percent collection.

So just to wrap up, I would like to emphasize two points. First, from a greenhouse gas perspective, incineration is not always preferable to landfilling. Since every landfill and every incinerator is different, the determination has to be made on a site-by-site basis. Second, the very rigorous best management practices in place at Juniper Ridge ensure that the concern raised by Mr. Spencer that landfill gas collection efficiency is only 20 percent is simply not applicable to Juniper Ridge where collection efficiency is, in fact, over 85 percent. Thank you.

MR. DOYLE: Thank you, Abbey. Well, that brings to a close our direct presentation and if I'm calculating this correctly, were at 10:32 or 3 . I think we've saved 41 minutes off of our 120, and I would like to bank that for potential cross examination if I need some additional time later today or tomorrow. I would also, to the extent they're not already in the record, I would like to formally introduce our 21 exhibits into the record. Perhaps they're already in since Mike put them in
this morning but they're in now.
HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Attorney Doyle. Addressing your second question first, all of your exhibits are part of the record but with your request, we've made sure to have that noted for the record. With respect to your first request of banking time, first of all, we very much appreciate your efficiency this morning in summarizing your testimony. Should you need additional cross examination time, we will make those determinations on a case-by-case basis at the end of your cross examination time. The factors that will be involved are whether or not the questions are repetitive, whether or not the questions are relevant and we will make a determination on a case-by-case basis how much additional time would be allotted during the cross examination. So when you get to the end of your allotted time, if you need additional time, please make the request at that time.

MR. DOYLE: Fair enough. So we will now present our witnesses for cross examination by I guess MMWAC, ecomaine and Citizens.

HEARING OFFICER: That is the next thing on the agenda after our break. At this time we will be having a 15-minute break. We will take a 15 -minute
break until 10:50. This will give people an opportunity to regroup in order to provide cross examination.

## (OFF RECORD)

HEARING OFFICER: We have reconvened the hearing on the Juniper Ridge Landfill. The applicant has finished its summary of testimony and we are now moving into the cross examination of the applicant. The order of the cross examination of the applicant will be MMWAC for five to ten minutes, ecomaine for five to ten minutes, the Citizens for 45 to 60 minutes and that will be followed by cross examination of other intervenors, if any. So we will start now with MMWAC for a maximum of ten minutes.

MR. BOWER: Thank you, Hearing Officer
Parent. Is this mike working okay?
MR. PARKER: No. Now it is.
HEARING OFFICER: Very good.
MR. BOWER: Just to start off, my name is Mark Bower. I represent MMWAC and ecomaine in this matter and for purposes of today's cross examination, we would request from the Hearing Officer to combine our time for efficiency because there will be a lot of overlapping questions. So I would just request
that the time be combined for the two intervenors, ecomaine and MMWAC.

HEARING OFFICER: You will have a maximum of 20 minutes.

MR. BOWER: Okay. The first question is for Mr. Oliver. You briefly mentioned this in your remarks today but I just want to clarify for the record. It's true that MERC shut down at the end of 2012, correct?

MR. OLIVER: That is correct.
MR. BOWER: And the shut down and the purchase and sale with the city of Biddeford is no longer contingent on this application being approved, correct?

MR. OLIVER: That is correct.
MR. BOWER: There was a letter agreement signed at the end of November that removed that contingency from the purchase and sale agreement, correct?

MR. OLIVER: Correct.
MR. BOWER: And so there's no -- regardless of what happens in this application for amending the license, MERC will not be reopened as a result, correct?

MR. OLIVER: That is correct.
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MR. BOWER: Now, since the closure of MERC, I think you mentioned in your testimony that what I refer to as MERC waste has been taken to, I think you said, PERC, ecomaine and some out-of-state facilities, is that correct?

MR. OLIVER: Yes.
MR. BOWER: And what are those out-of-state facilities where it's being brought?

MR. OLIVER: North Country Landfill in Bethlehem, New Hampshire.

MR. BOWER: Is that a Casella facility?
MR. OLIVER: Yes, it is.
HEARING OFFICER: Can I ask you to make sure that all of the panel projects as much as possible during your responses so that the people behind you can hear as well. Thank you.

MR. BOWER: And this has been for the past essentially three months or so since the end of 2012?

MR. OLIVER: Yes.
MR. BOWER: And this has been working thus far?

MR. OLIVER: Yes, it has.
MR. BOWER: Now, you mentioned in your testimony the cap on tonnage -- and I'm just going to paraphrase what the request is -- is that initially
the application requested a cap on MSW to be -unprocessed MSW to be disposed at JRL of 123,000 tons, correct.

MR. OLIVER: Yes.
MR. BOWER: And that was reduced in October or following an October agreement with PERC where contingent on this application, 30,000 tons would be brought to PERC, correct?

MR. OLIVER: Correct.
MR. BOWER: Bringing the cap that you're requesting down to 93,000 tons, correct?

MR. OLIVER: Yes.
MR. BOWER: Now, are you -- is it Casella's proposal to only open up Juniper Ridge for MERC waste under that 93,000 tons or will other haulers and communities be able to bring -- to use JRL to dispose MSW?

MR. OLIVER: It's a cap of 93,000 tons of in-state waste.

MR. BOWER: So any competitors of Casella can also bring waste under that 93,000 ton cap?

MR. OLIVER: Yes.
MR. BOWER: For example, if Waste Management wanted to bring some of their waste, rather than using their landfill in Norridgewock, they could
bring it to Juniper Ridge under that cap?
MR. OLIVER: Yes, it's capped at 93,000.
MR. BOWER: And if there's not enough
capacity -- if other entities and communities are
using that -- using up that 93,000 ton cap, what will
Casella do with the MERC waste that is not able to be disposed under that 93,000 ton cap?

MR. OLIVER: We have -- as I said earlier, we have outlets in New Hampshire with North Country. We can utilize that facility.

MR. BOWER: So there are other options?
MR. OLIVER: Yes.
MR. BOWER: Now, is there a tipping fee for waste brought to Juniper Ridge from Casella's haulers from the Westbrook Transfer Station? Is there a tipping fee that's charged from Casella to Pine Tree, for example, or is it just brought there from the transfer station?

MR. OLIVER: No, there's a tipping fee, absolutely.

MR. BOWER: And what would be the tipping fee that you would charge Waste Management for -- if they wanted to bring waste under this 93,000 ton cap?

MR. OLIVER: We have in the OSA a couple of items. We have a cap, the highest amount we can
charge anybody for specific materials, and we also have a non-discrimination clause in the OSA which would prohibit us from charging a Casella entity less than a competitor to make sure that no competitor is disadvantaged.

MR. BOWER: And this cap of 93,000 tons is what you call a sort of self-imposed limitation by Casella? It's not something that -- it's something that you agreed to and is not being imposed on Casella?

MR. OLIVER: We agreed to it, yes.
MR. BOWER: And you also mentioned in your testimony that you're proposing the tonnage cap rather than carrying over specific customers because, the way you put it, it would be administratively impossible to attempt to track new or existing individual customers which are constantly changing that could ultimately go through various in-state transfer stations or direct to JRL, and that's a quote from your testimony at page 4. Is that your recollection of your testimony?

MR. OLIVER: Yes.
MR. BOWER: So in other words, it's
difficult to sort of track where waste is coming from so rather than carrying over customers, you're just
wanting the cap to be representative of the waste that was being brought to MERC previously?

MR. OLIVER: It's not difficult to track
specific wastes by customer and origin into a
facility. So, for instance, at Maine Energy, historically any customer that brought material there, we would know exactly where it came from and what customers brought it. We would do the same thing at Westbrook or at any of our other facilities. The problem comes with the outbound material out of Westbrook and trying to track those specific customers to the ultimate disposal facility. So, for instance, a truck that would use Westbrook, a local route truck collection vehicle that might have ten tons on it, that's going to have a couple hundred customers that change all the time. They might be former customers of Maine Energy; they might not be, so that changes into Westbrook. Customers that come into Westbrook also change. So a customer that may not have used Maine Energy at a certain point may use Westbrook. So when that material gets tipped on the floor and you have 50 or 75 tons on the floor and that gets loaded into a trailer, you can't tie that specific customer in the outbound trailer to an inbound customer all the way back to the curb.

.
.
tit
.

in

MR. BOWER: Okay. Now, at the Westbrook
Transfer Station will there be any out-of-state waste processed at that transfer statin facility?

MR. OLIVER: Well, nothing is processed. It's a transfer station.

MR. BOWER: Sorry, sorted. Will any out-of-state waste be brought to the Westbrook Transfer Station?

MR. OLIVER: There is a small amount of out-of-state waste that comes in from one of our existing customers, and we make sure we have certain policies and procedures in place to segregate that. So, for instance, if an out-of -- every customer that actually comes across the scale has to sign a certification under penalty of law that it's in-state waste. If it's not in-state waste, then we notify the operator and we segregate that on the tip floor and that load gets loaded into a trailer and then every subsequent ton that goes into that trailer then becomes out-of-state as well and that whole trailer then goes to a facility that's licensed to accept it.

MR. BOWER: Okay. So while it's
administratively difficult to track some waste, it's not that difficult to track out-of-state waste is what you're saying?
fir
n

of wheth
Those 170,000 tons won't come into the state either way?

MR. OLIVER: Yes, I mean, we submitted the application based on that information, so that is correct.

MR. BOWER: Okay. So that -- so that waste reduction is not really -- is not contingent on approval of the Juniper Ridge license amendment, correct?

MR. OLIVER: That's correct.
MR. BOWER: It's just a function of Maine
Energy shutting down. The second point you made you
listed off a few recycling initiatives that Casella
has made that are both existing recycling initiatives and planned initiatives, the first being the -- you mentioned the tri-county communities. Now, those communities currently have recycling programs in place, correct?

MR. OLIVER: They do.
MR. BOWER: So those will not be affected by either the approval or denial of a license amendment at Juniper Ridge?

MR. OLIVER: Correct.
MR. BOWER: The second one is the Biddeford recycling which is slated to begin July 1st under the recycling agreement that was part of the purchase and sale, correct?

MR. OLIVER: Yes.
MR. BOWER: And that recycling agreement is not contingent on the approval of the Juniper Ridge license amendment, correct?

MR. OLIVER: Correct.
MR. BOWER: In fact, the recital of that agreement indicates that it was put in place as an
inducement to get Biddeford to agree on the purchase and sale agreement, correct?

MR. OLIVER: It was part of the purchase and sale, yes.

MR. BOWER: You also mentioned the plan for a Lewiston processing facility and that -- and one of the exhibits I think you have included is the lease agreement with city of Lewiston. Now, that lease agreement is not contingent on the approval of the license amendment, the current proceeding, is it?

MR. OLIVER: It is not.
MR. BOWER: And then finally you mentioned the PERC agreement which was signed in October as supporting the hierarchy due to the recycling initiatives that are contained in that agreement. I just wanted to clarify, those recycling initiatives which are -- that constitute several sections of the agreement, that recycling initiative is not contingent on approval of the Juniper Ridge license amendment, correct?

MR. OLIVER: That's correct.
MR. BOWER: The only provision of that agreement that's contingent on the approval of this license amendment is those 30,000 tons that used to be going to Maine Energy which will now be brought to

PERC, correct?
MR. OLIVER: Correct.
MR. BOWER: Now, you also testified in your pre-filed direct that you understand from PERC that the 30,000 tons per year of the Maine waste that will be delivered to PERC under the agreement is -- is approximately the same amount of out-of-state waste that is currently combusted at PERC. Based on this morning's testimony, would you concede that that's inconsistent with other testimony that shows that PERC imported over 90,000 tons of waste from out-of-state?

MR. OLIVER: No. Actually what I said was that the 30,000 tons of Maine waste that will be delivered to PERC will offset 30,000 tons of out-of-state waste being accepted. So they're a complete offset.

MR. BOWER: Okay. So you weren't saying that it would displace all of their out-of-state waste, just it will displace 30,000 tons of their out-of-state waste?

MR. OLIVER: Correct.
MR. BOWER: And why is it that these 30,000 tons are contingent on the Juniper Ridge Landfill amendment?

MR. OLIVER: I'm not sure. You'd have to ask them if they could handle more. They would have to displace existing tonnage if they were going to handle more.

MR. BOWER: Assuming that they could, how would this represent under that section of the agreement the maximum amount possibly processed by waste to energy facilities? It doesn't, does it?

MR. OLIVER: Well, provided we can come to grips on a financial agreement.

MR. BOWER: So what's unstated in that provision is that it depends on the economics of it, correct?

MR. OLIVER: Absolutely.
MR. BOWER: Now, the other aspect of the out-of-state waste issue is that in your testimony you state that the contracted out-of-state waste that was previously sent to Maine Energy will be diverted back to facilities outside the state. What does that term "contracted" refer to, "contracted out-of-state waste?" The current contracts or future contracts or both?

MR. OLIVER: Well, we have a large portion of that tonnage under contract to Casella and we're responsible to make sure that we find an appropriate
home for that waste. So either we have internal homes or we have third-party homes that we were able to move that waste to.

HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Bower, you have two minutes.

MR. BOWER: Okay. Just a couple questions for Don -- sorry -- for Mr. Barden. Isn't the state contractually obligated under Section 4.1 of the Operating Services Agreement to cooperate reasonably with Casella and provide reasonable assistance in the pending application?

MR. BARDEN: Yes.
MR. BOWER: Now that there's no more State Planning Office, is the Bureau of General Services considered the counterparty to the Operating Services Agreement or is some other state agency considered the counterparty?

MR. BARDEN: That's a good question. We have not amended the Operating Services Agreement to take account of that transfer of ownership.

MR. BOWER: And under the Operating Services Agreement, doesn't it also require Casella to use its best efforts to operate the landfill following the state's solid waste management hierarchy?

MR. BARDEN: Yes, that's in the OSA.

MR. BOWER: And is it the state's -- well, I guess as a -- I guess my other question for you is that you mentioned in your testimony that the state was the one that requested the annual cap on tonnage. Is your understanding of the purpose of the cap the same as what Mr. Oliver explained, that it's for any in-state waste, not just for Casella to use?

MR. BARDEN: Well, I mean, our reasoning at the point when we recommended that change to the prepared application is because that tonnage was used in the analysis of all of the technical aspects of the application, the truck traffic, the operations, so we wanted it basically to be included in the application as a cap to reflect the analysis that went into that tonnage. So it wasn't necessarily directed totally at it had to be the same municipalities that were going to the incinerator.
It's a tonnage cap.
MR. BOWER: And will that cap be enforceable by some state agency or is it self-imposed?

MR. BARDEN: It would be a condition of the agreement so it would be enforceable.

MR. BOWER: A question for Mr. Meagher. You mentioned in your remarks this morning that ecomaine and MMWAC have argued that the Operating Services

Agreement does not allow for the disposal of MSW. I couldn't find in their testimony where they argue that. Do you -- I think -- do you recall where in the testimony that was?

MR. MEAGHER: I believe I referenced that in my pre-filed rebuttal testimony. I will attempt to find that.

MR. BOWER: One moment.
HEARING OFFICER: Your time is up so when you resolve this question, I will ask you to move on.

MR. BOWER: Do I have anymore time remaining?

HEARING OFFICER: You do not.
MR. BOWER: Okay. Is Old Town Fuel and Fiber willing to give me their time?

HEARING OFFICER: Do you have a procedural question?

MR. SPENCER: Yes, Ed Spencer. The Citizen intervenors would like to cede some time to Mr. Bower so he can finish up.

MR. MEAGHER: Yes, I did. I had cited Kazar testimony at 4 and Roche testimony at 5 and their comment really pertained to MSW that was not being bypassed from the incinerator. In my remarks this morning if I did not make that clear, I apologize.

MR. BOWER: Okay. So they didn't argue that the Operating Services Agreement prohibits out-of-state -- any disposal of MSW, just that out-of-state MSW is not allowed to be disposed under the Operating Services Agreement?

MR. MEAGHER: Again, I believe their comment pertained to bypass MSW, not MSW generally.

MR. BOWER: I just have one question for Michael Booth, if I could.

HEARING OFFICER: Who is the feedback person?

MR. DOYLE: It was my attempt to object.
HEARING OFFICER: Can you go to speak to the other microphone, please, or just speak loudly where you are?

MR. DOYLE: I guess I'd like to hear at least some clarification about whether we're borrowing time from other parties. I mean, I asked to bank some time because we actually saved time over what we had thought we'd use and I sort of got a "we'll see" answer, and so are we now borrowing from other people and, if so, I guess I'd like to
understand what the rules are going to be going forward.

HEARING OFFICER: I was about to make a
ruling on Mr. Bower's request at the end of Mr. Meagher's statement exactly answering that question. I will grant the request of the Citizen intervenors to provide some time to ecomaine and MMWAC and I will be affording you similar latitude in your cross examination time opportunities so that there is equal fairness. As I had indicated in my response to you when you asked for additional time, I wanted to make those determinations on a case-by-case basis, and as you need additional time, I will make sure that I afford you similar fairness in your opportunity to take additional time.

MR. DOYLE: Thank you.
HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Bower, you can have up to an additional ten minutes of time. That time will be deducted from the Citizen intervenors' time for their cross examination of this applicant.

MR. BOWER: Thank you.
HEARING OFFICER: But if you don't have a full ten minutes, please take only the time that you need.

MR. BOWER: Of course. A question for Mr. Booth. In your testimony or your remarks earlier this morning, you mentioned or you questioned whether the solid waste hierarchy is applicable to this
application. Do you recall those remarks?
MR. BOOTH: I think my testimony had to do with how it was applied to this application.

MR. BOWER: Okay. So are you conceding that -- would you concede that the solid waste hierarchy is applicable to this application.

MR. BOOTH: I believe the Hearing Officer has made that determination or the DEP has made that determination.

MR. BOWER: Okay, one minute. Just a quick follow-up, Mr. Booth. You mentioned that the Hearing Officer determined that the solid waste hierarchy was applicable. I guess I'm more interested in what -in your perspective, since you made the comments this morning about the hierarchy, are you familiar with Chapter 400 of the DEP's regulations?

MR. BOOTH: Yes, I am.
MR. BOWER: Which is the Maine Solid Waste Management Rules. One of the defined terms under those regs is the term "Maine Solid Waste Logs." Are you familiar with that term?

MR. BOOTH: Yes, I am.
MR. BOWER: Under that definition, Maine Solid Waste Laws includes the Solid Waste Management and Recycling Law, paren, 38 M.R.S.A. Section 2101,
et seq. Is it your understanding that that is a reference to the waste hierarchy provision? Section 2101, do you recognize that as being a reference to the waste hierarchy provision?

MR. BOOTH: I believe it is, yes.
MR. BOWER: Now, in Section 2 of the regs, it states "it is unlawful for any person to locate, establish, construct, alter, expand or operate a solid waste facility or handle solid waste contrary to the Maine Solid Waste Laws and these rules," and that's a defined term, "Maine Solid Waste Laws." Would you agree that that is a reference back to the solid waste hierarchy provision which is included in the term "Maine Solid Waste Laws?"

MR. BOOTH: As one of them, yes, I guess I do.

HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Booth, can you please speak up when you're responding?

MR. BOOTH: Yes.
MR. BOWER: And in Section 3 of those regs, Chapter 400, it states "the Department shall issue a license for a solid waste facility or activity whenever it finds that the facility or activity satisfies all applicable requirements of the Maine Solid Waste Laws, all applicable requirements of this
chapter and other chapters of these rules." Would you agree that that is also a reference back to the defined term which includes the solid waste hierarchy?

MR. BOOTH: Yes.
MR. BOWER: Now, in Section 3-D, which the heading there is "Licensing Criteria for Solid Waste Facilities," provides in part that the Department must also find that the solid waste facility satisfies all the applicable requirements and criteria of the Maine Solid Waste Laws and these rules. Would you agree that that's also a reference back to the solid waste hierarchy which is in the defined term?

MR. BOOTH: Yes.
MR. BOWER: Just another question for Mr. Barden. In your testimony you referred to -- in your pre-filed testimony you referred to Public Law 2011 Chapter 655 in which you explained eliminating the State Planning Office and transferring its duties to other agencies. One of those agencies was your agency, the Department of Economic and Community Development, correct?

MR. BARDEN: Correct.
MR. BOWER: Is it your understanding that
the -- that some of the duties for the State Planning Office were also transferred to DEP?

MR. BARDEN: Yes.
MR. BOWER: And are you familiar with the -what's been provided as BGS/NEWSME Exhibit 14 which is the 2011 Waste Generation and Disposal Capacity Report?

MR. BARDEN: Generally.
MR. BOWER: That report at page 2 provides, and I quote, "historically the Department has been responsible for licensing and compliance" -- and here "the Department" is referred to as DEP -"historically the Department has been responsible for licensing and compliance of solid waste management facilities to ensure appropriate handling of materials. This traditional regulatory approach is designed to protect the environment and public health from pollution. Consolidation responsibilities for waste management planning and recycling provide the Department with an opportunity to apply a more holistic approach to waste management and encourages waste diversion and narrows the stream of waste materials ultimately disposed at landfills." Is that -- whether you've reviewed that or not, is that your general understanding for how the elimination of the

State Planning Office -- how those duties were divvied up between the agencies?

MR. BARDEN: Again, I mean, I don't know the details of that division. I was not employed in the position before September 24th and all of this occurred before I came on board.

MR. BOWER: Okay. Were you reviewing that as I read it or not?

MR. BARDEN: What was the exhibit?
MR. BOWER: BGS/NEWSME Exhibit 14 and it was page 2, and I just wanted to make sure I read it correctly, but if you weren't reading it as I was reading it, then I'll withdraw that question. Nothing further, thank you.

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Bower. At this time I would ask a representative of the Citizens intervenors to begin your presentation. You have 50 minutes.

MR. SPENCER: Hello. Can you hear me okay?
HEARING OFFICER: I can, thank you.
MR. SPENCER: Okay. My name is Ed Spencer. I'm part of the Citizen intervenors, and it is my pleasure to be chosen to pursue some lines of questioning here. I'd like to thank Mr. Bower for some excellent questions, although he did steal quite
a bit of my thunder, so I don't think this is going to take 50 minutes.

For starters for Mr. Oliver, you've made statements that from the beginning at JRL that MSW was a waste stream that JRL was intended to handle, although the -- there's language in both the RFP, the OSA, the DEP license and the Old Town Host Community Agreement that say otherwise. What's your response to that and on what basis does Casella claim that the waste hierarchy is not intended to be regulatory or considered in a permitting procedure?

MR. DOYLE: Objection. There are at least two or three questions there, so if we could just get one at a time?

MR. SPENCER: Sure.
MR. DOYLE: What's the first question?
HEARING OFFICER: Proceed, Mr. Spencer.
MR. SPENCER: The first question is --
HEARING OFFICER: Can you repeat the first question?

MR. SPENCER: Sure. You made a statement that MSW was a waste stream that Juniper Ridge was intended to handle from the beginning. There is language in the RFP, OSA and DEP license and OId Town's Host Community Agreement that contradict that.

How would you explain your interpretation?
MR. OLIVER: If I look at the various agreements that you just spoke about, in our proposal to the state, there are a couple pages, page 27 and page 28, that specifically identifies MSW in the range of 15,000 to 167,000 tons. There's another line item called non-contracted MSW which specifies anticipated volumes of 200,000 tons. On page 41 there's also a statement that says this capacity is available as a backup to Maine's existing disposal facilities should they be deemed no longer economically viable. So there's discussion in our original proposal about taking in MSW. The OSA has numerous clauses in there that talk about MSW, pages 25 and 26, 3.1, little a, triple little i, and I'm paraphrasing here, but it says basically Casella will have the exclusive right and authority to negotiate contracts, including long-term contracts for the disposal of local MSW at the landfill. There's also a section in there on page 22 and $23,2.11$, little a, that specifically talks about tip fees and it says -there's a category MSW, including MSW designated as bypass on an infrequent basis. So MSW is a category that was discussed. It is specifically referenced in the Old Town Host Agreement, as I said, the Maine
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Energy tonnage, it's in the application in 2003. So we reference this in numerous areas.

MR. SPENCER: On that Host Community Agreement, isn't MSW specifically mentioned as bypass only?

MR. OLIVER: Not in that section, no.
MR. SPENCER: Huh, I'll have to read that again. I'm pretty sure that's in one of your exhibits. Now, when a company bids, an RFP comes out and under scope of services it says, maybe not in exact words, but the operator will operate the landfill in accordance with Maine's state waste hierarchy and it lays it out, reduce, reuse, recycle, compost, incinerate, landfill. Do you think, okay, the hierarchy isn't really going to apply further down the road? Go ahead.

MR. OLIVER: There are specific areas in the OSA that identify areas of compliance for us in regard to that.

MR. SPENCER: I guess what I'm thinking about is if that's a requirement in the RFP, Casella is the only bidder on the RFP, and then in your response there seems to be language that, okay, we can bring all this MSW in, while, in effect, other companies may have looked at the RFP and said, you
know, based on this, we can't make any money if the waste hierarchy really applies to the state-owned landfill.

HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Spencer --
MR. DOYLE: I'm going to object. That was a statement not a question.

HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Spencer, can you please rephrase that into a question to ask the panel? Your objection is noted. Please rephrase, Mr. Spencer.

MR. SPENCER: Why don't we just strike that, okay? I'll ask a new question. On what basis does Casella claim that the waste hierarchy is not intended to be regulatory or considered in a permitting procedure such as this?

MR. OLIVER: Well, there's the -- what statute is this -- 2101 and it says specifically in here that it is the policy of the state to use the order of priority in this subsection as a guiding principle in making decisions related to solid waste management and that's what I stated.

MR. SPENCER: Okay. Like Mr. Bower said, this quote of yours in your original testimony that it would be administratively impossible to attempt to track new or existing individual customers, how can
we be assured that the Westbrook Transfer Station or the Lewiston Recycling Facility will not become a conduit for waste from outside of Maine's borders?

MR. OLIVER: The Maine law is very specific in terms of what constitutes in-state waste. We're not processing anything at Westbrook. It's strictly a transfer station and we have very specific procedures in place to identify what customers come in and the origin and if there is out-of-state waste, it is segregated and we make sure we handle it appropriately.

MR. SPENCER: So why wouldn't out-of-state waste just be prohibited in Westbrook? If all you're taking there is MSW and non-Maine MSW is prohibited, why would you even accept it at your Westbrook Transfer Facility?

MR. OLIVER: Well, it's not prohibited in our license at Westbrook and if we have customers that we need to service, then we'll accept that waste and we'll make sure that it goes to a licensed facility.

MR. SPENCER: But being in business, as I am in a very small way, it just seems very inefficient, would you agree, to have something hauled from out of state and then hauled back out of state? Do you
understand why that seems --
MR. OLIVER: The one customer right now that's bringing in from out of state, it's a Maine customer, their route dips into New Hampshire, they come back up through from a routing perspective into southern Maine and they tip it at Westbrook. So it's efficient for them and they're our customer.

MR. SPENCER: Okay. I guess I'll leave you alone. Thank you for your responses. I guess next up is Mr. Jeremy Labbe and you may consult with Ms. Webb if you'd like to.

MR. LABBE: Okay.
MR. SPENCER: When landfill gases are measured, okay, you said it's done quarterly?

MR. LABBE: We do many different types of landfill gas measurements.

MR. SPENCER: Okay. When -- your quantify tables that those numbers are based on, is that done quarterly?

MR. LABBE: I'm going to defer to Abbey. I'll explain one part of the question.

MR. SPENCER: Sure, go ahead.
MR. LABBE: And I'll defer to Abbey for the table itself. We do quarterly methane emissions scans to determine if the liner is, in fact -- to
make sure that the liner is, in fact, performing as we intend it to, and then Abbey will actually answer as to how the EPA provides guidance for the table.

MR. SPENCER: Well, what I'm asking and I want to know is if -- when you do this quarterly test for methane escape, is it done over an active part of the landfill or over a capped part of the landfill?

MR. LABBE: The quarterly surface scans are done in accordance with the EPA guidelines and they are done on the intermediate and final covered areas of the landfill. You have to remember that the active area of the landfill is where the waste is currently going in. So it hasn't reached that stage yet of anaerobic decomposition because basically what's going on is every new day you're putting in new waste on top of it. Does that make sense? And so what they tailored the gas monitoring for is your intermediate and final cover.

MR. SPENCER: Would you concede that there may be some methane escaping when you develop a new cell? Have you developed that cell -- was it cell 8 we came out and did a tour?

