			274
	272	1	This is day two of the hearing. Today we will begin
	1 STATE OF MAINE	2	with the summary testimony of PERC. We plan to break
	2 DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	3	at approximately 12:00 for lunch and we'll make a
	3	4	determination as to how far we get before we break
	4	5	for lunch as we move into the morning session.
	5	6	If there are any members of the public here
	6 * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	7	
	7 IN RE: STATE OF MAINE BUREAU OF GENERAL SERVICES AND NEWSME LANDFILL OPERATIONS, LLC		today that would like to ask questions of the
	8 JUNIPER RIDGE LANDFILL 8 AMENDMENT APPLICATION TO ACCEPT MUNICIPAL	8	witnesses, you must submit your questions to me in
	9 SOLID WASTE FROM MAINE SOURCES Old Town, PENOBSCOT COUNTY, MAINE	9	writing. Paper can be made available to you and you
	10 #S-020700-WD-N-A	10	would present those pieces of paper to me and I will
	11 * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	11	review those questions and make a determination as to
	12	12	their relevance and that they are not repetitive and
	13 PUBLIC HEARING	13	I may ask those questions as time permits.
	14	14	At this time I would ask everybody who has
	15 HEARING OFFICER: HEATHER PARENT	15	cellular telephones and other electronic devices to
	16 17	16	make sure that the sound is off from those devices.
	18	17	At this time I ask that all persons
	This hearing was held pursuant to Notice at	18	testifying who have not already been sworn in stand
	the Governor Hill Mansion, 136 State Street, 20	19	and raise your right hand. Do you affirm that the
	Augusta, Maine, on April 10, 2013, beginning at 21	20	
	9:00 a.m. 22	20	testimony you are about to give is the whole truth
	23		and nothing but the truth?
	24	22	(Witnesses respond in the affirmative.)
	25	23	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any
		24	questions before we begin? All right, so we will
		25	begin with the summary testimony by PERC. You will
	273		275
1	(This hearing was held before Heather	1	have 15 minutes to present your summary testimony.
2	Parent, Hearing Officer, at the Governor Hill	2	MR. MAHONEY: Good morning, Madam Hearing
3	Mansion, 136 State Street, Augusta, Maine, on April	3	Officer, Members of the Panel. Welcome back. In
4	10, 2013, beginning at 9:00 a.m.)	4	some ways I feel like I never left. My name is Mike
5	* * * * *	5	Mahoney. I'm an attorney with Federle and Mahoney
6	HEARING OFFICER: Good morning. I now call	6	here in Augusta and we are here today on behalf of
7	to order this hearing of the Department of	7	Penobscot Energy Recovery Company, better known as
8	Environmental Protection on the application from the	8	PERC. With me this morning is Kevin Nordby from
9	State of Maine Bureau of General Services prepared	9	PERC, and per the Hearing Officer's instructions, Mr.
10	and submitted by its operator and agent NEWSME	10	Nordby will be providing a summary of his pre-filed
11	Landfill Operations, LLC, to Amend Department Order	11	testimony and certainly will be available for cross
		12	
12 12	S-20700-WC-N-A in order to accept municipal solid		examination. So with that, I introduce Mr. Nordby.
13	waste from sources within the state of Maine at the	13	Thank you.
14	Juniper Ridge Landfill as a result of the closure of	14	MR. NORDBY: Good morning. My name is Kevin
15	the MERC energy facility in Biddeford. My name is	15	Nordby and I think, first of all, I'd like to
16	Heather Parent. I am the policy director of the	16	apologize for the snow that's headed your way from
17	Department of Environmental Protection and I will be	17	snowy Minnesota when I left it last night. As I
18	the presiding officer at this hearing. Other persons	18	said, my name is Kevin Nordby. I'm president of PERC
19	present with me today are Nancy Macirowski, Assistant	19	Holdings, one of the private partners in the PERC
20	Attorney General and counsel to the Department;	20	project. I've been involved with the project since
21	Melanie Loyzim, the director of the Bureau of	21	the year 2000 excuse me I've got a background
22	Remediation and Waste Management; Paula Clark, the	22	in the solid waste industry for approximately 30
23	Director of the Division of Solid Waste Management;	23	years. I've operated companies on several levels,
24	and DEP staff Cyndi Darling and Michael Parker. Our	24	recycling facilities, waste-to-energy, medical waste
25	court reporter is Joanne Alley of Alley & Morrisette.	25	incineration, solid waste collection, et cetera.

	276		278
1	PERC is a combination of two private	1	stated 30,000 tons per year should the pending
2	partners and the MRC which includes 187 Maine	2	application be approved. This reduction will also
3	communities. As I said, we've been involved with	3	result in decreased truck traffic in and around the
4	that since 2000. PERC, as you hopefully know, is a	4	Juniper Ridge Landfill. In addition, the
5	waste-to-energy facility in Orrington, Maine. We	5	Casella/PERC agreement is consistent with Maine's
6	produce approximately 25 megawatts of renewable power	6	solid waste hierarchy which, among other things,
7	and process approximately 300,000 tons of solid waste	7	favors recycling and waste incineration over
8	annually. We've worked with the MRC and the partners	8	landfilling.
9	to try to provide the most environmentally	9	First, the agreement redirects at least
10	responsible waste disposal services to our members.	10	30,000 tons of municipal solid waste to PERC that
11	We believe our unique ownership structure of PERC	11	would have otherwise been landfilled at Juniper
12	including a substantial financial investment by the	12	Ridge, again, assuming the pending application is
13	towns ensures a high degree of cooperation toward our	13	approved; second, the agreement contains a rather
14	shared objectives. Maintaining stable costs and	14	unique recycling section which provides for a robust
15	reliable service is dependent on both the	15	recycling opportunity to our communities within the
16	application, state and local waste management	16	MRC. For every time that the communities recycle
17	policies and ongoing reasonably priced disposal of	17	through the through a Casella facility at current
18	waste-to-energy facility residual residue rather.	18	levels, Casella will backfill an equal number of tons
19	To get to the agreement, I'd like to clarify	19	of municipal solid waste to PERC. This keeps PERC
20	in my testimony one part, Section 5. We entered an	20	operating at or near capacity and at the same time
21	agreement with Casella Waste Systems as part of a	21	allows the MRC communities to aggressively pursue
22	consolidation of existing agreements. Part of that	22	recycling without fear of falling below the minimum
23	agreement was to provide for the delivery of 30,000	23	solid waste tonnage thresholds that they have under
24	tons of in-state waste. In that agreement it's a	24	the PERC contract.
25	larger picture agreement. In that agreement, Casella	25	That concludes my initial testimony. Just
	277		279
1	had committed to up to 100,000 tons of municipal	1	to go on to the rebuttal testimony, I just wanted to
2	solid waste per year to PERC from various sources, a	2	address some of the issues that came up. I'm
3	substantial portion which would originate from	3	submitting the following testimony for two issues;
4	in-state sources. Specifically, of the 100,000 tons,	4	first, I'd like to clear up the apparent
5	at least 30,000 will be in-state municipal solid	5	misunderstanding that was expressed by the Sanborns
6	waste that was formerly going to the MERC facility in	6	in their direct testimony regarding the PERC/Casella
7	Biddeford, which closed in December 2012.	7	agreement. Specifically the Sanborns assert that the
8	We believe the infusion of this new	8	agreement will somehow result in additional
9	municipal solid waste to PERC is beneficial in	9	out-of-state waste being delivered to PERC; second,
10	multiple respects. First, it provides PERC with a	10	I'd like to respond to the claim by multiple
11	waste stream sufficient to allow us to operate at or	11	intervenors, ecomaine, MMWAC and Mr. Spencer, that
12	near capacity on a year-round basis; second, the	12	Maine's solid waste hierarchy somehow mandates MSW
13	30,000 tons in the in-state municipal solid waste	13	previously delivered to MERC should now be utilized
14	will allow PERC to displace a portion of the	14	to keep incinerators at capacity before being allowed
15	out-of-state municipal waste that we are receiving;	15	to go to JRL. The Sanborns' assertion regarding the
16	finally, the 30,000 tons of in-state municipal solid	16	apparent regarding the agreement is false.
17	waste will have a large financial impact on the	17	Beginning in 2001 pursuant to a separate contract
18	operations of PERC.	18	between PERC and Casella, a total of 17,500
19	As I said, there's three partners. The main	19	out-of-state waste tons were delivered to PERC by
20	the main reason for that was by displacing the	20	Casella on an annual basis, that tonnage category 4
21	lower-priced out-of-state waste, it helps it helps	21	MSW in the agreement. In reference to the agreement,
22	the project perform at a higher level. More broadly,	22	this tonnage is merely a recognition of the ongoing
23	the Casella/PERC agreement will reduce the amount of	23	obligation of Casella to PERC.
24	solid waste municipal solid waste that would be	24	In order to maintain full capacity and honor
25	disposed of at Juniper Ridge Landfill by at least the	25	our electrical output obligations PERC has been
1		1	

	280	1	282
1	forced to import out-of-state MSW for incineration.	1	MR. BOWER: Thank you. Again, my name is
2	In the past year, PERC has contracted with various	2	Mark Bower. I'm an attorney from the law firm of
3	entities to supply this waste. Under the agreement,	3	Jensen, Baird, Gardner and Henry, and I represent
4	Casella agreed to make commercially reasonable	4	ecomaine and MMWAC in this matter. Good morning, Mr.
5	efforts to deliver an additional 32,500 tons of	5	Nordby.
6	out-of-state waste to PERC. That tonnage from	6	MR. NORDBY: Good morning.
7	Casella, called category 5 MSW, would displace the	7	MR. BOWER: I just have a few questions
8	other out-of-state waste that PERC already brings	8	about the disposal agreement. I assume from your
9	into Maine in order to keep its operations at full	9	testimony that you're familiar with that agreement?
10	capacity. In no way does this result in more	10	MR. NORDBY: I am.
11	out-of-state waste being delivered to PERC than was	11	MR. BOWER: Although you were not a
12	delivered absent the agreement. It is nothing more	12	signatory, you didn't sign the agreement, but you are
13	than swapping one source of out-of-state waste for	13	familiar with the terms and conditions of it?
14	another.	14	MR. NORDBY: Yes, I am.
15	The assertion of Maine's solid waste	15	MR. BOWER: Isn't it true that under Section
16	hierarchy is likewise misguided. Since its	16	7.4 of that agreement PERC is obligated to publicly
17	inception, PERC has operated with the understanding	17	support Casella's the applicant's pending
18	that municipalities and other MSW generators are free	18	application?
19	to choose between the incinerators and the landfills	19	MR. NORDBY: Is that a term of the contract?
		20	MR. BOWER: Yes.
20	to meet their specific disposal needs. The hierarchy		
21	does not and should not automatically entitle	21	MR. NORDBY: Yes.
22	incinerators, including PERC, to receive available	22	MR. BOWER: And under that Section 7.4 it
23	MSW over landfills. If that were the case, landfills	23	provides "such reasonable public support shall
24	across Maine would now lawfully accept raw that	24	include without limitation the attendance at and
25	now lawfully accept raw MSW would be barred from	25	support of such expansion efforts at as many public
	201		000
	281		283
1	doing so and Maine's incinerators could charge	1	hearings as the representatives of PERC can
2	doing so and Maine's incinerators could charge municipalities and other waste suppliers any price of	2	hearings as the representatives of PERC can reasonably attend and the delivery of a reasonable
2 3	doing so and Maine's incinerators could charge municipalities and other waste suppliers any price of their choosing; rather, the hierarchy recognizes that	2 3	hearings as the representatives of PERC can reasonably attend and the delivery of a reasonable number of supportive communications with legislators,
2 3 4	doing so and Maine's incinerators could charge municipalities and other waste suppliers any price of their choosing; rather, the hierarchy recognizes that PERC and the other incinerators must compete in a	2 3 4	hearings as the representatives of PERC can reasonably attend and the delivery of a reasonable number of supportive communications with legislators, the Commissioner of the Maine Department of
2 3 4 5	doing so and Maine's incinerators could charge municipalities and other waste suppliers any price of their choosing; rather, the hierarchy recognizes that PERC and the other incinerators must compete in a marketplace in order to secure adequate supplies of	2 3 4 5	hearings as the representatives of PERC can reasonably attend and the delivery of a reasonable number of supportive communications with legislators, the Commissioner of the Maine Department of Environmental Protection, the staff of the Governor
2 3 4 5 6	doing so and Maine's incinerators could charge municipalities and other waste suppliers any price of their choosing; rather, the hierarchy recognizes that PERC and the other incinerators must compete in a marketplace in order to secure adequate supplies of MSW. The present case is a good example that	2 3 4 5 6	hearings as the representatives of PERC can reasonably attend and the delivery of a reasonable number of supportive communications with legislators, the Commissioner of the Maine Department of Environmental Protection, the staff of the Governor of Maine and with officials and administrative bodies
2 3 4 5 6 7	doing so and Maine's incinerators could charge municipalities and other waste suppliers any price of their choosing; rather, the hierarchy recognizes that PERC and the other incinerators must compete in a marketplace in order to secure adequate supplies of MSW. The present case is a good example that incinerators can still ably compete.	2 3 4 5 6 7	hearings as the representatives of PERC can reasonably attend and the delivery of a reasonable number of supportive communications with legislators, the Commissioner of the Maine Department of Environmental Protection, the staff of the Governor of Maine and with officials and administrative bodies of the relevant localities." Is your testimony today
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	doing so and Maine's incinerators could charge municipalities and other waste suppliers any price of their choosing; rather, the hierarchy recognizes that PERC and the other incinerators must compete in a marketplace in order to secure adequate supplies of MSW. The present case is a good example that incinerators can still ably compete. PERC recognized early on that the closing of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	hearings as the representatives of PERC can reasonably attend and the delivery of a reasonable number of supportive communications with legislators, the Commissioner of the Maine Department of Environmental Protection, the staff of the Governor of Maine and with officials and administrative bodies of the relevant localities." Is your testimony today consistent with that section?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	doing so and Maine's incinerators could charge municipalities and other waste suppliers any price of their choosing; rather, the hierarchy recognizes that PERC and the other incinerators must compete in a marketplace in order to secure adequate supplies of MSW. The present case is a good example that incinerators can still ably compete. PERC recognized early on that the closing of MERC presented an opportunity to secure additional	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	hearings as the representatives of PERC can reasonably attend and the delivery of a reasonable number of supportive communications with legislators, the Commissioner of the Maine Department of Environmental Protection, the staff of the Governor of Maine and with officials and administrative bodies of the relevant localities." Is your testimony today consistent with that section? MR. NORDBY: Yes, it is.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	doing so and Maine's incinerators could charge municipalities and other waste suppliers any price of their choosing; rather, the hierarchy recognizes that PERC and the other incinerators must compete in a marketplace in order to secure adequate supplies of MSW. The present case is a good example that incinerators can still ably compete. PERC recognized early on that the closing of MERC presented an opportunity to secure additional in-state MSW for our needs. We then entered into	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	hearings as the representatives of PERC can reasonably attend and the delivery of a reasonable number of supportive communications with legislators, the Commissioner of the Maine Department of Environmental Protection, the staff of the Governor of Maine and with officials and administrative bodies of the relevant localities." Is your testimony today consistent with that section? MR. NORDBY: Yes, it is. MR. BOWER: And turning to your direct
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	doing so and Maine's incinerators could charge municipalities and other waste suppliers any price of their choosing; rather, the hierarchy recognizes that PERC and the other incinerators must compete in a marketplace in order to secure adequate supplies of MSW. The present case is a good example that incinerators can still ably compete. PERC recognized early on that the closing of MERC presented an opportunity to secure additional in-state MSW for our needs. We then entered into negotiations with Casella and successfully secured a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	hearings as the representatives of PERC can reasonably attend and the delivery of a reasonable number of supportive communications with legislators, the Commissioner of the Maine Department of Environmental Protection, the staff of the Governor of Maine and with officials and administrative bodies of the relevant localities." Is your testimony today consistent with that section? MR. NORDBY: Yes, it is. MR. BOWER: And turning to your direct testimony, on page 3, I think it was in Section 5
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	doing so and Maine's incinerators could charge municipalities and other waste suppliers any price of their choosing; rather, the hierarchy recognizes that PERC and the other incinerators must compete in a marketplace in order to secure adequate supplies of MSW. The present case is a good example that incinerators can still ably compete. PERC recognized early on that the closing of MERC presented an opportunity to secure additional in-state MSW for our needs. We then entered into negotiations with Casella and successfully secured a position for more MSW to go to our facility. Maine's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	hearings as the representatives of PERC can reasonably attend and the delivery of a reasonable number of supportive communications with legislators, the Commissioner of the Maine Department of Environmental Protection, the staff of the Governor of Maine and with officials and administrative bodies of the relevant localities." Is your testimony today consistent with that section? MR. NORDBY: Yes, it is. MR. BOWER: And turning to your direct testimony, on page 3, I think it was in Section 5 that you referenced earlier, you state, quote, "the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	doing so and Maine's incinerators could charge municipalities and other waste suppliers any price of their choosing; rather, the hierarchy recognizes that PERC and the other incinerators must compete in a marketplace in order to secure adequate supplies of MSW. The present case is a good example that incinerators can still ably compete. PERC recognized early on that the closing of MERC presented an opportunity to secure additional in-state MSW for our needs. We then entered into negotiations with Casella and successfully secured a position for more MSW to go to our facility. Maine's other incinerators have throughout the last few	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	hearings as the representatives of PERC can reasonably attend and the delivery of a reasonable number of supportive communications with legislators, the Commissioner of the Maine Department of Environmental Protection, the staff of the Governor of Maine and with officials and administrative bodies of the relevant localities." Is your testimony today consistent with that section? MR. NORDBY: Yes, it is. MR. BOWER: And turning to your direct testimony, on page 3, I think it was in Section 5 that you referenced earlier, you state, quote, "the agreement will become effective only if the pending
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	doing so and Maine's incinerators could charge municipalities and other waste suppliers any price of their choosing; rather, the hierarchy recognizes that PERC and the other incinerators must compete in a marketplace in order to secure adequate supplies of MSW. The present case is a good example that incinerators can still ably compete. PERC recognized early on that the closing of MERC presented an opportunity to secure additional in-state MSW for our needs. We then entered into negotiations with Casella and successfully secured a position for more MSW to go to our facility. Maine's other incinerators have throughout the last few months been free to do the same. Not quite 15	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	hearings as the representatives of PERC can reasonably attend and the delivery of a reasonable number of supportive communications with legislators, the Commissioner of the Maine Department of Environmental Protection, the staff of the Governor of Maine and with officials and administrative bodies of the relevant localities." Is your testimony today consistent with that section? MR. NORDBY: Yes, it is. MR. BOWER: And turning to your direct testimony, on page 3, I think it was in Section 5 that you referenced earlier, you state, quote, "the agreement will become effective only if the pending application to allow municipal solid waste at Juniper
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	doing so and Maine's incinerators could charge municipalities and other waste suppliers any price of their choosing; rather, the hierarchy recognizes that PERC and the other incinerators must compete in a marketplace in order to secure adequate supplies of MSW. The present case is a good example that incinerators can still ably compete. PERC recognized early on that the closing of MERC presented an opportunity to secure additional in-state MSW for our needs. We then entered into negotiations with Casella and successfully secured a position for more MSW to go to our facility. Maine's other incinerators have throughout the last few months been free to do the same. Not quite 15 minutes but that's my testimony as submitted.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	hearings as the representatives of PERC can reasonably attend and the delivery of a reasonable number of supportive communications with legislators, the Commissioner of the Maine Department of Environmental Protection, the staff of the Governor of Maine and with officials and administrative bodies of the relevant localities." Is your testimony today consistent with that section? MR. NORDBY: Yes, it is. MR. BOWER: And turning to your direct testimony, on page 3, I think it was in Section 5 that you referenced earlier, you state, quote, "the agreement will become effective only if the pending application to allow municipal solid waste at Juniper Ridge Landfill is approved." Isn't it true that only
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	doing so and Maine's incinerators could charge municipalities and other waste suppliers any price of their choosing; rather, the hierarchy recognizes that PERC and the other incinerators must compete in a marketplace in order to secure adequate supplies of MSW. The present case is a good example that incinerators can still ably compete. PERC recognized early on that the closing of MERC presented an opportunity to secure additional in-state MSW for our needs. We then entered into negotiations with Casella and successfully secured a position for more MSW to go to our facility. Maine's other incinerators have throughout the last few months been free to do the same. Not quite 15 minutes but that's my testimony as submitted. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Nordby.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	hearings as the representatives of PERC can reasonably attend and the delivery of a reasonable number of supportive communications with legislators, the Commissioner of the Maine Department of Environmental Protection, the staff of the Governor of Maine and with officials and administrative bodies of the relevant localities." Is your testimony today consistent with that section? MR. NORDBY: Yes, it is. MR. BOWER: And turning to your direct testimony, on page 3, I think it was in Section 5 that you referenced earlier, you state, quote, "the agreement will become effective only if the pending application to allow municipal solid waste at Juniper Ridge Landfill is approved." Isn't it true that only Section 3.1(c), which provides the 30,000 tons of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	doing so and Maine's incinerators could charge municipalities and other waste suppliers any price of their choosing; rather, the hierarchy recognizes that PERC and the other incinerators must compete in a marketplace in order to secure adequate supplies of MSW. The present case is a good example that incinerators can still ably compete. PERC recognized early on that the closing of MERC presented an opportunity to secure additional in-state MSW for our needs. We then entered into negotiations with Casella and successfully secured a position for more MSW to go to our facility. Maine's other incinerators have throughout the last few months been free to do the same. Not quite 15 minutes but that's my testimony as submitted. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Nordby. We'll move on to cross examination of PERC and first	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	hearings as the representatives of PERC can reasonably attend and the delivery of a reasonable number of supportive communications with legislators, the Commissioner of the Maine Department of Environmental Protection, the staff of the Governor of Maine and with officials and administrative bodies of the relevant localities." Is your testimony today consistent with that section? MR. NORDBY: Yes, it is. MR. BOWER: And turning to your direct testimony, on page 3, I think it was in Section 5 that you referenced earlier, you state, quote, "the agreement will become effective only if the pending application to allow municipal solid waste at Juniper Ridge Landfill is approved." Isn't it true that only Section 3.1(c), which provides the 30,000 tons of MERC waste, that's the only section that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	doing so and Maine's incinerators could charge municipalities and other waste suppliers any price of their choosing; rather, the hierarchy recognizes that PERC and the other incinerators must compete in a marketplace in order to secure adequate supplies of MSW. The present case is a good example that incinerators can still ably compete. PERC recognized early on that the closing of MERC presented an opportunity to secure additional in-state MSW for our needs. We then entered into negotiations with Casella and successfully secured a position for more MSW to go to our facility. Maine's other incinerators have throughout the last few months been free to do the same. Not quite 15 minutes but that's my testimony as submitted. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Nordby. We'll move on to cross examination of PERC and first is MMWAC who has identified ten minutes of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	hearings as the representatives of PERC can reasonably attend and the delivery of a reasonable number of supportive communications with legislators, the Commissioner of the Maine Department of Environmental Protection, the staff of the Governor of Maine and with officials and administrative bodies of the relevant localities." Is your testimony today consistent with that section? MR. NORDBY: Yes, it is. MR. BOWER: And turning to your direct testimony, on page 3, I think it was in Section 5 that you referenced earlier, you state, quote, "the agreement will become effective only if the pending application to allow municipal solid waste at Juniper Ridge Landfill is approved." Isn't it true that only Section 3.1(c), which provides the 30,000 tons of MERC waste, that's the only section that's conditioned upon the pending application, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	doing so and Maine's incinerators could charge municipalities and other waste suppliers any price of their choosing; rather, the hierarchy recognizes that PERC and the other incinerators must compete in a marketplace in order to secure adequate supplies of MSW. The present case is a good example that incinerators can still ably compete. PERC recognized early on that the closing of MERC presented an opportunity to secure additional in-state MSW for our needs. We then entered into negotiations with Casella and successfully secured a position for more MSW to go to our facility. Maine's other incinerators have throughout the last few months been free to do the same. Not quite 15 minutes but that's my testimony as submitted. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Nordby. We'll move on to cross examination of PERC and first is MMWAC who has identified ten minutes of cross-examination, followed by ecomaine with five	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	hearings as the representatives of PERC can reasonably attend and the delivery of a reasonable number of supportive communications with legislators, the Commissioner of the Maine Department of Environmental Protection, the staff of the Governor of Maine and with officials and administrative bodies of the relevant localities." Is your testimony today consistent with that section? MR. NORDBY: Yes, it is. MR. BOWER: And turning to your direct testimony, on page 3, I think it was in Section 5 that you referenced earlier, you state, quote, "the agreement will become effective only if the pending application to allow municipal solid waste at Juniper Ridge Landfill is approved." Isn't it true that only Section 3.1(c), which provides the 30,000 tons of MERC waste, that's the only section that's conditioned upon the pending application, correct? MR. NORDBY: That is correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	doing so and Maine's incinerators could charge municipalities and other waste suppliers any price of their choosing; rather, the hierarchy recognizes that PERC and the other incinerators must compete in a marketplace in order to secure adequate supplies of MSW. The present case is a good example that incinerators can still ably compete. PERC recognized early on that the closing of MERC presented an opportunity to secure additional in-state MSW for our needs. We then entered into negotiations with Casella and successfully secured a position for more MSW to go to our facility. Maine's other incinerators have throughout the last few months been free to do the same. Not quite 15 minutes but that's my testimony as submitted. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Nordby. We'll move on to cross examination of PERC and first is MMWAC who has identified ten minutes of cross-examination, followed by ecomaine with five minutes of cross examination.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	hearings as the representatives of PERC can reasonably attend and the delivery of a reasonable number of supportive communications with legislators, the Commissioner of the Maine Department of Environmental Protection, the staff of the Governor of Maine and with officials and administrative bodies of the relevant localities." Is your testimony today consistent with that section? MR. NORDBY: Yes, it is. MR. BOWER: And turning to your direct testimony, on page 3, I think it was in Section 5 that you referenced earlier, you state, quote, "the agreement will become effective only if the pending application to allow municipal solid waste at Juniper Ridge Landfill is approved." Isn't it true that only Section 3.1(c), which provides the 30,000 tons of MERC waste, that's the only section that's conditioned upon the pending application, correct? MR. NORDBY: That is correct. MR. BOWER: The sort of I think you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	doing so and Maine's incinerators could charge municipalities and other waste suppliers any price of their choosing; rather, the hierarchy recognizes that PERC and the other incinerators must compete in a marketplace in order to secure adequate supplies of MSW. The present case is a good example that incinerators can still ably compete. PERC recognized early on that the closing of MERC presented an opportunity to secure additional in-state MSW for our needs. We then entered into negotiations with Casella and successfully secured a position for more MSW to go to our facility. Maine's other incinerators have throughout the last few months been free to do the same. Not quite 15 minutes but that's my testimony as submitted. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Nordby. We'll move on to cross examination of PERC and first is MMWAC who has identified ten minutes of cross-examination, followed by ecomaine with five	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	hearings as the representatives of PERC can reasonably attend and the delivery of a reasonable number of supportive communications with legislators, the Commissioner of the Maine Department of Environmental Protection, the staff of the Governor of Maine and with officials and administrative bodies of the relevant localities." Is your testimony today consistent with that section? MR. NORDBY: Yes, it is. MR. BOWER: And turning to your direct testimony, on page 3, I think it was in Section 5 that you referenced earlier, you state, quote, "the agreement will become effective only if the pending application to allow municipal solid waste at Juniper Ridge Landfill is approved." Isn't it true that only Section 3.1(c), which provides the 30,000 tons of MERC waste, that's the only section that's conditioned upon the pending application, correct? MR. NORDBY: That is correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	doing so and Maine's incinerators could charge municipalities and other waste suppliers any price of their choosing; rather, the hierarchy recognizes that PERC and the other incinerators must compete in a marketplace in order to secure adequate supplies of MSW. The present case is a good example that incinerators can still ably compete. PERC recognized early on that the closing of MERC presented an opportunity to secure additional in-state MSW for our needs. We then entered into negotiations with Casella and successfully secured a position for more MSW to go to our facility. Maine's other incinerators have throughout the last few months been free to do the same. Not quite 15 minutes but that's my testimony as submitted. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Nordby. We'll move on to cross examination of PERC and first is MMWAC who has identified ten minutes of cross-examination, followed by ecomaine with five minutes of cross examination. MR. BOWER: Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer. As with yesterday, I would request to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	hearings as the representatives of PERC can reasonably attend and the delivery of a reasonable number of supportive communications with legislators, the Commissioner of the Maine Department of Environmental Protection, the staff of the Governor of Maine and with officials and administrative bodies of the relevant localities." Is your testimony today consistent with that section? MR. NORDBY: Yes, it is. MR. BOWER: And turning to your direct testimony, on page 3, I think it was in Section 5 that you referenced earlier, you state, quote, "the agreement will become effective only if the pending application to allow municipal solid waste at Juniper Ridge Landfill is approved." Isn't it true that only Section 3.1(c), which provides the 30,000 tons of MERC waste, that's the only section that's conditioned upon the pending application, correct? MR. NORDBY: That is correct. MR. BOWER: The sort of I think you described it as the unique recycling section of the agreement. That whole section is not contingent on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	doing so and Maine's incinerators could charge municipalities and other waste suppliers any price of their choosing; rather, the hierarchy recognizes that PERC and the other incinerators must compete in a marketplace in order to secure adequate supplies of MSW. The present case is a good example that incinerators can still ably compete. PERC recognized early on that the closing of MERC presented an opportunity to secure additional in-state MSW for our needs. We then entered into negotiations with Casella and successfully secured a position for more MSW to go to our facility. Maine's other incinerators have throughout the last few months been free to do the same. Not quite 15 minutes but that's my testimony as submitted. MEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Nordby. We'll move on to cross examination of PERC and first is MMWAC who has identified ten minutes of cross-examination, followed by ecomaine with five minutes of cross examination. MR. BOWER: Thank you, Madam Hearing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	hearings as the representatives of PERC can reasonably attend and the delivery of a reasonable number of supportive communications with legislators, the Commissioner of the Maine Department of Environmental Protection, the staff of the Governor of Maine and with officials and administrative bodies of the relevant localities." Is your testimony today consistent with that section? MR. NORDBY: Yes, it is. MR. BOWER: And turning to your direct testimony, on page 3, I think it was in Section 5 that you referenced earlier, you state, quote, "the agreement will become effective only if the pending application to allow municipal solid waste at Juniper Ridge Landfill is approved." Isn't it true that only Section 3.1(c), which provides the 30,000 tons of MERC waste, that's the only section that's conditioned upon the pending application, correct? MR. NORDBY: That is correct. MR. BOWER: The sort of I think you described it as the unique recycling section of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	doing so and Maine's incinerators could charge municipalities and other waste suppliers any price of their choosing; rather, the hierarchy recognizes that PERC and the other incinerators must compete in a marketplace in order to secure adequate supplies of MSW. The present case is a good example that incinerators can still ably compete. PERC recognized early on that the closing of MERC presented an opportunity to secure additional in-state MSW for our needs. We then entered into negotiations with Casella and successfully secured a position for more MSW to go to our facility. Maine's other incinerators have throughout the last few months been free to do the same. Not quite 15 minutes but that's my testimony as submitted. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Nordby. We'll move on to cross examination of PERC and first is MMWAC who has identified ten minutes of cross-examination, followed by ecomaine with five minutes of cross examination. MR. BOWER: Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer. As with yesterday, I would request to combine the time of ecomaine and MMWAC together for a total of 15 minutes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	hearings as the representatives of PERC can reasonably attend and the delivery of a reasonable number of supportive communications with legislators, the Commissioner of the Maine Department of Environmental Protection, the staff of the Governor of Maine and with officials and administrative bodies of the relevant localities." Is your testimony today consistent with that section? MR. NORDBY: Yes, it is. MR. BOWER: And turning to your direct testimony, on page 3, I think it was in Section 5 that you referenced earlier, you state, quote, "the agreement will become effective only if the pending application to allow municipal solid waste at Juniper Ridge Landfill is approved." Isn't it true that only Section 3.1(c), which provides the 30,000 tons of MERC waste, that's the only section that's conditioned upon the pending application, correct? MR. NORDBY: That is correct. MR. BOWER: The sort of I think you described it as the unique recycling section of the agreement. That whole section is not contingent on the approval of this license amendment, correct? MR. NORDBY: No, it's not.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	doing so and Maine's incinerators could charge municipalities and other waste suppliers any price of their choosing; rather, the hierarchy recognizes that PERC and the other incinerators must compete in a marketplace in order to secure adequate supplies of MSW. The present case is a good example that incinerators can still ably compete. PERC recognized early on that the closing of MERC presented an opportunity to secure additional in-state MSW for our needs. We then entered into negotiations with Casella and successfully secured a position for more MSW to go to our facility. Maine's other incinerators have throughout the last few months been free to do the same. Not quite 15 minutes but that's my testimony as submitted. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, Mr. Nordby. We'll move on to cross examination of PERC and first is MMWAC who has identified ten minutes of cross-examination, followed by ecomaine with five minutes of cross examination. MR. BOWER: Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer. As with yesterday, I would request to combine the time of ecomaine and MMWAC together for a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	hearings as the representatives of PERC can reasonably attend and the delivery of a reasonable number of supportive communications with legislators, the Commissioner of the Maine Department of Environmental Protection, the staff of the Governor of Maine and with officials and administrative bodies of the relevant localities." Is your testimony today consistent with that section? MR. NORDBY: Yes, it is. MR. BOWER: And turning to your direct testimony, on page 3, I think it was in Section 5 that you referenced earlier, you state, quote, "the agreement will become effective only if the pending application to allow municipal solid waste at Juniper Ridge Landfill is approved." Isn't it true that only Section 3.1(c), which provides the 30,000 tons of MERC waste, that's the only section that's conditioned upon the pending application, correct? MR. NORDBY: That is correct. MR. BOWER: The sort of I think you described it as the unique recycling section of the agreement. That whole section is not contingent on the approval of this license amendment, correct?

	004	1	000
	284		286
1	waste including up to 50,000 tons between category 4	1	application to amend the Juniper Ridge Landfill
2	and 5, that's not contingent on the Juniper Ridge	2	license is consistent with the hierarchy?
3	Landfill amendment, correct?	3	MR. NORDBY: I'm only here to really talk
4	MR. NORDBY: That's correct.	4	about the PERC/Casella agreement so I don't really
5	MR. BOWER: And on pages 3 to 4 of your	5	know if I'd have an answer for that.
6	testimony, you stated the 30,000 tons of in-state	6	MR. BOWER: Okay. Turning back to the
7	municipal solid waste will allow PERC to displace a	7	disposal agreement, in Section 8 is the termination
8	portion of the out-of-state municipal solid waste	8	now, just to clarify, the only signatories to this
9	that it historically has had to utilize in order to	9	contract are PERC and Casella, correct? Those are
10	operate at capacity. What's the remainder so that	10	the only two parties to the agreement?
11	will displace 30,000. What's the remainder of the	11	MR. NORDBY: I believe the operating company
12	out-of-state waste in terms of tonnage? If you could	12	ESCO is also represented through U.S.A. and the
13	back up that 30,000, what's the that's not the	13	general partner.
14	entirety of the out-of-state waste that PERC accepts,	14	MR. BOWER: Okay. The state of Maine is not
15	correct?	15	a party to the agreement, correct?
16	MR. NORDBY: That's correct.	16	MR. NORDBY: This is a private agreement.
17	MR. BOWER: Do you have a figure for what	17	MR. BOWER: Section 8 is the termination
18	the remainder is or would be?	18	provision and Section 8.1(a) provides that the
19	MR. NORDBY: Yes, I do. I apologize for	19	agreement may be terminated by all parties hereto
		20	
20	the 30,000 coming from the closure of MERC will displace out-of-state waste that has been delivered	20	upon mutual written agreement. Is that your
21	•	21	understanding as well of the termination provision?
22	by a variety of different vendors. We've got an	22	MR. NORDBY: It is.
23	agreement with Casella in which they deliver		MR. BOWER: So in other words, the agreement
24	out-of-state waste. We also deal with two or three	24	really can be terminated at any time if Casella
25	other vendors.	25	and PERC both agree to terminate it, it can be
	205		202
	285		287
1	MR. BOWER: I think one of Casella's	1	terminated at any time and the state doesn't have any
2	MR. BOWER: I think one of Casella's exhibits was the 2011 DEP solid waste report and my	2	terminated at any time and the state doesn't have any sort of say about the state doesn't need to
2 3	MR. BOWER: I think one of Casella's exhibits was the 2011 DEP solid waste report and my recollection is that it was around 91,000 tons, does	2 3	terminated at any time and the state doesn't have any sort of say about the state doesn't need to consent to the termination of the agreement, correct?
2 3 4	MR. BOWER: I think one of Casella's exhibits was the 2011 DEP solid waste report and my recollection is that it was around 91,000 tons, does that sound about right, of out-of-state waste that	2 3 4	terminated at any time and the state doesn't have any sort of say about the state doesn't need to consent to the termination of the agreement, correct? MR. NORDBY: That's correct.
2 3 4 5	MR. BOWER: I think one of Casella's exhibits was the 2011 DEP solid waste report and my recollection is that it was around 91,000 tons, does that sound about right, of out-of-state waste that PERC incinerated?	2 3 4 5	terminated at any time and the state doesn't have any sort of say about the state doesn't need to consent to the termination of the agreement, correct? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: Finally, on Section 7.5 of the
2 3 4 5 6	MR. BOWER: I think one of Casella's exhibits was the 2011 DEP solid waste report and my recollection is that it was around 91,000 tons, does that sound about right, of out-of-state waste that PERC incinerated? MR. NORDBY: I don't have that figure in	2 3 4 5 6	terminated at any time and the state doesn't have any sort of say about the state doesn't need to consent to the termination of the agreement, correct? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: Finally, on Section 7.5 of the disposal agreement talks about support for the
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. BOWER: I think one of Casella's exhibits was the 2011 DEP solid waste report and my recollection is that it was around 91,000 tons, does that sound about right, of out-of-state waste that PERC incinerated? MR. NORDBY: I don't have that figure in front of me.	2 3 4 5 6 7	terminated at any time and the state doesn't have any sort of say about the state doesn't need to consent to the termination of the agreement, correct? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: Finally, on Section 7.5 of the disposal agreement talks about support for the hierarchy, and in that provision Casella states that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. BOWER: I think one of Casella's exhibits was the 2011 DEP solid waste report and my recollection is that it was around 91,000 tons, does that sound about right, of out-of-state waste that PERC incinerated? MR. NORDBY: I don't have that figure in front of me. MR. BOWER: Okay, that's all right. I just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	terminated at any time and the state doesn't have any sort of say about the state doesn't need to consent to the termination of the agreement, correct? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: Finally, on Section 7.5 of the disposal agreement talks about support for the hierarchy, and in that provision Casella states that the solid waste hierarchy is, quote, structured so
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. BOWER: I think one of Casella's exhibits was the 2011 DEP solid waste report and my recollection is that it was around 91,000 tons, does that sound about right, of out-of-state waste that PERC incinerated? MR. NORDBY: I don't have that figure in front of me. MR. BOWER: Okay, that's all right. I just wanted to clarify that that 30,000 is not going to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	terminated at any time and the state doesn't have any sort of say about the state doesn't need to consent to the termination of the agreement, correct? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: Finally, on Section 7.5 of the disposal agreement talks about support for the hierarchy, and in that provision Casella states that the solid waste hierarchy is, quote, structured so that the maximum amount of solid waste possible will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. BOWER: I think one of Casella's exhibits was the 2011 DEP solid waste report and my recollection is that it was around 91,000 tons, does that sound about right, of out-of-state waste that PERC incinerated? MR. NORDBY: I don't have that figure in front of me. MR. BOWER: Okay, that's all right. I just wanted to clarify that that 30,000 is not going to satisfy your need for out-of-state waste; it will	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	terminated at any time and the state doesn't have any sort of say about the state doesn't need to consent to the termination of the agreement, correct? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: Finally, on Section 7.5 of the disposal agreement talks about support for the hierarchy, and in that provision Casella states that the solid waste hierarchy is, quote, structured so that the maximum amount of solid waste possible will be processed by facilities in Maine such as the PERC
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. BOWER: I think one of Casella's exhibits was the 2011 DEP solid waste report and my recollection is that it was around 91,000 tons, does that sound about right, of out-of-state waste that PERC incinerated? MR. NORDBY: I don't have that figure in front of me. MR. BOWER: Okay, that's all right. I just wanted to clarify that that 30,000 is not going to satisfy your need for out-of-state waste; it will displace a portion of it but not the entirety of what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	terminated at any time and the state doesn't have any sort of say about the state doesn't need to consent to the termination of the agreement, correct? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: Finally, on Section 7.5 of the disposal agreement talks about support for the hierarchy, and in that provision Casella states that the solid waste hierarchy is, quote, structured so that the maximum amount of solid waste possible will be processed by facilities in Maine such as the PERC facility in preference to landfills in Maine such as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. BOWER: I think one of Casella's exhibits was the 2011 DEP solid waste report and my recollection is that it was around 91,000 tons, does that sound about right, of out-of-state waste that PERC incinerated? MR. NORDBY: I don't have that figure in front of me. MR. BOWER: Okay, that's all right. I just wanted to clarify that that 30,000 is not going to satisfy your need for out-of-state waste; it will displace a portion of it but not the entirety of what you need?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	terminated at any time and the state doesn't have any sort of say about the state doesn't need to consent to the termination of the agreement, correct? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: Finally, on Section 7.5 of the disposal agreement talks about support for the hierarchy, and in that provision Casella states that the solid waste hierarchy is, quote, structured so that the maximum amount of solid waste possible will be processed by facilities in Maine such as the PERC facility in preference to landfills in Maine such as the Juniper Ridge Landfill, and my question is, do
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. BOWER: I think one of Casella's exhibits was the 2011 DEP solid waste report and my recollection is that it was around 91,000 tons, does that sound about right, of out-of-state waste that PERC incinerated? MR. NORDBY: I don't have that figure in front of me. MR. BOWER: Okay, that's all right. I just wanted to clarify that that 30,000 is not going to satisfy your need for out-of-state waste; it will displace a portion of it but not the entirety of what you need? MR. NORDBY: That's correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	terminated at any time and the state doesn't have any sort of say about the state doesn't need to consent to the termination of the agreement, correct? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: Finally, on Section 7.5 of the disposal agreement talks about support for the hierarchy, and in that provision Casella states that the solid waste hierarchy is, quote, structured so that the maximum amount of solid waste possible will be processed by facilities in Maine such as the PERC facility in preference to landfills in Maine such as the Juniper Ridge Landfill, and my question is, do you believe that this agreement provides for as much
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. BOWER: I think one of Casella's exhibits was the 2011 DEP solid waste report and my recollection is that it was around 91,000 tons, does that sound about right, of out-of-state waste that PERC incinerated? MR. NORDBY: I don't have that figure in front of me. MR. BOWER: Okay, that's all right. I just wanted to clarify that that 30,000 is not going to satisfy your need for out-of-state waste; it will displace a portion of it but not the entirety of what you need? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: Okay, and under the disposal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	terminated at any time and the state doesn't have any sort of say about the state doesn't need to consent to the termination of the agreement, correct? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: Finally, on Section 7.5 of the disposal agreement talks about support for the hierarchy, and in that provision Casella states that the solid waste hierarchy is, quote, structured so that the maximum amount of solid waste possible will be processed by facilities in Maine such as the PERC facility in preference to landfills in Maine such as the Juniper Ridge Landfill, and my question is, do you believe that this agreement provides for as much solid waste as possible being processed by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. BOWER: I think one of Casella's exhibits was the 2011 DEP solid waste report and my recollection is that it was around 91,000 tons, does that sound about right, of out-of-state waste that PERC incinerated? MR. NORDBY: I don't have that figure in front of me. MR. BOWER: Okay, that's all right. I just wanted to clarify that that 30,000 is not going to satisfy your need for out-of-state waste; it will displace a portion of it but not the entirety of what you need? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: Okay, and under the disposal agreement, Casella will be providing up to 50,000	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	terminated at any time and the state doesn't have any sort of say about the state doesn't need to consent to the termination of the agreement, correct? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: Finally, on Section 7.5 of the disposal agreement talks about support for the hierarchy, and in that provision Casella states that the solid waste hierarchy is, quote, structured so that the maximum amount of solid waste possible will be processed by facilities in Maine such as the PERC facility in preference to landfills in Maine such as the Juniper Ridge Landfill, and my question is, do you believe that this agreement provides for as much solid waste as possible being processed by waste-to-energy facilities such as PERC or could
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. BOWER: I think one of Casella's exhibits was the 2011 DEP solid waste report and my recollection is that it was around 91,000 tons, does that sound about right, of out-of-state waste that PERC incinerated? MR. NORDBY: I don't have that figure in front of me. MR. BOWER: Okay, that's all right. I just wanted to clarify that that 30,000 is not going to satisfy your need for out-of-state waste; it will displace a portion of it but not the entirety of what you need? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: Okay, and under the disposal agreement, Casella will be providing up to 50,000 tons between categories 4 and 5, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	terminated at any time and the state doesn't have any sort of say about the state doesn't need to consent to the termination of the agreement, correct? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: Finally, on Section 7.5 of the disposal agreement talks about support for the hierarchy, and in that provision Casella states that the solid waste hierarchy is, quote, structured so that the maximum amount of solid waste possible will be processed by facilities in Maine such as the PERC facility in preference to landfills in Maine such as the Juniper Ridge Landfill, and my question is, do you believe that this agreement provides for as much solid waste as possible being processed by waste-to-energy facilities such as PERC or could there have been more? You know, why how did the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. BOWER: I think one of Casella's exhibits was the 2011 DEP solid waste report and my recollection is that it was around 91,000 tons, does that sound about right, of out-of-state waste that PERC incinerated? MR. NORDBY: I don't have that figure in front of me. MR. BOWER: Okay, that's all right. I just wanted to clarify that that 30,000 is not going to satisfy your need for out-of-state waste; it will displace a portion of it but not the entirety of what you need? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: Okay, and under the disposal agreement, Casella will be providing up to 50,000 tons between categories 4 and 5, correct? MR. NORDBY: That's correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	terminated at any time and the state doesn't have any sort of say about the state doesn't need to consent to the termination of the agreement, correct? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: Finally, on Section 7.5 of the disposal agreement talks about support for the hierarchy, and in that provision Casella states that the solid waste hierarchy is, quote, structured so that the maximum amount of solid waste possible will be processed by facilities in Maine such as the PERC facility in preference to landfills in Maine such as the Juniper Ridge Landfill, and my question is, do you believe that this agreement provides for as much solid waste as possible being processed by waste-to-energy facilities such as PERC or could there have been more? You know, why how did the 30,000 ton figure come about?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. BOWER: I think one of Casella's exhibits was the 2011 DEP solid waste report and my recollection is that it was around 91,000 tons, does that sound about right, of out-of-state waste that PERC incinerated? MR. NORDBY: I don't have that figure in front of me. MR. BOWER: Okay, that's all right. I just wanted to clarify that that 30,000 is not going to satisfy your need for out-of-state waste; it will displace a portion of it but not the entirety of what you need? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: Okay, and under the disposal agreement, Casella will be providing up to 50,000 tons between categories 4 and 5, correct? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: In your testimony you also state	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	terminated at any time and the state doesn't have any sort of say about the state doesn't need to consent to the termination of the agreement, correct? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: Finally, on Section 7.5 of the disposal agreement talks about support for the hierarchy, and in that provision Casella states that the solid waste hierarchy is, quote, structured so that the maximum amount of solid waste possible will be processed by facilities in Maine such as the PERC facility in preference to landfills in Maine such as the Juniper Ridge Landfill, and my question is, do you believe that this agreement provides for as much solid waste as possible being processed by waste-to-energy facilities such as PERC or could there have been more? You know, why how did the 30,000 ton figure come about? MR. MAHONEY: Objection, Madam Hearing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. BOWER: I think one of Casella's exhibits was the 2011 DEP solid waste report and my recollection is that it was around 91,000 tons, does that sound about right, of out-of-state waste that PERC incinerated? MR. NORDBY: I don't have that figure in front of me. MR. BOWER: Okay, that's all right. I just wanted to clarify that that 30,000 is not going to satisfy your need for out-of-state waste; it will displace a portion of it but not the entirety of what you need? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: Okay, and under the disposal agreement, Casella will be providing up to 50,000 tons between categories 4 and 5, correct? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: In your testimony you also state that the you say "in addition, the Casella/PERC	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	terminated at any time and the state doesn't have any sort of say about the state doesn't need to consent to the termination of the agreement, correct? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: Finally, on Section 7.5 of the disposal agreement talks about support for the hierarchy, and in that provision Casella states that the solid waste hierarchy is, quote, structured so that the maximum amount of solid waste possible will be processed by facilities in Maine such as the PERC facility in preference to landfills in Maine such as the Juniper Ridge Landfill, and my question is, do you believe that this agreement provides for as much solid waste as possible being processed by waste-to-energy facilities such as PERC or could there have been more? You know, why how did the 30,000 ton figure come about? MR. MAHONEY: Objection, Madam Hearing Officer. I think there's several questions there.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. BOWER: I think one of Casella's exhibits was the 2011 DEP solid waste report and my recollection is that it was around 91,000 tons, does that sound about right, of out-of-state waste that PERC incinerated? MR. NORDBY: I don't have that figure in front of me. MR. BOWER: Okay, that's all right. I just wanted to clarify that that 30,000 is not going to satisfy your need for out-of-state waste; it will displace a portion of it but not the entirety of what you need? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: Okay, and under the disposal agreement, Casella will be providing up to 50,000 tons between categories 4 and 5, correct? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: In your testimony you also state that the you say "in addition, the Casella/PERC agreement is consistent with Maine's solid waste	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	terminated at any time and the state doesn't have any sort of say about the state doesn't need to consent to the termination of the agreement, correct? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: Finally, on Section 7.5 of the disposal agreement talks about support for the hierarchy, and in that provision Casella states that the solid waste hierarchy is, quote, structured so that the maximum amount of solid waste possible will be processed by facilities in Maine such as the PERC facility in preference to landfills in Maine such as the Juniper Ridge Landfill, and my question is, do you believe that this agreement provides for as much solid waste as possible being processed by waste-to-energy facilities such as PERC or could there have been more? You know, why how did the 30,000 ton figure come about? MR. MAHONEY: Objection, Madam Hearing Officer. I think there's several questions there. If we could break them down one at a time.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. BOWER: I think one of Casella's exhibits was the 2011 DEP solid waste report and my recollection is that it was around 91,000 tons, does that sound about right, of out-of-state waste that PERC incinerated? MR. NORDBY: I don't have that figure in front of me. MR. BOWER: Okay, that's all right. I just wanted to clarify that that 30,000 is not going to satisfy your need for out-of-state waste; it will displace a portion of it but not the entirety of what you need? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: Okay, and under the disposal agreement, Casella will be providing up to 50,000 tons between categories 4 and 5, correct? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: In your testimony you also state that the you say "in addition, the Casella/PERC agreement is consistent with Maine's solid waste hierarchy which, among other things, favors recycling	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	terminated at any time and the state doesn't have any sort of say about the state doesn't need to consent to the termination of the agreement, correct? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: Finally, on Section 7.5 of the disposal agreement talks about support for the hierarchy, and in that provision Casella states that the solid waste hierarchy is, quote, structured so that the maximum amount of solid waste possible will be processed by facilities in Maine such as the PERC facility in preference to landfills in Maine such as the Juniper Ridge Landfill, and my question is, do you believe that this agreement provides for as much solid waste as possible being processed by waste-to-energy facilities such as PERC or could there have been more? You know, why how did the 30,000 ton figure come about? MR. MAHONEY: Objection, Madam Hearing Officer. I think there's several questions there. If we could break them down one at a time. MR. BOWER: Sorry about that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. BOWER: I think one of Casella's exhibits was the 2011 DEP solid waste report and my recollection is that it was around 91,000 tons, does that sound about right, of out-of-state waste that PERC incinerated? MR. NORDBY: I don't have that figure in front of me. MR. BOWER: Okay, that's all right. I just wanted to clarify that that 30,000 is not going to satisfy your need for out-of-state waste; it will displace a portion of it but not the entirety of what you need? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: Okay, and under the disposal agreement, Casella will be providing up to 50,000 tons between categories 4 and 5, correct? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: In your testimony you also state that the you say "in addition, the Casella/PERC agreement is consistent with Maine's solid waste hierarchy which, among other things, favors recycling and waste incineration over landfilling." Would you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	terminated at any time and the state doesn't have any sort of say about the state doesn't need to consent to the termination of the agreement, correct? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: Finally, on Section 7.5 of the disposal agreement talks about support for the hierarchy, and in that provision Casella states that the solid waste hierarchy is, quote, structured so that the maximum amount of solid waste possible will be processed by facilities in Maine such as the PERC facility in preference to landfills in Maine such as the Juniper Ridge Landfill, and my question is, do you believe that this agreement provides for as much solid waste as possible being processed by waste-to-energy facilities such as PERC or could there have been more? You know, why how did the 30,000 ton figure come about? MR. MAHONEY: Objection, Madam Hearing Officer. I think there's several questions there. If we could break them down one at a time.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. BOWER: I think one of Casella's exhibits was the 2011 DEP solid waste report and my recollection is that it was around 91,000 tons, does that sound about right, of out-of-state waste that PERC incinerated? MR. NORDBY: I don't have that figure in front of me. MR. BOWER: Okay, that's all right. I just wanted to clarify that that 30,000 is not going to satisfy your need for out-of-state waste; it will displace a portion of it but not the entirety of what you need? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: Okay, and under the disposal agreement, Casella will be providing up to 50,000 tons between categories 4 and 5, correct? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: In your testimony you also state that the you say "in addition, the Casella/PERC agreement is consistent with Maine's solid waste hierarchy which, among other things, favors recycling and waste incineration over landfilling." Would you agree that the issue in this proceeding is not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	terminated at any time and the state doesn't have any sort of say about the state doesn't need to consent to the termination of the agreement, correct? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: Finally, on Section 7.5 of the disposal agreement talks about support for the hierarchy, and in that provision Casella states that the solid waste hierarchy is, quote, structured so that the maximum amount of solid waste possible will be processed by facilities in Maine such as the PERC facility in preference to landfills in Maine such as the Juniper Ridge Landfill, and my question is, do you believe that this agreement provides for as much solid waste as possible being processed by waste-to-energy facilities such as PERC or could there have been more? You know, why how did the 30,000 ton figure come about? MR. MAHONEY: Objection, Madam Hearing Officer. I think there's several questions there. If we could break them down one at a time. MR. BOWER: Sorry about that. HEARING OFFICER: Please ask the questions one at a time.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. BOWER: I think one of Casella's exhibits was the 2011 DEP solid waste report and my recollection is that it was around 91,000 tons, does that sound about right, of out-of-state waste that PERC incinerated? MR. NORDBY: I don't have that figure in front of me. MR. BOWER: Okay, that's all right. I just wanted to clarify that that 30,000 is not going to satisfy your need for out-of-state waste; it will displace a portion of it but not the entirety of what you need? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: Okay, and under the disposal agreement, Casella will be providing up to 50,000 tons between categories 4 and 5, correct? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: In your testimony you also state that the you say "in addition, the Casella/PERC agreement is consistent with Maine's solid waste hierarchy which, among other things, favors recycling and waste incineration over landfilling." Would you agree that the issue in this proceeding is not whether the Casella/PERC agreement is consistent with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	terminated at any time and the state doesn't have any sort of say about the state doesn't need to consent to the termination of the agreement, correct? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: Finally, on Section 7.5 of the disposal agreement talks about support for the hierarchy, and in that provision Casella states that the solid waste hierarchy is, quote, structured so that the maximum amount of solid waste possible will be processed by facilities in Maine such as the PERC facility in preference to landfills in Maine such as the Juniper Ridge Landfill, and my question is, do you believe that this agreement provides for as much solid waste as possible being processed by waste-to-energy facilities such as PERC or could there have been more? You know, why how did the 30,000 ton figure come about? MR. MAHONEY: Objection, Madam Hearing Officer. I think there's several questions there. If we could break them down one at a time. MR. BOWER: Sorry about that. HEARING OFFICER: Please ask the questions one at a time. MR. BOWER: Okay. I guess the first
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. BOWER: I think one of Casella's exhibits was the 2011 DEP solid waste report and my recollection is that it was around 91,000 tons, does that sound about right, of out-of-state waste that PERC incinerated? MR. NORDBY: I don't have that figure in front of me. MR. BOWER: Okay, that's all right. I just wanted to clarify that that 30,000 is not going to satisfy your need for out-of-state waste; it will displace a portion of it but not the entirety of what you need? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: Okay, and under the disposal agreement, Casella will be providing up to 50,000 tons between categories 4 and 5, correct? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: In your testimony you also state that the you say "in addition, the Casella/PERC agreement is consistent with Maine's solid waste hierarchy which, among other things, favors recycling and waste incineration over landfilling." Would you agree that the issue in this proceeding is not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	terminated at any time and the state doesn't have any sort of say about the state doesn't need to consent to the termination of the agreement, correct? MR. NORDBY: That's correct. MR. BOWER: Finally, on Section 7.5 of the disposal agreement talks about support for the hierarchy, and in that provision Casella states that the solid waste hierarchy is, quote, structured so that the maximum amount of solid waste possible will be processed by facilities in Maine such as the PERC facility in preference to landfills in Maine such as the Juniper Ridge Landfill, and my question is, do you believe that this agreement provides for as much solid waste as possible being processed by waste-to-energy facilities such as PERC or could there have been more? You know, why how did the 30,000 ton figure come about? MR. MAHONEY: Objection, Madam Hearing Officer. I think there's several questions there. If we could break them down one at a time. MR. BOWER: Sorry about that. HEARING OFFICER: Please ask the questions one at a time.