MR. LABBE: Yup.
MR. SPENCER: So that's being filled now?
MR. LABBE: It is being filled now.

MR. SPENCER: Okay. So that's like, what, six, seven, eight acres.

MR. LABBE: Yup.
MR. SPENCER: Now, when you do that, do you
fill just a section of that, like an acre at a time and bring it all up at the --

MR. LABBE: Um-hum.
MR. SPENCER: Okay, and then that gets an intermediate cover?

MR. LABBE: No. What we do is we put intermediate cover on the side slopes as we come up and the surface keeps getting filled. So there's always waste being put in, and remember, like I mentioned with the horizontals, we put the first layer of horizontals in at 20 feet, after the waste reaches 20 feet above base grade, which is the leachate collection sand, and then at 40 feet from then on we put horizontals in as we're placing waste. So we can collect waste, and that's typically done on a monthly basis, and, you know, studies have shown that it's usually about three to six months before you reach that anaerobic stage and methane starts being produced.

MR. SPENCER: I might dispute that later on but --

## MR. DOYLE: Objection, move to strike. HEARING OFFICER: His comment about

 disputing later is stricken.MR. SPENCER: Would you offer an opinion on if you had an equal amount of MSW or an equal amount of other material, ash, CDD, which -- if put into an anaerobic situation, okay, which material is going to give off the most methane?

MR. LABBE: It all depends again and that's a number you have to run based on the composition of each material you're talking about. It all depends on the source of the construction debris, how much organics are in there, and the source of the MSW and how much organics are in the MSW. While you may think that $C$ and $D$ doesn't have a lot of organics, it does but it just takes a little longer to recover those organics. So when people like Mike Booth do the analysis, there's a decay rate they use for the rate of decay of waste and that's what determines the methane generation.

MR. SPENCER: Okay. I think I'm going to get some questions related to that later on, so let's just move ahead. Mr. Michael Barden, I've got a question for you. Mr. Barden, in your opinion, why did it take so long for the contract between PERC and

1 Casella to become null?

MR. BARDEN: I can't answer that. That was a private contract. I can't answer that question.

HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Barden, please speak up when you're responding.

MR. BARDEN: That was a private contract. The state was not a party to that contract.

MR. SPENCER: So when Casella/NEWSME presented a revised application, December 20th or whatever it was, was that the first time you had known about this agreement they had between PERC and Casella?

MR. BARDEN: That was the first that we'd seen a signed agreement. During our initial review of the application in September, Casella had indicated that they had ongoing discussions with PERC and that's all we knew at that point.

MR. SPENCER: Okay. I think that's it. That's all I've got for now. Thank you for bearing with me.

HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Spencer, are there other Citizen intervenors who will be asking questions as part of the group or does this conclude your cross examination of the applicant?

MR. SPENCER: I think we'll conclude right
now.
HEARING OFFICER: Thank you very much. MR. SPENCER: Thank you.
HEARING OFFICER: At this time I would ask
if there are any other intervenors who have cross
examination questions. Are there any other intervenors who have cross examination questions? Seeing none, we will be breaking for lunch a bit early. It is approximately $11: 40$. We will resume here in one hour at 12:40, and we will pick up at that time with the redirect by the applicant, recross of the applicant and DEP staff questions of the applicant. We'll be back in one hour.

## (LUNCH RECESS)

HEARING OFFICER: Good afternoon. We are reconvening the Juniper Ridge Landfill hearing.
Again, my name is Heather Parent. I'm the presiding officer. At this time we will pick up on the agenda where we left off with the redirect by the applicant. So, Mr. Doyle at this time.

MR. DOYLE: Okay, Mr. Booth, during his cross examination of you, Mr. Bower asked you whether the waste management hierarchy is a solid waste law.

MR. BOOTH: Yes, it is.

MR. DOYLE: But is the waste management hierarchy a permitting standard applicable to an application like this to accept additional MSW?

MR. BOOTH: No, it is not.
MR. DOYLE: Why not?
MR. BOOTH: There's no quantifiable standards to evaluate a project on. Over the years I've dealt with a number of different projects and how the hierarchy applies to them and there's nothing in the regulations which address the standard of how that would be applied typical to other permitting standards. As an example, leachate generation or, you know, stability analysis that are part of the solid waste rules that have specific standards which you have to demonstrate compliance with.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Oliver, whether the hierarchy applies or not, do you think that this application is consistent with the waste management hierarchy?

MR. OLIVER: I do, and I've explained that in great detail in my testimony the consistency and the number of ways that value is added.

MR. DOYLE: Brian, Mr. Bower asked you about disposing of the former in-state Maine Energy MSW at other locations currently. If that's the case, why
do you need this application approved?
MR. OLIVER: Well, right now, as I said, we're taking tons to North County Landfill. We're also taking the majority of the tons from Westbrook to PERC under an interim agreement. That interim agreement expires at the end of April so we would have to renegotiate that agreement with PERC or we could take all 123,000 tons to that out-of-state landfill and that would require the waste to energy facilities to import a large amount of out-of-state waste to meet their needs at lower tip fees. I don't think that's what the state of Maine would have in mind or what the Governor would have in mind for the state. Really the best long-term option is to approve the application to have PERC be able to take the volume, to be able to take the tons to Juniper Ridge and to really just continue talking with the other incinerators and this really -- providing more options is better for the municipalities and the businesses in Maine because it allows for competition.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Bower also asked you about various source reduction and recycling items not contingent on approval of this application. Can you explain why these are commitments that Casella and

NEWSME have undertaken nevertheless?
MR. OLIVER: Yes. Obviously we are
committed to source reduction and recycling. We have made these commitments even though really they're not subject to the approval of the application, and when you look at what we've done, what commitments we've made, the Lewiston lease agreement, the PERC and the MRC recycling component of that agreement, the Biddeford curbside recycling, we closed Maine Energy, pushing 200,000 tons back out-of-state, we've built the Westbrook Transfer Station, and I believe this is a testament to Casella's core values as a company that we're moving forward with these commitments outside the framework of this application because we take our commitment seriously.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Spencer asked you a question regarding the Host Community Benefit Agreement with Old Town and the MSW accepted at Juniper Ridge. Can you explain the municipal solid waste provision that you were referring to in responding to his question about the agreement?

MR. OLIVER: Yes. It's in Section 3.1B, and it states, and I quote, "Casella agrees that if Maine Energy ceases to operate permanently as a result of a decision by its management and/or owners or the
cities of Biddeford and/or Saco or by order of any governmental authority, then the $\$ 2.50$ per ton fee would apply from the date of such cessation of operations."

MR. DOYLE: So that's MSW from the closure --

MR. OLIVER: Correct.
MR. DOYLE: -- going to Juniper Ridge?
MR. OLIVER: Yes.
MR. DOYLE: And the benefit to Old Town?
MR. OLIVER: Correct.
MR. DOYLE: That's it. Thank you.
HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Doyle. At
this time I would ask if any parties wish to do what
is called recross of the applicant. Essentially at
this time if during this redirect there has been additional information that you would like to ask them about, this is your opportunity to recross them. Are there any parties who wish to at this time?

MR. BOWER: Yes.
HEARING OFFICER: Okay. We'll start in order of the parties and start with MMWAC and ecomaine.

MR. BOWER: Mr. Oliver, just a question on your comments that you just made about what happens
if the application is denied. You mentioned that the 123,000 tons may be taken out-of-state and then PERC and other incinerators may have to import. PERC -if the -- if the application is denied under the disposal agreement PERC would lose out on the 30,000 tons, correct?

MR. OLIVER: Correct.
MR. BOWER: But they are still getting the
50,000 tons of the class 4 and 5 waste, correct?
MR. OLIVER: Correct.
MR. BOWER: So they would just need to make up that 30,000 tons that they're losing if the application is denied, is that correct?

MR. OLIVER: That is correct.
MR. BOWER: And you mentioned that you have an interim agreement with PERC that expires soon. Is there any reason why that cannot be extended? Is there an extension provision in that?

MR. OLIVER: No, but we would look to do some sort of an extension with them.

MR. BOWER: And then finally in your -- in Casella's or Pine Tree Waste's application for the Westbrook Transfer Station a representation was made that Casella has capacity at the Southbridge Landfill in Massachusetts. Is there any reason why that could
not be used as another option?
MR. OLIVER: There is no reason, no.
MR. BOWER: Thank you. No further questions.

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Bower. Do the Citizens have some recross at this time? Mr. Spencer.

MR. SPENCER: Thank you. I've got one question for Mr. Oliver. You were saying how there are other smaller landfills in Maine that are licensed to take MSW, and would you concede that Juniper Ridge Landfill because it is state owned might want to adhere more strictly to our waste hierarchy than the other landfills are required to?

MR. OLIVER: I think, as we've stated, this application is consistent with that hierarchy.

MR. SPENCER: So you don't think there's any special responsibility on the part of the state to be a little stricter with its policies -- applying its own policies to its own landfill?

MR. OLIVER: I do not.
MR. SPENCER: Okay, thank you.
HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Spencer.
At this time I am looking for the DEP staff to ask questions of the applicant.

MS. LOYZIM: I had a clarifying question for Abigail regarding the table that you showed with the estimated collection efficiencies. Does the EPA formula and subpart double H include in the calculation differences based on different waste types?

MS. WEBB: It does. The subpart HH calculations actually calculate the emissions in two ways and then they take the higher number of the two methods. So one method is based on the gas curve which integrates the decay -- the decay rate and the waste composition is all factored into that method. It is not reflected in the other method, the one that was shown in the table. I think I answered that right.

MS. LOYZIM: So for the -- the calculation of the decay rate and the collection efficiency that's been determined for Juniper Ridge is that with the current waste stream or an estimation based on adjusting some of the volume for MSW instead of FEPR and ash?

MS. WEBB: For the purposes of this it represents the new proposed waste stream.

MR. BOWER: Could I just inject, could the speakers from DEP staff identify themselves so we can
identify them later in the transcript and so forth?
MS. LOYZIM: I'm sorry, I'm Melanie Loyzim, the director of the Bureau of Remediation, waste management, at the DEP. And then I had another follow-up question for Jeremy Labbe. If I recall, you had stated -- and maybe I misunderstood -- that active cell where waste is being disposed you're estimating there is not anaerobic activity generating methane from that cell?

MR. LABBE: Well, again, it all depends on the lifetime of that cell, and if the lifetime of the cell is longer than three to six months, then anaerobic does start. The great thing about what we do is that we put infrastructure in on a monthly basis so that if it does begin in the cell as it's being placed, we can actually collect it while -from below where the waste is actively being placed so the new material that's continually added gets gas collection infrastructure. I don't know if that answers your question.

MS. LOYZIM: So then you would estimate that there is methane generated from an active cell that has waste in place that's more than six months old?

MR. LABBE: Yes.
MR. PARKER: I'm Mike Parker, the DEP

Project Manager. We'll stay with you, Jeremy, since we left off with you. Again, referring to the placement of the horizontal collectors, you said those are put in approximately after every 40-foot lift, is that correct?

MR. LABBE: Um-hum.
MR. PARKER: Is it possible to install those if -- if your gas generation starts sooner, could you install those at a more frequent rate?

MR. LABBE: Absolutely we could and we have done so in the past as necessary. That's one of the points I made in the testimony about our site personnel being certified to actually install this gas piping on their own so if, contrary to our design, you know, that we've gone through, if we do notice any issues, we can proactively install stuff as it arises.

MR. PARKER: Thank you. You talked about the quarterly scans that you do. Is there any other corroborating data that's generated around the facility that supports your contention that there's no off-site odors being generated?

MR. LABBE: Well, obviously odor complaints are a big one for us. We like to get feedback from the neighbors, and then additionally, we have
hydrogen sulfide monitors, stationary monitors, six of them, stationed around the landfill footprint in strategic locations that were developed with the DEP to determine and make sure that our collection is working properly.

MR. PARKER: This is a tossup for either you or Abigail. You talked about the waste generation curve. You had projections for waste -- I'm sorry -for gas generation. Is that somehow corroborated with what you're actually collecting? If you project you're going to generate 3,000 cubic feet per minute of gas, is that actually what you're collecting right now and how does that factor into your collection efficiency calculations?

MR. LABBE: Well, if I understand the question correctly, it's are we comparing empirical data, the data we're seeing at the site, to theoretical, is that correct?

MR. PARKER: That's correct.
MR. LABBE: Yeah, absolutely, and Sanborn does take that into account and they have all the data that we produced from our well tuning activities as well as our flare run rates and flow rates, and they make corrections and adjustments to that gas projection analysis based on what we're actually
made that assumption just for discussion purposes.
MR. PARKER: Okay. A question for Mr. Oliver. In your testimony today you said under "penalty of law" referencing out-of-state waste. What law are you referencing to I guess?

MR. OLIVER: That's a good question. That's just how our weight ticket reads.

MR. PARKER: Okay. Is it like they don't want to perjure themselves? Is that what they're --

MR. OLIVER: It actually says specifically perjury, yes.

MR. PARKER: Okay. Thank you.
HEARING OFFICER: I have one additional question for -- I believe Mr. Labbe would be the appropriate person. Given that the applicant must demonstrate -- has the burden of proof of demonstrating that each of the criteria are satisfied, has the -- has the applicant provided to the Department or will it be providing to the Department documentation that it has satisfied the leachate disposal method with both its primary and secondary options, primary obviously being Old Town Fuel and Fiber and secondary being Brewer? We have seen some estimates about the ability to handle but we also need to see the documentation that it will be

1 handled. So can you speak a little bit to that?

MR. LABBE: I might have to defer to Don on this but I believe we have an agreement in place with Old Town Fuel and Fiber for disposal or at least a guarantee of ability to dispose of our leachate. Is that what you're referring to?

HEARING OFFICER: And does that agreement account for the change in leachate both for Old Town Fuel and Fiber and the city of Brewer, who I believe is the secondary?

MR. LABBE: Yeah, I'll speak a little bit to the city of Brewer because we have a specific permit -- an industrial wastewater discharge permit with the city of Brewer and as part of that permit there is requirements for concentrations -- parameter concentrations that we have to meet prior to disposal over there and that basically -- you know, assuming we meet those parameters, we can dispose of leachate at Brewer.

HEARING OFFICER: And you've provided that documentation to the Department?

MR. LABBE: Yes, we have.
HEARING OFFICER: Do we have any other questions?

MR. PARKER: I have some questions. Jeremy,
sticking with the Brewer leachate contract, there was a comment made from one of the interested persons that that contract had expired with the city of Brewer. Is that correct and have you renegotiated that for an additional term?

MR. LABBE: That is correct and we have a new permit in place as of 2013.

MR. PARKER: Okay, thank you. This one is directed to Mr. Booth following up on Heather's comments. You've seen the memo that came out a week or so ago regarding the Department's review of leachate quality and quantity. Do you have any follow-ups or response to that or are you in agreement with what the Department reached on its own accord or do you have any comments on that at all?

MR. BOOTH: I totally agree with what was in that analysis. They came to similar conclusions that we did on the quality, and they also identified, you know, that it met the standards in both the Old Town Fuel and Fiber and the city of Brewer pretreatment requirements, and I agree that there's nothing that I've gone through in the analysis that said that this material wouldn't meet any of the requirements of either Old Town Fuel and Fiber or for the city of Brewer.

MR. PARKER: I think this is directed at Mr. Oliver. It may not even require a response, but I just want to reiterate, you have at this point no intention or plans to bring out-of-state waste to the Westbrook facility other than that one contract you talked about, is that correct?

MR. OLIVER: Specifically one thing we did was reroute our own collection vehicles so all of Pine Tree's collection vehicles stop at the border and then come back. We do not collect out-of-state waste and bring it to Westbrook. We'll evaluate it on a customer-by-customer basis and if we do have requests, then we'll deal with it and we'll handle it appropriately.

MR. PARKER: And you would agree with the statement that it is a transfer station and that the mythical truck of out-of-state waste couldn't come there, you pull out one tin can for recycling and send the remainder up to Juniper Ridge as processing residue?

MR. OLIVER: Correct. It is a transfer station. It's not a processing facility.

MR. PARKER: Thank you.
HEARING OFFICER: I believe that's all the questions that the Department has. So thank you to
the applicant for the presentation and the answers to questions you provided. We will now be moving on to the summary of testimony by MRC.

MS. McBRADY: Good afternoon, Presiding Officer Parent, Assistant Attorney General Macirowski, Director Loyzim and Members of the Department.

HEARING OFFICER: Please be sure to speak up.

MS. McBRADY: My name is Nancy McBrady. I am an attorney with Preti, Flaherty, and I am counsel to the Municipal Review Committee here today.

I would like to introduce the three witnesses that will be providing summaries of the testimony that they have already filed within the record. The first to speak today will be Mr. Chip Reeves. He is board president of the MRC and also the director of public works for the town of Bar Harbor. There's Greg Lounder second, who is the executive director of the MRC and then George Aronson, principal of Commonwealth Resource Management Corporation who has provided consulting services to the MRC for the past two decades. To the extent that their testimony is less than the allotted time, similar to other parties earlier today, we
would like to reserve the remainder for either redirect or cross examination purposes. Thank you.

MR. REEVES: Good afternoon, Presiding Officer Parent and Members of the Department of Environmental Protection. As stated before, my name is Chip Reeves. I'm the board president of the Municipal Review Committee. I'm also director of public works for the town of Bar Harbor.

The MRC is a nonprofit organization that represents 187 municipalities in central and eastern Maine whose citizens, businesses and institutions generate municipal solid waste that is currently disposed of at the Penobscot Energy Recovery Company waste to energy facility in Orrington, Maine, and which owns roughly 25 percent of the limited partnership interest. The member municipalities have each contracted with PERC to dispose of their MSW through March 31st of 2018.

The MRC has intervened in this hearing regarding the amendment application because it has an interest in affordable, long-term and environmentally sound disposal of its charter municipalities' MSW. Casella's amendment application proposes to allow acceptance of unprocessed MSW for disposal at the Juniper Ridge Landfill in Old Town from in-state
sources, including some of the MSW that had previously been processed by the now closed Maine Energy waste to energy facility that was located in Biddeford; however, Casella and PERC's private partners have negotiated a contract that delivers a portion of the in-state waste MSW stream that previously went to Maine Energy to the PERC facility. In the short-term, the contract between Casella and PERC, together with closure of the MERC facility, offers significant benefits to the charter municipalities regarding a long-standing concern of the MRC; namely, the provision of an adequate supply of MSW to the PERC facility from in-state sources. The new Casella/PERC contract would have Casella deliver up to 100,000 tons per year of MSW to the PERC facility, including up to 30,000 tons per year of MSW that had previously been delivered to the Biddeford facility from in-state sources. As a result, the new contract assists the PERC facility in operating at or near full capacity with reduced reliance on out-of-state MSW and the contract's tip fees are more favorable than what PERC would have received by accepting the out-of-state MSW. This results in economic benefit both to PERC and to the charter municipalities which will share the benefits
of PERC's improved financial performance.
Another long-standing concern of the MRC and its member municipalities is the proper implementation of the state solid waste management hierarchy. After careful consideration of the application amendment, MRC believes that the Casella/PERC contract offers the following benefits; number one, delivery of additional MSW to the PERC facility will divert a significant volume of MSW away from the Juniper Ridge Landfill and extend somewhat the life of the landfill. This will preserve the landfill's airspace for disposal of PERC's residual materials and other materials from separate sources for which landfilling is the best disposal option.

Number two, under certain provisions of the contract Casella would deliver additional MSW to the PERC facility to replace materials that charter municipalities recycle through a Casella facility, thus charter municipalities can increase recycling efforts without incurring increased tipping fees or contract term penalties regarding minimum MSW deliveries to PERC.

Third, the Casella/PERC contract contains several other provisions that would reduce charter municipality exposure to delivery shortfall
penalties; for example, it contains insurances to preclude MSW collected by Casella within charter municipalities from being delivered to any other facility other than the PERC facility.

MRC is confident that the Casella/PERC contract will benefit the charter municipalities to the extent PERC continues to operate at capacity and existing licensed airspace continues to be available for PERC residuals. MRC is not opposed to the excess MSW going to Juniper Ridge Landfill. As a result, MRC does not object to this particular Casella amendment application currently before the Maine DEP.

MR. LOUNDER: Thank you, Chip. Good afternoon, Presiding Officer Parent, Members of the DEP. My name is Greg Lounder. I'm the executive director of the MRC.

The MRC was formed back in 1991 for the benefit of the member municipalities. The principal job through these years has been to ensure that our mission of affordable, long-term,
environmentally-sound disposal of MSW continues to be met.

All together we represent 187 Maine municipalities. Our role has evolved considerably through these 21 or 22 years and through time we have
evolved as needed to ensure that the interests of our communities continue to be met.

I want to touch briefly on longer-term issues related to today's proceeding. Repeating points made by others earlier, the closure of Maine Energy is certainly a significant state-wide event. The MRC has carefully considered the long-term implications of this change. We have evaluated a number of approaches and options in response to this change and we ultimately worked with PERC to implement the PERC/Casella contract. I want to be clear, the PERC facility is very reliable, has been for a number of years and it remains our preferred extension option for after 2018.

The application amendment and the PERC/Casella contract have not changed our effort to extend PERC; however, I do want to discuss a couple key challenges that we face in relation to that endeavor; number one, project scale. Clearly the PERC facility requires more MSW than the existing municipalities can provide. The new MSW that would be available to PERC as a result of this amendment application being approved would not be enough MSW to fully satisfy that challenge, but our sense at this time is that it is a clear step in the right
direction.
I also want to be clear on another point, and I do want to express appreciation. There have been a number of suggestions, theories that have been discussed in the context of this proceeding that contemplate circumstances where we may ultimately have been able to acquire more MSW than is currently available and I just want to make the strong point that we've considered any and all possibilities to addressing the needs of the communities here and we ultimately decided that the contract route pursued was the best solution for our municipalities in this case.

The second issue in relation to long-term reliability of waste to energy relates to revenue loss from the sale of energy products, and we are exploring a number of approaches to securing value post 2018, including state financial support. We're looking at a number of emerging processing technologies that could lead to the production of higher value energy products, and, again, that needs to be at a scale that is a good fit for the MSW that our municipalities could be expected to generate over the long-term; however, we're at a point where we cannot guarantee that our mission will continue
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So in light of these challenges, the MRC and PERC's private partners recently took action to secure new tons and to begin to look at a post 2018 MSW contingency plan, and that contingency plan being an option possibly for the municipalities that we serve to potentially transition their disposal needs after 2018. The contingency plan referenced in the PERC/Casella contract, however, has no bearing on this proceeding and would be the subject of a separate licensing process.

And I also want to make the point, and I'll do this truly as a contingency plan, all the terms that would be required to implement such a plan are not nearly fully developed, it's all quite new, but our feeling is that it's just good, straightforward advance contingency planning for our members, and I've discussed this prospect in my recent travels with member communities and they have expressed some sense of relief that we're taking a very broad-based approach to our post 2018 planning process rather than just remaining in the confines of the box we built, so to speak, at any cost. In the past, MRC --

HEARING OFFICER: You have about two minutes to summarize the rest of your testimony.

MR. LOUNDER: Thank you. Moving forward, just a closing thought on the hierarchy. We've always been supportive of the state's hierarchy and that remains so and we feel its strength and enduring quality is its flexibility as a guiding principle.
The MRC has supported and will continue to support
the hierarchy for the guiding principle that it is.
We also appreciate the flexibility built into the declaration of policy that makes it clear the state is not committed to a particular disposal method where such commitment would cause other options to be foreclosed upon or eliminated, and that is very consistent with our thinking with respect to post 2018. So I'll close. Thanks.

MR. ARONSON: Good afternoon, Presiding Officer Parent, Members of the DEP. My name is George Aronson. I am a principal with Commonwealth Resource Management Corporation based in Boston, Mass. I've been involved in the waste to energy industry since 1982. I've been a technical and economic consultant for the MRC since its inception in 1991; in fact, I helped negotiate the long-term waste disposal agreements between PERC and the member
communities in 1990 and ' 91 which gave rise to the MRC and since then I have represented MRC on an ongoing basis regarding compliance with the amended and restated waste disposal agreements, oversight of technical performance, capital and major projects for sustaining the PERC facility and efforts to acquire waste to enable PERC to operate at capacity and on terms favorable to the charter municipalities for these last 22 years.

Just to -- my testimony focuses on the impacts of the contract between Casella and PERC that allows the acceptance of unprocessed MSW for disposal to the Juniper Ridge Landfill from in-state sources, some of which had been previously processed by the now closed Maine Energy facility. The contract also allows for the delivery of some of Maine Energy's MSW to the PERC facility, in short, a contract in concert with Casella's amendment application attempts to comply with the state's waste management hierarchy while also supporting and improving certain aspects of the continued operations of PERC.

It's my view that the Casella/PERC contract will assist in reducing the amount of out-of-state waste needed for the PERC facility to operate at capacity. The guaranteed in-state MSW delivered to

PERC by Casella will further assist with the diversion of some MSW away from landfills, which supports the state's hierarchy. As a result, the Casella/PERC contract and this particular amendment application, if implemented as intended, will provide significant economic benefits to the MRC member municipalities.

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you very much. At this time we will do cross examination of MRC and the witnesses that are before us. MMWAC and ecomaine have both indicated that they would like to cross examine. I have allotted five minutes for each one of them.

MR. BOWER: Again, if we could, we would like to combine the time for MMWAC and ecomaine in which case we would have ten minutes.

HEARING OFFICER: Ten minutes is allotted. Please stay within the ten minutes.

MR. BOWER: Okay. A question for Mr. Lounder. You close your pre-filed testimony with the statement, "therefore, MRC does not object to the application pending before Maine DEP." You state you don't object but do you support the application?

MR. LOUNDER: Given the benefits potentially available to charter municipalities we're certainly
supportive of it.

MR. BOWER: In the past MRC -- and you made reference to this in your testimony -- MRC has expressed significant concerns about allowing for the landfill of raw MSW at Juniper Ridge, at Pine Tree Landfill in Hampden, and you also testified against the licensing of the Westbrook Transfer Station more recently. Has something changed such that MRC now takes a different approach and is not objecting to this application other than the 30,000 tons?

MR. LOUNDER: I think our position in relation to the Westbrook Transfer Station was prior to the terms of this arrangement being fully developed.

MR. BOWER: So it's really just the contract for the 30,000 tons that has changed the way that MRC views the issue of landfilling raw MSW?

MR. LOUNDER: The contract addresses a number of concerns that have been longstanding at MRC related to that, yeah.

MR. BOWER: In your remarks a moment ago you discussed that -- you made reference to the disposal agreement but also commented that 30,000 tons is not necessarily enough to meet MRC -- or PERC's long-term needs for that incinerator. Wouldn't -- wouldn't the
status quo -- by status quo I mean no MSW at Juniper Ridge except for bypass from incinerators, wouldn't that situation be more beneficial to the MRC communities in the long-term?

MR. LOUNDER: If we felt so, we likely would have had an adjusted position in the proceeding.

MR. BOWER: I'm not sure I understand the answer. I guess I'm comparing would the status quo of no MSW at Juniper Ridge except for bypass be more beneficial than the agreement to have 30,000 tons which does not satisfy the needs of the incinerator currently?

MR. LOUNDER: I don't agree with that assessment.

MR. BOWER: Do you -- if the status quo were to remain, do you think you would get more or less than 30,000 tons at the PERC facility?

MR. LOUNDER: Less.
MR. BOWER: In your opinion -- and this is my last question -- does a proposal to landfill 93,000 tons of waste that used to be incinerated, do you believe that's consistent with the solid waste hierarchy?

MR. LOUNDER: Given certain conditions it could be.

MR. BOWER: To move 93,000 tons of waste from a higher rung in the hierarchy to the lowest rung in the hierarchy in your opinion is consistent with that solid waste hierarchy?

MR. LOUNDER: Well, in relation to the reality that one of the four incinerators closed.

MR. BOWER: In Brian Oliver's testimony earlier he mentioned an interim agreement with PERC that is about to expire. Have there been discussions that you know of between PERC and Casella to extend -- what's going to happen when that interim agreement expires?

MR. LOUNDER: Not to my knowledge.
MR. BOWER: There have been no discussions to your knowledge?

MR. LOUNDER: Not to my knowledge, no.
MR. BOWER: And then finally, you mentioned in the event that PERC were to shut down and this is contemplated in the disposal agreement, that Juniper Ridge could be an option for MRC communities for the disposal, is that correct?

MR. LOUNDER: I characterized that as an arrangement that's less than fully developed. There would be a fair amount involved for that to reach a point where it was a plausible solution.

MR. LOUNDER: The total MSW generated by the charter municipalities?

MR. BOWER: Right.
MR. LOUNDER: It's about 182,000 tons at present.

MR. BOWER: Okay. No further questions.
HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there other intervenors who wish to cross examine MRC at this time? Mr. Spencer, please come forward.

MR. SPENCER: Thank you. I'll be brief. We've been hearing about a $\$ 450,000$ annual savings if this -- once this unappealable permit is provided to Casella and BGS. Of that $\$ 450,000$, is that \$450,000 total to PERC?

MR. LOUNDER: Annually, yup, total to PERC.
MR. SPENCER: Annually, okay. So MRC owns about 25 percent of PERC so would MRC towns be saving $\$ 450,000$ for the towns or 25 percent of the $\$ 450,000$ for the towns?

MR. LOUNDER: Well, given the overall
structure of our arrangement, we're going to do a little better than 25 percent because we have contractual rights to a share of the revenue, but to sum it up, the value to the charter municipalities would be about 41 percent of the total.

MR. SPENCER: Okay. Well, thank you.
MR. LOUNDER: Sure.
HEARING OFFICER: Are there other intervenors who wish to cross-examine MRC at this time? Moving on to the redirect by MRC, Ms. McBrady. MS. McBRADY: Just very briefly. I wanted to touch on the benefits of the PERC/Casella contract and I'm going to open this to any of you three. It's correct that the 30,000 tons that will be brought to PERC is from in-state MSW that is replacing out-of-state waste, is that correct?
(All three witnesses nod in the affirmative)
MS. McBRADY: Could you also address some of the other opportunities and attributes of the Casella/PERC contract that directly impacts MRC?

MR. ARONSON: There are other benefits that are contractual going to the ongoing relationship between Casella and PERC where there had been some questions in open areas on the operations level that were resolved. There's been concern about accounting
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for waste originating within the charter municipalities. That has been addressed as well. That's been a longstanding concern of the MRC. There are some changes to some escalation provisions and those also provided some benefits to the MRC as well. So it's not just the 30,000 tons, and also in terms of acquiring tonnage from out-of-state, that requires a significant amount of effort to do from multiple sources for the PERC staff and to the extent that comes from a single source, there's an advantage in having -- basically in having that come from one source rather than from multiple sources as well.

MS. McBRADY: Thank you. No other questions.

HEARING OFFICER: At this time would any of the intervenors like to recross? And I see Mr. Bower coming forward.

MR. BOWER: Just quickly to follow up on that point that Mr. Aronson made. The other attributes of the PERC disposal agreement are not contingent on the approval of the pending application, correct?

MR. ARONSON: They are part of the agreement and my understanding is that the agreement is in force.

MR. BOWER: What is the basis of that understanding that those other parts of the agreement are contingent on --

MR. ARONSON: No, no, that's not what I said.

MR. BOWER: Oh, okay.
MR. ARONSON: My understanding is that the 30,000 are contingent but the other --

MR. BOWER: The other attributes are not contingent, correct?

MR. ARONSON: That's correct.
MR. BOWER: It's just the 30,000 tons that were not previously going to PERC, that's contingent on the granting of this application, correct?

MR. ARONSON: Yes.
MR. Bower: Okay, nothing further.
HEARING OFFICER: Are there other intervenors who wish to recross MRC at this time? Seeing none, we can take a brief recess and I can see -- oh, excuse me, does the staff have questions?

MR. PARKER: Mike Parker again, project manager. Getting back to one of Mr. Bower's earlier points, Mr. Lounder, if 30,000 tons going to the PERC facility is good, why isn't it even better that the full 90,000 tons goes to PERC and we flip this around 136
and only 30,000 tons go to Juniper Ridge? Is there some detail in the contracts that I'm missing?

MR. LOUNDER: No, I think not. It's more a matter of if here in the spring of 2013 we could have developed an approach that would have secured 90,000 tons in some way, we certainly would have acted toward that end.

MR. PARKER: Are you aware of what those roadblocks are to preventing that from happening, from securing that full 90,000 tons that would pretty much replace what you take in currently for out-of-state waste?

MR. LOUNDER: The approach we took was one that we believed would secure as much of that tonnage as possible. So it's a competitive marketplace out there. Well, I should point out, you know, PERC's the signatory of the contract and, you know, this question may also be well suited to them as the signatory to that agreement, but I guess I'll try to close by saying all factors considered in a competitive marketplace, we took the best action we could to secure as much MSW as we could.

MR. PARKER: But you would agree if you could secure more tons either through Casella or someone else, that would certainly be more beneficial
to the facility and to MRC?

MR. LOUNDER: Yeah, yeah, and there's -yeah, there's more job left to do certainly.

MR. PARKER: Okay. Mr. Aronson, do you have anything to add to that?

MR. ARONSON: I think that was a straight answer. I should point out that the MRC was indirectly involved in this negotiation. We were giving input to the partners but we were not directly involved and so questions were asked of us as to what our opinions were on certain issues that have been longstanding concerns and we gave our responses as best we could.

MR. PARKER: Thanks, all set.
MS. LOYZIM: Again, I'm Melanie Loyzim, bureau director for Bureau of Remediation, Waste Management, Maine DEP. There's been a number of references to an interim agreement and reference to an expiration in the near term. Are you aware of what the expiration date of that interim agreement is?

MR. LOUNDER: I'm not certain to the day. I'm thinking mid-to-late April.

MS. LOYZIM: Is that April 2013, this month?
MR. LOUNDER: Yes. what will happen after expiration of that agreement? What are the changing conditions for the waste stream pertaining to MRC's communities?

MR. LOUNDER: In relation to the interim disposal agreement? There have not been extension discussions between PERC and Casella that I'm aware of.

MS. LOYZIM: So what is the impact on the waste stream for the MRC communities upon expiration of that interim agreement?

MR. LOUNDER: Well, we would have to return to the out-of-state marketplace and make every effort to secure those tons.

MR. ARONSON: If I can add something, April
is the start of the seasonal uptick in waste deliveries and generation in Maine in general and so we would typically expect to see waste quantities increase in April and through the summer months in any event. So there tends to be a greater need for waste particularly in February and March than there are in later months so it's a somewhat different marketplace. We have not been involved in any way with those -- if there are discussions, we have not been involved with them so we can't give you
particulars on what those discussions are.
MS. LOYZIM: Thank you.
MR. PARKER: I have a couple of follow-ups for you. We've talked about shortages to the MRC communities. Greg, up to this point is there some average amount in tonnage or cubic yards that in aggregate those communities have been short?

MR. LOUNDER: In relation to --
MR. PARKER: Up to this point, going back, not moving forward yet.

MR. LOUNDER: I'm unsure I understand the question.

MR. PARKER: The MRC communities have an obligation to deliver a certain amount of tonnage. Is there some aggregate number of those that are short in their tonnage obligations?

MR. LOUNDER: The aggregate tonnage obligation I think is 182,000 tons, give or take.

MR. PARKER: Okay, and given this proposal before us, you're comfortable that they could -- that Casella could at least fill in some of that as part of their contractual obligations, is that correct?

MR. LOUNDER: That's correct.
MR. PARKER: That's it. No further questions.
ecomaine and MMWAC begin your presentation. You have a collective time for the two parties of 20 minutes for your summary of testimony, and I was just reminded that a number of people have not been sworn in. So if you would please stand if you have not been sworn in yet and plan to testify. Raise your right hand. Do you affirm to tell the truth and nothing but the truth?
(Witnesses respond in the affirmative)
HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Please proceed.

MR. BOWER: Thank you, Hearing Officer
Parent. My name again is Mark Bower. I'm an attorney at the law firm of Jensen, Baird, Gardner and Henry. I represent both ecomaine and MMWAC in this proceeding. They are testifying as a panel and our first witness is Kevin Roche who is the general manager of ecomaine.

MR. ROCHE: Thank you for the opportunity to testify today on the Juniper Ridge Landfill amendment. My name is Kevin Roche and I'm the general manager for ecomaine. I've been in that position for about nine years. I have 24 years of experience in several different states in this industry, both private and public experience.

For those of you who are not all that familiar with ecomaine, we are a quasi-municipal nonprofit organization. We have 47 member communities, 21 of those communities are owner communities and 26 are contract communities. Ecomaine owns and operates a waste energy facility, a single sort recycling facility and also a landfill. Our -- all three of our facilities of ISO 14001 certified, which is proof of our environmental performance, as well as OHSAS 18,001 certified, which is proof of our safety performance.

Interestingly, the decision that's before you is very similar to the decision that is always before our communities because, like the state, ecomaine owns and operates -- actually, ecomaine owns a landfill and ecomaine does operate our landfill. In your case, you have a private operator. During the year and in my career with ecomaine over the last nine years several times it has come up as to how we use our landfill, and our communities have been dedicated or committed to the solid waste hierarchy as a way of managing our landfill. So we look first at reduce, reuse, recycle, then at composting and digestion and then at waste to energy and then the very bottom rung, as we all know, is landfilling.

When I say we're committed to that, we could easily open up our landfill and landfill unprocessed waste, and financially we would be better off by doing that and each year we can consider doing that, but our communities have never done that and the reason why they haven't done that is they're in this for the long-term. They don't want to use up that valuable asset because once it's filled up, it's no longer an asset. It becomes a huge liability.

And so we have in our landfill, which is only two miles from downtown Portland, we have about 25 years of capacity left in that landfill. If we didn't have waste to energy and we didn't have aggressive recycling, that landfill would have been filled up long ago and we, too, would have been shipping our waste to far away places and dependent upon small communities, such as Old Town, to manage our waste for us, but that isn't the case because I think our communities did the right thing. They had a lot of foresight in looking at proper, sound solid waste management strategies and conserved our landfill for future generations.

Here are some other reasons why we believe this amendment should not be granted. Landfilling is a storage strategy. We've actually gone back 15, 20
years and dug up a lot of the waste and a lot of the newspapers can still be read and a lot of the oak leaves actually can still be identified.

MR. DOYLE: Objection. You know, all of this is not in his testimony. He's supposed to stay within the confines of his pre-filed direct testimony and so far none of it, other than his introduction and the number of communities in his organization, are in his pre-filed testimony. So I ask that all of this be struck.

HEARING OFFICER: To the extent that the information that you have provided is not in the testimony, that information will be struck from the record. I ask that you please stick to the testimony that you provided in your pre-filed testimony.

MR. ROCHE: Moving along, out-of-state waste, we wouldn't have to take so much out-of-state waste if there wasn't so much in-state waste being landfilled. That's part of the problem right now with the state policy, and if we open up -- if we grant the landfill amendment, that issue will only get worse.

Recycling in many of our communities has been very successful. Our communities are recycling 30 to 40 percent of our waste. We are now looking at
other solid waste management strategies such as organic diversion. These cutting edge or leading edge technologies won't happen if landfill is the easy way out.

MR. DOYLE: Objection. This is not in his pre-filed testimony.

HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Roche, please stick to your pre-filed testimony. As it is, you are eating up time talking about things that are being stricken from the record and collectively as a group you have 20 minutes. So if you want to speak for 20 minutes on things that won't enter the record, that's going to be the end result here.

MR. ROCHE: Okay.
HEARING OFFICER: If perhaps you have a copy of your pre-filed testimony in front of you, that would be helpful.

MR. ROCHE: Regarding energy captured from waste to energy versus landfills, landfilling -- the capture of gas from landfilling --

MR. DOYLE: Objection, objection. Show me in your pre-filed testimony where any word that just came out of your mouth is located.

HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Doyle, please direct your objections and your statements to me.

MR. DOYLE: I'm sorry.
MR. ROCHE: Thank you.
MR. DOYLE: Objection. This is not in his pre-filed testimony. What he appears to be doing is reading testimony that he used for another purpose.

MR. ROCHE: Okay, I will close and turn over to our board chairman.

MR. McGOVERN: Thank you. Can I ask the amount of time we have in our initial testimony?

HEARING OFFICER: For the collective of ecomaine and MMWAC you have 12 minutes.

MR. McGOVERN: Okay, great. I'll probably take about two of those minutes, thank you. I'm Mike McGovern. I serve as the board chair of ecomaine. It's -- as Kevin explained, we have various member communities and I'd like to briefly highlight that the municipalities are responsible for waste, that there's a statutory basis for waste to energy in the hierarchy and to speak also briefly about the economics.

The municipal responsibility for waste has been founded in Maine law for quite some time. We are responsible for the disposal of the solid waste in our communities, no questions asked. Within the hierarchy of the state, the statutory basis for it,
it's very clear in our view of our board of where we fall and where the different methods fall with reduce, reuse, recycle, methods of incineration and then with landfills. Landfills, in our view, is at the very bottom. To that degree, we've made investments at ecomaine, the member communities, of over 130 million dollars in waste to energy. We believe in the economics of it. We have gone to tremendous expense to do that. We've even paid down our debt, and to have an entity look for an amendment to a permit where, you know, suddenly they want the rules changed as we see them. They don't want to follow the hierarchy. They don't want to follow the economics. You know, the economics aren't the greatest for municipalities in the state of Maine; you know, we're getting hit left and right and this is just another example of an entity that is trying to get the rules changed to benefit a private corporation instead of a public benefit for the citizens of Maine.

And I do have -- if I might, we had submitted some letters from our member communities stating our concerns with the hierarchy and I have a few more letters today that came in after the early deadline and I would ask for your permission to
submit those.
MR. BOWER: We would just move to supplement the Exhibit $A$ to his testimony with additional letters from communities.

MR. DOYLE: Objection. We haven't seen them, and they're not pre-filed.

HEARING OFFICER: Why do these letters -why were they not able to submit these letters at the time you submitted your testimony?

MR. McGOVERN: I think some of the managers and other officials were too busy trying to figure out what was going on in balancing budgets and probably just didn't meet the deadline.

HEARING OFFICER: I will not be admitting these into the hearing record; however, there is a public comment period that is part of the application process. I will be providing information at the close of the hearing tomorrow as far as how long that written public comment period is open, and anybody who wishes to provide information through that mechanism can do that at that time, but I will not be admitting those letters into the hearing record.

MR. McGOVERN: Okay, Ms. Parent. I call your attention to the letters we did submit that make many of the same points as the ones that won't be
whether this was a good business judgment and that's
officially submitted into the record, but we ask you to follow the hierarchy, we ask you to look at the economics and we ask for fairness. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.
MR. DESCHENE: Good afternoon. I'm Clint Deschene, city manager for the city of Auburn, host community for MMWAC. I wanted to start and highlight some of the points of my testimony and wanted to highlight, most importantly, the business investment and the economics of the hierarchy the city of Auburn undertook more than 25 years ago when making these investments. Sound business investments is an important part of how you run your private sector business as well as a municipality, and in doing that, the opportunity Auburn saw was to invest in a hierarchy that prioritized the way we handle our waste. The city of Auburn took that opportunity and took out over 45 million dollars in principal bonds. That's a significant investment for a community of any size at any time in the state of Maine. Based upon this business investment, I'm here today to tell you that the decision you will give will severely impact how that investment was made and to change the decision that was made decades ago to determine
why I'm here to say that the hierarchy is important not only for what it does for waste but also what it does to support the business decisions of many municipalities in the state of Maine. Other businesses are allowed to do this on regular basis. Business decisions made by large corporations in our city also take on the hierarchy and understand the benefits of that and a decision here today to change that will also change the economic benefits that the city of Auburn can provide them.

Every day businesses decide to leave the state of Maine for different reasons. I could cite multiple examples but I think it would be better for people to visit and see the businesses and speak to them themselves in Auburn that have made those choices to say that instilling the values of the hierarchy are important goals that the state of Maine has always operated under. I think that more of these goals are important to sustaining those investments and a decision here today to change that would change the value of every business investment and every investment that the city of Auburn has made to that end. If we are going to move landfilling to a higher level in the hierarchy, I think the best motive that we could do now is say that there is no
more hierarchy and find the largest landfill in the state of Maine and say let's just bury it there with everything else because we're not going to follow it.

I'd like to talk more on business investments but I think it's important at this point that we let Mr. Kazar speak on some of the other issues that have faced the city of Auburn.

MR. KAZAR: Hello, my name is Joseph Kazar. I'm the executive director of MMWAC, Mid-Maine Waste Action Corporation in Auburn. I've been active in the solid waste field, primarily in waste to energy for more than 30 years.

MMWAC is a nonprofit quasi-municipal corporation. We were formed in 1986. We took over the Pioneering Auburn Resource Recovery facility and built an even newer facility there. Auburn, our host community, has been joined by 11 partner municipalities to form and support MMWAC. We also provide services to 14 other contract municipalities and a number of other municipalities for their private haulers. We own and operate one of the two publically-owned waste to energy plants, ecomaine being the other one, which is why so much of our testimony is similar. We have very similar interests in regard to the hierarchy. We also operate a
transfer station and recycling center.
The primary purpose of my testimony is to express the concern that the application currently pending before the Department is inconsistent with Maine's solid waste hierarchy, which is set forth in statute. The application requests the removal of certain important restrictions currently contained in the JRL license. If the Department were to grant the application, thus allowing the significant disposal of large amounts of MSW at the state-owned landfill, the net result would be to move a large quantity of MSW previously processed at MERC down to the lowest rung in the hierarchy.

My pre-filed testimony explained in detail the origin of Maine's solid waste hierarchy, the reasons that the Legislature had adopted and later reaffirmed this policy and the many reasons why waste to energy is ahead of landfill in that hierarchy. Yes, we need landfills but no, they are not above waste to energy, and if they directly compete with waste-to-energy, they will starve those facilities and keep them from running at full capacity. We need to run at full capacity in order to be efficient and to survive. We need a secure source of waste in order to operate efficiently, as I say, and to
deliver the power that it's obligated to supply under our power purchase agreements. In addition, progress in recycling throughout the state has been terrific.
We see all the towns involved in recycling and we see them recycling more and more, composting looks to be the next big thing. These will lessen the amount of solid waste that's left for processing at waste to energy facilities which is another reason why we feel that this application is inappropriate.

If JRL were to become the primary option for the disposal of raw MSW, as the applicant has proposed, the potential of this steady supply would be threatened and our future, therefore, would be threatened, the future of a facility that is supported by taxpayers in our area.

So for MMWAC, this is not about the ability to enter into limited-term contracts for the supply of MSW. This is about long-term state policy and our long-term future.

The hierarchy was not developed, as I understand it, based on cost. It was based on what was best for the environment, what was best for the people of the state of Maine. It was a very thoughtful policy and reaffirmed by the Legislature and it hasn't been changed. We haven't reversed any
of the preferences. We fully subscribed to it and we support it.

Unlike landfills with inherently limited capacity and limited lives, waste to energy has a constant capacity that is never used up. If we are used to our full capacity, we can extend scarce and valuable landfill life by a multiple of times. We can extract many of -- many more times the energy of the landfill, even the best landfills, can extract through their gas extraction systems. The EPA has underscored that we do -- we are a net reducer in greenhouse gas emissions and we serve the local community for their disposal needs, for their processing needs without wasteful long-haul trash. Landfills should be reserved for the solid waste that waste to energies lack the capacity for or for the inert sterile ash that we produce and for those materials that we were not designed to process.

The applicant initially proposed to bring MSW which previously had been incinerated at MERC to Juniper Ridge for disposal. Now they have altered that concept and they're proposing not to bring that specific waste but to bring an amount equal to that. We have concerns that this could be a loophole that would allow even more municipal solid waste to be
diverted from waste-to-energy plants.
Specifically, the application seeks to remove all restrictions and limitations with the existing license that's in place at Juniper Ridge. Chief among the restrictions is that MSW goes there only if it's bypassed from waste to energy. That's worked so far and that could work under this situation.

HEARING OFFICER: You have one minute, sir.
MR. KAZAR: There's three waste to energy facilities that remain, and if none of them require the capacity, then it would seem fine under the current license for that waste to be landfilled at Juniper Ridge. It's working now, it can work in the future.

Lastly, JRL is a state asset. It's a valuable source of capacity and it's one that we need to retain for the future. A waste to energy plant could have problems like MERC and be forced to shut down, economic problems or technical problems and where is the waste going to go? We shouldn't prematurely fill it. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. That concludes the direct testimony presentation of ecomaine and MMWAC. Before we move on, I would like to ask Mr. is that correct? that correct?
ten minutes earlier today, correct?

HEARING OFFICER: Absolutely. As you were walking over I said if you need more time, please let me know, and that's what you're doing right now. You have 30 minutes, Mr. Doyle.

MR. DOYLE: Thank you. Mr. Deschene, on page one of your testimony you state that you're concerned that allowing Juniper Ridge to serve as the, quote, primary disposal option, closed quote, for in-state MSW could lead to the demise of MMWAC,

MR. DESCHENE: Yes.
MR. DOYLE: I'm going to show you Exhibit 14 which is attached to Mr. Oliver's testimony. I assume you don't have it before you?

MR. DESCHENE: No.
MR. DOYLE: I'm referring there to table 3 of that testimony. Can you find table 3?

MR. DESCHENE: Yes.
MR. DOYLE: This is on page 15 of that exhibit which is the state's 2011 disposal capacity report, the most recent disposal capacity report, is

MR. DESCHENE: It would appear so.
MR. DOYLE: If I recall correctly, I gained

MR. DOYLE: Augusta Hatch Hill?
MR. DESCHENE: Yes.
MR. DOYLE: And Bath, they took in 10,282 tons of in-state MSW, correct?

MR. DESCHENE: Yes.
MR. DOYLE: And Brunswick, they took in 3,543 tons of in-state MSW, right, just below that?

MR. DESCHENE: Yes. It doesn't say in-state but it does say MSW.

MR. DOYLE: MSW, and Presque Isle, they took in 5,573 tons of in-state MSW, is that right?

MR. DESCHENE: Yes.
MR. DOYLE: Given this, table 3 and table 1, in-state MSW, how does allowing 93,000 tons of MSW at Juniper Ridge make JRL the primary disposal option for in-state MSW in Maine?

MR. DESCHENE: I guess as I would understand, you are the largest landfill in the state of Maine. Is that not accurate?

MR. DOYLE: This is time for me to ask questions of you, not you of me.

MR. DESCHENE: Well, I guess my answer then is as the largest landfill in the state of Maine, to my knowledge, that would make you primary. Largest to me also means primary.

## MR. DOYLE: But if it's capped at 93,000

 tons and all of these other waste facilities are taking as much or more than Juniper Ridge, how does Juniper Ridge become the primary disposal option for in-state MSW?MR. DESCHENE: But, again, that's what you're currently taking. What's your capacity? I don't -- your total capacity would exceed this.

MR. DOYLE: We're not currently taking 93,000 tons. We're asking to take 93,000 tons.

MR. BOWER: I'm going to object. He's testifying.

HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Doyle, please --
MR. DOYLE: Isn't that correct?
MR. DESCHENE: I'm answering your question to the best of my knowledge. What I would say is this is what you're taking but your capacity is the size of your landfill. Primary to me is based upon the size of your landfill.

HEARING OFFICER: In response to the objection, Mr. Doyle, your statement will be stricken. You can rephrase if you would like.

MR. DOYLE: This proposal doesn't interfere with the supply of waste from Auburn to MMWAC, does it?

MR. DESCHENE: This proposal doesn't interfere? Yes, I would say it does.

MR. DOYLE: This procedure interferes with the supply of waste from Auburn to MMWAC?

MR. DESCHENE: Oh, from Auburn to MMWAC, no, it would not interfere with Auburn to MMWAC.

MR. DOYLE: And it doesn't interfere with the supply of municipal solid waste from any of the MMWAC towns or contracted customers to MMWAC, does it?

MR. DESCHENE: So long as they remain members, no, it would not.

MR. DOYLE: Nothing about this proposal prevents MMWAC from competing for the former -- for the former Maine Energy in-state customers, does it?

MR. DESCHENE: Compete? No.
MR. DOYLE: Mr. Kazar, on page 2, line 10 of your pre-filed testimony you state that MMWAC has the capacity to accept approximately 70,000 tons of MSW annually, correct?

MR. KAZAR: That's right.
MR. DOYLE: Could you take that Exhibit 14 from Mr. Deschene that I showed to him and turn to that same table 3?

MR. KAZAR: Where am I going to find it?

MR. DOYLE: It's on page 15.
MR. DESCHENE: I closed it. I didn't know you were going back.

MR. DOYLE: We're looking at table 3 again. Did you find it?

MR. KAZAR: Yes, I have it.
MR. DOYLE: In that year, this table shows that MMWAC actually disposed of slightly more than 70,000, 71,529 tons in 2011, correct?

MR. KAZAR: That's right.
MR. DOYLE: So MMWAC is taking MSW at its capacity, correct?

MR. KAZAR: In that year, yes.
MR. DOYLE: And only 119 tons, according to this table, were from out-of-state, correct?

MR. KAZAR: That's right.
MR. DOYLE: On page 4, line 27 of your testimony you state that MMWAC is a facility, quote, available, closed quote, to take MSW that used to go
to Maine Energy but MMWAC is already at its capacity, isn't it?

MR. KAZAR: Yes, we are right now.
MR. DOYLE: Do you think MMWAC is entitled to the MSW that used to go to Maine Energy?

MR. KAZAR: I think that a waste to energy
plant, including MMWAC, would be entitled to waste before a landfill is entitled to waste if the capacity needs were there.

MR. DOYLE: So it's your testimony that MMWAC is entitled to the former Maine Energy MSW? MR. KAZAR: If the hierarchy is followed, this permit application will not be approved and that waste will become available should there be a need.

MR. DOYLE: Is it entitled to that MSW at any price?

MR. KAZAR: Probably not.
MR. DOYLE: On page 6 of your testimony you claim to reduce MSW by 90 percent in an incinerator, correct?

MR. KAZAR: That's right.
MR. DOYLE: Let's look at table 2 of that capacity report again on page 15. In that year, it says MMWAC combusted 41,207 tons in 2011 and it had 17,673 ash tons to dispose but that's not 90 percent reduction, is it?

MR. KAZAR: No, and that's not real science either. This came from the State Planning Office years ago and was a misunderstanding of what occurs during combustion and they came up with this term combusted which has no scientific basis. It's an
arithmetic calculation that there's all kinds of apples and oranges.

MR. DOYLE: So the state's capacity report is wrong, is that what you're saying?

MR. KAZAR: This particular column is not very meaningful, no. Our 90 percent is a volume reduction between what comes in and what goes out as ash. It's well documented.

MR. DOYLE: And does it show here on these numbers?

MR. KAZAR: No, it doesn't.
MR. DOYLE: Okay, I didn't think so.
MR. KAZAR: And these numbers, if I could clarify, are weight. The 90 percent is a volume reduction which is what's important in a landfill. Landfills are volume machines and capacity is based on volume, not tonnage. So this table is not particularly useful for that exercise.

MR. DOYLE: Has MMWAC modeled for compliance with DEP's new carbon monoxide, NOx and SO2 air quality standards?

MR. KAZAR: MMWAC has no new requirements with regard to those.

MR. DOYLE: So you have not modeled for compliance with those standards?

MR. KAZAR: There's no need to do that, no. MR. DOYLE: On page 7 of your testimony, the first full paragraph, you state, and I'm quoting you, "additionally the USEPA has stated that the electricity produced by the nation-wide waste to energy industry has fewer impacts than almost any other source of electricity" and also confirmed that waste to energy is a net reducer of greenhouse gases and you cite to Exhibit B of your testimony at page 1 and page 22 and 23. Now, I've read those pages in their entirety of your Exhibit B and there's no such statement by EPA on those pages. Where is your support for these statements?

MR. KAZAR: That could be an incorrect cite. I can't answer that right now.

MR. DOYLE: Do you have a correct citation?
MR. KAZAR: Not in my possession. I could provide that at a later date.

MR. DOYLE: Also on page 7 of your testimony you state without any citation that EPA has estimated the rate of greenhouse gas reduction to be one ton of carbon dioxide for every ton of MSW processed into energy. Where and when did EPA say this?

MR. KAZAR: I'd have to supply that at a later date. I don't have that here.

MR. DOYLE: You don't have that here?
MR. KAZAR: I don't have that here.
HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Kazar, please speak up
when you're responding to questions.
MR. DOYLE: On page 9 of your testimony at the top, you state that you're concerned about the supply of municipal solid waste to MMWAC if this proposal is accepted, but Brian Oliver offered to supply MMWAC with in-state MSW but you never got back to him, did you?