	288		290
4		4	
1	provides for as much solid waste as possible being	1	the agreement? MR. NORDBY: April 30th.
2	processed by waste-to-energy facilities such as PERC?	2	MR. BOWER: So it's coming right up. Have
3	MR. NORDBY: I think your question has to be considered in a broader sense in terms of the	3 4	there been any talks to extend the interim agreement?
4		4 5	
5	economics that are involved with delivery of the	-	MR. NORDBY: We've had general discussions
6	waste to an appropriate facility; secondly, this was a negotiated agreement between PERC and Casella. We	6	about it. We haven't entered into negotiations
7		7	formally.
8	have to be able to operate on a standardized basis,	8	MR. BOWER: And how much tonnage is PERC
9	we have to schedule workers, things like this.	9	getting under the disposal agreement on a daily or
10 11	Casella had contractual agreements which prohibited them from being able to meet the obligation that we	10 11	weekly basis?
12		12	MR. NORDBY: It averages about 175 tons a
	wanted in terms of quarter pay. If we're going to		day.
13	schedule the processing of waste, we have to know	13	MR. BOWER: And not being able to do the
14 15	we're going to get it. So say we have a contract for 30 and only 5,000 show up, it becomes quite	14 15	math on the fly, is that more or less on a daily basis than the 30,000 tons under the disposal
			agreement?
16	problematic. So in terms of that agreement,	16 17	MR. NORDBY: It's approximately 30,000 tons,
17	economics played a large part in the 30,000 and		probably maybe on a run rate of 140 I'm sorry
18 19	arriving at that final number. MR. BOWER: So I take it you would have	18 19	40 rather.
20	preferred more than 30,000 if the economics had	20	MR. BOWER: Okay. Just one moment, please.
20	provided for that?	20	I have no further questions. Thank you.
22	MR. NORDBY: As a private businessman, I	22	HEARING OFFICER: Have you concluded your
23	would prefer waste to the rafters, yes, I would.	23	cross examination?
24	MR. BOWER: And I think earlier in your	24	MR. BOWER: Yes. I said no further
25	comments this morning, it sounded like you would	25	questions.
	5, ,		•
	289		291
1	289 prefer in-state waste to out-of-state waste if	1	291 HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any
1 2		1 2	
	prefer in-state waste to out-of-state waste if		HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any
2	prefer in-state waste to out-of-state waste if possible, correct, or am I mistaken?	2	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any other intervenors who wish to cross examine PERC at
2 3	prefer in-state waste to out-of-state waste if possible, correct, or am I mistaken? MR. NORDBY: I don't think I represented	2 3	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any other intervenors who wish to cross examine PERC at this time? Please do state your name.
2 3 4	prefer in-state waste to out-of-state waste if possible, correct, or am I mistaken? MR. NORDBY: I don't think I represented that. I was trying to stress that this agreement as	2 3 4	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any other intervenors who wish to cross examine PERC at this time? Please do state your name. MR. SANBORN: My name is Harry Sanborn. I
2 3 4 5	prefer in-state waste to out-of-state waste if possible, correct, or am I mistaken? MR. NORDBY: I don't think I represented that. I was trying to stress that this agreement as it is was beneficial in taking more in-state waste.	2 3 4 5	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any other intervenors who wish to cross examine PERC at this time? Please do state your name. MR. SANBORN: My name is Harry Sanborn. I represent my wife and I.
2 3 4 5 6	prefer in-state waste to out-of-state waste if possible, correct, or am I mistaken? MR. NORDBY: I don't think I represented that. I was trying to stress that this agreement as it is was beneficial in taking more in-state waste. MR. BOWER: And so my question is, in what way is that bene please explain how that's beneficial in your view to be accepting in-state	2 3 4 5 6	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any other intervenors who wish to cross examine PERC at this time? Please do state your name. MR. SANBORN: My name is Harry Sanborn. I represent my wife and I. HEARING OFFICER: And for the record, your wife's name is? MR. SANBORN: Laura, L-A-U-R-A.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	prefer in-state waste to out-of-state waste if possible, correct, or am I mistaken? MR. NORDBY: I don't think I represented that. I was trying to stress that this agreement as it is was beneficial in taking more in-state waste. MR. BOWER: And so my question is, in what way is that bene please explain how that's beneficial in your view to be accepting in-state waste as opposed to out-of-state waste?	2 3 4 5 6 7	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any other intervenors who wish to cross examine PERC at this time? Please do state your name. MR. SANBORN: My name is Harry Sanborn. I represent my wife and I. HEARING OFFICER: And for the record, your wife's name is? MR. SANBORN: Laura, L-A-U-R-A. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	prefer in-state waste to out-of-state waste if possible, correct, or am I mistaken? MR. NORDBY: I don't think I represented that. I was trying to stress that this agreement as it is was beneficial in taking more in-state waste. MR. BOWER: And so my question is, in what way is that bene please explain how that's beneficial in your view to be accepting in-state waste as opposed to out-of-state waste? MR. NORDBY: I would think it would speak to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any other intervenors who wish to cross examine PERC at this time? Please do state your name. MR. SANBORN: My name is Harry Sanborn. I represent my wife and I. HEARING OFFICER: And for the record, your wife's name is? MR. SANBORN: Laura, L-A-U-R-A. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have a transcription so we need to make sure it's on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	prefer in-state waste to out-of-state waste if possible, correct, or am I mistaken? MR. NORDBY: I don't think I represented that. I was trying to stress that this agreement as it is was beneficial in taking more in-state waste. MR. BOWER: And so my question is, in what way is that bene please explain how that's beneficial in your view to be accepting in-state waste as opposed to out-of-state waste? MR. NORDBY: I would think it would speak to your initial question as to the hierarchy. I don't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any other intervenors who wish to cross examine PERC at this time? Please do state your name. MR. SANBORN: My name is Harry Sanborn. I represent my wife and I. HEARING OFFICER: And for the record, your wife's name is? MR. SANBORN: Laura, L-A-U-R-A. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have a transcription so we need to make sure it's on the record.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	prefer in-state waste to out-of-state waste if possible, correct, or am I mistaken? MR. NORDBY: I don't think I represented that. I was trying to stress that this agreement as it is was beneficial in taking more in-state waste. MR. BOWER: And so my question is, in what way is that bene please explain how that's beneficial in your view to be accepting in-state waste as opposed to out-of-state waste? MR. NORDBY: I would think it would speak to your initial question as to the hierarchy. I don't think the hierarchy if we're taking waste in from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any other intervenors who wish to cross examine PERC at this time? Please do state your name. MR. SANBORN: My name is Harry Sanborn. I represent my wife and I. HEARING OFFICER: And for the record, your wife's name is? MR. SANBORN: Laura, L-A-U-R-A. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have a transcription so we need to make sure it's on the record. MR. MAHONEY: Madam Hearing Officer, just as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	prefer in-state waste to out-of-state waste if possible, correct, or am I mistaken? MR. NORDBY: I don't think I represented that. I was trying to stress that this agreement as it is was beneficial in taking more in-state waste. MR. BOWER: And so my question is, in what way is that bene please explain how that's beneficial in your view to be accepting in-state waste as opposed to out-of-state waste? MR. NORDBY: I would think it would speak to your initial question as to the hierarchy. I don't think the hierarchy if we're taking waste in from out of state, I would think Maine and I know my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any other intervenors who wish to cross examine PERC at this time? Please do state your name. MR. SANBORN: My name is Harry Sanborn. I represent my wife and I. HEARING OFFICER: And for the record, your wife's name is? MR. SANBORN: Laura, L-A-U-R-A. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have a transcription so we need to make sure it's on the record. MR. MAHONEY: Madam Hearing Officer, just as a point of clarification, I'm not certain whether Mr.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	prefer in-state waste to out-of-state waste if possible, correct, or am I mistaken? MR. NORDBY: I don't think I represented that. I was trying to stress that this agreement as it is was beneficial in taking more in-state waste. MR. BOWER: And so my question is, in what way is that bene please explain how that's beneficial in your view to be accepting in-state waste as opposed to out-of-state waste? MR. NORDBY: I would think it would speak to your initial question as to the hierarchy. I don't think the hierarchy if we're taking waste in from out of state, I would think Maine and I know my communities are more concerned about handling	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any other intervenors who wish to cross examine PERC at this time? Please do state your name. MR. SANBORN: My name is Harry Sanborn. I represent my wife and I. HEARING OFFICER: And for the record, your wife's name is? MR. SANBORN: Laura, L-A-U-R-A. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have a transcription so we need to make sure it's on the record. MR. MAHONEY: Madam Hearing Officer, just as a point of clarification, I'm not certain whether Mr. Sanborn was stated as a party who was intending to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	prefer in-state waste to out-of-state waste if possible, correct, or am I mistaken? MR. NORDBY: I don't think I represented that. I was trying to stress that this agreement as it is was beneficial in taking more in-state waste. MR. BOWER: And so my question is, in what way is that bene please explain how that's beneficial in your view to be accepting in-state waste as opposed to out-of-state waste? MR. NORDBY: I would think it would speak to your initial question as to the hierarchy. I don't think the hierarchy if we're taking waste in from out of state, I would think Maine and I know my communities are more concerned about handling responsibly in-state Maine waste.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any other intervenors who wish to cross examine PERC at this time? Please do state your name. MR. SANBORN: My name is Harry Sanborn. I represent my wife and I. HEARING OFFICER: And for the record, your wife's name is? MR. SANBORN: Laura, L-A-U-R-A. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have a transcription so we need to make sure it's on the record. MR. MAHONEY: Madam Hearing Officer, just as a point of clarification, I'm not certain whether Mr. Sanborn was stated as a party who was intending to cross examine Mr. Nordby. Is there a time limit
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	prefer in-state waste to out-of-state waste if possible, correct, or am I mistaken? MR. NORDBY: I don't think I represented that. I was trying to stress that this agreement as it is was beneficial in taking more in-state waste. MR. BOWER: And so my question is, in what way is that bene please explain how that's beneficial in your view to be accepting in-state waste as opposed to out-of-state waste? MR. NORDBY: I would think it would speak to your initial question as to the hierarchy. I don't think the hierarchy if we're taking waste in from out of state, I would think Maine and I know my communities are more concerned about handling responsibly in-state Maine waste. MR. BOWER: At yesterday's proceedings there	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any other intervenors who wish to cross examine PERC at this time? Please do state your name. MR. SANBORN: My name is Harry Sanborn. I represent my wife and I. HEARING OFFICER: And for the record, your wife's name is? MR. SANBORN: Laura, L-A-U-R-A. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have a transcription so we need to make sure it's on the record. MR. MAHONEY: Madam Hearing Officer, just as a point of clarification, I'm not certain whether Mr. Sanborn was stated as a party who was intending to cross examine Mr. Nordby. Is there a time limit imposed on his cross examination?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	prefer in-state waste to out-of-state waste if possible, correct, or am I mistaken? MR. NORDBY: I don't think I represented that. I was trying to stress that this agreement as it is was beneficial in taking more in-state waste. MR. BOWER: And so my question is, in what way is that bene please explain how that's beneficial in your view to be accepting in-state waste as opposed to out-of-state waste? MR. NORDBY: I would think it would speak to your initial question as to the hierarchy. I don't think the hierarchy if we're taking waste in from out of state, I would think Maine and I know my communities are more concerned about handling responsibly in-state Maine waste. MR. BOWER: At yesterday's proceedings there was a reference made to an interim agreement that's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any other intervenors who wish to cross examine PERC at this time? Please do state your name. MR. SANBORN: My name is Harry Sanborn. I represent my wife and I. HEARING OFFICER: And for the record, your wife's name is? MR. SANBORN: Laura, L-A-U-R-A. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have a transcription so we need to make sure it's on the record. MR. MAHONEY: Madam Hearing Officer, just as a point of clarification, I'm not certain whether Mr. Sanborn was stated as a party who was intending to cross examine Mr. Nordby. Is there a time limit imposed on his cross examination? HEARING OFFICER: That is a good question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	prefer in-state waste to out-of-state waste if possible, correct, or am I mistaken? MR. NORDBY: I don't think I represented that. I was trying to stress that this agreement as it is was beneficial in taking more in-state waste. MR. BOWER: And so my question is, in what way is that bene please explain how that's beneficial in your view to be accepting in-state waste as opposed to out-of-state waste? MR. NORDBY: I would think it would speak to your initial question as to the hierarchy. I don't think the hierarchy if we're taking waste in from out of state, I would think Maine and I know my communities are more concerned about handling responsibly in-state Maine waste. MR. BOWER: At yesterday's proceedings there was a reference made to an interim agreement that's effective while this proceeding is pending for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any other intervenors who wish to cross examine PERC at this time? Please do state your name. MR. SANBORN: My name is Harry Sanborn. I represent my wife and I. HEARING OFFICER: And for the record, your wife's name is? MR. SANBORN: Laura, L-A-U-R-A. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have a transcription so we need to make sure it's on the record. MR. MAHONEY: Madam Hearing Officer, just as a point of clarification, I'm not certain whether Mr. Sanborn was stated as a party who was intending to cross examine Mr. Nordby. Is there a time limit imposed on his cross examination? HEARING OFFICER: That is a good question. I will be limiting your cross examination to five
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	prefer in-state waste to out-of-state waste if possible, correct, or am I mistaken? MR. NORDBY: I don't think I represented that. I was trying to stress that this agreement as it is was beneficial in taking more in-state waste. MR. BOWER: And so my question is, in what way is that bene please explain how that's beneficial in your view to be accepting in-state waste as opposed to out-of-state waste? MR. NORDBY: I would think it would speak to your initial question as to the hierarchy. I don't think the hierarchy if we're taking waste in from out of state, I would think Maine and I know my communities are more concerned about handling responsibly in-state Maine waste. MR. BOWER: At yesterday's proceedings there was a reference made to an interim agreement that's effective while this proceeding is pending for disposal of waste by Casella. There was some	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any other intervenors who wish to cross examine PERC at this time? Please do state your name. MR. SANBORN: My name is Harry Sanborn. I represent my wife and I. HEARING OFFICER: And for the record, your wife's name is? MR. SANBORN: Laura, L-A-U-R-A. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have a transcription so we need to make sure it's on the record. MR. MAHONEY: Madam Hearing Officer, just as a point of clarification, I'm not certain whether Mr. Sanborn was stated as a party who was intending to cross examine Mr. Nordby. Is there a time limit imposed on his cross examination? HEARING OFFICER: That is a good question. I will be limiting your cross examination to five minutes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	prefer in-state waste to out-of-state waste if possible, correct, or am I mistaken? MR. NORDBY: I don't think I represented that. I was trying to stress that this agreement as it is was beneficial in taking more in-state waste. MR. BOWER: And so my question is, in what way is that bene please explain how that's beneficial in your view to be accepting in-state waste as opposed to out-of-state waste? MR. NORDBY: I would think it would speak to your initial question as to the hierarchy. I don't think the hierarchy if we're taking waste in from out of state, I would think Maine and I know my communities are more concerned about handling responsibly in-state Maine waste. MR. BOWER: At yesterday's proceedings there was a reference made to an interim agreement that's effective while this proceeding is pending for disposal of waste by Casella. There was some discussion that that agreement is about to expire, is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any other intervenors who wish to cross examine PERC at this time? Please do state your name. MR. SANBORN: My name is Harry Sanborn. I represent my wife and I. HEARING OFFICER: And for the record, your wife's name is? MR. SANBORN: Laura, L-A-U-R-A. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have a transcription so we need to make sure it's on the record. MR. MAHONEY: Madam Hearing Officer, just as a point of clarification, I'm not certain whether Mr. Sanborn was stated as a party who was intending to cross examine Mr. Nordby. Is there a time limit imposed on his cross examination? HEARING OFFICER: That is a good question. I will be limiting your cross examination to five minutes. MR. SANBORN: That's fine, thank you. Mr.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	prefer in-state waste to out-of-state waste if possible, correct, or am I mistaken? MR. NORDBY: I don't think I represented that. I was trying to stress that this agreement as it is was beneficial in taking more in-state waste. MR. BOWER: And so my question is, in what way is that bene please explain how that's beneficial in your view to be accepting in-state waste as opposed to out-of-state waste? MR. NORDBY: I would think it would speak to your initial question as to the hierarchy. I don't think the hierarchy if we're taking waste in from out of state, I would think Maine and I know my communities are more concerned about handling responsibly in-state Maine waste. MR. BOWER: At yesterday's proceedings there was a reference made to an interim agreement that's effective while this proceeding is pending for disposal of waste by Casella. There was some discussion that that agreement is about to expire, is that correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any other intervenors who wish to cross examine PERC at this time? Please do state your name. MR. SANBORN: My name is Harry Sanborn. I represent my wife and I. HEARING OFFICER: And for the record, your wife's name is? MR. SANBORN: Laura, L-A-U-R-A. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have a transcription so we need to make sure it's on the record. MR. MAHONEY: Madam Hearing Officer, just as a point of clarification, I'm not certain whether Mr. Sanborn was stated as a party who was intending to cross examine Mr. Nordby. Is there a time limit imposed on his cross examination? HEARING OFFICER: That is a good question. I will be limiting your cross examination to five minutes. MR. SANBORN: That's fine, thank you. Mr. Nordby, you represent in your testimony good
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	prefer in-state waste to out-of-state waste if possible, correct, or am I mistaken? MR. NORDBY: I don't think I represented that. I was trying to stress that this agreement as it is was beneficial in taking more in-state waste. MR. BOWER: And so my question is, in what way is that bene please explain how that's beneficial in your view to be accepting in-state waste as opposed to out-of-state waste? MR. NORDBY: I would think it would speak to your initial question as to the hierarchy. I don't think the hierarchy if we're taking waste in from out of state, I would think Maine and I know my communities are more concerned about handling responsibly in-state Maine waste. MR. BOWER: At yesterday's proceedings there was a reference made to an interim agreement that's effective while this proceeding is pending for disposal of waste by Casella. There was some discussion that that agreement is about to expire, is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any other intervenors who wish to cross examine PERC at this time? Please do state your name. MR. SANBORN: My name is Harry Sanborn. I represent my wife and I. HEARING OFFICER: And for the record, your wife's name is? MR. SANBORN: Laura, L-A-U-R-A. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have a transcription so we need to make sure it's on the record. MR. MAHONEY: Madam Hearing Officer, just as a point of clarification, I'm not certain whether Mr. Sanborn was stated as a party who was intending to cross examine Mr. Nordby. Is there a time limit imposed on his cross examination? HEARING OFFICER: That is a good question. I will be limiting your cross examination to five minutes. MR. SANBORN: That's fine, thank you. Mr.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	prefer in-state waste to out-of-state waste if possible, correct, or am I mistaken? MR. NORDBY: I don't think I represented that. I was trying to stress that this agreement as it is was beneficial in taking more in-state waste. MR. BOWER: And so my question is, in what way is that bene please explain how that's beneficial in your view to be accepting in-state waste as opposed to out-of-state waste? MR. NORDBY: I would think it would speak to your initial question as to the hierarchy. I don't think the hierarchy if we're taking waste in from out of state, I would think Maine and I know my communities are more concerned about handling responsibly in-state Maine waste. MR. BOWER: At yesterday's proceedings there was a reference made to an interim agreement that's effective while this proceeding is pending for disposal of waste by Casella. There was some discussion that that agreement is about to expire, is that correct? MR. NORDBY: The date on it is getting close	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any other intervenors who wish to cross examine PERC at this time? Please do state your name. MR. SANBORN: My name is Harry Sanborn. I represent my wife and I. HEARING OFFICER: And for the record, your wife's name is? MR. SANBORN: Laura, L-A-U-R-A. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have a transcription so we need to make sure it's on the record. MR. MAHONEY: Madam Hearing Officer, just as a point of clarification, I'm not certain whether Mr. Sanborn was stated as a party who was intending to cross examine Mr. Nordby. Is there a time limit imposed on his cross examination? HEARING OFFICER: That is a good question. I will be limiting your cross examination to five minutes. MR. SANBORN: That's fine, thank you. Mr. Nordby, you represent in your testimony good morning, by the way.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	prefer in-state waste to out-of-state waste if possible, correct, or am I mistaken? MR. NORDBY: I don't think I represented that. I was trying to stress that this agreement as it is was beneficial in taking more in-state waste. MR. BOWER: And so my question is, in what way is that bene please explain how that's beneficial in your view to be accepting in-state waste as opposed to out-of-state waste? MR. NORDBY: I would think it would speak to your initial question as to the hierarchy. I don't think the hierarchy if we're taking waste in from out of state, I would think Maine and I know my communities are more concerned about handling responsibly in-state Maine waste. MR. BOWER: At yesterday's proceedings there was a reference made to an interim agreement that's effective while this proceeding is pending for disposal of waste by Casella. There was some discussion that that agreement is about to expire, is that correct? MR. NORDBY: The date on it is getting close to the expiration date. We would hope that it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any other intervenors who wish to cross examine PERC at this time? Please do state your name. MR. SANBORN: My name is Harry Sanborn. I represent my wife and I. HEARING OFFICER: And for the record, your wife's name is? MR. SANBORN: Laura, L-A-U-R-A. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have a transcription so we need to make sure it's on the record. MR. MAHONEY: Madam Hearing Officer, just as a point of clarification, I'm not certain whether Mr. Sanborn was stated as a party who was intending to cross examine Mr. Nordby. Is there a time limit imposed on his cross examination? HEARING OFFICER: That is a good question. I will be limiting your cross examination to five minutes. MR. SANBORN: That's fine, thank you. Mr. Nordby, you represent in your testimony good morning, by the way. MR. NORDBY: Good morning to you.

	292		294
1	I look at your agreement, here's what I see. I see	1	Casella?
2	two problems with it; one being that the member	2	MR. NORDBY: Yes, sir.
3	communities over the last five years are all	3	MR. SANBORN: Okay, and you operate 365 days
4	generating less waste; two, you agreed to let Casella	4	a year?
5	introduce and market zero waste disposal to the	5	MR. NORDBY: No, sir.
6	member communities. They happen to do that fairly	6	MR. SANBORN: How many days a year?
7	well.	7	MR. NORDBY: Subtract approximately six or
8	HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Sanborn, can you	8	seven holidays out.
9	MR. SANBORN: Now the question is I'm	9	MR. SANBORN: Okay. So if I do the math
10	sorry, I had to bracket the question.	10	quickly in round numbers that's over 63,000 tons,
11	HEARING OFFICER: Yes, perfect, thank you.	11	not 30,000 tons, which you seem to correlate the two.
12	MR. SANBORN: So the question is, if Casella	12	MR. NORDBY: Again, Mr. Sanborn, I'd suggest
13	markets to the member communities like they have to	13	you read the agreement where it says up to 175 tons a
14	other communities, Holden, for instance, where they	14	day.
15	had a 24 percent reduction, you from in-state	15	MR. SANBORN: Again, I think I'm asking you,
16	waste, 71 percent of everything you combusted last	16	you're not asking me.
17	year came from in-state. If Casella takes out 24	17	MR. NORDBY: Then I would ask that you
18	percent of what they do, and I certainly hope they do	18	clarify your question so it actually means something
19	because that's the way to go, under the contract	19	so I can answer it.
20	they're going to backfill you with out-of-state	20	HEARING OFFICER: Ask him about the
21	waste. The in-state waste the inventory is going	21	correlation.
22	away. So how do you how do you represent to me	22	MR. SANBORN: What is the correlation
23	your assertion that it's not going to be out-of-state	23	between what Casella can reduce through zero sort and
24	waste?	24	where you're going to get it? Because they do zero
25	MR. NORDBY: I'd be interested if you could	25	sort with everybody, not just residences. They do
	293		295
1	293 reference where it says they're going to backfill the	1	295 commercial. There's going to be less if they do what
1 2		1 2	
	reference where it says they're going to backfill the		commercial. There's going to be less if they do what
2	reference where it says they're going to backfill the PERC needs with out-of-state waste?	2	commercial. There's going to be less if they do what they've proven they can do. If we're producing less
2 3	reference where it says they're going to backfill the PERC needs with out-of-state waste? MR. SANBORN: I'll quote Mr. Doyle from	2 3	commercial. There's going to be less if they do what they've proven they can do. If we're producing less in the state of Maine, there's only one place to get
2 3 4	reference where it says they're going to backfill the PERC needs with out-of-state waste? MR. SANBORN: I'll quote Mr. Doyle from yesterday. I think it's me asking you the questions now. MR. NORDBY: Okay. I'll answer your	2 3 4	commercial. There's going to be less if they do what they've proven they can do. If we're producing less in the state of Maine, there's only one place to get it and that's from out-of-state. Is that a correct assumption? MR. MAHONEY: I'm not hearing a question
2 3 4 5	reference where it says they're going to backfill the PERC needs with out-of-state waste? MR. SANBORN: I'll quote Mr. Doyle from yesterday. I think it's me asking you the questions now. MR. NORDBY: Okay. I'll answer your question then. Your assumption or to use your words	2 3 4 5	commercial. There's going to be less if they do what they've proven they can do. If we're producing less in the state of Maine, there's only one place to get it and that's from out-of-state. Is that a correct assumption? MR. MAHONEY: I'm not hearing a question there, Madam Hearing Officer.
2 3 4 5 6	reference where it says they're going to backfill the PERC needs with out-of-state waste? MR. SANBORN: I'll quote Mr. Doyle from yesterday. I think it's me asking you the questions now. MR. NORDBY: Okay. I'll answer your question then. Your assumption or to use your words bracketing the question, again are false. There's no	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	commercial. There's going to be less if they do what they've proven they can do. If we're producing less in the state of Maine, there's only one place to get it and that's from out-of-state. Is that a correct assumption? MR. MAHONEY: I'm not hearing a question there, Madam Hearing Officer. MR. SANBORN: The question was, is that a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	reference where it says they're going to backfill the PERC needs with out-of-state waste? MR. SANBORN: I'll quote Mr. Doyle from yesterday. I think it's me asking you the questions now. MR. NORDBY: Okay. I'll answer your question then. Your assumption or to use your words bracketing the question, again are false. There's no place in the agreement that Casella says or we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	commercial. There's going to be less if they do what they've proven they can do. If we're producing less in the state of Maine, there's only one place to get it and that's from out-of-state. Is that a correct assumption? MR. MAHONEY: I'm not hearing a question there, Madam Hearing Officer. MR. SANBORN: The question was, is that a correct assumption based on his testimony.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	reference where it says they're going to backfill the PERC needs with out-of-state waste? MR. SANBORN: I'll quote Mr. Doyle from yesterday. I think it's me asking you the questions now. MR. NORDBY: Okay. I'll answer your question then. Your assumption or to use your words bracketing the question, again are false. There's no place in the agreement that Casella says or we require that they backfill waste with out-of-state	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	commercial. There's going to be less if they do what they've proven they can do. If we're producing less in the state of Maine, there's only one place to get it and that's from out-of-state. Is that a correct assumption? MR. MAHONEY: I'm not hearing a question there, Madam Hearing Officer. MR. SANBORN: The question was, is that a correct assumption based on his testimony. HEARING OFFICER: And, Mr. Sanborn, I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	reference where it says they're going to backfill the PERC needs with out-of-state waste? MR. SANBORN: I'll quote Mr. Doyle from yesterday. I think it's me asking you the questions now. MR. NORDBY: Okay. I'll answer your question then. Your assumption or to use your words bracketing the question, again are false. There's no place in the agreement that Casella says or we require that they backfill waste with out-of-state waste.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	commercial. There's going to be less if they do what they've proven they can do. If we're producing less in the state of Maine, there's only one place to get it and that's from out-of-state. Is that a correct assumption? MR. MAHONEY: I'm not hearing a question there, Madam Hearing Officer. MR. SANBORN: The question was, is that a correct assumption based on his testimony. HEARING OFFICER: And, Mr. Sanborn, I believe he responded that is not a correct
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	reference where it says they're going to backfill the PERC needs with out-of-state waste? MR. SANBORN: I'll quote Mr. Doyle from yesterday. I think it's me asking you the questions now. MR. NORDBY: Okay. I'll answer your question then. Your assumption or to use your words bracketing the question, again are false. There's no place in the agreement that Casella says or we require that they backfill waste with out-of-state waste. MR. SANBORN: And when they are marketing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	commercial. There's going to be less if they do what they've proven they can do. If we're producing less in the state of Maine, there's only one place to get it and that's from out-of-state. Is that a correct assumption? MR. MAHONEY: I'm not hearing a question there, Madam Hearing Officer. MR. SANBORN: The question was, is that a correct assumption based on his testimony. HEARING OFFICER: And, Mr. Sanborn, I believe he responded that is not a correct assumption. So you have one more minute if you have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	reference where it says they're going to backfill the PERC needs with out-of-state waste? MR. SANBORN: I'll quote Mr. Doyle from yesterday. I think it's me asking you the questions now. MR. NORDBY: Okay. I'll answer your question then. Your assumption or to use your words bracketing the question, again are false. There's no place in the agreement that Casella says or we require that they backfill waste with out-of-state waste. MR. SANBORN: And when they are marketing zero sort as successful and you still need commodity,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	commercial. There's going to be less if they do what they've proven they can do. If we're producing less in the state of Maine, there's only one place to get it and that's from out-of-state. Is that a correct assumption? MR. MAHONEY: I'm not hearing a question there, Madam Hearing Officer. MR. SANBORN: The question was, is that a correct assumption based on his testimony. HEARING OFFICER: And, Mr. Sanborn, I believe he responded that is not a correct assumption. So you have one more minute if you have any other questions to ask.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	reference where it says they're going to backfill the PERC needs with out-of-state waste? MR. SANBORN: I'll quote Mr. Doyle from yesterday. I think it's me asking you the questions now. MR. NORDBY: Okay. I'll answer your question then. Your assumption or to use your words bracketing the question, again are false. There's no place in the agreement that Casella says or we require that they backfill waste with out-of-state waste. MR. SANBORN: And when they are marketing zero sort as successful and you still need commodity, where do you intend to get it?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	commercial. There's going to be less if they do what they've proven they can do. If we're producing less in the state of Maine, there's only one place to get it and that's from out-of-state. Is that a correct assumption? MR. MAHONEY: I'm not hearing a question there, Madam Hearing Officer. MR. SANBORN: The question was, is that a correct assumption based on his testimony. HEARING OFFICER: And, Mr. Sanborn, I believe he responded that is not a correct assumption. So you have one more minute if you have any other questions to ask. MR. SANBORN: How many more?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	reference where it says they're going to backfill the PERC needs with out-of-state waste? MR. SANBORN: I'll quote Mr. Doyle from yesterday. I think it's me asking you the questions now. MR. NORDBY: Okay. I'll answer your question then. Your assumption or to use your words bracketing the question, again are false. There's no place in the agreement that Casella says or we require that they backfill waste with out-of-state waste. MR. SANBORN: And when they are marketing zero sort as successful and you still need commodity, where do you intend to get it? MR. NORDBY: As I'm sure you looked at the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	commercial. There's going to be less if they do what they've proven they can do. If we're producing less in the state of Maine, there's only one place to get it and that's from out-of-state. Is that a correct assumption? MR. MAHONEY: I'm not hearing a question there, Madam Hearing Officer. MR. SANBORN: The question was, is that a correct assumption based on his testimony. HEARING OFFICER: And, Mr. Sanborn, I believe he responded that is not a correct assumption. So you have one more minute if you have any other questions to ask. MR. SANBORN: How many more? HEARING OFFICER: One more minute.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	reference where it says they're going to backfill the PERC needs with out-of-state waste? MR. SANBORN: I'll quote Mr. Doyle from yesterday. I think it's me asking you the questions now. MR. NORDBY: Okay. I'll answer your question then. Your assumption or to use your words bracketing the question, again are false. There's no place in the agreement that Casella says or we require that they backfill waste with out-of-state waste. MR. SANBORN: And when they are marketing zero sort as successful and you still need commodity, where do you intend to get it? MR. NORDBY: As I'm sure you looked at the agreement, you saw that they will provide reasonable	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	commercial. There's going to be less if they do what they've proven they can do. If we're producing less in the state of Maine, there's only one place to get it and that's from out-of-state. Is that a correct assumption? MR. MAHONEY: I'm not hearing a question there, Madam Hearing Officer. MR. SANBORN: The question was, is that a correct assumption based on his testimony. HEARING OFFICER: And, Mr. Sanborn, I believe he responded that is not a correct assumption. So you have one more minute if you have any other questions to ask. MR. SANBORN: How many more? HEARING OFFICER: One more minute. MR. SANBORN: Okay. I think I'll be done.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	reference where it says they're going to backfill the PERC needs with out-of-state waste? MR. SANBORN: I'll quote Mr. Doyle from yesterday. I think it's me asking you the questions now. MR. NORDBY: Okay. I'll answer your question then. Your assumption or to use your words bracketing the question, again are false. There's no place in the agreement that Casella says or we require that they backfill waste with out-of-state waste. MR. SANBORN: And when they are marketing zero sort as successful and you still need commodity, where do you intend to get it? MR. NORDBY: As I'm sure you looked at the agreement, you saw that they will provide reasonable commercial efforts to backfill that waste.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	commercial. There's going to be less if they do what they've proven they can do. If we're producing less in the state of Maine, there's only one place to get it and that's from out-of-state. Is that a correct assumption? MR. MAHONEY: I'm not hearing a question there, Madam Hearing Officer. MR. SANBORN: The question was, is that a correct assumption based on his testimony. HEARING OFFICER: And, Mr. Sanborn, I believe he responded that is not a correct assumption. So you have one more minute if you have any other questions to ask. MR. SANBORN: How many more? HEARING OFFICER: One more minute. MR. SANBORN: Okay. I think I'll be done. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	reference where it says they're going to backfill the PERC needs with out-of-state waste? MR. SANBORN: I'll quote Mr. Doyle from yesterday. I think it's me asking you the questions now. MR. NORDBY: Okay. I'll answer your question then. Your assumption or to use your words bracketing the question, again are false. There's no place in the agreement that Casella says or we require that they backfill waste with out-of-state waste. MR. SANBORN: And when they are marketing zero sort as successful and you still need commodity, where do you intend to get it? MR. NORDBY: As I'm sure you looked at the agreement, you saw that they will provide reasonable commercial efforts to backfill that waste. MR. SANBORN: Thank you. You also said that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	commercial. There's going to be less if they do what they've proven they can do. If we're producing less in the state of Maine, there's only one place to get it and that's from out-of-state. Is that a correct assumption? MR. MAHONEY: I'm not hearing a question there, Madam Hearing Officer. MR. SANBORN: The question was, is that a correct assumption based on his testimony. HEARING OFFICER: And, Mr. Sanborn, I believe he responded that is not a correct assumption. So you have one more minute if you have any other questions to ask. MR. SANBORN: How many more? HEARING OFFICER: One more minute. MR. SANBORN: Okay. I think I'll be done. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Are there other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	reference where it says they're going to backfill the PERC needs with out-of-state waste? MR. SANBORN: I'll quote Mr. Doyle from yesterday. I think it's me asking you the questions now. MR. NORDBY: Okay. I'll answer your question then. Your assumption or to use your words bracketing the question, again are false. There's no place in the agreement that Casella says or we require that they backfill waste with out-of-state waste. MR. SANBORN: And when they are marketing zero sort as successful and you still need commodity, where do you intend to get it? MR. NORDBY: As I'm sure you looked at the agreement, you saw that they will provide reasonable commercial efforts to backfill that waste. MR. SANBORN: Thank you. You also said that you're taking in on a temporary basis 175 tons a day	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	commercial. There's going to be less if they do what they've proven they can do. If we're producing less in the state of Maine, there's only one place to get it and that's from out-of-state. Is that a correct assumption? MR. MAHONEY: I'm not hearing a question there, Madam Hearing Officer. MR. SANBORN: The question was, is that a correct assumption based on his testimony. HEARING OFFICER: And, Mr. Sanborn, I believe he responded that is not a correct assumption. So you have one more minute if you have any other questions to ask. MR. SANBORN: How many more? HEARING OFFICER: One more minute. MR. SANBORN: Okay. I think I'll be done. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Are there other intervenors who would like to cross examine PERC at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	reference where it says they're going to backfill the PERC needs with out-of-state waste? MR. SANBORN: I'll quote Mr. Doyle from yesterday. I think it's me asking you the questions now. MR. NORDBY: Okay. I'll answer your question then. Your assumption or to use your words bracketing the question, again are false. There's no place in the agreement that Casella says or we require that they backfill waste with out-of-state waste. MR. SANBORN: And when they are marketing zero sort as successful and you still need commodity, where do you intend to get it? MR. NORDBY: As I'm sure you looked at the agreement, you saw that they will provide reasonable commercial efforts to backfill that waste. MR. SANBORN: Thank you. You also said that you're taking in on a temporary basis 175 tons a day approximately from MERC, is that what I understood?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	commercial. There's going to be less if they do what they've proven they can do. If we're producing less in the state of Maine, there's only one place to get it and that's from out-of-state. Is that a correct assumption? MR. MAHONEY: I'm not hearing a question there, Madam Hearing Officer. MR. SANBORN: The question was, is that a correct assumption based on his testimony. HEARING OFFICER: And, Mr. Sanborn, I believe he responded that is not a correct assumption. So you have one more minute if you have any other questions to ask. MR. SANBORN: How many more? HEARING OFFICER: One more minute. MR. SANBORN: Okay. I think I'll be done. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Are there other intervenors who would like to cross examine PERC at this time? Seeing none
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	reference where it says they're going to backfill the PERC needs with out-of-state waste? MR. SANBORN: I'll quote Mr. Doyle from yesterday. I think it's me asking you the questions now. MR. NORDBY: Okay. I'll answer your question then. Your assumption or to use your words bracketing the question, again are false. There's no place in the agreement that Casella says or we require that they backfill waste with out-of-state waste. MR. SANBORN: And when they are marketing zero sort as successful and you still need commodity, where do you intend to get it? MR. NORDBY: As I'm sure you looked at the agreement, you saw that they will provide reasonable commercial efforts to backfill that waste. MR. SANBORN: Thank you. You also said that you're taking in on a temporary basis 175 tons a day approximately from MERC, is that what I understood? Did I hear that correctly?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	commercial. There's going to be less if they do what they've proven they can do. If we're producing less in the state of Maine, there's only one place to get it and that's from out-of-state. Is that a correct assumption? MR. MAHONEY: I'm not hearing a question there, Madam Hearing Officer. MR. SANBORN: The question was, is that a correct assumption based on his testimony. HEARING OFFICER: And, Mr. Sanborn, I believe he responded that is not a correct assumption. So you have one more minute if you have any other questions to ask. MR. SANBORN: How many more? HEARING OFFICER: One more minute. MR. SANBORN: Okay. I think I'll be done. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Are there other intervenors who would like to cross examine PERC at this time? Seeing none MR. DOYLE: Madam Hearing Officer?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	reference where it says they're going to backfill the PERC needs with out-of-state waste? MR. SANBORN: I'll quote Mr. Doyle from yesterday. I think it's me asking you the questions now. MR. NORDBY: Okay. I'll answer your question then. Your assumption or to use your words bracketing the question, again are false. There's no place in the agreement that Casella says or we require that they backfill waste with out-of-state waste. MR. SANBORN: And when they are marketing zero sort as successful and you still need commodity, where do you intend to get it? MR. NORDBY: As I'm sure you looked at the agreement, you saw that they will provide reasonable commercial efforts to backfill that waste. MR. SANBORN: Thank you. You also said that you're taking in on a temporary basis 175 tons a day approximately from MERC, is that what I understood? Did I hear that correctly? MR. NORDBY: I said I was receiving	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	commercial. There's going to be less if they do what they've proven they can do. If we're producing less in the state of Maine, there's only one place to get it and that's from out-of-state. Is that a correct assumption? MR. MAHONEY: I'm not hearing a question there, Madam Hearing Officer. MR. SANBORN: The question was, is that a correct assumption based on his testimony. HEARING OFFICER: And, Mr. Sanborn, I believe he responded that is not a correct assumption. So you have one more minute if you have any other questions to ask. MR. SANBORN: How many more? HEARING OFFICER: One more minute. MR. SANBORN: Okay. I think I'll be done. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Are there other intervenors who would like to cross examine PERC at this time? Seeing none MR. DOYLE: Madam Hearing Officer? HEARING OFFICER: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	reference where it says they're going to backfill the PERC needs with out-of-state waste? MR. SANBORN: I'll quote Mr. Doyle from yesterday. I think it's me asking you the questions now. MR. NORDBY: Okay. I'll answer your question then. Your assumption or to use your words bracketing the question, again are false. There's no place in the agreement that Casella says or we require that they backfill waste with out-of-state waste. MR. SANBORN: And when they are marketing zero sort as successful and you still need commodity, where do you intend to get it? MR. NORDBY: As I'm sure you looked at the agreement, you saw that they will provide reasonable commercial efforts to backfill that waste. MR. SANBORN: Thank you. You also said that you're taking in on a temporary basis 175 tons a day approximately from MERC, is that what I understood? Did I hear that correctly? MR. NORDBY: I said I was receiving approximately 175 tons a day under the interim	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	commercial. There's going to be less if they do what they've proven they can do. If we're producing less in the state of Maine, there's only one place to get it and that's from out-of-state. Is that a correct assumption? MR. MAHONEY: I'm not hearing a question there, Madam Hearing Officer. MR. SANBORN: The question was, is that a correct assumption based on his testimony. HEARING OFFICER: And, Mr. Sanborn, I believe he responded that is not a correct assumption. So you have one more minute if you have any other questions to ask. MR. SANBORN: How many more? HEARING OFFICER: One more minute. MR. SANBORN: Okay. I think I'll be done. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Are there other intervenors who would like to cross examine PERC at this time? Seeing none MR. DOYLE: Madam Hearing Officer? HEARING OFFICER: Yes. MR. DOYLE: May the applicant ask questions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	reference where it says they're going to backfill the PERC needs with out-of-state waste? MR. SANBORN: I'll quote Mr. Doyle from yesterday. I think it's me asking you the questions now. MR. NORDBY: Okay. I'll answer your question then. Your assumption or to use your words bracketing the question, again are false. There's no place in the agreement that Casella says or we require that they backfill waste with out-of-state waste. MR. SANBORN: And when they are marketing zero sort as successful and you still need commodity, where do you intend to get it? MR. NORDBY: As I'm sure you looked at the agreement, you saw that they will provide reasonable commercial efforts to backfill that waste. MR. SANBORN: Thank you. You also said that you're taking in on a temporary basis 175 tons a day approximately from MERC, is that what I understood? Did I hear that correctly? MR. NORDBY: I said I was receiving	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	commercial. There's going to be less if they do what they've proven they can do. If we're producing less in the state of Maine, there's only one place to get it and that's from out-of-state. Is that a correct assumption? MR. MAHONEY: I'm not hearing a question there, Madam Hearing Officer. MR. SANBORN: The question was, is that a correct assumption based on his testimony. HEARING OFFICER: And, Mr. Sanborn, I believe he responded that is not a correct assumption. So you have one more minute if you have any other questions to ask. MR. SANBORN: How many more? HEARING OFFICER: One more minute. MR. SANBORN: Okay. I think I'll be done. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Are there other intervenors who would like to cross examine PERC at this time? Seeing none MR. DOYLE: Madam Hearing Officer? HEARING OFFICER: Yes.

		T	
	296		298
1	other intervenors but it would be correct to have the	1	MR. MAHONEY: And in the winter months in
2	applicant or other intervenors. Mr. Doyle, you will	2	Maine, in your experience is there less MSW that is
3	also have five minutes.	3	sent to facilities like PERC?
4	MR. DOYLE: Thank you. Good morning, Mr.	4	MR. NORDBY: Dismally less, yes.
5	Nordby.	5	MR. MAHONEY: So is it possible that in the
6	MR. NORDBY: Good morning.	6	month of March only 111 tons would have been sent up
7	MR. DOYLE: Mr. Bower asked you about the	7	to PERC under the terms of the agreement?
8	provision 7.4 in the agreement about support for the	8	MR. NORDBY: Yes.
9	application for this application?	9	MR. MAHONEY: Okay, and one other question.
10	MR. NORDBY: Yes, Sir.	10	Under the zero sort recycling, the backfilling
11	MR. DOYLE: Why did you agree to that	11	provision that was referenced on cross examination,
12	provision?	12	under the agreement is it your responsibility to
13	MR. NORDBY: PERC needs a landfill component	13	determine from what sources in-state or out-of-state
14	-	14	that tonnage comes?
	like any other integrated solid waste management		-
15	system. So our contract with Casella is going on	15	MR. NORDBY: No, it is not.
16	probably 20 years, and I need their disposal capacity	16	MR. MAHONEY: Whose responsibility is it?
17	not only for ash, my glass and grit. We feel it's	17	MR. NORDBY: That would be the other member
18	the best way to make sure the plant operated at a	18	of the contract, Casella Waste Systems.
19	maximum capacity.	19	MR. MAHONEY: Thank you. I don't have
20	MR. DOYLE: And there was a question about	20	anything further on redirect.
21	the difference between in-state and out-of-state	21	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. There is now
22	waste in the agreement. Don't you also get a higher	22	an opportunity for what is called recross of PERC.
23	price for in-state waste?	23	If you have additional cross examination questions
24	HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Doyle, be careful not	24	that have arisen as a result of the redirect
25	to lead the witness too far.	25	testimony, you would have an opportunity now to
	007		
	297		299
1	MR. DOYLE: This is cross examination.	1	299 recross. Does anybody wish to recross at this time?
1 2	MR. DOYLE: This is cross examination. MS. MACIROWSKI: It's not cross examination	1 2	
	MR. DOYLE: This is cross examination. MS. MACIROWSKI: It's not cross examination of a hostile witness though.		recross. Does anybody wish to recross at this time? MR. BOWER: I have nothing further. Thank you.
2	MR. DOYLE: This is cross examination. MS. MACIROWSKI: It's not cross examination	2	recross. Does anybody wish to recross at this time? MR. BOWER: I have nothing further. Thank
2 3	MR. DOYLE: This is cross examination. MS. MACIROWSKI: It's not cross examination of a hostile witness though.	2 3	recross. Does anybody wish to recross at this time? MR. BOWER: I have nothing further. Thank you.
2 3 4	MR. DOYLE: This is cross examination. MS. MACIROWSKI: It's not cross examination of a hostile witness though. MR. DOYLE: Do you get a higher price for	2 3 4	recross. Does anybody wish to recross at this time? MR. BOWER: I have nothing further. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have DEP
2 3 4 5	MR. DOYLE: This is cross examination. MS. MACIROWSKI: It's not cross examination of a hostile witness though. MR. DOYLE: Do you get a higher price for in-state waste	2 3 4 5	recross. Does anybody wish to recross at this time? MR. BOWER: I have nothing further. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have DEP staff questions of PERC.
2 3 4 5 6	MR. DOYLE: This is cross examination. MS. MACIROWSKI: It's not cross examination of a hostile witness though. MR. DOYLE: Do you get a higher price for in-state waste MR. NORDBY: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6	recross. Does anybody wish to recross at this time? MR. BOWER: I have nothing further. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have DEP staff questions of PERC. MR. PARKER: Good morning, Mr. Nordby. I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. DOYLE: This is cross examination. MS. MACIROWSKI: It's not cross examination of a hostile witness though. MR. DOYLE: Do you get a higher price for in-state waste MR. NORDBY: Yes. MR. DOYLE: than you do for out-of-state	2 3 4 5 6 7	recross. Does anybody wish to recross at this time? MR. BOWER: I have nothing further. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have DEP staff questions of PERC. MR. PARKER: Good morning, Mr. Nordby. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP Project Manager for the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. DOYLE: This is cross examination. MS. MACIROWSKI: It's not cross examination of a hostile witness though. MR. DOYLE: Do you get a higher price for in-state waste MR. NORDBY: Yes. MR. DOYLE: than you do for out-of-state waste?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	recross. Does anybody wish to recross at this time? MR. BOWER: I have nothing further. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have DEP staff questions of PERC. MR. PARKER: Good morning, Mr. Nordby. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP Project Manager for the application.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. DOYLE: This is cross examination. MS. MACIROWSKI: It's not cross examination of a hostile witness though. MR. DOYLE: Do you get a higher price for in-state waste MR. NORDBY: Yes. MR. DOYLE: than you do for out-of-state waste? MR. NORDBY: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	recross. Does anybody wish to recross at this time? MR. BOWER: I have nothing further. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have DEP staff questions of PERC. MR. PARKER: Good morning, Mr. Nordby. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP Project Manager for the application. MR. NORDBY: Hello.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. DOYLE: This is cross examination. MS. MACIROWSKI: It's not cross examination of a hostile witness though. MR. DOYLE: Do you get a higher price for in-state waste MR. NORDBY: Yes. MR. DOYLE: than you do for out-of-state waste? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MR. NORDBY: Yes. MR. DOYLE: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	recross. Does anybody wish to recross at this time? MR. BOWER: I have nothing further. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have DEP staff questions of PERC. MR. PARKER: Good morning, Mr. Nordby. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP Project Manager for the application. MR. NORDBY: Hello. MR. PARKER: A couple questions. Is there a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. DOYLE: This is cross examination. MS. MACIROWSKI: It's not cross examination of a hostile witness though. MR. DOYLE: Do you get a higher price for in-state waste MR. NORDBY: Yes. MR. DOYLE: than you do for out-of-state waste? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MR. DOYLE: Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: At this time we'll have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	recross. Does anybody wish to recross at this time? MR. BOWER: I have nothing further. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have DEP staff questions of PERC. MR. PARKER: Good morning, Mr. Nordby. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP Project Manager for the application. MR. NORDBY: Hello. MR. PARKER: A couple questions. Is there a no compete clause in the contract whereby PERC
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. DOYLE: This is cross examination. MS. MACIROWSKI: It's not cross examination of a hostile witness though. MR. DOYLE: Do you get a higher price for in-state waste MR. NORDBY: Yes. MR. DOYLE: than you do for out-of-state waste? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MR. NORDBY: Yes. MR. DOYLE: Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: At this time we'll have redirect testimony by PERC limited to five minutes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	recross. Does anybody wish to recross at this time? MR. BOWER: I have nothing further. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have DEP staff questions of PERC. MR. PARKER: Good morning, Mr. Nordby. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP Project Manager for the application. MR. NORDBY: Hello. MR. PARKER: A couple questions. Is there a no compete clause in the contract whereby PERC couldn't actively solicit the MERC communities for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. DOYLE: This is cross examination. MS. MACIROWSKI: It's not cross examination of a hostile witness though. MR. DOYLE: Do you get a higher price for in-state waste MR. NORDBY: Yes. MR. DOYLE: than you do for out-of-state waste? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MR. DOYLE: Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: At this time we'll have redirect testimony by PERC limited to five minutes. MR. MAHONEY: Just very quickly, Madam	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	recross. Does anybody wish to recross at this time? MR. BOWER: I have nothing further. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have DEP staff questions of PERC. MR. PARKER: Good morning, Mr. Nordby. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP Project Manager for the application. MR. NORDBY: Hello. MR. PARKER: A couple questions. Is there a no compete clause in the contract whereby PERC couldn't actively solicit the MERC communities for the waste?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. DOYLE: This is cross examination. MS. MACIROWSKI: It's not cross examination of a hostile witness though. MR. DOYLE: Do you get a higher price for in-state waste MR. NORDBY: Yes. MR. DOYLE: than you do for out-of-state waste? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MR. DOYLE: Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: At this time we'll have redirect testimony by PERC limited to five minutes. MR. MAHONEY: Just very quickly, Madam Hearing Officer. Following up on some of the issues	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	recross. Does anybody wish to recross at this time? MR. BOWER: I have nothing further. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have DEP staff questions of PERC. MR. PARKER: Good morning, Mr. Nordby. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP Project Manager for the application. MR. NORDBY: Hello. MR. PARKER: A couple questions. Is there a no compete clause in the contract whereby PERC couldn't actively solicit the MERC communities for the waste? MR. NORDBY: I'm sorry, that PERC can't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. DOYLE: This is cross examination. MS. MACIROWSKI: It's not cross examination of a hostile witness though. MR. DOYLE: Do you get a higher price for in-state waste MR. NORDBY: Yes. MR. DOYLE: than you do for out-of-state waste? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MR. DOYLE: Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: At this time we'll have redirect testimony by PERC limited to five minutes. MR. MAHONEY: Just very quickly, Madam Hearing Officer. Following up on some of the issues you were asked about on cross examination, Mr.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	recross. Does anybody wish to recross at this time? MR. BOWER: I have nothing further. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have DEP staff questions of PERC. MR. PARKER: Good morning, Mr. Nordby. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP Project Manager for the application. MR. NORDBY: Hello. MR. NORDBY: Hello. MR. PARKER: A couple questions. Is there a no compete clause in the contract whereby PERC couldn't actively solicit the MERC communities for the waste? MR. NORDBY: I'm sorry, that PERC can't solicit the MERC communities?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. DOYLE: This is cross examination. MS. MACIROWSKI: It's not cross examination of a hostile witness though. MR. DOYLE: Do you get a higher price for in-state waste MR. NORDBY: Yes. MR. DOYLE: than you do for out-of-state waste? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MR. DOYLE: Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: At this time we'll have redirect testimony by PERC limited to five minutes. MR. MAHONEY: Just very quickly, Madam Hearing Officer. Following up on some of the issues you were asked about on cross examination, Mr. Nordby, would it surprise you to know that in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	recross. Does anybody wish to recross at this time? MR. BOWER: I have nothing further. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have DEP staff questions of PERC. MR. PARKER: Good morning, Mr. Nordby. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP Project Manager for the application. MR. NORDBY: Hello. MR. NORDBY: Hello. MR. PARKER: A couple questions. Is there a no compete clause in the contract whereby PERC couldn't actively solicit the MERC communities for the waste? MR. NORDBY: I'm sorry, that PERC can't solicit the MERC communities? MR. PARKER: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. DOYLE: This is cross examination. MS. MACIROWSKI: It's not cross examination of a hostile witness though. MR. DOYLE: Do you get a higher price for in-state waste MR. NORDBY: Yes. MR. DOYLE: than you do for out-of-state waste? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MR. DOYLE: Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: At this time we'll have redirect testimony by PERC limited to five minutes. MR. MAHONEY: Just very quickly, Madam Hearing Officer. Following up on some of the issues you were asked about on cross examination, Mr. Nordby, would it surprise you to know that in the month of March under the interim agreement PERC	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	recross. Does anybody wish to recross at this time? MR. BOWER: I have nothing further. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have DEP staff questions of PERC. MR. PARKER: Good morning, Mr. Nordby. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP Project Manager for the application. MR. NORDBY: Hello. MR. PARKER: A couple questions. Is there a no compete clause in the contract whereby PERC couldn't actively solicit the MERC communities for the waste? MR. NORDBY: I'm sorry, that PERC can't solicit the MERC communities? MR. PARKER: Yes. MR. NORDBY: No, sir. MR. NORDBY: No, sir. MR. PARKER: So you could actually go out
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. DOYLE: This is cross examination. MS. MACIROWSKI: It's not cross examination of a hostile witness though. MR. DOYLE: Do you get a higher price for in-state waste MR. NORDBY: Yes. MR. DOYLE: than you do for out-of-state waste? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MR. DOYLE: Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: At this time we'll have redirect testimony by PERC limited to five minutes. MR. MAHONEY: Just very quickly, Madam Hearing Officer. Following up on some of the issues you were asked about on cross examination, Mr. Nordby, would it surprise you to know that in the month of March under the interim agreement PERC received only 111 tons of MSW from Casella?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	recross. Does anybody wish to recross at this time? MR. BOWER: I have nothing further. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have DEP staff questions of PERC. MR. PARKER: Good morning, Mr. Nordby. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP Project Manager for the application. MR. NORDBY: Hello. MR. PARKER: A couple questions. Is there a no compete clause in the contract whereby PERC couldn't actively solicit the MERC communities for the waste? MR. NORDBY: I'm sorry, that PERC can't solicit the MERC communities? MR. PARKER: Yes. MR. NORDBY: No, sir.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. DOYLE: This is cross examination. MS. MACIROWSKI: It's not cross examination of a hostile witness though. MR. DOYLE: Do you get a higher price for in-state waste MR. NORDBY: Yes. MR. DOYLE: than you do for out-of-state waste? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MR. DOYLE: Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: At this time we'll have redirect testimony by PERC limited to five minutes. MR. MAHONEY: Just very quickly, Madam Hearing Officer. Following up on some of the issues you were asked about on cross examination, Mr. Nordby, would it surprise you to know that in the month of March under the interim agreement PERC received only 111 tons of MSW from Casella? MR. MAHONEY: Yes, it would. MR. MAHONEY: And the agreement, however,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	recross. Does anybody wish to recross at this time? MR. BOWER: I have nothing further. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have DEP staff questions of PERC. MR. PARKER: Good morning, Mr. Nordby. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP Project Manager for the application. MR. NORDBY: Hello. MR. PARKER: A couple questions. Is there a no compete clause in the contract whereby PERC couldn't actively solicit the MERC communities for the waste? MR. NORDBY: I'm sorry, that PERC can't solicit the MERC communities? MR. PARKER: Yes. MR. NORDBY: No, sir. MR. PARKER: So you could actually go out there and essentially undercut Casella, if you will? MR. NORDBY: Yes, we could.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. DOYLE: This is cross examination. MS. MACIROWSKI: It's not cross examination of a hostile witness though. MR. DOYLE: Do you get a higher price for in-state waste MR. NORDBY: Yes. MR. DOYLE: than you do for out-of-state waste? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MR. DOYLE: Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: At this time we'll have redirect testimony by PERC limited to five minutes. MR. MAHONEY: Just very quickly, Madam Hearing Officer. Following up on some of the issues you were asked about on cross examination, Mr. Nordby, would it surprise you to know that in the month of March under the interim agreement PERC received only 111 tons of MSW from Casella? MR. MAHONEY: And the agreement, however, you indicated only allowed only provides that it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	recross. Does anybody wish to recross at this time? MR. BOWER: I have nothing further. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have DEP staff questions of PERC. MR. PARKER: Good morning, Mr. Nordby. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP Project Manager for the application. MR. NORDBY: Hello. MR. PARKER: A couple questions. Is there a no compete clause in the contract whereby PERC couldn't actively solicit the MERC communities for the waste? MR. NORDBY: I'm sorry, that PERC can't solicit the MERC communities? MR. PARKER: Yes. MR. NORDBY: No, sir. MR. PARKER: So you could actually go out there and essentially undercut Casella, if you will? MR. NORDBY: Yes, we could. MR. PARKER: I asked this question yesterday
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. DOYLE: This is cross examination. MS. MACIROWSKI: It's not cross examination of a hostile witness though. MR. DOYLE: Do you get a higher price for in-state waste MR. NORDBY: Yes. MR. DOYLE: than you do for out-of-state waste? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MR. DOYLE: Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: At this time we'll have redirect testimony by PERC limited to five minutes. MR. MAHONEY: Just very quickly, Madam Hearing Officer. Following up on some of the issues you were asked about on cross examination, Mr. Nordby, would it surprise you to know that in the month of March under the interim agreement PERC received only 111 tons of MSW from Casella? MR. MAHONEY: Yes, it would. MR. MAHONEY: And the agreement, however,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	recross. Does anybody wish to recross at this time? MR. BOWER: I have nothing further. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have DEP staff questions of PERC. MR. PARKER: Good morning, Mr. Nordby. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP Project Manager for the application. MR. NORDBY: Hello. MR. PARKER: A couple questions. Is there a no compete clause in the contract whereby PERC couldn't actively solicit the MERC communities for the waste? MR. NORDBY: I'm sorry, that PERC can't solicit the MERC communities? MR. NORDBY: No, sir. MR. NORDBY: No, sir. MR. PARKER: So you could actually go out there and essentially undercut Casella, if you will? MR. NORDBY: Yes, we could. MR. PARKER: I asked this question yesterday and I'm not sure I got the complete answer, but I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. DOYLE: This is cross examination. MS. MACIROWSKI: It's not cross examination of a hostile witness though. MR. DOYLE: Do you get a higher price for in-state waste MR. NORDBY: Yes. MR. DOYLE: than you do for out-of-state waste? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MR. DOYLE: Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: At this time we'll have redirect testimony by PERC limited to five minutes. MR. MAHONEY: Just very quickly, Madam Hearing Officer. Following up on some of the issues you were asked about on cross examination, Mr. Nordby, would it surprise you to know that in the month of March under the interim agreement PERC received only 111 tons of MSW from Casella? MR. NORDBY: Yes, it would. MR. MAHONEY: And the agreement, however, you indicated only allowed only provides that it's a figure up to 175 tons per month? MR. NORDBY: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	recross. Does anybody wish to recross at this time? MR. BOWER: I have nothing further. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have DEP staff questions of PERC. MR. PARKER: Good morning, Mr. Nordby. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP Project Manager for the application. MR. NORDBY: Hello. MR. PARKER: A couple questions. Is there a no compete clause in the contract whereby PERC couldn't actively solicit the MERC communities for the waste? MR. NORDBY: I'm sorry, that PERC can't solicit the MERC communities? MR. NORDBY: I'm sorry, that PERC can't solicit the MERC communities? MR. NORDBY: No, sir. MR. PARKER: Yes. MR. NORDBY: No, sir. MR. PARKER: So you could actually go out there and essentially undercut Casella, if you will? MR. NORDBY: Yes, we could. MR. PARKER: I asked this question yesterday and I'm not sure I got the complete answer, but I'm going to blame Mr. Lounder for this because he said
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. DOYLE: This is cross examination. MS. MACIROWSKI: It's not cross examination of a hostile witness though. MR. DOYLE: Do you get a higher price for in-state waste MR. NORDBY: Yes. MR. DOYLE: than you do for out-of-state waste? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MR. DOYLE: Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: At this time we'll have redirect testimony by PERC limited to five minutes. MR. MAHONEY: Just very quickly, Madam Hearing Officer. Following up on some of the issues you were asked about on cross examination, Mr. Nordby, would it surprise you to know that in the month of March under the interim agreement PERC received only 111 tons of MSW from Casella? MR. NORDBY: Yes, it would. MR. MAHONEY: And the agreement, however, you indicated only allowed only provides that it's a figure up to 175 tons per month?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 3	recross. Does anybody wish to recross at this time? MR. BOWER: I have nothing further. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We have DEP staff questions of PERC. MR. PARKER: Good morning, Mr. Nordby. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP Project Manager for the application. MR. NORDBY: Hello. MR. PARKER: A couple questions. Is there a no compete clause in the contract whereby PERC couldn't actively solicit the MERC communities for the waste? MR. NORDBY: I'm sorry, that PERC can't solicit the MERC communities? MR. NORDBY: No, sir. MR. NORDBY: No, sir. MR. PARKER: So you could actually go out there and essentially undercut Casella, if you will? MR. NORDBY: Yes, we could. MR. PARKER: I asked this question yesterday and I'm not sure I got the complete answer, but I'm