MR. KAZAR: Brian Oliver made no specific proposal to MMWAC. Brian Oliver visited me a day or two after a news article indicating we were going to intervene in this case. We talked about a number of things that I've talked to Casella about in the past, among them waste supply, but there was no specific proposal offered at that time; and, frankly, it seemed somewhat inappropriate given the process that we're involved in to be negotiating simultaneously. As I indicated in my testimony and in my summary, for MMWAC this is more about long-term policy and less about short-term contracts.

MR. DOYLE: This proposal isn't interfering with the supply of MSW from any of MMWAC's communities or contracted customers, is it?

MR. KAZAR: Not at the current time.
MR. DOYLE: According to the recently published capacity report which is still in your possession, Exhibit 14, for calendar year 2011, MMWAC bypassed 10,572 tons, is that correct?

MR. KAZAR: Lead me to that, if you would.
MR. DOYLE: Well, let's see, it's the third column down on table 2.

MR. KAZAR: Yeah, and actually I believe that I corrected that with Mike Parker who brought that to my attention that there was a significant difference in the numbers between 2010 and 2011. We looked at it and we made a mistake on the filing. The bypass that MMWAC's done in the last several years has been approximately equal to our two annual outages that are a week long, so about 2,800 tons a year, give or take, is what we've been bypassing. The 10,000 included -- we operate a transfer station, I mentioned that in my testimony. The transfer station is there for bulky waste and construction and demolition waste that we don't incinerate. We don't run that through the waste energy plant and that was inadvertently included as bypass when it shouldn't have been. It's not MSW and it wasn't bypassed from our facility.

MR. KAZAR: Yes, and it --
MR. DOYLE: 10,500 --
MR. KAZAR: -- has since been corrected.
MR. DOYLE: Can I finish my question?
MR. KAZAR: Sure.
MR. DOYLE: 10,572 was reported in MMWAC's annual report as bypass to DEP, correct?

MR. KAZAR: It was incorrectly recorded, as I just explained in detail.

MR. DOYLE: Where did you dispose of the MSW bypass in 2011?

MR. KAZAR: Waste Management operates our transfer station and they hauled that to their location. I don't know which location that might have been.

MR. DOYLE: Could it have gone to their landfill?

MR. KAZAR: It could have gone to their landfill.

MR. DOYLE: Consistent with your theory of the waste management hierarchy, why didn't you send it to ecomaine, PERC or Maine Energy?

MR. KAZAR: Well, as we heard from PERC, the
outages are in April and October during a period when the state is flush with trash and frankly, nobody needs trash at that time. It's in the wintertime when the trash is low. That's not when we're bypassing.

MR. DOYLE: In April the incinerators are flush with trash?

MR. KAZAR: April is when there's an uptick.
MR. DOYLE: An uptick or flush?
MR. KAZAR: In our case, enough to be full.
MR. DOYLE: So you didn't feel that the waste management hierarchy required you to offer this MSW to another incinerator, did it?

MR. KAZAR: Their facility wasn't subject to any permit hearing like this nor was it a state landfill so it did not come up.

MR. DOYLE: So the waste management hierarchy only applies to state facilities?

MR. KAZAR: No, it should apply throughout.
MR. DOYLE: It should apply to all
facilities, right? In 2001 and ' 2 Waste
Management/Crossroads applied for and obtained a public benefit determination and a DEP license to expand its landfill, Phase 8, by 75 acres. In that application Waste Management applied to take MSW both

170
in-state and out-of-state without any limitation on volume. Did MMWAC object to the Crossroads application to take MSW without any limitations on volume in that expansion?

MR. KAZAR: We didn't participate in that.
MR. DOYLE: Didn't object at all?
MR. KAZAR: We didn't participate in that at all.

MR. DOYLE: Did you object?
MR. KAZAR: Well, no.
MR. DOYLE: Mr. Roche, these are questions
about your pre-filed direct testimony. On page 5 and 6 of your direct testimony you stated that there are other available facilities, including ecomaine, to take the MSW that formerly went to Maine Energy. Brian Oliver offered to provide you in-state MSW tons. If ecomaine is really available, why did you not accept his offer?

MR. ROCHE: Could you repeat the question?
MR. DOYLE: You talked about being available on page 5 and 6 of your pre-filed testimony.

MR. ROCHE: Yup.
MR. DOYLE: Brian Oliver offered to send you MSW from Maine Energy, in-state MSW, but you didn't accept his offer. Why not?

MR. DOYLE: Do you think ecomaine is entitled to this MSW?

MR. ROCHE: I agree with Joe. I believe in waste hierarchy wholeheartedly, and the waste should not go to a landfill, it should go to one of the higher rungs in the hierarchy, and since waste to energy is higher than the landfilling, yes, I believe it should go to a landfill.

MR. DOYLE: So you think ecomaine is entitled to --

MR. ROCHE: I don't use the word "entitled." I don't think that's the proper word.

MR. DOYLE: Do you think ecomaine should be able to charge whatever it wants to for the waste?

MR. ROCHE: I think ecomaine should do what it's done in the past and, that is, compete for that waste at reasonable market prices and that's what our track record has been.

MR. DOYLE: Isn't it true that ecomaine recently signed a multi-year hauling contract with a hauling company known as Oceanside to dispose of its MSW at ecomaine?

MR. ROCHE: We have multiple --
MR. BOWER: I'm just going to object. This
is not in -- he's not responding to testimony that Kevin Roche has given. This is a new subject. MR. DOYLE: This is cross examination. HEARING OFFICER: Cross examination is limited to the pre-filed testimony.

MR. DOYLE: And this is related to his pre-filed testimony.

MR. BOWER: I don't believe he mentioned that in his pre-filed testimony.

HEARING OFFICER: Can you identify where in his pre-filed testimony you're --

MR. DOYLE: We're talking about their ability -- he talked about his ability to compete for waste if this application is approved. This goes to that question. I should be allowed to probe that statement and that assertion in their testimony.

HEARING OFFICER: If you can identify where in Mr. Roche's pre-filed testify you're gleaning that statement, then you're allowed to pursue that line of questioning.

MR. DOYLE: It's -- throughout his pre-filed testimony he's talking about the ability of waste-to-energy facilities to compete for waste if this application is approved. That's the thrust of his testimony.
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HEARING OFFICER: Okay. So limit your questions to that line of questioning.

MR. DOYLE: And this goes to that issue.
Isn't it true that ecomaine recently signed a
multi-year hauling contract with a hauling company called Oceanside to dispose of MSW at ecomaine?

MR. BOWER: Same objection. That statement is not in the -- I mean, I can't tell from his question if this relates to a competition issue but I guess we'll have to take his word for it.

MR. DOYLE: Can I be allowed some latitude here to tie this up?

HEARING OFFICER: Actually I believe Mr. Doyle did explain --

MR. BOWER: Okay, he'll answer.
HEARING OFFICER: I will give you a short opportunity, Mr. Doyle, but I will cut you off if it seems to be going too far astray.

MR. ROCHE: We have a delta of between capacity and what's being received from our member communities. We fill that delta as best we can with spot. We sign some of that spot with contracts. We've had contracts, yes, with Oceanside, with Casella, with other entities, to enable us to operate at full capacity.

.
.

MR. DOYLE: Did you sign a recent one with Oceanside?

MR. ROCHE: You said "multi-year." I don't believe it's multi-year but we did sign recently with them, yes.

MR. DOYLE: And that company is a former customer of Maine Energy, isn't it?

MR. ROCHE: I'm sure they brought some of their waste to Maine Energy.

MR. DOYLE: And isn't it also true that ecomaine signed a multi-year, five-year contract with the town of Limerick, a former customer of Maine Energy, to dispose of MSW at ecomaine?

MR. ROCHE: That is correct.
MR. DOYLE: This shows that ecomaine can successfully compete for MSW that formerly went to Maine Energy, doesn't it?

MR. ROCHE: Went to Maine Energy -- went to a waste energy plant. Where I think we have trouble competing is when it goes to a landfill.

MR. DOYLE: And you didn't need denial of this application to compete successfully for the MSW, did you?

MR. ROCHE: At that point in time, obviously we didn't.
maximize the value of that asset for, quote, the people of Maine," is that correct?

MR. ROCHE: Correct.
MR. DOYLE: Do you consider the citizens of Biddeford to be the "people of Maine."

MR. ROCHE: Some of the people in Maine.
MR. DOYLE: How about the citizens of the 13 other tri-communities, are they "people of Maine?"

MR. ROCHE: That's correct.
MR. DOYLE: Are the citizens of the 187 MRC communities "people of Maine?"

MR. ROCHE: Yes.
MR. DOYLE: They all benefit significantly if this application is approved, don't they?

MR. ROCHE: I disagree.
MR. DOYLE: They don't benefit from this application if it's approved?

MR. ROCHE: No. We get -- we get a huge land -- we get another huge landfill in this state and that's what we don't need.

MR. DOYLE: The landfill is already there, sir.

MR. ROCHE: We can make it a lot smaller.
MR. DOYLE: How are we going to diminish the capacity of the landfill? It's already at its --

MR. ROCHE: By conserving the space for as long as we can and that's exactly what the ecomaine communities have done with their landfill two and a half -- two miles away from the city of Portland.

MR. DOYLE: In 2001 and '2, Waste
Management's Crossroads facility applied for and obtained a PBD and expansion permit for its landfill to expand it by 75 acres. In that application, it took -- it takes MSW, both in-state and out-of-state without any limit on volume. Did ecomaine or RWS object to the Crossroads application?

MR. ROCHE: We did testify. You're challenging my memory. We provided testimony. We felt that it didn't jive with the waste hierarchy. I can't remember if we were objecting or neither for nor against, but we did testify.

MR. DOYLE: Could you take hold of that same testimony?

MR. DESCHENE: Exhibit 14 ?
MR. DOYLE: Exhibit 16, please, turn to page 4 and 5. This is the exhibit of the Waste Management expansion, public participation, pages 4 and 5 and
the top of 6. Exhibit 16, do you have it there, page 4 and 5 ?

MR. ROCHE: Yup.
MR. DOYLE: This is a summary of everybody who testified on the application or participated. Do you see ecomaine or RWS' name there?

MR. BOWER: Are you referring to the intervenor section?

MR. DOYLE: I'm referring to public participation.

MR. BOWER: I don't see a list.
MR. DOYLE: No, it summarizes the public participation. There's no mention of ecomaine or RWS, is there?

MR. ROCHE: I mean, I don't know where you're referencing.

MR. DOYLE: I'm referencing on pages 4, 5 and 6, public participation.

MR. ROCHE: Number 3.
MR. DOYLE: Number 3.
MR. ROCHE: I mean, quite frankly, as I said, we were -- we were active in the legislation in the last session and that was one that we spoke on and I spoke to the Natural Resources Committee on. I don't know exactly in what context I did that.

MR. DOYLE: I'm talking about this permit in 2001 or '2, the last expansion of the Crossroads landfill by 75 acres to take MSW, the very waste stream we're talking about here.

MR. ROCHE: I'm sorry, this --
HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Doyle --
MR. ROCHE: -- is 2001 you're talking about?
MR. DOYLE: 2001 and '2.
MR. ROCHE: Okay. I misunderstood. I
thought you were talking about the last amendment to the expansion which was last session.

HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Doyle, you are making statements now. Please try to direct him to what you're getting at and ask some questions, please.

MR. DOYLE: I thought it was pretty clear that I was talking about this permit and those pages.

MR. ROCHE: Yeah, and I was talking about the last expansion in the last legislative session that we -- we worked pretty hard on. I wasn't even around in 2001. I couldn't answer that question.

MR. DOYLE: Okay. On page 9 of your pre-filed testimony, lines 15 and 17 -- through 17 you state, quote, if the application were granted, the only thing to prevent the applicant from bringing out-of-state waste to Juniper Ridge is the OSA which
may be amended at any time, closed quote, is that right?

MR. ROCHE: That's what I said in my testimony.

MR. DOYLE: Isn't it true that the DEP
license for Juniper Ridge prevents out-of-state waste from entering the landfill?

MR. ROCHE: I thought the license was going
to prevent unprocessed solid waste to go into the landfill and here we are today. So my worry is that that might be the next step.

MR. DOYLE: But this proposal doesn't interfere with any of the ecomaine member communities or contracted customers' ability to send their waste to ecomaine, does it?

MR. ROCHE: If they choose to leave ecomaine, it does.

MR. DOYLE: But this proposal doesn't interfere with member communities or contracted customers' ability to send their waste to ecomaine, does it?

MR. ROCHE: If they get a better price from landfilling waste, which you usually can, then we could stand to lose municipalities.

MR. DOYLE: But not if they're contracted,
right?
to us. So, yes, I would argue that --
MR. DOYLE: When they were under contract to
Maine Energy they would go to you?
MR. ROCHE: Well, I know that the town of Biddeford was under a contract with Maine Energy and they showed up at our door.

MR. DOYLE: Ecomaine stores MSW in its ash landfill, doesn't it?

MR. ROCHE: We store it for a short period of time, correct.

MR. DOYLE: How short?
MR. ROCHE: Our general business plan is
that we bring in excess waste during the tourist season in the summer and we usually return that waste during the winter months and that's what happened this year.

MR. DOYLE: Is it stored for longer than three months?

MR. ROCHE: Yes.
MR. DOYLE: Longer than six months?
MR. ROCHE: Yes.
MR. DOYLE: Do you have a landfill gas
collection system in the area where the MSW is stored?

MR. ROCHE: We don't.

MR. DOYLE: Are you reporting greenhouse gas
emissions to EPA from the landfill?
MR. ROCHE: We are.
MR. DOYLE: You are?
MR. ROCHE: We -- let me just get my note on
that. Ecomaine -- yes, we continue to submit all reports of greenhouse gas emissions to the regulators in conformance with the law.

MR. DOYLE: Okay, that may be for your incinerator. I'm asking about your landfill. Are you reporting greenhouse gas emissions from your MSW storage area which has no gas collection to the EPA?

MR. BOWER: Again, I'm going to object to this question. It's not in his pre-filed testimony. We're not addressing issues in his pre-filed testimony.

HEARING OFFICER: I'm sorry, I need to hear the question that's at issue.

MR. DOYLE: The question at issue is I'm asking whether he stores MSW in his landfill. He said yes. I asked him whether he has a landfill gas collection system in the area where the MSW is stored. He said no. I asked him are you reporting the greenhouse gas emissions to EPA. He talks about greenhouse gas emissions in his pre-filed testimony,
and he said -- I'm not sure of your answer, sir.
MR. BOWER: We're waiting for a ruling on the objection. This proceeding is not about ecomaine's landfill. I don't know why -- where these questions are relevant to his pre-filed testimony.

HEARING OFFICER: I will sustain Mr. Bower's objection. I've given you a lot of latitude and we're going to stop at that line of questioning.

MR. DOYLE: So greenhouse gas emissions are no longer relevant?

HEARING OFFICER: You're asking questions with respect to their facility and their landfill and his testimony with respect to greenhouse gases was with respect to the other facility. I've given you a fair amount of latitude and you cannot go further down this line of questioning. I would ask you how many more questions do you have?

MR. DOYLE: Just two more.
HEARING OFFICER: Okay, because I've given you a couple extra minutes due to the exchange, so if you can ask those last two questions.

MR. DOYLE: If I could just make an offer of proof here to tie this up.

HEARING OFFICER: Yes.
MR. DOYLE: The Department has said that the
waste management hierarchy is a consideration in this proceeding. They brought up greenhouse gas emissions in their testimony, Mr. Spencer has brought it up in his testimony, and what they're suggesting is that greenhouse gas emissions are lower from waste-to-energy facilities and their associated facilities than landfills and so greenhouse gas emissions, they've made it an issue in this proceeding and now you're saying I can't ask him about it. So I object for the record.

HEARING OFFICER: They are not the applicants here so their facilities are not at issue here. The issue of greenhouse gas we've addressed in the pre-hearing orders.

MR. DOYLE: Let's talk about your facility again, waste-to-energy facility. Isn't it true that ecomaine is the number one emitter of mercury among all point source air emission sources in Maine?

HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Doyle, that's another question on the line of questioning I just shut down.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Roche, who wrote your testimony?

MR. ROCHE: My attorney, Mark Bower.
MR. DOYLE: I'm going to move to strike his entire pre-filed testimony. This is supposed to be
the testimony of Mr. Roche not Mr. Bower, and so I'm not cross examining the right person.

HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Bower, would you like to address that motion?

MR. BOWER: I would. This testimony was, as I'm sure their testimony was, drafted in conjunction with all the witnesses. All the information came from them. The fact that I drafted it does not mean -- impede the attesting to the testimony. I would -I would venture a guess that Mr. Doyle also assisted his witnesses in drafting their testimony. So I don't see -- I mean, I think it's a fairly common practice that witnesses will consult with the attorney when they're drafting testimony.

MR. DOYLE: We do not draft testimony.
HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Roche -- hold on one moment.

MR. BOWER: I'll also just add that --
HEARING OFFICER: Did you review and sign the testimony indicating that -- can you go to the signature page of your testimony, please?

MR. ROCHE: Yes.
HEARING OFFICER: And what did you attest to in the signature line of the testimony?

MR. ROCHE: Right, and our attorney, there
was a lot of dialogue between him and I on this testimony. He drafted it, I finalized it, I edited it and then I signed my name to this.

HEARING OFFICER: And what does it say?
MR. BOWER: Read it out loud.
MR. ROCHE: Personally appeared to the -"personally appeared the above-named Kevin Roche before me this 28th day of February 2013 and made oath that the above-stated facts are upon his own personal knowledge, information or belief and he swears that he believes them to be true."

HEARING OFFICER: And you signed that, correct?

MR. ROCHE: I did sign it.
HEARING OFFICER: I'm denying your motion, Mr. Doyle. Let's move on.

MR. DOYLE: But you just admitted that -you just admitted, didn't you, that Mr. Bower wrote the testimony, correct?

HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Doyle, let's move on. Do you have any other questions?

MR. DOYLE: I do.
HEARING OFFICER: I'll allow you one more question because we're well beyond the time I've allotted for you.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Roche, can you explain why your testimony is virtually identical to the testimony of MMWAC's Mr. Kazar?

HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Doyle, that's along the same lines as the last testimony. Do you have any other questions that are relevant?

MR. DOYLE: I have one for Mr. McGovern.
I didn't want him to think that he came all this way without --

MR. McGOVERN: That's okay.
MR. DOYLE: I think I'll sit down. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER: At this time can I have a representative of the Citizens come up and cross examine the panel?

MR. SPENCER: Thank you. Let's take a deep breath here, Mr. Roche. If we take a ton of MSW waste, okay, we take a ton of MSW waste and we send it through an incinerator, not necessarily yours, say an average incinerator, average pollution controls, average facility, okay, and then we take the same ton of MSW and we send it to a landfill and at the landfill it's turned into energy either by burning the gas and generating electricity directly or harvesting it for another purpose, you know, for
example, like for heating a building, the relative amount of energy efficiency, energy capture, if you will, between the average incinerator and the average landfill?

MR. ROCHE: I would direct you to a report that we hold that I would be happy to share copies of, Environmental Science and Technology, 2009, and that report states that energy from one ton of waste from a waste-to-energy facility generates about ten times the amount of energy from that of landfilling and a lot of that is simply because plastic or those types of items isn't going to generate any energy in a landfill, and I will add that it does frustrate me and I am troubled that a lot of landfill owners are using gas recovery as a way to promote landfilling and I do object to that line of thinking.

MR. SPENCER: As far as overall pollution, I realize this is a really hard thing to do and I'm not trying to do apples to apples, I admit this might be apples to kumquats or something else, but what's the accepted science as far as relative amounts of overall pollution with the same -- going to the same facilities, that is, your average incinerator or your average in-compliance landfill?

MR. DOYLE: Objection. I wasn't allowed to
pursue this line of questioning talking about pollution from a waste-to-energy facility and now Mr. Spencer is asking the same question.

HEARING OFFICER: Can you narrow the question to the focus of Mr. Roche's testimony, please, Mr. Spencer? The question has been stricken.

MR. SPENCER: Okay. Is there more pollution created by incinerating a ton of MSW or landfilling a ton of MSW?

MR. DOYLE: Objection. It's the same question.

HEARING OFFICER: This objection is overruled. My responses to your earlier lines of questioning were with respect to their particular facility. This goes directly to Mr. Roche's testimony.

MR. ROCHE: It is my belief that the full footprint of a waste-to-energy strategy creates less pollution than that of a landfill which is probably why it's a preferable solid waste management strategy in the EPA's eyes, as well as the state of Maine's eyes, as well as many other states in the country.

MR. SPENCER: Thank you for that. I have one question for Mr. Kazar. When we were talking about bypass, as Mr. Doyle was pressing you on how
you would bypass material from your facility to others, and, you know, why didn't it go to -- why did some of it end up at the landfill, what happens if you get a tractor-trailer load of mattresses? That would be oversized bulky waste, that's how that's probably categorized. Now, if you -- if you are bypassing oversized bulky waste, doesn't that mean you can't burn it? If you follow me, if -- okay, I'll rephrase that. If you bypass -- passed on some oversized bulky waste to another incinerator for whatever reason, you're over capacity, will they be able to burn it, to transform it and to reduce that volume?

MR. KAZAR: I can't really speak to whether or not other facilities are trying to handle bulky waste. I think for the most part they don't. There might be some streams they take. Bypass is MSW. It's not construction demolition and it's not bulky waste. MMWAC is unique among waste-to-energy plants in Maine in that we operate a transfer station for the benefit of the local residents in the Auburn area. They and small contractors are bringing us bulky waste and construction demolition waste and we send that right to a landfill. It's not really bypasses. It's the C and D waste that we shouldn't
be trying to incinerate so we don't. We normally report it differently. In 2011 there had been an error that we made in the report which has since been corrected.

MR. SPENCER: I think that clarifies it for me and thank you both for your answers. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Spencer. At this time is a representative for MRC -- would you please come forward and cross-examine?

MS. McBRADY: This will be very quick. I'm Nancy McBrady for MRC. We do not have any questions for cross examination.

HEARING OFFICER: Are there any other intervenors who wish to cross-examine either ecomaine or MMWAC at this time? Okay. So at this -- there doesn't appear to be any other intervenors who wish to cross-examine so at this time I will -- ecomaine and MMWAC, you can have redirect at this time. Mr. Bower?

MR. BOWER: Yeah, could I just have one moment, please?

HEARING OFFICER: Yes.
MR. BOWER: Thank you. No questions. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER: No redirect at this time?

MR. BOWER: No.
HEARING OFFICER: So DEP staff.
MR. PARKER: More a point of clarification than a question. Mr. Kazar, you mentioned the discrepancy in your annual report. That was for 2010 which we have since resolved. I think that the issue that Mr. Doyle was getting to, the 10,000 tons of bypass, that's a combination of your bypass and your -- your bypass and your OBW and that does amount to 10,947 tons, is that correct?

MR. KAZAR: Yes, that's what I tried to clarify.

MR. PARKER: Thank you.
MR. KAZAR: It included that transfer station bulky waste that I don't believe should have been recorded in that same column.

MR. PARKER: Correct. Mr. Roche, again, just for clarification, did you actively solicit any of the former MERC communities about taking their waste to your facility?

MR. ROCHE: Actually if you're referring to the 13 down in southern Maine, they approached me. They indicated to me that when they signed on with Biddeford, they signed on for waste-to-energy, not for landfilling, and when they learned that there was
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a possibility that their waste might be landfilled, they basically said we're not paying $\$ 86$ a ton for landfilling waste. We might have paid that for waste-to-energy but we're not going to pay it for landfilling. So we did enter into negotiations with them and offered them a price and ultimately Casella was able to offer or at least match that price.

MR. PARKER: Thank you.
HEARING OFFICER: There appear to be no more questions for ecomaine and MMWAC. So thank you very much. We are going to recess in just a moment for an extended dinner break and we will be returning here at 6:30 in the evening for the public testimony portion of the hearing. When we recess, we will be picking it up then and we will start again tomorrow morning at 9 a.m., and start in with the summary testimony of PERC tomorrow morning. So we have the public testimony portion this evening and we're starting with PERC tomorrow morning at 9 a.m. So at this time we will recess until 6:30 in the evening.

## (OFF RECORD)

HEARING OFFICER: Good evening. I now call to order this public comment portion of the hearing of the Department of Environmental Protection on the
application from the State of Maine Bureau of General Services prepared by its operator and agent, NEWSME Landfill Operations, LLC to amend Department Order S-20700-WD-N-A in order to accept municipal solid waste from sources within the State of Maine at Juniper Ridge Landfill as a result of the closure of Maine Energy Facility in Biddeford.

My name is Heather Parent. I'm the policy director at the Department of Environmental Protection and I will be the presiding officer at this hearing. Other people present with me this evening are Nancy Macirowski, our Assistant Attorney General and counsel to the Department; Melanie Loyzim, the Director of the Bureau of Remediation and Waste Management; Paula Clark, the Director of the Division of Solid Waste Management; additional DEP staff, Cyndi Darling and Michael Parker. Our court reporter is Joanne Alley of Alley \& Morrisette.

Our goal is a fair and productive hearing. We are here to listen to and consider all of the evidence placed before us. I do know that there are highly emotional issues for many of you but it is our job to ensure that everybody has the opportunity to speak so I ask that you all respect each other's right to present his or her viewpoint. Also, I
realize that there are many issues related to this proposal and we can only consider those issues which pertain to the environmental statutes and regulations that are applicable to this amendment application. Please make this as productive a public session as possible by limiting your comments to the issues over which we can decide, and please, because of limited time and because it is our desire to hear all of the various environmental concerns try not to repeat testimony that has already been given. New testimony is important to us but many repetitive statements do not assist us in our responsibilities. Also, in order to keep this as productive as possible, please do not applaud or make other comments when it is not your turn to speak. Thank you all for your understanding and your participation here tonight.

This hearing is being held by the Department pursuant to the Maine Administrative Procedures Act Title 5, Sections 9051 to 9053 in Chapter 3 of the Department of Environmental Protection Rules. Notice of the hearing was published in the Bangor Daily News and the Journal Tribune on March 14th and March 30th, 2013. Notice was also sent to the parties and all of those specifically requesting notification.
Additionally, press releases and public service
announcements were distributed to regional media outlets on March 12th and April 1st, 2013.

Today the Department began hearing testimony from the parties. The Department will continue to hear testimony from the parties tomorrow. This hearing is being recorded and transcribed. All witnesses at this hearing will be sworn and all evidence entered into the record will be available during the course of the hearing for inspection by anyone who wishes to do so. After the hearing, the project file will be available for public inspection during regular business hours at the DEP office in Augusta.

There are sign-up sheets located at the front of the room and at the table to my left for any member of the public who would like to offer testimony to the Department. There are separate sheets for those who want to testify in support of the project, in opposition to the project and those that are neither for nor against. If you wish to speak this evening and have not already signed up to do so, please do so now. If you do not want to testify this evening, the record in this matter will remain open to receive your written comments until April 30th, 2013. That's April 30th. Written
comments should be sent to the Department of Environmental Protection, attention Michael Parker, at the Department of Environmental Protection, 17 State House Station, Augusta, Maine, 04333. You may also e-mail comments to michael.t.parker@maine.gov by the deadline of April 30th. I will call upon those who have signed up to testify. When your name is called, you should come to the podium and clearly identify yourself by name, place of residence and affiliation, if any, before beginning your testimony. Based on the number of people who have signed up to testify, I will be allotting six minutes per person to testify this evening.

Again, I will limit irrelevant or unduly repetitious testimony to ensure that as many people as possible have a chance to participate and make their views known, and thank you very much.

One more note before we swear in the testifiers and begin the proceeding, if you have a cell phone or another electronic device that makes noise, please turn off the sound to that device now.

At this time would all persons who are planning on testifying this evening stand and raise your right hand? Do you affirm that the testimony you are about to give is the whole truth and nothing

## but the truth?

(Witnesses answer in the affirmative.)
HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any questions before we begin this evening? There's a person with a question in the back.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Do I have to come up? Will there be some sort of time indication given to people so they know when their six minutes are going to run out?

HEARING OFFICER: I will be trying to give an indication of one to two minutes left when people get close to the end of their time limit.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you.
HEARING OFFICER: I will be identifying the person to testify and then the next two people who are planning on testifying so that you will have advance notice that you are next.

The first person on the list -- we are going to start with testimony now -- the first person to testify is -- and I apologize for messing up these names. I'll do that blanket apology at the beginning. The first person to testify will be Steve Perry, followed by Charles Leithiser and then Craig Pendleton. So Steve Perry, please come forward. MR. PERRY: Good evening. My name is Steve
Perry, and I'm here representing H.E. Sargent of
Sargent Corporation in Stillwater, Maine, and I'm
here to support the amendment. Sargent Corporation
is a construction company located in Stillwater,
Maine, just a few miles south of the Juniper Ridge
Landfill. We employ over 300 employees. Most of
these folks are from Maine and have -- a lot of them
have worked on the landfill project and are from the
local community.
$\quad$ As a construction company, we've been
involved with landfill construction since the early
eighties and even though we're a Maine-based company,
we've had the opportunity to construct projects in
Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Maryland, Virginia,
Pennsylvania and as far south as North Carolina.
These projects are state-of-the-art projects and we
have had a large experience and reputation in
building landfills. I'd like to say that we've had
the opportunity to construct Juniper Ridge Landfill
from the first cell and I can say that the projects
and the construction of that project is
state-of-the-art. There's nothing any better from
here to North Carolina as far as protecting our
environment.
Juniper Ridge has been a good neighbor for

Juniper Ridge has been a good neighbor for

1 us in the community providing well-paying jobs and supporting the community. The solid waste disposal cost has improved our opportunities for businesses to come in and be competitive, regardless of whether it's power or transportation or solid waste. We need to be competitive in this state in all arenas to encourage business to come here, and Juniper Ridge has been a big facility in that cause.

In closing, I'd just like to say that I'd like to encourage you to support the amendment. Thank you. If you have any questions, I'll be glad to answer.

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you very much. Charles Leithiser.

MR. LEITHISER: Thank you very much. I'm Charles Leithiser from Old Town, Maine. I'm not affiliated with the applicant or anybody else at this point. I did submit written comments regarding this application. In the BGS and NEWSME's response to public comments, Mr. Tom Doyle cited some of my written testimony. In his response to Leithiser comment \#5, he quotes me as saying MSW could simply be sent to landfills that are already licensed for large amounts of municipal solid waste. Mr. Doyle claims there's an inconsistency between this

1 statement and my logic regarding the hierarchy, the solid waste hierarchy. If Mr. Doyle had only included the remainder of my statement, I believe any inconsistency would have quickly been cleared up.
The rest of my statement continued to say or more preferably would be sent to -- send the MSW to other waste to energy incinerators. I do support the hierarchy. I believe that incineration and the bio reduction accomplished by incinerators is much more appropriate than simply sending the municipal solid waste to the landfill.

This is important for many reasons. For starters, Casella first made closure of the MERC plant contingent on the municipal solid waste coming to Juniper Ridge. That's no longer the case.
Evidently that municipal solid waste has found another home or homes. It is not currently coming to Juniper Ridge. There's been an appreciable and appreciated decrease in truck traffic to Juniper Ridge since January.

Secondly, as my complete comments make obvious, I do support Maine's solid waste hierarchy. There's no good reason for the State of Maine to accept additional municipal solid waste at Juniper Ridge when there are more preferable uses and options
for that waste, especially when the other uses reduce the amount of waste being landfilled at Juniper Ridge and help save a valuable resource for waste that can only be landfilled. Juniper Ridge should only be used when no other options exist.

Speaking of supporting the hierarchy and a waste policy and plan that makes sense, the municipal solid waste that was being sent to MERC was subject to source reduction and recycling at that plant. If the waste were sent directly to Juniper Ridge instead, that sorting will not occur. While Mr. Doyle notes that only two percent of the waste metals were recycled at the MERC plant, that amounted to approximately 6,000 tons per year. Even if only a third of that amount actually came from the State of Maine in-state waste, that's still 2,000 tons a year.

I had a Toyota Corolla. Toyota says it weighs 2,734 pounds. If you take out the plastic and glass, it probably comes in at about a ton, 2,000 pounds. So that would mean 2,000 Toyota Corollas going into Juniper Ridge every year of metal that had been previously recycled at the MERC plant. That metal should and could be recycled if the municipal solid waste goes to other waste-to-energy plants instead. All of their annual reports do indicate
that they separate out metals before incineration.
Casella boasts about their recycling efforts which makes me question why they would allow this to happen or support this happening. Would I like to see that recycled at the Westbrook transfer station? Absolutely not. We all know what happens to out-of-state waste when it hits a processing facility. I'd prefer that that stays a transfer station only and that the municipal solid waste go to other waste-to-energy incinerators.

Mr. Doyle requested this morning of Mr. Kevin Roche, the source for his statement that waste-to-energy facilities produce fewer greenhouse gas emissions, and I believe -- I'm not speaking for Mr. Roche -- I did find a source, Environmental Science and Technology 2009 Policy Analysis, is it better to burn or bury waste for clean electricity generation. That study states that greenhouse gas emissions are reduced by one-half to 1.3 tons of CO2 equivalents per ton of municipal solid waste combusted rather than landfilled, and that is assuming that the landfill does have a landfill gas recovery and reuse system in place.

Again, I fully support the Maine solid waste hierarchy. I surely hope the Commissioner will also.

Maine is currently talking about a climate change plan that needs to be adopted by the state; we should be focusing on greenhouse gas and methane reduction whenever possible. We also need to reserve our state landfill capacity for waste that truly has no other outcome or possibility for it, save that capacity for waste that truly needs to be landfilled. Denying this application would greatly help achieve those goals and would adhere to established Maine policy. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you very much. Next we have Craig Pendleton testifying in support; after him we have Mark Bower testifying in opposition.

MR. PENDLETON: Good evening. My name is Craig Pendleton. I'm a resident of Saco and I'm the executive director of the Biddeford/Saco Chamber of Commerce.

Dear Committee Members, on behalf of the Biddeford/Saco Chamber of Commerce and Industry I'm here to lend our support of the application before you to accept municipal solid waste at the Juniper Ridge Landfill. Our chamber has played an active role in the purchase of the Maine Energy Recovery Corporation site in downtown Biddeford by the city of Biddeford. We set up a dedicated website where we
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posted official documents issued between the parties and several relevant news stories on the issue as a way to provide the public with accurate information. The Biddeford/Saco Chamber, while recognizing that Casella and Maine Energy were active supportive members, publicly supported the purchase and closing the Maine Energy plant. It was the right thing to do after so many years of complaints regarding the odor in our downtowns. We weighed the loss of good-paying jobs against the long-term benefits of future economic development and prosperity in our two cities. Removing the trash incinerator from our downtown has immediately spike interest in new economic development. The cities of Biddeford and Saco, our local economic development corporation, our two Main Street Maine organizations and the Chamber recently developed a regional brand. This brand is now being launched and will specifically focus on recruiting new economic development into our communities. Simply stated, none of this positive momentum would be possible without the negotiated purchase of the Maine Energy property. We applaud the city of Biddeford and Casella for engaging in civil and respectful negotiations which was not the case in the past. We are excited that the city of

Biddeford and Casella have reached an agreement on curbside single sort recycling. This alone will significantly reduce the amount of municipal waste that will be required -- will require transportation to Juniper Ridge. We strongly support taking care of our own waste here in Maine. This agreement will eliminate nearly 200,000 tons of waste that comes in from out-of-state that was burned at MERC.

The Chamber respectfully requests that you weigh the positive outcomes created by the purchase of Maine Energy and grant approval to the amendment application before you. Thank you very much.

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Next we have Mark Bower testifying in opposition. On deck is Will Armitage.

MR. BOWER: Thank you. I'm not actually filing --

MR. DOYLE: Madam Hearing Officer, I'm going to object at the outset. Mr. Bower is representing two parties in this proceeding and so he should not be testifying as a witness either in his -- either for his parties or here in the public session, and I believe he also would be violating a Maine Bar Rule on professional responsibility that prevents an attorney where he's an advocate also being a witness
in the same case, Rule 3.7(a).
HEARING OFFICER: As the Hearing Officer, I am not -- I am overruling your objection with respect to his testifying despite the fact that he's participating in these proceedings. There's nothing in Chapter 3 that prohibits it and in situations where people are grouped together, this is an opportunity for an individual viewpoint to be provided. Once again, there's nothing in Chapter 3 that prohibits it. With respect to the Bar Rules, that is not within my purview to rule upon.

MR. BOWER: Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer. If I had a chance to complete my sentence, I'm not actually offering testimony. As you already understand, I'm the attorney for ecomaine and MMWAC. In this afternoon's testimony, some letters from municipalities were offered as exhibits to Mike McGovern's testimony. Those were denied and I'm just here to offer those letters as written comments and they're from 20 ecomaine municipalities, the town of Gray, the town of Bridgton, the town of Hollis, the town of Gorham, the town of North Yarmouth, the town of Falmouth, the town of Harrison, the city of Portland, the town of Cape Elizabeth, the town of Bridgton, the town of Lyman, the town of Freeport,
the town of Yarmouth, the town of Cumberland, the city of South Portland, the town of Waterboro, the town of Scarborough, the town of Ogunquit, the town of Windham and the town of Casco. So I'm just submitting those. I'm not offering testimony.

HEARING OFFICER: And these letters will be considered along with all the other written comments that must be provided by April 30th.

MR. BOWER: Thank you. Should I submit them to you?

HEARING OFFICER: Yes. Will Armitage speaking in support and then Cheryl Spencer is next after that speaking in opposition.

MR. ARMITAGE: Good evening. My name is Will Armitage. I'm a resident of Falmouth, and I am the executive director of the Biddeford/Saco Area Economic Development Corporation, and I'm here to testify in support of the Maine Energy closure and Juniper Ridge amendment application.

I urge your support of this application because it's a reasonable proposal that benefits the entire state. As a former town councilor, I appreciate the concerns being raised by other citizens of our state. This is an emotional and complex issue, but when we look at the big picture,
this is a win-win scenario for the citizens of our state. This proposal -- while there will be economic benefits for Biddeford/Saco, this proposal will benefit the entire state by eliminating 170,000 tons of waste currently being brought into Maine from out-of-state, generating an estimated 450,000 in annual benefit to PERC and its member communities, reducing the overall waste currently being shipped to Juniper Ridge from MERC by over 20,000 tons, stimulating a 4.1 million dollar investment in a new transfer station in Westbrook and providing the opportunity for new curbside recycling programs to be started in Biddeford, Old Town and Westbrook.

The city of Biddeford has taken the initiative to solve a long-standing concern in its downtown. All the parties involved have negotiated in good faith and have arrived at a reasonable, responsible solution that involves compromise. In short, this proposal is not just about the closure of MERC. It does not just benefit Biddeford. I encourage you to support this proposal because of the overall benefit to our state. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Next we have Cheryl Spencer speaking in opposition. After Cheryl we have Randy Sever speaking in support.

MS. SPENCER: Hello. Thank you for the opportunity to address the Department. My name is Cheryl Spencer and I live in West Old Town. I've been a resident there for 34 years. From my home I can see the landfill -- I can see the landfill on my morning commute and from my home I can smell and hear it. When the bedroom windows are open in summer I need no alarm clock as Casella's machines begin the day at 6 a.m., with the clanging of tracked vehicles and truck bodies.

Earlier today we heard Casella tout the benefits of this license being approved. One thing they included was free recycle cans for residents of Old Town. They're very carrot and stick oriented and I think a new recycle can -- they think a new recycle can will make the hardships of hosting a landfill go away. They already have us doing their advertising on our pay-per-throw bags boldly emblazoned with "Casella."

We heard from Mr. Doyle that MSW was intended to be taken from early on. I know you are aware that Casella uses common language very craftily and I do not mean that in a good way. So early on we had bypass which was actually MSW, but it wasn't MSW, it was called bypass. There would be no MSW. Then
we received again MSW in the form of soft layer construction materials. It was not yet MSW. It was soft layer construction materials. Now finally we hear the plea to have raw MSW. Craftily.

In the resolve that made this landfill a state resource, it said the state shall control the landfill. Today we heard Michael Barden say that he has visited there once since taking oversight in September 2011, not exactly control. I do know that the DEP engineer, Amanda Wade, has a regular presence there and we do appreciate that.

Control to a layperson means directing the activity and having oversight. I would like the state to take control of this landfill. The state has the hierarchy in place to encourage best management practices and waste handling. It is the guiding policy -- guiding -- in statute that charts the course for agency decision making. The hierarchy provides for a nominal level of sustainability in a world that should be working on a forward progressive goal of zero waste. I encourage the agency to reject this license. Let's not move backwards in our collective actions and allow landfilling of a material that has a higher use.

Approval of this license to accept raw MSW

1 is just opening the door to future expansions of 2 volumes, waste streams and manipulations of the

1 for a regional waste incinerator. Although I support the hierarchy and I believe most people support Maine's solid waste hierarchy as a matter of philosophy, it should be noted that the Maine Energy Recovery Company was somewhat unique. Unlike the facilities located at Orrington, Auburn or Portland, Maine Energy was in the center of our downtown area. If you wonder what it's like to live within close proximity --

HEARING OFFICER: Can you please slow down a little bit so we can get the words down?

MR. SEVER: Okay, I'm sorry. I apologize. Maine Energy has been a source of controversy. Whether that's been imaged or real is up for debate perhaps but it has been a source of controversy and it has been a detriment to the economic wellbeing of my community. A lot of people who are here tonight would also tell you about their concerns about health impacts about Maine Energy, but Maine Energy has been closed so really Biddeford has nothing really to gain or to lose at this point except this: when I look at this application, I look at the future for Maine's solid waste landscape. Maine communities beyond Biddeford, including Bangor, Brewer, Buckfield, Bucksport, any community in Maine is better served
when we have a diversity of options and when we have a diversity of companies. We have six landfills operating in the state of Maine. They should all be on a level playing field. Communities such as mine and other communities across the state are right now grappling with very serious and very real budget concerns. This deal that Biddeford was able to negotiate with Casella was originally contingent on Juniper Ridge. People in my community knew that, they accepted it and they voted in favor of it -- my city council did rather and it should be noted that they voted overwhelmingly eight to one.

Juniper Ridge is a state-owned landfill. That means people in my community have been financially supporting Juniper Ridge, including its purchase. Juniper Ridge also has a history. It did not appear ten years ago out of thin air. It's been there. I understand the concerns of some people in Old Town. I also understand those in Old Town who would welcome the new revenue. There are no perfect solutions in Maine's solid waste landscape, none. In an ideal world we would not have municipal waste. Unfortunately, we do not live in an ideal world.

For us, Juniper Ridge makes sense for a lot of other reasons which I also have bulleted out in my
written testimony submitted to you so I won't bother going through those points.

I urge you to accept this application. It makes sense on an economic, on an environmental and on a responsible planning for Maine's solid waste future. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Paul Schroeder and after Paul we have Connie, I believe, Gemmer.

MR. SCHROEDER: Good evening, Hearing Officer Parent, Members of the Panel, everyone else who is attending here tonight. I found that today particularly provided a great opportunity to reflect on the permitting and history of the Juniper Ridge, formerly West Old Town, Landfill. Because today, the 9th of April, is to the day the ninth anniversary of the granting of the license amendment that allowed for the -- that authorized many more waste streams and much larger volumes to be brought in at a much more rapid pace to Old Town.

Now, in 2003, just before that -- you know, this started in the spring of 2003. In 2003 -- by the end of 2003, the state was under a lot of pressure to get the deal done. That pressure was coming from G.P. which was demanding certain financial returns from their mill in Old Town. So

1 December was an important month. In January of 2004 was the first public informational meeting on this issue that was held in our community. Over 300 people turned up and that public informational meeting was held about seven weeks after the closing of the period for public requests for public hearings, and actually, as everyone knows, there hasn't been an actual public hearing on any issue around this landfill since day one until today.

So here we are today and we're wondering are we going to find out that a major promise that the people of our region were given at that time, which was that raw municipal solid waste would not be coming to this landfill, we're going to find out whether or not this promise is going to hold. Now, we know that the -- this issue today is of critical importance to the applicants. That was obvious from the strenuousness of their various objections and comments this afternoon and this morning. We also know that this application opens a huge gateway for some kind of change in the waste streams in Maine and we don't know what its implications are.

Where is the actual state in this process? The state is the owner and this morning Mr. Laubenstein, the Assistant Attorney General, was
identified as co-representing Casella and the state and he never spoke and he never did speak, and actually the public is rubbed the wrong way when the corporate partner is writing the briefs and carrying the argument for the public entity.

I see that this is an opportunity for the state to take control of waste policy. Who is going to be responsible for this? We found out this morning that the DECD won't. Mr. Barden, although he claimed that the state has management oversight of the facility, he allowed his team to argue against strict application of the hierarchy. So I don't think we can look to them for stewardship of Maine waste policy. Meanwhile, Casella economically undercuts their public sector competitors who are trying to do a good job environmentally and socially in their communities by offering below market or at least cheaper landfill dumping space so that their communities can truck it to Old Town. Now, if the state had taken responsibility sometime along this line for its own waste policy, we wouldn't be here tonight. We'd all be operating operations like ecomaine and MMWAC and working together to solve these problems.

So I'd like to suggest that the DEP today
takes a step back, denies this application and makes today the day they take the first step in undertaking their new responsibilities of stewardship for solid waste policy in Maine. Thank you very much.

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Next we have -- I believe it's Connie Gemmer and then after that is Joanne -- I think it's Gurney -- Tummey, sorry.

Ms. Gemmer: Good evening. My name is Connie Gemmer and actually I'm here to read a letter that was given to me by Daniel Cote of Auburn. I, myself, live in Portland. Although I am unable to be at the public hearing in Augusta, I do want to express my support for Casella in their efforts to move ahead with a plan to transfer in-state municipal solid waste from the former MERC plant to the Juniper Ridge Landfill in West Old Town. I have reviewed the elements of their plan and believe that it makes sense from an environmental and an economic standpoint. Our company has done business with Casella and KTI for 17 years. We have found them to be a good organization to deal with and appreciate their efforts to help the state of Maine achieve its goals with regard to solid waste disposal and a greater emphasis on recycling.

This is not an easy industry for the public to fully understand or support. Casella is working diligently to do what is in the best interest of many Maine communities and deserves to have their application supported by the state agencies and communities across the state. We commend their efforts, sincerely, Daniel A. Cote.

HEARING OFFICER: And you're submitting that letter? Thank you. Now we have Joanne Tummey testifying in opposition and next up after Joanne is Dan Thornton testifying in support.

MS. TUMMEY: Good evening. Thank you very much for having this public hearing. My name is Joanne Tummey. I live in Biddeford. I am the former mayor of Biddeford for four years, I served in the Maine State Legislature for eight years and I served on the Natural Resource Committee. So I was on the committee when all of these things happened. I have to tell you that the reason I ran for public office was because of the incinerator. I'm not a scientist and I've decided that science isn't going to solve this. I was also put on the Blue Ribbon Commission on Solid Waste. Paula and I used to see each other quite often when she came to our committee.

I'm on record for being opposed to
incineration. It's Neanderthal to take all our waste and burn it and to pollute the air and then to pollute the ground. Now, I am very happy that this incinerator is closed, but I drove an hour and a half and I'll drive an hour and a half back tonight because morally I cannot send our lifestyle to northern Maine, to Old Town, to my friends who I made in the Maine State Legislature. Laura Sanborn and I were -- not seat mates but we served together. I joined with We The People and I stood for many, many years about solid waste and I want to go on record telling you that I came tonight because it's always been about the health of my community, and I was glad to see that they were going to sell it. What I was not glad to see was the test results that we never had a public hearing about. There are two hot spots and I have to tell you, and I'm not pointing fingers at you, but the DEP was not there for us. That was a lesson I learned when I came to the Maine State Legislature because I believed anybody who worked for the DEP wore L.L. Bean boots and they liked to mountain climb and they were my people. I found out early on it isn't about that, it's about politics, and that saddened me.

On the Blue Ribbon Commission I was the only
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one that tried to struggle to have recycling in the hierarchy as number one. The State Planning Office, which Paula was part of at the time, was not pushing recycling as fast as I thought we should.

We have responsibility for the waste we generate, but I have a responsibility to my fellow Mainers. I love all of Maine. I live in southern Maine but I love northern Maine, and I have a responsibility to stand here telling you that the people did not vote for Juniper Ridge. Eight councilors and one who did not support it is not the people's vote of Biddeford and they never sent it out to referendum for a vote whether we should buy it for 6.5 million dollars either, and they're getting all our recyclables.

Somebody loves Casella and I have to tell you that I worked with them when I was mayor for over a year in hopes -- I put all my activism aside and I have to tell you that I collected ash samples that brought a two million dollar fine to Biddeford.
Those samples -- Dr. Frakes was the state toxicologist at the time and because he said there was mercury in those fish, they got rid of Dr. Frakes. He was the best scientist we ever had; anyway, unacceptable levels of lead and dioxin were
spewed. Those are in your DEP records, okay? A two million dollar fine against that company. We couldn't eat our gardens anymore, we couldn't eat our herbs and to this day we've got two hot spots. My councilor, my best friend, one of my best friends at the time said there's no deal here, nothing is written in stone until we get the test results and that validated me in saying this is a good way to approach it, but the test results were never made public and there are two hot spots, one they say was from a former company. Prove it. How do we know it was from a former company? The other hot spot is dioxin. Dioxin comes with incineration. The two million dollar fine against that facility was unacceptable levels of dioxin and lead. It was spewing all over us and people in open cars were getting spewed with this stuff. Landfills, you're going to have to have a liner. I know this is tied into the methane gas at the university but common sense, science aside, how much is it going to cost to transport the garbage from Biddeford to Juniper Ridge? Casella has some great friends in the Legislature, some great lawyers, and I saw that when I was on the committee.

HEARING OFFICER: You have one minute.
some issues and within two hours a representative from the landfill was at her house with a sniffing machine to verify any kind of odor and then I got a phone call to bring in some cover material. Within three hours her complaint was addressed and solved. In most respect, she was wild at first and the way that they handled it was so professional she was smiling, shaking hands at the end. It was unbelievable and it was really great to see from a business side because we were involved in bringing some cover material up as well as, you know, personally with my aunt. So from a neighbor, they're outstanding. There's no better company that cares about the area around them. They take -- the environmental concerns are -- it's their most important thing that they do there. Like I said, we transport material in. They have us brushing off our tailgates before we leave the landfill, cleaning our tires so we're not tracking out. The precautions they take are outstanding, and if you don't do it, you get a phone call and it's not a nice phone call. They really take it very serious.

From the selectman point of view, Milford and Old Town have always worked pretty closely together. We're neighbors. Old Town recently
switched over to this single-sort recycling and pay-per-bag disposal. I was in opposition of the paper bag. I think it creates an expense on the citizens that they have to spend every week that a lot of people haven't budgeted for. We just had an article in the paper of people taking their trash because they didn't buy the $\$ 2$ bag and bringing it over to Orono for collection because they didn't have the money to dispose of their trash. The other side of that, we were lucky enough that that person went to Orono and had their trash collected. We own some land in Milford and it's all dirt roads and it's a big piece of land, logging roads, and we get couches, TVs, bags of trash, everything, that we have to deal with and as a big property owner around the area, we put gates up because we can't do it anymore. If we continue to add costs to waste disposal, it's going to come back on us and Casella does a great job managing it and that's where it needs to be. It doesn't need to be out in our streams, in our ditches along the roads for us to pick up.

A business person, like I said, we employ 50 to 60 people around the area right local in Milford. Those are direct employees that work every day in the landfill. They're also employees that work every day
in the mill in Old Town. One of the several reasons that the Old Town mill is around is in cooperation with the state but one of the largest is cooperation with the landfill. If that landfill was not there, you can forget about all of those jobs, the 250 jobs in the Old Town mill. That doesn't even go outside the realm of the mill. I have 14 employees also in a logging operation that work directly with that mill. Without that, those jobs are gone. Business point of view, again, if we can't manage trash expense and disposal expense for these mills, they're going to shut down. It has to go somewhere. It's an environmentally safe landfill, lined, all the leachate is collected, it's the best place for it and that's where it needs to go. Like any other business, we're looking for additional revenue streams. If this is an additional revenue stream to manage costs for the Juniper Ridge Landfill, then it needs to be done. I've seen the direct effect. We also demolish buildings and houses and haul into the landfill. If they can keep their prices down, people are going to continue doing these projects. We've already seen it. I've cut my waste hauling of demolition by 90 percent since the economy has turned. If we cannot keep the price of demolition,
all of that is going to go away and if they can get beneficial revenue from taking MSW, then that's what we need to do.

So that's my support for the landfill.
Thank you.
HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Next we have Bob Duchesne testifying in opposition. After Bob Duchesne we have Paul Blair, I believe, testifying in support.

MR. DUCHESNE: For starters, you're going to have to watch me carefully and slow me down. You know how I get.

Madam Presiding Officer and members of the DEP staff, Attorney General's Office, my name is Bob Duchesne. I'm from Hudson. I'm a recovering representative, no longer in the Legislature but for the eight years I was in the Legislature, I was on the Environment and Natural Resources Committee, chaired it for awhile and so I'm familiar with the issues. I was actually the chairman of the Blue Ribbon Commission on Solid Waste Management, and I know Mike and Paula are certainly familiar with me from that. So I do have some familiarity with these issues. I'm pleased to submit my written comments and you'll be pleased I'm not reading them all.

1 First, I'm just going to do some quick bullet points.

1 management hierarchy cannot be applied in making a decision on the application. That finding by the Board, as it says in the footnote, was about permitting decisions of a technical nature. This isn't a technical nature. This is the solid waste management planning and implementation measure that the Board was talking about. This is what the guiding principle in the statute is supposed to apply to.

Third, Section 2.6 also makes a claim that should be further clarified for the record as evidence that Casella is doing a lot of good recycling at numerous geographic locations in Maine as it says in the application. The application fails to mention how much of that recycling isn't actually Maine waste. The application asserts that Casella's KTI facility in Lewiston generated 145,300 tons of recyclables but the Department's own waste generation and disposal capacity report reveals that only 6 percent of that construction and demolition debris was actually from Maine. This is not illegal. It's not even reprehensible and, quite frankly, I think KTI has improved their operation and they're doing a pretty good job of recycling Massachusetts' waste.

HEARING OFFICER: Please be sure to slow
down.
MR. DUCHESNE: All I'm suggesting is the Commissioner should weigh those figures carefully when examining the evidence.

Fourth, the application is not consistent with DEP rules. DEP rules require that an amendment to the license be consistent with licensing criteria. Now, you can read about my written remarks or you can wait for the movie to come out but I think it was covered pretty well by Mr. Bower earlier in the testimony so I don't need to repeat that to get that on the record.

Fifth, the application would create uneven competition between Casella and waste-to-energy facilities using a state asset as the lever. Now, this threatens to undermine the solid waste management system in the state. Earlier today Casella characterized this as ecomaine and MMWAC seeking subsidy. It's actually a concern of being competitively undercut. I didn't actually hear ecomaine or MMWAC ever say they deserved the waste, that they deserved a subsidy. What they said was they did not want to be undercut by cheaper capacity suddenly created by the state in its own landfill.

Number six, the application is in conflict
with Title 38, 2101. It should concern the
Commissioner that the application supposedly pushes 200,000 tons of imported waste back out-of-state and there's almost no change to the fill rate at Juniper Ridge. I put some things in the record that I think you'll be able to examine at your leisure to possibly explain that, but that's a weird situation to arrive at.

So three quick conclusions. One, while the hierarchy is the bedrock principle of state solid waste policy, it is not the role of the Department of Environmental Protection to direct specific waste streams. You don't control waste flow to higher priority disposal options. It is also not the role of DEP to approve permits that inhibit waste streams from going to higher priority disposal options. The state should not be in the business of forcing Casella to pay higher tipping fees merely because incinerators are a higher priority in the hierarchy, nor should the state allow its own property to be used to uncut those incinerators by permitting cheaper competition. The Department should simply deny the application and let the marketplace work.