		1	
	300		302
1	then.	1	due to the temporary pricing that's involved with
2	MR. PARKER: In simplistic terms and some of	2	those tons.
3	the other testimony this morning brought this out, if	3	MS. LOYZIM: Okay, thank you.
4	30,000 tons is good, is 90,000 tons better in that it	4	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. That concludes
5	would make you you're displacing more out-of-state	5	the testimony and examination of PERC. I would ask
6	waste up to the 90,000 that you're currently taking	6	thank you, Mr. Nordby. I would ask whether the
7	from out-of-state, is that correct?	7	Citizen intervenors are prepared to present their
8	MR. NORDBY: At the risk of backtracking a	8	summary of testimony? Please step forward and we
9	little bit, if the 30,000 was derived from the	9	will begin the summary of the testimony of the
10	economic factors involved with the negotiation, you	10	Citizen intervenors.
11	know, in a vacuum is 90,000 better than 30,000? The	11	MR. PARKER: Mr. Coffman, are you coming up
12	answer would be yes, but in terms of the constraints,	12	front?
13	whether it's transportation pricing, such like that,	13	MR. SPENCER: Do I need a microphone?
14	PERC and the MRC feel pretty good about our	14	HEARING OFFICER: You have pretty good
15	negotiation to capture that additional in-state	15	volume but there might be others, so perhaps we can
16	waste. So in terms of a business transaction,	16	take the hand mike and just pass it around. You will
17	financially it was very advantageous to the project	17	have 45 minutes for the panel of Citizen intervenors
18	and we feel it was within the benefit of the	18 19	to summarize your testimony. Thank you.
19 20	hierarchy also.	20	MR. SPENCER: To begin with, I'm going to briefly read. My total testimony is about two and a
20	MR. PARKER: Thank you. You pre-answered one of my questions in follow up from yesterday which	20	half typed pages so why don't we just go through it.
22	was what are the roadblocks to that, and you've	22	The first part of it is titled "Municipal
23	answered those for me. Thank you. No further	23	Solid Waste to Juniper Ridge Landfill, Methane
24	questions.	24	Threat." We are presented information concerning the
25	HEARING OFFICER: Melanie.	25	greenhouse gases produced by trucking MSW,
	301		303
1	301 MS. LOYZIM: Mr. Nordby, you had indicated	1	303 specifically carbon dioxide, although I understand
1 2		1 2	
	MS. LOYZIM: Mr. Nordby, you had indicated	-	specifically carbon dioxide, although I understand
2	MS. LOYZIM: Mr. Nordby, you had indicated that the interim agreement will expire at the end of	2	specifically carbon dioxide, although I understand that's not a part of this procedure. There should
2 3	MS. LOYZIM: Mr. Nordby, you had indicated that the interim agreement will expire at the end of this month?	2 3	specifically carbon dioxide, although I understand that's not a part of this procedure. There should also be concern of the amounts of methane that will
2 3 4	MS. LOYZIM: Mr. Nordby, you had indicated that the interim agreement will expire at the end of this month? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MS. LOYZIM: And did you indicate that you have an interest in pursuing a continuance of that	2 3 4	specifically carbon dioxide, although I understand that's not a part of this procedure. There should also be concern of the amounts of methane that will be emitted during the lifetime of landfilled MSW.
2 3 4 5	MS. LOYZIM: Mr. Nordby, you had indicated that the interim agreement will expire at the end of this month? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MS. LOYZIM: And did you indicate that you have an interest in pursuing a continuance of that agreement with Casella?	2 3 4 5	specifically carbon dioxide, although I understand that's not a part of this procedure. There should also be concern of the amounts of methane that will be emitted during the lifetime of landfilled MSW. Methane is produced by the anaerobic decomposition of organic waste. MSW is over 50 percent organic. We have all heard that methane is a far more dangerous
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. LOYZIM: Mr. Nordby, you had indicated that the interim agreement will expire at the end of this month? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MS. LOYZIM: And did you indicate that you have an interest in pursuing a continuance of that agreement with Casella? MR. NORDBY: If I could, I would say the	2 3 4 5 6	specifically carbon dioxide, although I understand that's not a part of this procedure. There should also be concern of the amounts of methane that will be emitted during the lifetime of landfilled MSW. Methane is produced by the anaerobic decomposition of organic waste. MSW is over 50 percent organic. We have all heard that methane is a far more dangerous greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide when considering
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. LOYZIM: Mr. Nordby, you had indicated that the interim agreement will expire at the end of this month? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MS. LOYZIM: And did you indicate that you have an interest in pursuing a continuance of that agreement with Casella? MR. NORDBY: If I could, I would say the purpose for that interim agreement was to start the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	specifically carbon dioxide, although I understand that's not a part of this procedure. There should also be concern of the amounts of methane that will be emitted during the lifetime of landfilled MSW. Methane is produced by the anaerobic decomposition of organic waste. MSW is over 50 percent organic. We have all heard that methane is a far more dangerous greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide when considering climate change. It is commonly said that methane has
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS. LOYZIM: Mr. Nordby, you had indicated that the interim agreement will expire at the end of this month? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MS. LOYZIM: And did you indicate that you have an interest in pursuing a continuance of that agreement with Casella? MR. NORDBY: If I could, I would say the purpose for that interim agreement was to start the beneficial impact of being able to take that waste at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	specifically carbon dioxide, although I understand that's not a part of this procedure. There should also be concern of the amounts of methane that will be emitted during the lifetime of landfilled MSW. Methane is produced by the anaerobic decomposition of organic waste. MSW is over 50 percent organic. We have all heard that methane is a far more dangerous greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide when considering climate change. It is commonly said that methane has on the order of 23 times the warming potential of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. LOYZIM: Mr. Nordby, you had indicated that the interim agreement will expire at the end of this month? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MS. LOYZIM: And did you indicate that you have an interest in pursuing a continuance of that agreement with Casella? MR. NORDBY: If I could, I would say the purpose for that interim agreement was to start the beneficial impact of being able to take that waste at PERC immediately, so, yes, we would be interested in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	specifically carbon dioxide, although I understand that's not a part of this procedure. There should also be concern of the amounts of methane that will be emitted during the lifetime of landfilled MSW. Methane is produced by the anaerobic decomposition of organic waste. MSW is over 50 percent organic. We have all heard that methane is a far more dangerous greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide when considering climate change. It is commonly said that methane has on the order of 23 times the warming potential of CO2. This number is derived from a 100-year time
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. LOYZIM: Mr. Nordby, you had indicated that the interim agreement will expire at the end of this month? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MS. LOYZIM: And did you indicate that you have an interest in pursuing a continuance of that agreement with Casella? MR. NORDBY: If I could, I would say the purpose for that interim agreement was to start the beneficial impact of being able to take that waste at PERC immediately, so, yes, we would be interested in continuing some form of agreement to carry that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	specifically carbon dioxide, although I understand that's not a part of this procedure. There should also be concern of the amounts of methane that will be emitted during the lifetime of landfilled MSW. Methane is produced by the anaerobic decomposition of organic waste. MSW is over 50 percent organic. We have all heard that methane is a far more dangerous greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide when considering climate change. It is commonly said that methane has on the order of 23 times the warming potential of CO2. This number is derived from a 100-year time period. Over a 20-year span, methane poses as much
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. LOYZIM: Mr. Nordby, you had indicated that the interim agreement will expire at the end of this month? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MS. LOYZIM: And did you indicate that you have an interest in pursuing a continuance of that agreement with Casella? MR. NORDBY: If I could, I would say the purpose for that interim agreement was to start the beneficial impact of being able to take that waste at PERC immediately, so, yes, we would be interested in continuing some form of agreement to carry that forth.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	specifically carbon dioxide, although I understand that's not a part of this procedure. There should also be concern of the amounts of methane that will be emitted during the lifetime of landfilled MSW. Methane is produced by the anaerobic decomposition of organic waste. MSW is over 50 percent organic. We have all heard that methane is a far more dangerous greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide when considering climate change. It is commonly said that methane has on the order of 23 times the warming potential of CO2. This number is derived from a 100-year time period. Over a 20-year span, methane poses as much as 72 times the negative effects of CO2. This is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. LOYZIM: Mr. Nordby, you had indicated that the interim agreement will expire at the end of this month? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MS. LOYZIM: And did you indicate that you have an interest in pursuing a continuance of that agreement with Casella? MR. NORDBY: If I could, I would say the purpose for that interim agreement was to start the beneficial impact of being able to take that waste at PERC immediately, so, yes, we would be interested in continuing some form of agreement to carry that forth. MS. LOYZIM: And the PERC agreement that's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	specifically carbon dioxide, although I understand that's not a part of this procedure. There should also be concern of the amounts of methane that will be emitted during the lifetime of landfilled MSW. Methane is produced by the anaerobic decomposition of organic waste. MSW is over 50 percent organic. We have all heard that methane is a far more dangerous greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide when considering climate change. It is commonly said that methane has on the order of 23 times the warming potential of CO2. This number is derived from a 100-year time period. Over a 20-year span, methane poses as much as 72 times the negative effects of CO2. This is because while CO2 in the atmosphere lasts over a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. LOYZIM: Mr. Nordby, you had indicated that the interim agreement will expire at the end of this month? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MS. LOYZIM: And did you indicate that you have an interest in pursuing a continuance of that agreement with Casella? MR. NORDBY: If I could, I would say the purpose for that interim agreement was to start the beneficial impact of being able to take that waste at PERC immediately, so, yes, we would be interested in continuing some form of agreement to carry that forth. MS. LOYZIM: And the PERC agreement that's been provided to us as part of the record, that is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	specifically carbon dioxide, although I understand that's not a part of this procedure. There should also be concern of the amounts of methane that will be emitted during the lifetime of landfilled MSW. Methane is produced by the anaerobic decomposition of organic waste. MSW is over 50 percent organic. We have all heard that methane is a far more dangerous greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide when considering climate change. It is commonly said that methane has on the order of 23 times the warming potential of CO2. This number is derived from a 100-year time period. Over a 20-year span, methane poses as much as 72 times the negative effects of CO2. This is because while CO2 in the atmosphere lasts over a century, methane only persists in the atmosphere for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. LOYZIM: Mr. Nordby, you had indicated that the interim agreement will expire at the end of this month? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MS. LOYZIM: And did you indicate that you have an interest in pursuing a continuance of that agreement with Casella? MR. NORDBY: If I could, I would say the purpose for that interim agreement was to start the beneficial impact of being able to take that waste at PERC immediately, so, yes, we would be interested in continuing some form of agreement to carry that forth. MS. LOYZIM: And the PERC agreement that's been provided to us as part of the record, that is the PERC/Casella agreement that's been referenced,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	specifically carbon dioxide, although I understand that's not a part of this procedure. There should also be concern of the amounts of methane that will be emitted during the lifetime of landfilled MSW. Methane is produced by the anaerobic decomposition of organic waste. MSW is over 50 percent organic. We have all heard that methane is a far more dangerous greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide when considering climate change. It is commonly said that methane has on the order of 23 times the warming potential of CO2. This number is derived from a 100-year time period. Over a 20-year span, methane poses as much as 72 times the negative effects of CO2. This is because while CO2 in the atmosphere lasts over a century, methane only persists in the atmosphere for 12 to 13 years; therefore, reducing methane emissions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. LOYZIM: Mr. Nordby, you had indicated that the interim agreement will expire at the end of this month? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MS. LOYZIM: And did you indicate that you have an interest in pursuing a continuance of that agreement with Casella? MR. NORDBY: If I could, I would say the purpose for that interim agreement was to start the beneficial impact of being able to take that waste at PERC immediately, so, yes, we would be interested in continuing some form of agreement to carry that forth. MS. LOYZIM: And the PERC agreement that's been provided to us as part of the record, that is the PERC/Casella agreement that's been referenced, that's in effect currently?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	specifically carbon dioxide, although I understand that's not a part of this procedure. There should also be concern of the amounts of methane that will be emitted during the lifetime of landfilled MSW. Methane is produced by the anaerobic decomposition of organic waste. MSW is over 50 percent organic. We have all heard that methane is a far more dangerous greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide when considering climate change. It is commonly said that methane has on the order of 23 times the warming potential of CO2. This number is derived from a 100-year time period. Over a 20-year span, methane poses as much as 72 times the negative effects of CO2. This is because while CO2 in the atmosphere lasts over a century, methane only persists in the atmosphere for 12 to 13 years; therefore, reducing methane emissions now or before they begin can have a large positive
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. LOYZIM: Mr. Nordby, you had indicated that the interim agreement will expire at the end of this month? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MS. LOYZIM: And did you indicate that you have an interest in pursuing a continuance of that agreement with Casella? MR. NORDBY: If I could, I would say the purpose for that interim agreement was to start the beneficial impact of being able to take that waste at PERC immediately, so, yes, we would be interested in continuing some form of agreement to carry that forth. MS. LOYZIM: And the PERC agreement that's been provided to us as part of the record, that is the PERC/Casella agreement that's been referenced, that's in effect currently? MR. NORDBY: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	specifically carbon dioxide, although I understand that's not a part of this procedure. There should also be concern of the amounts of methane that will be emitted during the lifetime of landfilled MSW. Methane is produced by the anaerobic decomposition of organic waste. MSW is over 50 percent organic. We have all heard that methane is a far more dangerous greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide when considering climate change. It is commonly said that methane has on the order of 23 times the warming potential of CO2. This number is derived from a 100-year time period. Over a 20-year span, methane poses as much as 72 times the negative effects of CO2. This is because while CO2 in the atmosphere lasts over a century, methane only persists in the atmosphere for 12 to 13 years; therefore, reducing methane emissions now or before they begin can have a large positive impact over a relatively short time span, thus,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. LOYZIM: Mr. Nordby, you had indicated that the interim agreement will expire at the end of this month? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MS. LOYZIM: And did you indicate that you have an interest in pursuing a continuance of that agreement with Casella? MR. NORDBY: If I could, I would say the purpose for that interim agreement was to start the beneficial impact of being able to take that waste at PERC immediately, so, yes, we would be interested in continuing some form of agreement to carry that forth. MS. LOYZIM: And the PERC agreement that's been provided to us as part of the record, that is the PERC/Casella agreement that's been referenced, that's in effect currently?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	specifically carbon dioxide, although I understand that's not a part of this procedure. There should also be concern of the amounts of methane that will be emitted during the lifetime of landfilled MSW. Methane is produced by the anaerobic decomposition of organic waste. MSW is over 50 percent organic. We have all heard that methane is a far more dangerous greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide when considering climate change. It is commonly said that methane has on the order of 23 times the warming potential of CO2. This number is derived from a 100-year time period. Over a 20-year span, methane poses as much as 72 times the negative effects of CO2. This is because while CO2 in the atmosphere lasts over a century, methane only persists in the atmosphere for 12 to 13 years; therefore, reducing methane emissions now or before they begin can have a large positive impact over a relatively short time span, thus, greatly reducing man-made climate change.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. LOYZIM: Mr. Nordby, you had indicated that the interim agreement will expire at the end of this month? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MS. LOYZIM: And did you indicate that you have an interest in pursuing a continuance of that agreement with Casella? MR. NORDBY: If I could, I would say the purpose for that interim agreement was to start the beneficial impact of being able to take that waste at PERC immediately, so, yes, we would be interested in continuing some form of agreement to carry that forth. MS. LOYZIM: And the PERC agreement that's been provided to us as part of the record, that is the PERC/Casella agreement that's been referenced, that's in effect currently? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MS. LOYZIM: And so the you would not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	specifically carbon dioxide, although I understand that's not a part of this procedure. There should also be concern of the amounts of methane that will be emitted during the lifetime of landfilled MSW. Methane is produced by the anaerobic decomposition of organic waste. MSW is over 50 percent organic. We have all heard that methane is a far more dangerous greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide when considering climate change. It is commonly said that methane has on the order of 23 times the warming potential of CO2. This number is derived from a 100-year time period. Over a 20-year span, methane poses as much as 72 times the negative effects of CO2. This is because while CO2 in the atmosphere lasts over a century, methane only persists in the atmosphere for 12 to 13 years; therefore, reducing methane emissions now or before they begin can have a large positive impact over a relatively short time span, thus,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. LOYZIM: Mr. Nordby, you had indicated that the interim agreement will expire at the end of this month? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MS. LOYZIM: And did you indicate that you have an interest in pursuing a continuance of that agreement with Casella? MR. NORDBY: If I could, I would say the purpose for that interim agreement was to start the beneficial impact of being able to take that waste at PERC immediately, so, yes, we would be interested in continuing some form of agreement to carry that forth. MS. LOYZIM: And the PERC agreement that's been provided to us as part of the record, that is the PERC/Casella agreement that's been referenced, that's in effect currently? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MS. LOYZIM: And so the you would not then have a would there be a scenario where the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	specifically carbon dioxide, although I understand that's not a part of this procedure. There should also be concern of the amounts of methane that will be emitted during the lifetime of landfilled MSW. Methane is produced by the anaerobic decomposition of organic waste. MSW is over 50 percent organic. We have all heard that methane is a far more dangerous greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide when considering climate change. It is commonly said that methane has on the order of 23 times the warming potential of CO2. This number is derived from a 100-year time period. Over a 20-year span, methane poses as much as 72 times the negative effects of CO2. This is because while CO2 in the atmosphere lasts over a century, methane only persists in the atmosphere for 12 to 13 years; therefore, reducing methane emissions now or before they begin can have a large positive impact over a relatively short time span, thus, greatly reducing man-made climate change. Landfills are the single largest source of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. LOYZIM: Mr. Nordby, you had indicated that the interim agreement will expire at the end of this month? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MS. LOYZIM: And did you indicate that you have an interest in pursuing a continuance of that agreement with Casella? MR. NORDBY: If I could, I would say the purpose for that interim agreement was to start the beneficial impact of being able to take that waste at PERC immediately, so, yes, we would be interested in continuing some form of agreement to carry that forth. MS. LOYZIM: And the PERC agreement that's been provided to us as part of the record, that is the PERC/Casella agreement that's been referenced, that's in effect currently? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MS. LOYZIM: And so the you would not then have a would there be a scenario where the interim agreement could be continued and the current	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	specifically carbon dioxide, although I understand that's not a part of this procedure. There should also be concern of the amounts of methane that will be emitted during the lifetime of landfilled MSW. Methane is produced by the anaerobic decomposition of organic waste. MSW is over 50 percent organic. We have all heard that methane is a far more dangerous greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide when considering climate change. It is commonly said that methane has on the order of 23 times the warming potential of CO2. This number is derived from a 100-year time period. Over a 20-year span, methane poses as much as 72 times the negative effects of CO2. This is because while CO2 in the atmosphere lasts over a century, methane only persists in the atmosphere for 12 to 13 years; therefore, reducing methane emissions now or before they begin can have a large positive impact over a relatively short time span, thus, greatly reducing man-made climate change. Landfills are the single largest source of man-made greenhouse gases in North America. Since
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. LOYZIM: Mr. Nordby, you had indicated that the interim agreement will expire at the end of this month? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MS. LOYZIM: And did you indicate that you have an interest in pursuing a continuance of that agreement with Casella? MR. NORDBY: If I could, I would say the purpose for that interim agreement was to start the beneficial impact of being able to take that waste at PERC immediately, so, yes, we would be interested in continuing some form of agreement to carry that forth. MS. LOYZIM: And the PERC agreement that's been provided to us as part of the record, that is the PERC/Casella agreement that's been referenced, that's in effect currently? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MS. LOYZIM: And so the you would not then have a would there be a scenario where the interim agreement could be continued and the current existing PERC and Casella agreement could exist in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	specifically carbon dioxide, although I understand that's not a part of this procedure. There should also be concern of the amounts of methane that will be emitted during the lifetime of landfilled MSW. Methane is produced by the anaerobic decomposition of organic waste. MSW is over 50 percent organic. We have all heard that methane is a far more dangerous greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide when considering climate change. It is commonly said that methane has on the order of 23 times the warming potential of CO2. This number is derived from a 100-year time period. Over a 20-year span, methane poses as much as 72 times the negative effects of CO2. This is because while CO2 in the atmosphere lasts over a century, methane only persists in the atmosphere for 12 to 13 years; therefore, reducing methane emissions now or before they begin can have a large positive impact over a relatively short time span, thus, greatly reducing man-made climate change. Landfills are the single largest source of man-made greenhouse gases in North America. Since MSW has a much higher organic content than most of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. LOYZIM: Mr. Nordby, you had indicated that the interim agreement will expire at the end of this month? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MS. LOYZIM: And did you indicate that you have an interest in pursuing a continuance of that agreement with Casella? MR. NORDBY: If I could, I would say the purpose for that interim agreement was to start the beneficial impact of being able to take that waste at PERC immediately, so, yes, we would be interested in continuing some form of agreement to carry that forth. MS. LOYZIM: And the PERC agreement that's been provided to us as part of the record, that is the PERC/Casella agreement that's been referenced, that's in effect currently? MR. NORDBY: Yes. MS. LOYZIM: And so the you would not then have a would there be a scenario where the interim agreement could be continued and the current existing PERC and Casella agreement could exist in addition to that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	specifically carbon dioxide, although I understand that's not a part of this procedure. There should also be concern of the amounts of methane that will be emitted during the lifetime of landfilled MSW. Methane is produced by the anaerobic decomposition of organic waste. MSW is over 50 percent organic. We have all heard that methane is a far more dangerous greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide when considering climate change. It is commonly said that methane has on the order of 23 times the warming potential of CO2. This number is derived from a 100-year time period. Over a 20-year span, methane poses as much as 72 times the negative effects of CO2. This is because while CO2 in the atmosphere lasts over a century, methane only persists in the atmosphere for 12 to 13 years; therefore, reducing methane emissions now or before they begin can have a large positive impact over a relatively short time span, thus, greatly reducing man-made climate change. Landfills are the single largest source of man-made greenhouse gases in North America. Since MSW has a much higher organic content than most of the other wastes coming into Juniper Ridge,

	201		200
	304		306
1	JRL, it will be covered by other waste and begin to	1	The larger threat comes after the useful life of the
2	decompose in the anaerobic environment, thus,	2	gas extraction and is referred to as a second wave.
3	producing methane.	3	After the landfill is decommissioned, there is
4	Casella says in their application that with	4	settling and deterioration of the cover. This allows
5	their management techniques they capture on the order	5	more rain to enter the pile and the added moisture
6	of 85 percent of methane emissions at JRL and flaring	6	accelerates decomposition and the gas escapes through
7	the gas turns it into less harmful CO2. EPA assumes	7	breaches in the cover or liner. Remember, all
8	landfill operators capture on average 75 percent or	8	landfills eventually leak, and that's from below as
9	more of methane emissions. The best current	9	well as above. When you consider the total
10	information available to me says that Casella and the	10	environmental effect of Casella's plan to truck
11	EPA are mistaken on the amounts of methane captured.	11	southern Maine's MSW to Juniper Ridge in Old Town, it
12	The following is an excerpt of a paper	12	reinforces the wisdom of our waste hierarchy and that
13	presented by the Center for A Competitive Waste	13	incineration is far preferable to landfilling MSW.
14	Industry to the California Air Resources Board in	14	Far more energy is extracted from incinerating a ton
15	2007. It starts executive summary, conventional	15	of garbage than from putting it in a pile and making
16	wisdom based upon statements by the Environmental	16	electricity with the methane produced and likewise
17	Protection Agency assumes landfill operators capture	17	fewer greenhouse gas emissions are released by
18	75 percent or more of the methane gas, CH4, that is	18	incineration per unit of energy production.
19	generated at their facilities. Because of that	19	It bears mentioning that Casella's plan to
20	assumption of high collection efficiency, landfills	20	heat the University of Maine campus with gas from the
21	have been thought to be responsible for only two to	21	Juniper Ridge Landfill has not progressed since
22	three percent of man-made greenhouse gases. This	22	proposing it many years ago and shows no sign of
23	comment explains why the EPA assumption is	23	happening any time soon.
24	demonstrably wrong, why the best available evidence	24	Once again, the best solution for disposing
25	does not support a value greater than 20 percent and	25	of the former MERC's MSW in Maine is to redistribute
	305		307
1			
	why the appropriate remedies that follow from this	1	it to our other waste-to-energy plants
2	why the appropriate remedies that follow from this correction involve more diversion better than a	1	it to our other waste-to-energy plants.
2	correction involve more diversion better than a	2	How am I doing on time, by the way?
3	correction involve more diversion better than a landfill; specifically, there are no field	2 3	How am I doing on time, by the way? HEARING OFFICER: You've gone about seven
3 4	correction involve more diversion better than a landfill; specifically, there are no field measurements of the efficiency of landfilled gas	2 3 4	How am I doing on time, by the way? HEARING OFFICER: You've gone about seven minutes or so.
3 4 5	correction involve more diversion better than a landfill; specifically, there are no field measurements of the efficiency of landfilled gas collection systems. The EPA's assumed 75 percent gas	2 3 4 5	How am I doing on time, by the way? HEARING OFFICER: You've gone about seven minutes or so. MR. SPENCER: Okay, good, good. This one is
3 4 5 6	correction involve more diversion better than a landfill; specifically, there are no field measurements of the efficiency of landfilled gas collection systems. The EPA's assumed 75 percent gas collection efficiency has no factual basis, is based	2 3 4 5 6	How am I doing on time, by the way? HEARING OFFICER: You've gone about seven minutes or so. MR. SPENCER: Okay, good, good. This one is slightly shorter. That's it for the methane threat.
3 4 5 6 7	correction involve more diversion better than a landfill; specifically, there are no field measurements of the efficiency of landfilled gas collection systems. The EPA's assumed 75 percent gas collection efficiency has no factual basis, is based upon fundamentally incorrect definitions and uses	2 3 4 5 6 7	How am I doing on time, by the way? HEARING OFFICER: You've gone about seven minutes or so. MR. SPENCER: Okay, good, good. This one is slightly shorter. That's it for the methane threat. The second part of my testimony is titled, "From the
3 4 5 6 7 8	correction involve more diversion better than a landfill; specifically, there are no field measurements of the efficiency of landfilled gas collection systems. The EPA's assumed 75 percent gas collection efficiency has no factual basis, is based upon fundamentally incorrect definitions and uses bias selection from unsupported and self-serving	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	How am I doing on time, by the way? HEARING OFFICER: You've gone about seven minutes or so. MR. SPENCER: Okay, good, good. This one is slightly shorter. That's it for the methane threat. The second part of my testimony is titled, "From the Beginning, The Waste Hierarchy and Juniper Ridge
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	correction involve more diversion better than a landfill; specifically, there are no field measurements of the efficiency of landfilled gas collection systems. The EPA's assumed 75 percent gas collection efficiency has no factual basis, is based upon fundamentally incorrect definitions and uses bias selection from unsupported and self-serving guesses as the basis for its assumption.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	How am I doing on time, by the way? HEARING OFFICER: You've gone about seven minutes or so. MR. SPENCER: Okay, good, good. This one is slightly shorter. That's it for the methane threat. The second part of my testimony is titled, "From the Beginning, The Waste Hierarchy and Juniper Ridge Landfill." We have included the statutes which lay
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	correction involve more diversion better than a landfill; specifically, there are no field measurements of the efficiency of landfilled gas collection systems. The EPA's assumed 75 percent gas collection efficiency has no factual basis, is based upon fundamentally incorrect definitions and uses bias selection from unsupported and self-serving guesses as the basis for its assumption. The best evidence of typical lifetime	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	How am I doing on time, by the way? HEARING OFFICER: You've gone about seven minutes or so. MR. SPENCER: Okay, good, good. This one is slightly shorter. That's it for the methane threat. The second part of my testimony is titled, "From the Beginning, The Waste Hierarchy and Juniper Ridge Landfill." We have included the statutes which lay out the state of Maine waste policy and waste
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	correction involve more diversion better than a landfill; specifically, there are no field measurements of the efficiency of landfilled gas collection systems. The EPA's assumed 75 percent gas collection efficiency has no factual basis, is based upon fundamentally incorrect definitions and uses bias selection from unsupported and self-serving guesses as the basis for its assumption. The best evidence of typical lifetime capture rates based upon correct definitions does not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	How am I doing on time, by the way? HEARING OFFICER: You've gone about seven minutes or so. MR. SPENCER: Okay, good, good. This one is slightly shorter. That's it for the methane threat. The second part of my testimony is titled, "From the Beginning, The Waste Hierarchy and Juniper Ridge Landfill." We have included the statutes which lay out the state of Maine waste policy and waste hierarchy. When the process began in 2003 to change
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	correction involve more diversion better than a landfill; specifically, there are no field measurements of the efficiency of landfilled gas collection systems. The EPA's assumed 75 percent gas collection efficiency has no factual basis, is based upon fundamentally incorrect definitions and uses bias selection from unsupported and self-serving guesses as the basis for its assumption. The best evidence of typical lifetime capture rates based upon correct definitions does not support a value greater than 20 as further attested	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	How am I doing on time, by the way? HEARING OFFICER: You've gone about seven minutes or so. MR. SPENCER: Okay, good, good. This one is slightly shorter. That's it for the methane threat. The second part of my testimony is titled, "From the Beginning, The Waste Hierarchy and Juniper Ridge Landfill." We have included the statutes which lay out the state of Maine waste policy and waste hierarchy. When the process began in 2003 to change the West Old Town Landfill owned by the local paper
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	correction involve more diversion better than a landfill; specifically, there are no field measurements of the efficiency of landfilled gas collection systems. The EPA's assumed 75 percent gas collection efficiency has no factual basis, is based upon fundamentally incorrect definitions and uses bias selection from unsupported and self-serving guesses as the basis for its assumption. The best evidence of typical lifetime capture rates based upon correct definitions does not support a value greater than 20 as further attested to by the International Panel on Climate Change.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	How am I doing on time, by the way? HEARING OFFICER: You've gone about seven minutes or so. MR. SPENCER: Okay, good, good. This one is slightly shorter. That's it for the methane threat. The second part of my testimony is titled, "From the Beginning, The Waste Hierarchy and Juniper Ridge Landfill." We have included the statutes which lay out the state of Maine waste policy and waste hierarchy. When the process began in 2003 to change the West Old Town Landfill owned by the local paper mill and restricted to that mill's waste stream into
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	correction involve more diversion better than a landfill; specifically, there are no field measurements of the efficiency of landfilled gas collection systems. The EPA's assumed 75 percent gas collection efficiency has no factual basis, is based upon fundamentally incorrect definitions and uses bias selection from unsupported and self-serving guesses as the basis for its assumption. The best evidence of typical lifetime capture rates based upon correct definitions does not support a value greater than 20 as further attested to by the International Panel on Climate Change. Correcting the capture rate from 75 to 20 percent	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	How am I doing on time, by the way? HEARING OFFICER: You've gone about seven minutes or so. MR. SPENCER: Okay, good, good. This one is slightly shorter. That's it for the methane threat. The second part of my testimony is titled, "From the Beginning, The Waste Hierarchy and Juniper Ridge Landfill." We have included the statutes which lay out the state of Maine waste policy and waste hierarchy. When the process began in 2003 to change the West Old Town Landfill owned by the local paper mill and restricted to that mill's waste stream into a state-owned multi-waste landfill, it was clear from
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	correction involve more diversion better than a landfill; specifically, there are no field measurements of the efficiency of landfilled gas collection systems. The EPA's assumed 75 percent gas collection efficiency has no factual basis, is based upon fundamentally incorrect definitions and uses bias selection from unsupported and self-serving guesses as the basis for its assumption. The best evidence of typical lifetime capture rates based upon correct definitions does not support a value greater than 20 as further attested to by the International Panel on Climate Change. Correcting the capture rate from 75 to 20 percent increases the landfill's responsibility for man-made	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	How am I doing on time, by the way? HEARING OFFICER: You've gone about seven minutes or so. MR. SPENCER: Okay, good, good. This one is slightly shorter. That's it for the methane threat. The second part of my testimony is titled, "From the Beginning, The Waste Hierarchy and Juniper Ridge Landfill." We have included the statutes which lay out the state of Maine waste policy and waste hierarchy. When the process began in 2003 to change the West Old Town Landfill owned by the local paper mill and restricted to that mill's waste stream into a state-owned multi-waste landfill, it was clear from the beginning that our waste hierarchy was to be
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	correction involve more diversion better than a landfill; specifically, there are no field measurements of the efficiency of landfilled gas collection systems. The EPA's assumed 75 percent gas collection efficiency has no factual basis, is based upon fundamentally incorrect definitions and uses bias selection from unsupported and self-serving guesses as the basis for its assumption. The best evidence of typical lifetime capture rates based upon correct definitions does not support a value greater than 20 as further attested to by the International Panel on Climate Change. Correcting the capture rate from 75 to 20 percent increases the landfill's responsibility for man-made greenhouse gas emissions from approximately two to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	How am I doing on time, by the way? HEARING OFFICER: You've gone about seven minutes or so. MR. SPENCER: Okay, good, good. This one is slightly shorter. That's it for the methane threat. The second part of my testimony is titled, "From the Beginning, The Waste Hierarchy and Juniper Ridge Landfill." We have included the statutes which lay out the state of Maine waste policy and waste hierarchy. When the process began in 2003 to change the West Old Town Landfill owned by the local paper mill and restricted to that mill's waste stream into a state-owned multi-waste landfill, it was clear from the beginning that our waste hierarchy was to be followed. In testimony by George McDonald who was
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	correction involve more diversion better than a landfill; specifically, there are no field measurements of the efficiency of landfilled gas collection systems. The EPA's assumed 75 percent gas collection efficiency has no factual basis, is based upon fundamentally incorrect definitions and uses bias selection from unsupported and self-serving guesses as the basis for its assumption. The best evidence of typical lifetime capture rates based upon correct definitions does not support a value greater than 20 as further attested to by the International Panel on Climate Change. Correcting the capture rate from 75 to 20 percent increases the landfill's responsibility for man-made greenhouse gas emissions from approximately two to three percent to eight to nine percent or more.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	How am I doing on time, by the way? HEARING OFFICER: You've gone about seven minutes or so. MR. SPENCER: Okay, good, good. This one is slightly shorter. That's it for the methane threat. The second part of my testimony is titled, "From the Beginning, The Waste Hierarchy and Juniper Ridge Landfill." We have included the statutes which lay out the state of Maine waste policy and waste hierarchy. When the process began in 2003 to change the West Old Town Landfill owned by the local paper mill and restricted to that mill's waste stream into a state-owned multi-waste landfill, it was clear from the beginning that our waste hierarchy was to be followed. In testimony by George McDonald who was the manager of Waste Management and Recycling at the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	correction involve more diversion better than a landfill; specifically, there are no field measurements of the efficiency of landfilled gas collection systems. The EPA's assumed 75 percent gas collection efficiency has no factual basis, is based upon fundamentally incorrect definitions and uses bias selection from unsupported and self-serving guesses as the basis for its assumption. The best evidence of typical lifetime capture rates based upon correct definitions does not support a value greater than 20 as further attested to by the International Panel on Climate Change. Correcting the capture rate from 75 to 20 percent increases the landfill's responsibility for man-made greenhouse gas emissions from approximately two to three percent to eight to nine percent or more. Because gas collection is actually very poor, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	How am I doing on time, by the way? HEARING OFFICER: You've gone about seven minutes or so. MR. SPENCER: Okay, good, good. This one is slightly shorter. That's it for the methane threat. The second part of my testimony is titled, "From the Beginning, The Waste Hierarchy and Juniper Ridge Landfill." We have included the statutes which lay out the state of Maine waste policy and waste hierarchy. When the process began in 2003 to change the West Old Town Landfill owned by the local paper mill and restricted to that mill's waste stream into a state-owned multi-waste landfill, it was clear from the beginning that our waste hierarchy was to be followed. In testimony by George McDonald who was the manager of Waste Management and Recycling at the State Planning Office at that time, he told the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	correction involve more diversion better than a landfill; specifically, there are no field measurements of the efficiency of landfilled gas collection systems. The EPA's assumed 75 percent gas collection efficiency has no factual basis, is based upon fundamentally incorrect definitions and uses bias selection from unsupported and self-serving guesses as the basis for its assumption. The best evidence of typical lifetime capture rates based upon correct definitions does not support a value greater than 20 as further attested to by the International Panel on Climate Change. Correcting the capture rate from 75 to 20 percent increases the landfill's responsibility for man-made greenhouse gas emissions from approximately two to three percent to eight to nine percent or more. Because gas collection is actually very poor, the case for diverting decomposable discards from the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	How am I doing on time, by the way? HEARING OFFICER: You've gone about seven minutes or so. MR. SPENCER: Okay, good, good. This one is slightly shorter. That's it for the methane threat. The second part of my testimony is titled, "From the Beginning, The Waste Hierarchy and Juniper Ridge Landfill." We have included the statutes which lay out the state of Maine waste policy and waste hierarchy. When the process began in 2003 to change the West Old Town Landfill owned by the local paper mill and restricted to that mill's waste stream into a state-owned multi-waste landfill, it was clear from the beginning that our waste hierarchy was to be followed. In testimony by George McDonald who was the manager of Waste Management and Recycling at the State Planning Office at that time, he told the Natural Resources Committee, this was in 2003, what
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	correction involve more diversion better than a landfill; specifically, there are no field measurements of the efficiency of landfilled gas collection systems. The EPA's assumed 75 percent gas collection efficiency has no factual basis, is based upon fundamentally incorrect definitions and uses bias selection from unsupported and self-serving guesses as the basis for its assumption. The best evidence of typical lifetime capture rates based upon correct definitions does not support a value greater than 20 as further attested to by the International Panel on Climate Change. Correcting the capture rate from 75 to 20 percent increases the landfill's responsibility for man-made greenhouse gas emissions from approximately two to three percent to eight to nine percent or more. Because gas collection is actually very poor, the case for diverting decomposable discards from the landfill becomes clear.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	How am I doing on time, by the way? HEARING OFFICER: You've gone about seven minutes or so. MR. SPENCER: Okay, good, good. This one is slightly shorter. That's it for the methane threat. The second part of my testimony is titled, "From the Beginning, The Waste Hierarchy and Juniper Ridge Landfill." We have included the statutes which lay out the state of Maine waste policy and waste hierarchy. When the process began in 2003 to change the West Old Town Landfill owned by the local paper mill and restricted to that mill's waste stream into a state-owned multi-waste landfill, it was clear from the beginning that our waste hierarchy was to be followed. In testimony by George McDonald who was the manager of Waste Management and Recycling at the State Planning Office at that time, he told the Natural Resources Committee, this was in 2003, what the intent was of SPO in owning this landfill. One
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	correction involve more diversion better than a landfill; specifically, there are no field measurements of the efficiency of landfilled gas collection systems. The EPA's assumed 75 percent gas collection efficiency has no factual basis, is based upon fundamentally incorrect definitions and uses bias selection from unsupported and self-serving guesses as the basis for its assumption. The best evidence of typical lifetime capture rates based upon correct definitions does not support a value greater than 20 as further attested to by the International Panel on Climate Change. Correcting the capture rate from 75 to 20 percent increases the landfill's responsibility for man-made greenhouse gas emissions from approximately two to three percent to eight to nine percent or more. Because gas collection is actually very poor, the case for diverting decomposable discards from the landfill becomes clear. Okay, that's the end of the quote from that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	How am I doing on time, by the way? HEARING OFFICER: You've gone about seven minutes or so. MR. SPENCER: Okay, good, good. This one is slightly shorter. That's it for the methane threat. The second part of my testimony is titled, "From the Beginning, The Waste Hierarchy and Juniper Ridge Landfill." We have included the statutes which lay out the state of Maine waste policy and waste hierarchy. When the process began in 2003 to change the West Old Town Landfill owned by the local paper mill and restricted to that mill's waste stream into a state-owned multi-waste landfill, it was clear from the beginning that our waste hierarchy was to be followed. In testimony by George McDonald who was the manager of Waste Management and Recycling at the State Planning Office at that time, he told the Natural Resources Committee, this was in 2003, what the intent was of SPO in owning this landfill. One of his bullet points, quote, support the waste
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	correction involve more diversion better than a landfill; specifically, there are no field measurements of the efficiency of landfilled gas collection systems. The EPA's assumed 75 percent gas collection efficiency has no factual basis, is based upon fundamentally incorrect definitions and uses bias selection from unsupported and self-serving guesses as the basis for its assumption. The best evidence of typical lifetime capture rates based upon correct definitions does not support a value greater than 20 as further attested to by the International Panel on Climate Change. Correcting the capture rate from 75 to 20 percent increases the landfill's responsibility for man-made greenhouse gas emissions from approximately two to three percent to eight to nine percent or more. Because gas collection is actually very poor, the case for diverting decomposable discards from the landfill becomes clear. Okay, that's the end of the quote from that paper, but the paper goes on to explain that the high	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	How am I doing on time, by the way? HEARING OFFICER: You've gone about seven minutes or so. MR. SPENCER: Okay, good, good. This one is slightly shorter. That's it for the methane threat. The second part of my testimony is titled, "From the Beginning, The Waste Hierarchy and Juniper Ridge Landfill." We have included the statutes which lay out the state of Maine waste policy and waste hierarchy. When the process began in 2003 to change the West Old Town Landfill owned by the local paper mill and restricted to that mill's waste stream into a state-owned multi-waste landfill, it was clear from the beginning that our waste hierarchy was to be followed. In testimony by George McDonald who was the manager of Waste Management and Recycling at the State Planning Office at that time, he told the Natural Resources Committee, this was in 2003, what the intent was of SPO in owning this landfill. One of his bullet points, quote, support the waste management hierarchy in the state to the greatest
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	correction involve more diversion better than a landfill; specifically, there are no field measurements of the efficiency of landfilled gas collection systems. The EPA's assumed 75 percent gas collection efficiency has no factual basis, is based upon fundamentally incorrect definitions and uses bias selection from unsupported and self-serving guesses as the basis for its assumption. The best evidence of typical lifetime capture rates based upon correct definitions does not support a value greater than 20 as further attested to by the International Panel on Climate Change. Correcting the capture rate from 75 to 20 percent increases the landfill's responsibility for man-made greenhouse gas emissions from approximately two to three percent to eight to nine percent or more. Because gas collection is actually very poor, the case for diverting decomposable discards from the landfill becomes clear. Okay, that's the end of the quote from that paper, but the paper goes on to explain that the high percentage rates come from a one-time snapshot of a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	How am I doing on time, by the way? HEARING OFFICER: You've gone about seven minutes or so. MR. SPENCER: Okay, good, good. This one is slightly shorter. That's it for the methane threat. The second part of my testimony is titled, "From the Beginning, The Waste Hierarchy and Juniper Ridge Landfill." We have included the statutes which lay out the state of Maine waste policy and waste hierarchy. When the process began in 2003 to change the West Old Town Landfill owned by the local paper mill and restricted to that mill's waste stream into a state-owned multi-waste landfill, it was clear from the beginning that our waste hierarchy was to be followed. In testimony by George McDonald who was the manager of Waste Management and Recycling at the State Planning Office at that time, he told the Natural Resources Committee, this was in 2003, what the intent was of SPO in owning this landfill. One of his bullet points, quote, support the waste management hierarchy in the state to the greatest extent possible, end quote. Like I said, that was on
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	correction involve more diversion better than a landfill; specifically, there are no field measurements of the efficiency of landfilled gas collection systems. The EPA's assumed 75 percent gas collection efficiency has no factual basis, is based upon fundamentally incorrect definitions and uses bias selection from unsupported and self-serving guesses as the basis for its assumption. The best evidence of typical lifetime capture rates based upon correct definitions does not support a value greater than 20 as further attested to by the International Panel on Climate Change. Correcting the capture rate from 75 to 20 percent increases the landfill's responsibility for man-made greenhouse gas emissions from approximately two to three percent to eight to nine percent or more. Because gas collection is actually very poor, the case for diverting decomposable discards from the landfill becomes clear. Okay, that's the end of the quote from that paper, but the paper goes on to explain that the high	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	How am I doing on time, by the way? HEARING OFFICER: You've gone about seven minutes or so. MR. SPENCER: Okay, good, good. This one is slightly shorter. That's it for the methane threat. The second part of my testimony is titled, "From the Beginning, The Waste Hierarchy and Juniper Ridge Landfill." We have included the statutes which lay out the state of Maine waste policy and waste hierarchy. When the process began in 2003 to change the West Old Town Landfill owned by the local paper mill and restricted to that mill's waste stream into a state-owned multi-waste landfill, it was clear from the beginning that our waste hierarchy was to be followed. In testimony by George McDonald who was the manager of Waste Management and Recycling at the State Planning Office at that time, he told the Natural Resources Committee, this was in 2003, what the intent was of SPO in owning this landfill. One of his bullet points, quote, support the waste management hierarchy in the state to the greatest

	202	1	040
	308		310
1	known as Juniper Ridge Landfill.	1	was to be the law of the landfill. Their contract
2	On June 13th, 2003, SPO issued a request for	2	with the state requires compliance as does their
3	proposals to contract for landfill operators. On	3	existing license. The state of Maine's only
4	page 4 of that RFP under scope of services, at the	4	functional state-owned landfill should certainly be
5	very top it said, quote, the scope of services under	5	following our state waste policy. That's it.
6	this contract will include those listed below. The	6	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Continue to
7	landfill will be operated on a basis consistent with	7	pass it down for the other pre-filed testimony
8	the state's waste management hierarchy which	8	summaries. Thank you.
9	establishes the following priority for the management	9	MR. LINCOLN: My name is David Lincoln and
10	of waste: reduce, reuse, recycle, compost,	10	I live within the umbrella or cut off umbrella for
11	incinerate, landfill, end quote. Casella was the	11	the landfill, and I'm not here to present testimony
12	sole bidder and became the JRL operator. The point	12	to relate to specific management policies in Maine
13	is, it was known to them before they bid that the	13	nor the long-term environmental impacts of allowing
14	waste hierarchy was to be vigorously applied. The	14	disposal of additional unprocessed municipal waste,
15	Operating Services Agreement between the state and	15	MSW. I'm here to represent Wanda as well, my wife.
16	Casella was signed on February 4th the following	16	She's out of town. We will we feel we can present
17	year. On page 24, Section 2.13, quote, waste	17	compelling testimony related to the nuisance factors
18	management hierarchy, Casella agrees to use its best	18	we are subject to on a daily basis because of our
19	efforts to achieve the following goals, A, to operate	19	proximity to the Juniper Ridge Landfill.
20	the landfill following the state's solid waste	20	We are subject to odorous fumes from JRL
21	management hierarchy, end quote. On page 37 of the	21	throughout the year. We do not have the benefit of
22	same agreement it reads, quote, 13.5, Casella	22	enjoying our home as others do; in fact, we've had to
23	covenants and agrees to operate the landfill and	23	install air conditioning because during the warmer
24	otherwise conduct all aspects of its business at the	24	months we cannot open our windows due to the odor
25	landfill in compliance with all applicable laws and	25	from the landfill as well as fumes and noise from the
	309		311
1	regulations and permits, end quote. Certainly	1	trucks. We contend that approval of this application
2			
	Casella knew that the state statutes on hierarchy	2	will our most valuable asset, our home, approval
3	would apply here.	3	will further devalue our house and we are losing the
3 4	would apply here. On April 9th, 2004, nine years ago	3 4	will further devalue our house and we are losing the value of it every day as time goes on. We further
3 4 5	would apply here. On April 9th, 2004, nine years ago yesterday, DEP issued a permit to SPO and Casella	3 4 5	will further devalue our house and we are losing the value of it every day as time goes on. We further believe that bringing the incinerator ash to JRL does
3 4 5 6	would apply here. On April 9th, 2004, nine years ago yesterday, DEP issued a permit to SPO and Casella which amended the original paper mill landfill	3 4 5 6	will further devalue our house and we are losing the value of it every day as time goes on. We further believe that bringing the incinerator ash to JRL does not does fit into the state of Maine waste
3 4 5 6 7	would apply here. On April 9th, 2004, nine years ago yesterday, DEP issued a permit to SPO and Casella which amended the original paper mill landfill license when the state became owner. On page 50 of	3 4 5 6 7	will further devalue our house and we are losing the value of it every day as time goes on. We further believe that bringing the incinerator ash to JRL does not does fit into the state of Maine waste hierarchy while bringing MSW to JRL does not.
3 4 5 6 7 8	would apply here. On April 9th, 2004, nine years ago yesterday, DEP issued a permit to SPO and Casella which amended the original paper mill landfill license when the state became owner. On page 50 of that document it says, quote, in signing the OSA	3 4 5 6 7 8	will further devalue our house and we are losing the value of it every day as time goes on. We further believe that bringing the incinerator ash to JRL does not does fit into the state of Maine waste hierarchy while bringing MSW to JRL does not. In closing, we offer that regarding JRL, we
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	would apply here. On April 9th, 2004, nine years ago yesterday, DEP issued a permit to SPO and Casella which amended the original paper mill landfill license when the state became owner. On page 50 of that document it says, quote, in signing the OSA Casella agreed, in part, to use its best efforts to	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	will further devalue our house and we are losing the value of it every day as time goes on. We further believe that bringing the incinerator ash to JRL does not does fit into the state of Maine waste hierarchy while bringing MSW to JRL does not. In closing, we offer that regarding JRL, we can smell it and we can hear the we can hear it
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	would apply here. On April 9th, 2004, nine years ago yesterday, DEP issued a permit to SPO and Casella which amended the original paper mill landfill license when the state became owner. On page 50 of that document it says, quote, in signing the OSA Casella agreed, in part, to use its best efforts to operate the landfill following the state's solid	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	will further devalue our house and we are losing the value of it every day as time goes on. We further believe that bringing the incinerator ash to JRL does not does fit into the state of Maine waste hierarchy while bringing MSW to JRL does not. In closing, we offer that regarding JRL, we can smell it and we can hear the we can hear it and we can hear the trucks and all those factors
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	would apply here. On April 9th, 2004, nine years ago yesterday, DEP issued a permit to SPO and Casella which amended the original paper mill landfill license when the state became owner. On page 50 of that document it says, quote, in signing the OSA Casella agreed, in part, to use its best efforts to operate the landfill following the state's solid waste management hierarchy, end quote. This is the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	will further devalue our house and we are losing the value of it every day as time goes on. We further believe that bringing the incinerator ash to JRL does not does fit into the state of Maine waste hierarchy while bringing MSW to JRL does not. In closing, we offer that regarding JRL, we can smell it and we can hear the we can hear it and we can hear the trucks and all those factors relate to the proximity of JRL. We believe we and
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	would apply here. On April 9th, 2004, nine years ago yesterday, DEP issued a permit to SPO and Casella which amended the original paper mill landfill license when the state became owner. On page 50 of that document it says, quote, in signing the OSA Casella agreed, in part, to use its best efforts to operate the landfill following the state's solid waste management hierarchy, end quote. This is the license being considered for amendment now.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	will further devalue our house and we are losing the value of it every day as time goes on. We further believe that bringing the incinerator ash to JRL does not does fit into the state of Maine waste hierarchy while bringing MSW to JRL does not. In closing, we offer that regarding JRL, we can smell it and we can hear the we can hear it and we can hear the trucks and all those factors relate to the proximity of JRL. We believe we and other the other three residents living on the Old
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	would apply here. On April 9th, 2004, nine years ago yesterday, DEP issued a permit to SPO and Casella which amended the original paper mill landfill license when the state became owner. On page 50 of that document it says, quote, in signing the OSA Casella agreed, in part, to use its best efforts to operate the landfill following the state's solid waste management hierarchy, end quote. This is the license being considered for amendment now. On page 59, that's that same document, DEP	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	will further devalue our house and we are losing the value of it every day as time goes on. We further believe that bringing the incinerator ash to JRL does not does fit into the state of Maine waste hierarchy while bringing MSW to JRL does not. In closing, we offer that regarding JRL, we can smell it and we can hear the we can hear it and we can hear the trucks and all those factors relate to the proximity of JRL. We believe we and other the other three residents living on the Old Bennoch Road in Old Town may be the most aggrieved or
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	would apply here. On April 9th, 2004, nine years ago yesterday, DEP issued a permit to SPO and Casella which amended the original paper mill landfill license when the state became owner. On page 50 of that document it says, quote, in signing the OSA Casella agreed, in part, to use its best efforts to operate the landfill following the state's solid waste management hierarchy, end quote. This is the license being considered for amendment now. On page 59, that's that same document, DEP permit, it says, quote, 16, with regard to the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	will further devalue our house and we are losing the value of it every day as time goes on. We further believe that bringing the incinerator ash to JRL does not does fit into the state of Maine waste hierarchy while bringing MSW to JRL does not. In closing, we offer that regarding JRL, we can smell it and we can hear the we can hear it and we can hear the trucks and all those factors relate to the proximity of JRL. We believe we and other the other three residents living on the Old Bennoch Road in Old Town may be the most aggrieved or impacted residents in Old Town and none receive any
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	would apply here. On April 9th, 2004, nine years ago yesterday, DEP issued a permit to SPO and Casella which amended the original paper mill landfill license when the state became owner. On page 50 of that document it says, quote, in signing the OSA Casella agreed, in part, to use its best efforts to operate the landfill following the state's solid waste management hierarchy, end quote. This is the license being considered for amendment now. On page 59, that's that same document, DEP permit, it says, quote, 16, with regard to the acceptance of MSW for disposal, consistent with its	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	will further devalue our house and we are losing the value of it every day as time goes on. We further believe that bringing the incinerator ash to JRL does not does fit into the state of Maine waste hierarchy while bringing MSW to JRL does not. In closing, we offer that regarding JRL, we can smell it and we can hear the we can hear it and we can hear the trucks and all those factors relate to the proximity of JRL. We believe we and other the other three residents living on the Old Bennoch Road in Old Town may be the most aggrieved or impacted residents in Old Town and none receive any benefit at all. We not only live closer to JRL than
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	would apply here. On April 9th, 2004, nine years ago yesterday, DEP issued a permit to SPO and Casella which amended the original paper mill landfill license when the state became owner. On page 50 of that document it says, quote, in signing the OSA Casella agreed, in part, to use its best efforts to operate the landfill following the state's solid waste management hierarchy, end quote. This is the license being considered for amendment now. On page 59, that's that same document, DEP permit, it says, quote, 16, with regard to the acceptance of MSW for disposal, consistent with its proposal the applicant, A, shall not dispose of	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	will further devalue our house and we are losing the value of it every day as time goes on. We further believe that bringing the incinerator ash to JRL does not does fit into the state of Maine waste hierarchy while bringing MSW to JRL does not. In closing, we offer that regarding JRL, we can smell it and we can hear the we can hear it and we can hear the trucks and all those factors relate to the proximity of JRL. We believe we and other the other three residents living on the Old Bennoch Road in Old Town may be the most aggrieved or impacted residents in Old Town and none receive any benefit at all. We not only live closer to JRL than most other citizens and are, therefore, suffering a
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	would apply here. On April 9th, 2004, nine years ago yesterday, DEP issued a permit to SPO and Casella which amended the original paper mill landfill license when the state became owner. On page 50 of that document it says, quote, in signing the OSA Casella agreed, in part, to use its best efforts to operate the landfill following the state's solid waste management hierarchy, end quote. This is the license being considered for amendment now. On page 59, that's that same document, DEP permit, it says, quote, 16, with regard to the acceptance of MSW for disposal, consistent with its proposal the applicant, A, shall not dispose of unprocessed MSW from any source other than bypass	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	will further devalue our house and we are losing the value of it every day as time goes on. We further believe that bringing the incinerator ash to JRL does not does fit into the state of Maine waste hierarchy while bringing MSW to JRL does not. In closing, we offer that regarding JRL, we can smell it and we can hear the we can hear it and we can hear the trucks and all those factors relate to the proximity of JRL. We believe we and other the other three residents living on the Old Bennoch Road in Old Town may be the most aggrieved or impacted residents in Old Town and none receive any benefit at all. We not only live closer to JRL than most other citizens and are, therefore, suffering a greater impact than any other party, group,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	would apply here. On April 9th, 2004, nine years ago yesterday, DEP issued a permit to SPO and Casella which amended the original paper mill landfill license when the state became owner. On page 50 of that document it says, quote, in signing the OSA Casella agreed, in part, to use its best efforts to operate the landfill following the state's solid waste management hierarchy, end quote. This is the license being considered for amendment now. On page 59, that's that same document, DEP permit, it says, quote, 16, with regard to the acceptance of MSW for disposal, consistent with its proposal the applicant, A, shall not dispose of unprocessed MSW from any source other than bypass from the following sources: PERC incinerator in	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	will further devalue our house and we are losing the value of it every day as time goes on. We further believe that bringing the incinerator ash to JRL does not does fit into the state of Maine waste hierarchy while bringing MSW to JRL does not. In closing, we offer that regarding JRL, we can smell it and we can hear the we can hear it and we can hear the trucks and all those factors relate to the proximity of JRL. We believe we and other the other three residents living on the Old Bennoch Road in Old Town may be the most aggrieved or impacted residents in Old Town and none receive any benefit at all. We not only live closer to JRL than most other citizens and are, therefore, suffering a greater impact than any other party, group, corporation or individual and will suffer greater
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	would apply here. On April 9th, 2004, nine years ago yesterday, DEP issued a permit to SPO and Casella which amended the original paper mill landfill license when the state became owner. On page 50 of that document it says, quote, in signing the OSA Casella agreed, in part, to use its best efforts to operate the landfill following the state's solid waste management hierarchy, end quote. This is the license being considered for amendment now. On page 59, that's that same document, DEP permit, it says, quote, 16, with regard to the acceptance of MSW for disposal, consistent with its proposal the applicant, A, shall not dispose of unprocessed MSW from any source other than bypass from the following sources: PERC incinerator in Orrington and the Maine Energy incinerator in	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	will further devalue our house and we are losing the value of it every day as time goes on. We further believe that bringing the incinerator ash to JRL does not does fit into the state of Maine waste hierarchy while bringing MSW to JRL does not. In closing, we offer that regarding JRL, we can smell it and we can hear the we can hear it and we can hear the trucks and all those factors relate to the proximity of JRL. We believe we and other the other three residents living on the Old Bennoch Road in Old Town may be the most aggrieved or impacted residents in Old Town and none receive any benefit at all. We not only live closer to JRL than most other citizens and are, therefore, suffering a greater impact than any other party, group, corporation or individual and will suffer greater than any other interested party, group, corporation
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	would apply here. On April 9th, 2004, nine years ago yesterday, DEP issued a permit to SPO and Casella which amended the original paper mill landfill license when the state became owner. On page 50 of that document it says, quote, in signing the OSA Casella agreed, in part, to use its best efforts to operate the landfill following the state's solid waste management hierarchy, end quote. This is the license being considered for amendment now. On page 59, that's that same document, DEP permit, it says, quote, 16, with regard to the acceptance of MSW for disposal, consistent with its proposal the applicant, A, shall not dispose of unprocessed MSW from any source other than bypass from the following sources: PERC incinerator in Orrington and the Maine Energy incinerator in Biddeford, waste delivered under an interruptible	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	will further devalue our house and we are losing the value of it every day as time goes on. We further believe that bringing the incinerator ash to JRL does not does fit into the state of Maine waste hierarchy while bringing MSW to JRL does not. In closing, we offer that regarding JRL, we can smell it and we can hear the we can hear it and we can hear the trucks and all those factors relate to the proximity of JRL. We believe we and other the other three residents living on the Old Bennoch Road in Old Town may be the most aggrieved or impacted residents in Old Town and none receive any benefit at all. We not only live closer to JRL than most other citizens and are, therefore, suffering a greater impact than any other party, group, corporation or individual and will suffer greater than any other interested party, group, corporation or individual should this application be approved.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	would apply here. On April 9th, 2004, nine years ago yesterday, DEP issued a permit to SPO and Casella which amended the original paper mill landfill license when the state became owner. On page 50 of that document it says, quote, in signing the OSA Casella agreed, in part, to use its best efforts to operate the landfill following the state's solid waste management hierarchy, end quote. This is the license being considered for amendment now. On page 59, that's that same document, DEP permit, it says, quote, 16, with regard to the acceptance of MSW for disposal, consistent with its proposal the applicant, A, shall not dispose of unprocessed MSW from any source other than bypass from the following sources: PERC incinerator in Orrington and the Maine Energy incinerator in Biddeford, waste delivered under an interruptible contract with PERC or waste delivered in excess of	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	will further devalue our house and we are losing the value of it every day as time goes on. We further believe that bringing the incinerator ash to JRL does not does fit into the state of Maine waste hierarchy while bringing MSW to JRL does not. In closing, we offer that regarding JRL, we can smell it and we can hear the we can hear it and we can hear the trucks and all those factors relate to the proximity of JRL. We believe we and other the other three residents living on the Old Bennoch Road in Old Town may be the most aggrieved or impacted residents in Old Town and none receive any benefit at all. We not only live closer to JRL than most other citizens and are, therefore, suffering a greater impact than any other party, group, corporation or individual and will suffer greater than any other interested party, group, corporation or individual should this application be approved. Thank you.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	would apply here. On April 9th, 2004, nine years ago yesterday, DEP issued a permit to SPO and Casella which amended the original paper mill landfill license when the state became owner. On page 50 of that document it says, quote, in signing the OSA Casella agreed, in part, to use its best efforts to operate the landfill following the state's solid waste management hierarchy, end quote. This is the license being considered for amendment now. On page 59, that's that same document, DEP permit, it says, quote, 16, with regard to the acceptance of MSW for disposal, consistent with its proposal the applicant, A, shall not dispose of unprocessed MSW from any source other than bypass from the following sources: PERC incinerator in Orrington and the Maine Energy incinerator in Biddeford, waste delivered under an interruptible contract with PERC or waste delivered in excess of processing capacity at other MSW incinerators in	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	will further devalue our house and we are losing the value of it every day as time goes on. We further believe that bringing the incinerator ash to JRL does not does fit into the state of Maine waste hierarchy while bringing MSW to JRL does not. In closing, we offer that regarding JRL, we can smell it and we can hear the we can hear it and we can hear the trucks and all those factors relate to the proximity of JRL. We believe we and other the other three residents living on the Old Bennoch Road in Old Town may be the most aggrieved or impacted residents in Old Town and none receive any benefit at all. We not only live closer to JRL than most other citizens and are, therefore, suffering a greater impact than any other party, group, corporation or individual and will suffer greater than any other interested party, group, corporation or individual should this application be approved. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	would apply here. On April 9th, 2004, nine years ago yesterday, DEP issued a permit to SPO and Casella which amended the original paper mill landfill license when the state became owner. On page 50 of that document it says, quote, in signing the OSA Casella agreed, in part, to use its best efforts to operate the landfill following the state's solid waste management hierarchy, end quote. This is the license being considered for amendment now. On page 59, that's that same document, DEP permit, it says, quote, 16, with regard to the acceptance of MSW for disposal, consistent with its proposal the applicant, A, shall not dispose of unprocessed MSW from any source other than bypass from the following sources: PERC incinerator in Orrington and the Maine Energy incinerator in Biddeford, waste delivered under an interruptible contract with PERC or waste delivered in excess of processing capacity at other MSW incinerators in Maine, end quote.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 will further devalue our house and we are losing the value of it every day as time goes on. We further believe that bringing the incinerator ash to JRL does not does fit into the state of Maine waste hierarchy while bringing MSW to JRL does not. In closing, we offer that regarding JRL, we can smell it and we can hear the we can hear it and we can hear the trucks and all those factors relate to the proximity of JRL. We believe we and other the other three residents living on the Old Bennoch Road in Old Town may be the most aggrieved or impacted residents in Old Town and none receive any benefit at all. We not only live closer to JRL than most other citizens and are, therefore, suffering a greater impact than any other party, group, corporation or individual and will suffer greater than any other interested party, group, corporation or individual should this application be approved. Thank you. MR. SANBORN: A question on time?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	would apply here. On April 9th, 2004, nine years ago yesterday, DEP issued a permit to SPO and Casella which amended the original paper mill landfill license when the state became owner. On page 50 of that document it says, quote, in signing the OSA Casella agreed, in part, to use its best efforts to operate the landfill following the state's solid waste management hierarchy, end quote. This is the license being considered for amendment now. On page 59, that's that same document, DEP permit, it says, quote, 16, with regard to the acceptance of MSW for disposal, consistent with its proposal the applicant, A, shall not dispose of unprocessed MSW from any source other than bypass from the following sources: PERC incinerator in Orrington and the Maine Energy incinerator in Biddeford, waste delivered under an interruptible contract with PERC or waste delivered in excess of processing capacity at other MSW incinerators in Maine, end quote. In summary, Casella knew well in advance of	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	will further devalue our house and we are losing the value of it every day as time goes on. We further believe that bringing the incinerator ash to JRL does not does fit into the state of Maine waste hierarchy while bringing MSW to JRL does not. In closing, we offer that regarding JRL, we can smell it and we can hear the we can hear it and we can hear the trucks and all those factors relate to the proximity of JRL. We believe we and other the other three residents living on the Old Bennoch Road in Old Town may be the most aggrieved or impacted residents in Old Town and none receive any benefit at all. We not only live closer to JRL than most other citizens and are, therefore, suffering a greater impact than any other party, group, corporation or individual and will suffer greater than any other interested party, group, corporation or individual should this application be approved. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	would apply here. On April 9th, 2004, nine years ago yesterday, DEP issued a permit to SPO and Casella which amended the original paper mill landfill license when the state became owner. On page 50 of that document it says, quote, in signing the OSA Casella agreed, in part, to use its best efforts to operate the landfill following the state's solid waste management hierarchy, end quote. This is the license being considered for amendment now. On page 59, that's that same document, DEP permit, it says, quote, 16, with regard to the acceptance of MSW for disposal, consistent with its proposal the applicant, A, shall not dispose of unprocessed MSW from any source other than bypass from the following sources: PERC incinerator in Orrington and the Maine Energy incinerator in Biddeford, waste delivered under an interruptible contract with PERC or waste delivered in excess of processing capacity at other MSW incinerators in Maine, end quote.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 will further devalue our house and we are losing the value of it every day as time goes on. We further believe that bringing the incinerator ash to JRL does not does fit into the state of Maine waste hierarchy while bringing MSW to JRL does not. In closing, we offer that regarding JRL, we can smell it and we can hear the we can hear it and we can hear the trucks and all those factors relate to the proximity of JRL. We believe we and other the other three residents living on the Old Bennoch Road in Old Town may be the most aggrieved or impacted residents in Old Town and none receive any benefit at all. We not only live closer to JRL than most other citizens and are, therefore, suffering a greater impact than any other party, group, corporation or individual and will suffer greater than any other interested party, group, corporation or individual should this application be approved. Thank you. MR. SANBORN: A question on time?

	312		314
1	MR. SANBORN: Thank you. Waste management	1	accomplish? One, it moves much of the Maine
2	in Maine, is there really a clearly defined policy or	2	generated waste from southern Maine down one category
3	has a clearly defined policy been manipulated or	3	on the waste hierarchy from incinerating to
4	overlooked or perhaps not even addressed at all?	4	landfilling; two, it appears from a high level to
5	We'll attempt to suggest and prove that the latter is	5	eliminate out-of-state generated waste but due to
	correctly the fact.	6	_
6	The Legislature of the state of Maine was	7	Maine definition, when that waste is moved to Westbrook, where it likely will be based on history,
8	_	8	
	very clear and succinct in its adoption of this	9	it will become Maine generated waste and also
9	sentence of intent when it passed the solid waste and	10	diverted to JRL. An even more blatant disregard and
10 11	recycling legislation; quote, it is the policy of the	11	misrepresentation of the facts is the contract
	state to plan for and implement an integrated		between Casella and PERC for diverting MSW to the
12	approach to solid waste management for solid waste	12	PERC facility. While the owner may not have been a
13	generated in this state and solid waste imported into	13	signatory to this agreement, the owner's
14	this state which must be based on the following order	14	representatives did sign the amendment to the
15	of priority, unquote. Title 38 goes on to explain	15	application and is, therefore, also implicit in the
16	what the intent of the Legislature was without any	16	misrepresentation of the facts and submission of
17	ambiguity at all. So what happens to the intent that	17	misleading data. At face value and based on
18	the Legislature adopted and who owns the fault by not	18	owner/operator statements, the contract appears to
19	adhering to those policies and directives? Two state	19	move MERC MSW to PERC; however, a careful read
20	entities appear to be without much, if any,	20	reveals that of the hundred thousand tons, 20,000 are
21	competition to shoulder that blame. These two are	21	already delivered to PERC by Casella, 30,000 tons are
22	now the defunct Maine State Planning Office and the	22	MERC diverted MSW and 50,000 tons are out-of-state
23	Maine Department of Environmental Protection. Few	23	waste. And even more blatant is that should PERC
24	will argue that either has a history of more than a	24	require further fuel, Casella will deliver it but
25	weak attempt at following the format of the waste	25	contractually it's mandatory that it be out-of-state
	313		315
1	hierarchy that the Legislature had desired. The	1	waste. It opens JRL to yet another waste stream that
2	targeted 50 percent recycling rate set for 2009 is	2	waster in opens site to yet another waste stream that was specifically included in the excuse me
		-	was specifically included in the excuse the
3	still below 40 percent even when including MSW buried	3	specifically excluded in the operating agreement
3	still below 40 percent even when including MSW buried in landfills under the quise that it was used in	3 4	specifically excluded in the operating agreement. What could the application have accomplished had the
4	in landfills under the guise that it was used in	4	What could the application have accomplished had the
4 5	in landfills under the guise that it was used in recycling. To date, the management of waste in	4 5	What could the application have accomplished had the owner really looked at the impact of landfilling
4 5 6	in landfills under the guise that it was used in recycling. To date, the management of waste in Maine, particularly at JRL, has been largely	4 5 6	What could the application have accomplished had the owner really looked at the impact of landfilling MERC's MSW at Juniper Ridge and put forward a
4 5 6 7	in landfills under the guise that it was used in recycling. To date, the management of waste in Maine, particularly at JRL, has been largely accomplished through the manipulation of definitions.	4 5 6 7	What could the application have accomplished had the owner really looked at the impact of landfilling MERC's MSW at Juniper Ridge and put forward a solution that adequately accomplishes what was
4 5 6 7 8	in landfills under the guise that it was used in recycling. To date, the management of waste in Maine, particularly at JRL, has been largely accomplished through the manipulation of definitions. Why? Because the former SPO and the Maine DEP has	4 5 6 7 8	What could the application have accomplished had the owner really looked at the impact of landfilling MERC's MSW at Juniper Ridge and put forward a solution that adequately accomplishes what was purported in the first place, that being the
4 5 6 7 8 9	in landfills under the guise that it was used in recycling. To date, the management of waste in Maine, particularly at JRL, has been largely accomplished through the manipulation of definitions. Why? Because the former SPO and the Maine DEP has stood by idle while the lobbying firm for the	4 5 6 7 8 9	What could the application have accomplished had the owner really looked at the impact of landfilling MERC's MSW at Juniper Ridge and put forward a solution that adequately accomplishes what was purported in the first place, that being the management of truck traffic, reducing the waste
4 5 6 7 8 9	in landfills under the guise that it was used in recycling. To date, the management of waste in Maine, particularly at JRL, has been largely accomplished through the manipulation of definitions. Why? Because the former SPO and the Maine DEP has stood by idle while the lobbying firm for the operator of JRL completed all the necessary	4 5 6 7 8 9 10	What could the application have accomplished had the owner really looked at the impact of landfilling MERC's MSW at Juniper Ridge and put forward a solution that adequately accomplishes what was purported in the first place, that being the management of truck traffic, reducing the waste stream consistent with the hierarchy and the
4 5 7 8 9 10 11	in landfills under the guise that it was used in recycling. To date, the management of waste in Maine, particularly at JRL, has been largely accomplished through the manipulation of definitions. Why? Because the former SPO and the Maine DEP has stood by idle while the lobbying firm for the operator of JRL completed all the necessary paperwork, lobbied at the Legislature to accept their	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	What could the application have accomplished had the owner really looked at the impact of landfilling MERC's MSW at Juniper Ridge and put forward a solution that adequately accomplishes what was purported in the first place, that being the management of truck traffic, reducing the waste stream consistent with the hierarchy and the elimination of out-of-state waste previously
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	in landfills under the guise that it was used in recycling. To date, the management of waste in Maine, particularly at JRL, has been largely accomplished through the manipulation of definitions. Why? Because the former SPO and the Maine DEP has stood by idle while the lobbying firm for the operator of JRL completed all the necessary paperwork, lobbied at the Legislature to accept their proposals and agreed to make changes by rule when the	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	What could the application have accomplished had the owner really looked at the impact of landfilling MERC's MSW at Juniper Ridge and put forward a solution that adequately accomplishes what was purported in the first place, that being the management of truck traffic, reducing the waste stream consistent with the hierarchy and the elimination of out-of-state waste previously combusted by MERC. The owner could have accomplished
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	in landfills under the guise that it was used in recycling. To date, the management of waste in Maine, particularly at JRL, has been largely accomplished through the manipulation of definitions. Why? Because the former SPO and the Maine DEP has stood by idle while the lobbying firm for the operator of JRL completed all the necessary paperwork, lobbied at the Legislature to accept their proposals and agreed to make changes by rule when the Legislature where the legislative approval was not	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	What could the application have accomplished had the owner really looked at the impact of landfilling MERC's MSW at Juniper Ridge and put forward a solution that adequately accomplishes what was purported in the first place, that being the management of truck traffic, reducing the waste stream consistent with the hierarchy and the elimination of out-of-state waste previously combusted by MERC. The owner could have accomplished exactly what was purported from the start had the
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	in landfills under the guise that it was used in recycling. To date, the management of waste in Maine, particularly at JRL, has been largely accomplished through the manipulation of definitions. Why? Because the former SPO and the Maine DEP has stood by idle while the lobbying firm for the operator of JRL completed all the necessary paperwork, lobbied at the Legislature to accept their proposals and agreed to make changes by rule when the Legislature where the legislative approval was not needed.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	What could the application have accomplished had the owner really looked at the impact of landfilling MERC's MSW at Juniper Ridge and put forward a solution that adequately accomplishes what was purported in the first place, that being the management of truck traffic, reducing the waste stream consistent with the hierarchy and the elimination of out-of-state waste previously combusted by MERC. The owner could have accomplished exactly what was purported from the start had the owner focused on options instead of focusing only on
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	in landfills under the guise that it was used in recycling. To date, the management of waste in Maine, particularly at JRL, has been largely accomplished through the manipulation of definitions. Why? Because the former SPO and the Maine DEP has stood by idle while the lobbying firm for the operator of JRL completed all the necessary paperwork, lobbied at the Legislature to accept their proposals and agreed to make changes by rule when the Legislature where the legislative approval was not needed. Do we need to bury MSW? Certainly we do, at	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	What could the application have accomplished had the owner really looked at the impact of landfilling MERC's MSW at Juniper Ridge and put forward a solution that adequately accomplishes what was purported in the first place, that being the management of truck traffic, reducing the waste stream consistent with the hierarchy and the elimination of out-of-state waste previously combusted by MERC. The owner could have accomplished exactly what was purported from the start had the owner focused on options instead of focusing only on landfilling, that being that it would take care of
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	in landfills under the guise that it was used in recycling. To date, the management of waste in Maine, particularly at JRL, has been largely accomplished through the manipulation of definitions. Why? Because the former SPO and the Maine DEP has stood by idle while the lobbying firm for the operator of JRL completed all the necessary paperwork, lobbied at the Legislature to accept their proposals and agreed to make changes by rule when the Legislature where the legislative approval was not needed. Do we need to bury MSW? Certainly we do, at least some of it. No one could argue otherwise	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	What could the application have accomplished had the owner really looked at the impact of landfilling MERC's MSW at Juniper Ridge and put forward a solution that adequately accomplishes what was purported in the first place, that being the management of truck traffic, reducing the waste stream consistent with the hierarchy and the elimination of out-of-state waste previously combusted by MERC. The owner could have accomplished exactly what was purported from the start had the owner focused on options instead of focusing only on landfilling, that being that it would take care of the MSW from the decommissioned MERC facility in ways
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	in landfills under the guise that it was used in recycling. To date, the management of waste in Maine, particularly at JRL, has been largely accomplished through the manipulation of definitions. Why? Because the former SPO and the Maine DEP has stood by idle while the lobbying firm for the operator of JRL completed all the necessary paperwork, lobbied at the Legislature to accept their proposals and agreed to make changes by rule when the Legislature where the legislative approval was not needed. Do we need to bury MSW? Certainly we do, at least some of it. No one could argue otherwise successfully; however, if we do, we should start	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	What could the application have accomplished had the owner really looked at the impact of landfilling MERC's MSW at Juniper Ridge and put forward a solution that adequately accomplishes what was purported in the first place, that being the management of truck traffic, reducing the waste stream consistent with the hierarchy and the elimination of out-of-state waste previously combusted by MERC. The owner could have accomplished exactly what was purported from the start had the owner focused on options instead of focusing only on landfilling, that being that it would take care of the MSW from the decommissioned MERC facility in ways that meet the waste hierarchy policy.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	in landfills under the guise that it was used in recycling. To date, the management of waste in Maine, particularly at JRL, has been largely accomplished through the manipulation of definitions. Why? Because the former SPO and the Maine DEP has stood by idle while the lobbying firm for the operator of JRL completed all the necessary paperwork, lobbied at the Legislature to accept their proposals and agreed to make changes by rule when the Legislature where the legislative approval was not needed. Do we need to bury MSW? Certainly we do, at least some of it. No one could argue otherwise successfully; however, if we do, we should start looking at the waste hierarchy. Taking MSW from MERC	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	What could the application have accomplished had the owner really looked at the impact of landfilling MERC's MSW at Juniper Ridge and put forward a solution that adequately accomplishes what was purported in the first place, that being the management of truck traffic, reducing the waste stream consistent with the hierarchy and the elimination of out-of-state waste previously combusted by MERC. The owner could have accomplished exactly what was purported from the start had the owner focused on options instead of focusing only on landfilling, that being that it would take care of the MSW from the decommissioned MERC facility in ways that meet the waste hierarchy policy. First, the owner could have proposed
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	in landfills under the guise that it was used in recycling. To date, the management of waste in Maine, particularly at JRL, has been largely accomplished through the manipulation of definitions. Why? Because the former SPO and the Maine DEP has stood by idle while the lobbying firm for the operator of JRL completed all the necessary paperwork, lobbied at the Legislature to accept their proposals and agreed to make changes by rule when the Legislature where the legislative approval was not needed. Do we need to bury MSW? Certainly we do, at least some of it. No one could argue otherwise successfully; however, if we do, we should start looking at the waste hierarchy. Taking MSW from MERC and burying it at JRL should be our last and final	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	What could the application have accomplished had the owner really looked at the impact of landfilling MERC's MSW at Juniper Ridge and put forward a solution that adequately accomplishes what was purported in the first place, that being the management of truck traffic, reducing the waste stream consistent with the hierarchy and the elimination of out-of-state waste previously combusted by MERC. The owner could have accomplished exactly what was purported from the start had the owner focused on options instead of focusing only on landfilling, that being that it would take care of the MSW from the decommissioned MERC facility in ways that meet the waste hierarchy policy. First, the owner could have proposed diverting a minimum of 80,000 tons and perhaps as
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	in landfills under the guise that it was used in recycling. To date, the management of waste in Maine, particularly at JRL, has been largely accomplished through the manipulation of definitions. Why? Because the former SPO and the Maine DEP has stood by idle while the lobbying firm for the operator of JRL completed all the necessary paperwork, lobbied at the Legislature to accept their proposals and agreed to make changes by rule when the Legislature where the legislative approval was not needed. Do we need to bury MSW? Certainly we do, at least some of it. No one could argue otherwise successfully; however, if we do, we should start looking at the waste hierarchy. Taking MSW from MERC and burying it at JRL should be our last and final option left on the table after all other options are	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	What could the application have accomplished had the owner really looked at the impact of landfilling MERC's MSW at Juniper Ridge and put forward a solution that adequately accomplishes what was purported in the first place, that being the management of truck traffic, reducing the waste stream consistent with the hierarchy and the elimination of out-of-state waste previously combusted by MERC. The owner could have accomplished exactly what was purported from the start had the owner focused on options instead of focusing only on landfilling, that being that it would take care of the MSW from the decommissioned MERC facility in ways that meet the waste hierarchy policy. First, the owner could have proposed diverting a minimum of 80,000 tons and perhaps as much as 91,000 tons of MERC MSW to PERC keeping it at
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	in landfills under the guise that it was used in recycling. To date, the management of waste in Maine, particularly at JRL, has been largely accomplished through the manipulation of definitions. Why? Because the former SPO and the Maine DEP has stood by idle while the lobbying firm for the operator of JRL completed all the necessary paperwork, lobbied at the Legislature to accept their proposals and agreed to make changes by rule when the Legislature where the legislative approval was not needed. Do we need to bury MSW? Certainly we do, at least some of it. No one could argue otherwise successfully; however, if we do, we should start looking at the waste hierarchy. Taking MSW from MERC and burying it at JRL should be our last and final option left on the table after all other options are exhausted.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	What could the application have accomplished had the owner really looked at the impact of landfilling MERC's MSW at Juniper Ridge and put forward a solution that adequately accomplishes what was purported in the first place, that being the management of truck traffic, reducing the waste stream consistent with the hierarchy and the elimination of out-of-state waste previously combusted by MERC. The owner could have accomplished exactly what was purported from the start had the owner focused on options instead of focusing only on landfilling, that being that it would take care of the MSW from the decommissioned MERC facility in ways that meet the waste hierarchy policy. First, the owner could have proposed diverting a minimum of 80,000 tons and perhaps as much as 91,000 tons of MERC MSW to PERC keeping it at least at the same level of the hierarchy as it was at
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	in landfills under the guise that it was used in recycling. To date, the management of waste in Maine, particularly at JRL, has been largely accomplished through the manipulation of definitions. Why? Because the former SPO and the Maine DEP has stood by idle while the lobbying firm for the operator of JRL completed all the necessary paperwork, lobbied at the Legislature to accept their proposals and agreed to make changes by rule when the Legislature where the legislative approval was not needed. Do we need to bury MSW? Certainly we do, at least some of it. No one could argue otherwise successfully; however, if we do, we should start looking at the waste hierarchy. Taking MSW from MERC and burying it at JRL should be our last and final option left on the table after all other options are exhausted. Now, what does the document entitled	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	What could the application have accomplished had the owner really looked at the impact of landfilling MERC's MSW at Juniper Ridge and put forward a solution that adequately accomplishes what was purported in the first place, that being the management of truck traffic, reducing the waste stream consistent with the hierarchy and the elimination of out-of-state waste previously combusted by MERC. The owner could have accomplished exactly what was purported from the start had the owner focused on options instead of focusing only on landfilling, that being that it would take care of the MSW from the decommissioned MERC facility in ways that meet the waste hierarchy policy. First, the owner could have proposed diverting a minimum of 80,000 tons and perhaps as much as 91,000 tons of MERC MSW to PERC keeping it at least at the same level of the hierarchy as it was at MERC, where it would have created 1.2 million dollars
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	in landfills under the guise that it was used in recycling. To date, the management of waste in Maine, particularly at JRL, has been largely accomplished through the manipulation of definitions. Why? Because the former SPO and the Maine DEP has stood by idle while the lobbying firm for the operator of JRL completed all the necessary paperwork, lobbied at the Legislature to accept their proposals and agreed to make changes by rule when the Legislature where the legislative approval was not needed. Do we need to bury MSW? Certainly we do, at least some of it. No one could argue otherwise successfully; however, if we do, we should start looking at the waste hierarchy. Taking MSW from MERC and burying it at JRL should be our last and final option left on the table after all other options are exhausted. Now, what does the document entitled Application of the State of Maine and NEWSME Landfill	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	What could the application have accomplished had the owner really looked at the impact of landfilling MERC's MSW at Juniper Ridge and put forward a solution that adequately accomplishes what was purported in the first place, that being the management of truck traffic, reducing the waste stream consistent with the hierarchy and the elimination of out-of-state waste previously combusted by MERC. The owner could have accomplished exactly what was purported from the start had the owner focused on options instead of focusing only on landfilling, that being that it would take care of the MSW from the decommissioned MERC facility in ways that meet the waste hierarchy policy. First, the owner could have proposed diverting a minimum of 80,000 tons and perhaps as much as 91,000 tons of MERC MSW to PERC keeping it at least at the same level of the hierarchy as it was at MERC, where it would have created 1.2 million dollars in additional revenue instead of the 450,000 for PERC
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	in landfills under the guise that it was used in recycling. To date, the management of waste in Maine, particularly at JRL, has been largely accomplished through the manipulation of definitions. Why? Because the former SPO and the Maine DEP has stood by idle while the lobbying firm for the operator of JRL completed all the necessary paperwork, lobbied at the Legislature to accept their proposals and agreed to make changes by rule when the Legislature where the legislative approval was not needed. Do we need to bury MSW? Certainly we do, at least some of it. No one could argue otherwise successfully; however, if we do, we should start looking at the waste hierarchy. Taking MSW from MERC and burying it at JRL should be our last and final option left on the table after all other options are exhausted. Now, what does the document entitled	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	What could the application have accomplished had the owner really looked at the impact of landfilling MERC's MSW at Juniper Ridge and put forward a solution that adequately accomplishes what was purported in the first place, that being the management of truck traffic, reducing the waste stream consistent with the hierarchy and the elimination of out-of-state waste previously combusted by MERC. The owner could have accomplished exactly what was purported from the start had the owner focused on options instead of focusing only on landfilling, that being that it would take care of the MSW from the decommissioned MERC facility in ways that meet the waste hierarchy policy. First, the owner could have proposed diverting a minimum of 80,000 tons and perhaps as much as 91,000 tons of MERC MSW to PERC keeping it at least at the same level of the hierarchy as it was at MERC, where it would have created 1.2 million dollars

	316		318
1	have also kept 80,000 to 91,000 tons of MSW out of	1	application to PERC in the amended application. The
2	Juniper Ridge and it would have also kept 50,000 tons	2	combination of the three documents, the initial
3	of out-of-state waste where the owner and operator	3	application, the amended application and the contract
4	claimed it would be beyond Maine's borders. It would	4	between Casella and PERC allow for measurement
5	have also helped save 125 million dollars in future	5	excuse me measuring the transportation involved.
6	landfill development as the Maine Department of	6	The ability to measure is the key of the key
7	Environmental Protection states that we could do if	7	performance indicators of transportation as they
8	we only recycled more.	8	relate to the application and the alternatives
9	We have seen too many secret agreements	9	available is made possible because of the data within
10	between the Maine DEP, Casella Waste Systems and the	10	the three documents. Including in the application
11	former SPO. We've heard too many times from the	11	including the application alternative there are
12	state and Casella representatives that few should not	12	only three alternatives. The first alternative I
13		12	won't read in detail, we all know what that is.
	expect any more, only to find out that we actually		-
14 15	got more, and we've heard too many times that Maine	14 15	It's the one that's been presented. Number two, an obvious alternative would be to deliver the PERC
	does not have a policy for management of waste; it		
16	has suggestions.	16	to PERC, ecomaine and MMWAC all of the amount of MERC
17	We can think of a few suggestions that would	17	diverted MSW, make it equivalent to their combustion
18	be helpful and fair to all concerned. One, let's get	18	of out-of-state waste. This alternative has some
19	it right this time; two, let's do it without fuzzy	19	inherent problems and it requires more negotiations
20	definitions; three, let's do it without fuzzy math;	20	in the assumption that all the entities are willing
21	and finally, number four, let's do it let's do the	21	to negotiate. It would, however, look like this if
22	right thing for the environment and the people, not	22	it happened, 91,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW would
23	the operator of JRL. Landfilling of municipal solid	23	go to JRL, 100 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go to
24	waste at Juniper Ridge Landfill is a move backwards,	24	MMWAC, 2,900 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go to
25	not a move forward, in our management of waste	25	ecomaine, 29,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go
	317		319
1	317 streams. The following quote from an EPA document	1	319 to IRL, 123,000 tons is what that totals and it
1	streams. The following quote from an EPA document	1	to JRL, 123,000 tons is what that totals and it
2	streams. The following quote from an EPA document sums up in simple, yet clear words, what landfills	2	to JRL, 123,000 tons is what that totals and it matches what the owner/operator has targeted for
2 3	streams. The following quote from an EPA document sums up in simple, yet clear words, what landfills are. Quote, the basis of a good solid waste	2 3	to JRL, 123,000 tons is what that totals and it matches what the owner/operator has targeted for tonnage.
2 3 4	streams. The following quote from an EPA document sums up in simple, yet clear words, what landfills are. Quote, the basis of a good solid waste management system is the municipal solid waste, MSW,	2 3 4	to JRL, 123,000 tons is what that totals and it matches what the owner/operator has targeted for tonnage. A third, what we call a compromise solution,
2 3 4 5	streams. The following quote from an EPA document sums up in simple, yet clear words, what landfills are. Quote, the basis of a good solid waste management system is the municipal solid waste, MSW, landfill. MSW landfills provide for the	2 3 4 5	to JRL, 123,000 tons is what that totals and it matches what the owner/operator has targeted for tonnage. A third, what we call a compromise solution, it is somewhere between number one and number two,
2 3 4 5 6	streams. The following quote from an EPA document sums up in simple, yet clear words, what landfills are. Quote, the basis of a good solid waste management system is the municipal solid waste, MSW, landfill. MSW landfills provide for the environmentally sound disposal of waste that cannot	2 3 4 5 6	to JRL, 123,000 tons is what that totals and it matches what the owner/operator has targeted for tonnage. A third, what we call a compromise solution, it is somewhere between number one and number two, affords that all 123,000 tons of MERC are taken care
2 3 4 5 6 7	streams. The following quote from an EPA document sums up in simple, yet clear words, what landfills are. Quote, the basis of a good solid waste management system is the municipal solid waste, MSW, landfill. MSW landfills provide for the environmentally sound disposal of waste that cannot be reduced, recycled, composted, combusted or	2 3 4 5 6 7	to JRL, 123,000 tons is what that totals and it matches what the owner/operator has targeted for tonnage. A third, what we call a compromise solution, it is somewhere between number one and number two, affords that all 123,000 tons of MERC are taken care of as the owner/operator expressed as the focus in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	streams. The following quote from an EPA document sums up in simple, yet clear words, what landfills are. Quote, the basis of a good solid waste management system is the municipal solid waste, MSW, landfill. MSW landfills provide for the environmentally sound disposal of waste that cannot be reduced, recycled, composted, combusted or processed in some other manner, end quote.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	to JRL, 123,000 tons is what that totals and it matches what the owner/operator has targeted for tonnage. A third, what we call a compromise solution, it is somewhere between number one and number two, affords that all 123,000 tons of MERC are taken care of as the owner/operator expressed as the focus in the application. This alternative would look like
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	streams. The following quote from an EPA document sums up in simple, yet clear words, what landfills are. Quote, the basis of a good solid waste management system is the municipal solid waste, MSW, landfill. MSW landfills provide for the environmentally sound disposal of waste that cannot be reduced, recycled, composted, combusted or processed in some other manner, end quote. What is the key that opens all of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	to JRL, 123,000 tons is what that totals and it matches what the owner/operator has targeted for tonnage. A third, what we call a compromise solution, it is somewhere between number one and number two, affords that all 123,000 tons of MERC are taken care of as the owner/operator expressed as the focus in the application. This alternative would look like this, 91,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	streams. The following quote from an EPA document sums up in simple, yet clear words, what landfills are. Quote, the basis of a good solid waste management system is the municipal solid waste, MSW, landfill. MSW landfills provide for the environmentally sound disposal of waste that cannot be reduced, recycled, composted, combusted or processed in some other manner, end quote. What is the key that opens all of the options that may be better than landfilling MSW from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	to JRL, 123,000 tons is what that totals and it matches what the owner/operator has targeted for tonnage. A third, what we call a compromise solution, it is somewhere between number one and number two, affords that all 123,000 tons of MERC are taken care of as the owner/operator expressed as the focus in the application. This alternative would look like this, 91,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go to PERC, 32,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	streams. The following quote from an EPA document sums up in simple, yet clear words, what landfills are. Quote, the basis of a good solid waste management system is the municipal solid waste, MSW, landfill. MSW landfills provide for the environmentally sound disposal of waste that cannot be reduced, recycled, composted, combusted or processed in some other manner, end quote. What is the key that opens all of the options that may be better than landfilling MSW from MERC at JRL? The answer would be transportation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	to JRL, 123,000 tons is what that totals and it matches what the owner/operator has targeted for tonnage. A third, what we call a compromise solution, it is somewhere between number one and number two, affords that all 123,000 tons of MERC are taken care of as the owner/operator expressed as the focus in the application. This alternative would look like this, 91,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go to PERC, 32,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go to JRL. That totals 123,000 tons which is what the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	streams. The following quote from an EPA document sums up in simple, yet clear words, what landfills are. Quote, the basis of a good solid waste management system is the municipal solid waste, MSW, landfill. MSW landfills provide for the environmentally sound disposal of waste that cannot be reduced, recycled, composted, combusted or processed in some other manner, end quote. What is the key that opens all of the options that may be better than landfilling MSW from MERC at JRL? The answer would be transportation. The owner in the initial application excuse me	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	to JRL, 123,000 tons is what that totals and it matches what the owner/operator has targeted for tonnage. A third, what we call a compromise solution, it is somewhere between number one and number two, affords that all 123,000 tons of MERC are taken care of as the owner/operator expressed as the focus in the application. This alternative would look like this, 91,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go to PERC, 32,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go to JRL. That totals 123,000 tons which is what the owner/operator state as the target tonnage. The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	streams. The following quote from an EPA document sums up in simple, yet clear words, what landfills are. Quote, the basis of a good solid waste management system is the municipal solid waste, MSW, landfill. MSW landfills provide for the environmentally sound disposal of waste that cannot be reduced, recycled, composted, combusted or processed in some other manner, end quote. What is the key that opens all of the options that may be better than landfilling MSW from MERC at JRL? The answer would be transportation. The owner in the initial application excuse me in the amended application the operator spent time	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	to JRL, 123,000 tons is what that totals and it matches what the owner/operator has targeted for tonnage. A third, what we call a compromise solution, it is somewhere between number one and number two, affords that all 123,000 tons of MERC are taken care of as the owner/operator expressed as the focus in the application. This alternative would look like this, 91,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go to PERC, 32,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go to JRL. That totals 123,000 tons which is what the owner/operator state as the target tonnage. The third, or compromise scenario, pays use dividends and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	streams. The following quote from an EPA document sums up in simple, yet clear words, what landfills are. Quote, the basis of a good solid waste management system is the municipal solid waste, MSW, landfill. MSW landfills provide for the environmentally sound disposal of waste that cannot be reduced, recycled, composted, combusted or processed in some other manner, end quote. What is the key that opens all of the options that may be better than landfilling MSW from MERC at JRL? The answer would be transportation. The owner in the initial application excuse me in the amended application the operator spent time pointing out two important factors. The volume of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	to JRL, 123,000 tons is what that totals and it matches what the owner/operator has targeted for tonnage. A third, what we call a compromise solution, it is somewhere between number one and number two, affords that all 123,000 tons of MERC are taken care of as the owner/operator expressed as the focus in the application. This alternative would look like this, 91,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go to PERC, 32,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go to JRL. That totals 123,000 tons which is what the owner/operator state as the target tonnage. The third, or compromise scenario, pays use dividends and it not only places the 123,000 tons of MERC diverted
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	streams. The following quote from an EPA document sums up in simple, yet clear words, what landfills are. Quote, the basis of a good solid waste management system is the municipal solid waste, MSW, landfill. MSW landfills provide for the environmentally sound disposal of waste that cannot be reduced, recycled, composted, combusted or processed in some other manner, end quote. What is the key that opens all of the options that may be better than landfilling MSW from MERC at JRL? The answer would be transportation. The owner in the initial application excuse me in the amended application the operator spent time pointing out two important factors. The volume of out-of-state waste handled by MERC and equal to about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	to JRL, 123,000 tons is what that totals and it matches what the owner/operator has targeted for tonnage. A third, what we call a compromise solution, it is somewhere between number one and number two, affords that all 123,000 tons of MERC are taken care of as the owner/operator expressed as the focus in the application. This alternative would look like this, 91,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go to PERC, 32,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go to JRL. That totals 123,000 tons which is what the owner/operator state as the target tonnage. The third, or compromise scenario, pays use dividends and it not only places the 123,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW in the most advantageous locations, it also has
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	streams. The following quote from an EPA document sums up in simple, yet clear words, what landfills are. Quote, the basis of a good solid waste management system is the municipal solid waste, MSW, landfill. MSW landfills provide for the environmentally sound disposal of waste that cannot be reduced, recycled, composted, combusted or processed in some other manner, end quote. What is the key that opens all of the options that may be better than landfilling MSW from MERC at JRL? The answer would be transportation. The owner in the initial application excuse me in the amended application the operator spent time pointing out two important factors. The volume of out-of-state waste handled by MERC and equal to about 170,000 tons would stay outside of Maine's borders;	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	to JRL, 123,000 tons is what that totals and it matches what the owner/operator has targeted for tonnage. A third, what we call a compromise solution, it is somewhere between number one and number two, affords that all 123,000 tons of MERC are taken care of as the owner/operator expressed as the focus in the application. This alternative would look like this, 91,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go to PERC, 32,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go to JRL. That totals 123,000 tons which is what the owner/operator state as the target tonnage. The third, or compromise scenario, pays use dividends and it not only places the 123,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW in the most advantageous locations, it also has huge impacts on reducing truck traffic and reduces
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	streams. The following quote from an EPA document sums up in simple, yet clear words, what landfills are. Quote, the basis of a good solid waste management system is the municipal solid waste, MSW, landfill. MSW landfills provide for the environmentally sound disposal of waste that cannot be reduced, recycled, composted, combusted or processed in some other manner, end quote. What is the key that opens all of the options that may be better than landfilling MSW from MERC at JRL? The answer would be transportation. The owner in the initial application excuse me in the amended application the operator spent time pointing out two important factors. The volume of out-of-state waste handled by MERC and equal to about 170,000 tons would stay outside of Maine's borders; two, there would be a zero net increase in truck	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	to JRL, 123,000 tons is what that totals and it matches what the owner/operator has targeted for tonnage. A third, what we call a compromise solution, it is somewhere between number one and number two, affords that all 123,000 tons of MERC are taken care of as the owner/operator expressed as the focus in the application. This alternative would look like this, 91,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go to PERC, 32,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go to JRL. That totals 123,000 tons which is what the owner/operator state as the target tonnage. The third, or compromise scenario, pays use dividends and it not only places the 123,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW in the most advantageous locations, it also has huge impacts on reducing truck traffic and reduces mileage. By the numbers
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	streams. The following quote from an EPA document sums up in simple, yet clear words, what landfills are. Quote, the basis of a good solid waste management system is the municipal solid waste, MSW, landfill. MSW landfills provide for the environmentally sound disposal of waste that cannot be reduced, recycled, composted, combusted or processed in some other manner, end quote. What is the key that opens all of the options that may be better than landfilling MSW from MERC at JRL? The answer would be transportation. The owner in the initial application excuse me in the amended application the operator spent time pointing out two important factors. The volume of out-of-state waste handled by MERC and equal to about 170,000 tons would stay outside of Maine's borders; two, there would be a zero net increase in truck traffic to JRL. Both factors appear at face value to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	to JRL, 123,000 tons is what that totals and it matches what the owner/operator has targeted for tonnage. A third, what we call a compromise solution, it is somewhere between number one and number two, affords that all 123,000 tons of MERC are taken care of as the owner/operator expressed as the focus in the application. This alternative would look like this, 91,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go to PERC, 32,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go to JRL. That totals 123,000 tons which is what the owner/operator state as the target tonnage. The third, or compromise scenario, pays use dividends and it not only places the 123,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW in the most advantageous locations, it also has huge impacts on reducing truck traffic and reduces mileage. By the numbers MR. RAYBACK: Objection. Those elements of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	streams. The following quote from an EPA document sums up in simple, yet clear words, what landfills are. Quote, the basis of a good solid waste management system is the municipal solid waste, MSW, landfill. MSW landfills provide for the environmentally sound disposal of waste that cannot be reduced, recycled, composted, combusted or processed in some other manner, end quote. What is the key that opens all of the options that may be better than landfilling MSW from MERC at JRL? The answer would be transportation. The owner in the initial application excuse me in the amended application the operator spent time pointing out two important factors. The volume of out-of-state waste handled by MERC and equal to about 170,000 tons would stay outside of Maine's borders; two, there would be a zero net increase in truck traffic to JRL. Both factors appear at face value to be desirable. Leaving 170,000 tons of MSW beyond	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	to JRL, 123,000 tons is what that totals and it matches what the owner/operator has targeted for tonnage. A third, what we call a compromise solution, it is somewhere between number one and number two, affords that all 123,000 tons of MERC are taken care of as the owner/operator expressed as the focus in the application. This alternative would look like this, 91,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go to PERC, 32,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go to JRL. That totals 123,000 tons which is what the owner/operator state as the target tonnage. The third, or compromise scenario, pays use dividends and it not only places the 123,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW in the most advantageous locations, it also has huge impacts on reducing truck traffic and reduces mileage. By the numbers MR. RAYBACK: Objection. Those elements of his testimony had been struck.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	streams. The following quote from an EPA document sums up in simple, yet clear words, what landfills are. Quote, the basis of a good solid waste management system is the municipal solid waste, MSW, landfill. MSW landfills provide for the environmentally sound disposal of waste that cannot be reduced, recycled, composted, combusted or processed in some other manner, end quote. What is the key that opens all of the options that may be better than landfilling MSW from MERC at JRL? The answer would be transportation. The owner in the initial application excuse me in the amended application the operator spent time pointing out two important factors. The volume of out-of-state waste handled by MERC and equal to about 170,000 tons would stay outside of Maine's borders; two, there would be a zero net increase in truck traffic to JRL. Both factors appear at face value to be desirable. Leaving 170,000 tons of MSW beyond Maine's borders is certainly good news. No increase	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	to JRL, 123,000 tons is what that totals and it matches what the owner/operator has targeted for tonnage. A third, what we call a compromise solution, it is somewhere between number one and number two, affords that all 123,000 tons of MERC are taken care of as the owner/operator expressed as the focus in the application. This alternative would look like this, 91,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go to PERC, 32,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go to JRL. That totals 123,000 tons which is what the owner/operator state as the target tonnage. The third, or compromise scenario, pays use dividends and it not only places the 123,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW in the most advantageous locations, it also has huge impacts on reducing truck traffic and reduces mileage. By the numbers MR. RAYBACK: Objection. Those elements of his testimony had been struck. MR. SANBORN: I didn't read anything that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	streams. The following quote from an EPA document sums up in simple, yet clear words, what landfills are. Quote, the basis of a good solid waste management system is the municipal solid waste, MSW, landfill. MSW landfills provide for the environmentally sound disposal of waste that cannot be reduced, recycled, composted, combusted or processed in some other manner, end quote. What is the key that opens all of the options that may be better than landfilling MSW from MERC at JRL? The answer would be transportation. The owner in the initial application excuse me in the amended application the operator spent time pointing out two important factors. The volume of out-of-state waste handled by MERC and equal to about 170,000 tons would stay outside of Maine's borders; two, there would be a zero net increase in truck traffic to JRL. Both factors appear at face value to be desirable. Leaving 170,000 tons of MSW beyond Maine's borders is certainly good news. No increase in truck traffic is also good news, and then the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	to JRL, 123,000 tons is what that totals and it matches what the owner/operator has targeted for tonnage. A third, what we call a compromise solution, it is somewhere between number one and number two, affords that all 123,000 tons of MERC are taken care of as the owner/operator expressed as the focus in the application. This alternative would look like this, 91,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go to PERC, 32,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go to JRL. That totals 123,000 tons which is what the owner/operator state as the target tonnage. The third, or compromise scenario, pays use dividends and it not only places the 123,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW in the most advantageous locations, it also has huge impacts on reducing truck traffic and reduces mileage. By the numbers MR. RAYBACK: Objection. Those elements of his testimony had been struck. MR. SANBORN: I didn't read anything that was struck.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	streams. The following quote from an EPA document sums up in simple, yet clear words, what landfills are. Quote, the basis of a good solid waste management system is the municipal solid waste, MSW, landfill. MSW landfills provide for the environmentally sound disposal of waste that cannot be reduced, recycled, composted, combusted or processed in some other manner, end quote. What is the key that opens all of the options that may be better than landfilling MSW from MERC at JRL? The answer would be transportation. The owner in the initial application excuse me in the amended application the operator spent time pointing out two important factors. The volume of out-of-state waste handled by MERC and equal to about 170,000 tons would stay outside of Maine's borders; two, there would be a zero net increase in truck traffic to JRL. Both factors appear at face value to be desirable. Leaving 170,000 tons of MSW beyond Maine's borders is certainly good news. No increase in truck traffic is also good news, and then the owner/operator submitted an amendment with a document	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	to JRL, 123,000 tons is what that totals and it matches what the owner/operator has targeted for tonnage. A third, what we call a compromise solution, it is somewhere between number one and number two, affords that all 123,000 tons of MERC are taken care of as the owner/operator expressed as the focus in the application. This alternative would look like this, 91,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go to PERC, 32,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go to JRL. That totals 123,000 tons which is what the owner/operator state as the target tonnage. The third, or compromise scenario, pays use dividends and it not only places the 123,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW in the most advantageous locations, it also has huge impacts on reducing truck traffic and reduces mileage. By the numbers MR. RAYBACK: Objection. Those elements of his testimony had been struck. MR. SANBORN: I didn't read anything that was struck. HEARING OFFICER: Those elements have not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	streams. The following quote from an EPA document sums up in simple, yet clear words, what landfills are. Quote, the basis of a good solid waste management system is the municipal solid waste, MSW, landfill. MSW landfills provide for the environmentally sound disposal of waste that cannot be reduced, recycled, composted, combusted or processed in some other manner, end quote. What is the key that opens all of the options that may be better than landfilling MSW from MERC at JRL? The answer would be transportation. The owner in the initial application excuse me in the amended application the operator spent time pointing out two important factors. The volume of out-of-state waste handled by MERC and equal to about 170,000 tons would stay outside of Maine's borders; two, there would be a zero net increase in truck traffic to JRL. Both factors appear at face value to be desirable. Leaving 170,000 tons of MSW beyond Maine's borders is certainly good news. No increase in truck traffic is also good news, and then the owner/operator submitted an amendment with a document that they bring forth that Casella and PERC have also	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to JRL, 123,000 tons is what that totals and it matches what the owner/operator has targeted for tonnage. A third, what we call a compromise solution, it is somewhere between number one and number two, affords that all 123,000 tons of MERC are taken care of as the owner/operator expressed as the focus in the application. This alternative would look like this, 91,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go to PERC, 32,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go to JRL. That totals 123,000 tons which is what the owner/operator state as the target tonnage. The third, or compromise scenario, pays use dividends and it not only places the 123,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW in the most advantageous locations, it also has huge impacts on reducing truck traffic and reduces mileage. By the numbers MR. RAYBACK: Objection. Those elements of his testimony had been struck. MR. SANBORN: I didn't read anything that was struck. HEARING OFFICER: Those elements have not been stricken.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	streams. The following quote from an EPA document sums up in simple, yet clear words, what landfills are. Quote, the basis of a good solid waste management system is the municipal solid waste, MSW, landfill. MSW landfills provide for the environmentally sound disposal of waste that cannot be reduced, recycled, composted, combusted or processed in some other manner, end quote. What is the key that opens all of the options that may be better than landfilling MSW from MERC at JRL? The answer would be transportation. The owner in the initial application excuse me in the amended application the operator spent time pointing out two important factors. The volume of out-of-state waste handled by MERC and equal to about 170,000 tons would stay outside of Maine's borders; two, there would be a zero net increase in truck traffic to JRL. Both factors appear at face value to be desirable. Leaving 170,000 tons of MSW beyond Maine's borders is certainly good news. No increase in truck traffic is also good news, and then the owner/operator submitted an amendment with a document	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	to JRL, 123,000 tons is what that totals and it matches what the owner/operator has targeted for tonnage. A third, what we call a compromise solution, it is somewhere between number one and number two, affords that all 123,000 tons of MERC are taken care of as the owner/operator expressed as the focus in the application. This alternative would look like this, 91,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go to PERC, 32,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW would go to JRL. That totals 123,000 tons which is what the owner/operator state as the target tonnage. The third, or compromise scenario, pays use dividends and it not only places the 123,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW in the most advantageous locations, it also has huge impacts on reducing truck traffic and reduces mileage. By the numbers MR. RAYBACK: Objection. Those elements of his testimony had been struck. MR. SANBORN: I didn't read anything that was struck. HEARING OFFICER: Those elements have not