Conclusion two, the amendment is not needed and should be denied. Municipal solid waste can
already go to JRL as bypass. Casella is free to make whatever contractual arrangement it wishes with any of the waste-to-energy facilities and the legitimate bypass from those facilities is authorized already to go to JRL. No change to the current permit is needed because Casella is also free to make other disposal arrangements if it cannot reach a satisfactory agreement. That's how the marketplace works. I was amused a little bit by the suggestion that they'll be able to divert some of that waste out of state. The two options they were talking about is North Country. If they took all the waste that's in this application and took it up to New Hampshire --

HEARING OFFICER: You have 30 seconds.
MR. DUCHESNE: -- that would double the flow rate for that one year. It's a small landfill. The other one, Southbridge is on the Connecticut border, six miles north of the Connecticut border, and so that's a long way away.

So my -- my last conclusion I guess is few, if any, of the benefits of the proposal asserted by the applicant actually require an amendment to the permit, not the recycling, not the PERC deal, not the 170,000 tons of waste pushed out of state, not the Biddeford, Westbrook, Lewiston, Old Town deals, none
of that is actually required -- is required to happen because of this permit application. You get the benefits. You don't have to pay this cost of the solid waste hierarchy. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. I'm glad we have a recording of that. Next we have Paul Blair, I believe that name is, testifying in support, followed by Paul McCarrier testifying in opposition.

MR. BLAIR: Hello. My name is Paul. I grew up in Old Town and when I was growing up we had a dump in Old Town and the dump was right beside a stream and the dump is still there. It has some little candy canes on it to let out methane but that old dump is literally leachating into that stream.
Okay, nowadays we, the people of Maine, own a really nice landfill that's state-of-the-art, nothing leaches out anywhere. It's just positively contained. It's something we should all be proud of. I don't think we should be condemning it. There's no Toyota Corollas in there, and if someone would like a state person to come and check -- I'm a little nervous -- if someone would like a state person to come and check and watch the work being done there, the people of Casella would be more than happy to have that done because they're proud of what they do
and they have really good people that do it. A lot of money is spent in the Old Town/Orono area. Without that money, the taxes would be astronomically high. An incinerator is nothing but a soot machine. I don't know about you people but I don't want to go through soot. I would rather have it in a landfill creating what could be a massive amount of energy, enough to supply 10,000 students at the University of Maine with methane for their heat for the winter instead of buying fossil fuels from overseas.

The landfill is there. It's not going anywhere. Why don't we all work together. It's already great. Let's work together and make it better, make it more useful for the state of Maine instead of putting soot in the air with garbage. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Next we have Paul McCarrier testifying in opposition. Following Paul McCarrier, we'll have John Leslie testifying in support.

MR. McCARRIER: Good evening. My name is Paul T. McCarrier and I grew up in Belfast, Maine, and I would like to thank the Hearing Officer and other committee members, thanks for hearing the testimony of concerned citizens about Casella's
proposal to send out-of-state municipal solid waste to Maine's state-owned landfill.

I would like to read 11 headlines that have concerned Casella and lawsuits they have filled in these towns. With this, I wish to show you how Casella is a failing company that lacks integrity and will be deceitful in working with the state and different municipalities.

These headlines include, Biddeford plans to sue KTI over merger, PERC's co-owners' suit echoes complaints in town's claim, shareholders sue, refuse handler KTI accused of hiding financial woes, councilor seeks document release, with the byline of city councilor Mark Johnson wants the city to release several privileged documents before a planned March 19th public hearing on a proposed contract settlement with Maine Energy Recovery Company, Casella Waste Systems, Incorporated, from bags to riches, couple sues over sludge truck accident, byline, the suit alleges the truck was not inspected, maintained or properly operated before and at the time of the accident, New England Organics is an assumed name, in quotes, of New England Waste Services of Maine, Incorporated, according to court documents filed at the Kennebec County Superior Courthouse. The

1 companies are divisions of Casella Waste Systems,

Incorporated, MERC and city to settle disputes, the agreement would tighten environmental controls but reduce the company's tax bill, Herman business sues Casella Waste Disposal for alleged violations of antitrust laws, Casella sues city over zoning changes, New York Attorney General, quote, state recycling probe uncovers abuses by Casella, town of Senica files suit against county, Casella.

I would also like to pose to you and the members of the general public as a representative of the 125th Legislature questions that were presented to the Government Oversight Committee concerning Casella. What percentage of waste being sent to Juniper Ridge Landfill is generated outside Maine's borders; is Casella operating Juniper Ridge and its other facilities in a manner that follows the state's solid waste management hierarchy; the hierarchy, reduce, reuse, recycle, compost, waste-to-energy and landfill prioritizes waste management practices in an effort to reduce the amount of landfill waste in the state; have the terms of the Operating Services Agreement been followed; has there been a misuse of public funds related to Casella's operation of the Juniper Ridge Landfill; has Casella complied with the
terms of the Host Community Agreement with Old Town; are there conflicts of interest involving the State Planning Office's oversight of Juniper Ridge, and if the Planning Office is eliminated in 2012, are there potential conflicts of interest with the oversight of the landfill by the DEP; have there been anti-competitive actions relating to requests for proposal in the processes of awarding state-funded contracts to Casella.

Wrapping up, I would like to encourage you to please reject this license that would accept out-of-state municipal solid waste into the Maine state-owned landfill. I believe this violates the intent of the original agreement and continues to break promises not only to Old Town and the surrounding communities but the whole state of Maine. Casella has proved we cannot trust them and if you need to ask someone about Casella and trust, please talk to New York Attorney General Eric T.
Schneiderman. Thank you very much.
HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Next we have John Leslie testifying in support. Following John Leslie we have Sam Hunting testifying in opposition.

MR. LESLIE: Good evening. I'll keep it short and sweet. I'm a resident of Orrington, Maine,
and I support Casella's application. I just -- we have two commercially-operated landfills in this state, one that's commercially owned, and it would hurt northern Maine to not have competition for commercial landfill space. I can't imagine where the prices would go. That's all I have. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Next we have Sam Hunting testifying in opposition, followed by Ralph Coffman testifying in opposition.

MR. HUNTING: Hearing Officer Parent and Members of the Panel, I represent -- I live in Orono, Maine, and I'm from the Orono Forums and basically I'm -- the only thing I really do for them is hold the key to the office so we can have our meetings every week but at this meeting we're talking about a key of another kind. We're building a record for Commissioner Aho and we're fashioning a key that's going to open the door to future solid waste policy for the state of Maine. Even bigger than that, we're determining the role of the state in promoting our common welfare which the preamble of the Maine State Constitution says is the object of government. So it isn't only a landfill issue here. The issues are much, much larger.

To refresh my memory at least on the solid
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waste hierarchy so I don't get it wrong, at the top, reduce, reuse, recycle, then compost, then waste-to-energy, then the landfill down at the bottom, and I have to presume that the law was passed with the benefit of the people of the state of Maine in mind to promote our common welfare, and we just have to take that as read that the law was enacted for that purpose and, you know, we enacted the law so people should obey it. The permit -- this amendment to the permit ignores the solid waste hierarchy in a couple of ways, and I'm going to briefly summarize what I heard this morning and I hope it's not repetitive.

First, the permit -- under the permit, landfill -- landfilling trumps energy and, of course, that violates the hierarchy. Commissioner Parker asked why is 30 better than 90 ? Well, 30 is better than 90 if you think the highest and best use is dumping trash wherever the margin is greatest, but that wasn't what the solid waste hierarchy was set up to do, and 30 is not better than 90 if you want to serve the public purpose by getting the most energy possible from a ton of trash, as Ed Spencer pointed out in his cross examination.

Second, the landfill also trumped reduce,
reuse and recycle because under the amendment if a town successfully recycles, it reduces input to the waste stream. That's great, we all want that to happen. What happens then? Out-of-state trash comes in to make up the difference. So that may make sense from Casella's perspective, right, because they get to make money on the trash, but why does it make any sense at all from the perspective of the people of the state of Maine? It's filling up their landfill space, they're not making any more of it, and there's no public purpose to be served by it. So these are crazy up is down, black is white type outcomes. They're so crazy that if this permit goes through, there is no solid waste hierarchy. In fact, I'd paraphrase Brian Oliver's testimony this morning as boiling down to exactly that. I hope I'm doing it accurately because I'm not a transcriber. He's asked, do you believe the solid waste hierarchy can be used for purposes of regulation, and what he says is it's only principles, right? There's no real way to obey it because there aren't any metrics to show you that you've actually obeyed it and he gives the example of measuring leachate. Well, I submit that if we are moving landfilling above energy and we're moving landfilling above reduce, reusing and
recycling, which we are, then that's all the metric we need. We don't need to worry about leachate. We know everything we need to know already from the testimony here today.

Larger than the landfill, larger than the inversion of the solid waste hierarchy is the role of the state in promoting the common welfare. People are going to be harmed by this proposal that the state should be protecting.

First, the people of the state of Maine generally. Again, the solid waste hierarchy was put in place to serve the common welfare. We shouldn't violate it. By definition, it's hurting the people of the state of Maine to violate it.

Second, there are entities that did follow the solid waste hierarchy as Casella is arguing that nobody should. For example, corporate citizens that we've heard from this morning placed a bet that the solid waste hierarchy was something that the state would adhere to. That was their business model and, you know, fine, it's business, they placed the bet, they lost their profit, just business as the Godfather would say, but this administration wants to be business friendly. I agree with that. Being business friendly is good, but how is it business
friendly to change the rules in the middle of the process to benefit one company and to disfavor another company that played by those rules?

HEARING OFFICER: You have one minute.
MR. HUNTING: I'm almost done. So I think it's Civics 101. I don't think this is hard or complex at all. The state should play its proper role. The role is, number one, do not approve this amendment; number two, do enforce the solid waste hierarchy, write the necessary rules, write the necessary regulations, take control of the landfill and that way you're going to be protecting the public welfare of the citizens of the state of Maine. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Next we have Ralph Coffman and following Ralph Coffman, we have Ed Spencer.

MR. DOYLE: Madam Hearing Officer, Ralph Coffman is an intervening party. You're not supposed to be able to have the opportunity to testify as a party and then also testify as a member of the public. He didn't testify but that was his choice. He really can't have it both ways.

HEARING OFFICER: Speaking of Chapter 3 Rules, Chapter 3 does not prohibit a person from
testifying both as an intervening party and within the public hearing session. One example of a time when it might be relevant is if I have grouped a group of individuals together, their testimony needs to be harmonious and this would be an opportunity for the individual parties to express their testimony. I am overruling your objection.

MR. DOYLE: Just for clarification, so can any member of a company who is also the applicant then testify at night?

HEARING OFFICER: If they choose to sign up and to provide their testimony, that is the case.

MR. DOYLE: Thank you for that clarification because from your prior procedural orders that was not our understanding.

HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Coffman, you may proceed.

MR. COFFMAN: Thank you. As has been stated, it's been almost ten years to get to this point where we have a real public hearing. Reduce, reuse, recycle and landfill, that's at the bottom. So how did this get reversed? I don't know. I've been in Maine for quite awhile. I've been living in Old Town for 40 years. I've had businesses in Old Town and watched this town go from the gateway to the

North Maine Woods, Henry David Thoreau came up here to Old Town, Maine and went to the Penobscot Nation and picked up a Native American guide and went for a walk in the Maine woods up to Mount Katahdin, wrote a book and made us famous, made us sort of an outdoor environmental state, a location that people hungered for. People moved here from all over for that reason and that's why people live here for that reason; yet, in Old Town -- I mean, we had everything. We had Old Town Canoe. I mean, it's like Cabella's. You know, we should have had outlet stores. We should have had -- I've seen cities in other places around the world, even in Munich, Germany, that have diverted the waters so that they have whitewater rafting all year-round. We could have done that. We could have done all kinds of things but instead what did we do? We tried to accept responsibility for the mill that was in our town by giving them a place to put their garbage, their toxic waste. Well, what happened then? They sold themselves and they made several tens of millions of dollars just on the fact that they had a dump for their refuse. So we got taken by that. Then the state came in and took over and here we are.

Juniper Ridge, I walked that ground before
there was a bag of trash on there. I was a representative from that area. The fellow who owned that property took me around and showed me test wells that were underwater. You go out there now, it's all flooded. Junipers grow in swamps. I just want to remind you. They don't grow on ridges. This is a total artificial environment built on a swamp in between Pushaw Stream and Birch Stream. I was told by an engineer that you could have two test wells three feet apart and you could have a fracture of toxic waste going out in between them and those test wells would not pick it up. So what's -- what good is that? And eventually the liners are going to break. They all do, and even Casella's people have testified, their engineers have testified that they'll break.

Today listening to the different testimony, I was kind of -- well, I knew before that we -- we've been subsidizing for how many years out-of-state trash coming in here? We charge our towns like what, $\$ 70$ a ton, is that what the figure was, but yet out-of-state waste is $\$ 21$ a ton. That was the figure that I heard. I mean, were subsidizing out-of-state garbage to come into Maine because why, PERC and MERC want to generate electricity. Look, I was in the

Legislature, I was on the Utility Committee. I saw so much fraud and corruption, 300 million dollars paid out to the owners of Enfield and Jonesboro wood chip plants, you know, which brings me to another thing in Old Town. We not only have the largest toxic waste site in New England pretty soon but we also have an incinerator. That's what that is over there that used to be a paper mill. Isn't that the boiler that was brought over from Solon or wherever it was that's all defective? Now we read every day in the paper -- well, not every day but a lot that the mill -- that whatever that incinerator is is in constant violation of air standards. They're releasing pollutants in the air. So we get it from the dump, we get it from the air, and yeah, you fine them, the Department of Environmental Protection fines them and takes their money, but what do we get? We just get to breathe that air.

I feel bad for the people in Bradley. Like the other representative said, you know, she loves the people in this state.

HEARING OFFICER: You have one minute.
MR. COFFMAN: I do too and it isn't just my community. Biddeford and Saco say, oh, wow, economic development since we got rid of that incinerator.

Yeah, at our expense. I can't even sell a piece of property I have because it's located by the dump. I had dreams of a campground at one time to fit in with the outdoorsy part of Old Town, but it isn't happening. You know, the state has no control over this toxic waste site. It's Casella's baby to make money on and lots of it, and when Casella has friends like Baldacci and Cashman, well, there you go, and now we're going to continue to protect them and their financial interest. You know, it's wrong.

Solution? We should -- if you want to take a proactive stand, why don't you look into like plasma arc technology? Why don't we have a bond issue, like 27 million dollars, and give it to the University of Maine to solve this problem? It's a land grant institution developed -- signed into law by Abraham Lincoln and a land grant institution is supposed to solve the problems of the community that they're in. So why don't we talk about something like that, a real solution and get rid of that pile, and incidentally, plasma arc technology creates temperatures hotter than the surface temperature of the sun and it can decrease the volume of what's there to 20 percent of what's there and encapsulate it like in glass. It looks like Obsidian.

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you for your testimony.

MR. COFFMAN: Thank you. So there are solutions.

HEARING OFFICER: Next we have Ed Spencer and following Ed Spencer we have Hillary Lister.

MR. DOYLE: Same objection.
MR. SPENCER: Yeah, on that front, I remember our very first meeting over at DEP for the intervenors and the concerned parties we kind of resented being grouped as we were individual intervenors and if you recall, we were assured that we would still be able to come up here and testify as individuals, and if you go back and read the transcript, you will see that. It might even have been your own words.

HEARING OFFICER: Please address me and you'll want to get right to it.

MR. SPENCER: Yup, okay, let's get right to it. Something I neglected to point out today in the rebuttal testimony of Jeremy Labbe, first page, halfway down the page, it goes -- and this is in relation to he was talking about the new air license for the landfill by the DEP as part of the new air license and, two, that the proposed MSW amendment was
considered by both NEWSME and the DEP as part of the air licensing process and this was taking place mid-to-late summer of 2011. Now, I think there's something wrong with the chronology here because I believe that the public benefit determination was happening at about that same time and I also believe there wasn't any mention of large new amounts of MSW coming in. So when you get time, would you please check that out?

And, you know, it was brought up today that somebody for the applicants questioned whether some of the intervenors' testimony was actually their own testimony, whether it was authored by them, whether it was their work, and I just have to point out that if you look in this rebuttal document, I'm not naming names but some of it all sounds like the same language.

One more thing, lastly, with all due respect to Mr. Thornton, I'm glad there's jobs, I'm glad -someone has to do that work for now and I'm glad it's them. He's in a very responsible position as, you know, a selectman in Milford, but when you start to give credit to Casella for the jobs at the Old Town mill, if you really know the history there, that is nuts. Give credit to G.P. fattening their pockets
.

.
but as far as I'm concerned not this mill owner but the one before, Red Shield Environmental which went bankrupt, cost Mainers 17 million dollars. That was in part due to the failures of Casella to furnish clean enough wood, fuel derived from CDD to run that mill, okay, 16 of the 31 DEP samples tested in excess, okay, followed by the hazardous waste ash into the landfill where it wasn't supposed to go followed by bankruptcy. So I just wanted to set the record straight, nothing personal.

And lastly, I really appreciate everyone coming here and speaking out both for and against. It's part of what democracy should look like. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Next is Hillary Lister and following Hillary is Charles -I'll need help with that name after.

MS. LISTER: Hello. Thank you for finally having a public hearing on this issue. My name is Hillary Lister. I live in Athens, Maine, which was host to the just recently mentioned biomass burner that was shut down in Athens when it switched from burning plain waste wood to construction demolition debris. There was a fuel pile fire, a number of problems and as part of the penalty for those
been a claim pretty well from the start of the permitting for this facility that it would only take Maine waste. It was soon after that that the Legislature's definition of Maine waste changed to include anything processed in Maine. Now I also see a claim in the papers that they would only be taking waste that's currently going to the Westbrook Transfer Station but from reading through the application and from hearing testimony today, it does not seem that there's any actual limit in the application to the waste just coming from the Westbrook facility. It looks like it's an overall tonnage increase and allowing raw MSW, and please correct me if I'm wrong on that. And with that, there had also been the claim in the application that the Westbrook facility was only taking Maine
generated waste and then from testimony today from Casella representatives it came out that the Westbrook facility is also taking some out-of-state waste, though, it is somehow being segregated. Again, it seems like there's not enough funding for oversight of these things and we just need more reassurances that there really will be no out-of-state waste.

Also, with Casella recently signing a lease agreement with the city of Lewiston for a recycling facility, there were a number of concerns that came up at the hearings on that facility that it would be allowing out-of-state waste. Again, originally they had claimed that there would be no out-of-state waste, and then when the final language of the lease came out, it showed that they would be accepting out-of-state waste from KTI, anything that KTI -construction demolition debris that could not be recycled could be going over to the new Lewiston recycling facility and KTI has been shown to be taking at least almost 90 percent of their waste coming in from out-of-state. The estimates for the amount of waste from KTI that would not be able to be recycling that would be going through the Lewiston facility ranged from 3,000 to seven and a half
thousand tons per year and the question that came up at those hearings that was unanswered was could that waste be then sent to JRL. So I think we really need clear definitions of what Maine waste would be and what out-of-state waste would be.

Just another side issue, I was here for the intervenor testimony earlier and there was testimony from a representative of Commonwealth Consulting on behalf of MRC in favor of this application and I didn't hear it disclosed but Commonwealth Consulting has consulted with projects relating to Casella including recommending that the town of Houlton contract with Casella for private waste hauling services. So once again, I would just be concerned about conflicts of interest and it should be something that people are aware of, and I appreciate you folks having a public hearing here and I hope the public's concerns are really listened to and followed through on. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Charles Gibbs, I believe, and after Charles is Tracie Konopinski.

MR. GIBBS: Hi, Charlie Gibbs, LLP, from Alton, Maine. LLP is limited liability person. I thought I'd just throw that out there. Everyone is wearing a suit and they're all someone special,
they're a mayor of a town or, you know, they have a business to run or they just want to take and deal with trash. When the Old Town farm, now referred to as Juniper Ridge, was at its planning stages, the propaganda thrown out at that time was mixing sludge with wood chips would keep the smell of the dump to a minimum. Due to the cost of wood chips, gravel was used, no point in using good clean wood chips when you can use gravel because they can make paper out of wood chips. That was the thought process back then. So the dump stunk and it shifted as it filled. Casella comes to the rescue. So they obligated themselves to the state to supply construction demolish debris wood chips to fuel the mill in Old Town. Now, the reason this was going to happen is they didn't really give a crap about the mill in Old Town as much as they did being obligated to bring in the construction demolition debris because there's more money in bringing it in because a lot of other states don't allow it in their dumps. So if they get this in, they'll bring in the construction demolition debris chips, they're going to burn. As has been mentioned here before, the only mistake that's been made tonight is where the boiler was from. It was from Athens. It poisoned our community. They didn't
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give a care. The fight was on. They were going to bring it to Old Town, gonna save that mill, gonna save those jobs, gonna give them a lower cost per ton for those wood fuel chips so these men and women can continue to work, and I'm thinking, this is great, I have a lot of friends that work at that mill, probably lost a lot since I've been talking about this because you're familiar to me and I'm familiar to you in a lot of meetings we've been at, but the fact is we're all getting duped here, the same way the MERC plant, PERC plant brought in -- they can't just bring in something just to generate electricity from some trash, they have to build this behemoth that requires out-of-state waste because we don't create enough waste in Maine, we're too damn poor, no money, no trash to throw away. It's that simple. If you can't buy it, you can't throw it away. So 60 percent of out-of-state waste went into the MERC plant and 40 percent in-state-waste is what's reported. The PERC plant, 60 percent Maine waste, 40 percent out-of-state waste. I'm not real good at math but 60 and 40 comes to 100 . There's no reason why anyone should stand in front of this microphone and say, hey, listen, we've got a business to run, we've got jobs, we've got a community, they're all

1 going to fall apart if Casella can't bring in garbage 2 from out-of-state or anywhere else in the state and say it's Maine waste because they've been saying that now for the eight, nine years I've been dealing with this. Once you get this train running to bring this garbage in, it's not going to stop. The only one that's going to benefit is going to be Casella. They'll be subsidized because they're going to make the methane plant and send that pipeline to the University of Maine, all subsidized by me and you. I would suggest the DEP take this time to take the high road and join us. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Tracie Konopinski.

MS. KONOPINSKI: Good evening. Hearing Officer Parent and other Members of the Panel, thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on this process. My name is Tracie Konopinski, and I live in Portland. I'm here to testify in opposition to Casella Waste System's amendment to bring municipal solid waste to the Juniper Ridge Landfill. So by way of introduction, I'm the community organizer with Toxics Action Center. Toxics Action Center is a Maine nonprofit organization that works side by side with residents to clean up and prevent pollution.

Since our start in this state in 1999, we've worked actively with concerned citizens from Old Town, Lewiston, Biddeford, Westbrook, among others, who have approached us for help in minimizing the environmental and public health risks associated with how we manage our waste in this state. So in each of these places concerned residents have come together with their neighbors to learn how to best protect the health of their families, their neighborhood, their wellbeing and their sense of place.

We have a waste problem in this state. We produce too much waste, our waste is toxic and the corporate need of waste companies to make a profit largely outweighs the community's need to reduce waste and to protect public health and the environment from potentially destructive waste management practices.

When faced with the problem of waste, we shouldn't be frantically figuring out where to put it but instead we should be deciding how to reduce the amount of waste we create.

At Toxics Action Center, we celebrate the closure of the MERC incinerator, however, there are clear winners and losers in this deal. The clear winners are the residents of Biddeford and
surrounding communities who can expect to breathe easier with the closure of the incinerator. As I'm sure you know, incinerators spew a wide array of dangerous pollutants into the air, including hazardous dioxins for which there is no safe level of exposure and heavy metals. Airborne pollutants from incineration settle to the ground potentially contaminating soil and water or combining with atmospheric moisture leading to acid rain.

Maine is also a winner. The closure of the state's largest incinerator is not insignificant when it comes to public health and the environment, however, waste is not a zero sum gain. Biddeford's gain doesn't have to equal a loss for other communities like Old Town. We know that the folks in Old Town will become the clear losers if change does not happen at the statewide level. The EPA says that all landfills eventually leak so claims that state-of-the-art technology will protect our groundwater in our communities by waste industry representatives are simply not true. In addition to threats to groundwater, landfills give off potentially harmful gases and odors which often permeate neighborhoods.

The perennial question when it comes to
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trash, particularly in a case like this one, is where will it go. The answer, again, waste is not a zero sum gain. So we encourage the Department of Environmental Protection to take a two-pronged approach when it comes to reducing trash.

First, the Department should focus on increasing diversion of waste generated here in Maine from landfills and incinerators.

HEARING OFFICER: You have one minute left.
MS. KONOPINSKI: Thank you. The solid waste
hierarchy exists for a reason and Maine encourages its implementation and enforcement. Our recycling rate has hardly budged for more than a decade and there are steps that we can take to fix this. There are programs like SMART, the Saving Money And Reducing Trash program, which financially incentivizes waste reducing and can help municipalities jump start their recycling rate. Large scale composting can begin to tackle the organic wastes, the food scraps, the yard waste and the like that makes up about a third of our waste stream.

The second prong is to really draw a line in the sand when it comes to out-of-state waste. We've been importing half a million tons of waste each year
from other states. This is approaching about one-third of our waste stream.

So Maine should not be a dumping ground for the rest of New England. State leaders should not look to continue the trend of importing waste from our neighbors to the south. MERC's closure should be a tipping point when it comes to Maine's waste. Let's reduce, reuse and recycle and stop importing trash. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have reached the end of the sign-in sheets for testimony either in opposition, in support of or neither for nor against. Are there -- is there anyone here who wishes to testify who has not signed up? Before testifying, please sign in on the sheet right here. When you're done signing in, please let me know, sir. Anybody else who is wishing to testify, please sign in and I will swear you in and then I will provide an order in which you can go.

MR. BOYD: Madam Presiding Officer --
HEARING OFFICER: Hold on, sir, please. I need to take anybody else who is testifying and swear you in and make sure that you're testifying under oath. Your time won't begin until we make sure that that happens.
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At this time, would you raise your right hand? Do you affirm that the testimony you're about to give is the whole truth and nothing but the truth?
(Witnesses respond in the affirmative.)
HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Especially since the information is not in front of me, would you please state your name and your location and affiliation?

MR. BOYD: Sure. I'm Wayne Boyd. I live in Holden, Maine. I do work for Casella. Before I start, it is my understanding -- it was not my intent to testify this evening but due to the resent decision to let others testify, it's my understanding it's okay, is that correct?

HEARING OFFICER: Please proceed.
MR. BOYD: Okay, thank you. I've been in the trash business for 35 years, started in Aroostook County and I remember -- I remember the first dump. That's what we used to call them, was dumps. I unloaded the first load of trash and if you didn't light it on fire before you left, the town manager would usually call and be upset with you. That was the time when DEP started taking a hard look at all these small dumps that were across the state and they started to make a real detailed plan. The detailed
plan was to go to -- ti try to have state-of-the-art landfills that are regional. I watched that progress. I was on the ground floor when the recycling started. I'll just be honest with you, recycling came on to us, I owned my own business at the time, recycling wasn't a profitable thing to get into but we understood from the entrepreneurship perspective that that was the wave and that was the right thing to do. We took it upon ourselves to start the recycling. It was really crude back then, but we took it upon ourselves as a local trash hauler to do that. It's progressed to the point where only entrepreneurship could put it to where it is today. The reason that I'm mentioning that, I'll come full circle, backing up to the landfill, the landfill is the same thing. We've come to where the DEP -- at that time way back in the seventies, the late seventies and the early eighties, we've come full circle to where we're -- the plan was to have regional landfills. Yes, many people here this evening I'm sure recognize me, again, as the general manager of Juniper Ridge Landfill and, yes, it is the largest regional landfill in the state. It's exactly what the DEP wanted. That was always the intent. I can tell you through this testimony that we operate
the largest landfill in the state of Maine right now anyway that from an environmental perspective is second to none. It's state-of-the-art. I have a crew that works there and many of them are here this evening. Many have stickers on supporting Juniper Ridge this evening. We work diligently every day from an environmental perspective. I've scratched my head a couple times and I've said, hum, every other landfill in the state of Maine can take MSW but Juniper Ridge cannot. It doesn't make sense. It doesn't make sense. Again, I've watched this over 35 years. Coming back to the recycling side of it, Casella has stuck to the plate from a recycling perspective that is second to none in this state. We do an outstanding job, and I'm proud of it.