	220	1	200
	320	4	322
1	looking at from Mr. Parker, those have been struck	1	of Environmental Protection, Casella and now the
2	through.	2	Bureau of General Services are not good stewards and
3	HEARING OFFICER: As you may recall, after	3	certainly not good managers of the waste stream.
4	my third Procedural Order there was an appeal. The	4	A reduction in truck traffic is not only
5	Commissioner upheld my order in part and upheld the	5	important to the citizens of Maine and Maine's
6	appeal in part and the portions of the testimony	6	environment, we see and hear every truck entering
7	related to truck miles were not stricken after the	7	JRL, many with loud exhaust systems, many using
8	Commissioner's response to that appeal.	8	engine retarder systems, some even on upshifting,
9	MR. RAYBACK: So if I can clarify, mileage	9	seven days a week starting as early as 3 a.m. to 4
10	is acceptable but costs, diesel costs, diesel fuel	10	a.m. and continuing through to as late as 11:00,
11	consumption has been struck still?	11	12:00 at night. We've lived with the noise, we've
12	MR. PARKER: That's correct.	12	lived with the nuisance, we've lived with the
13	HEARING OFFICER: Yes.	13	landfill machinery noise, we've lived with the smell
14	MR. RAYBACK: Thank you.	14	and we've lived with the disregard for neighbors and
15	MR. SANBORN: By the numbers, the compromise	15 16	community for years. It's time to get it right.
16	scenario accomplishes the following; one, it places	_	We ask that you measure it accurately so
17	123,000 tons from MERC into the most advantageous	17	that you can manage it properly. There are only two
18 19	locations; it eliminates 50,000 tons of out-of-state	18 19	alternatives in regards to this application, one, withdraw it, fix it and resubmit it; or, two,
20	waste as the application warranted would happen;	20	negotiate an alternative that meets policies and
20	three, it reduces the annual truck load count to JRL by 1,818 trucks per year and it reduces the annual	20	hierarchy and treats all parties fairly and
22	mileage driven by truck drivers by 701,000 miles. It	22	equitably.
23	also increases the new increases a new revenue	23	HEARING OFFICER: I am only able to accept
24	stream to PERC from the reported 450,000 annually to	24	the summaries of pre-filed testimony. Is there any
25	1.2 million. There is, however, one loser in this	25	other summary of pre-filed testimony of the Citizen
			······································
	321		323
1	321 compromise scenario and that would be that Casella	1	323 intervenors? Seeing none, I believe now would be an
1		1 2	
	compromise scenario and that would be that Casella		intervenors? Seeing none, I believe now would be an
2	compromise scenario and that would be that Casella wouldn't be afforded the opportunity to bring in	2	intervenors? Seeing none, I believe now would be an appropriate time to take a break prior to the cross
2 3	compromise scenario and that would be that Casella wouldn't be afforded the opportunity to bring in those 50,000 tons of out-of-state waste to PERC.	2 3	intervenors? Seeing none, I believe now would be an appropriate time to take a break prior to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors. We will
2 3 4	compromise scenario and that would be that Casella wouldn't be afforded the opportunity to bring in those 50,000 tons of out-of-state waste to PERC. It's important to note that Casella and the owner	2 3 4	intervenors? Seeing none, I believe now would be an appropriate time to take a break prior to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors. We will reconvene at 10:45.
2 3 4 5	compromise scenario and that would be that Casella wouldn't be afforded the opportunity to bring in those 50,000 tons of out-of-state waste to PERC. It's important to note that Casella and the owner never claimed in their applications to bring in	2 3 4 5	intervenors? Seeing none, I believe now would be an appropriate time to take a break prior to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors. We will reconvene at 10:45. (OFF RECORD)
2 3 4 5 6	compromise scenario and that would be that Casella wouldn't be afforded the opportunity to bring in those 50,000 tons of out-of-state waste to PERC. It's important to note that Casella and the owner never claimed in their applications to bring in out-of-state waste. What they did do was promise to leave 170,000 tons beyond Maine's borders. The compromise meets and exceeds everything the owner has	2 3 4 5 6	intervenors? Seeing none, I believe now would be an appropriate time to take a break prior to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors. We will reconvene at 10:45. (OFF RECORD) HEARING OFFICER: Good morning again. We
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	compromise scenario and that would be that Casella wouldn't be afforded the opportunity to bring in those 50,000 tons of out-of-state waste to PERC. It's important to note that Casella and the owner never claimed in their applications to bring in out-of-state waste. What they did do was promise to leave 170,000 tons beyond Maine's borders. The compromise meets and exceeds everything the owner has stated as objectives in their applications.	2 3 4 5 6 7	intervenors? Seeing none, I believe now would be an appropriate time to take a break prior to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors. We will reconvene at 10:45. (OFF RECORD) HEARING OFFICER: Good morning again. We have resumed the hearing after a brief break. Before we proceed to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors, we do have a procedural item that we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	compromise scenario and that would be that Casella wouldn't be afforded the opportunity to bring in those 50,000 tons of out-of-state waste to PERC. It's important to note that Casella and the owner never claimed in their applications to bring in out-of-state waste. What they did do was promise to leave 170,000 tons beyond Maine's borders. The compromise meets and exceeds everything the owner has stated as objectives in their applications. We offer to give the owner/operator exactly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	intervenors? Seeing none, I believe now would be an appropriate time to take a break prior to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors. We will reconvene at 10:45. (OFF RECORD) HEARING OFFICER: Good morning again. We have resumed the hearing after a brief break. Before we proceed to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors, we do have a procedural item that we want to present before we move on to the cross
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	compromise scenario and that would be that Casella wouldn't be afforded the opportunity to bring in those 50,000 tons of out-of-state waste to PERC. It's important to note that Casella and the owner never claimed in their applications to bring in out-of-state waste. What they did do was promise to leave 170,000 tons beyond Maine's borders. The compromise meets and exceeds everything the owner has stated as objectives in their applications. We offer to give the owner/operator exactly what they asked for, addressing 123,000 tons of MERC	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	intervenors? Seeing none, I believe now would be an appropriate time to take a break prior to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors. We will reconvene at 10:45. (OFF RECORD) HEARING OFFICER: Good morning again. We have resumed the hearing after a brief break. Before we proceed to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors, we do have a procedural item that we want to present before we move on to the cross examination. Nancy Macirowski will be introducing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	compromise scenario and that would be that Casella wouldn't be afforded the opportunity to bring in those 50,000 tons of out-of-state waste to PERC. It's important to note that Casella and the owner never claimed in their applications to bring in out-of-state waste. What they did do was promise to leave 170,000 tons beyond Maine's borders. The compromise meets and exceeds everything the owner has stated as objectives in their applications. We offer to give the owner/operator exactly what they asked for, addressing 123,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW and because the owner and the operator	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	intervenors? Seeing none, I believe now would be an appropriate time to take a break prior to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors. We will reconvene at 10:45. (OFF RECORD) HEARING OFFICER: Good morning again. We have resumed the hearing after a brief break. Before we proceed to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors, we do have a procedural item that we want to present before we move on to the cross examination. Nancy Macirowski will be introducing that procedural information.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	compromise scenario and that would be that Casella wouldn't be afforded the opportunity to bring in those 50,000 tons of out-of-state waste to PERC. It's important to note that Casella and the owner never claimed in their applications to bring in out-of-state waste. What they did do was promise to leave 170,000 tons beyond Maine's borders. The compromise meets and exceeds everything the owner has stated as objectives in their applications. We offer to give the owner/operator exactly what they asked for, addressing 123,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW and because the owner and the operator fail to address reduction of or any other aspects	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	intervenors? Seeing none, I believe now would be an appropriate time to take a break prior to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors. We will reconvene at 10:45. (OFF RECORD) HEARING OFFICER: Good morning again. We have resumed the hearing after a brief break. Before we proceed to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors, we do have a procedural item that we want to present before we move on to the cross examination. Nancy Macirowski will be introducing that procedural information. MS. MACIROWSKI: As part of the session last
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	compromise scenario and that would be that Casella wouldn't be afforded the opportunity to bring in those 50,000 tons of out-of-state waste to PERC. It's important to note that Casella and the owner never claimed in their applications to bring in out-of-state waste. What they did do was promise to leave 170,000 tons beyond Maine's borders. The compromise meets and exceeds everything the owner has stated as objectives in their applications. We offer to give the owner/operator exactly what they asked for, addressing 123,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW and because the owner and the operator fail to address reduction of or any other aspects of the hierarchy, we also offer reductions in truck	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	intervenors? Seeing none, I believe now would be an appropriate time to take a break prior to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors. We will reconvene at 10:45. (OFF RECORD) HEARING OFFICER: Good morning again. We have resumed the hearing after a brief break. Before we proceed to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors, we do have a procedural item that we want to present before we move on to the cross examination. Nancy Macirowski will be introducing that procedural information. MS. MACIROWSKI: As part of the session last evening which was designated for testimony from the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	compromise scenario and that would be that Casella wouldn't be afforded the opportunity to bring in those 50,000 tons of out-of-state waste to PERC. It's important to note that Casella and the owner never claimed in their applications to bring in out-of-state waste. What they did do was promise to leave 170,000 tons beyond Maine's borders. The compromise meets and exceeds everything the owner has stated as objectives in their applications. We offer to give the owner/operator exactly what they asked for, addressing 123,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW and because the owner and the operator fail to address reduction of or any other aspects of the hierarchy, we also offer reductions in truck traffic. An added benefit is that it helps reach	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	intervenors? Seeing none, I believe now would be an appropriate time to take a break prior to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors. We will reconvene at 10:45. (OFF RECORD) HEARING OFFICER: Good morning again. We have resumed the hearing after a brief break. Before we proceed to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors, we do have a procedural item that we want to present before we move on to the cross examination. Nancy Macirowski will be introducing that procedural information. MS. MACIROWSKI: As part of the session last evening which was designated for testimony from the public there were several individuals who testified
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	compromise scenario and that would be that Casella wouldn't be afforded the opportunity to bring in those 50,000 tons of out-of-state waste to PERC. It's important to note that Casella and the owner never claimed in their applications to bring in out-of-state waste. What they did do was promise to leave 170,000 tons beyond Maine's borders. The compromise meets and exceeds everything the owner has stated as objectives in their applications. We offer to give the owner/operator exactly what they asked for, addressing 123,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW and because the owner and the operator fail to address reduction of or any other aspects of the hierarchy, we also offer reductions in truck traffic. An added benefit is that it helps reach that 125 million dollar savings in future landfill	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	intervenors? Seeing none, I believe now would be an appropriate time to take a break prior to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors. We will reconvene at 10:45. (OFF RECORD) HEARING OFFICER: Good morning again. We have resumed the hearing after a brief break. Before we proceed to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors, we do have a procedural item that we want to present before we move on to the cross examination. Nancy Macirowski will be introducing that procedural information. MS. MACIROWSKI: As part of the session last evening which was designated for testimony from the public there were several individuals who testified who have an affiliation with intervenors or other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	compromise scenario and that would be that Casella wouldn't be afforded the opportunity to bring in those 50,000 tons of out-of-state waste to PERC. It's important to note that Casella and the owner never claimed in their applications to bring in out-of-state waste. What they did do was promise to leave 170,000 tons beyond Maine's borders. The compromise meets and exceeds everything the owner has stated as objectives in their applications. We offer to give the owner/operator exactly what they asked for, addressing 123,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW and because the owner and the operator fail to address reduction of or any other aspects of the hierarchy, we also offer reductions in truck traffic. An added benefit is that it helps reach that 125 million dollar savings in future landfill development that the Maine Department of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	intervenors? Seeing none, I believe now would be an appropriate time to take a break prior to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors. We will reconvene at 10:45. (OFF RECORD) HEARING OFFICER: Good morning again. We have resumed the hearing after a brief break. Before we proceed to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors, we do have a procedural item that we want to present before we move on to the cross examination. Nancy Macirowski will be introducing that procedural information. MS. MACIROWSKI: As part of the session last evening which was designated for testimony from the public there were several individuals who testified who have an affiliation with intervenors or other parties and that is not a problem in and of itself
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	compromise scenario and that would be that Casella wouldn't be afforded the opportunity to bring in those 50,000 tons of out-of-state waste to PERC. It's important to note that Casella and the owner never claimed in their applications to bring in out-of-state waste. What they did do was promise to leave 170,000 tons beyond Maine's borders. The compromise meets and exceeds everything the owner has stated as objectives in their applications. We offer to give the owner/operator exactly what they asked for, addressing 123,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW and because the owner and the operator fail to address reduction of or any other aspects of the hierarchy, we also offer reductions in truck traffic. An added benefit is that it helps reach that 125 million dollar savings in future landfill development that the Maine Department of Environmental Protection has pointed out in their	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	intervenors? Seeing none, I believe now would be an appropriate time to take a break prior to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors. We will reconvene at 10:45. (OFF RECORD) HEARING OFFICER: Good morning again. We have resumed the hearing after a brief break. Before we proceed to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors, we do have a procedural item that we want to present before we move on to the cross examination. Nancy Macirowski will be introducing that procedural information. MS. MACIROWSKI: As part of the session last evening which was designated for testimony from the public there were several individuals who testified who have an affiliation with intervenors or other parties and that is not a problem in and of itself and, in fact, during the prehearing conference during
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	compromise scenario and that would be that Casella wouldn't be afforded the opportunity to bring in those 50,000 tons of out-of-state waste to PERC. It's important to note that Casella and the owner never claimed in their applications to bring in out-of-state waste. What they did do was promise to leave 170,000 tons beyond Maine's borders. The compromise meets and exceeds everything the owner has stated as objectives in their applications. We offer to give the owner/operator exactly what they asked for, addressing 123,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW and because the owner and the operator fail to address reduction of or any other aspects of the hierarchy, we also offer reductions in truck traffic. An added benefit is that it helps reach that 125 million dollar savings in future landfill development that the Maine Department of Environmental Protection has pointed out in their 2010 annual report.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	intervenors? Seeing none, I believe now would be an appropriate time to take a break prior to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors. We will reconvene at 10:45. (OFF RECORD) HEARING OFFICER: Good morning again. We have resumed the hearing after a brief break. Before we proceed to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors, we do have a procedural item that we want to present before we move on to the cross examination. Nancy Macirowski will be introducing that procedural information. MS. MACIROWSKI: As part of the session last evening which was designated for testimony from the public there were several individuals who testified who have an affiliation with intervenors or other parties and that is not a problem in and of itself and, in fact, during the prehearing conference during a discussion about grouping the Citizen intervenors,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	compromise scenario and that would be that Casella wouldn't be afforded the opportunity to bring in those 50,000 tons of out-of-state waste to PERC. It's important to note that Casella and the owner never claimed in their applications to bring in out-of-state waste. What they did do was promise to leave 170,000 tons beyond Maine's borders. The compromise meets and exceeds everything the owner has stated as objectives in their applications. We offer to give the owner/operator exactly what they asked for, addressing 123,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW and because the owner and the operator fail to address reduction of or any other aspects of the hierarchy, we also offer reductions in truck traffic. An added benefit is that it helps reach that 125 million dollar savings in future landfill development that the Maine Department of Environmental Protection has pointed out in their 2010 annual report. It is time, it is actually past the time,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	intervenors? Seeing none, I believe now would be an appropriate time to take a break prior to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors. We will reconvene at 10:45. (OFF RECORD) HEARING OFFICER: Good morning again. We have resumed the hearing after a brief break. Before we proceed to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors, we do have a procedural item that we want to present before we move on to the cross examination. Nancy Macirowski will be introducing that procedural information. MS. MACIROWSKI: As part of the session last evening which was designated for testimony from the public there were several individuals who testified who have an affiliation with intervenors or other parties and that is not a problem in and of itself and, in fact, during the prehearing conference during a discussion about grouping the Citizen intervenors, the hearing officer expressly told the intervenors
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	compromise scenario and that would be that Casella wouldn't be afforded the opportunity to bring in those 50,000 tons of out-of-state waste to PERC. It's important to note that Casella and the owner never claimed in their applications to bring in out-of-state waste. What they did do was promise to leave 170,000 tons beyond Maine's borders. The compromise meets and exceeds everything the owner has stated as objectives in their applications. We offer to give the owner/operator exactly what they asked for, addressing 123,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW and because the owner and the operator fail to address reduction of or any other aspects of the hierarchy, we also offer reductions in truck traffic. An added benefit is that it helps reach that 125 million dollar savings in future landfill development that the Maine Department of Environmental Protection has pointed out in their 2010 annual report. It is time, it is actually past the time, when we should be addressing Maine's waste problems	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	intervenors? Seeing none, I believe now would be an appropriate time to take a break prior to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors. We will reconvene at 10:45. (OFF RECORD) HEARING OFFICER: Good morning again. We have resumed the hearing after a brief break. Before we proceed to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors, we do have a procedural item that we want to present before we move on to the cross examination. Nancy Macirowski will be introducing that procedural information. MS. MACIROWSKI: As part of the session last evening which was designated for testimony from the public there were several individuals who testified who have an affiliation with intervenors or other parties and that is not a problem in and of itself and, in fact, during the prehearing conference during a discussion about grouping the Citizen intervenors, the hearing officer expressly told the intervenors that they could also testify in their individual
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	compromise scenario and that would be that Casella wouldn't be afforded the opportunity to bring in those 50,000 tons of out-of-state waste to PERC. It's important to note that Casella and the owner never claimed in their applications to bring in out-of-state waste. What they did do was promise to leave 170,000 tons beyond Maine's borders. The compromise meets and exceeds everything the owner has stated as objectives in their applications. We offer to give the owner/operator exactly what they asked for, addressing 123,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW and because the owner and the operator fail to address reduction of or any other aspects of the hierarchy, we also offer reductions in truck traffic. An added benefit is that it helps reach that 125 million dollar savings in future landfill development that the Maine Department of Environmental Protection has pointed out in their 2010 annual report. It is time, it is actually past the time, when we should be addressing Maine's waste problems with the thoughts and plans to address it correctly.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	intervenors? Seeing none, I believe now would be an appropriate time to take a break prior to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors. We will reconvene at 10:45. (OFF RECORD) HEARING OFFICER: Good morning again. We have resumed the hearing after a brief break. Before we proceed to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors, we do have a procedural item that we want to present before we move on to the cross examination. Nancy Macirowski will be introducing that procedural information. MS. MACIROWSKI: As part of the session last evening which was designated for testimony from the public there were several individuals who testified who have an affiliation with intervenors or other parties and that is not a problem in and of itself and, in fact, during the prehearing conference during a discussion about grouping the Citizen intervenors, the hearing officer expressly told the intervenors that they could also testify in their individual capacities during the public comment session;
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	compromise scenario and that would be that Casella wouldn't be afforded the opportunity to bring in those 50,000 tons of out-of-state waste to PERC. It's important to note that Casella and the owner never claimed in their applications to bring in out-of-state waste. What they did do was promise to leave 170,000 tons beyond Maine's borders. The compromise meets and exceeds everything the owner has stated as objectives in their applications. We offer to give the owner/operator exactly what they asked for, addressing 123,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW and because the owner and the operator fail to address reduction of or any other aspects of the hierarchy, we also offer reductions in truck traffic. An added benefit is that it helps reach that 125 million dollar savings in future landfill development that the Maine Department of Environmental Protection has pointed out in their 2010 annual report. It is time, it is actually past the time, when we should be addressing Maine's waste problems with the thoughts and plans to address it correctly. Simply moving everything down to the very last level	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	intervenors? Seeing none, I believe now would be an appropriate time to take a break prior to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors. We will reconvene at 10:45. (OFF RECORD) HEARING OFFICER: Good morning again. We have resumed the hearing after a brief break. Before we proceed to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors, we do have a procedural item that we want to present before we move on to the cross examination. Nancy Macirowski will be introducing that procedural information. MS. MACIROWSKI: As part of the session last evening which was designated for testimony from the public there were several individuals who testified who have an affiliation with intervenors or other parties and that is not a problem in and of itself and, in fact, during the prehearing conference during a discussion about grouping the Citizen intervenors, the hearing officer expressly told the intervenors that they could also testify in their individual capacities during the public comment session; however, after that prehearing conference and before
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	compromise scenario and that would be that Casella wouldn't be afforded the opportunity to bring in those 50,000 tons of out-of-state waste to PERC. It's important to note that Casella and the owner never claimed in their applications to bring in out-of-state waste. What they did do was promise to leave 170,000 tons beyond Maine's borders. The compromise meets and exceeds everything the owner has stated as objectives in their applications. We offer to give the owner/operator exactly what they asked for, addressing 123,000 tons of MERC diverted MSW and because the owner and the operator fail to address reduction of or any other aspects of the hierarchy, we also offer reductions in truck traffic. An added benefit is that it helps reach that 125 million dollar savings in future landfill development that the Maine Department of Environmental Protection has pointed out in their 2010 annual report. It is time, it is actually past the time, when we should be addressing Maine's waste problems with the thoughts and plans to address it correctly.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	intervenors? Seeing none, I believe now would be an appropriate time to take a break prior to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors. We will reconvene at 10:45. (OFF RECORD) HEARING OFFICER: Good morning again. We have resumed the hearing after a brief break. Before we proceed to the cross examination of the Citizen intervenors, we do have a procedural item that we want to present before we move on to the cross examination. Nancy Macirowski will be introducing that procedural information. MS. MACIROWSKI: As part of the session last evening which was designated for testimony from the public there were several individuals who testified who have an affiliation with intervenors or other parties and that is not a problem in and of itself and, in fact, during the prehearing conference during a discussion about grouping the Citizen intervenors, the hearing officer expressly told the intervenors that they could also testify in their individual capacities during the public comment session;

	324		206
1	324 discussed testimony from the public, and it states	1	326 MR. SANBORN: Correct.
2	"in circumstances where a member of the public is	2	MR. RAYBACK: Would you say that most trucks
3	affiliated with a party to the proceeding, the member	3	use that route going to the landfill?
4	of the public shall speak on his or her own behalf	4	MR. SANBORN: I would say that most trucks
5	and shall not provide evidence that should have been	5	come from that southerly direction, yes.
6	provided by the party as part of the case in chief"	6	MR. RAYBACK: Okay. Once they come off at
7	and, again, I think this is a nuance that was not	7	the exit, they turn left to head north onto Bennoch
8	fully explained previously. So one of the	8	Road, correct?
9	intervenors, there's one portion of an individual's	9	MR. SANBORN: Correct.
10	testimony which spoke to an applicant's witness'	10	MR. RAYBACK: And then they travel, would
11	testimony, and I think that arguably that falls	11	you agree, about a tenth of a mile on Bennoch Road to
12	within something that was evidence that should have	12	the JRL access road?
13	been provided by the party as part of their case in	13	MR. SANBORN: That would be close enough for
14	chief. So to cure any potential issue with this	14	what we're talking about today.
15	before the close of the record today, if they choose	15	MR. RAYBACK: Approximately?
16	to do so, the applicant has the opportunity to offer	16	MR. SANBORN: Yup.
17	redirect testimony by this particular witness. So I	17	MR. RAYBACK: Do they go past your house
18	just wanted to clarify that.	18	between the
19	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you, and now we move	19	MR. SANBORN: No, they do not.
20	on to the cross examination of the Citizen	20	MR. RAYBACK: exit and the access road?
21	intervenors beginning with the applicant who has been	21	MR. SANBORN: No, they do not.
22	allotted 30 minutes. Consistent with our discussions	22	MR. RAYBACK: They do not, and after the
23	yesterday, as you end the as you near the end of	23	trucks make the turn on the access road and then they
24	your 30 minutes, if you do need more time, please	24	head toward the landfill, are they getting closer to
25	indicate that to me as well as the substance of the	25	your house or are they getting farther away?
	205		207
1	325	1	327
1	types of questions you will be asking if you are	1	MR. SANBORN: They are getting farther away.
2	types of questions you will be asking if you are afforded more time.	2	MR. SANBORN: They are getting farther away. MR. RAYBACK: On page 4 of your testimony,
2 3	types of questions you will be asking if you are afforded more time. MR. RAYBACK: Thank you. Is this on? Can	2 3	MR. SANBORN: They are getting farther away. MR. RAYBACK: On page 4 of your testimony, and you mentioned it again this morning, you suggest
2 3 4	types of questions you will be asking if you are afforded more time. MR. RAYBACK: Thank you. Is this on? Can you hear me okay?	2 3 4	MR. SANBORN: They are getting farther away. MR. RAYBACK: On page 4 of your testimony, and you mentioned it again this morning, you suggest that sending 80,000 tons to PERC as a compromise
2 3 4 5	types of questions you will be asking if you are afforded more time. MR. RAYBACK: Thank you. Is this on? Can you hear me okay? MR. DOYLE: No.	2 3	MR. SANBORN: They are getting farther away. MR. RAYBACK: On page 4 of your testimony, and you mentioned it again this morning, you suggest that sending 80,000 tons to PERC as a compromise scenario would create 1.37 million dollars in revenue
2 3 4	types of questions you will be asking if you are afforded more time. MR. RAYBACK: Thank you. Is this on? Can you hear me okay? MR. DOYLE: No. MR. RAYBACK: How about now?	2 3 4 5	MR. SANBORN: They are getting farther away. MR. RAYBACK: On page 4 of your testimony, and you mentioned it again this morning, you suggest that sending 80,000 tons to PERC as a compromise scenario would create 1.37 million dollars in revenue for PERC rather than just the \$450,000 that Mr.
2 3 4 5 6	types of questions you will be asking if you are afforded more time. MR. RAYBACK: Thank you. Is this on? Can you hear me okay? MR. DOYLE: No.	2 3 4 5 6	MR. SANBORN: They are getting farther away. MR. RAYBACK: On page 4 of your testimony, and you mentioned it again this morning, you suggest that sending 80,000 tons to PERC as a compromise scenario would create 1.37 million dollars in revenue
2 3 4 5 6 7	types of questions you will be asking if you are afforded more time. MR. RAYBACK: Thank you. Is this on? Can you hear me okay? MR. DOYLE: No. MR. RAYBACK: How about now? MR. PARKER: You have to get closer to it.	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. SANBORN: They are getting farther away. MR. RAYBACK: On page 4 of your testimony, and you mentioned it again this morning, you suggest that sending 80,000 tons to PERC as a compromise scenario would create 1.37 million dollars in revenue for PERC rather than just the \$450,000 that Mr. Nordby talked about earlier today. Are you assuming
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	types of questions you will be asking if you are afforded more time. MR. RAYBACK: Thank you. Is this on? Can you hear me okay? MR. DOYLE: No. MR. RAYBACK: How about now? MR. PARKER: You have to get closer to it. MR. RAYBACK: Okay, how about that? Good	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. SANBORN: They are getting farther away. MR. RAYBACK: On page 4 of your testimony, and you mentioned it again this morning, you suggest that sending 80,000 tons to PERC as a compromise scenario would create 1.37 million dollars in revenue for PERC rather than just the \$450,000 that Mr. Nordby talked about earlier today. Are you assuming when you make that calculation that PERC would get
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	types of questions you will be asking if you are afforded more time. MR. RAYBACK: Thank you. Is this on? Can you hear me okay? MR. DOYLE: No. MR. RAYBACK: How about now? MR. PARKER: You have to get closer to it. MR. RAYBACK: Okay, how about that? Good morning. My name is Brian Rayback. Thank you, Madam	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. SANBORN: They are getting farther away. MR. RAYBACK: On page 4 of your testimony, and you mentioned it again this morning, you suggest that sending 80,000 tons to PERC as a compromise scenario would create 1.37 million dollars in revenue for PERC rather than just the \$450,000 that Mr. Nordby talked about earlier today. Are you assuming when you make that calculation that PERC would get the same rate, the same price per ton?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	types of questions you will be asking if you are afforded more time. MR. RAYBACK: Thank you. Is this on? Can you hear me okay? MR. DOYLE: No. MR. RAYBACK: How about now? MR. PARKER: You have to get closer to it. MR. RAYBACK: Okay, how about that? Good morning. My name is Brian Rayback. Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer and members of the panel. I am here	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. SANBORN: They are getting farther away. MR. RAYBACK: On page 4 of your testimony, and you mentioned it again this morning, you suggest that sending 80,000 tons to PERC as a compromise scenario would create 1.37 million dollars in revenue for PERC rather than just the \$450,000 that Mr. Nordby talked about earlier today. Are you assuming when you make that calculation that PERC would get the same rate, the same price per ton? MR. SANBORN: Yes. The number was reached
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	types of questions you will be asking if you are afforded more time. MR. RAYBACK: Thank you. Is this on? Can you hear me okay? MR. DOYLE: No. MR. RAYBACK: How about now? MR. PARKER: You have to get closer to it. MR. RAYBACK: Okay, how about that? Good morning. My name is Brian Rayback. Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer and members of the panel. I am here on behalf of NEWSME Landfill Operations. Good	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. SANBORN: They are getting farther away. MR. RAYBACK: On page 4 of your testimony, and you mentioned it again this morning, you suggest that sending 80,000 tons to PERC as a compromise scenario would create 1.37 million dollars in revenue for PERC rather than just the \$450,000 that Mr. Nordby talked about earlier today. Are you assuming when you make that calculation that PERC would get the same rate, the same price per ton? MR. SANBORN: Yes. The number was reached by dividing 450,000 tons coming up with \$15 a ton.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	types of questions you will be asking if you are afforded more time. MR. RAYBACK: Thank you. Is this on? Can you hear me okay? MR. DOYLE: No. MR. RAYBACK: How about now? MR. PARKER: You have to get closer to it. MR. RAYBACK: Okay, how about that? Good morning. My name is Brian Rayback. Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer and members of the panel. I am here on behalf of NEWSME Landfill Operations. Good morning. I'd like to start with asking the Sanborns	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. SANBORN: They are getting farther away. MR. RAYBACK: On page 4 of your testimony, and you mentioned it again this morning, you suggest that sending 80,000 tons to PERC as a compromise scenario would create 1.37 million dollars in revenue for PERC rather than just the \$450,000 that Mr. Nordby talked about earlier today. Are you assuming when you make that calculation that PERC would get the same rate, the same price per ton? MR. SANBORN: Yes. The number was reached by dividing 450,000 tons coming up with \$15 a ton. That was a correct assumption.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	types of questions you will be asking if you are afforded more time. MR. RAYBACK: Thank you. Is this on? Can you hear me okay? MR. DOYLE: No. MR. RAYBACK: How about now? MR. PARKER: You have to get closer to it. MR. RAYBACK: Okay, how about that? Good morning. My name is Brian Rayback. Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer and members of the panel. I am here on behalf of NEWSME Landfill Operations. Good morning. I'd like to start with asking the Sanborns some questions and I'm happy for either one of you to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. SANBORN: They are getting farther away. MR. RAYBACK: On page 4 of your testimony, and you mentioned it again this morning, you suggest that sending 80,000 tons to PERC as a compromise scenario would create 1.37 million dollars in revenue for PERC rather than just the \$450,000 that Mr. Nordby talked about earlier today. Are you assuming when you make that calculation that PERC would get the same rate, the same price per ton? MR. SANBORN: Yes. The number was reached by dividing 450,000 tons coming up with \$15 a ton. That was a correct assumption. MR. RAYBACK: Do you think Mr. Nordby would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	types of questions you will be asking if you are afforded more time. MR. RAYBACK: Thank you. Is this on? Can you hear me okay? MR. DOYLE: No. MR. RAYBACK: How about now? MR. PARKER: You have to get closer to it. MR. RAYBACK: Okay, how about that? Good morning. My name is Brian Rayback. Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer and members of the panel. I am here on behalf of NEWSME Landfill Operations. Good morning. I'd like to start with asking the Sanborns some questions and I'm happy for either one of you to answer these as you see fit. You live at 2845 Bennoch Road in Alton, correct? MR. SANBORN: Correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. SANBORN: They are getting farther away. MR. RAYBACK: On page 4 of your testimony, and you mentioned it again this morning, you suggest that sending 80,000 tons to PERC as a compromise scenario would create 1.37 million dollars in revenue for PERC rather than just the \$450,000 that Mr. Nordby talked about earlier today. Are you assuming when you make that calculation that PERC would get the same rate, the same price per ton? MR. SANBORN: Yes. The number was reached by dividing 450,000 tons coming up with \$15 a ton. That was a correct assumption. MR. RAYBACK: Do you think Mr. Nordby would have negotiated for that if he could have gotten it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	types of questions you will be asking if you are afforded more time. MR. RAYBACK: Thank you. Is this on? Can you hear me okay? MR. DOYLE: No. MR. RAYBACK: How about now? MR. PARKER: You have to get closer to it. MR. RAYBACK: Okay, how about that? Good morning. My name is Brian Rayback. Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer and members of the panel. I am here on behalf of NEWSME Landfill Operations. Good morning. I'd like to start with asking the Sanborns some questions and I'm happy for either one of you to answer these as you see fit. You live at 2845 Bennoch Road in Alton, correct? MR. SANBORN: Correct. MR. RAYBACK: One of the concerns you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. SANBORN: They are getting farther away. MR. RAYBACK: On page 4 of your testimony, and you mentioned it again this morning, you suggest that sending 80,000 tons to PERC as a compromise scenario would create 1.37 million dollars in revenue for PERC rather than just the \$450,000 that Mr. Nordby talked about earlier today. Are you assuming when you make that calculation that PERC would get the same rate, the same price per ton? MR. SANBORN: Yes. The number was reached by dividing 450,000 tons coming up with \$15 a ton. That was a correct assumption. MR. RAYBACK: Do you think Mr. Nordby would have negotiated for that if he could have gotten it given what he said this morning about wanting MSW to the rafters? MR. SANBORN: That is a question better
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	types of questions you will be asking if you are afforded more time. MR. RAYBACK: Thank you. Is this on? Can you hear me okay? MR. DOYLE: No. MR. RAYBACK: How about now? MR. PARKER: You have to get closer to it. MR. RAYBACK: Okay, how about that? Good morning. My name is Brian Rayback. Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer and members of the panel. I am here on behalf of NEWSME Landfill Operations. Good morning. I'd like to start with asking the Sanborns some questions and I'm happy for either one of you to answer these as you see fit. You live at 2845 Bennoch Road in Alton, correct? MR. SANBORN: Correct. MR. RAYBACK: One of the concerns you mention in your pre-filed testimony relates to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. SANBORN: They are getting farther away. MR. RAYBACK: On page 4 of your testimony, and you mentioned it again this morning, you suggest that sending 80,000 tons to PERC as a compromise scenario would create 1.37 million dollars in revenue for PERC rather than just the \$450,000 that Mr. Nordby talked about earlier today. Are you assuming when you make that calculation that PERC would get the same rate, the same price per ton? MR. SANBORN: Yes. The number was reached by dividing 450,000 tons coming up with \$15 a ton. That was a correct assumption. MR. RAYBACK: Do you think Mr. Nordby would have negotiated for that if he could have gotten it given what he said this morning about wanting MSW to the rafters? MR. SANBORN: That is a question better asked of Mr. Nordby and not me.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	types of questions you will be asking if you are afforded more time. MR. RAYBACK: Thank you. Is this on? Can you hear me okay? MR. DOYLE: No. MR. RAYBACK: How about now? MR. PARKER: You have to get closer to it. MR. RAYBACK: Okay, how about that? Good morning. My name is Brian Rayback. Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer and members of the panel. I am here on behalf of NEWSME Landfill Operations. Good morning. I'd like to start with asking the Sanborns some questions and I'm happy for either one of you to answer these as you see fit. You live at 2845 Bennoch Road in Alton, correct? MR. SANBORN: Correct. MR. RAYBACK: One of the concerns you mention in your pre-filed testimony relates to the truck traffic into and out of JRL. If trucks are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. SANBORN: They are getting farther away. MR. RAYBACK: On page 4 of your testimony, and you mentioned it again this morning, you suggest that sending 80,000 tons to PERC as a compromise scenario would create 1.37 million dollars in revenue for PERC rather than just the \$450,000 that Mr. Nordby talked about earlier today. Are you assuming when you make that calculation that PERC would get the same rate, the same price per ton? MR. SANBORN: Yes. The number was reached by dividing 450,000 tons coming up with \$15 a ton. That was a correct assumption. MR. RAYBACK: Do you think Mr. Nordby would have negotiated for that if he could have gotten it given what he said this morning about wanting MSW to the rafters? MR. SANBORN: That is a question better asked of Mr. Nordby and not me. MR. RAYBACK: And if this application is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	types of questions you will be asking if you are afforded more time. MR. RAYBACK: Thank you. Is this on? Can you hear me okay? MR. DOYLE: No. MR. RAYBACK: How about now? MR. PARKER: You have to get closer to it. MR. RAYBACK: Okay, how about that? Good morning. My name is Brian Rayback. Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer and members of the panel. I am here on behalf of NEWSME Landfill Operations. Good morning. I'd like to start with asking the Sanborns some questions and I'm happy for either one of you to answer these as you see fit. You live at 2845 Bennoch Road in Alton, correct? MR. SANBORN: Correct. MR. RAYBACK: One of the concerns you mention in your pre-filed testimony relates to the truck traffic into and out of JRL. If trucks are traveling on I-95 north coming to the landfill, they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. SANBORN: They are getting farther away. MR. RAYBACK: On page 4 of your testimony, and you mentioned it again this morning, you suggest that sending 80,000 tons to PERC as a compromise scenario would create 1.37 million dollars in revenue for PERC rather than just the \$450,000 that Mr. Nordby talked about earlier today. Are you assuming when you make that calculation that PERC would get the same rate, the same price per ton? MR. SANBORN: Yes. The number was reached by dividing 450,000 tons coming up with \$15 a ton. That was a correct assumption. MR. RAYBACK: Do you think Mr. Nordby would have negotiated for that if he could have gotten it given what he said this morning about wanting MSW to the rafters? MR. SANBORN: That is a question better asked of Mr. Nordby and not me. MR. RAYBACK: And if this application is denied, do you think that will necessary result in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	types of questions you will be asking if you are afforded more time. MR. RAYBACK: Thank you. Is this on? Can you hear me okay? MR. DOYLE: No. MR. RAYBACK: How about now? MR. PARKER: You have to get closer to it. MR. RAYBACK: Okay, how about that? Good morning. My name is Brian Rayback. Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer and members of the panel. I am here on behalf of NEWSME Landfill Operations. Good morning. I'd like to start with asking the Sanborns some questions and I'm happy for either one of you to answer these as you see fit. You live at 2845 Bennoch Road in Alton, correct? MR. SANBORN: Correct. MR. RAYBACK: One of the concerns you mention in your pre-filed testimony relates to the truck traffic into and out of JRL. If trucks are traveling on I-95 north coming to the landfill, they probably get off at the exit on Bennoch Road which is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. SANBORN: They are getting farther away. MR. RAYBACK: On page 4 of your testimony, and you mentioned it again this morning, you suggest that sending 80,000 tons to PERC as a compromise scenario would create 1.37 million dollars in revenue for PERC rather than just the \$450,000 that Mr. Nordby talked about earlier today. Are you assuming when you make that calculation that PERC would get the same rate, the same price per ton? MR. SANBORN: Yes. The number was reached by dividing 450,000 tons coming up with \$15 a ton. That was a correct assumption. MR. RAYBACK: Do you think Mr. Nordby would have negotiated for that if he could have gotten it given what he said this morning about wanting MSW to the rafters? MR. SANBORN: That is a question better asked of Mr. Nordby and not me. MR. RAYBACK: And if this application is denied, do you think that will necessary result in Casella negotiating for a new contract with PERC on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	types of questions you will be asking if you are afforded more time. MR. RAYBACK: Thank you. Is this on? Can you hear me okay? MR. DOYLE: No. MR. RAYBACK: How about now? MR. PARKER: You have to get closer to it. MR. RAYBACK: Okay, how about that? Good morning. My name is Brian Rayback. Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer and members of the panel. I am here on behalf of NEWSME Landfill Operations. Good morning. I'd like to start with asking the Sanborns some questions and I'm happy for either one of you to answer these as you see fit. You live at 2845 Bennoch Road in Alton, correct? MR. SANBORN: Correct. MR. RAYBACK: One of the concerns you mention in your pre-filed testimony relates to the truck traffic into and out of JRL. If trucks are traveling on I-95 north coming to the landfill, they probably get off at the exit on Bennoch Road which is Route 16, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. SANBORN: They are getting farther away. MR. RAYBACK: On page 4 of your testimony, and you mentioned it again this morning, you suggest that sending 80,000 tons to PERC as a compromise scenario would create 1.37 million dollars in revenue for PERC rather than just the \$450,000 that Mr. Nordby talked about earlier today. Are you assuming when you make that calculation that PERC would get the same rate, the same price per ton? MR. SANBORN: Yes. The number was reached by dividing 450,000 tons coming up with \$15 a ton. That was a correct assumption. MR. RAYBACK: Do you think Mr. Nordby would have negotiated for that if he could have gotten it given what he said this morning about wanting MSW to the rafters? MR. SANBORN: That is a question better asked of Mr. Nordby and not me. MR. RAYBACK: And if this application is denied, do you think that will necessary result in Casella negotiating for a new contract with PERC on that issue? In other words, can DEP mandate Casella
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	types of questions you will be asking if you are afforded more time. MR. RAYBACK: Thank you. Is this on? Can you hear me okay? MR. DOYLE: No. MR. RAYBACK: How about now? MR. PARKER: You have to get closer to it. MR. RAYBACK: Okay, how about that? Good morning. My name is Brian Rayback. Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer and members of the panel. I am here on behalf of NEWSME Landfill Operations. Good morning. I'd like to start with asking the Sanborns some questions and I'm happy for either one of you to answer these as you see fit. You live at 2845 Bennoch Road in Alton, correct? MR. SANBORN: Correct. MR. RAYBACK: One of the concerns you mention in your pre-filed testimony relates to the truck traffic into and out of JRL. If trucks are traveling on I-95 north coming to the landfill, they probably get off at the exit on Bennoch Road which is Route 16, correct? MR. SANBORN: Number 199.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. SANBORN: They are getting farther away. MR. RAYBACK: On page 4 of your testimony, and you mentioned it again this morning, you suggest that sending 80,000 tons to PERC as a compromise scenario would create 1.37 million dollars in revenue for PERC rather than just the \$450,000 that Mr. Nordby talked about earlier today. Are you assuming when you make that calculation that PERC would get the same rate, the same price per ton? MR. SANBORN: Yes. The number was reached by dividing 450,000 tons coming up with \$15 a ton. That was a correct assumption. MR. RAYBACK: Do you think Mr. Nordby would have negotiated for that if he could have gotten it given what he said this morning about wanting MSW to the rafters? MR. SANBORN: That is a question better asked of Mr. Nordby and not me. MR. RAYBACK: And if this application is denied, do you think that will necessary result in Casella negotiating for a new contract with PERC on that issue? In other words, can DEP mandate Casella to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	types of questions you will be asking if you are afforded more time. MR. RAYBACK: Thank you. Is this on? Can you hear me okay? MR. DOYLE: No. MR. RAYBACK: How about now? MR. PARKER: You have to get closer to it. MR. RAYBACK: Okay, how about that? Good morning. My name is Brian Rayback. Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer and members of the panel. I am here on behalf of NEWSME Landfill Operations. Good morning. I'd like to start with asking the Sanborns some questions and I'm happy for either one of you to answer these as you see fit. You live at 2845 Bennoch Road in Alton, correct? MR. SANBORN: Correct. MR. RAYBACK: One of the concerns you mention in your pre-filed testimony relates to the truck traffic into and out of JRL. If trucks are traveling on I-95 north coming to the landfill, they probably get off at the exit on Bennoch Road which is Route 16, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. SANBORN: They are getting farther away. MR. RAYBACK: On page 4 of your testimony, and you mentioned it again this morning, you suggest that sending 80,000 tons to PERC as a compromise scenario would create 1.37 million dollars in revenue for PERC rather than just the \$450,000 that Mr. Nordby talked about earlier today. Are you assuming when you make that calculation that PERC would get the same rate, the same price per ton? MR. SANBORN: Yes. The number was reached by dividing 450,000 tons coming up with \$15 a ton. That was a correct assumption. MR. RAYBACK: Do you think Mr. Nordby would have negotiated for that if he could have gotten it given what he said this morning about wanting MSW to the rafters? MR. SANBORN: That is a question better asked of Mr. Nordby and not me. MR. RAYBACK: And if this application is denied, do you think that will necessary result in Casella negotiating for a new contract with PERC on that issue? In other words, can DEP mandate Casella

	328		330
1	MR. RAYBACK: Thank you. Mr. Spencer	1	does both of those things, right?
2	MR. SPENCER: Yes.	2	MR. SPENCER: Yes.
3	MR. RAYBACK: you express concern in your	3	MR. RAYBACK: When you filed your pre-filed
4	pre-filed testimony about methane emissions from	4	testimony, did you realize they were taking those
5	landfills. One of the issues you raised relates to	5	steps at JRL?
6	how efficiently landfills can capture landfill gas,	6	MR. SPENCER: I realized that they have a
7	correct?	7	gas collection system that they flare and, yes, to an
8	MR. SPENCER: Yup.	8	extent. I don't know the details, how far apart the
9	MR. RAYBACK: One of the papers you cited is	9	horizontal pipes are, et cetera.
10	a chapter written by a number of authors for the	10	MR. RAYBACK: Bogner goes on to say that
11	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. That's	11	other measures to reduce methane emissions include
12	the one whose lead author was Jean Bogner, correct?	12	installation of geomembrane composite covers,
13	MR. SPENCER: Yup.	13	correct?
14	MR. RAYBACK: It looks like you have it in	14	MR. SPENCER: (Nods).
15	front of you?	15	MR. RAYBACK: And, again, Ms. Webb testified
16	MR. SPENCER: Yes.	16	that JRL uses those synthetic geomembrane covers,
17	MR. RAYBACK: As Ms. Webb testified	17	correct?
18	yesterday, the Bogner paper includes a statement that	18	MR. SPENCER: Yes.
19	lifetime capture efficiencies for landfill gas may be	19	MR. RAYBACK: Were you aware that they did
20	as low as 20 percent in some cases, correct?	20	that when you submitted your pre-filed testimony?
21	MR. SPENCER: Correct.	21	MR. SPENCER: Sure, yup.
22	MR. RAYBACK: And that's the basis, I	22	MR. RAYBACK: All right. Let's turn to
23	assume, of your concern about or that's one of the	23	another one of the exhibits that you included in your
24 25	bases for your concern about capture efficiencies here?	24 25	pre-filed testimony. That's the Sierra Club report on landfill gas to energy. One of the problems
25	nere:	25	on landing gas to energy. One of the problems
	329		331
1	MR. SPENCER: Not so much the 20 percent but	1	identified in that study with landfills that are used
2	the fact that there's a large variation from the	2	as gas-to-energy plants is that many operators use
3	reported commonly assumed reported by EPA of 75	3	something called the wet cell method in which
4	percent.	4	landfill operators actually increase the moisture
5	MR. RAYBACK: Okay. I assume you were here	5	content in the landfill to increase methane
6	for Abbey Webb's testimony yesterday. I believe I	6	generation, is that right?
7	saw you sitting in the audience?	7	MR. SPENCER: I've seen that, sure.
8	MR. SPENCER: Yes.	8	MR. RAYBACK: Are you familiar with the air
9	MR. RAYBACK: Where she discussed the rest	9	license that has been issued by DEP for JRL back in
10	of that quote from Bogner, correct?	10	November of last year?
11	MR. SPENCER: Um-hum.	11	MR. SPENCER: I am to an extent, yes.
12	MR. RAYBACK: The one that says	12	MR. RAYBACK: I'd like to take a look at a
13	"implementing an active landfill gas collection	13	provision in that license. This was included in
14 15	system is the single most important mitigation	14 15	BGS/NEWSME Exhibit 18 and if you don't have it in front of you
16	measure to reduce emissions," right? MR. SPENCER: Correct.	16	MR. SPENCER: I've got it right here. What
17	MR. RAYBACK: And you heard her testify that	17	page?
18	Bogner goes on to say that measures to improve	18	MR. RAYBACK: Let's take a look on page 25,
19	collection efficiencies include the installation of	19	please.
20	horizontal gas collection systems concurrent with	20	MR. SPENCER: Okay.
21	filling and frequent monitoring and remediation of	21	MR. RAYBACK: Under specific condition one,
22	leaks, true?	22	there is a provision there and let's make sure I
23	MR. SPENCER: Correct.	23	get this right "Juniper Ridge Landfill shall
24	MR. RAYBACK: And, again, you've seen Ms.	24	continue to use good operating practices to minimize
25	Webb's testimony in her pre-filed testimony that JRL	25	the formation and release of the TRS laden landfill
		1	

	332		334
1	gases. These practices include, but are not limited	1	pre-filed testimony, were you aware of that provision
2	to, minimizing landfill waste moisture and ambient	2	requiring them to do those things?
			MR. SPENCER: No, but I was aware that
3	landfill gas releases through the use of synthetic	3	
4	intermediate cover or approved equivalent, the	4	basically I knew that they had applied for a
5	appropriate use of daily cover and the proper design,	5	change in their air license and I knew that they were
6	installation, maintenance and operation of landfill	6	basically in compliance with their air license.
7	gas management system infrastructure in accordance	7	MR. RAYBACK: Would you agree that these
8	with the solid waste management regulations." Did I	8	steps that we've been talking about, intermediate
9	read that accurately? Were you able to follow along?	9	cover, daily cover, a gas management system
10	It's a mouthful.	10	preventing moisture from getting into the landfill,
11	MR. SPENCER: Yes, except I think we should	11	those are some of the steps that Bogner and the
12	clarify what TRS stands for.	12	Sierra Club were talking about as the best practices
13	MR. RAYBACK: Please do.	13	to reduce emission of methane?
14	MR. SPENCER: Total reduced sulfur which	14	MR. SPENCER: Yes, yes, no argument.
15	seems to be the focus of the air license.	15	MR. RAYBACK: Thank you. No further
16	MR. RAYBACK: Okay. You think that this	16	questions.
17	provision has to do with TRS but do you see it's	17	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is somebody
18	talking about TRS laden landfill gas?	18	from MRC available to conduct their cross
19	MR. SPENCER: Yes.	19	examination?
20	MR. RAYBACK: The gas is all combined	20	MS. McBRADY: Good morning. I feel like a
21	together, isn't it, or do you think there are	21	talk show host with this. My name is Nancy McBrady.
22	separate gas streams?	22	I'm an attorney for MRC. I just have a few questions
23	MR. SPENCER: I think they have different	23	this morning. Thank you for being here. Mr.
24	atmospheric waste so they might combine for a time.	24	Spencer, you live in Old Town, is that correct?
25	Something I neglected to say, for example, is that	25	MR. SPENCER: Correct.
	5 5 ,, 1,		
	333		335
1	333 methane can mix with a liquid and become part of, in	1	335 MS. McBRADY: And you dispose of your
1	methane can mix with a liquid and become part of, in	1	MS. McBRADY: And you dispose of your
2	methane can mix with a liquid and become part of, in effect, a landfill gas escape but just not into the	1 2 3	MS. McBRADY: And you dispose of your household waste in Old Town, I'm assuming?
2 3	methane can mix with a liquid and become part of, in effect, a landfill gas escape but just not into the air. Perhaps, if there's no leaks which I assume,	2 3	MS. McBRADY: And you dispose of your household waste in Old Town, I'm assuming? MR. SPENCER: We participate in the pay to
2 3 4	methane can mix with a liquid and become part of, in effect, a landfill gas escape but just not into the air. Perhaps, if there's no leaks which I assume, through the leachate but I never checked to see what	2 3 4	MS. McBRADY: And you dispose of your household waste in Old Town, I'm assuming? MR. SPENCER: We participate in the pay to throw currently in place in Old Town. It's picked up
2 3 4 5	methane can mix with a liquid and become part of, in effect, a landfill gas escape but just not into the air. Perhaps, if there's no leaks which I assume, through the leachate but I never checked to see what the if there's a methane component in JRL's	2 3 4 5	MS. McBRADY: And you dispose of your household waste in Old Town, I'm assuming? MR. SPENCER: We participate in the pay to throw currently in place in Old Town. It's picked up on the Kirkland Road and taken, I hope directly, by
2 3 4 5 6	methane can mix with a liquid and become part of, in effect, a landfill gas escape but just not into the air. Perhaps, if there's no leaks which I assume, through the leachate but I never checked to see what the if there's a methane component in JRL's leachate, if you follow me.	2 3 4 5 6	MS. McBRADY: And you dispose of your household waste in Old Town, I'm assuming? MR. SPENCER: We participate in the pay to throw currently in place in Old Town. It's picked up on the Kirkland Road and taken, I hope directly, by Casella to the PERC incinerator in Orrington.
2 3 4 5 6 7	methane can mix with a liquid and become part of, in effect, a landfill gas escape but just not into the air. Perhaps, if there's no leaks which I assume, through the leachate but I never checked to see what the if there's a methane component in JRL's leachate, if you follow me. MR. RAYBACK: I think I do. So do you know	2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. McBRADY: And you dispose of your household waste in Old Town, I'm assuming? MR. SPENCER: We participate in the pay to throw currently in place in Old Town. It's picked up on the Kirkland Road and taken, I hope directly, by Casella to the PERC incinerator in Orrington. MS. McBRADY: Well, that was my next
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	methane can mix with a liquid and become part of, in effect, a landfill gas escape but just not into the air. Perhaps, if there's no leaks which I assume, through the leachate but I never checked to see what the if there's a methane component in JRL's leachate, if you follow me. MR. RAYBACK: I think I do. So do you know whether that's happening? You don't know whether	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. McBRADY: And you dispose of your household waste in Old Town, I'm assuming? MR. SPENCER: We participate in the pay to throw currently in place in Old Town. It's picked up on the Kirkland Road and taken, I hope directly, by Casella to the PERC incinerator in Orrington. MS. McBRADY: Well, that was my next question and I wanted to know whether you were aware
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	methane can mix with a liquid and become part of, in effect, a landfill gas escape but just not into the air. Perhaps, if there's no leaks which I assume, through the leachate but I never checked to see what the if there's a methane component in JRL's leachate, if you follow me. MR. RAYBACK: I think I do. So do you know whether that's happening? You don't know whether that's happening at JRL?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. McBRADY: And you dispose of your household waste in Old Town, I'm assuming? MR. SPENCER: We participate in the pay to throw currently in place in Old Town. It's picked up on the Kirkland Road and taken, I hope directly, by Casella to the PERC incinerator in Orrington. MS. McBRADY: Well, that was my next question and I wanted to know whether you were aware that the town of Old Town's MSW does go directly to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	methane can mix with a liquid and become part of, in effect, a landfill gas escape but just not into the air. Perhaps, if there's no leaks which I assume, through the leachate but I never checked to see what the if there's a methane component in JRL's leachate, if you follow me. MR. RAYBACK: I think I do. So do you know whether that's happening? You don't know whether that's happening at JRL? MR. SPENCER: No, I'm just saying that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS. McBRADY: And you dispose of your household waste in Old Town, I'm assuming? MR. SPENCER: We participate in the pay to throw currently in place in Old Town. It's picked up on the Kirkland Road and taken, I hope directly, by Casella to the PERC incinerator in Orrington. MS. McBRADY: Well, that was my next question and I wanted to know whether you were aware that the town of Old Town's MSW does go directly to PERC?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	methane can mix with a liquid and become part of, in effect, a landfill gas escape but just not into the air. Perhaps, if there's no leaks which I assume, through the leachate but I never checked to see what the if there's a methane component in JRL's leachate, if you follow me. MR. RAYBACK: I think I do. So do you know whether that's happening? You don't know whether that's happening at JRL? MR. SPENCER: No, I'm just saying that I'm giving as an example of whether gases are all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. McBRADY: And you dispose of your household waste in Old Town, I'm assuming? MR. SPENCER: We participate in the pay to throw currently in place in Old Town. It's picked up on the Kirkland Road and taken, I hope directly, by Casella to the PERC incinerator in Orrington. MS. McBRADY: Well, that was my next question and I wanted to know whether you were aware that the town of Old Town's MSW does go directly to PERC? MR. SPENCER: Um-hum.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	methane can mix with a liquid and become part of, in effect, a landfill gas escape but just not into the air. Perhaps, if there's no leaks which I assume, through the leachate but I never checked to see what the if there's a methane component in JRL's leachate, if you follow me. MR. RAYBACK: I think I do. So do you know whether that's happening? You don't know whether that's happening at JRL? MR. SPENCER: No, I'm just saying that I'm giving as an example of whether gases are all together or what, but if your question is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. McBRADY: And you dispose of your household waste in Old Town, I'm assuming? MR. SPENCER: We participate in the pay to throw currently in place in Old Town. It's picked up on the Kirkland Road and taken, I hope directly, by Casella to the PERC incinerator in Orrington. MS. McBRADY: Well, that was my next question and I wanted to know whether you were aware that the town of Old Town's MSW does go directly to PERC? MR. SPENCER: Um-hum. MS. McBRADY: Thank you. Are you aware that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	methane can mix with a liquid and become part of, in effect, a landfill gas escape but just not into the air. Perhaps, if there's no leaks which I assume, through the leachate but I never checked to see what the if there's a methane component in JRL's leachate, if you follow me. MR. RAYBACK: I think I do. So do you know whether that's happening? You don't know whether that's happening at JRL? MR. SPENCER: No, I'm just saying that I'm giving as an example of whether gases are all together or what, but if your question is MR. RAYBACK: I wanted to start with did we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. McBRADY: And you dispose of your household waste in Old Town, I'm assuming? MR. SPENCER: We participate in the pay to throw currently in place in Old Town. It's picked up on the Kirkland Road and taken, I hope directly, by Casella to the PERC incinerator in Orrington. MS. McBRADY: Well, that was my next question and I wanted to know whether you were aware that the town of Old Town's MSW does go directly to PERC? MR. SPENCER: Um-hum. MS. McBRADY: Thank you. Are you aware that in 2013 the net disposal cost for Old Town to dispose
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	methane can mix with a liquid and become part of, in effect, a landfill gas escape but just not into the air. Perhaps, if there's no leaks which I assume, through the leachate but I never checked to see what the if there's a methane component in JRL's leachate, if you follow me. MR. RAYBACK: I think I do. So do you know whether that's happening? You don't know whether that's happening at JRL? MR. SPENCER: No, I'm just saying that I'm giving as an example of whether gases are all together or what, but if your question is MR. RAYBACK: I wanted to start with did we get the provision right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. McBRADY: And you dispose of your household waste in Old Town, I'm assuming? MR. SPENCER: We participate in the pay to throw currently in place in Old Town. It's picked up on the Kirkland Road and taken, I hope directly, by Casella to the PERC incinerator in Orrington. MS. McBRADY: Well, that was my next question and I wanted to know whether you were aware that the town of Old Town's MSW does go directly to PERC? MR. SPENCER: Um-hum. MS. McBRADY: Thank you. Are you aware that in 2013 the net disposal cost for Old Town to dispose of its MSW at PERC is about \$51 per ton?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	methane can mix with a liquid and become part of, in effect, a landfill gas escape but just not into the air. Perhaps, if there's no leaks which I assume, through the leachate but I never checked to see what the if there's a methane component in JRL's leachate, if you follow me. MR. RAYBACK: I think I do. So do you know whether that's happening? You don't know whether that's happening at JRL? MR. SPENCER: No, I'm just saying that I'm giving as an example of whether gases are all together or what, but if your question is MR. RAYBACK: I wanted to start with did we get the provision right? MR. SPENCER: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. McBRADY: And you dispose of your household waste in Old Town, I'm assuming? MR. SPENCER: We participate in the pay to throw currently in place in Old Town. It's picked up on the Kirkland Road and taken, I hope directly, by Casella to the PERC incinerator in Orrington. MS. McBRADY: Well, that was my next question and I wanted to know whether you were aware that the town of Old Town's MSW does go directly to PERC? MR. SPENCER: Um-hum. MS. McBRADY: Thank you. Are you aware that in 2013 the net disposal cost for Old Town to dispose of its MSW at PERC is about \$51 per ton? MR. SPENCER: I was aware of that being the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	methane can mix with a liquid and become part of, in effect, a landfill gas escape but just not into the air. Perhaps, if there's no leaks which I assume, through the leachate but I never checked to see what the if there's a methane component in JRL's leachate, if you follow me. MR. RAYBACK: I think I do. So do you know whether that's happening? You don't know whether that's happening at JRL? MR. SPENCER: No, I'm just saying that I'm giving as an example of whether gases are all together or what, but if your question is MR. RAYBACK: I wanted to start with did we get the provision right? MR. SPENCER: Yes. MR. RAYBACK: Okay. So I'll ask you the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. McBRADY: And you dispose of your household waste in Old Town, I'm assuming? MR. SPENCER: We participate in the pay to throw currently in place in Old Town. It's picked up on the Kirkland Road and taken, I hope directly, by Casella to the PERC incinerator in Orrington. MS. McBRADY: Well, that was my next question and I wanted to know whether you were aware that the town of Old Town's MSW does go directly to PERC? MR. SPENCER: Um-hum. MS. McBRADY: Thank you. Are you aware that in 2013 the net disposal cost for Old Town to dispose of its MSW at PERC is about \$51 per ton? MR. SPENCER: I was aware of that being the ballpark figure, sure.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	methane can mix with a liquid and become part of, in effect, a landfill gas escape but just not into the air. Perhaps, if there's no leaks which I assume, through the leachate but I never checked to see what the if there's a methane component in JRL's leachate, if you follow me. MR. RAYBACK: I think I do. So do you know whether that's happening? You don't know whether that's happening at JRL? MR. SPENCER: No, I'm just saying that I'm giving as an example of whether gases are all together or what, but if your question is MR. RAYBACK: I wanted to start with did we get the provision right? MR. SPENCER: Yes. MR. RAYBACK: Okay. So I'll ask you the follow-up question. So it seems to me, I read this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. McBRADY: And you dispose of your household waste in Old Town, I'm assuming? MR. SPENCER: We participate in the pay to throw currently in place in Old Town. It's picked up on the Kirkland Road and taken, I hope directly, by Casella to the PERC incinerator in Orrington. MS. McBRADY: Well, that was my next question and I wanted to know whether you were aware that the town of Old Town's MSW does go directly to PERC? MR. SPENCER: Um-hum. MS. McBRADY: Thank you. Are you aware that in 2013 the net disposal cost for Old Town to dispose of its MSW at PERC is about \$51 per ton? MR. SPENCER: I was aware of that being the ballpark figure, sure. MS. McBRADY: Okay, and in 2017 are you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	methane can mix with a liquid and become part of, in effect, a landfill gas escape but just not into the air. Perhaps, if there's no leaks which I assume, through the leachate but I never checked to see what the if there's a methane component in JRL's leachate, if you follow me. MR. RAYBACK: I think I do. So do you know whether that's happening? You don't know whether that's happening at JRL? MR. SPENCER: No, I'm just saying that I'm giving as an example of whether gases are all together or what, but if your question is MR. RAYBACK: I wanted to start with did we get the provision right? MR. SPENCER: Yes. MR. RAYBACK: Okay. So I'll ask you the follow-up question. So it seems to me, I read this provision to say JRL has to minimize how much	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. McBRADY: And you dispose of your household waste in Old Town, I'm assuming? MR. SPENCER: We participate in the pay to throw currently in place in Old Town. It's picked up on the Kirkland Road and taken, I hope directly, by Casella to the PERC incinerator in Orrington. MS. McBRADY: Well, that was my next question and I wanted to know whether you were aware that the town of Old Town's MSW does go directly to PERC? MR. SPENCER: Um-hum. MS. McBRADY: Thank you. Are you aware that in 2013 the net disposal cost for Old Town to dispose of its MSW at PERC is about \$51 per ton? MR. SPENCER: I was aware of that being the ballpark figure, sure. MS. McBRADY: Okay, and in 2017 are you aware that that cost will increase to about \$67 per
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	methane can mix with a liquid and become part of, in effect, a landfill gas escape but just not into the air. Perhaps, if there's no leaks which I assume, through the leachate but I never checked to see what the if there's a methane component in JRL's leachate, if you follow me. MR. RAYBACK: I think I do. So do you know whether that's happening? You don't know whether that's happening at JRL? MR. SPENCER: No, I'm just saying that I'm giving as an example of whether gases are all together or what, but if your question is MR. RAYBACK: I wanted to start with did we get the provision right? MR. SPENCER: Yes. MR. RAYBACK: Okay. So I'll ask you the follow-up question. So it seems to me, I read this provision to say JRL has to minimize how much moisture is getting into the landfill and then they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. McBRADY: And you dispose of your household waste in Old Town, I'm assuming? MR. SPENCER: We participate in the pay to throw currently in place in Old Town. It's picked up on the Kirkland Road and taken, I hope directly, by Casella to the PERC incinerator in Orrington. MS. McBRADY: Well, that was my next question and I wanted to know whether you were aware that the town of Old Town's MSW does go directly to PERC? MR. SPENCER: Um-hum. MS. McBRADY: Thank you. Are you aware that in 2013 the net disposal cost for Old Town to dispose of its MSW at PERC is about \$51 per ton? MR. SPENCER: I was aware of that being the ballpark figure, sure. MS. McBRADY: Okay, and in 2017 are you aware that that cost will increase to about \$67 per ton?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	methane can mix with a liquid and become part of, in effect, a landfill gas escape but just not into the air. Perhaps, if there's no leaks which I assume, through the leachate but I never checked to see what the if there's a methane component in JRL's leachate, if you follow me. MR. RAYBACK: I think I do. So do you know whether that's happening? You don't know whether that's happening at JRL? MR. SPENCER: No, I'm just saying that I'm giving as an example of whether gases are all together or what, but if your question is MR. RAYBACK: I wanted to start with did we get the provision right? MR. SPENCER: Yes. MR. RAYBACK: Okay. So I'll ask you the follow-up question. So it seems to me, I read this provision to say JRL has to minimize how much moisture is getting into the landfill and then they have to minimize landfill gas releases by using	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. McBRADY: And you dispose of your household waste in Old Town, I'm assuming? MR. SPENCER: We participate in the pay to throw currently in place in Old Town. It's picked up on the Kirkland Road and taken, I hope directly, by Casella to the PERC incinerator in Orrington. MS. McBRADY: Well, that was my next question and I wanted to know whether you were aware that the town of Old Town's MSW does go directly to PERC? MR. SPENCER: Um-hum. MS. McBRADY: Thank you. Are you aware that in 2013 the net disposal cost for Old Town to dispose of its MSW at PERC is about \$51 per ton? MR. SPENCER: I was aware of that being the ballpark figure, sure. MS. McBRADY: Okay, and in 2017 are you aware that that cost will increase to about \$67 per ton? MR. SPENCER: I no, I would not have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	methane can mix with a liquid and become part of, in effect, a landfill gas escape but just not into the air. Perhaps, if there's no leaks which I assume, through the leachate but I never checked to see what the if there's a methane component in JRL's leachate, if you follow me. MR. RAYBACK: I think I do. So do you know whether that's happening? You don't know whether that's happening at JRL? MR. SPENCER: No, I'm just saying that I'm giving as an example of whether gases are all together or what, but if your question is MR. RAYBACK: I wanted to start with did we get the provision right? MR. SPENCER: Yes. MR. RAYBACK: Okay. So I'll ask you the follow-up question. So it seems to me, I read this provision to say JRL has to minimize how much moisture is getting into the landfill and then they have to minimize landfill gas releases by using cover, both intermediate and daily, and the landfill	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. McBRADY: And you dispose of your household waste in Old Town, I'm assuming? MR. SPENCER: We participate in the pay to throw currently in place in Old Town. It's picked up on the Kirkland Road and taken, I hope directly, by Casella to the PERC incinerator in Orrington. MS. McBRADY: Well, that was my next question and I wanted to know whether you were aware that the town of Old Town's MSW does go directly to PERC? MR. SPENCER: Um-hum. MS. McBRADY: Thank you. Are you aware that in 2013 the net disposal cost for Old Town to dispose of its MSW at PERC is about \$51 per ton? MR. SPENCER: I was aware of that being the ballpark figure, sure. MS. McBRADY: Okay, and in 2017 are you aware that that cost will increase to about \$67 per ton? MR. SPENCER: I no, I would not have known that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	methane can mix with a liquid and become part of, in effect, a landfill gas escape but just not into the air. Perhaps, if there's no leaks which I assume, through the leachate but I never checked to see what the if there's a methane component in JRL's leachate, if you follow me. MR. RAYBACK: I think I do. So do you know whether that's happening? You don't know whether that's happening at JRL? MR. SPENCER: No, I'm just saying that I'm giving as an example of whether gases are all together or what, but if your question is MR. RAYBACK: I wanted to start with did we get the provision right? MR. SPENCER: Yes. MR. RAYBACK: Okay. So I'll ask you the follow-up question. So it seems to me, I read this provision to say JRL has to minimize how much moisture is getting into the landfill and then they have to minimize landfill gas releases by using cover, both intermediate and daily, and the landfill gas management system. Would you agree that's what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. McBRADY: And you dispose of your household waste in Old Town, I'm assuming? MR. SPENCER: We participate in the pay to throw currently in place in Old Town. It's picked up on the Kirkland Road and taken, I hope directly, by Casella to the PERC incinerator in Orrington. MS. McBRADY: Well, that was my next question and I wanted to know whether you were aware that the town of Old Town's MSW does go directly to PERC? MR. SPENCER: Um-hum. MS. McBRADY: Thank you. Are you aware that in 2013 the net disposal cost for Old Town to dispose of its MSW at PERC is about \$51 per ton? MR. SPENCER: I was aware of that being the ballpark figure, sure. MS. McBRADY: Okay, and in 2017 are you aware that that cost will increase to about \$67 per ton? MR. SPENCER: I no, I would not have known that. MS. McBRADY: Okay. Based on your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	methane can mix with a liquid and become part of, in effect, a landfill gas escape but just not into the air. Perhaps, if there's no leaks which I assume, through the leachate but I never checked to see what the if there's a methane component in JRL's leachate, if you follow me. MR. RAYBACK: I think I do. So do you know whether that's happening? You don't know whether that's happening at JRL? MR. SPENCER: No, I'm just saying that I'm giving as an example of whether gases are all together or what, but if your question is MR. RAYBACK: I wanted to start with did we get the provision right? MR. SPENCER: Yes. MR. RAYBACK: Okay. So I'll ask you the follow-up question. So it seems to me, I read this provision to say JRL has to minimize how much moisture is getting into the landfill and then they have to minimize landfill gas releases by using cover, both intermediate and daily, and the landfill gas management system. Would you agree that's what the license is saying?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. McBRADY: And you dispose of your household waste in Old Town, I'm assuming? MR. SPENCER: We participate in the pay to throw currently in place in Old Town. It's picked up on the Kirkland Road and taken, I hope directly, by Casella to the PERC incinerator in Orrington. MS. McBRADY: Well, that was my next question and I wanted to know whether you were aware that the town of Old Town's MSW does go directly to PERC? MR. SPENCER: Um-hum. MS. McBRADY: Thank you. Are you aware that in 2013 the net disposal cost for Old Town to dispose of its MSW at PERC is about \$51 per ton? MR. SPENCER: I was aware of that being the ballpark figure, sure. MS. McBRADY: Okay, and in 2017 are you aware that that cost will increase to about \$67 per ton? MR. SPENCER: I no, I would not have known that. MS. McBRADY: Okay. Based on your testimony, your pre-filed testimony and your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	methane can mix with a liquid and become part of, in effect, a landfill gas escape but just not into the air. Perhaps, if there's no leaks which I assume, through the leachate but I never checked to see what the if there's a methane component in JRL's leachate, if you follow me. MR. RAYBACK: I think I do. So do you know whether that's happening? You don't know whether that's happening at JRL? MR. SPENCER: No, I'm just saying that I'm giving as an example of whether gases are all together or what, but if your question is MR. RAYBACK: I wanted to start with did we get the provision right? MR. SPENCER: Yes. MR. RAYBACK: Okay. So I'll ask you the follow-up question. So it seems to me, I read this provision to say JRL has to minimize how much moisture is getting into the landfill and then they have to minimize landfill gas releases by using cover, both intermediate and daily, and the landfill gas management system. Would you agree that's what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. McBRADY: And you dispose of your household waste in Old Town, I'm assuming? MR. SPENCER: We participate in the pay to throw currently in place in Old Town. It's picked up on the Kirkland Road and taken, I hope directly, by Casella to the PERC incinerator in Orrington. MS. McBRADY: Well, that was my next question and I wanted to know whether you were aware that the town of Old Town's MSW does go directly to PERC? MR. SPENCER: Um-hum. MS. McBRADY: Thank you. Are you aware that in 2013 the net disposal cost for Old Town to dispose of its MSW at PERC is about \$51 per ton? MR. SPENCER: I was aware of that being the ballpark figure, sure. MS. McBRADY: Okay, and in 2017 are you aware that that cost will increase to about \$67 per ton? MR. SPENCER: I no, I would not have known that. MS. McBRADY: Okay. Based on your

	226		220
	336		338
1	MR. SPENCER: Correct.	1	Let's reconvene at let's just say 11:15 and give
2	MS. McBRADY: And your preferred method of	2	you the opportunity to confer and get back in our
3	disposal for your town's MSW would be to continue to	3	seats at 11:15, please.
4	go to PERC, is that right, after reducing and reusing	4	(OFF RECORD)
5	and recycling?	5	
6	MR. SPENCER: I see that as the best	6	HEARING OFFICER: We are back on the record
7	alternative for our town into 2018.	7	and reconvening to do the redirect by the Citizen
8	MS. McBRADY: Okay, and would you still see	8	intervenors. You've been allotted 10 minutes for
9	that as the preferred alternative for your town if	9	redirect which is testimony that gets at the issues
10	those net disposal costs were to increase, say, by	10	that were raised on cross examination. Please
		_	
11	\$20 a ton?	11	proceed.
12	MR. SPENCER: May I qualify?	12	MR. SPENCER: I'll start. Number one, my
13	MS. McBRADY: Certainly.	13	testimony basically assumes that more MSW in the JRL
14	MR. SPENCER: There's not just a fee for	14	will equal more methane potential released; number
15	picking up the waste and taking it to PERC. There's	15	two, at JRL, the quarterly test procedures of the
16	also a fee involved to the town for doing the zero	16	covered part of the landfill does not accurately
17	sort recycling which has just begun in our town.	17	reflect the methane escaping. Waste-to-energy beats
18	MS. McBRADY: Okay.	18	incinerating by every scientific study that I've
19	MR. SPENCER: So there are other	19	seen; and, lastly, on page 14 of that same JRL air
20	considerations, not just PERC, but I think to me	20	license it says, quote, AP-42, Section 2.4 also
21	personally if there's an additional cost and it can	21	estimates that active gas collection and control
22	be proven that this is the best available, you know,	22	systems have capture efficiencies of 60 to 95
23	disposal for our waste as a community, yes.	23	percent I'll repeat that 60 to 95 percent and
24	MS. McBRADY: Is there a limit to what you	24	flares typically destroy approximately 98 percent of
25	would pay for that best disposal means for your	25	the collected NMOCs, VOCs and methane. So I just
	337		339
1	community?	1	wanted to say that because it shows 60 percent as a
1 2	community? MR. SPENCER: I would say no and this is	1 2	wanted to say that because it shows 60 percent as a as opposed to, you know, 85 percent or whatever
	community?		wanted to say that because it shows 60 percent as a
2	community? MR. SPENCER: I would say no and this is	2	wanted to say that because it shows 60 percent as a as opposed to, you know, 85 percent or whatever
2 3	community? MR. SPENCER: I would say no and this is why, because I have a commitment. We don't put out	2 3	wanted to say that because it shows 60 percent as a as opposed to, you know, 85 percent or whatever the landfill says.
2 3 4	community? MR. SPENCER: I would say no and this is why, because I have a commitment. We don't put out much waste, okay? One pay to throw bag every other	2 3 4	wanted to say that because it shows 60 percent as a as opposed to, you know, 85 percent or whatever the landfill says. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there other
2 3 4 5	community? MR. SPENCER: I would say no and this is why, because I have a commitment. We don't put out much waste, okay? One pay to throw bag every other week might be an average. So before it's an issue to	2 3 4 5	wanted to say that because it shows 60 percent as a as opposed to, you know, 85 percent or whatever the landfill says. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there other redirect testimony?
2 3 4 5 6	community? MR. SPENCER: I would say no and this is why, because I have a commitment. We don't put out much waste, okay? One pay to throw bag every other week might be an average. So before it's an issue to me and my family, you know, my personal feelings are likely to be irrelevant because there's other people	2 3 4 5 6	wanted to say that because it shows 60 percent as a as opposed to, you know, 85 percent or whatever the landfill says. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there other redirect testimony? MR. LINCOLN: Yes. The truck nuisance was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	community? MR. SPENCER: I would say no and this is why, because I have a commitment. We don't put out much waste, okay? One pay to throw bag every other week might be an average. So before it's an issue to me and my family, you know, my personal feelings are likely to be irrelevant because there's other people who are going to produce a lot more waste. The idea	2 3 4 5 6 7	 wanted to say that because it shows 60 percent as a as opposed to, you know, 85 percent or whatever the landfill says. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there other redirect testimony? MR. LINCOLN: Yes. The truck nuisance was brought up and we also get truck nuisance. My previous testimony was stricken because of that, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	community? MR. SPENCER: I would say no and this is why, because I have a commitment. We don't put out much waste, okay? One pay to throw bag every other week might be an average. So before it's an issue to me and my family, you know, my personal feelings are likely to be irrelevant because there's other people who are going to produce a lot more waste. The idea is to reduce the waste stream.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 wanted to say that because it shows 60 percent as a as opposed to, you know, 85 percent or whatever the landfill says. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there other redirect testimony? MR. LINCOLN: Yes. The truck nuisance was brought up and we also get truck nuisance. My previous testimony was stricken because of that, but we do get truck noise nuisance from the jake brakes
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	community? MR. SPENCER: I would say no and this is why, because I have a commitment. We don't put out much waste, okay? One pay to throw bag every other week might be an average. So before it's an issue to me and my family, you know, my personal feelings are likely to be irrelevant because there's other people who are going to produce a lot more waste. The idea is to reduce the waste stream. MS. McBRADY: And do you feel that your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 wanted to say that because it shows 60 percent as a as opposed to, you know, 85 percent or whatever the landfill says. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there other redirect testimony? MR. LINCOLN: Yes. The truck nuisance was brought up and we also get truck nuisance. My previous testimony was stricken because of that, but we do get truck noise nuisance from the jake brakes coming off of 95 and if that is allowed to bring in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	community? MR. SPENCER: I would say no and this is why, because I have a commitment. We don't put out much waste, okay? One pay to throw bag every other week might be an average. So before it's an issue to me and my family, you know, my personal feelings are likely to be irrelevant because there's other people who are going to produce a lot more waste. The idea is to reduce the waste stream. MS. McBRADY: And do you feel that your preferences are representative of other members of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 wanted to say that because it shows 60 percent as a as opposed to, you know, 85 percent or whatever the landfill says. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there other redirect testimony? MR. LINCOLN: Yes. The truck nuisance was brought up and we also get truck nuisance. My previous testimony was stricken because of that, but we do get truck noise nuisance from the jake brakes coming off of 95 and if that is allowed to bring in more MSW, that means more truck traffic and more
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	community? MR. SPENCER: I would say no and this is why, because I have a commitment. We don't put out much waste, okay? One pay to throw bag every other week might be an average. So before it's an issue to me and my family, you know, my personal feelings are likely to be irrelevant because there's other people who are going to produce a lot more waste. The idea is to reduce the waste stream. MS. McBRADY: And do you feel that your preferences are representative of other members of your community at home?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 wanted to say that because it shows 60 percent as a as opposed to, you know, 85 percent or whatever the landfill says. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there other redirect testimony? MR. LINCOLN: Yes. The truck nuisance was brought up and we also get truck nuisance. My previous testimony was stricken because of that, but we do get truck noise nuisance from the jake brakes coming off of 95 and if that is allowed to bring in more MSW, that means more truck traffic and more noise coming off 95.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	community? MR. SPENCER: I would say no and this is why, because I have a commitment. We don't put out much waste, okay? One pay to throw bag every other week might be an average. So before it's an issue to me and my family, you know, my personal feelings are likely to be irrelevant because there's other people who are going to produce a lot more waste. The idea is to reduce the waste stream. MS. McBRADY: And do you feel that your preferences are representative of other members of your community at home? MR. SPENCER: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 wanted to say that because it shows 60 percent as a as opposed to, you know, 85 percent or whatever the landfill says. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there other redirect testimony? MR. LINCOLN: Yes. The truck nuisance was brought up and we also get truck nuisance. My previous testimony was stricken because of that, but we do get truck noise nuisance from the jake brakes coming off of 95 and if that is allowed to bring in more MSW, that means more truck traffic and more noise coming off 95. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you for that note.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	community? MR. SPENCER: I would say no and this is why, because I have a commitment. We don't put out much waste, okay? One pay to throw bag every other week might be an average. So before it's an issue to me and my family, you know, my personal feelings are likely to be irrelevant because there's other people who are going to produce a lot more waste. The idea is to reduce the waste stream. MS. McBRADY: And do you feel that your preferences are representative of other members of your community at home? MR. SPENCER: Yes. MS. McBRADY: Thank you. I don't have any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 wanted to say that because it shows 60 percent as a as opposed to, you know, 85 percent or whatever the landfill says. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there other redirect testimony? MR. LINCOLN: Yes. The truck nuisance was brought up and we also get truck nuisance. My previous testimony was stricken because of that, but we do get truck noise nuisance from the jake brakes coming off of 95 and if that is allowed to bring in more MSW, that means more truck traffic and more noise coming off 95. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you for that note. I would make sure that you understand that there is a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	community? MR. SPENCER: I would say no and this is why, because I have a commitment. We don't put out much waste, okay? One pay to throw bag every other week might be an average. So before it's an issue to me and my family, you know, my personal feelings are likely to be irrelevant because there's other people who are going to produce a lot more waste. The idea is to reduce the waste stream. MS. McBRADY: And do you feel that your preferences are representative of other members of your community at home? MR. SPENCER: Yes. MS. McBRADY: Thank you. I don't have any other questions.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 wanted to say that because it shows 60 percent as a as opposed to, you know, 85 percent or whatever the landfill says. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there other redirect testimony? MR. LINCOLN: Yes. The truck nuisance was brought up and we also get truck nuisance. My previous testimony was stricken because of that, but we do get truck noise nuisance from the jake brakes coming off of 95 and if that is allowed to bring in more MSW, that means more truck traffic and more noise coming off 95. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you for that note. I would make sure that you understand that there is a difference between truck trips in miles and the truck
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	community? MR. SPENCER: I would say no and this is why, because I have a commitment. We don't put out much waste, okay? One pay to throw bag every other week might be an average. So before it's an issue to me and my family, you know, my personal feelings are likely to be irrelevant because there's other people who are going to produce a lot more waste. The idea is to reduce the waste stream. MS. McBRADY: And do you feel that your preferences are representative of other members of your community at home? MR. SPENCER: Yes. MS. McBRADY: Thank you. I don't have any other questions. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 wanted to say that because it shows 60 percent as a as opposed to, you know, 85 percent or whatever the landfill says. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there other redirect testimony? MR. LINCOLN: Yes. The truck nuisance was brought up and we also get truck nuisance. My previous testimony was stricken because of that, but we do get truck noise nuisance from the jake brakes coming off of 95 and if that is allowed to bring in more MSW, that means more truck traffic and more noise coming off 95. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you for that note. I would make sure that you understand that there is a difference between truck trips in miles and the truck noise. So I would ask you to look to our previous
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	community? MR. SPENCER: I would say no and this is why, because I have a commitment. We don't put out much waste, okay? One pay to throw bag every other week might be an average. So before it's an issue to me and my family, you know, my personal feelings are likely to be irrelevant because there's other people who are going to produce a lot more waste. The idea is to reduce the waste stream. MS. McBRADY: And do you feel that your preferences are representative of other members of your community at home? MR. SPENCER: Yes. MS. McBRADY: Thank you. I don't have any other questions. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any other intervenors who wish to cross examine the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 wanted to say that because it shows 60 percent as a as opposed to, you know, 85 percent or whatever the landfill says. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there other redirect testimony? MR. LINCOLN: Yes. The truck nuisance was brought up and we also get truck nuisance. My previous testimony was stricken because of that, but we do get truck noise nuisance from the jake brakes coming off of 95 and if that is allowed to bring in more MSW, that means more truck traffic and more noise coming off 95. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you for that note. I would make sure that you understand that there is a difference between truck trips in miles and the truck noise. So I would ask you to look to our previous procedural orders to determine whether or not those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	community? MR. SPENCER: I would say no and this is why, because I have a commitment. We don't put out much waste, okay? One pay to throw bag every other week might be an average. So before it's an issue to me and my family, you know, my personal feelings are likely to be irrelevant because there's other people who are going to produce a lot more waste. The idea is to reduce the waste stream. MS. McBRADY: And do you feel that your preferences are representative of other members of your community at home? MR. SPENCER: Yes. MS. McBRADY: Thank you. I don't have any other questions. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any other intervenors who wish to cross examine the Citizen intervenors at this time? Seeing none, I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 wanted to say that because it shows 60 percent as a as opposed to, you know, 85 percent or whatever the landfill says. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there other redirect testimony? MR. LINCOLN: Yes. The truck nuisance was brought up and we also get truck nuisance. My previous testimony was stricken because of that, but we do get truck noise nuisance from the jake brakes coming off of 95 and if that is allowed to bring in more MSW, that means more truck traffic and more noise coming off 95. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you for that note. I would make sure that you understand that there is a difference between truck trips in miles and the truck noise. So I would ask you to look to our previous procedural orders to determine whether or not those are relevant.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	community? MR. SPENCER: I would say no and this is why, because I have a commitment. We don't put out much waste, okay? One pay to throw bag every other week might be an average. So before it's an issue to me and my family, you know, my personal feelings are likely to be irrelevant because there's other people who are going to produce a lot more waste. The idea is to reduce the waste stream. MS. McBRADY: And do you feel that your preferences are representative of other members of your community at home? MR. SPENCER: Yes. MS. McBRADY: Thank you. I don't have any other questions. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any other intervenors who wish to cross examine the Citizen intervenors at this time? Seeing none, I would ask the Citizen intervenors do you need a few	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 wanted to say that because it shows 60 percent as a as opposed to, you know, 85 percent or whatever the landfill says. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there other redirect testimony? MR. LINCOLN: Yes. The truck nuisance was brought up and we also get truck nuisance. My previous testimony was stricken because of that, but we do get truck noise nuisance from the jake brakes coming off of 95 and if that is allowed to bring in more MSW, that means more truck traffic and more noise coming off 95. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you for that note. I would make sure that you understand that there is a difference between truck trips in miles and the truck noise. So I would ask you to look to our previous procedural orders to determine whether or not those are relevant. MR. RAYBACK: Objection, and we move to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	community? MR. SPENCER: I would say no and this is why, because I have a commitment. We don't put out much waste, okay? One pay to throw bag every other week might be an average. So before it's an issue to me and my family, you know, my personal feelings are likely to be irrelevant because there's other people who are going to produce a lot more waste. The idea is to reduce the waste stream. MS. McBRADY: And do you feel that your preferences are representative of other members of your community at home? MR. SPENCER: Yes. MS. McBRADY: Thank you. I don't have any other questions. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any other intervenors who wish to cross examine the Citizen intervenors at this time? Seeing none, I would ask the Citizen intervenors do you need a few moments to discuss things as a group before we move	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 wanted to say that because it shows 60 percent as a as opposed to, you know, 85 percent or whatever the landfill says. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there other redirect testimony? MR. LINCOLN: Yes. The truck nuisance was brought up and we also get truck nuisance. My previous testimony was stricken because of that, but we do get truck noise nuisance from the jake brakes coming off of 95 and if that is allowed to bring in more MSW, that means more truck traffic and more noise coming off 95. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you for that note. I would make sure that you understand that there is a difference between truck trips in miles and the truck noise. So I would ask you to look to our previous procedural orders to determine whether or not those are relevant. MR. RAYBACK: Objection, and we move to strike that testimony. He didn't testify the first
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	community? MR. SPENCER: I would say no and this is why, because I have a commitment. We don't put out much waste, okay? One pay to throw bag every other week might be an average. So before it's an issue to me and my family, you know, my personal feelings are likely to be irrelevant because there's other people who are going to produce a lot more waste. The idea is to reduce the waste stream. MS. McBRADY: And do you feel that your preferences are representative of other members of your community at home? MR. SPENCER: Yes. MS. McBRADY: Thank you. I don't have any other questions. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any other intervenors who wish to cross examine the Citizen intervenors at this time? Seeing none, I would ask the Citizen intervenors do you need a few	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 wanted to say that because it shows 60 percent as a as opposed to, you know, 85 percent or whatever the landfill says. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there other redirect testimony? MR. LINCOLN: Yes. The truck nuisance was brought up and we also get truck nuisance. My previous testimony was stricken because of that, but we do get truck noise nuisance from the jake brakes coming off of 95 and if that is allowed to bring in more MSW, that means more truck traffic and more noise coming off 95. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you for that note. I would make sure that you understand that there is a difference between truck trips in miles and the truck noise. So I would ask you to look to our previous procedural orders to determine whether or not those are relevant. MR. RAYBACK: Objection, and we move to strike that testimony. He didn't testify the first time around so he can't offer redirect testimony now,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	community? MR. SPENCER: I would say no and this is why, because I have a commitment. We don't put out much waste, okay? One pay to throw bag every other week might be an average. So before it's an issue to me and my family, you know, my personal feelings are likely to be irrelevant because there's other people who are going to produce a lot more waste. The idea is to reduce the waste stream. MS. McBRADY: And do you feel that your preferences are representative of other members of your community at home? MR. SPENCER: Yes. MS. McBRADY: Thank you. I don't have any other questions. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any other intervenors who wish to cross examine the Citizen intervenors at this time? Seeing none, I would ask the Citizen intervenors do you need a few moments to discuss things as a group before we move	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 wanted to say that because it shows 60 percent as a as opposed to, you know, 85 percent or whatever the landfill says. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there other redirect testimony? MR. LINCOLN: Yes. The truck nuisance was brought up and we also get truck nuisance. My previous testimony was stricken because of that, but we do get truck noise nuisance from the jake brakes coming off of 95 and if that is allowed to bring in more MSW, that means more truck traffic and more noise coming off 95. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you for that note. I would make sure that you understand that there is a difference between truck trips in miles and the truck noise. So I would ask you to look to our previous procedural orders to determine whether or not those are relevant. MR. RAYBACK: Objection, and we move to strike that testimony. He didn't testify the first
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	community? MR. SPENCER: I would say no and this is why, because I have a commitment. We don't put out much waste, okay? One pay to throw bag every other week might be an average. So before it's an issue to me and my family, you know, my personal feelings are likely to be irrelevant because there's other people who are going to produce a lot more waste. The idea is to reduce the waste stream. MS. McBRADY: And do you feel that your preferences are representative of other members of your community at home? MR. SPENCER: Yes. MS. McBRADY: Thank you. I don't have any other questions. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any other intervenors who wish to cross examine the Citizen intervenors at this time? Seeing none, I would ask the Citizen intervenors do you need a few moments to discuss things as a group before we move on to the redirect testimony or are you prepared to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 wanted to say that because it shows 60 percent as a as opposed to, you know, 85 percent or whatever the landfill says. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there other redirect testimony? MR. LINCOLN: Yes. The truck nuisance was brought up and we also get truck nuisance. My previous testimony was stricken because of that, but we do get truck noise nuisance from the jake brakes coming off of 95 and if that is allowed to bring in more MSW, that means more truck traffic and more noise coming off 95. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you for that note. I would make sure that you understand that there is a difference between truck trips in miles and the truck noise. So I would ask you to look to our previous procedural orders to determine whether or not those are relevant. MR. RAYBACK: Objection, and we move to strike that testimony. He didn't testify the first time around so he can't offer redirect testimony now,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	community? MR. SPENCER: I would say no and this is why, because I have a commitment. We don't put out much waste, okay? One pay to throw bag every other week might be an average. So before it's an issue to me and my family, you know, my personal feelings are likely to be irrelevant because there's other people who are going to produce a lot more waste. The idea is to reduce the waste stream. MS. McBRADY: And do you feel that your preferences are representative of other members of your community at home? MR. SPENCER: Yes. MS. McBRADY: Thank you. I don't have any other questions. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any other intervenors who wish to cross examine the Citizen intervenors at this time? Seeing none, I would ask the Citizen intervenors do you need a few moments to discuss things as a group before we move on to the redirect testimony or are you prepared to proceed to your redirect at this time? If you need a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 wanted to say that because it shows 60 percent as a as opposed to, you know, 85 percent or whatever the landfill says. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there other redirect testimony? MR. LINCOLN: Yes. The truck nuisance was brought up and we also get truck nuisance. My previous testimony was stricken because of that, but we do get truck noise nuisance from the jake brakes coming off of 95 and if that is allowed to bring in more MSW, that means more truck traffic and more noise coming off 95. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you for that note. I would make sure that you understand that there is a difference between truck trips in miles and the truck noise. So I would ask you to look to our previous procedural orders to determine whether or not those are relevant. MR. RAYBACK: Objection, and we move to strike that testimony. He didn't testify the first time around so he can't offer redirect testimony now, and I'm sorry, nobody crossed him either, excuse me.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	community? MR. SPENCER: I would say no and this is why, because I have a commitment. We don't put out much waste, okay? One pay to throw bag every other week might be an average. So before it's an issue to me and my family, you know, my personal feelings are likely to be irrelevant because there's other people who are going to produce a lot more waste. The idea is to reduce the waste stream. MS. McBRADY: And do you feel that your preferences are representative of other members of your community at home? MR. SPENCER: Yes. MS. McBRADY: Thank you. I don't have any other questions. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any other intervenors who wish to cross examine the Citizen intervenors at this time? Seeing none, I would ask the Citizen intervenors do you need a few moments to discuss things as a group before we move on to the redirect testimony or are you prepared to proceed to your redirect at this time? If you need a moment to confer, I will provide you that moment.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 wanted to say that because it shows 60 percent as a as opposed to, you know, 85 percent or whatever the landfill says. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there other redirect testimony? MR. LINCOLN: Yes. The truck nuisance was brought up and we also get truck nuisance. My previous testimony was stricken because of that, but we do get truck noise nuisance from the jake brakes coming off of 95 and if that is allowed to bring in more MSW, that means more truck traffic and more noise coming off 95. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you for that note. I would make sure that you understand that there is a difference between truck trips in miles and the truck noise. So I would ask you to look to our previous procedural orders to determine whether or not those are relevant. MR. RAYBACK: Objection, and we move to strike that testimony. He didn't testify the first time around so he can't offer redirect testimony now, and I'm sorry, nobody crossed him either, excuse me. HEARING OFFICER: That testimony will be

		T	
	340		342
1	speak under the redirect?	1	MR. SPENCER: At the instant that it is
2	HEARING OFFICER: He is not because he did	2	being measured, which at JRL is quarterly over a
3	not provide pre-filed testimony and this would only	3	covered surface.
4	be with respect to pre-filed testimony and cross	4	MR. RAYBACK: Were you here yesterday for
5	examination of that pre-filed testimony.	5	Ms. Webb's testimony about capture efficiencies on a
6	MR. SANBORN: Okay, thank you. Mr I	6	lifetime basis?
7	can't read the name from here and I didn't write it.	7	MR. SPENCER: Sure, yes, I was.
8	I think it's Rayback.	8	MR. RAYBACK: Do you recall that she
9	HEARING OFFICER: Rayback.	9	concluded that the lifetime collection efficiency in
10	MR. SANBORN: Thank you. He brought up the	10	her exhibit, BGS/NEWSME Exhibit 21, was 86.9 percent?
11	question of where my wife and I's home is located	11	MR. SPENCER: She described a graph with her
12	within proximity of the egress to the interstate, and	12	hand like this, steep to start with and then
13	I want to address that. He asked the question, the	13	declining. I think there was a follow-up question on
14	trucks get off the interstate and would you agree	14	just what the lifetime, you know, equals and I can't
15	they only travel a tenth of a mile until they get to	15	really recall if she said it was 20 years, 30 years,
16	the entrance of JRL. He never asked me how far my	16	40 years, because what I'm saying and what Sierra
17	house was from the entrance to JRL. It's less than a	17	Club and others are saying is look out for what they
18	tenth of a mile. I also have a piece of commercial	18	call the second wave of methane generation which is
19	property between my house and the entrance to JRL.	19	after the landfill is closed, the operator is gone,
20	That's considerably less than a tenth of a mile. We	20	the state is still owner, there's settling, there's
21	see every single one of those trucks. I can walk out	21	gas coming rainwater coming in, more water, okay,
22	to get the newspaper every morning at 5:30 and I can	22	and more methane emitted.
23	count three to five trucks. My driveway is 85 feet	23	MR. RAYBACK: So when that second wave
24	long.	24	occurs, is that that's sort of in the latter part
25	The other thing that I'd like to address,	25	of the landfill life, correct? That's what you're
-		1	
	341		343
1	341 they don't all get off from I-95. Many of them get	1	343 talking about?
1		1	
	they don't all get off from I-95. Many of them get		talking about?
2	they don't all get off from I-95. Many of them get off at Exit 197 and then come up Route 16. It all	2	talking about? MR. SPENCER: It's beyond the active
2 3	they don't all get off from I-95. Many of them get off at Exit 197 and then come up Route 16. It all depends on when the commercial vehicle trucks are on	2 3	talking about? MR. SPENCER: It's beyond the active landfill life, from what I understand.
2 3 4	they don't all get off from I-95. Many of them get off at Exit 197 and then come up Route 16. It all depends on when the commercial vehicle trucks are on the interstate, but when they get off there, they're	2 3 4	talking about? MR. SPENCER: It's beyond the active landfill life, from what I understand. MR. RAYBACK: Do you recall Ms. Webb's
2 3 4 5	they don't all get off from I-95. Many of them get off at Exit 197 and then come up Route 16. It all depends on when the commercial vehicle trucks are on the interstate, but when they get off there, they're traveling by David's house, they're traveling by	2 3 4 5	talking about? MR. SPENCER: It's beyond the active landfill life, from what I understand. MR. RAYBACK: Do you recall Ms. Webb's exhibit had that represented as years 41 to 100 final
2 3 4 5 6	they don't all get off from I-95. Many of them get off at Exit 197 and then come up Route 16. It all depends on when the commercial vehicle trucks are on the interstate, but when they get off there, they're traveling by David's house, they're traveling by Ralph Coffman's property, they see it, they hear it,	2 3 4 5 6	talking about? MR. SPENCER: It's beyond the active landfill life, from what I understand. MR. RAYBACK: Do you recall Ms. Webb's exhibit had that represented as years 41 to 100 final cover with no gas collection which she explained was
2 3 4 5 6 7	they don't all get off from I-95. Many of them get off at Exit 197 and then come up Route 16. It all depends on when the commercial vehicle trucks are on the interstate, but when they get off there, they're traveling by David's house, they're traveling by Ralph Coffman's property, they see it, they hear it, they can't enjoy their property. So I just wanted to	2 3 4 5 6 7	talking about? MR. SPENCER: It's beyond the active landfill life, from what I understand. MR. RAYBACK: Do you recall Ms. Webb's exhibit had that represented as years 41 to 100 final cover with no gas collection which she explained was conservative; she said there was only 6 percent total
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	they don't all get off from I-95. Many of them get off at Exit 197 and then come up Route 16. It all depends on when the commercial vehicle trucks are on the interstate, but when they get off there, they're traveling by David's house, they're traveling by Ralph Coffman's property, they see it, they hear it, they can't enjoy their property. So I just wanted to clarify that while I do live on the other side,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	talking about? MR. SPENCER: It's beyond the active landfill life, from what I understand. MR. RAYBACK: Do you recall Ms. Webb's exhibit had that represented as years 41 to 100 final cover with no gas collection which she explained was conservative; she said there was only 6 percent total generation lifetime occurring in that 60-year period.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	they don't all get off from I-95. Many of them get off at Exit 197 and then come up Route 16. It all depends on when the commercial vehicle trucks are on the interstate, but when they get off there, they're traveling by David's house, they're traveling by Ralph Coffman's property, they see it, they hear it, they can't enjoy their property. So I just wanted to clarify that while I do live on the other side, there's no imaginary line between me and the entrance	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	talking about? MR. SPENCER: It's beyond the active landfill life, from what I understand. MR. RAYBACK: Do you recall Ms. Webb's exhibit had that represented as years 41 to 100 final cover with no gas collection which she explained was conservative; she said there was only 6 percent total generation lifetime occurring in that 60-year period. Do you disagree with that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	they don't all get off from I-95. Many of them get off at Exit 197 and then come up Route 16. It all depends on when the commercial vehicle trucks are on the interstate, but when they get off there, they're traveling by David's house, they're traveling by Ralph Coffman's property, they see it, they hear it, they can't enjoy their property. So I just wanted to clarify that while I do live on the other side, there's no imaginary line between me and the entrance to JRL. We still see it, we still hear it, there's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	talking about? MR. SPENCER: It's beyond the active landfill life, from what I understand. MR. RAYBACK: Do you recall Ms. Webb's exhibit had that represented as years 41 to 100 final cover with no gas collection which she explained was conservative; she said there was only 6 percent total generation lifetime occurring in that 60-year period. Do you disagree with that? MR. SPENCER: I don't have the scientific
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	they don't all get off from I-95. Many of them get off at Exit 197 and then come up Route 16. It all depends on when the commercial vehicle trucks are on the interstate, but when they get off there, they're traveling by David's house, they're traveling by Ralph Coffman's property, they see it, they hear it, they can't enjoy their property. So I just wanted to clarify that while I do live on the other side, there's no imaginary line between me and the entrance to JRL. We still see it, we still hear it, there's still noise. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	talking about? MR. SPENCER: It's beyond the active landfill life, from what I understand. MR. RAYBACK: Do you recall Ms. Webb's exhibit had that represented as years 41 to 100 final cover with no gas collection which she explained was conservative; she said there was only 6 percent total generation lifetime occurring in that 60-year period. Do you disagree with that? MR. SPENCER: I don't have the scientific basis to make a statement whether I agree or disagree
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	they don't all get off from I-95. Many of them get off at Exit 197 and then come up Route 16. It all depends on when the commercial vehicle trucks are on the interstate, but when they get off there, they're traveling by David's house, they're traveling by Ralph Coffman's property, they see it, they hear it, they can't enjoy their property. So I just wanted to clarify that while I do live on the other side, there's no imaginary line between me and the entrance to JRL. We still see it, we still hear it, there's still noise. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	talking about? MR. SPENCER: It's beyond the active landfill life, from what I understand. MR. RAYBACK: Do you recall Ms. Webb's exhibit had that represented as years 41 to 100 final cover with no gas collection which she explained was conservative; she said there was only 6 percent total generation lifetime occurring in that 60-year period. Do you disagree with that? MR. SPENCER: I don't have the scientific basis to make a statement whether I agree or disagree with that. I just lack the knowledge, but it sounds
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	they don't all get off from I-95. Many of them get off at Exit 197 and then come up Route 16. It all depends on when the commercial vehicle trucks are on the interstate, but when they get off there, they're traveling by David's house, they're traveling by Ralph Coffman's property, they see it, they hear it, they can't enjoy their property. So I just wanted to clarify that while I do live on the other side, there's no imaginary line between me and the entrance to JRL. We still see it, we still hear it, there's still noise. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there any other redirect from the Citizen intervenors at this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	talking about? MR. SPENCER: It's beyond the active landfill life, from what I understand. MR. RAYBACK: Do you recall Ms. Webb's exhibit had that represented as years 41 to 100 final cover with no gas collection which she explained was conservative; she said there was only 6 percent total generation lifetime occurring in that 60-year period. Do you disagree with that? MR. SPENCER: I don't have the scientific basis to make a statement whether I agree or disagree with that. I just lack the knowledge, but it sounds very low to me.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	they don't all get off from I-95. Many of them get off at Exit 197 and then come up Route 16. It all depends on when the commercial vehicle trucks are on the interstate, but when they get off there, they're traveling by David's house, they're traveling by Ralph Coffman's property, they see it, they hear it, they can't enjoy their property. So I just wanted to clarify that while I do live on the other side, there's no imaginary line between me and the entrance to JRL. We still see it, we still hear it, there's still noise. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there any other redirect from the Citizen intervenors at this time? Seeing none, we will move on to the recross of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	talking about? MR. SPENCER: It's beyond the active landfill life, from what I understand. MR. RAYBACK: Do you recall Ms. Webb's exhibit had that represented as years 41 to 100 final cover with no gas collection which she explained was conservative; she said there was only 6 percent total generation lifetime occurring in that 60-year period. Do you disagree with that? MR. SPENCER: I don't have the scientific basis to make a statement whether I agree or disagree with that. I just lack the knowledge, but it sounds very low to me. MR. RAYBACK: Thank you. No further
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	they don't all get off from I-95. Many of them get off at Exit 197 and then come up Route 16. It all depends on when the commercial vehicle trucks are on the interstate, but when they get off there, they're traveling by David's house, they're traveling by Ralph Coffman's property, they see it, they hear it, they can't enjoy their property. So I just wanted to clarify that while I do live on the other side, there's no imaginary line between me and the entrance to JRL. We still see it, we still hear it, there's still noise. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there any other redirect from the Citizen intervenors at this time? Seeing none, we will move on to the recross of the Citizen intervenors.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	talking about? MR. SPENCER: It's beyond the active landfill life, from what I understand. MR. RAYBACK: Do you recall Ms. Webb's exhibit had that represented as years 41 to 100 final cover with no gas collection which she explained was conservative; she said there was only 6 percent total generation lifetime occurring in that 60-year period. Do you disagree with that? MR. SPENCER: I don't have the scientific basis to make a statement whether I agree or disagree with that. I just lack the knowledge, but it sounds very low to me. MR. RAYBACK: Thank you. No further questions.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	they don't all get off from I-95. Many of them get off at Exit 197 and then come up Route 16. It all depends on when the commercial vehicle trucks are on the interstate, but when they get off there, they're traveling by David's house, they're traveling by Ralph Coffman's property, they see it, they hear it, they can't enjoy their property. So I just wanted to clarify that while I do live on the other side, there's no imaginary line between me and the entrance to JRL. We still see it, we still hear it, there's still noise. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there any other redirect from the Citizen intervenors at this time? Seeing none, we will move on to the recross of the Citizen intervenors. MR. RAYBACK: Mr. Spencer, you pointed us to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<pre>talking about? MR. SPENCER: It's beyond the active landfill life, from what I understand. MR. RAYBACK: Do you recall Ms. Webb's exhibit had that represented as years 41 to 100 final cover with no gas collection which she explained was conservative; she said there was only 6 percent total generation lifetime occurring in that 60-year period. Do you disagree with that? MR. SPENCER: I don't have the scientific basis to make a statement whether I agree or disagree with that. I just lack the knowledge, but it sounds very low to me. MR. RAYBACK: Thank you. No further questions. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there any</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	they don't all get off from I-95. Many of them get off at Exit 197 and then come up Route 16. It all depends on when the commercial vehicle trucks are on the interstate, but when they get off there, they're traveling by David's house, they're traveling by Ralph Coffman's property, they see it, they hear it, they can't enjoy their property. So I just wanted to clarify that while I do live on the other side, there's no imaginary line between me and the entrance to JRL. We still see it, we still hear it, there's still noise. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there any other redirect from the Citizen intervenors at this time? Seeing none, we will move on to the recross of the Citizen intervenors. MR. RAYBACK: Mr. Spencer, you pointed us to page 14 of the air license where you read off the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 talking about? MR. SPENCER: It's beyond the active landfill life, from what I understand. MR. RAYBACK: Do you recall Ms. Webb's exhibit had that represented as years 41 to 100 final cover with no gas collection which she explained was conservative; she said there was only 6 percent total generation lifetime occurring in that 60-year period. Do you disagree with that? MR. SPENCER: I don't have the scientific basis to make a statement whether I agree or disagree with that. I just lack the knowledge, but it sounds very low to me. MR. RAYBACK: Thank you. No further questions. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there any other recross?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	they don't all get off from I-95. Many of them get off at Exit 197 and then come up Route 16. It all depends on when the commercial vehicle trucks are on the interstate, but when they get off there, they're traveling by David's house, they're traveling by Ralph Coffman's property, they see it, they hear it, they can't enjoy their property. So I just wanted to clarify that while I do live on the other side, there's no imaginary line between me and the entrance to JRL. We still see it, we still hear it, there's still noise. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there any other redirect from the Citizen intervenors at this time? Seeing none, we will move on to the recross of the Citizen intervenors. MR. RAYBACK: Mr. Spencer, you pointed us to page 14 of the air license where you read off the provision about the AP 42 factor that EPA uses for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<pre>talking about? MR. SPENCER: It's beyond the active landfill life, from what I understand. MR. RAYBACK: Do you recall Ms. Webb's exhibit had that represented as years 41 to 100 final cover with no gas collection which she explained was conservative; she said there was only 6 percent total generation lifetime occurring in that 60-year period. Do you disagree with that? MR. SPENCER: I don't have the scientific basis to make a statement whether I agree or disagree with that. I just lack the knowledge, but it sounds very low to me. MR. RAYBACK: Thank you. No further questions. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there any other recross? MS. McBRADY: No, there is not.</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	they don't all get off from I-95. Many of them get off at Exit 197 and then come up Route 16. It all depends on when the commercial vehicle trucks are on the interstate, but when they get off there, they're traveling by David's house, they're traveling by Ralph Coffman's property, they see it, they hear it, they can't enjoy their property. So I just wanted to clarify that while I do live on the other side, there's no imaginary line between me and the entrance to JRL. We still see it, we still hear it, there's still noise. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there any other redirect from the Citizen intervenors at this time? Seeing none, we will move on to the recross of the Citizen intervenors. MR. RAYBACK: Mr. Spencer, you pointed us to page 14 of the air license where you read off the provision about the AP 42 factor that EPA uses for estimates of gas collection. Did I hear correctly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<pre>talking about? MR. SPENCER: It's beyond the active landfill life, from what I understand. MR. RAYBACK: Do you recall Ms. Webb's exhibit had that represented as years 41 to 100 final cover with no gas collection which she explained was conservative; she said there was only 6 percent total generation lifetime occurring in that 60-year period. Do you disagree with that? MR. SPENCER: I don't have the scientific basis to make a statement whether I agree or disagree with that. I just lack the knowledge, but it sounds very low to me. MR. RAYBACK: Thank you. No further questions. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there any other recross? MS. McBRADY: No, there is not. HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Does the Department</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	they don't all get off from I-95. Many of them get off at Exit 197 and then come up Route 16. It all depends on when the commercial vehicle trucks are on the interstate, but when they get off there, they're traveling by David's house, they're traveling by Ralph Coffman's property, they see it, they hear it, they can't enjoy their property. So I just wanted to clarify that while I do live on the other side, there's no imaginary line between me and the entrance to JRL. We still see it, we still hear it, there's still noise. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there any other redirect from the Citizen intervenors at this time? Seeing none, we will move on to the recross of the Citizen intervenors. MR. RAYBACK: Mr. Spencer, you pointed us to page 14 of the air license where you read off the provision about the AP 42 factor that EPA uses for estimates of gas collection. Did I hear correctly and am I reading this correctly that it's a range of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<pre>talking about?</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	they don't all get off from I-95. Many of them get off at Exit 197 and then come up Route 16. It all depends on when the commercial vehicle trucks are on the interstate, but when they get off there, they're traveling by David's house, they're traveling by Ralph Coffman's property, they see it, they hear it, they can't enjoy their property. So I just wanted to clarify that while I do live on the other side, there's no imaginary line between me and the entrance to JRL. We still see it, we still hear it, there's still noise. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there any other redirect from the Citizen intervenors at this time? Seeing none, we will move on to the recross of the Citizen intervenors. MR. RAYBACK: Mr. Spencer, you pointed us to page 14 of the air license where you read off the provision about the AP 42 factor that EPA uses for estimates of gas collection. Did I hear correctly and am I reading this correctly that it's a range of between 60 and 95 percent?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	talking about? MR. SPENCER: It's beyond the active landfill life, from what I understand. MR. RAYBACK: Do you recall Ms. Webb's exhibit had that represented as years 41 to 100 final cover with no gas collection which she explained was conservative; she said there was only 6 percent total generation lifetime occurring in that 60-year period. Do you disagree with that? MR. SPENCER: I don't have the scientific basis to make a statement whether I agree or disagree with that. I just lack the knowledge, but it sounds very low to me. MR. RAYBACK: Thank you. No further questions. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there any other recross? MS. McBRADY: No, there is not. HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Does the Department have any questions? MR. PARKER: No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	they don't all get off from I-95. Many of them get off at Exit 197 and then come up Route 16. It all depends on when the commercial vehicle trucks are on the interstate, but when they get off there, they're traveling by David's house, they're traveling by Ralph Coffman's property, they see it, they hear it, they can't enjoy their property. So I just wanted to clarify that while I do live on the other side, there's no imaginary line between me and the entrance to JRL. We still see it, we still hear it, there's still noise. Thank you. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there any other redirect from the Citizen intervenors at this time? Seeing none, we will move on to the recross of the Citizen intervenors. MR. RAYBACK: Mr. Spencer, you pointed us to page 14 of the air license where you read off the provision about the AP 42 factor that EPA uses for estimates of gas collection. Did I hear correctly and am I reading this correctly that it's a range of between 60 and 95 percent? MR. SPENCER: Correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	talking about? MR. SPENCER: It's beyond the active landfill life, from what I understand. MR. RAYBACK: Do you recall Ms. Webb's exhibit had that represented as years 41 to 100 final cover with no gas collection which she explained was conservative; she said there was only 6 percent total generation lifetime occurring in that 60-year period. Do you disagree with that? MR. SPENCER: I don't have the scientific basis to make a statement whether I agree or disagree with that. I just lack the knowledge, but it sounds very low to me. MR. RAYBACK: Thank you. No further questions. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there any other recross? MS. McBRADY: No, there is not. HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Does the Department have any questions? MR. PARKER: No. HEARING OFFICER: That concludes the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	they don't all get off from I-95. Many of them get off at Exit 197 and then come up Route 16. It all depends on when the commercial vehicle trucks are on the interstate, but when they get off there, they're traveling by David's house, they're traveling by Ralph Coffman's property, they see it, they hear it, they can't enjoy their property. So I just wanted to clarify that while I do live on the other side, there's no imaginary line between me and the entrance to JRL. We still see it, we still hear it, there's still noise. Thank you. MEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there any other redirect from the Citizen intervenors at this time? Seeing none, we will move on to the recross of the Citizen intervenors. MR. RAYBACK: Mr. Spencer, you pointed us to page 14 of the air license where you read off the provision about the AP 42 factor that EPA uses for estimates of gas collection. Did I hear correctly and am I reading this correctly that it's a range of between 60 and 95 percent? MR. SPENCER: Correct. MR. RAYBACK: You focused on the 60 percent	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	talking about? MR. SPENCER: It's beyond the active landfill life, from what I understand. MR. RAYBACK: Do you recall Ms. Webb's exhibit had that represented as years 41 to 100 final cover with no gas collection which she explained was conservative; she said there was only 6 percent total generation lifetime occurring in that 60-year period. Do you disagree with that? MR. SPENCER: I don't have the scientific basis to make a statement whether I agree or disagree with that. I just lack the knowledge, but it sounds very low to me. MR. RAYBACK: Thank you. No further questions. HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Is there any other recross? MS. McBRADY: No, there is not. HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Does the Department have any questions? MR. PARKER: No. HEARING OFFICER: That concludes the testimony of the Citizen intervenors. Due to

	we re going to recess for functionally we will resume		there for about eight years and prior to becoming the
2	the hearing at 1:00, and at that time we will have	2	city manager for Biddeford, I was the city manager
3	the summary testimony of the cities of Biddeford and	3	for Bath, Maine for eight years before that and have
4	Saco at 1:00. So we are recessing for lunch and will	4	been in the profession for about 40 years.
5	be back here at 1:00 with the summary testimony of	5	The city of Biddeford offers the following
6	Biddeford and Saco.	6	comments in the matter of the amendment application
7	(LUNCH RECESS)	7	to accept municipal solid waste from Maine sources.
8	()	8	The city of Biddeford supports the application. The
9	HEARING OFFICER: Good afternoon. Again,	9	approval of the application provides several direct
	2 .		
10	my name is Heather Parent. We are back on the record	10	and indirect benefits, all of which are consistent
11	for the Juniper Ridge Landfill Amendment Application	11	with and support the Maine solid waste management
12	public hearings. We are reconvening and starting	12	policies.
13	with the summary testimony by the cities of Biddeford	13	The city of Biddeford is well aware of the
14	and Saco. I do believe that I will need to swear in	14	larger policy issues surrounding the solid waste
15	those people who have not been sworn in yet. So at	15	management having lived with the ramifications within
16	this time if you have not been sworn in and plan on	16	the city of Biddeford, being a host community for the
17	testifying this afternoon, please stand and raise	17	Maine Energy Recovery Facility, Maine Energy, since
18	your right hand. Repeat after me, do you affirm	18	1987. Maine Energy has served as the solution to a
19	do you affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth and	19	solid waste management disposal issue for Biddeford,
20	nothing but the truth?	20	for 13 southern Maine communities, as well as many
21	(Witness responds in the affirmative.)	21	other communities within the state of Maine for about
22	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We will begin	22	25 years. Unfortunately the facility has also served
23	with the testimony of the cities of Biddeford and	23	as the processor of approximately 170,000 tons of
24	Saco, and if you are testifying, please come forward	24	out-of-state waste and on November 30th, 2012, the
25	to the table. You will have ten minutes for your	25	city of Biddeford purchased the Maine Energy facility
_		-	.,
	345		347
1	testimony.	1	and the facility ceased operations at the end of
2	MR. KEITH JACQUES: Thank you. My name is	2	2012. Beginning on January 1, 2013, Biddeford began
3	Keith Jacques and I'm the	3	transporting its waste to the transfer facility in
4	HEARING OFFICER: Can you turn on your	4	Westbrook, Maine. Biddeford has a substantial
5	microphone, please?	5	interest in ensuring that the state-owned Juniper
6	MR. JACQUES: Good afternoon. My name is	6	Ridge facility, JRL, available will become
7	Keith Jacques and I am the city solicitor for the	7	available to Biddeford and other southern Maine
8	city of Biddeford and for the purpose of this	8	communities previously served by Maine Energy. The
9	afternoon, I am representing both the city of	9	application proposes that Juniper Ridge will receive
10	Biddeford and Saco. Speaking on behalf of the twin	10	up to 93,000 tons per year of municipal solid waste
11	cities will be John Bubier who is the city manager	11	which they previously disposed of at Maine Energy and
12	for the city of Biddeford, who filed his pre-filed	12	at the same time, however, the amount of front-end
13	testimony a couple weeks ago.	13	processing residue and incinerator ash disposed at
14	HEARING OFFICER: And can you speak up a	14	the Juniper Ridge Landfill will decrease by
15	little bit, please?	15	approximately the same amount.
16	MR. JACQUES: I'm done talking, how's that?	16	Biddeford understands that the application
17	HEARING OFFICER: That's fine too. Thank	17	will not represent an increase in the amount of the
18	you.	18	solid waste disposed annually at Juniper Ridge nor
19	MR. BUBIER: Are these live or do I need	19	will it affect the design and life expectancy of
20	this?	20	Juniper Ridge.
21	HEARING OFFICER: You will need the	21	Biddeford also has a substantial interest in
22	hand-held mike.	22	the amount of municipal solid waste that is disposed
23	MR. BUBIER: Thank you. My name is John	23	at Maine facilities. In this regard, Biddeford has
24	Bubier, and I'm the appointed city manager for the	24	been an advocate for improving state-wide recycling
1			
25	city of Biddeford, Maine. I've been the city manager	25	and limiting the import of out-of-state waste for