You know, earlier today it was mentioned that more -- how do you get more BTUs out of a mouth jug, well, if you burn it, you get BTUs but you also get emissions. It's Casella's intent through zero sort to put it in neither place. It shouldn't be in the landfill, that mouth jug, and it should not be in an incinerator. You know, when you really stop and you understand it, and I'm not real good at this public part of it, but when you really start to understand this and you really understand the issue
with recycling and MSW and solid waste, it's become very complex over the last 35 years. It was very simple 35 years ago. The fact is if it wasn't for private enterprise such as the Casellas of this world, we would not be where we are from a recycling perspective. MSW, it is our intent and we will work diligently when this MSW permit is approved --

HEARING OFFICER: You have one minute.
MR. BOYD: Thank you. We will work
diligently to implement zero sort and then hopefully -- it is my dream to see when a load is unloaded at the landfill that there is no plastic in it, there is no paper in it. That is our goal. That is the company's goal as a whole.

Again, thank you for your time. I was not planning on testifying this evening, but I thought it was important with the decision that was recently made. Thank you.

MR. SNOWMAN: Hi, my name is Dana Snowman. I'm from Alton. I think I'm in opposition. I really came to ask some questions and learn something. What is the current air space volume at Juniper Ridge Landfill right now at this point?

HEARING OFFICER: This is not an opportunity for us to respond to you. This is an opportunity for
you to provide testimony.
MR. SNOWMAN: Oh, okay. The 93,000 tons that is in question here, that is -- I can't ask you, for instance, is that the -- is that equal to the amount of waste that Maine communities contributed to MERC last year approximately?

HEARING OFFICER: We're not in a position to answer any of your questions this evening, sir.

MR. SNOWMAN: Okay. I just wanted to say a lot of broken promises. I don't see how anybody in their right mind could proceed any farther until they get a handle on what's going on up there. It seems like a massive fraud has been perpetrated on the citizens of the state. It's high time that you guys essentially, you're the watch dog, the state of Maine, and they're going to -- of course, we know what they want to do and you guys are supposed to -you know, you're on our side supposedly, not on theirs, and, you know, we live in a large state, not a lot of people, not a lot of Maine garbage. It would seem there are all kinds of places you could put these stinking incinerators and dumps instead of around people.

That's about all I've got to say, a lot of broken promises.

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. The public hearing opportunity is an opportunity for us to hear from you and gather information that's relevant to our licensing decisions. That is why we're not answering questions this evening.

With that, I believe that there are no other people -- I would ask that anybody else who is wishing to testify, this is your last call. I don't want people coming up to and from. So any other person -- this is your last opportunity. If you do not sign up now, I will assume that you do not wish to testify this evening. Mr. Bales, you may proceed. You're testifying in support, I believe?

MR. BALES: Yes, thank you. Chris Bales, Buxton, Maine. I've been involved with solid waste and recycling for well over 30 years. I started teaching school right out of college in Vermont and it was talking about the great idea of recycling. It was very small, very token in the seventies. I got married, moved to Maine, my wife is from Buxton, been there since '77. I got a chance to get my hands dirty and walk the walk, not just talk the talk, and I've been essentially involved in this industry ever since, and that led me from a hands dirty job on Warren Avenue recycling material from S.D. Warren and
shredding paper and baling it, that led me to the town of Brunswick where I was the solid waste -well, I was called the recycling director but that was a euphemism for the head trash man because we picked up recycling one day a week and we picked up trash four days a week. At the time we were running the worst landfill on the top ten list in the state and at the same time, I was in Buxton on the Solid Waste Committee where we also had the distinction of having one of the top ten worst landfills in the state. Both of those got closed, and in Buxton on that committee I was involved in making a decision to go to MERC, and that seemed to be the right choice based on what was available at the time, and in the connect of solid waste decisions, there's an ideal and then there's the reality of what are the cards we've got to work with today. It's not going to vanish, it's not going to go away. Being able to reduce, reuse, recycle, I'm all for it and I believe what I've seen from Casella -- and I will disclose that I am a Casella employee. I work for a company that was founded -- well, let's see -- this week it's 28 years I've been with the outfit. I call it "the outfit" because it's had three name changes. Casella is the most recent owner. They bought us because we

|  |  | 269 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | were an organics recycling company and they liked | 1 |
| 2 | what we did. John Casella and his team wanted to | 2 |
| 3 | expand his vision of recycling material, and as | 3 |
| 4 | you've heard, food waste, organic waste, municipal | 4 |
| 5 | treatment plant waste are all organic materials that | 5 |
| 6 | can be recycled, and I'm proud to say that back when | 6 |
| 7 | Sherry Huber's group was trying to site landfills | 7 |
| 8 | around the state there was a lot of opposition | 8 |
| 9 | everywhere, including my town. I was on a | 9 |
| 10 | committee that actually I got recruited to help | 10 |
| 11 | oppose it, but in that the outcome was that I've | 11 |
| 12 | actually made a living selling material that was | 12 |
| 13 | destined to go into those landfills years ago because | 13 |
| 14 | we now recycle the material and it's useful. | 14 |
| 15 | $\quad$ And there's a very simple thought I want to | 15 |
| 16 | leave you with on the organics recycling is that I | 16 |
| 17 | couldn't have been here for 28 years doing what I do | 17 |
| 18 | but for one reason, people reorder and they only | 18 |
| 19 | reorder for two reasons, the recyclable organic | 19 |
| 20 | material must have worked the first time and the | 20 |
| 21 | price must be right. So we're doing a good thing and | 21 |
| 22 | Casella -- I'm pleased to tell you that I was anxious | 22 |
| 23 | at first, who are these guys, what is their agenda in | 23 |
| 24 | buying our company -- I call it "our company," but I | 24 |
| 25 | just work there, but I really feel it's our company, | 25 | Casella and his team wants to do. This stuff is not going to evaporate, you've got to deal with it. 4 What's wrong with in-state to in-state? Thank you 5 very much.

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. With that, we have no more people testifying this evening. I will close the public testimony portion of the hearing on the application amendment. We will be resuming our public hearing tomorrow with the testimony of the remaining parties where the parties and the intervenors will have testimony and cross examination opportunities.

Thank you all for a very productive, efficient evening. I do appreciate your cooperation and have a good evening.
(Whereupon, the hearing was suspended until 9:00 a.m., April 10, 2013.
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|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { percentage }[3]- \\ & \text { 27:13, } 34: 16,237: 14 \\ & \text { perennial }[1]-259: 25 \\ & \text { perfect }[1]-215: 20 \\ & \text { performance }[4]- \\ & \text { 121:1, 127:5, } \\ & \text { 142:10, 142:11 } \\ & \text { performed }[1]-48: 5 \\ & \text { performing }[1]-98: 1 \\ & \text { perhaps }[3]-66: 25, \\ & \text { 145:15, 214:15 } \\ & \text { perimeter }[3]-45: 18, \\ & 50: 4,58: 10 \\ & \text { period }[8]-42: 8, \\ & 64: 23,65: 10, \\ & 148: 16,148: 19, \\ & 169: 1,182: 9,217: 6 \\ & \text { periods }[3]-33: 13, \\ & 39: 12,52: 18 \\ & \text { perjure }[1]-114: 9 \\ & \text { perjury }[1]-114: 11 \\ & \text { permanently }[1]- \\ & 105: 24 \\ & \text { permeate }[1]-259: 24 \\ & \text { permission }[1]- \\ & 147: 25 \\ & \text { permit }[26]-32: 2, \\ & 33: 15,36: 11,36: 15, \\ & 36: 17,40: 4,115: 13, \\ & 115: 14,116: 7, \\ & 132: 17,147: 11, \\ & 163: 7,169: 15, \\ & 177: 10,179: 1, \\ & 179: 16,233: 5, \\ & 233: 23,234: 2, \\ & 240: 9,240: 10, \\ & 240: 14,241: 13, \\ & 265: 7 \\ & \text { permits }[7]-6: 11, \\ & 40: 4,40: 15,45: 20, \\ & 55: 2,229: 12,232: 15 \\ & \text { permitted }[3]-10: 8, \\ & 17: 15,30: 15 \\ & \text { permitting }[12]- \\ & 23: 20,39: 17,52: 4, \\ & 53: 19,92: 11,95: 15, \\ & 103: 2,103: 11, \\ & 216: 13,230: 4, \\ & 232: 21,252: 11 \\ & \text { perpetrated }[1]- \\ & 266: 13 \\ & \text { PERRY }{ }_{[1]}-199: 25 \\ & \text { Perry }[3]-199: 23, \\ & \text { 199:24, 200:1 } \\ & \text { person }[21]-10: 1, \\ & 10: 5,85: 11,88: 7, \\ & 114: 15,186: 2, \\ & \text { 198:12, 199:5, } \\ & \text { 199:15, 199:18, } \\ & 199: 19,199: 22, \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 224:21, 226:10, } \\ & \text { 226:22, 234:21, } \\ & \text { 234:22, 243:25, } \\ & \text { 254:23, 267:10, } \\ & 271: 14 \\ & \text { personal }[2]-187: 10, \\ & 251: 10 \\ & \text { personally }[4]-187: 6, \\ & \text { 187:7, 225:12, 271:6 } \\ & \text { personnel }[1]-111: 13 \\ & \text { persons }[4]-3: 8,7: 1, \\ & 116: 2,198: 22 \\ & \text { perspective }[11]- \\ & 66: 5,87: 14,97: 5, \\ & 213: 22,241: 6, \\ & 241: 8,263: 8,264: 2, \\ & 264: 7,264: 14,265: 6 \\ & \text { perspectives }[1]- \\ & 224: 20 \\ & \text { pertain }[1]-196: 3 \\ & \text { pertained }[2]-84: 23, \\ & 85: 7 \\ & \text { pertaining }[1]-138: 4 \\ & \text { Peter }[1]-58: 23 \\ & \text { Phase }[2]-39: 25, \\ & 169: 24 \\ & \text { philosophy }[1]-214: 4 \\ & \text { phone }[4]-198: 20, \\ & 225: 4,225: 21 \\ & \text { phones }[1]-3: 18 \\ & \text { physical }[2]-33: 25, \\ & 35: 5 \\ & \text { pick }[4]-102: 10, \\ & 102: 19,226: 21, \\ & 246: 12 \\ & \text { picked }[3]-245: 3, \\ & 268: 5 \\ & \text { picking }[2]-113: 17, \\ & 194: 15 \\ & \text { picture }[6]-45: 13, \\ & 45: 20,46: 1,46: 11, \\ & 59: 23,209: 25 \\ & \text { piece }[4]-60: 10, \\ & 64: 24,226: 13,248: 1 \\ & \text { pile }[2]-248: 20, \\ & 251: 24 \\ & \text { Pine }[5]-50: 15, \\ & 72: 16,107: 22, \\ & 117: 9,129: 5 \\ & \text { Pioneering }[1]- \\ & 151: 15 \\ & \text { pipeline }[1]-257: 9 \\ & \text { pipes }[1]-58: 17 \\ & \text { piping }[4]-48: 3, \\ & 58: 10,61: 22,111: 14 \\ & \text { place }[31]-10: 13, \\ & 12: 15,36: 20,37: 3, \\ & 37: 10,37: 19,43: 25, \\ & 44: 23,53: 14,58: 18, \\ & 59: 9,61: 18,66: 10, \end{aligned}$ | ```75:12, 77:9, 77:25, 96:8, 110:23, 115:3, 116:7, 155:4, 198:9, 204:23, 212:15, 213:8, 227:14, 242:12, 245:18, 250:2, 258:10, 264:20 placed [15] - 7:17, 34:7, 34:12, 37:6, 47:10, 47:12, 50:4, 60:1, 61:22, 110:16, 110:17, 113:23, 195:21, 242:18, 242:21 placement [5] - 37:12, 37:13, 47:8, 61:9, 111:3 places [5] - 47:3, 143:16, 245:12, 258:7, 266:21 placing [1] - 99:18 plain [1] - 251:23 plan [19]-7:19, 11:21, 44:23, 44:24, 78:5, 125:7, 125:10, 125:15, 125:16, 141:6, 182:12, 203:7, 205:2, 219:15, 219:18, 262:25, 263:1, 263:19 planned [2]-77:6, 236:15 planner [1] - 16:21 Planning [9]-42:11, 82:14, 89:20, 90:1, 91:1, 163:22, 222:2, 238:3, \(238: 4\) planning [15] - 17:4, 42:10, 54:1, 54:4, 54:9, 55:23, 90:19, 125:19, 125:23, 198:23, 199:16, 216:5, 230:6, 255:4, 265:16 plans [2]-117:4, 236:9 plant [19]-21:18, 62:17, 155:18, 163:1, 167:22, 175:19, 202:14, 203:9, 203:13, 203:22, 206:7, 219:16, 224:18, 256:11, 256:19, 256:20, 257:9, 269:5 plants [6] - 62:16, 151:22, 155:1, 191:19, 203:24,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



| $\begin{aligned} & \text { proactive [1] - 248:12 } \\ & \text { proactively }[1]- \\ & \text { 111:16 } \\ & \text { probe }[2]-173: 15, \\ & \text { 237:8 } \\ & \text { problem }[5]-74: 10, \\ & 144: 19,248: 15, \\ & 258: 11,258: 18 \\ & \text { problems }[7]-155: 19, \\ & 155: 20,218: 24, \\ & \text { 248:18, 251:25, } \\ & \text { 252:1 } \\ & \text { procedural }[7]-7: 22, \\ & 7: 25,9: 7,11: 7,11: 9, \\ & 84: 16,244: 14 \\ & \text { Procedural }[3]-5: 14, \\ & 8: 4,9: 19 \\ & \text { Procedure }[1]-3: 22 \\ & \text { procedure }[4]-7: 8, \\ & 92: 11,95: 15,161: 3 \\ & \text { Procedures }[1]- \\ & \text { 196:18 } \\ & \text { procedures }[9]- \\ & 43: 21,43: 25,44: 2, \\ & 47: 24,48: 18,50: 7, \\ & 53: 14,75: 12,96: 8 \\ & \text { proceed }[7]-11: 23, \\ & 92: 17,141: 11, \\ & 244: 17,262: 15, \\ & 266: 11,267: 12 \\ & \text { proceeding }[18]- \\ & 4: 13,9: 13,10: 11, \\ & 10: 22,12: 9,30: 2, \\ & 30: 22,78: 10,123: 4, \\ & 124: 5,125: 12, \\ & 130: 6,141: 16, \\ & 184: 3,185: 2,185: 9, \\ & 198: 19,207: 20 \\ & \text { proceedings }[9]- \\ & 4: 22,5: 3,5: 16,7: 21, \\ & 7: 24,10: 14,11: 14, \\ & 140: 20,208: 5 \\ & \text { process }[18]-8: 7, \\ & 14: 4,21: 14,32: 21, \\ & 33: 3,52: 1,52: 13, \\ & 53: 2,125: 13, \\ & 125: 23,148: 17, \\ & 154: 18,166: 18, \\ & 217: 23,243: 2, \\ & 250: 2,255: 10, \\ & 257: 17 \\ & \text { processed }[9]-75: 3, \\ & 75: 4,80: 21,81: 7, \\ & 120: 2,127: 14, \\ & 152: 12,165: 22, \\ & 252: 14 \\ & \text { processes }[1]-238: 8 \\ & \text { processing }[11]- \\ & 11: 1,27: 17,27: 25, \\ & 78: 6,96: 6,117: 19, \end{aligned}$ | ```117:22, 124:19, 153:7, 154:14, 204:7 produce [3]-154:17, 204:13, 258:12 produced [5]-65:15, 65:19, 99:23, 112:22, 165:5 produces [2]-56:8, 62:21 production [5] - 59:25, 60:2, 60:9, 61:13, 124:20 productive [5]-7:10, 195:19, 196:5, 196:13, 270:14 products [4]-49:9, 124:16, 124:21, 125:3 professional [6] - 31:17, 42:17, 207:24, 213:18, 213:19, 225:7 profit [2] - 242:22, 258:13 profitable [1]-263:6 program [2]-41:7, 260:16 Program [2]-23:6, 27:4 programming [3] - 41:1, 42:3, 42:4 programs [7]-26:19, 26:22, 26:25, 77:8, 210:12, 260:15 progress [2] - 153:2, 263:3 progressed [1] - 263:12 progressive [1] - 212:20 prohibit [2] - 73:3, 243:25 prohibited [4]-55:14, 96:13, 96:14, 96:17 prohibits [5] - 54:20, 55:8, 85:2, 208:6, 208:10 project [15] - 2:24, 6:17, 10:21, 31:18, 37:16, 103:7, 112:10, 113:6, 123:19, 135:21, 197:11, 197:19, 200:8, 200:21 Project \({ }_{[1]}\) - 111:1 projection [1]-112:25 projections [2]- 36:10, 112:8 projects [10] - 55:20, 70:14, 103:8, 127:5,``` |  |  | ```provisions [6] - 19:12, 30:12, 40:8, 121:15, 121:24, 134:4 proximity [1]-214:9 public [71]-2:23, 4:5, 6:1, 6:3, 6:18, 10:2, 10:5, 11:6, 11:11, 52:12, 52:14, 52:15, 52:17, 52:18, 52:19, 53:5, 90:17, 118:18, 119:8, 141:25, 147:19, 148:16, 148:19, 169:23, 177:25, 178:9, 178:12, 178:18, 194:13, 194:18, 194:24, 196:5, 196:25, 197:11, 197:16, 201:20, 206:3, 207:22, 217:2, 217:4, 217:6, 217:8, 218:3, 218:5, 218:15, 219:13, 220:1, 220:13, 220:19, 221:16, 223:10, 236:16, 237:11, 237:24, 240:22, 241:11, 243:12, 243:22, 244:2, 244:20, 250:5, 251:19, 254:17, 258:5, 258:15, 259:12, 264:24, 267:1, 270:8, 270:10 Public [4]-16:23, 89:18, 271:4, 271:22 PUBLIC \({ }_{[1]}\) - 1:13 public's [1]-254:18 publically \([1]\) - 151:22 publically-owned [1] - 151:22 publicly [1] - 206:6 published [3] - 3:25, 167:3, 196:21 pull [2] - 63:20, 117:18 Pulp [1] - 16:25 purchase [11]-69:12, 69:18, 77:17, 78:1, 78:3, 153:2, 205:23, 206:6, 206:22, 207:10, 215:16 purpose [8]-2:22, 83:5, 146:5, 152:2, 188:25, 240:8, 240:22, 241:11 purposes [6] - 68:22, 109:22, 113:21, 114:1, 119:2, 241:19 pursuant \([4]-1: 18\),``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 88:2, 88:3, 88:12, } \\ & \text { 89:2, 89:12, 94:2, } \\ & \text { 129:3, 129:22, } \\ & \text { 137:18 } \\ & \text { referenced }[5]-56: 24, \\ & 58: 22,84: 5,93: 24, \\ & \text { 125:10 } \\ & \text { references }[2]-56: 10, \\ & 137: 18 \\ & \text { referencing [4] - } \\ & 114: 4,114: 5, \\ & \text { 178:16, 178:17 } \\ & \text { referendum [1] - } \\ & 222: 13 \\ & \text { referred }[5]-62: 9, \\ & 89: 17,89: 18,90: 12, \\ & 255: 3 \\ & \text { referring }[7]-105: 20, \\ & 111: 2,115: 6, \\ & 157: 18,178: 7, \\ & 178: 9,193: 21 \\ & \text { reflect }[3]-42: 6, \\ & 83: 14,216: 12 \\ & \text { reflected }[2]-18: 24, \\ & \text { 109:13 } \\ & \text { refresh }[1]-239: 25 \\ & \text { refuse }[2]-236: 11, \\ & 245: 22 \\ & \text { Refuse }[1]-27: 7 \\ & \text { regard }[5]-43: 23, \\ & 94: 19,151: 25, \\ & 164: 23,219: 24 \\ & \text { regarding }[15]-24: 20, \\ & 40: 5,51: 16,54: 13, \\ & 105: 17,109: 2, \\ & 116: 11,119: 20, \\ & 120: 11,121: 21, \\ & 127: 3,145: 18, \\ & 201: 18,202: 1,206: 8 \\ & \text { regardless }[3]-69: 21, \\ & 76: 15,201: 4 \\ & \text { regards }[1]-18: 4 \\ & \text { region }[1]-217: 12 \\ & \text { regional }[11]-4: 6, \\ & 17: 4,19: 18,54: 9, \\ & 55: 22,197: 1, \\ & 206: 17,214: 1, \\ & 263: 2,263: 20, \\ & 263: 23 \\ & \text { regroup }[1]-68: 2 \\ & \text { regs }[3]-87: 20,88: 6, \\ & 88: 20 \\ & \text { regular }[8]-6: 18, \\ & 43: 17,44: 21,50: 5, \\ & 58: 16,150: 5, \\ & \text { 197:12, 212:10 } \\ & \text { regulated }[3]-29: 21, \\ & 51: 11,52: 24 \\ & \text { regulating }[1]-23: 22 \\ & \text { regulation }[2]-50: 19, \\ & \text { reg } \end{aligned}$ | ```241:19 regulations [6]-52:4, 55:3, 87:16, 103:10, 196:3, 243:11 regulators \({ }_{[1]}-183: 7\) regulatory [6] - \(7: 13\), 51:9, 52:3, 90:16, 92:10, 95:14 reiterate [1]-117:3 reiterated [2]-40:20, 41:2 reject [2]-212:21, 238:11 rejecting [1]-213:11 related [27]-5:2, 32:22, 38:11, 38:20, 45:4, 45:5, 45:6, 45:7, 46:7, 46:8, 46:10, 48:7, 48:20, 49:1, 49:3, 49:19, 50:8, 50:24, 54:12, 55:24, 95:20, 100:22, 123:4, 129:20, 173:6, 196:1, 237:24 relates [2]-124:15, 174:9 relating [4] - 32:6, 44:1, 238:7, 254:11 relation [8]-123:18, 124:14, 129:12, 131:5, 138:5, 139:8, 213:23, 249:23 relationship [2] - 30:21, 133:22 relative [2]-189:1, 189:21 release [2]-236:13, 236:14 releases [2] - 4:4, 196:25 releasing [1] - 247:14 relevance [1] - 6:10 relevant [9]-7:13, 62:17, 67:14, 184:5, 184:10, 188:6, 206:2, 244:3, 267:3 reliability \({ }_{[1]}\) - 124:15 reliable [1] - 123:12 reliance [1] - 120:21 relied [1]-40:15 relief [1] - 125:22 rely \({ }_{[2]}\) - 14:12, 181:20 remain [5]-34:14, 130:16, 155:11, 161:11, 197:24 remainder [3]- 117:19, 119:1, 202:3 remaining [10] -9:18, 29:1, 34:13, 38:17,``` | ```46:19, 65:20, 65:22, 84:12, 125:24, 270:11 remains [2]-123:13, 126:6 remarks [8] - 69:7, 76:5, 83:24, 84:24, 86:23, 87:1, 129:21, 231:8 Remediation [4] - 3:12, 110:3, 137:16, 195:14 remediation [1] - 58:9 remedied [1] - 58:3 remember [6] - 98:11, 99:13, 177:18, 249:9, 262:18 remind [1]-246:6 reminded [1] - 141:4 removal [1] - 152:6 remove [1] - 155:3 removed [2]-55:7, 69:17 removing [1] - 206:12 renegotiate [1] - 104:7 renegotiated [1] - 116:4 reopened [1]-69:23 reorder [2]-269:18, 269:19 repair [1] - 48:3 repeat [4]-92:19, 170:19, 196:9, 231:11 repeating [1]-123:4 repetitious [1] - 198:15 repetitive [4]-6:10, 67:13, 196:11, 240:13 rephrase [4]-95:8, 95:9, 160:22, 191:9 replace [5] - 23:7, 25:19, 38:17, 121:17, 136:11 replaced [1] - 33:10 replacing [1] - 133:15 Report [2] - 18:5, 90:7 report [20]-56:19, 56:20, 58:20, 58:22, 62:11, 63:12, 90:9, 157:23, 163:17, 164:3, 167:3, 168:2, 168:9, 189:5, 189:8, 192:2, 192:3, 193:5, 230:19 report's [1]-62:23 reported [3]-168:2, 168:8, 256:20 REPORTER [1] - 8:25``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| ```reporter [3]-3:15, 9:3, 195:18 Reporter/Notary [1] - 271:22 reporting [4]-55:20, 183:1, 183:11, 183:23 reports [6]-8:11, 8:13, 18:12, 56:25, 183:7, 203:25 Reports [2] - 18:8 reprehensible [1] - 230:22 represent \([7]\)-12:6, 61:3, 68:21, 81:6, 122:23, 141:15, 239:11 representation [1] - 107:23 representative [12] - 8:18, 74:1, 91:16, 140:3, 188:14, 192:8, 225:1, 228:16, 237:11, 246:2, 247:20, 254:8 representatives [3] - 140:25, 253:2, 259:21 represented [2] - 64:22, 127:2 representing \([4]\) - 200:1, 207:19, 218:1, 224:12 represents [4]-24:15, 59:7, 109:23, 119:10 reputation [1] - 200:17 request \([9]-10: 12\), 67:5, 67:6, 67:19, 68:23, 68:25, 70:25, 86:1, 86:3 requested [3]-71:1, 83:4, 204:11 requesting [3] - 4:3, 71:11, 196:24 requests [7]-25:18, 52:19, 117:13, 152:6, 207:9, 217:6, 238:7 require [8]-50:23, 82:22, 104:9, 117:2, 155:11, 207:4, 231:6, 233:22 required [8]-39:21, 42:8, 108:14, 125:16, 169:12, 207:4, 234:1 requirement [2] - 94:21, 113:24 requirements [13] -``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2:24, 19:11, 40:10, } \\ & \text { 40:12, 53:1, 53:19, } \\ & \text { 88:24, 88:15, 89:10, } \\ & \text { 115:15, 116:21, } \\ & \text { 116:23, 164:22 } \\ & \text { requires [4]-13:25, } \\ & \text { 123:20, 134:7, } \\ & \text { 256:14 } \\ & \text { requiring }[2]-26: 13, \\ & \text { 40:18 } \\ & \text { reroute }[1]-117: 8 \\ & \text { rescue }[1]-255: 12 \\ & \text { resent }[1]-262: 12 \\ & \text { resented }[1]-249: 11 \\ & \text { reserve }[3]-16: 13, \\ & 119: 1,205: 4 \\ & \text { reserved }[1]-154: 15 \\ & \text { residence }[1]-198: 9 \\ & \text { resident }[6]-205: 15, \\ & 209: 15,211: 4, \\ & 213: 16,213: 21, \\ & 238: 25 \\ & \text { Residential }[1]-27: 7 \\ & \text { residents }[6]-26: 12, \\ & 191: 21,211: 13, \\ & 257: 25,258: 7, \\ & 258: 25 \\ & \text { resides }[2]-17: 17, \\ & 17: 24 \\ & \text { residual }[3]-26: 21, \\ & 38: 4,121: 12 \\ & \text { residuals }[3]-33: 7, \\ & 33: 9,122: 9 \\ & \text { residue }[2]-27: 25, \\ & 117: 20 \\ & \text { residues }[1]-24: 7 \\ & \text { resistance }[1]- \\ & 229: 13 \\ & \text { resolve }[2]-84: 10, \\ & 212: 5 \\ & \text { resolved }[2]-133: 25, \\ & 193: 6 \\ & \text { Resource }[4]-118: 21, \\ & 126: 20,151: 15, \\ & 220: 17 \\ & \text { resource }[4]-17: 4, \\ & 40: 8,203: 3,212: 6 \\ & \text { resources }[1]-49: 11 \\ & \text { Resources }[2]- \\ & 178: 24,228: 18 \\ & \text { respet }[18]-7: 25, \\ & 8: 3,9: 7,10: 7,10: 11, \\ & 37: 20,43: 11,67: 6, \\ & 126: 15,184: 12, \\ & 184: 13,184: 14, \\ & 190: 14,195: 24, \\ & 208: 3,208: 10, \\ & 225: 6,250: 18 \\ & \text { respected }[2]-56: 21, \\ & 63: 9 \end{aligned}$ | ```respectful [1] - 206:24 respectfully \({ }_{[1]}\) - 207:9 respective [1] - 18:1 respond [4]-42:6, 141:9, 262:4, 265:25 Respond [1]-7:6 responding [6] - 9:4, 88:18, 101:5, 105:20, 166:4, 173:1 response [11] - 44:23, 51:16, 86:7, 92:8, 94:23, 116:13, 117:2, 123:9, 160:20, 201:19, 201:21 responses [4]-70:15, 97:9, 137:12, 190:13 responsibilities [6] - 18:1, 20:8, 42:22, 90:18, 196:12, 219:3 responsibility [10] - 21:20, 40:13, 108:18, 146:21, 207:24, 218:20, 222:5, 222:6, 222:9, 245:17 responsible [9] - 81:25, 90:11, 90:13, 146:17, 146:23, 210:18, 216:5, 218:8, 250:21 responsibly [1] - 48:4 rest [4]-16:10, 126:2, 202:5, 261:4 restated [1] - 127:4 restrictions [3] - 152:7, 155:3, 155:5 result [21]-2:20, 10:10, 20:3, 23:11, 28:11, 31:7, 33:5, 34:18, 37:21, 42:12, 47:24, 51:12, 69:23, 105:24, 120:19, 122:10, 123:22, 128:3, 145:13, 152:11, 195:6 resulting [2]-23:7, 24:9 results [5] - 52:5, 120:24, 221:15, 223:7, 223:9 resume [1] - 102:9 resuming [1]-270:9 retain [1]-155:18 return [2]-138:12, 182:14 returning [1] - 194:12 returns [1]-216:25 reuse [14]-40:23,``` |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| ```172:24, 174:19, 175:3, 175:8, 175:14, 175:18, 175:24, 176:6, 176:9, 176:12, 176:15, 176:18, 176:21, 177:1, 177:4, 177:15, 178:3, 178:15, 178:19, 178:21, 179:5, 179:7, 179:9, 179:17, 180:3, 180:8, 180:16, 180:22, 181:2, 181:6, 181:9, 181:12, 181:18, 181:23, 182:4, 182:9, 182:12, 182:19, 182:21, 182:25, 183:3, 183:5, 185:23, 186:22, 186:25, 187:6, 187:14, 189:5, 190:17, 193:21 Roche [18] - 54:12, 84:22, 141:17, 141:21, 145:7, 156:1, 156:18, 170:11, 173:2, 185:21, 186:1, 186:16, 187:7, 188:1, 188:17, 193:17, 204:12, 204:15 Roche's [3]-173:18, 190:5, 190:15 role [8]-122:24, 205:23, 232:11, 232:14, 239:20, 242:6, 243:8 roles [1] - 17:25 room [5] - 3:9, 5:18, 11:18, 11:21, 197:15 roughly [1] - 119:15 round [1] - 245:15 route [3] - 74:14, 97:4, 124:11 routine [1]-61:25 routing [1] - 97:5 rubbed [1]-218:3 rule [2]-8:6, 208:11 Rule [2] - 207:23, 208:1 Rules [8] - 3:3, 3:4, 3:24, 51:10, 87:19, 196:20, 208:10, 243:25 rules [16] - 23:22, 50:20, 51:12, 51:15,``` |  | ```Sargent [3]-200:1, 200:2, 200:3 satisfactory [1] - 233:7 satisfied [2] - 114:18, 114:20 satisfies [2]-88:24, 89:10 satisfy [2]-123:24, 130:11 save [5] - 19:17, 203:3, 205:6, 256:2, 256:3 saved [2] - 66:19, 85:19 Saving [1] - 260:15 saving [3] - 31:7, 49:10, 132:22 savings [1] - 132:16 saw [4]-21:12, 149:15, 223:23, 247:1 Sawyer [1]-54:7 scale [6] - 75:14, 80:13, 123:19, 124:22, 125:1, 260:19 scans [5] - 48:9, 61:25, 97:25, 98:8, 111:19 Scarborough [1] - 209:3 scarce [1] - 154:6 scenario [3] - 58:20, 61:7, 210:1 scenarios [2]-64:15, 65:24 schedule [3] - 5:17, 140:6, 140:11 scheduling [1] - 140:4 Schneiderman [1] - 238:20 school [1]-267:17 Schroeder [2] - 213:14, 216:7 SCHROEDER [1] - 216:9 science [8] - 17:2, 17:3, 19:24, 163:21, 189:21, 220:21, 223:20 Science [3] - 62:10, 189:7, 204:16 scientific [2]-163:25, 213:4 scientist [3]-213:5, 220:20, 222:24 scientists [2]-56:21, 63:9 scope [1] - 94:10``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { scraps }[1]-260: 20 \\ & \text { scratched }[1]-264: 7 \\ & \text { screen }[1]-63: 20 \\ & \text { seagulls }[1]-49: 18 \\ & \text { searching }[1]-213: 7 \\ & \text { season }[1]-182: 14 \\ & \text { seasonal }[2]-39: 7, \\ & 138: 16 \\ & \text { seat }[1]-221: 9 \\ & \text { seats }[1]-2: 7 \\ & \text { second }[26]-9: 7, \\ & 15: 9,26: 9,42: 3, \\ & 44: 1,44: 14,45: 5, \\ & 46: 7,53: 11,56: 7, \\ & 57: 25,60: 15,61: 22, \\ & 63: 24,64: 19,669, \\ & 67: 3,77: 3,77: 15, \\ & 118: 19,124: 14, \\ & 240: 25,242: 15, \\ & 260: 23,264: 3, \\ & 264: 14 \\ & \text { Second }[2]-9: 19, \\ & 229: 19 \\ & \text { secondary }[5]-37: 5, \\ & 58: 10,114: 22, \\ & 114: 23,115: 10 \\ & \text { secondly }[2]-34: 11, \\ & 202: 21 \\ & \text { seconds }[1]-233: 14 \\ & \text { section }[10]-22: 25, \\ & 41: 3,81: 6,88: 2, \\ & 93: 20,94: 6,99: 5, \\ & 171: 9,178: 8,229: 22 \\ & \text { Section }[13]-3: 1, \\ & 9: 10,40: 19,80: 17, \\ & 82: 8,87: 25,88: 6, \\ & 88: 20,89: 6,105: 22, \\ & 229: 4,229: 19, \\ & 230: 10 \\ & \text { sections }[1]-78: 17 \\ & \text { Sections }[3]-3: 3, \\ & 3: 23,196: 19 \\ & \text { sector }[5]-54: 6, \\ & 56: 24,63: 1,149: 13, \\ & 218: 15 \\ & \text { secure }[7]-32: 7, \\ & 125: 6,136: 14, \\ & 136: 22,136: 24, \\ & 138: 14,152: 24 \\ & \text { secured }[1]-136: 5 \\ & \text { securing }[2]-124: 17, \\ & 136: 10 \\ & \text { see }[36]-13: 21,25: 24, \\ & 46: 4,47: 6,47: 13, \\ & 49: 3,59: 12,59: 14, \\ & 59: 17,85: 21, \\ & 114: 25,134: 16, \\ & 135: 19,138: 18, \\ & 140: 14,147: 12, \\ & 150: 14,153: 4, \\ & \text { 15, } \end{aligned}$ | ```167:7, 178:6, 178:11, 186:12, 204:5, 211:5, 218:6, 220:23, 221:14, 221:15, 225:9, 249:15, 252:14, 265:11, 266:10, 268:22 seeing [6] - 37:14, 102:8, 112:17, 113:1, 135:19, 252:3 seek [3]-13:14, 14:10 seeking [2] - 8:17, 231:19 seeks [2] - 155:2, 236:13 seem [3] - 155:12, 252:19, 266:21 segregate [2]-75:12, 75:17 segregated \(\left.{ }^{2} 2\right]\) - 96:10, 253:4 selectman [3] - 224:21, 225:23, 250:22 self [2]-73:7, 83:20 self-imposed [2] - 73:7, 83:20 sell [3] - 30:3, 221:14, 248:1 selling [1] - 269:12 send [17]-9:24, 13:6, 13:17, 117:19, 168:23, 170:23, 171:2, 180:14, 180:20, 181:13, 188:18, 188:22, 191:24, 202:6, 221:6, 236:1, 257:9 sending [1] - 202:10 Senica [1] - 237:9 senior [3]-16:21, 31:18, 55:17 sense [14]-98:16, 123:24, 125:22, 203:7, 213:8, 215:24, 216:4, 219:19, 223:20, 241:5, 241:8, 258:10, 264:10, 264:11 sensitive [2] - 113:6, 113:8 sent [16] - 4:2, 14:1, 21:25, 22:4, 22:8, 27:19, 81:18, 196:23, 198:1, 201:23, 202:6, 203:8, 203:10, 222:12, 237:14,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |





| suited [1] - 136:18 | su |  | 104:14, 116:5, | 10:6, 10:7, 10:10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| sulfide [2]-47:20, | 78:14, 127:20, |  | 9:21, 120:8, | 11:9, 11:24, 11:25, |
| 112:1 | 1:2, 203:6 | table [28]-3:8, 6:7, | 121:21, 122:20, | 18:3, 20:4, 20:5, |
| sulfur ${ }_{[1]}$ - 52:8 | 15:15, 264:5 | 19, 32:18, 37:8 | 123:3, 123:7 | 21:5, 21:13, 23:18 |
| sum [3]-133:4, | supportive [3]-126:5, | 63:23, 63:24, 63:25, | 124:14, 124:24, | 28:13, 29:2, 29:18, |
| 259:13, 260:3 | 129:1, 206:5 | 4:19, 64:23, 97:24, | 26:24, 129:24, | 32:13, 32:19, 33 |
| summaries [1] - | supports [3]-39:16, | 98:3, 109:2, 109:14, | 130:4, 137:19, | 38:13, 38:14, 38:24, |
| 118:14 | 111:21, 128:3 | 18, 157:19, | 143:7, 153:17 | 39:9, 39:24, 43:6, |
| summarize [4] | supposed [7] - 144:5, | 158:1, 158:16, | 153:18, 153:19, | 43:7, 43:10, 44:4, |
| 32:23, 52:23, 126:2, | 185:25, 230:8, | 59:13, 161:24 | 163:24, 166:21, | 51:16, 51:18, 54:11, |
| 240:11 | 243:19, 248:18, | 2:4, 162:7 | 166:22, 206:10 | 55:25, 56:4, 67:9, |
| summarized [1] | 251:8, 266:17 | 162:15, 163:16, | terms [9]-87:19, | 68:8, 70:2, 70:24, |
| 41:11 | supposedly ${ }^{\text {[2] }}$ - | 164:17, 167:8, 197:15 | $\begin{aligned} & 96: 5,125: 15,127: 8, \\ & 129: 13,134: 6, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 73: 13,73: 20,73: 21, \\ & 76: 3,79: 9,79: 10, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { summarizes }[1] \text { - } \\ & 178: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 232:2, 266:18 } \\ \text { surely }[1]-204: 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 197:15 } \\ & \text { tables [2] }-34: 5,97: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 129:13, 134:6, } \\ & \text { 181:20, 237:22, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 76: 3,79: 9,79: 10, \\ & 81: 16,83: 3,84: 2, \end{aligned}$ |
| summarizing | surface $[7]-46: 20$ | tackle [1] - 260:19 | 238:1 | 84:4, 84:6, 84:22 |
| 67:8 | 48:8, 48:11, 61:25, | tail [1] - 60:8 | terrific [1]-153:3 | 86:23, 87:2, 89:17 |
| summary [8] - 16:4, | 98:8, 99:12, 248:22 | tailgates [1] - 225:18 | territory [1]-17:16 | 89:18, 95:23, |
| 68:8, 118:3, 140:23, | surrounding [2] | tailored [1] - 98:17 | test $[7]-98: 5,221: 15$, | 103:21, 111:12, |
| 141:3, 166:20, | 238:16, 259: | talks [2] - 93:21, | 223:7, 223:9, 246:3, | 114:3, 118:3, |
| 178:4, 194:16 | surveys [3] - 44:20, | 183:24 | 246:9, 246:11 | 118:15, 118:24, |
| summer [5]-39:12, | 48:5, 48:6 | $\operatorname{tax}_{[1]}-237: 4$ | testament [1] - 105:12 <br> tested [1]-251:6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 126:2, 127:10, } \\ & \text { 128:20, 129:3, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 138:19, 182:14, $211: 7,250: 3$ | survive ${ }_{[1]}-152: 24$ suspended ${ }_{[1]}$ - | taxes [1]-235:3 <br> taxpayers [1]-153:15 | tested [1] - 251:6 testified [5] - 79:3, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 128:20, 129:3, } \\ & \text { 131:7, 140:2, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 211:7, } 250: 3 \\ \text { sums }[1]-60: 25 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { suspended }[1] \text { - } \\ & 270: 17 \end{aligned}$ | taxpayers [1]-153:15 <br> teaching ${ }_{[1]}$ - 267:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { testified }[5]-79: 3, \\ & 129: 6,178: 5,246: 15 \end{aligned}$ | 140:23, 141:3, |
| sun [1] - 248:23 | sustain [1] - 184:6 | team [3]-218:11, | testifiers [1]-198:19 | 144:5, 144:6, 144:9, |
| Superior [1]-236:25 | sustainability [1] - | 269:2, 270:2 | testify [30]-11:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 144:13, 144:14, } \\ & \text { 144:15, 145:6, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { supplement }[1] \text { - } \\ & 148: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 212: 19 \\ \text { sustainin! } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { technical [9] - 32:20, } \\ 38: 10,43: 4,83: 11, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:21, 32:8, 141:6, } \\ & \text { 141:20, 173:18, } \end{aligned}$ | 145:8, 145:16, |
| supply [17] - 22:18, | $150: 19$ | $6: 22,127: 5$ | 177:15, 177:19, | 145:22, 146:4, |
| 28:7, 28:17, 120:12, | swamp [1] - 246:7 | 155:20, 230:4, 230:5 | 197:18, 197:23, | 146:5, 146:9, 148:3, |
| 153:1, 153:12, | swamps [1] - 246:5 | techniques [3]- | 8:7, 198:12, | 8:9, 149:8, |
| 153:17, 160:24, | swear [5] - 7:3, 11:18, | 49:23, 49:25, 50:17 | 198:13, 199:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 151:24, 152:2, } \\ & \text { 152:14, 155:24, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 161:4, 161:8, | 198:18, 261:18, | technologies [4]- | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 199:20, 199:22, } \\ & \text { 209:18, 243:20, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 152: 14,155: 24, \\ & 156: 1,156: 5,156: 9, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 165:24, 166:7, } \\ & \text { 166:9, 166:16, } \end{aligned}$ | $261: 22$ | $\begin{aligned} & 63: 2,63: 4,124: 20, \\ & 145: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 209:18, 243:20, } \\ & \text { 243:21, 243:22, } \end{aligned}$ | 156:13, 156:16, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 166: 9,166: 16, \\ & 166: 24,235: 8, \end{aligned}$ | swears [1]-187:11 <br> sweet ${ }_{[1]}$ - 238:25 | 145:3 | 244:10, 249:13, | 156:17, 156:19, |
| 255:13 | switched [2]-226:1, | $62: 10,189: 7,204: 16$ | 257:19, 261:14, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 157:8, 157:15, } \\ & \text { 157:19, 161:18, } \end{aligned}$ |
| support [40]-29:2, $56.9,80 \cdot 18,124: 18$, | 251:22 | technology [5] - | $\begin{aligned} & 61: 17,262: 12, \\ & 62: 13,267: 8, \end{aligned}$ | 162:18, 163:4, |
| 56:9, 80:18, 124:18, 126:8, 128:23, | sworn [8] - 6:14, 9:9, 11:19, 11:21, 141:4 | $\begin{aligned} & 50: 14,63: 8,248: 13, \\ & 248: 21,259: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { 267:12, } 271: 7$ | 163:12, 165:2, |
| 150:3, 151:18, | 141:6, 197:7, 271:7 | temperature | testifying [31] - 7:2, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 165:9, 165:19, } \\ & \text { 166:5, 166:20, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 154:2, 165:13, | symmetry [1] - 80:6 | 48:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 141:16, 160:12, } \\ & \text { 198:23, 199:16, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 166:5, 166:20, } \\ & \text { 167:19, 170:12, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 197:18, 200:3, } \\ & 201: 10,202: 7, \end{aligned}$ | synthetic [3]-46:13, | temperatures [1] | 205:12, 205:13, | 170:13, 170:21, |
| 202:22, 204:4, | $46: 15,61: 23$ system [18]-26:11 | $\begin{aligned} & 248: 22 \\ & \text { temporarv }[11-49 \end{aligned}$ | 07:14, 207:21, | 171:8, 171:11, |
| 204:24, 205:12, | system [18] - 26:11 $33: 18,35: 9,44: 1$ | $\text { ten }[18]-65: 5,65:$ | 208:4, 220:10, | 173:1, 173:5, 173:7, |
| 205:20, 207:5, | $45: 16,45: 18,47: 2$ | $68: 11,68: 12,68: 15,$ | 220:11, 224:9, | 173:9, 173:11, |
| 209:12, 209:18, | 47:18, 47:22, 57:18, | $74: 14,86: 15,86: 20,$ | 224:10, 228:7, | :16, 173:22, $: 25,116: 2$ |
| 209:20, 210:21, | 62:2, 65:3, 65:10, | 128:16, 128:17, | $\begin{aligned} & 228: 8,234: 7,234: 8, \\ & 235: 18,235: 19, \end{aligned}$ | 177:16, 177:21, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 210:25, 214:1, } \\ & \text { 214:2, 219:14, } \end{aligned}$ | 113:24, 182:23, | $128: 18,157: 2$ | $238: 22,238: 23,$ | 179:22, 180:4, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 214:2, 219:14, } \\ & \text { 220:2, 220:11, } \end{aligned}$ | 183:22, 204:23, | 189:9, 213:6, | 239:8, 239:9, 244:1, | 183:14, 183:16, |
| 222:11, 224:9, |  |  | 261:15, 261:22, | 183:25, 184:5, |
| 228:4, 228:9, 234:7, | systems [4] | tends [1] - 138:20 | 61:23, 265:16, | 184:13, 185:3, |
| 235:20, 238:22, | $58: 8,58: 11,154: 10$ | tens [1]-245:21 | $267: 13,270: 7$ | 35:4, 185:22, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 239:1, 261:12, } \\ & 267 \cdot 13 \end{aligned}$ | Systems [4] - 19:19, | term [31] - 37:14, | testimony [207] - 2:23, 4:23, 4:24, 5:2, 5:4, | 186:5, 186:6, 186:9, |
| supported [4] - | 55:18, 236:18, 237:1 | 87:20, 87:21, | $5: 25,6: 21,7: 3,7: 13$ | 186:11, 186:14, |
| 153:15, 206:6, 220:5 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 88: 11,88: 14,89: 3 \\ & 89: 14,93: 18, \end{aligned}$ | 7:15, 9:10, 9:14, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 186:15, 186:20, } \\ & \text { 186:21, 186:24, } \end{aligned}$ |





| 158:6, 160:2, | 230:16, 230:18, | 177:24, 195:15, | weird [1] - 232:7 | 258:25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 160:24, 161:4, | 230:24, 231:14, | 195:16, 220:23, | welcome [1] - 215:20 | winter [2]-182:15, |
| 161:8, 162:25, | 231:16, 231:21, | 228:21, 236:17, | welfare [5]-239:21, | 235: |
| 163:1, 163:2, 163:8, | 232:3, 232:11, | 236:23, 237:1, | 240:6, 242:7, | wintertime [1] - 169:3 |
| 165:5, 165:8, 166:7, | 232:12, 232:13, | 237:5, 257:19, $268: 9$ | 242:12, 243:13 | wires [1] - 49:24 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 166:16, 167:20, } \\ & \text { 167:21, 167:22, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 232:15, 232:25, } \\ & \text { 233:3, 233:10, } \end{aligned}$ | Waste's [1] - 107:22 | well-paying [1] $201 \cdot 1$ | wish [11]-106:14, 106:19, 132:13, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 167:21, 167:22, } \\ & \text { 168:14, 168:23, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 233:3, 233:10, } \\ & \text { 233:12, 233:24, } \end{aligned}$ | waste-related [1] - $45: 7$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 201:1 } \\ & \text { well-re } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 106:19, 132:13, } \\ & \text { 133:9, 135:18, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 169:12, 169:17, | 234:4, 236:1, | waste-to-energ | $56: 21,63: 9$ | 156:4, 192:14 |
| 172:5, 172:7, | 77:14, 237:18, | 152:21, 155:1, | wellbeing [2]-214:16, | 2:16, 197:20, |
| 172:15, 172:18, | 237:19, 237:20, | 173:23, 185:6 | 258:10 | 236:5, 267:11 |
| 173:14, 173:23, | 237:21, 238:12 | 185:16, 189:9 | wellihead [1] - 47: | wishes [5]-6:16 |
| 175:9, 175:19, | 239:18, 240:1, | 0:2, 190:18, | wells [3]-246:3, | 148:20, 197:10 |
| 177:17, 179:3, | 240:3, 240:10, | 191:19, 193:24, | 246:9, 246:12 | 233:2, 261:14 |
| 179:25, 180:6, | 240:20, 241:3, | 194:4, 203:24, | West [3]-211:3, | wishing [2]-261:17, |
| 180:9, 180:14, | 241:14, 241:18, | 204:10, 204:13 | 216:14, 219:17 | 267:8 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 180:20, 180:23, } \\ & \text { 181:13, 181:14, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 242:6, 242:11, } \\ & \text { 242:16. 242:19 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 231: 14,233: 3, \\ & 237 \cdot 19 \text { 240.3 } \end{aligned}$ | Westbrook [32]-31:9, | withdraw [6] - 9:8, |
| 181:19, 182:13, | 243:9, 245:19, | wasteful [1]-154:14 | $\begin{aligned} & 72: 15,74: 9,74: 1 \\ & 74: 13,74: 18,74: \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 9,9: 12,10 \\ & 91: 13,181: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| 182:14, 185:1, | 246:11, 246:22, | wastes [3]-45:16, | 4:21, 75:1, 75:7, | withdrawal [5] - 10:9, |
| 185:6, 185:16, | 247:6, 248:6, 251:7, | 74:4, 260:20 | :1, 96:6, 96:13 | 10:12, 10:13, 181:13 |
| 188:18, 189:8, | 251:23, 252:4, | wastewater [1] | :15, 96:18, 97:6, | withdrawing [1] - 9:15 |
| 189:9, 190:2, | 13 | 15:13 | 04:4, 105:11, | withdrawn [1] - 10:6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 190:18, 190:20, } \\ & \text { 191:5, 191:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 252:12, 252:13, } \\ & \text { 252:16, 252:20, } \end{aligned}$ | watch [3]-228:11, 234:23, 266:15 | 107:23, 117:5, | within-named ${ }_{[1]}$ - |
| 191:10, 191:16, | 253:1, 253:4, 253:8, | watched [4]-213:24 | $\begin{aligned} & 17: 11,129: 7, \\ & \text { 29:12, 204:5, } \end{aligned}$ | 271:7 <br> witness [10]-9:16, |
| 191:19, 191:23, | 253:13, 253:15, | 244:25, 263:2, | 10:11, 210:13, | 16:17, 19:17, 31:16, |
| 191:25, 193:15, | 253:17, 253:21 | 264:11 | 233:25, 252:16, | $42: 14,53: 25,55: 16$ |
| 193:20, 193:24, | 253:23, 254:3, | Water [1] - 18:7 | 252:21, 252:25, | 141:17, 207:21, |
| 194:1, 194:3, 194:4, | 254:4, 254:5, | water [1] - 259:8 | 253:3, 258:3 | 207:25 |
| 195:5, 201:2, 201:5, 201:24, 202.2, | 254:13, 256:14, | Waterboro [1]-209:2 | WHEREOF ${ }_{[1]}$ | WITNESS [1] - 271:17 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 201:24, 202:2 } \\ & \text { 202:7, 202:1 } \end{aligned}$ |  | waters [1]-245:14 | 271:1 | witnesses [14]-5:7, |
| 202:14, 202:16, | $256: 21,257: 3,$ | wave [1] - 263:8 | white [1] - 241:12 | 6:5, 6:13, 7:6, 16:11, |
| 202:22, 202:24, | $\begin{aligned} & 256: 21,25 /: 3, \\ & 257: 20,258: 6, \end{aligned}$ | Wayne [1] - 262:9 | whitewater [1] | 67:21, 118:14, |
| 203:1, 203:2, 203:3, | 258:11, 258:12, | ways [4]-103:22 | whole [7]-7:4, 75:20 | 86:7, 106:11, |
| 203:7, 203:8, | 258:13, 258:15, | 243:23 | 198:25, 238:16, | 186:13, 197:7, 271:7 |
| 203:10, 203:12, | 258:16, 258:18, | wearing [1]-254:25 | $262: 3,265: 14,271: 8$ | Witnesses [3] - 141:9, |
| 203:16, 203:24, | $258: 21,259: 13$ $259: 20,260: 2$ | weather [2]-45:12, | wholeheartedly [1] - | 199:2, 262:4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 204:7, 204:9, } \\ & \text { 204:10, 204:13, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 259: 20,260: 2, \\ & 260: 7,260: 10 \end{aligned}$ | 45:20 | 172:5 | woes [1] - 236:12 |
| 204:17, 204:20, | 60:17, 260:2 | webb [1] - 97:11 | whopping [1] - 229:16 | women [1]-256:4 |
| 204:24, 205:5, | $260: 21,260: 24$ | Webb [1] - 55:17 | wide [7]-28:7, $28: 22$, | wonder [1]-214:8 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 204: 24, \angle 05: 5, \\ & 205: 7,205: 21, \end{aligned}$ | $260: 25,261: 2,$ | WEBB [5]-56:2, 56:4, | 55:19, 63:1, 123:6, | wondering [2]-32:16, |
| 207:3, 207:6, 207:7, | 261:5, 261:7, 265:1, | 109:7, 109:22, | 65:5, 259:3 | 217:10 |
| 210:5, 210:8, | 266:5, 267:15, | 113:20 <br> website [1] - 205:25 | wild [1]-225:6 | wood [9]-247:3, 251:5, 251:23, |
| 212:16, 212:21, | 268:2, 268:15, | website [1] - 205:25 <br> Wednesday [1] - 6:24 | wild [1] - 225:6 <br> willing [1] - 84:15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 251:5, 251:23, } \\ & \text { 255:6, 255:7, 255:8, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 213:2, 213:22, 214:1, 214:3, | 269:4, 269:5 <br> WASTE [1]-1.9 | Wednesday [1]-6:24 <br> week [7]-116:10, | $\operatorname{win}_{[2]}-210: 1$ | $255: 10,255: 14,$ |
| 214:1, 214:3, 214:23, 215:2 | WASTE [1]-1:9 <br> Waste [46]-2:25, 3:1, | 167:16, 226:4, | win-win [1]-210:1 | 256:4 |
| 215:22, 216:5, | Waste [46]-2:25, 3:1, 3:3, 3:12, 3:13, 4:15, | 239:15, 268:5, | wind [6] - 44:7, 49:6, | Woods [1] - 245:1 |
| 216:17, 217:13, | $13: 25,15: 1,16: 6$ | 268:6, 268:22 | 49:8, 50:6, 50:10, | woods [1]-245:4 |
| 217:21, 218:7, | 19:19, 20:2, 23:25, | weeks [1]-217:5 | 53:13 | word [4]-145:22, |
| 218:14, 218:21, | 28:2, 42:18, 51:10, | weigh [3]-207:10 | wind-blown [6]-44:7, | 172:12, 172:13, |
| 219:4, 219:16, | 55:18, 58:24, 71:23, | 231:3, 257:17 | 49:6, 49:8, $50: 6$, | 174:10 |
| 219:24, 221:1, | 72:22, 87:18, 87:20, | weighed [1] - 206:9 | $50: 10,53: 13$ | words [5]-29:15, |
| 221:11, 222:5, $224: 16,226: 17$ | $87: 24,88: 10,88: 11$ | weighs [1] - 203:18 weight [2]-114:7, | windfall [1] - 13:23 <br> Windham [1] - 209:4 | 73:23, 94:11, 214:11, 249:16 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 224:16, 226:17, } \\ & \text { 227:23, 229:8, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 88:14, 88:25, 89:7, } \\ & \text { 89:11, 90:6, 137:16, } \end{aligned}$ | 164:14 | windows [1]-211:7 | wore [1] - 221:21 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 229:14, 229:24, } \\ & \text { 229:25, 230:5, } \end{aligned}$ | 151:9, 169:21, $169 \cdot 25 \quad 177 \cdot 8$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { weighted }[3]-36: 24, \\ & 37: 2,59: 18 \end{aligned}$ | winner [1]-259:10 <br> winners [2]-258:24, | $\begin{gathered} \text { works [5] - 118:18, } \\ \text { 119:8, 233:8, } \end{gathered}$ |