1

We're going to recess for lunch and we will resume

1

05/07/2013 01:06:37 PM

346

there for about eight years and prior to becoming the

	348		350
1	Maine solid waste for many years. The application	1	achieved without increasing the amount of solid waste
2	achieves these goals. The closure of the Maine	2	disposal per year at Juniper Ridge and without
3	Energy facility and the diversion of the state	3	impacting the municipal solid waste capacity for the
4	in-state municipal solid waste to Juniper Ridge will	4	state of Maine as a whole.
5	ensure that approximately 170,000 tons of	5	For those reasons, Biddeford supports the
6	out-of-state waste previously processed and combusted	6	application. Thank you for your consideration.
7	at Maine Energy will remain outside of the state of	7	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Now we're
8	Maine's boundaries, thereby resulting in a	8	moving on to the cross examination of the cities of
9	significant source reduction in Maine's waste	9	Biddeford and Saco with MMWAC and ecomaine. You are
10	management system. It is Biddeford's belief that the	10	limited to a total of ten minutes.
11	application will further reduce the disposal of	11	MR. BOWER: Okay. Should I grab that
12	municipal solid waste by facilitating the development	12	microphone?
13	of municipal recycling programs additional	13	HEARING OFFICER: Yes, and Mr. Bubier, I
14	recycling programs. In this regard beginning this	14	would ask you to please project when you respond to
15	July of 2012, Biddeford will commence a curbside	15	the questions. Thank you.
16	single sort recycling program that it has sought	16	MR. BOWER: Good afternoon, Mr. Bubier. Is
17	after for the past ten years.	17	it Bubier or Bubia?
18	It is Biddeford's understanding that Casella	18	MR. BUBIER: Bubier.
19	Waste Systems and/or its affiliates are planning	19	MR. BOWER: Okay. My name is Mark Bower and
20	single sort recycling facilities in the Lewiston area	20	I'm an attorney representing ecomaine and MMWAC in
21	and it is reasonable to assume through general	21	this matter. I just have a few questions for you
22	conversation that as additional single sort recycling	22	regarding your testimony, the remarks that you just
23	programs at facilities are made available and as	23	gave, and as well the letter agreement between the
24	contemplated by this application, other	24	city of Biddeford and Casella dated November 30th,
25	municipalities will increase their recycling efforts,	25	2012. Do you happen to have that letter agreement
	040		351
	349		301
1	thereby diverting municipal solid waste from the	1	that was part of the purchase and sale agreement with
1 2		1 2	
	thereby diverting municipal solid waste from the		that was part of the purchase and sale agreement with
2	thereby diverting municipal solid waste from the Maine solid waste system.	2	that was part of the purchase and sale agreement with you?
2 3	thereby diverting municipal solid waste from the Maine solid waste system. The elimination of approximately 170,000	2 3	that was part of the purchase and sale agreement with you? MR. BUBIER: I don't.
2 3 4	thereby diverting municipal solid waste from the Maine solid waste system. The elimination of approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and the diversion of the	2 3 4	that was part of the purchase and sale agreement with you? MR. BUBIER: I don't. MR. BOWER: Okay. It was attached as
2 3 4 5	thereby diverting municipal solid waste from the Maine solid waste system. The elimination of approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and the diversion of the in-state municipal solid waste through greater	2 3 4 5	that was part of the purchase and sale agreement with you? MR. BUBIER: I don't. MR. BOWER: Okay. It was attached as Exhibit A to Joe Kazar's testimony and so just for
2 3 4 5 6	thereby diverting municipal solid waste from the Maine solid waste system. The elimination of approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and the diversion of the in-state municipal solid waste through greater recycling efforts without a corresponding increase in the amount of solid waste disposed at the Juniper Ridge Landfill will have a positive implication for	2 3 4 5 6	that was part of the purchase and sale agreement with you? MR. BUBIER: I don't. MR. BOWER: Okay. It was attached as Exhibit A to Joe Kazar's testimony and so just for your reference, I'll give you a copy of that exhibit.
2 3 4 5 6 7	thereby diverting municipal solid waste from the Maine solid waste system. The elimination of approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and the diversion of the in-state municipal solid waste through greater recycling efforts without a corresponding increase in the amount of solid waste disposed at the Juniper Ridge Landfill will have a positive implication for the citizens of Maine which is consistent with the	2 3 4 5 6 7	that was part of the purchase and sale agreement with you? MR. BUBIER: I don't. MR. BOWER: Okay. It was attached as Exhibit A to Joe Kazar's testimony and so just for your reference, I'll give you a copy of that exhibit. MR. BUBIER: Thank you. MR. BOWER: Would you agree that this do you recall signing this agreement in the end of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	thereby diverting municipal solid waste from the Maine solid waste system. The elimination of approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and the diversion of the in-state municipal solid waste through greater recycling efforts without a corresponding increase in the amount of solid waste disposed at the Juniper Ridge Landfill will have a positive implication for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that was part of the purchase and sale agreement with you? MR. BUBIER: I don't. MR. BOWER: Okay. It was attached as Exhibit A to Joe Kazar's testimony and so just for your reference, I'll give you a copy of that exhibit. MR. BUBIER: Thank you. MR. BOWER: Would you agree that this do
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	thereby diverting municipal solid waste from the Maine solid waste system. The elimination of approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and the diversion of the in-state municipal solid waste through greater recycling efforts without a corresponding increase in the amount of solid waste disposed at the Juniper Ridge Landfill will have a positive implication for the citizens of Maine which is consistent with the Maine solid waste management policy. The state's solid waste management hierarchy	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	that was part of the purchase and sale agreement with you? MR. BUBIER: I don't. MR. BOWER: Okay. It was attached as Exhibit A to Joe Kazar's testimony and so just for your reference, I'll give you a copy of that exhibit. MR. BUBIER: Thank you. MR. BUBIER: Thank you. MR. BOWER: Would you agree that this do you recall signing this agreement in the end of November last year? MR. BUBIER: Sure, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	thereby diverting municipal solid waste from the Maine solid waste system. The elimination of approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and the diversion of the in-state municipal solid waste through greater recycling efforts without a corresponding increase in the amount of solid waste disposed at the Juniper Ridge Landfill will have a positive implication for the citizens of Maine which is consistent with the Maine solid waste management policy. The state's solid waste management hierarchy recognizes it as the policy of the state to actively	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	that was part of the purchase and sale agreement with you? MR. BUBIER: I don't. MR. BOWER: Okay. It was attached as Exhibit A to Joe Kazar's testimony and so just for your reference, I'll give you a copy of that exhibit. MR. BUBIER: Thank you. MR. BUBIER: Thank you. MR. BOWER: Would you agree that this do you recall signing this agreement in the end of November last year? MR. BUBIER: Sure, yes. MR. BOWER: Would you agree that the purpose
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	thereby diverting municipal solid waste from the Maine solid waste system. The elimination of approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and the diversion of the in-state municipal solid waste through greater recycling efforts without a corresponding increase in the amount of solid waste disposed at the Juniper Ridge Landfill will have a positive implication for the citizens of Maine which is consistent with the Maine solid waste management policy. The state's solid waste management hierarchy recognizes it as the policy of the state to actively promote and encourage waste reduction and from all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that was part of the purchase and sale agreement with you? MR. BUBIER: I don't. MR. BOWER: Okay. It was attached as Exhibit A to Joe Kazar's testimony and so just for your reference, I'll give you a copy of that exhibit. MR. BUBIER: Thank you. MR. BUBIER: Thank you. MR. BOWER: Would you agree that this do you recall signing this agreement in the end of November last year? MR. BUBIER: Sure, yes. MR. BOWER: Would you agree that the purpose of this agreement was to waive certain conditions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	thereby diverting municipal solid waste from the Maine solid waste system. The elimination of approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and the diversion of the in-state municipal solid waste through greater recycling efforts without a corresponding increase in the amount of solid waste disposed at the Juniper Ridge Landfill will have a positive implication for the citizens of Maine which is consistent with the Maine solid waste management policy. The state's solid waste management hierarchy recognizes it as the policy of the state to actively promote and encourage waste reduction and from all sources to maximize waste diversion efforts. The	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that was part of the purchase and sale agreement with you? MR. BUBIER: I don't. MR. BOWER: Okay. It was attached as Exhibit A to Joe Kazar's testimony and so just for your reference, I'll give you a copy of that exhibit. MR. BUBIER: Thank you. MR. BUBIER: Thank you. MR. BOWER: Would you agree that this do you recall signing this agreement in the end of November last year? MR. BUBIER: Sure, yes. MR. BOWER: Would you agree that the purpose of this agreement was to waive certain conditions precedent to the purchase and sale agreement as it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	thereby diverting municipal solid waste from the Maine solid waste system. The elimination of approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and the diversion of the in-state municipal solid waste through greater recycling efforts without a corresponding increase in the amount of solid waste disposed at the Juniper Ridge Landfill will have a positive implication for the citizens of Maine which is consistent with the Maine solid waste management policy. The state's solid waste management hierarchy recognizes it as the policy of the state to actively promote and encourage waste reduction and from all sources to maximize waste diversion efforts. The application eliminates approximately 170,000 tons, as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<pre>that was part of the purchase and sale agreement with you?</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	thereby diverting municipal solid waste from the Maine solid waste system. The elimination of approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and the diversion of the in-state municipal solid waste through greater recycling efforts without a corresponding increase in the amount of solid waste disposed at the Juniper Ridge Landfill will have a positive implication for the citizens of Maine which is consistent with the Maine solid waste management policy. The state's solid waste management hierarchy recognizes it as the policy of the state to actively promote and encourage waste reduction and from all sources to maximize waste diversion efforts. The application eliminates approximately 170,000 tons, as we said earlier, of state waste and actively	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that was part of the purchase and sale agreement with you? MR. BUBIER: I don't. MR. BOWER: Okay. It was attached as Exhibit A to Joe Kazar's testimony and so just for your reference, I'll give you a copy of that exhibit. MR. BUBIER: Thank you. MR. BUBIER: Thank you. MR. BOWER: Would you agree that this do you recall signing this agreement in the end of November last year? MR. BUBIER: Sure, yes. MR. BUBIER: Sure, yes. MR. BOWER: Would you agree that the purpose of this agreement was to waive certain conditions precedent to the purchase and sale agreement as it had been drafted? MR. BUBIER: The original question that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	thereby diverting municipal solid waste from the Maine solid waste system. The elimination of approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and the diversion of the in-state municipal solid waste through greater recycling efforts without a corresponding increase in the amount of solid waste disposed at the Juniper Ridge Landfill will have a positive implication for the citizens of Maine which is consistent with the Maine solid waste management policy. The state's solid waste management hierarchy recognizes it as the policy of the state to actively promote and encourage waste reduction and from all sources to maximize waste diversion efforts. The application eliminates approximately 170,000 tons, as we said earlier, of state waste and actively encourages single sort recycling. A potential of up	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that was part of the purchase and sale agreement with you? MR. BUBIER: I don't. MR. BOWER: Okay. It was attached as Exhibit A to Joe Kazar's testimony and so just for your reference, I'll give you a copy of that exhibit. MR. BUBIER: Thank you. MR. BUBIER: Thank you. MR. BOWER: Would you agree that this do you recall signing this agreement in the end of November last year? MR. BUBIER: Sure, yes. MR. BUBIER: Sure, yes. MR. BOWER: Would you agree that the purpose of this agreement was to waive certain conditions precedent to the purchase and sale agreement as it had been drafted? MR. BUBIER: The original question that you're asking is are you asking what is the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	thereby diverting municipal solid waste from the Maine solid waste system. The elimination of approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and the diversion of the in-state municipal solid waste through greater recycling efforts without a corresponding increase in the amount of solid waste disposed at the Juniper Ridge Landfill will have a positive implication for the citizens of Maine which is consistent with the Maine solid waste management policy. The state's solid waste management hierarchy recognizes it as the policy of the state to actively promote and encourage waste reduction and from all sources to maximize waste diversion efforts. The application eliminates approximately 170,000 tons, as we said earlier, of state waste and actively encourages single sort recycling. A potential of up to 40 percent recycling may be reachable as a result	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that was part of the purchase and sale agreement with you? MR. BUBIER: I don't. MR. BOWER: Okay. It was attached as Exhibit A to Joe Kazar's testimony and so just for your reference, I'll give you a copy of that exhibit. MR. BUBIER: Thank you. MR. BUBIER: Thank you. MR. BOWER: Would you agree that this do you recall signing this agreement in the end of November last year? MR. BUBIER: Sure, yes. MR. BUBIER: Sure, yes. MR. BOWER: Would you agree that the purpose of this agreement was to waive certain conditions precedent to the purchase and sale agreement as it had been drafted? MR. BUBIER: The original question that you're asking is are you asking what is the situation as it relates to the city and Casella with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	thereby diverting municipal solid waste from the Maine solid waste system. The elimination of approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and the diversion of the in-state municipal solid waste through greater recycling efforts without a corresponding increase in the amount of solid waste disposed at the Juniper Ridge Landfill will have a positive implication for the citizens of Maine which is consistent with the Maine solid waste management policy. The state's solid waste management hierarchy recognizes it as the policy of the state to actively promote and encourage waste reduction and from all sources to maximize waste diversion efforts. The application eliminates approximately 170,000 tons, as we said earlier, of state waste and actively encourages single sort recycling. A potential of up to 40 percent recycling may be reachable as a result of that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<pre>that was part of the purchase and sale agreement with you?</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	thereby diverting municipal solid waste from the Maine solid waste system. The elimination of approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and the diversion of the in-state municipal solid waste through greater recycling efforts without a corresponding increase in the amount of solid waste disposed at the Juniper Ridge Landfill will have a positive implication for the citizens of Maine which is consistent with the Maine solid waste management policy. The state's solid waste management hierarchy recognizes it as the policy of the state to actively promote and encourage waste reduction and from all sources to maximize waste diversion efforts. The application eliminates approximately 170,000 tons, as we said earlier, of state waste and actively encourages single sort recycling. A potential of up to 40 percent recycling may be reachable as a result of that. In addition, an outdated and inefficient	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that was part of the purchase and sale agreement with you? MR. BUBIER: I don't. MR. BOWER: Okay. It was attached as Exhibit A to Joe Kazar's testimony and so just for your reference, I'll give you a copy of that exhibit. MR. BUBIER: Thank you. MR. BUBIER: Thank you. MR. BOWER: Would you agree that this do you recall signing this agreement in the end of November last year? MR. BUBIER: Sure, yes. MR. BUBIER: Sure, yes. MR. BOWER: Would you agree that the purpose of this agreement was to waive certain conditions precedent to the purchase and sale agreement as it had been drafted? MR. BUBIER: The original question that you're asking is are you asking what is the situation as it relates to the city and Casella with respect to support for their application? MR. BOWER: Sorry, I probably didn't ask you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	thereby diverting municipal solid waste from the Maine solid waste system. The elimination of approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and the diversion of the in-state municipal solid waste through greater recycling efforts without a corresponding increase in the amount of solid waste disposed at the Juniper Ridge Landfill will have a positive implication for the citizens of Maine which is consistent with the Maine solid waste management policy. The state's solid waste management hierarchy recognizes it as the policy of the state to actively promote and encourage waste reduction and from all sources to maximize waste diversion efforts. The application eliminates approximately 170,000 tons, as we said earlier, of state waste and actively encourages single sort recycling. A potential of up to 40 percent recycling may be reachable as a result of that. In addition, an outdated and inefficient incinerator has been eliminated from the Biddeford	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that was part of the purchase and sale agreement with you? MR. BUBIER: I don't. MR. BOWER: Okay. It was attached as Exhibit A to Joe Kazar's testimony and so just for your reference, I'll give you a copy of that exhibit. MR. BUBIER: Thank you. MR. BOWER: Would you agree that this do you recall signing this agreement in the end of November last year? MR. BUBIER: Sure, yes. MR. BOWER: Would you agree that the purpose of this agreement was to waive certain conditions precedent to the purchase and sale agreement as it had been drafted? MR. BUBIER: The original question that you're asking is are you asking what is the situation as it relates to the city and Casella with respect to support for their application? MR. BOWER: Sorry, I probably didn't ask you a very good question. Is it your understanding that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	thereby diverting municipal solid waste from the Maine solid waste system. The elimination of approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and the diversion of the in-state municipal solid waste through greater recycling efforts without a corresponding increase in the amount of solid waste disposed at the Juniper Ridge Landfill will have a positive implication for the citizens of Maine which is consistent with the Maine solid waste management policy. The state's solid waste management hierarchy recognizes it as the policy of the state to actively promote and encourage waste reduction and from all sources to maximize waste diversion efforts. The application eliminates approximately 170,000 tons, as we said earlier, of state waste and actively encourages single sort recycling. A potential of up to 40 percent recycling may be reachable as a result of that. In addition, an outdated and inefficient incinerator has been eliminated from the Biddeford downtown triggering significant economic development	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that was part of the purchase and sale agreement with you? MR. BUBIER: I don't. MR. BOWER: Okay. It was attached as Exhibit A to Joe Kazar's testimony and so just for your reference, I'll give you a copy of that exhibit. MR. BUBIER: Thank you. MR. BOWER: Would you agree that this do you recall signing this agreement in the end of November last year? MR. BUBIER: Sure, yes. MR. BOWER: Would you agree that the purpose of this agreement was to waive certain conditions precedent to the purchase and sale agreement as it had been drafted? MR. BUBIER: The original question that you're asking is are you asking what is the situation as it relates to the city and Casella with respect to support for their application? MR. BOWER: Sorry, I probably didn't ask you a very good question. Is it your understanding that the purpose of this agreement was to waive certain
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	thereby diverting municipal solid waste from the Maine solid waste system. The elimination of approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and the diversion of the in-state municipal solid waste through greater recycling efforts without a corresponding increase in the amount of solid waste disposed at the Juniper Ridge Landfill will have a positive implication for the citizens of Maine which is consistent with the Maine solid waste management policy. The state's solid waste management hierarchy recognizes it as the policy of the state to actively promote and encourage waste reduction and from all sources to maximize waste diversion efforts. The application eliminates approximately 170,000 tons, as we said earlier, of state waste and actively encourages single sort recycling. A potential of up to 40 percent recycling may be reachable as a result of that. In addition, an outdated and inefficient incinerator has been eliminated from the Biddeford downtown triggering significant economic development within Biddeford in specific terms and in southern	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that was part of the purchase and sale agreement with you? MR. BUBIER: I don't. MR. BOWER: Okay. It was attached as Exhibit A to Joe Kazar's testimony and so just for your reference, I'll give you a copy of that exhibit. MR. BUBIER: Thank you. MR. BOWER: Would you agree that this do you recall signing this agreement in the end of November last year? MR. BUBIER: Sure, yes. MR. BOWER: Would you agree that the purpose of this agreement was to waive certain conditions precedent to the purchase and sale agreement as it had been drafted? MR. BUBIER: The original question that you're asking is are you asking what is the situation as it relates to the city and Casella with respect to support for their application? MR. BOWER: Sorry, I probably didn't ask you a very good question. Is it your understanding that the purpose of this agreement was to waive certain conditions precedent to the purchase and sale
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	thereby diverting municipal solid waste from the Maine solid waste system. The elimination of approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and the diversion of the in-state municipal solid waste through greater recycling efforts without a corresponding increase in the amount of solid waste disposed at the Juniper Ridge Landfill will have a positive implication for the citizens of Maine which is consistent with the Maine solid waste management policy. The state's solid waste management hierarchy recognizes it as the policy of the state to actively promote and encourage waste reduction and from all sources to maximize waste diversion efforts. The application eliminates approximately 170,000 tons, as we said earlier, of state waste and actively encourages single sort recycling. A potential of up to 40 percent recycling may be reachable as a result of that. In addition, an outdated and inefficient incinerator has been eliminated from the Biddeford downtown triggering significant economic development	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that was part of the purchase and sale agreement with you? MR. BUBIER: I don't. MR. BOWER: Okay. It was attached as Exhibit A to Joe Kazar's testimony and so just for your reference, I'll give you a copy of that exhibit. MR. BUBIER: Thank you. MR. BOWER: Would you agree that this do you recall signing this agreement in the end of November last year? MR. BUBIER: Sure, yes. MR. BOWER: Would you agree that the purpose of this agreement was to waive certain conditions precedent to the purchase and sale agreement as it had been drafted? MR. BUBIER: The original question that you're asking is are you asking what is the situation as it relates to the city and Casella with respect to support for their application? MR. BOWER: Sorry, I probably didn't ask you a very good question. Is it your understanding that the purpose of this agreement was to waive certain

	352		354
1		4	
1	agreement had a section in it that required that the	1	is Biddeford's belief that the application will also
2	city support an application and movement forward. It	2	further reduce the disposal of MSW by facilitating
3	was part of the contractual obligation. That	3	the development of municipal recycling programs and
4	obligation was released subsequent to the original	4	then you talk about the fact that beginning in July
5	signing of that letter and the current condition	5	of 2013 Biddeford will commence a curbside single
6	simply allows us to support the application	6	sort recycling program. Was that comment referring
7	essentially not as a requirement of the contract.	7	to the recycling collection and disposal agreement
8	MR. BOWER: Okay. You're jumping to my next	8	between Pine Tree Waste and Biddeford that was signed
9	question but that's fine. I just want to confirm	9	as part of the purchase and sale agreement for the
10	that this letter agreement from November 30th of 2012	10	MERC facility?
11	waived the conditions that Casella obtain an	11	MR. BUBIER: There is a part of the
12	amendment to the Juniper Ridge license as a condition	12	agreement that the city and Casella will work
13	precedent to that purchase and sale?	13	together Pine Tree Waste I should say, which is a
14	MR. BUBIER: If that's what this letter	14	Casella company, will work together to establish the
15	says, we did agree to that.	15	curbside pickup and to establish a recycling
16	MR. BOWER: Okay. Now, you were	16	program a single sort recycling program that we
17	anticipating my next question. On the second page,	17	feel will elevate our current 7 percent recycling
18	the second paragraph, it states, "seller acknowledges	18	ratio upwards over a period of years to potentially
19	that seller shall be solely responsible for the	19	in the 40 to 45 percent range.
20	satisfaction of terms acceptable to seller of the	20	MR. BOWER: Okay, and that agreement is not
21	conditions set forth in Section 5.1, 5.2 and 5.7	21	contingent upon an amendment to the Juniper Ridge
22	following the closing, paren, if and to the extent	22	license, is it?
23	seller desires to have the same satisfied, closed	23	MR. BUBIER: It is not.
24	paren, except that buyer agrees that buyer will not	24	MR. BOWER: And you also on page 2 of
25	oppose and will publicly and privately support	25	MR. BUBIER: But I would suggest as I've
			55
	353		355
1	353 seller's efforts to satisfy the same." Is it your	1	355 said earlier
1	seller's efforts to satisfy the same." Is it your	1	said earlier
			said earlier MR. BOWER: I'm on to my next question,
2	seller's efforts to satisfy the same." Is it your testimony that this is no longer binding on the city of Biddeford?	2	said earlier MR. BOWER: I'm on to my next question, thank you. On page 2 of your testimony you state,
2 3	seller's efforts to satisfy the same." Is it your testimony that this is no longer binding on the city of Biddeford? MR. BUBIER: The city is not bound to	2 3	said earlier MR. BOWER: I'm on to my next question, thank you. On page 2 of your testimony you state, "the application eliminates approximately 170,000
2 3 4	seller's efforts to satisfy the same." Is it your testimony that this is no longer binding on the city of Biddeford? MR. BUBIER: The city is not bound to support an application. It does seem that as we go	2 3 4	said earlier MR. BOWER: I'm on to my next question, thank you. On page 2 of your testimony you state, "the application eliminates approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and actively encourages
2 3 4 5	seller's efforts to satisfy the same." Is it your testimony that this is no longer binding on the city of Biddeford? MR. BUBIER: The city is not bound to support an application. It does seem that as we go through the testimony that was delivered earlier that	2 3 4 5	said earlier MR. BOWER: I'm on to my next question, thank you. On page 2 of your testimony you state, "the application eliminates approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and actively encourages single sort recycling. Wouldn't you agree that the
2 3 4 5 6 7	seller's efforts to satisfy the same." Is it your testimony that this is no longer binding on the city of Biddeford? MR. BUBIER: The city is not bound to support an application. It does seem that as we go through the testimony that was delivered earlier that it is in our best interest for a number of reasons to	2 3 4 5 6	said earlier MR. BOWER: I'm on to my next question, thank you. On page 2 of your testimony you state, "the application eliminates approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and actively encourages single sort recycling. Wouldn't you agree that the closure of MERC itself eliminates the 170,000 tons of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	seller's efforts to satisfy the same." Is it your testimony that this is no longer binding on the city of Biddeford? MR. BUBIER: The city is not bound to support an application. It does seem that as we go through the testimony that was delivered earlier that it is in our best interest for a number of reasons to provide for opportunities in a facility that was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	said earlier MR. BOWER: I'm on to my next question, thank you. On page 2 of your testimony you state, "the application eliminates approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and actively encourages single sort recycling. Wouldn't you agree that the closure of MERC itself eliminates the 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste rather than the application that's
2 3 4 5 6 7	seller's efforts to satisfy the same." Is it your testimony that this is no longer binding on the city of Biddeford? MR. BUBIER: The city is not bound to support an application. It does seem that as we go through the testimony that was delivered earlier that it is in our best interest for a number of reasons to provide for opportunities in a facility that was purchased with Maine funds and that has serviced the	2 3 4 5 6 7	said earlier MR. BOWER: I'm on to my next question, thank you. On page 2 of your testimony you state, "the application eliminates approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and actively encourages single sort recycling. Wouldn't you agree that the closure of MERC itself eliminates the 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste rather than the application that's pending before DEP?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	seller's efforts to satisfy the same." Is it your testimony that this is no longer binding on the city of Biddeford? MR. BUBIER: The city is not bound to support an application. It does seem that as we go through the testimony that was delivered earlier that it is in our best interest for a number of reasons to provide for opportunities in a facility that was purchased with Maine funds and that has serviced the city, as I said, bypass materials have been sent	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	said earlier MR. BOWER: I'm on to my next question, thank you. On page 2 of your testimony you state, "the application eliminates approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and actively encourages single sort recycling. Wouldn't you agree that the closure of MERC itself eliminates the 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste rather than the application that's pending before DEP? MR. BUBIER: I'm not sure that that's the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	seller's efforts to satisfy the same." Is it your testimony that this is no longer binding on the city of Biddeford? MR. BUBIER: The city is not bound to support an application. It does seem that as we go through the testimony that was delivered earlier that it is in our best interest for a number of reasons to provide for opportunities in a facility that was purchased with Maine funds and that has serviced the city, as I said, bypass materials have been sent there every year for the last 25 years I suspect, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	said earlier MR. BOWER: I'm on to my next question, thank you. On page 2 of your testimony you state, "the application eliminates approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and actively encourages single sort recycling. Wouldn't you agree that the closure of MERC itself eliminates the 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste rather than the application that's pending before DEP? MR. BUBIER: I'm not sure that that's the case. I'm not completely familiar with all of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	seller's efforts to satisfy the same." Is it your testimony that this is no longer binding on the city of Biddeford? MR. BUBIER: The city is not bound to support an application. It does seem that as we go through the testimony that was delivered earlier that it is in our best interest for a number of reasons to provide for opportunities in a facility that was purchased with Maine funds and that has serviced the city, as I said, bypass materials have been sent	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	said earlier MR. BOWER: I'm on to my next question, thank you. On page 2 of your testimony you state, "the application eliminates approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and actively encourages single sort recycling. Wouldn't you agree that the closure of MERC itself eliminates the 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste rather than the application that's pending before DEP? MR. BUBIER: I'm not sure that that's the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	seller's efforts to satisfy the same." Is it your testimony that this is no longer binding on the city of Biddeford? MR. BUBIER: The city is not bound to support an application. It does seem that as we go through the testimony that was delivered earlier that it is in our best interest for a number of reasons to provide for opportunities in a facility that was purchased with Maine funds and that has serviced the city, as I said, bypass materials have been sent there every year for the last 25 years I suspect, and we are no longer doing that but we are still suggesting that the amount of materials that we send	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	said earlier MR. BOWER: I'm on to my next question, thank you. On page 2 of your testimony you state, "the application eliminates approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and actively encourages single sort recycling. Wouldn't you agree that the closure of MERC itself eliminates the 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste rather than the application that's pending before DEP? MR. BUBIER: I'm not sure that that's the case. I'm not completely familiar with all of the documents that Casella would have had with the state
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	seller's efforts to satisfy the same." Is it your testimony that this is no longer binding on the city of Biddeford? MR. BUBIER: The city is not bound to support an application. It does seem that as we go through the testimony that was delivered earlier that it is in our best interest for a number of reasons to provide for opportunities in a facility that was purchased with Maine funds and that has serviced the city, as I said, bypass materials have been sent there every year for the last 25 years I suspect, and we are no longer doing that but we are still suggesting that the amount of materials that we send there will be within that 93,000 cubic yard range.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	said earlier MR. BOWER: I'm on to my next question, thank you. On page 2 of your testimony you state, "the application eliminates approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and actively encourages single sort recycling. Wouldn't you agree that the closure of MERC itself eliminates the 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste rather than the application that's pending before DEP? MR. BUBIER: I'm not sure that that's the case. I'm not completely familiar with all of the documents that Casella would have had with the state on the one hand or other outside sources as a result
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	seller's efforts to satisfy the same." Is it your testimony that this is no longer binding on the city of Biddeford? MR. BUBIER: The city is not bound to support an application. It does seem that as we go through the testimony that was delivered earlier that it is in our best interest for a number of reasons to provide for opportunities in a facility that was purchased with Maine funds and that has serviced the city, as I said, bypass materials have been sent there every year for the last 25 years I suspect, and we are no longer doing that but we are still suggesting that the amount of materials that we send there will be within that 93,000 cubic yard range. MR. BOWER: Okay. My question is just is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	said earlier MR. BOWER: I'm on to my next question, thank you. On page 2 of your testimony you state, "the application eliminates approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and actively encourages single sort recycling. Wouldn't you agree that the closure of MERC itself eliminates the 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste rather than the application that's pending before DEP? MR. BUBIER: I'm not sure that that's the case. I'm not completely familiar with all of the documents that Casella would have had with the state on the one hand or other outside sources as a result of that. So I couldn't really definitively answer that. It does strike me that the sale of Maine
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	seller's efforts to satisfy the same." Is it your testimony that this is no longer binding on the city of Biddeford? MR. BUBIER: The city is not bound to support an application. It does seem that as we go through the testimony that was delivered earlier that it is in our best interest for a number of reasons to provide for opportunities in a facility that was purchased with Maine funds and that has serviced the city, as I said, bypass materials have been sent there every year for the last 25 years I suspect, and we are no longer doing that but we are still suggesting that the amount of materials that we send there will be within that 93,000 cubic yard range. MR. BOWER: Okay. My question is just is this this agreement was never rescinded or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	said earlier MR. BOWER: I'm on to my next question, thank you. On page 2 of your testimony you state, "the application eliminates approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and actively encourages single sort recycling. Wouldn't you agree that the closure of MERC itself eliminates the 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste rather than the application that's pending before DEP? MR. BUBIER: I'm not sure that that's the case. I'm not completely familiar with all of the documents that Casella would have had with the state on the one hand or other outside sources as a result of that. So I couldn't really definitively answer that. It does strike me that the sale of Maine Energy to the city was not something which
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	seller's efforts to satisfy the same." Is it your testimony that this is no longer binding on the city of Biddeford? MR. BUBIER: The city is not bound to support an application. It does seem that as we go through the testimony that was delivered earlier that it is in our best interest for a number of reasons to provide for opportunities in a facility that was purchased with Maine funds and that has serviced the city, as I said, bypass materials have been sent there every year for the last 25 years I suspect, and we are no longer doing that but we are still suggesting that the amount of materials that we send there will be within that 93,000 cubic yard range. MR. BOWER: Okay. My question is just is this this agreement was never rescinded or anything. This is still a binding agreement between	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	said earlier MR. BOWER: I'm on to my next question, thank you. On page 2 of your testimony you state, "the application eliminates approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and actively encourages single sort recycling. Wouldn't you agree that the closure of MERC itself eliminates the 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste rather than the application that's pending before DEP? MR. BUBIER: I'm not sure that that's the case. I'm not completely familiar with all of the documents that Casella would have had with the state on the one hand or other outside sources as a result of that. So I couldn't really definitively answer that. It does strike me that the sale of Maine Energy to the city was not something which specifically denies 170,000 tons from coming into the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	seller's efforts to satisfy the same." Is it your testimony that this is no longer binding on the city of Biddeford? MR. BUBIER: The city is not bound to support an application. It does seem that as we go through the testimony that was delivered earlier that it is in our best interest for a number of reasons to provide for opportunities in a facility that was purchased with Maine funds and that has serviced the city, as I said, bypass materials have been sent there every year for the last 25 years I suspect, and we are no longer doing that but we are still suggesting that the amount of materials that we send there will be within that 93,000 cubic yard range. MR. BOWER: Okay. My question is just is this this agreement was never rescinded or anything. This is still a binding agreement between Casella and the city of Biddeford, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	said earlier MR. BOWER: I'm on to my next question, thank you. On page 2 of your testimony you state, "the application eliminates approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and actively encourages single sort recycling. Wouldn't you agree that the closure of MERC itself eliminates the 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste rather than the application that's pending before DEP? MR. BUBIER: I'm not sure that that's the case. I'm not completely familiar with all of the documents that Casella would have had with the state on the one hand or other outside sources as a result of that. So I couldn't really definitively answer that. It does strike me that the sale of Maine Energy to the city was not something which specifically denies 170,000 tons from coming into the state. There may have been discussions with other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	seller's efforts to satisfy the same." Is it your testimony that this is no longer binding on the city of Biddeford? MR. BUBIER: The city is not bound to support an application. It does seem that as we go through the testimony that was delivered earlier that it is in our best interest for a number of reasons to provide for opportunities in a facility that was purchased with Maine funds and that has serviced the city, as I said, bypass materials have been sent there every year for the last 25 years I suspect, and we are no longer doing that but we are still suggesting that the amount of materials that we send there will be within that 93,000 cubic yard range. MR. BOWER: Okay. My question is just is this this agreement was never rescinded or anything. This is still a binding agreement between Casella and the city of Biddeford, correct? MR. BUBIER: The only agreement I think in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	said earlier MR. BOWER: I'm on to my next question, thank you. On page 2 of your testimony you state, "the application eliminates approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and actively encourages single sort recycling. Wouldn't you agree that the closure of MERC itself eliminates the 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste rather than the application that's pending before DEP? MR. BUBIER: I'm not sure that that's the case. I'm not completely familiar with all of the documents that Casella would have had with the state on the one hand or other outside sources as a result of that. So I couldn't really definitively answer that. It does strike me that the sale of Maine Energy to the city was not something which specifically denies 170,000 tons from coming into the state. There may have been discussions with other state regulatory agencies that occurred to that, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	seller's efforts to satisfy the same." Is it your testimony that this is no longer binding on the city of Biddeford? MR. BUBIER: The city is not bound to support an application. It does seem that as we go through the testimony that was delivered earlier that it is in our best interest for a number of reasons to provide for opportunities in a facility that was purchased with Maine funds and that has serviced the city, as I said, bypass materials have been sent there every year for the last 25 years I suspect, and we are no longer doing that but we are still suggesting that the amount of materials that we send there will be within that 93,000 cubic yard range. MR. BOWER: Okay. My question is just is this this agreement was never rescinded or anything. This is still a binding agreement between Casella and the city of Biddeford, correct? MR. BUBIER: The only agreement I think in terms of this subject that you're referring to is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	said earlier MR. BOWER: I'm on to my next question, thank you. On page 2 of your testimony you state, "the application eliminates approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and actively encourages single sort recycling. Wouldn't you agree that the closure of MERC itself eliminates the 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste rather than the application that's pending before DEP? MR. BUBIER: I'm not sure that that's the case. I'm not completely familiar with all of the documents that Casella would have had with the state on the one hand or other outside sources as a result of that. So I couldn't really definitively answer that. It does strike me that the sale of Maine Energy to the city was not something which specifically denies 170,000 tons from coming into the state. There may have been discussions with other state regulatory agencies that occurred to that, but that's not within my purview.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	seller's efforts to satisfy the same." Is it your testimony that this is no longer binding on the city of Biddeford? MR. BUBIER: The city is not bound to support an application. It does seem that as we go through the testimony that was delivered earlier that it is in our best interest for a number of reasons to provide for opportunities in a facility that was purchased with Maine funds and that has serviced the city, as I said, bypass materials have been sent there every year for the last 25 years I suspect, and we are no longer doing that but we are still suggesting that the amount of materials that we send there will be within that 93,000 cubic yard range. MR. BOWER: Okay. My question is just is this this agreement was never rescinded or anything. This is still a binding agreement between Casella and the city of Biddeford, correct? MR. BUBIER: The only agreement I think in terms of this subject that you're referring to is that the city in a letter has agreed that we will	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	said earlier MR. BOWER: I'm on to my next question, thank you. On page 2 of your testimony you state, "the application eliminates approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and actively encourages single sort recycling. Wouldn't you agree that the closure of MERC itself eliminates the 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste rather than the application that's pending before DEP? MR. BUBIER: I'm not sure that that's the case. I'm not completely familiar with all of the documents that Casella would have had with the state on the one hand or other outside sources as a result of that. So I couldn't really definitively answer that. It does strike me that the sale of Maine Energy to the city was not something which specifically denies 170,000 tons from coming into the state. There may have been discussions with other state regulatory agencies that occurred to that, but that's not within my purview. MR. BOWER: So what's the basis for your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	seller's efforts to satisfy the same." Is it your testimony that this is no longer binding on the city of Biddeford? MR. BUBIER: The city is not bound to support an application. It does seem that as we go through the testimony that was delivered earlier that it is in our best interest for a number of reasons to provide for opportunities in a facility that was purchased with Maine funds and that has serviced the city, as I said, bypass materials have been sent there every year for the last 25 years I suspect, and we are no longer doing that but we are still suggesting that the amount of materials that we send there will be within that 93,000 cubic yard range. MR. BOWER: Okay. My question is just is this this agreement was never rescinded or anything. This is still a binding agreement between Casella and the city of Biddeford, correct? MR. BUBIER: The only agreement I think in terms of this subject that you're referring to is that the city in a letter has agreed that we will support to the extent that we can the issues that are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	said earlier MR. BOWER: I'm on to my next question, thank you. On page 2 of your testimony you state, "the application eliminates approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and actively encourages single sort recycling. Wouldn't you agree that the closure of MERC itself eliminates the 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste rather than the application that's pending before DEP? MR. BUBIER: I'm not sure that that's the case. I'm not completely familiar with all of the documents that Casella would have had with the state on the one hand or other outside sources as a result of that. So I couldn't really definitively answer that. It does strike me that the sale of Maine Energy to the city was not something which specifically denies 170,000 tons from coming into the state. There may have been discussions with other state regulatory agencies that occurred to that, but that's not within my purview. MR. BOWER: So what's the basis for your statement that the application eliminates 170,000
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	seller's efforts to satisfy the same." Is it your testimony that this is no longer binding on the city of Biddeford? MR. BUBIER: The city is not bound to support an application. It does seem that as we go through the testimony that was delivered earlier that it is in our best interest for a number of reasons to provide for opportunities in a facility that was purchased with Maine funds and that has serviced the city, as I said, bypass materials have been sent there every year for the last 25 years I suspect, and we are no longer doing that but we are still suggesting that the amount of materials that we send there will be within that 93,000 cubic yard range. MR. BOWER: Okay. My question is just is this this agreement was never rescinded or anything. This is still a binding agreement between Casella and the city of Biddeford, correct? MR. BUBIER: The only agreement I think in terms of this subject that you're referring to is that the city in a letter has agreed that we will support to the extent that we can the issues that are surrounding this application.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	said earlier MR. BOWER: I'm on to my next question, thank you. On page 2 of your testimony you state, "the application eliminates approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and actively encourages single sort recycling. Wouldn't you agree that the closure of MERC itself eliminates the 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste rather than the application that's pending before DEP? MR. BUBIER: I'm not sure that that's the case. I'm not completely familiar with all of the documents that Casella would have had with the state on the one hand or other outside sources as a result of that. So I couldn't really definitively answer that. It does strike me that the sale of Maine Energy to the city was not something which specifically denies 170,000 tons from coming into the state. There may have been discussions with other state regulatory agencies that occurred to that, but that's not within my purview. MR. BOWER: So what's the basis for your statement that the application eliminates 170,000 tons?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	seller's efforts to satisfy the same." Is it your testimony that this is no longer binding on the city of Biddeford? MR. BUBIER: The city is not bound to support an application. It does seem that as we go through the testimony that was delivered earlier that it is in our best interest for a number of reasons to provide for opportunities in a facility that was purchased with Maine funds and that has serviced the city, as I said, bypass materials have been sent there every year for the last 25 years I suspect, and we are no longer doing that but we are still suggesting that the amount of materials that we send there will be within that 93,000 cubic yard range. MR. BOWER: Okay. My question is just is this this agreement was never rescinded or anything. This is still a binding agreement between Casella and the city of Biddeford, correct? MR. BUBIER: The only agreement I think in terms of this subject that you're referring to is that the city in a letter has agreed that we will support to the extent that we can the issues that are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	said earlier MR. BOWER: I'm on to my next question, thank you. On page 2 of your testimony you state, "the application eliminates approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste and actively encourages single sort recycling. Wouldn't you agree that the closure of MERC itself eliminates the 170,000 tons of out-of-state waste rather than the application that's pending before DEP? MR. BUBIER: I'm not sure that that's the case. I'm not completely familiar with all of the documents that Casella would have had with the state on the one hand or other outside sources as a result of that. So I couldn't really definitively answer that. It does strike me that the sale of Maine Energy to the city was not something which specifically denies 170,000 tons from coming into the state. There may have been discussions with other state regulatory agencies that occurred to that, but that's not within my purview. MR. BOWER: So what's the basis for your statement that the application eliminates 170,000

	356		358
1	into the state as a result of this facility.	1	we're going to back out of this contract? Is there a
		2	
2	MR. BOWER: As a result of the facility		penalty in that contract that you're aware of?
3	shutting down?	3	MR. BUBIER: There may be. I don't know.
4	MR. BUBIER: As a result of the facility	4	MR. PARKER: Thank you.
5	shutting down and negotiations with other agencies.	5	MS. LOYZIM: Good afternoon, Mr. Bubier.
6	MR. BOWER: And finally, you make reference	6	MR. BUBIER: Good afternoon.
7	to the outdated and inefficient incinerator that has	7	MS. LOYZIM: Following up, just some
8	been eliminated from Biddeford's downtown. Hasn't	8	clarifying questions regarding some of the questions
9	the incinerator been eliminated regardless of the	9	posed to you a couple of moments ago. Is it your
10	outcome of the pending application?	10	belief that the 170,000 tons of MSW that was
11	MR. BUBIER: I'm not sure I understand what	11	incinerated at the MERC facility that had been
12	you're saying.	12	brought in from out-of-state will no longer be
13	MR. BOWER: At the end of 2012, the MERC	13	brought into the state solely as a result of approval
14	incinerator was shut down, correct?	14	of the JRL application before us that's the subject
15	MR. BUBIER: Um-hum.	15	of this hearing?
16	MR. BOWER: And regardless of what happens	16	MR. BUBIER: Frankly, I'm not sure what the
17	with the pending application before DEP, it will	17	conditions were, not having been a party to those
18	remain shut down, correct?	18	discussions, simply anecdotal discussions around the
19	MR. BUBIER: That's correct.	19	contract and around the 170,000 tons. So, again, my
20	MR. BOWER: No further questions.	20	understanding is that there were discussions that
21	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any	21	were not on my watch but were on another set of
22	other parties who would wish to cross-examine the	22	agendas, that discussion of that out-of-state waste
23	cities of Biddeford and Saco? Seeing none, I will	23	was had and that the out-of-state waste was conceded.
24	move on to the redirect for the cities of Biddeford	24	MS. LOYZIM: Okay, thank you.
25	and Saco.	25	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you very much. That
			HERRING OFFICER. Hank you very mach. Hac
	357		359
1	357 MR 14COUES: We don't have any redirect	1	359 concludes the testimony of the cities of Biddeford
1	MR. JACQUES: We don't have any redirect.	1	concludes the testimony of the cities of Biddeford
2	MR. JACQUES: We don't have any redirect. HEARING OFFICER: Given that there's no	2	concludes the testimony of the cities of Biddeford and Saco. We will move right on to the summary
2 3	MR. JACQUES: We don't have any redirect. HEARING OFFICER: Given that there's no redirect, we'll move on to DEP staff questions.	2 3	concludes the testimony of the cities of Biddeford and Saco. We will move right on to the summary testimony by the city of Old Town at this time. If
2 3 4	MR. JACQUES: We don't have any redirect. HEARING OFFICER: Given that there's no redirect, we'll move on to DEP staff questions. MR. PARKER: Good after, Mr. Bubier. My	2 3 4	concludes the testimony of the cities of Biddeford and Saco. We will move right on to the summary testimony by the city of Old Town at this time. If you would please come forward.
2 3 4 5	MR. JACQUES: We don't have any redirect. HEARING OFFICER: Given that there's no redirect, we'll move on to DEP staff questions. MR. PARKER: Good after, Mr. Bubier. My name is Mike Parker. I'm the project manager for	2 3 4 5	concludes the testimony of the cities of Biddeford and Saco. We will move right on to the summary testimony by the city of Old Town at this time. If you would please come forward. MR. KATSIAFICAS: Hearing Officer Parent,
2 3 4 5 6	MR. JACQUES: We don't have any redirect. HEARING OFFICER: Given that there's no redirect, we'll move on to DEP staff questions. MR. PARKER: Good after, Mr. Bubier. My name is Mike Parker. I'm the project manager for this application. To use one of Mr. Doyle's terms,	2 3 4 5 6	concludes the testimony of the cities of Biddeford and Saco. We will move right on to the summary testimony by the city of Old Town at this time. If you would please come forward. MR. KATSIAFICAS: Hearing Officer Parent, Members of the Panel. My name is Jim Katsiaficas.
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. JACQUES: We don't have any redirect. HEARING OFFICER: Given that there's no redirect, we'll move on to DEP staff questions. MR. PARKER: Good after, Mr. Bubier. My name is Mike Parker. I'm the project manager for this application. To use one of Mr. Doyle's terms, is there ability for the city of Biddeford to breach	2 3 4 5 6 7	concludes the testimony of the cities of Biddeford and Saco. We will move right on to the summary testimony by the city of Old Town at this time. If you would please come forward. MR. KATSIAFICAS: Hearing Officer Parent, Members of the Panel. My name is Jim Katsiaficas. I'm an attorney with Perkins Thompson representing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. JACQUES: We don't have any redirect. HEARING OFFICER: Given that there's no redirect, we'll move on to DEP staff questions. MR. PARKER: Good after, Mr. Bubier. My name is Mike Parker. I'm the project manager for this application. To use one of Mr. Doyle's terms, is there ability for the city of Biddeford to breach its current contract with Pine Tree Waste for the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	concludes the testimony of the cities of Biddeford and Saco. We will move right on to the summary testimony by the city of Old Town at this time. If you would please come forward. MR. KATSIAFICAS: Hearing Officer Parent, Members of the Panel. My name is Jim Katsiaficas. I'm an attorney with Perkins Thompson representing the city of Old Town and here to present the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. JACQUES: We don't have any redirect. HEARING OFFICER: Given that there's no redirect, we'll move on to DEP staff questions. MR. PARKER: Good after, Mr. Bubier. My name is Mike Parker. I'm the project manager for this application. To use one of Mr. Doyle's terms, is there ability for the city of Biddeford to breach its current contract with Pine Tree Waste for the management of your MSW?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	concludes the testimony of the cities of Biddeford and Saco. We will move right on to the summary testimony by the city of Old Town at this time. If you would please come forward. MR. KATSIAFICAS: Hearing Officer Parent, Members of the Panel. My name is Jim Katsiaficas. I'm an attorney with Perkins Thompson representing the city of Old Town and here to present the pre-filed testimony for the city of Old Town is Old
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. JACQUES: We don't have any redirect. HEARING OFFICER: Given that there's no redirect, we'll move on to DEP staff questions. MR. PARKER: Good after, Mr. Bubier. My name is Mike Parker. I'm the project manager for this application. To use one of Mr. Doyle's terms, is there ability for the city of Biddeford to breach its current contract with Pine Tree Waste for the management of your MSW? MR. BUBIER: Is there what? I'm sorry.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	concludes the testimony of the cities of Biddeford and Saco. We will move right on to the summary testimony by the city of Old Town at this time. If you would please come forward. MR. KATSIAFICAS: Hearing Officer Parent, Members of the Panel. My name is Jim Katsiaficas. I'm an attorney with Perkins Thompson representing the city of Old Town and here to present the pre-filed testimony for the city of Old Town is Old Town city manager, Bill Mayo, and shall I hand him
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. JACQUES: We don't have any redirect. HEARING OFFICER: Given that there's no redirect, we'll move on to DEP staff questions. MR. PARKER: Good after, Mr. Bubier. My name is Mike Parker. I'm the project manager for this application. To use one of Mr. Doyle's terms, is there ability for the city of Biddeford to breach its current contract with Pine Tree Waste for the management of your MSW? MR. BUBIER: Is there what? I'm sorry. MR. PARKER: Is there an ability for you to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	concludes the testimony of the cities of Biddeford and Saco. We will move right on to the summary testimony by the city of Old Town at this time. If you would please come forward. MR. KATSIAFICAS: Hearing Officer Parent, Members of the Panel. My name is Jim Katsiaficas. I'm an attorney with Perkins Thompson representing the city of Old Town and here to present the pre-filed testimony for the city of Old Town is Old Town city manager, Bill Mayo, and shall I hand him the microphone?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. JACQUES: We don't have any redirect. HEARING OFFICER: Given that there's no redirect, we'll move on to DEP staff questions. MR. PARKER: Good after, Mr. Bubier. My name is Mike Parker. I'm the project manager for this application. To use one of Mr. Doyle's terms, is there ability for the city of Biddeford to breach its current contract with Pine Tree Waste for the management of your MSW? MR. BUBIER: Is there what? I'm sorry. MR. PARKER: Is there an ability for you to breach the contract?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	concludes the testimony of the cities of Biddeford and Saco. We will move right on to the summary testimony by the city of Old Town at this time. If you would please come forward. MR. KATSIAFICAS: Hearing Officer Parent, Members of the Panel. My name is Jim Katsiaficas. I'm an attorney with Perkins Thompson representing the city of Old Town and here to present the pre-filed testimony for the city of Old Town is Old Town city manager, Bill Mayo, and shall I hand him the microphone? HEARING OFFICER: Yes, please. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. JACQUES: We don't have any redirect. HEARING OFFICER: Given that there's no redirect, we'll move on to DEP staff questions. MR. PARKER: Good after, Mr. Bubier. My name is Mike Parker. I'm the project manager for this application. To use one of Mr. Doyle's terms, is there ability for the city of Biddeford to breach its current contract with Pine Tree Waste for the management of your MSW? MR. BUBIER: Is there what? I'm sorry. MR. PARKER: Is there an ability for you to breach the contract? MR. BUBIER: To breach the contract?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	concludes the testimony of the cities of Biddeford and Saco. We will move right on to the summary testimony by the city of Old Town at this time. If you would please come forward. MR. KATSIAFICAS: Hearing Officer Parent, Members of the Panel. My name is Jim Katsiaficas. I'm an attorney with Perkins Thompson representing the city of Old Town and here to present the pre-filed testimony for the city of Old Town is Old Town city manager, Bill Mayo, and shall I hand him the microphone? HEARING OFFICER: Yes, please. Thank you. MR. MAYO: Good afternoon. My name is Bill
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. JACQUES: We don't have any redirect. HEARING OFFICER: Given that there's no redirect, we'll move on to DEP staff questions. MR. PARKER: Good after, Mr. Bubier. My name is Mike Parker. I'm the project manager for this application. To use one of Mr. Doyle's terms, is there ability for the city of Biddeford to breach its current contract with Pine Tree Waste for the management of your MSW? MR. BUBIER: Is there what? I'm sorry. MR. PARKER: Is there an ability for you to breach the contract? MR. BUBIER: To breach the contract? MR. PARKER: Yes. Is there an escape	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	concludes the testimony of the cities of Biddeford and Saco. We will move right on to the summary testimony by the city of Old Town at this time. If you would please come forward. MR. KATSIAFICAS: Hearing Officer Parent, Members of the Panel. My name is Jim Katsiaficas. I'm an attorney with Perkins Thompson representing the city of Old Town and here to present the pre-filed testimony for the city of Old Town is Old Town city manager, Bill Mayo, and shall I hand him the microphone? HEARING OFFICER: Yes, please. Thank you. MR. MAYO: Good afternoon. My name is Bill Mayo. I'm the duly appointed city manager for the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. JACQUES: We don't have any redirect. HEARING OFFICER: Given that there's no redirect, we'll move on to DEP staff questions. MR. PARKER: Good after, Mr. Bubier. My name is Mike Parker. I'm the project manager for this application. To use one of Mr. Doyle's terms, is there ability for the city of Biddeford to breach its current contract with Pine Tree Waste for the management of your MSW? MR. BUBIER: Is there what? I'm sorry. MR. PARKER: Is there an ability for you to breach the contract? MR. BUBIER: To breach the contract? MR. PARKER: Yes. Is there an escape clause, if you will, where if you're not happy with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	concludes the testimony of the cities of Biddeford and Saco. We will move right on to the summary testimony by the city of Old Town at this time. If you would please come forward. MR. KATSIAFICAS: Hearing Officer Parent, Members of the Panel. My name is Jim Katsiaficas. I'm an attorney with Perkins Thompson representing the city of Old Town and here to present the pre-filed testimony for the city of Old Town is Old Town city manager, Bill Mayo, and shall I hand him the microphone? HEARING OFFICER: Yes, please. Thank you. MR. MAYO: Good afternoon. My name is Bill Mayo. I'm the duly appointed city manager for the city of Old Town.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. JACQUES: We don't have any redirect. HEARING OFFICER: Given that there's no redirect, we'll move on to DEP staff questions. MR. PARKER: Good after, Mr. Bubier. My name is Mike Parker. I'm the project manager for this application. To use one of Mr. Doyle's terms, is there ability for the city of Biddeford to breach its current contract with Pine Tree Waste for the management of your MSW? MR. BUBIER: Is there what? I'm sorry. MR. PARKER: Is there an ability for you to breach the contract? MR. BUBIER: To breach the contract? MR. PARKER: Yes. Is there an escape clause, if you will, where if you're not happy with how Casella is managing your MSW, is there a way for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	concludes the testimony of the cities of Biddeford and Saco. We will move right on to the summary testimony by the city of Old Town at this time. If you would please come forward. MR. KATSIAFICAS: Hearing Officer Parent, Members of the Panel. My name is Jim Katsiaficas. I'm an attorney with Perkins Thompson representing the city of Old Town and here to present the pre-filed testimony for the city of Old Town is Old Town city manager, Bill Mayo, and shall I hand him the microphone? HEARING OFFICER: Yes, please. Thank you. MR. MAYO: Good afternoon. My name is Bill Mayo. I'm the duly appointed city manager for the city of Old Town. HEARING OFFICER: Speak right into the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. JACQUES: We don't have any redirect. HEARING OFFICER: Given that there's no redirect, we'll move on to DEP staff questions. MR. PARKER: Good after, Mr. Bubier. My name is Mike Parker. I'm the project manager for this application. To use one of Mr. Doyle's terms, is there ability for the city of Biddeford to breach its current contract with Pine Tree Waste for the management of your MSW? MR. BUBIER: Is there what? I'm sorry. MR. PARKER: Is there an ability for you to breach the contract? MR. BUBIER: To breach the contract? MR. PARKER: Yes. Is there an escape clause, if you will, where if you're not happy with how Casella is managing your MSW, is there a way for you to breach that contact? Would you have to notify	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	concludes the testimony of the cities of Biddeford and Saco. We will move right on to the summary testimony by the city of Old Town at this time. If you would please come forward. MR. KATSIAFICAS: Hearing Officer Parent, Members of the Panel. My name is Jim Katsiaficas. I'm an attorney with Perkins Thompson representing the city of Old Town and here to present the pre-filed testimony for the city of Old Town is Old Town city manager, Bill Mayo, and shall I hand him the microphone? HEARING OFFICER: Yes, please. Thank you. MR. MAYO: Good afternoon. My name is Bill Mayo. I'm the duly appointed city manager for the city of Old Town. HEARING OFFICER: Speak right into the microphone, please.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. JACQUES: We don't have any redirect. HEARING OFFICER: Given that there's no redirect, we'll move on to DEP staff questions. MR. PARKER: Good after, Mr. Bubier. My name is Mike Parker. I'm the project manager for this application. To use one of Mr. Doyle's terms, is there ability for the city of Biddeford to breach its current contract with Pine Tree Waste for the management of your MSW? MR. BUBIER: Is there what? I'm sorry. MR. PARKER: Is there an ability for you to breach the contract? MR. BUBIER: To breach the contract? MR. PARKER: Yes. Is there an escape clause, if you will, where if you're not happy with how Casella is managing your MSW, is there a way for you to breach that contact? Would you have to notify them at some point.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	concludes the testimony of the cities of Biddeford and Saco. We will move right on to the summary testimony by the city of Old Town at this time. If you would please come forward. MR. KATSIAFICAS: Hearing Officer Parent, Members of the Panel. My name is Jim Katsiaficas. I'm an attorney with Perkins Thompson representing the city of Old Town and here to present the pre-filed testimony for the city of Old Town is Old Town city manager, Bill Mayo, and shall I hand him the microphone? HEARING OFFICER: Yes, please. Thank you. MR. MAYO: Good afternoon. My name is Bill Mayo. I'm the duly appointed city manager for the city of Old Town. HEARING OFFICER: Speak right into the microphone, please. MR. MAYO: One of my duties as city manager
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. JACQUES: We don't have any redirect. HEARING OFFICER: Given that there's no redirect, we'll move on to DEP staff questions. MR. PARKER: Good after, Mr. Bubier. My name is Mike Parker. I'm the project manager for this application. To use one of Mr. Doyle's terms, is there ability for the city of Biddeford to breach its current contract with Pine Tree Waste for the management of your MSW? MR. BUBIER: Is there what? I'm sorry. MR. PARKER: Is there an ability for you to breach the contract? MR. BUBIER: To breach the contract? MR. PARKER: Yes. Is there an escape clause, if you will, where if you're not happy with how Casella is managing your MSW, is there a way for you to breach that contact? Would you have to notify them at some point. MR. BUBIER: I would assume that if the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	concludes the testimony of the cities of Biddeford and Saco. We will move right on to the summary testimony by the city of Old Town at this time. If you would please come forward. MR. KATSIAFICAS: Hearing Officer Parent, Members of the Panel. My name is Jim Katsiaficas. I'm an attorney with Perkins Thompson representing the city of Old Town and here to present the pre-filed testimony for the city of Old Town is Old Town city manager, Bill Mayo, and shall I hand him the microphone? HEARING OFFICER: Yes, please. Thank you. MR. MAYO: Good afternoon. My name is Bill Mayo. I'm the duly appointed city manager for the city of Old Town. HEARING OFFICER: Speak right into the microphone, please. MR. MAYO: One of my duties as city manager is monitoring issues regarding the operation of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. JACQUES: We don't have any redirect. HEARING OFFICER: Given that there's no redirect, we'll move on to DEP staff questions. MR. PARKER: Good after, Mr. Bubier. My name is Mike Parker. I'm the project manager for this application. To use one of Mr. Doyle's terms, is there ability for the city of Biddeford to breach its current contract with Pine Tree Waste for the management of your MSW? MR. BUBIER: Is there what? I'm sorry. MR. PARKER: Is there an ability for you to breach the contract? MR. BUBIER: To breach the contract? MR. PARKER: Yes. Is there an escape clause, if you will, where if you're not happy with how Casella is managing your MSW, is there a way for you to breach that contact? Would you have to notify them at some point. MR. BUBIER: I would assume that if the contract conditions and provisions were not followed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	concludes the testimony of the cities of Biddeford and Saco. We will move right on to the summary testimony by the city of Old Town at this time. If you would please come forward. MR. KATSIAFICAS: Hearing Officer Parent, Members of the Panel. My name is Jim Katsiaficas. I'm an attorney with Perkins Thompson representing the city of Old Town and here to present the pre-filed testimony for the city of Old Town is Old Town city manager, Bill Mayo, and shall I hand him the microphone? HEARING OFFICER: Yes, please. Thank you. MR. MAYO: Good afternoon. My name is Bill Mayo. I'm the duly appointed city manager for the city of Old Town. HEARING OFFICER: Speak right into the microphone, please. MR. MAYO: One of my duties as city manager is monitoring issues regarding the operation of the Juniper Ridge Landfill and advising the Old Town City
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. JACQUES: We don't have any redirect. HEARING OFFICER: Given that there's no redirect, we'll move on to DEP staff questions. MR. PARKER: Good after, Mr. Bubier. My name is Mike Parker. I'm the project manager for this application. To use one of Mr. Doyle's terms, is there ability for the city of Biddeford to breach its current contract with Pine Tree Waste for the management of your MSW? MR. BUBIER: Is there what? I'm sorry. MR. PARKER: Is there an ability for you to breach the contract? MR. BUBIER: To breach the contract? MR. BUBIER: Yes. Is there an escape clause, if you will, where if you're not happy with how Casella is managing your MSW, is there a way for you to breach that contact? Would you have to notify them at some point. MR. BUBIER: I would assume that if the contract conditions and provisions were not followed either by one or the other or both of the parties,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	concludes the testimony of the cities of Biddeford and Saco. We will move right on to the summary testimony by the city of Old Town at this time. If you would please come forward. MR. KATSIAFICAS: Hearing Officer Parent, Members of the Panel. My name is Jim Katsiaficas. I'm an attorney with Perkins Thompson representing the city of Old Town and here to present the pre-filed testimony for the city of Old Town is Old Town city manager, Bill Mayo, and shall I hand him the microphone? HEARING OFFICER: Yes, please. Thank you. MR. MAYO: Good afternoon. My name is Bill Mayo. I'm the duly appointed city manager for the city of Old Town. HEARING OFFICER: Speak right into the microphone, please. MR. MAYO: One of my duties as city manager is monitoring issues regarding the operation of the Juniper Ridge Landfill and advising the Old Town City Council of those issues.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. JACQUES: We don't have any redirect. HEARING OFFICER: Given that there's no redirect, we'll move on to DEP staff questions. MR. PARKER: Good after, Mr. Bubier. My name is Mike Parker. I'm the project manager for this application. To use one of Mr. Doyle's terms, is there ability for the city of Biddeford to breach its current contract with Pine Tree Waste for the management of your MSW? MR. BUBIER: Is there what? I'm sorry. MR. PARKER: Is there an ability for you to breach the contract? MR. BUBIER: To breach the contract? MR. PARKER: Yes. Is there an escape clause, if you will, where if you're not happy with how Casella is managing your MSW, is there a way for you to breach that contact? Would you have to notify them at some point. MR. BUBIER: I would assume that if the contract conditions and provisions were not followed either by one or the other or both of the parties, there would be an option to breach the contract.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	concludes the testimony of the cities of Biddeford and Saco. We will move right on to the summary testimony by the city of Old Town at this time. If you would please come forward. MR. KATSIAFICAS: Hearing Officer Parent, Members of the Panel. My name is Jim Katsiaficas. I'm an attorney with Perkins Thompson representing the city of Old Town and here to present the pre-filed testimony for the city of Old Town is Old Town city manager, Bill Mayo, and shall I hand him the microphone? HEARING OFFICER: Yes, please. Thank you. MR. MAYO: Good afternoon. My name is Bill Mayo. I'm the duly appointed city manager for the city of Old Town. HEARING OFFICER: Speak right into the microphone, please. MR. MAYO: One of my duties as city manager is monitoring issues regarding the operation of the Juniper Ridge Landfill and advising the Old Town City Council of those issues. The city of Old Town is a host community for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. JACQUES: We don't have any redirect. HEARING OFFICER: Given that there's no redirect, we'll move on to DEP staff questions. MR. PARKER: Good after, Mr. Bubier. My name is Mike Parker. I'm the project manager for this application. To use one of Mr. Doyle's terms, is there ability for the city of Biddeford to breach its current contract with Pine Tree Waste for the management of your MSW? MR. BUBIER: Is there what? I'm sorry. MR. PARKER: Is there an ability for you to breach the contract? MR. BUBIER: To breach the contract? MR. PARKER: Yes. Is there an escape clause, if you will, where if you're not happy with how Casella is managing your MSW, is there a way for you to breach that contact? Would you have to notify them at some point. MR. BUBIER: I would assume that if the contract conditions and provisions were not followed either by one or the other or both of the parties, there would be an option to breach the contract. I'm not I'm not sure what the conditions are.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	concludes the testimony of the cities of Biddeford and Saco. We will move right on to the summary testimony by the city of Old Town at this time. If you would please come forward. MR. KATSIAFICAS: Hearing Officer Parent, Members of the Panel. My name is Jim Katsiaficas. I'm an attorney with Perkins Thompson representing the city of Old Town and here to present the pre-filed testimony for the city of Old Town is Old Town city manager, Bill Mayo, and shall I hand him the microphone? HEARING OFFICER: Yes, please. Thank you. MR. MAYO: Good afternoon. My name is Bill Mayo. I'm the duly appointed city manager for the city of Old Town. HEARING OFFICER: Speak right into the microphone, please. MR. MAYO: One of my duties as city manager is monitoring issues regarding the operation of the Juniper Ridge Landfill and advising the Old Town City Council of those issues. The city of Old Town is a host community for Juniper Ridge Landfill. As a host community of JRL
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. JACQUES: We don't have any redirect. HEARING OFFICER: Given that there's no redirect, we'll move on to DEP staff questions. MR. PARKER: Good after, Mr. Bubier. My name is Mike Parker. I'm the project manager for this application. To use one of Mr. Doyle's terms, is there ability for the city of Biddeford to breach its current contract with Pine Tree Waste for the management of your MSW? MR. BUBIER: Is there what? I'm sorry. MR. PARKER: Is there an ability for you to breach the contract? MR. BUBIER: To breach the contract? MR. PARKER: Yes. Is there an escape clause, if you will, where if you're not happy with how Casella is managing your MSW, is there a way for you to breach that contact? Would you have to notify them at some point. MR. BUBIER: I would assume that if the contract conditions and provisions were not followed either by one or the other or both of the parties, there would be an option to breach the contract.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	concludes the testimony of the cities of Biddeford and Saco. We will move right on to the summary testimony by the city of Old Town at this time. If you would please come forward. MR. KATSIAFICAS: Hearing Officer Parent, Members of the Panel. My name is Jim Katsiaficas. I'm an attorney with Perkins Thompson representing the city of Old Town and here to present the pre-filed testimony for the city of Old Town is Old Town city manager, Bill Mayo, and shall I hand him the microphone? HEARING OFFICER: Yes, please. Thank you. MR. MAYO: Good afternoon. My name is Bill Mayo. I'm the duly appointed city manager for the city of Old Town. HEARING OFFICER: Speak right into the microphone, please. MR. MAYO: One of my duties as city manager is monitoring issues regarding the operation of the Juniper Ridge Landfill and advising the Old Town City Council of those issues. The city of Old Town is a host community for

	360		362
1	positive or negative, that JRL has on its residents;	1	year in the future. The city understands that the
2	therefore, the city offers the following comments in	2	overall reduction in truck traffic is attributable to
3	the matter of the amendment application to accept	3	the reduction in truck traffic necessary to transport
		4	
4	municipal solid waste from Maine sources.	_	FEPR, incinerator and MSW incinerator ash from Maine
5	The application proposes that JRL will	5	Energy. So long as the overall number of truck loads
6	receive up to 93,000 tons per year of municipal solid	6	entering JRL does not increase, the city's concerns
7	waste that previously had been disposed of at Maine	7	are addressed. Perhaps if DEP might attach a
8	Energy. This does not represent an increase in the	8	condition of approval that the number of trips per
9	amount of solid waste disposed at JRL but does	9	year or truck loads per year and per day not exceed
10	represent a change in the nature of that solid waste	10	certain numbers based upon past use would help assure
11	and it is that change that concerns the city of Old	11	our residents who live in that area that the granting
12	Town.	12	of this application will not create any harm due to
13	Until the end of calendar year 2012, JRL	13	increased truck traffic.
14	received front-end process residual and incinerator	14	Odor is another concern of the city. Odor
15	ash as well as incinerator bypass MSW and soft layer	15	complaints, like other landfill related complaints,
16	MSW from both Maine Energy incinerator in Biddeford	16	regarding JRL are reported to the city and the city
17	and the PERC facility in Orrington. The change in	17	follows up with NEWSME and Casella Waste Systems,
18	the nature of the waste stream proposed in this	18	Inc., as contract operator JRL, to seek to have these
19	application which results from the closure of Maine	19	issues addressed. The city's experience has been
20	Energy and its cessation of incineration of MSW means	20	that NEWSME and Casella are responsive when odor
21	that the amount of MSW to be disposed of at JRL will	21	complaints arise. At Sections 2.5, 3.5 and 4.8 of
22	increase from 22,400 cubic yards in 2011 to 81,800	22	the revised application, the applicant's propose to
23	cubic yards according to figure 1-1 in the	23	continue their active measures in place to control
24	applicant's December 2012 revised application. At	24	gas and odor at JRL including a fogging system,
25	the same time, the amounts of FEPR will decline from	25	operational changes, flare gas emissions and to use
	361		363
1	361 103,300 cubic yards per year to 60,500 cubic yards	1	363 landfill gas as a fuel for the University of Maine at
1		1 2	
	103,300 cubic yards per year to 60,500 cubic yards		landfill gas as a fuel for the University of Maine at
2	103,300 cubic yards per year to 60,500 cubic yards per year and the amounts of incinerator ash will	2	landfill gas as a fuel for the University of Maine at Orono campus. So long as DEP is satisfied that these
2 3	103,300 cubic yards per year to 60,500 cubic yards per year and the amounts of incinerator ash will decline from 105,500 cubic yards to 55,600 cubic	2 3	landfill gas as a fuel for the University of Maine at Orono campus. So long as DEP is satisfied that these efforts are sufficient to address odor issues that
2 3 4	103,300 cubic yards per year to 60,500 cubic yards per year and the amounts of incinerator ash will decline from 105,500 cubic yards to 55,600 cubic yards per year, thus the quantities of incinerator	2 3 4	landfill gas as a fuel for the University of Maine at Orono campus. So long as DEP is satisfied that these efforts are sufficient to address odor issues that might arise at JRL as a result of disposal of
2 3 4 5	103,300 cubic yards per year to 60,500 cubic yards per year and the amounts of incinerator ash will decline from 105,500 cubic yards to 55,600 cubic yards per year, thus the quantities of incinerator ash which is largely an inert material posing no odor	2 3 4 5	landfill gas as a fuel for the University of Maine at Orono campus. So long as DEP is satisfied that these efforts are sufficient to address odor issues that might arise at JRL as a result of disposal of increased amounts of MSW, the city is satisfied with
2 3 4 5 6	103,300 cubic yards per year to 60,500 cubic yards per year and the amounts of incinerator ash will decline from 105,500 cubic yards to 55,600 cubic yards per year, thus the quantities of incinerator ash which is largely an inert material posing no odor or vector control issues would be reduced by half and	2 3 4 5 6	landfill gas as a fuel for the University of Maine at Orono campus. So long as DEP is satisfied that these efforts are sufficient to address odor issues that might arise at JRL as a result of disposal of increased amounts of MSW, the city is satisfied with DEP's review.
2 3 4 5 6 7	103,300 cubic yards per year to 60,500 cubic yards per year and the amounts of incinerator ash will decline from 105,500 cubic yards to 55,600 cubic yards per year, thus the quantities of incinerator ash which is largely an inert material posing no odor or vector control issues would be reduced by half and the amounts of MSW that do present potential odor and	2 3 4 5 6 7	landfill gas as a fuel for the University of Maine at Orono campus. So long as DEP is satisfied that these efforts are sufficient to address odor issues that might arise at JRL as a result of disposal of increased amounts of MSW, the city is satisfied with DEP's review. Vectors and litter, because the application
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	103,300 cubic yards per year to 60,500 cubic yards per year and the amounts of incinerator ash will decline from 105,500 cubic yards to 55,600 cubic yards per year, thus the quantities of incinerator ash which is largely an inert material posing no odor or vector control issues would be reduced by half and the amounts of MSW that do present potential odor and vector issues will be nearly quadruple according to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	landfill gas as a fuel for the University of Maine at Orono campus. So long as DEP is satisfied that these efforts are sufficient to address odor issues that might arise at JRL as a result of disposal of increased amounts of MSW, the city is satisfied with DEP's review. Vectors and litter, because the application involves a reduction in the amount of relatively
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	103,300 cubic yards per year to 60,500 cubic yards per year and the amounts of incinerator ash will decline from 105,500 cubic yards to 55,600 cubic yards per year, thus the quantities of incinerator ash which is largely an inert material posing no odor or vector control issues would be reduced by half and the amounts of MSW that do present potential odor and vector issues will be nearly quadruple according to the applicant's submittals.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	landfill gas as a fuel for the University of Maine at Orono campus. So long as DEP is satisfied that these efforts are sufficient to address odor issues that might arise at JRL as a result of disposal of increased amounts of MSW, the city is satisfied with DEP's review. Vectors and litter, because the application involves a reduction in the amount of relatively inert incinerator ash being delivered and an increase
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	103,300 cubic yards per year to 60,500 cubic yards per year and the amounts of incinerator ash will decline from 105,500 cubic yards to 55,600 cubic yards per year, thus the quantities of incinerator ash which is largely an inert material posing no odor or vector control issues would be reduced by half and the amounts of MSW that do present potential odor and vector issues will be nearly quadruple according to the applicant's submittals. It is a potential for issues caused by the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	landfill gas as a fuel for the University of Maine at Orono campus. So long as DEP is satisfied that these efforts are sufficient to address odor issues that might arise at JRL as a result of disposal of increased amounts of MSW, the city is satisfied with DEP's review. Vectors and litter, because the application involves a reduction in the amount of relatively inert incinerator ash being delivered and an increase in the amount of raw MSW being delivered to JRL, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	103,300 cubic yards per year to 60,500 cubic yards per year and the amounts of incinerator ash will decline from 105,500 cubic yards to 55,600 cubic yards per year, thus the quantities of incinerator ash which is largely an inert material posing no odor or vector control issues would be reduced by half and the amounts of MSW that do present potential odor and vector issues will be nearly quadruple according to the applicant's submittals. It is a potential for issues caused by the proposed change in waste stream that concerns the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	landfill gas as a fuel for the University of Maine at Orono campus. So long as DEP is satisfied that these efforts are sufficient to address odor issues that might arise at JRL as a result of disposal of increased amounts of MSW, the city is satisfied with DEP's review. Vectors and litter, because the application involves a reduction in the amount of relatively inert incinerator ash being delivered and an increase in the amount of raw MSW being delivered to JRL, the city has concerns about the way in which this MSW
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	103,300 cubic yards per year to 60,500 cubic yards per year and the amounts of incinerator ash will decline from 105,500 cubic yards to 55,600 cubic yards per year, thus the quantities of incinerator ash which is largely an inert material posing no odor or vector control issues would be reduced by half and the amounts of MSW that do present potential odor and vector issues will be nearly quadruple according to the applicant's submittals. It is a potential for issues caused by the proposed change in waste stream that concerns the city. The city's specific concerns as are follows,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	landfill gas as a fuel for the University of Maine at Orono campus. So long as DEP is satisfied that these efforts are sufficient to address odor issues that might arise at JRL as a result of disposal of increased amounts of MSW, the city is satisfied with DEP's review. Vectors and litter, because the application involves a reduction in the amount of relatively inert incinerator ash being delivered and an increase in the amount of raw MSW being delivered to JRL, the city has concerns about the way in which this MSW will be managed in order to minimize litter issues
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	103,300 cubic yards per year to 60,500 cubic yards per year and the amounts of incinerator ash will decline from 105,500 cubic yards to 55,600 cubic yards per year, thus the quantities of incinerator ash which is largely an inert material posing no odor or vector control issues would be reduced by half and the amounts of MSW that do present potential odor and vector issues will be nearly quadruple according to the applicant's submittals. It is a potential for issues caused by the proposed change in waste stream that concerns the city. The city's specific concerns as are follows, transportation, existing haul routes as noted by the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	landfill gas as a fuel for the University of Maine at Orono campus. So long as DEP is satisfied that these efforts are sufficient to address odor issues that might arise at JRL as a result of disposal of increased amounts of MSW, the city is satisfied with DEP's review. Vectors and litter, because the application involves a reduction in the amount of relatively inert incinerator ash being delivered and an increase in the amount of raw MSW being delivered to JRL, the city has concerns about the way in which this MSW will be managed in order to minimize litter issues and access to birds and animals. Section 4.6 of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	103,300 cubic yards per year to 60,500 cubic yards per year and the amounts of incinerator ash will decline from 105,500 cubic yards to 55,600 cubic yards per year, thus the quantities of incinerator ash which is largely an inert material posing no odor or vector control issues would be reduced by half and the amounts of MSW that do present potential odor and vector issues will be nearly quadruple according to the applicant's submittals. It is a potential for issues caused by the proposed change in waste stream that concerns the city. The city's specific concerns as are follows, transportation, existing haul routes as noted by the applicants in Section 2.4 of the revised application	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	landfill gas as a fuel for the University of Maine at Orono campus. So long as DEP is satisfied that these efforts are sufficient to address odor issues that might arise at JRL as a result of disposal of increased amounts of MSW, the city is satisfied with DEP's review. Vectors and litter, because the application involves a reduction in the amount of relatively inert incinerator ash being delivered and an increase in the amount of raw MSW being delivered to JRL, the city has concerns about the way in which this MSW will be managed in order to minimize litter issues and access to birds and animals. Section 4.6 of the revised application proposes placement of daily cover
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	103,300 cubic yards per year to 60,500 cubic yards per year and the amounts of incinerator ash will decline from 105,500 cubic yards to 55,600 cubic yards per year, thus the quantities of incinerator ash which is largely an inert material posing no odor or vector control issues would be reduced by half and the amounts of MSW that do present potential odor and vector issues will be nearly quadruple according to the applicant's submittals. It is a potential for issues caused by the proposed change in waste stream that concerns the city. The city's specific concerns as are follows, transportation, existing haul routes as noted by the applicants in Section 2.4 of the revised application require trucks hauling waste to pass over Route 16	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	landfill gas as a fuel for the University of Maine at Orono campus. So long as DEP is satisfied that these efforts are sufficient to address odor issues that might arise at JRL as a result of disposal of increased amounts of MSW, the city is satisfied with DEP's review. Vectors and litter, because the application involves a reduction in the amount of relatively inert incinerator ash being delivered and an increase in the amount of raw MSW being delivered to JRL, the city has concerns about the way in which this MSW will be managed in order to minimize litter issues and access to birds and animals. Section 4.6 of the revised application proposes placement of daily cover over all areas receiving MSW, FEPR and other waste
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	103,300 cubic yards per year to 60,500 cubic yards per year and the amounts of incinerator ash will decline from 105,500 cubic yards to 55,600 cubic yards per year, thus the quantities of incinerator ash which is largely an inert material posing no odor or vector control issues would be reduced by half and the amounts of MSW that do present potential odor and vector issues will be nearly quadruple according to the applicant's submittals. It is a potential for issues caused by the proposed change in waste stream that concerns the city. The city's specific concerns as are follows, transportation, existing haul routes as noted by the applicants in Section 2.4 of the revised application require trucks hauling waste to pass over Route 16 between the Interstate 95 interchange and JRL. While	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	landfill gas as a fuel for the University of Maine at Orono campus. So long as DEP is satisfied that these efforts are sufficient to address odor issues that might arise at JRL as a result of disposal of increased amounts of MSW, the city is satisfied with DEP's review. Vectors and litter, because the application involves a reduction in the amount of relatively inert incinerator ash being delivered and an increase in the amount of raw MSW being delivered to JRL, the city has concerns about the way in which this MSW will be managed in order to minimize litter issues and access to birds and animals. Section 4.6 of the revised application proposes placement of daily cover over all areas receiving MSW, FEPR and other waste with odor generating potential. It also proposes the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	103,300 cubic yards per year to 60,500 cubic yards per year and the amounts of incinerator ash will decline from 105,500 cubic yards to 55,600 cubic yards per year, thus the quantities of incinerator ash which is largely an inert material posing no odor or vector control issues would be reduced by half and the amounts of MSW that do present potential odor and vector issues will be nearly quadruple according to the applicant's submittals. It is a potential for issues caused by the proposed change in waste stream that concerns the city. The city's specific concerns as are follows, transportation, existing haul routes as noted by the applicants in Section 2.4 of the revised application require trucks hauling waste to pass over Route 16 between the Interstate 95 interchange and JRL. While this distance is only a tenth of a mile, it still	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	landfill gas as a fuel for the University of Maine at Orono campus. So long as DEP is satisfied that these efforts are sufficient to address odor issues that might arise at JRL as a result of disposal of increased amounts of MSW, the city is satisfied with DEP's review. Vectors and litter, because the application involves a reduction in the amount of relatively inert incinerator ash being delivered and an increase in the amount of raw MSW being delivered to JRL, the city has concerns about the way in which this MSW will be managed in order to minimize litter issues and access to birds and animals. Section 4.6 of the revised application proposes placement of daily cover over all areas receiving MSW, FEPR and other waste with odor generating potential. It also proposes the placement of intermediate cover when additional waste
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	103,300 cubic yards per year to 60,500 cubic yards per year and the amounts of incinerator ash will decline from 105,500 cubic yards to 55,600 cubic yards per year, thus the quantities of incinerator ash which is largely an inert material posing no odor or vector control issues would be reduced by half and the amounts of MSW that do present potential odor and vector issues will be nearly quadruple according to the applicant's submittals. It is a potential for issues caused by the proposed change in waste stream that concerns the city. The city's specific concerns as are follows, transportation, existing haul routes as noted by the applicants in Section 2.4 of the revised application require trucks hauling waste to pass over Route 16 between the Interstate 95 interchange and JRL. While this distance is only a tenth of a mile, it still causes trucks loaded with MSW to be passing by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	landfill gas as a fuel for the University of Maine at Orono campus. So long as DEP is satisfied that these efforts are sufficient to address odor issues that might arise at JRL as a result of disposal of increased amounts of MSW, the city is satisfied with DEP's review. Vectors and litter, because the application involves a reduction in the amount of relatively inert incinerator ash being delivered and an increase in the amount of raw MSW being delivered to JRL, the city has concerns about the way in which this MSW will be managed in order to minimize litter issues and access to birds and animals. Section 4.6 of the revised application proposes placement of daily cover over all areas receiving MSW, FEPR and other waste with odor generating potential. It also proposes the placement of intermediate cover when additional waste is placed for periods of six months or longer and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	103,300 cubic yards per year to 60,500 cubic yards per year and the amounts of incinerator ash will decline from 105,500 cubic yards to 55,600 cubic yards per year, thus the quantities of incinerator ash which is largely an inert material posing no odor or vector control issues would be reduced by half and the amounts of MSW that do present potential odor and vector issues will be nearly quadruple according to the applicant's submittals. It is a potential for issues caused by the proposed change in waste stream that concerns the city. The city's specific concerns as are follows, transportation, existing haul routes as noted by the applicants in Section 2.4 of the revised application require trucks hauling waste to pass over Route 16 between the Interstate 95 interchange and JRL. While this distance is only a tenth of a mile, it still causes trucks loaded with MSW to be passing by residences. The noise of these trucks traveling at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	landfill gas as a fuel for the University of Maine at Orono campus. So long as DEP is satisfied that these efforts are sufficient to address odor issues that might arise at JRL as a result of disposal of increased amounts of MSW, the city is satisfied with DEP's review. Vectors and litter, because the application involves a reduction in the amount of relatively inert incinerator ash being delivered and an increase in the amount of raw MSW being delivered to JRL, the city has concerns about the way in which this MSW will be managed in order to minimize litter issues and access to birds and animals. Section 4.6 of the revised application proposes placement of daily cover over all areas receiving MSW, FEPR and other waste with odor generating potential. It also proposes the placement of intermediate cover when additional waste is placed for periods of six months or longer and Section 4.9 proposes waste compacting as well as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	103,300 cubic yards per year to 60,500 cubic yards per year and the amounts of incinerator ash will decline from 105,500 cubic yards to 55,600 cubic yards per year, thus the quantities of incinerator ash which is largely an inert material posing no odor or vector control issues would be reduced by half and the amounts of MSW that do present potential odor and vector issues will be nearly quadruple according to the applicant's submittals. It is a potential for issues caused by the proposed change in waste stream that concerns the city. The city's specific concerns as are follows, transportation, existing haul routes as noted by the applicants in Section 2.4 of the revised application require trucks hauling waste to pass over Route 16 between the Interstate 95 interchange and JRL. While this distance is only a tenth of a mile, it still causes trucks loaded with MSW to be passing by residences. The noise of these trucks traveling at all time of day and occasionally using jake brakes	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	landfill gas as a fuel for the University of Maine at Orono campus. So long as DEP is satisfied that these efforts are sufficient to address odor issues that might arise at JRL as a result of disposal of increased amounts of MSW, the city is satisfied with DEP's review. Vectors and litter, because the application involves a reduction in the amount of relatively inert incinerator ash being delivered and an increase in the amount of raw MSW being delivered to JRL, the city has concerns about the way in which this MSW will be managed in order to minimize litter issues and access to birds and animals. Section 4.6 of the revised application proposes placement of daily cover over all areas receiving MSW, FEPR and other waste with odor generating potential. It also proposes the placement of intermediate cover when additional waste is placed for periods of six months or longer and Section 4.9 proposes waste compacting as well as daily cover and placement of litter control fencing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	103,300 cubic yards per year to 60,500 cubic yards per year and the amounts of incinerator ash will decline from 105,500 cubic yards to 55,600 cubic yards per year, thus the quantities of incinerator ash which is largely an inert material posing no odor or vector control issues would be reduced by half and the amounts of MSW that do present potential odor and vector issues will be nearly quadruple according to the applicant's submittals. It is a potential for issues caused by the proposed change in waste stream that concerns the city. The city's specific concerns as are follows, transportation, existing haul routes as noted by the applicants in Section 2.4 of the revised application require trucks hauling waste to pass over Route 16 between the Interstate 95 interchange and JRL. While this distance is only a tenth of a mile, it still causes trucks loaded with MSW to be passing by residences. The noise of these trucks traveling at all time of day and occasionally using jake brakes for engine braking is disturbing to residents along	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	landfill gas as a fuel for the University of Maine at Orono campus. So long as DEP is satisfied that these efforts are sufficient to address odor issues that might arise at JRL as a result of disposal of increased amounts of MSW, the city is satisfied with DEP's review. Vectors and litter, because the application involves a reduction in the amount of relatively inert incinerator ash being delivered and an increase in the amount of raw MSW being delivered to JRL, the city has concerns about the way in which this MSW will be managed in order to minimize litter issues and access to birds and animals. Section 4.6 of the revised application proposes placement of daily cover over all areas receiving MSW, FEPR and other waste with odor generating potential. It also proposes the placement of intermediate cover when additional waste is placed for periods of six months or longer and Section 4.9 proposes waste compacting as well as daily cover and placement of litter control fencing to minimize litter.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	103,300 cubic yards per year to 60,500 cubic yards per year and the amounts of incinerator ash will decline from 105,500 cubic yards to 55,600 cubic yards per year, thus the quantities of incinerator ash which is largely an inert material posing no odor or vector control issues would be reduced by half and the amounts of MSW that do present potential odor and vector issues will be nearly quadruple according to the applicant's submittals. It is a potential for issues caused by the proposed change in waste stream that concerns the city. The city's specific concerns as are follows, transportation, existing haul routes as noted by the applicants in Section 2.4 of the revised application require trucks hauling waste to pass over Route 16 between the Interstate 95 interchange and JRL. While this distance is only a tenth of a mile, it still causes trucks loaded with MSW to be passing by residences. The noise of these trucks traveling at all time of day and occasionally using jake brakes for engine braking is disturbing to residents along that road. The city notes that the applicants	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Iandfill gas as a fuel for the University of Maine at Orono campus. So long as DEP is satisfied that these efforts are sufficient to address odor issues that might arise at JRL as a result of disposal of increased amounts of MSW, the city is satisfied with DEP's review. Vectors and litter, because the application involves a reduction in the amount of relatively inert incinerator ash being delivered and an increase in the amount of raw MSW being delivered to JRL, the city has concerns about the way in which this MSW will be managed in order to minimize litter issues and access to birds and animals. Section 4.6 of the revised application proposes placement of daily cover over all areas receiving MSW, FEPR and other waste with odor generating potential. It also proposes the placement of intermediate cover when additional waste is placed for periods of six months or longer and Section 4.9 proposes waste compacting as well as daily cover and placement of litter control fencing to minimize litter.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	103,300 cubic yards per year to 60,500 cubic yards per year and the amounts of incinerator ash will decline from 105,500 cubic yards to 55,600 cubic yards per year, thus the quantities of incinerator ash which is largely an inert material posing no odor or vector control issues would be reduced by half and the amounts of MSW that do present potential odor and vector issues will be nearly quadruple according to the applicant's submittals. It is a potential for issues caused by the proposed change in waste stream that concerns the city. The city's specific concerns as are follows, transportation, existing haul routes as noted by the applicants in Section 2.4 of the revised application require trucks hauling waste to pass over Route 16 between the Interstate 95 interchange and JRL. While this distance is only a tenth of a mile, it still causes trucks loaded with MSW to be passing by residences. The noise of these trucks traveling at all time of day and occasionally using jake brakes for engine braking is disturbing to residents along that road. The city notes that the applicants propose fewer total loads per day and per year,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	landfill gas as a fuel for the University of Maine at Orono campus. So long as DEP is satisfied that these efforts are sufficient to address odor issues that might arise at JRL as a result of disposal of increased amounts of MSW, the city is satisfied with DEP's review. Vectors and litter, because the application involves a reduction in the amount of relatively inert incinerator ash being delivered and an increase in the amount of raw MSW being delivered to JRL, the city has concerns about the way in which this MSW will be managed in order to minimize litter issues and access to birds and animals. Section 4.6 of the revised application proposes placement of daily cover over all areas receiving MSW, FEPR and other waste with odor generating potential. It also proposes the placement of intermediate cover when additional waste is placed for periods of six months or longer and Section 4.9 proposes waste compacting as well as daily cover and placement of litter control fencing to minimize litter. Under Section 4.11 of the revised application, vector control includes that same

	204	T	200
	364		366
1	also indicates that JRL maintains a contract with	1	significant source reduction from Maine's waste
2	Modern Pest Control to control potential rodents at	2	management system. The city supports the concept of
3	the facility.	3	reducing the amount of out-of-state waste processed
4	So long as DEP's review demonstrates that	4	by Maine's solid waste management system and disposed
5	these actions are sufficient to control litter and	5	of at JRL and asks DEP to ensure that this reduction
6	vector exposure, the city is satisfied with DEP's	6	in disposal of out-of-state MSW derived waste at JRL
7	review of these issues.	7	is part of any approval of the revised application.
8	Noise, the Old Town residents who live near	8	Finally, I wish to make it clear that the
9	JRL do have occasional noise complaints. Section 4.2	9	city does not object to and is not opposed to the
10	of the revised application specifies standard hours	10	proposed application. Applicants NEWSME and Casella
11	of operation Monday through Friday, 6 a.m. to 8 p.m.,	11	have been responsive to issues and questions that
12	Saturday and Sunday, 7 a.m. to 4 p.m., but it also	12	have arisen regarding landfill operation and have
13	states that delivery of some of these wastes may	13	been a responsible community business contributing to
14	occur outside these standard hours of operation. The	14	civic organizations and events in Old Town; however,
15	city asks that the applicant attempts to stay within	15	the city of Old Town represents all its residents,
16	the standard hours of operation to the greatest	16	some of who are affected or may be affected by
17	extent possible.	17	transportation, noise, odors, truck traffic,
18	Leachate management, I won't read down	18	leachate, litter and vectors that could be impacted
19	through this because I believe yesterday one of the	19	as a result of the change in the nature of the waste
20	concerns we had with the city of Brewer, Jeremy Labbe	20	stream proposed by this application. It is for these
21	dealt with that and that permit has been okayed. I	21	reasons that the city presents these concerns with
22	guess to look at that, my only thing to say to that	22	every expectation that DEP will ensure that the
23	is that the city would ask that DEP review those	23	applicants satisfactorily address those concerns and
24	leachate standards parameters closely to assure	24	with every expectation that the applicants will do
25	the public that there will adequate disposal	25	so. Thank you.
	365		367
1	365 availability for leachate generating if the	1	367 HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any
1		1 2	
	availability for leachate generating if the		HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any
2	availability for leachate generating if the application is approved.	2	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any parties who wish to cross examine the city of Old
2 3	availability for leachate generating if the application is approved. Out-of-state waste, a number of city	2 3	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any parties who wish to cross examine the city of Old Town? Seeing none, Department questions?
2 3 4	availability for leachate generating if the application is approved. Out-of-state waste, a number of city residents have expressed concerns that capacity at	2 3 4	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any parties who wish to cross examine the city of Old Town? Seeing none, Department questions? MR. PARKER: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. I'm
2 3 4 5	availability for leachate generating if the application is approved. Out-of-state waste, a number of city residents have expressed concerns that capacity at JRL is being used to dispose of out-of-state waste.	2 3 4 5	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any parties who wish to cross examine the city of Old Town? Seeing none, Department questions? MR. PARKER: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP project manager. Are you aware
2 3 4 5 6	availability for leachate generating if the application is approved. Out-of-state waste, a number of city residents have expressed concerns that capacity at JRL is being used to dispose of out-of-state waste. Their concerns arise because the Operating Services	2 3 4 5 6	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any parties who wish to cross examine the city of Old Town? Seeing none, Department questions? MR. PARKER: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP project manager. Are you aware of any instances where JRL or their staff have not
2 3 4 5 6 7	availability for leachate generating if the application is approved. Out-of-state waste, a number of city residents have expressed concerns that capacity at JRL is being used to dispose of out-of-state waste. Their concerns arise because the Operating Services Agreement between the state of Maine and Casella	2 3 4 5 6 7	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any parties who wish to cross examine the city of Old Town? Seeing none, Department questions? MR. PARKER: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP project manager. Are you aware of any instances where JRL or their staff have not responded appropriately to any odor complaints?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	availability for leachate generating if the application is approved. Out-of-state waste, a number of city residents have expressed concerns that capacity at JRL is being used to dispose of out-of-state waste. Their concerns arise because the Operating Services Agreement between the state of Maine and Casella prohibits the disposal of waste generated upstate at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any parties who wish to cross examine the city of Old Town? Seeing none, Department questions? MR. PARKER: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP project manager. Are you aware of any instances where JRL or their staff have not responded appropriately to any odor complaints? MR. MAYO: No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	availability for leachate generating if the application is approved. Out-of-state waste, a number of city residents have expressed concerns that capacity at JRL is being used to dispose of out-of-state waste. Their concerns arise because the Operating Services Agreement between the state of Maine and Casella prohibits the disposal of waste generated upstate at JRL and also because disposal of such waste lead to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any parties who wish to cross examine the city of Old Town? Seeing none, Department questions? MR. PARKER: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP project manager. Are you aware of any instances where JRL or their staff have not responded appropriately to any odor complaints? MR. MAYO: No. MR. PARKER: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	availability for leachate generating if the application is approved. Out-of-state waste, a number of city residents have expressed concerns that capacity at JRL is being used to dispose of out-of-state waste. Their concerns arise because the Operating Services Agreement between the state of Maine and Casella prohibits the disposal of waste generated upstate at JRL and also because disposal of such waste lead to early filling of this landfill which is a state solid	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any parties who wish to cross examine the city of Old Town? Seeing none, Department questions? MR. PARKER: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP project manager. Are you aware of any instances where JRL or their staff have not responded appropriately to any odor complaints? MR. MAYO: No. MR. PARKER: Thank you. MS. LOYZIM: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. It
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	availability for leachate generating if the application is approved. Out-of-state waste, a number of city residents have expressed concerns that capacity at JRL is being used to dispose of out-of-state waste. Their concerns arise because the Operating Services Agreement between the state of Maine and Casella prohibits the disposal of waste generated upstate at JRL and also because disposal of such waste lead to early filling of this landfill which is a state solid waste management resource; yet, MSW has had to be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any parties who wish to cross examine the city of Old Town? Seeing none, Department questions? MR. PARKER: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP project manager. Are you aware of any instances where JRL or their staff have not responded appropriately to any odor complaints? MR. MAYO: No. MR. PARKER: Thank you. MS. LOYZIM: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. It was stated earlier today I believe that there might
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	availability for leachate generating if the application is approved. Out-of-state waste, a number of city residents have expressed concerns that capacity at JRL is being used to dispose of out-of-state waste. Their concerns arise because the Operating Services Agreement between the state of Maine and Casella prohibits the disposal of waste generated upstate at JRL and also because disposal of such waste lead to early filling of this landfill which is a state solid waste management resource; yet, MSW has had to be imported from out of state to ensure continuous	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any parties who wish to cross examine the city of Old Town? Seeing none, Department questions? MR. PARKER: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP project manager. Are you aware of any instances where JRL or their staff have not responded appropriately to any odor complaints? MR. MAYO: No. MR. PARKER: Thank you. MS. LOYZIM: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. It was stated earlier today I believe that there might be some cost to the city of Old Town associated with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	availability for leachate generating if the application is approved. Out-of-state waste, a number of city residents have expressed concerns that capacity at JRL is being used to dispose of out-of-state waste. Their concerns arise because the Operating Services Agreement between the state of Maine and Casella prohibits the disposal of waste generated upstate at JRL and also because disposal of such waste lead to early filling of this landfill which is a state solid waste management resource; yet, MSW has had to be imported from out of state to ensure continuous operations of the Maine Energy waste-to-energy	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any parties who wish to cross examine the city of Old Town? Seeing none, Department questions? MR. PARKER: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP project manager. Are you aware of any instances where JRL or their staff have not responded appropriately to any odor complaints? MR. MAYO: No. MR. PARKER: Thank you. MS. LOYZIM: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. It was stated earlier today I believe that there might be some cost to the city of Old Town associated with the zero sort recycling efforts in that town. Could
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	availability for leachate generating if the application is approved. Out-of-state waste, a number of city residents have expressed concerns that capacity at JRL is being used to dispose of out-of-state waste. Their concerns arise because the Operating Services Agreement between the state of Maine and Casella prohibits the disposal of waste generated upstate at JRL and also because disposal of such waste lead to early filling of this landfill which is a state solid waste management resource; yet, MSW has had to be imported from out of state to ensure continuous operations of the Maine Energy waste-to-energy incinerator and the resulting ash, FEPR and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any parties who wish to cross examine the city of Old Town? Seeing none, Department questions? MR. PARKER: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP project manager. Are you aware of any instances where JRL or their staff have not responded appropriately to any odor complaints? MR. MAYO: No. MR. PARKER: Thank you. MS. LOYZIM: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. It was stated earlier today I believe that there might be some cost to the city of Old Town associated with the zero sort recycling efforts in that town. Could you speak to that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	availability for leachate generating if the application is approved. Out-of-state waste, a number of city residents have expressed concerns that capacity at JRL is being used to dispose of out-of-state waste. Their concerns arise because the Operating Services Agreement between the state of Maine and Casella prohibits the disposal of waste generated upstate at JRL and also because disposal of such waste lead to early filling of this landfill which is a state solid waste management resource; yet, MSW has had to be imported from out of state to ensure continuous operations of the Maine Energy waste-to-energy incinerator and the resulting ash, FEPR and incinerator bypass have been disposed of at JRL.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any parties who wish to cross examine the city of Old Town? Seeing none, Department questions? MR. PARKER: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP project manager. Are you aware of any instances where JRL or their staff have not responded appropriately to any odor complaints? MR. MAYO: No. MR. PARKER: Thank you. MS. LOYZIM: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. It was stated earlier today I believe that there might be some cost to the city of Old Town associated with the zero sort recycling efforts in that town. Could you speak to that? MR. MAYO: Not that I'm aware of.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	availability for leachate generating if the application is approved. Out-of-state waste, a number of city residents have expressed concerns that capacity at JRL is being used to dispose of out-of-state waste. Their concerns arise because the Operating Services Agreement between the state of Maine and Casella prohibits the disposal of waste generated upstate at JRL and also because disposal of such waste lead to early filling of this landfill which is a state solid waste management resource; yet, MSW has had to be imported from out of state to ensure continuous operations of the Maine Energy waste-to-energy incinerator and the resulting ash, FEPR and incinerator bypass have been disposed of at JRL. While resulting ash, FEPR and incinerator bypass	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any parties who wish to cross examine the city of Old Town? Seeing none, Department questions? MR. PARKER: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP project manager. Are you aware of any instances where JRL or their staff have not responded appropriately to any odor complaints? MR. MAYO: No. MR. PARKER: Thank you. MS. LOYZIM: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. It was stated earlier today I believe that there might be some cost to the city of Old Town associated with the zero sort recycling efforts in that town. Could you speak to that? MR. MAYO: Not that I'm aware of. MS. LOYZIM: What is the arrangement that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	availability for leachate generating if the application is approved. Out-of-state waste, a number of city residents have expressed concerns that capacity at JRL is being used to dispose of out-of-state waste. Their concerns arise because the Operating Services Agreement between the state of Maine and Casella prohibits the disposal of waste generated upstate at JRL and also because disposal of such waste lead to early filling of this landfill which is a state solid waste management resource; yet, MSW has had to be imported from out of state to ensure continuous operations of the Maine Energy waste-to-energy incinerator and the resulting ash, FEPR and incinerator bypass have been disposed of at JRL. While resulting ash, FEPR and incinerator bypass technically are considered in-state waste under Maine	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any parties who wish to cross examine the city of Old Town? Seeing none, Department questions? MR. PARKER: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP project manager. Are you aware of any instances where JRL or their staff have not responded appropriately to any odor complaints? MR. MAYO: No. MR. PARKER: Thank you. MS. LOYZIM: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. It was stated earlier today I believe that there might be some cost to the city of Old Town associated with the zero sort recycling efforts in that town. Could you speak to that? MR. MAYO: Not that I'm aware of. MS. LOYZIM: What is the arrangement that the town has for zero sort?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	availability for leachate generating if the application is approved. Out-of-state waste, a number of city residents have expressed concerns that capacity at JRL is being used to dispose of out-of-state waste. Their concerns arise because the Operating Services Agreement between the state of Maine and Casella prohibits the disposal of waste generated upstate at JRL and also because disposal of such waste lead to early filling of this landfill which is a state solid waste management resource; yet, MSW has had to be imported from out of state to ensure continuous operations of the Maine Energy waste-to-energy incinerator and the resulting ash, FEPR and incinerator bypass have been disposed of at JRL. While resulting ash, FEPR and incinerator bypass technically are considered in-state waste under Maine law, we're all aware that it results from MSW that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any parties who wish to cross examine the city of Old Town? Seeing none, Department questions? MR. PARKER: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP project manager. Are you aware of any instances where JRL or their staff have not responded appropriately to any odor complaints? MR. MAYO: No. MR. PARKER: Thank you. MS. LOYZIM: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. It was stated earlier today I believe that there might be some cost to the city of Old Town associated with the zero sort recycling efforts in that town. Could you speak to that? MR. MAYO: Not that I'm aware of. MS. LOYZIM: What is the arrangement that the town has for zero sort? MR. MAYO: We have a pay per bag municipal
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	availability for leachate generating if the application is approved. Out-of-state waste, a number of city residents have expressed concerns that capacity at JRL is being used to dispose of out-of-state waste. Their concerns arise because the Operating Services Agreement between the state of Maine and Casella prohibits the disposal of waste generated upstate at JRL and also because disposal of such waste lead to early filling of this landfill which is a state solid waste management resource; yet, MSW has had to be imported from out of state to ensure continuous operations of the Maine Energy waste-to-energy incinerator and the resulting ash, FEPR and incinerator bypass have been disposed of at JRL. While resulting ash, FEPR and incinerator bypass technically are considered in-state waste under Maine law, we're all aware that it results from MSW that originated out of state. The applicants state in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any parties who wish to cross examine the city of Old Town? Seeing none, Department questions? MR. PARKER: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP project manager. Are you aware of any instances where JRL or their staff have not responded appropriately to any odor complaints? MR. MAYO: No. MR. PARKER: Thank you. MS. LOYZIM: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. It was stated earlier today I believe that there might be some cost to the city of Old Town associated with the zero sort recycling efforts in that town. Could you speak to that? MR. MAYO: Not that I'm aware of. MS. LOYZIM: What is the arrangement that the town has for zero sort? MR. MAYO: We have a pay per bag municipal solid waste pickup right now at curbside and a zero
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	availability for leachate generating if the application is approved. Out-of-state waste, a number of city residents have expressed concerns that capacity at JRL is being used to dispose of out-of-state waste. Their concerns arise because the Operating Services Agreement between the state of Maine and Casella prohibits the disposal of waste generated upstate at JRL and also because disposal of such waste lead to early filling of this landfill which is a state solid waste management resource; yet, MSW has had to be imported from out of state to ensure continuous operations of the Maine Energy waste-to-energy incinerator and the resulting ash, FEPR and incinerator bypass have been disposed of at JRL. While resulting ash, FEPR and incinerator bypass technically are considered in-state waste under Maine law, we're all aware that it results from MSW that originated out of state. The applicants state in the conclusion of their revised application that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any parties who wish to cross examine the city of Old Town? Seeing none, Department questions? MR. PARKER: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP project manager. Are you aware of any instances where JRL or their staff have not responded appropriately to any odor complaints? MR. MAYO: No. MR. PARKER: Thank you. MS. LOYZIM: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. It was stated earlier today I believe that there might be some cost to the city of Old Town associated with the zero sort recycling efforts in that town. Could you speak to that? MR. MAYO: Not that I'm aware of. MS. LOYZIM: What is the arrangement that the town has for zero sort? MR. MAYO: We have a pay per bag municipal solid waste pickup right now at curbside and a zero sort program also. We we do get paid a fee for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	availability for leachate generating if the application is approved. Out-of-state waste, a number of city residents have expressed concerns that capacity at JRL is being used to dispose of out-of-state waste. Their concerns arise because the Operating Services Agreement between the state of Maine and Casella prohibits the disposal of waste generated upstate at JRL and also because disposal of such waste lead to early filling of this landfill which is a state solid waste management resource; yet, MSW has had to be imported from out of state to ensure continuous operations of the Maine Energy waste-to-energy incinerator and the resulting ash, FEPR and incinerator bypass have been disposed of at JRL. While resulting ash, FEPR and incinerator bypass technically are considered in-state waste under Maine law, we're all aware that it results from MSW that originated out of state. The applicants state in the conclusion of their revised application that the closure of Maine Energy which is enabled by the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any parties who wish to cross examine the city of Old Town? Seeing none, Department questions? MR. PARKER: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP project manager. Are you aware of any instances where JRL or their staff have not responded appropriately to any odor complaints? MR. MAYO: No. MR. PARKER: Thank you. MS. LOYZIM: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. It was stated earlier today I believe that there might be some cost to the city of Old Town associated with the zero sort recycling efforts in that town. Could you speak to that? MR. MAYO: Not that I'm aware of. MS. LOYZIM: What is the arrangement that the town has for zero sort? MR. MAYO: We have a pay per bag municipal solid waste pickup right now at curbside and a zero sort program also. We we do get paid a fee for processing zero sort at our transfer station, but I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	availability for leachate generating if the application is approved. Out-of-state waste, a number of city residents have expressed concerns that capacity at JRL is being used to dispose of out-of-state waste. Their concerns arise because the Operating Services Agreement between the state of Maine and Casella prohibits the disposal of waste generated upstate at JRL and also because disposal of such waste lead to early filling of this landfill which is a state solid waste management resource; yet, MSW has had to be imported from out of state to ensure continuous operations of the Maine Energy waste-to-energy incinerator bypass have been disposed of at JRL. While resulting ash, FEPR and incinerator bypass have been disposed of at JRL. While resulting ash, FEPR and incinerator bypass technically are considered in-state waste under Maine law, we're all aware that it results from MSW that originated out of state. The applicants state in the conclusion of their revised application that the closure of Maine Energy which is enabled by the requested amendment to the JRL permits and approvals	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any parties who wish to cross examine the city of Old Town? Seeing none, Department questions? MR. PARKER: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP project manager. Are you aware of any instances where JRL or their staff have not responded appropriately to any odor complaints? MR. MAYO: No. MR. PARKER: Thank you. MS. LOYZIM: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. It was stated earlier today I believe that there might be some cost to the city of Old Town associated with the zero sort recycling efforts in that town. Could you speak to that? MR. MAYO: Not that I'm aware of. MS. LOYZIM: What is the arrangement that the town has for zero sort? MR. MAYO: We have a pay per bag municipal solid waste pickup right now at curbside and a zero sort program also. We we do get paid a fee for processing zero sort at our transfer station, but I'm not aware of us having a cost associated with that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	availability for leachate generating if the application is approved. Out-of-state waste, a number of city residents have expressed concerns that capacity at JRL is being used to dispose of out-of-state waste. Their concerns arise because the Operating Services Agreement between the state of Maine and Casella prohibits the disposal of waste generated upstate at JRL and also because disposal of such waste lead to early filling of this landfill which is a state solid waste management resource; yet, MSW has had to be imported from out of state to ensure continuous operations of the Maine Energy waste-to-energy incinerator and the resulting ash, FEPR and incinerator bypass have been disposed of at JRL. While resulting ash, FEPR and incinerator bypass technically are considered in-state waste under Maine law, we're all aware that it results from MSW that originated out of state. The applicants state in the conclusion of their revised application that the closure of Maine Energy which is enabled by the requested amendment to the JRL permits and approvals will leave approximately 170,000 tons of out-of-state	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Are there any parties who wish to cross examine the city of Old Town? Seeing none, Department questions? MR. PARKER: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. I'm Mike Parker, the DEP project manager. Are you aware of any instances where JRL or their staff have not responded appropriately to any odor complaints? MR. MAYO: No. MR. PARKER: Thank you. MS. LOYZIM: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayo. It was stated earlier today I believe that there might be some cost to the city of Old Town associated with the zero sort recycling efforts in that town. Could you speak to that? MR. MAYO: Not that I'm aware of. MS. LOYZIM: What is the arrangement that the town has for zero sort? MR. MAYO: We have a pay per bag municipal solid waste pickup right now at curbside and a zero sort program also. We we do get paid a fee for processing zero sort at our transfer station, but I'm not aware of us having a cost associated with that. MS. LOYZIM: Okay, thank you.

	368		370
1	I wanted to thank you all for your participation in	1	HEARING OFFICER: You caught us right under
2	presenting evidence, all of the parties for their	2	the wire. Yes, Mr. Mayo.
3	participation in presenting of the evidence for the	3	MR. MAYO: I answered too quickly. Let
4	Department's consideration on the amendment	4	me I misunderstood when you asked me about zero
5	application. We do expect that the transcript of the	5	sort. Were you asking if we have a contract that we
6	hearing will be ready by May 3rd. Provided that we	6	pay for?
7	receive it by May 3rd, the closing briefs by the	7	MS. LOYZIM: Yes.
8	parties are due May 17th. The reply briefs are due	8	MR. MAYO: Yes, we do and we do pay for
9	May 24th. The record at the conclusion of this	9	that. I thought you were talking about zero sort as
10	hearing will be closed with the exception of the	10	far as processing it.
11	public comments that we can receive in writing to the	11	MS. LOYZIM: Thank you.
12	Department, to Michael Parker by April 30th, and with	12	MR. MAYO: We do have a contract.
13	the exception of the submission of the post-hearing	13	HEARING OFFICER: And just for accuracy,
14	briefs that I just described the schedule for. I may	14	that additional piece of information will be part of
15	reopen the record at my discretion but I will only do	15	the record. Are we all set? Okay, thank you. With
16	so upon a demonstration of good cause for why the	16	that, I thank all the parties for your participation
17	record needs to be reopened.	17	and this hearing in closed.
18	We will evaluate all the evidence in the	18	(Whereupon, the above-named hearing was
19	record and make a licensing decision based on that	19	concluded at 1:40 p.m.)
20	evidence and any other evidence that the Department	20	
21	has.	21	
22	MR. DOYLE: Madam Hearing Officer, a	22	
23	question?	22	
23 24	HEARING OFFICER: Yes, Mr. Doyle.	23	
24 25	MR. DOYLE: So the closing briefs that are	24	
23	MR. DOTEE. So the closing briefs that are	25	
	369		
			371
1	due on the 17th, this is based on the evidence in the	1	CERTIFICATE
2	due on the 17th, this is based on the evidence in the record. There's no opportunity to present additional	2	CERTIFICATE
2 3	due on the 17th, this is based on the evidence in the record. There's no opportunity to present additional evidence, correct?	2 3	CERTIFICATE I, Joanne P. Alley, a Notary Public in and for
2 3 4	due on the 17th, this is based on the evidence in the record. There's no opportunity to present additional evidence, correct? HEARING OFFICER: The closing briefs will be	2 3 4	CERTIFICATE I, Joanne P. Alley, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that on the 10th
2 3 4 5	due on the 17th, this is based on the evidence in the record. There's no opportunity to present additional evidence, correct? HEARING OFFICER: The closing briefs will be consistent with and I'm trying to find it here	2 3 4 5	CERTIFICATE I, Joanne P. Alley, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that on the 10th day of April, 2012, personally appeared before me the
2 3 4 5 6	due on the 17th, this is based on the evidence in the record. There's no opportunity to present additional evidence, correct? HEARING OFFICER: The closing briefs will be consistent with and I'm trying to find it here will be consistent with Chapter 3, Section 23,	2 3 4 5 6	CERTIFICATE I, Joanne P. Alley, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that on the 10th day of April, 2012, personally appeared before me the within-named witnesses who were sworn to testify to
2 3 4 5 6 7	due on the 17th, this is based on the evidence in the record. There's no opportunity to present additional evidence, correct? HEARING OFFICER: The closing briefs will be consistent with and I'm trying to find it here will be consistent with Chapter 3, Section 23, post-hearing brief and proposed findings. That	2 3 4 5 6 7	CERTIFICATE I, Joanne P. Alley, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that on the 10th day of April, 2012, personally appeared before me the within-named witnesses who were sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	due on the 17th, this is based on the evidence in the record. There's no opportunity to present additional evidence, correct? HEARING OFFICER: The closing briefs will be consistent with and I'm trying to find it here will be consistent with Chapter 3, Section 23, post-hearing brief and proposed findings. That section says that all parties have a right to submit	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	CERTIFICATE I, Joanne P. Alley, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that on the 10th day of April, 2012, personally appeared before me the within-named witnesses who were sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in the aforementioned cause of action and that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	due on the 17th, this is based on the evidence in the record. There's no opportunity to present additional evidence, correct? HEARING OFFICER: The closing briefs will be consistent with and I'm trying to find it here will be consistent with Chapter 3, Section 23, post-hearing brief and proposed findings. That section says that all parties have a right to submit briefs and proposed findings of fact in writing after	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	CERTIFICATE I, Joanne P. Alley, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that on the 10th day of April, 2012, personally appeared before me the within-named witnesses who were sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in the aforementioned cause of action and that the foregoing is a true and accurate record as taken by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	due on the 17th, this is based on the evidence in the record. There's no opportunity to present additional evidence, correct? HEARING OFFICER: The closing briefs will be consistent with and I'm trying to find it here will be consistent with Chapter 3, Section 23, post-hearing brief and proposed findings. That section says that all parties have a right to submit briefs and proposed findings of fact in writing after the close of the hearing and the record, within such	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	CERTIFICATE I, Joanne P. Alley, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that on the 10th day of April, 2012, personally appeared before me the within-named witnesses who were sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in the aforementioned cause of action and that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	due on the 17th, this is based on the evidence in the record. There's no opportunity to present additional evidence, correct? HEARING OFFICER: The closing briefs will be consistent with and I'm trying to find it here will be consistent with Chapter 3, Section 23, post-hearing brief and proposed findings. That section says that all parties have a right to submit briefs and proposed findings of fact in writing after the close of the hearing and the record, within such time as specified by me. In this case I am providing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	CERTIFICATE I, Joanne P. Alley, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that on the 10th day of April, 2012, personally appeared before me the within-named witnesses who were sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in the aforementioned cause of action and that the foregoing is a true and accurate record as taken by me by means of computer-aided machine shorthand.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	due on the 17th, this is based on the evidence in the record. There's no opportunity to present additional evidence, correct? HEARING OFFICER: The closing briefs will be consistent with and I'm trying to find it here will be consistent with Chapter 3, Section 23, post-hearing brief and proposed findings. That section says that all parties have a right to submit briefs and proposed findings of fact in writing after the close of the hearing and the record, within such time as specified by me. In this case I am providing for an opportunity for all of the parties to submit	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	CERTIFICATE I, Joanne P. Alley, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that on the 10th day of April, 2012, personally appeared before me the within-named witnesses who were sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in the aforementioned cause of action and that the foregoing is a true and accurate record as taken by me by means of computer-aided machine shorthand. I further certify that I am a disinterested
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	due on the 17th, this is based on the evidence in the record. There's no opportunity to present additional evidence, correct? HEARING OFFICER: The closing briefs will be consistent with and I'm trying to find it here will be consistent with Chapter 3, Section 23, post-hearing brief and proposed findings. That section says that all parties have a right to submit briefs and proposed findings of fact in writing after the close of the hearing and the record, within such time as specified by me. In this case I am providing for an opportunity for all of the parties to submit their closing briefs by May 17th and I am providing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CERTIFICATE I, Joanne P. Alley, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that on the 10th day of April, 2012, personally appeared before me the within-named witnesses who were sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in the aforementioned cause of action and that the foregoing is a true and accurate record as taken by me by means of computer-aided machine shorthand. I further certify that I am a disinterested person in the event or outcome of the aforementioned
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	due on the 17th, this is based on the evidence in the record. There's no opportunity to present additional evidence, correct? HEARING OFFICER: The closing briefs will be consistent with and I'm trying to find it here will be consistent with Chapter 3, Section 23, post-hearing brief and proposed findings. That section says that all parties have a right to submit briefs and proposed findings of fact in writing after the close of the hearing and the record, within such time as specified by me. In this case I am providing for an opportunity for all of the parties to submit their closing briefs by May 17th and I am providing all the parties an opportunity to provide reply	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	CERTIFICATE I, Joanne P. Alley, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that on the 10th day of April, 2012, personally appeared before me the within-named witnesses who were sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in the aforementioned cause of action and that the foregoing is a true and accurate record as taken by me by means of computer-aided machine shorthand. I further certify that I am a disinterested
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	due on the 17th, this is based on the evidence in the record. There's no opportunity to present additional evidence, correct? HEARING OFFICER: The closing briefs will be consistent with and I'm trying to find it here will be consistent with Chapter 3, Section 23, post-hearing brief and proposed findings. That section says that all parties have a right to submit briefs and proposed findings of fact in writing after the close of the hearing and the record, within such time as specified by me. In this case I am providing for an opportunity for all of the parties to submit their closing briefs by May 17th and I am providing all the parties an opportunity to provide reply briefs in reply to any comments made in the closing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	CERTIFICATEI, Joanne P. Alley, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that on the 10th day of April, 2012, personally appeared before me the within-named witnesses who were sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in the aforementioned cause of action and that the foregoing is a true and accurate record as taken by me by means of computer-aided machine shorthand.I further certify that I am a disinterested person in the event or outcome of the aforementioned cause of action.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	due on the 17th, this is based on the evidence in the record. There's no opportunity to present additional evidence, correct? HEARING OFFICER: The closing briefs will be consistent with and I'm trying to find it here will be consistent with Chapter 3, Section 23, post-hearing brief and proposed findings. That section says that all parties have a right to submit briefs and proposed findings of fact in writing after the close of the hearing and the record, within such time as specified by me. In this case I am providing for an opportunity for all of the parties to submit their closing briefs by May 17th and I am providing all the parties an opportunity to provide reply briefs in reply to any comments made in the closing briefs by May 24th. So with the outline of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CERTIFICATEI, Joanne P. Alley, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that on the 10th day of April, 2012, personally appeared before me the within-named witnesses who were sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in the aforementioned cause of action and that the foregoing is a true and accurate record as taken by me by means of computer-aided machine shorthand.I further certify that I am a disinterested person in the event or outcome of the aforementioned cause of action.IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	due on the 17th, this is based on the evidence in the record. There's no opportunity to present additional evidence, correct? HEARING OFFICER: The closing briefs will be consistent with and I'm trying to find it here will be consistent with Chapter 3, Section 23, post-hearing brief and proposed findings. That section says that all parties have a right to submit briefs and proposed findings of fact in writing after the close of the hearing and the record, within such time as specified by me. In this case I am providing for an opportunity for all of the parties to submit their closing briefs by May 17th and I am providing all the parties an opportunity to provide reply briefs in reply to any comments made in the closing briefs by May 24th. So with the outline of the procedures set forth, this hearing is closed and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	CERTIFICATEI, Joanne P. Alley, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that on the 10th day of April, 2012, personally appeared before me the within-named witnesses who were sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in the aforementioned cause of action and that the foregoing is a true and accurate record as taken by me by means of computer-aided machine shorthand.I further certify that I am a disinterested person in the event or outcome of the aforementioned cause of action.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	due on the 17th, this is based on the evidence in the record. There's no opportunity to present additional evidence, correct? HEARING OFFICER: The closing briefs will be consistent with and I'm trying to find it here will be consistent with Chapter 3, Section 23, post-hearing brief and proposed findings. That section says that all parties have a right to submit briefs and proposed findings of fact in writing after the close of the hearing and the record, within such time as specified by me. In this case I am providing for an opportunity for all of the parties to submit their closing briefs by May 17th and I am providing all the parties an opportunity to provide reply briefs in reply to any comments made in the closing briefs by May 24th. So with the outline of the procedures set forth, this hearing is closed and thank you all again for this hearing was almost	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CERTIFICATEI, Joanne P. Alley, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that on the 10th day of April, 2012, personally appeared before me the within-named witnesses who were sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in the aforementioned cause of action and that the foregoing is a true and accurate record as taken by me by means of computer-aided machine shorthand.I further certify that I am a disinterested person in the event or outcome of the aforementioned cause of action.IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	due on the 17th, this is based on the evidence in the record. There's no opportunity to present additional evidence, correct? HEARING OFFICER: The closing briefs will be consistent with and I'm trying to find it here will be consistent with Chapter 3, Section 23, post-hearing brief and proposed findings. That section says that all parties have a right to submit briefs and proposed findings of fact in writing after the close of the hearing and the record, within such time as specified by me. In this case I am providing for an opportunity for all of the parties to submit their closing briefs by May 17th and I am providing all the parties an opportunity to provide reply briefs in reply to any comments made in the closing briefs by May 24th. So with the outline of the procedures set forth, this hearing is closed and thank you all again for this hearing was almost closed. Go ahead Mr. Katsiaficas.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	CERTIFICATE I, Joanne P. Alley, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that on the 10th day of April, 2012, personally appeared before me the within-named witnesses who were sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in the aforementioned cause of action and that the foregoing is a true and accurate record as taken by me by means of computer-aided machine shorthand. I further certify that I am a disinterested person in the event or outcome of the aforementioned cause of action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 5th day of May, 2013.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	due on the 17th, this is based on the evidence in the record. There's no opportunity to present additional evidence, correct? HEARING OFFICER: The closing briefs will be consistent with and I'm trying to find it here will be consistent with Chapter 3, Section 23, post-hearing brief and proposed findings. That section says that all parties have a right to submit briefs and proposed findings of fact in writing after the close of the hearing and the record, within such time as specified by me. In this case I am providing for an opportunity for all of the parties to submit their closing briefs by May 17th and I am providing all the parties an opportunity to provide reply briefs in reply to any comments made in the closing briefs by May 24th. So with the outline of the procedures set forth, this hearing is closed and thank you all again for this hearing was almost closed. Go ahead Mr. Katsiaficas.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	CERTIFICATE I, Joanne P. Alley, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that on the 10th day of April, 2012, personally appeared before me the within-named witnesses who were sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in the aforementioned cause of action and that the foregoing is a true and accurate record as taken by me by means of computer-aided machine shorthand. I further certify that I am a disinterested person in the event or outcome of the aforementioned cause of action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 5th day of May, 2013.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	due on the 17th, this is based on the evidence in the record. There's no opportunity to present additional evidence, correct? HEARING OFFICER: The closing briefs will be consistent with and I'm trying to find it here will be consistent with Chapter 3, Section 23, post-hearing brief and proposed findings. That section says that all parties have a right to submit briefs and proposed findings of fact in writing after the close of the hearing and the record, within such time as specified by me. In this case I am providing for an opportunity for all of the parties to submit their closing briefs by May 17th and I am providing all the parties an opportunity to provide reply briefs in reply to any comments made in the closing briefs by May 24th. So with the outline of the procedures set forth, this hearing is closed and thank you all again for this hearing was almost closed. Go ahead Mr. Katsiaficas. MR. KATSIAFICAS: I apologize for keeping this open. There was a question asked by Ms. Loyzim	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CERTIFICATE I, Joanne P. Alley, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that on the 10th day of April, 2012, personally appeared before me the within-named witnesses who were sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in the aforementioned cause of action and that the foregoing is a true and accurate record as taken by me by means of computer-aided machine shorthand. I further certify that I am a disinterested person in the event or outcome of the aforementioned cause of action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 5th day of May, 2013.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	due on the 17th, this is based on the evidence in the record. There's no opportunity to present additional evidence, correct? HEARING OFFICER: The closing briefs will be consistent with and I'm trying to find it here will be consistent with Chapter 3, Section 23, post-hearing brief and proposed findings. That section says that all parties have a right to submit briefs and proposed findings of fact in writing after the close of the hearing and the record, within such time as specified by me. In this case I am providing for an opportunity for all of the parties to submit their closing briefs by May 17th and I am providing all the parties an opportunity to provide reply briefs in reply to any comments made in the closing briefs by May 24th. So with the outline of the procedures set forth, this hearing is closed and thank you all again for this hearing was almost closed. Go ahead Mr. Katsiaficas. MR. KATSIAFICAS: I apologize for keeping this open. There was a question asked by Ms. Loyzim of Mr. Mayo, and I think he misunderstood the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CERTIFICATE I, Joanne P. Alley, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that on the 10th day of April, 2012, personally appeared before me the within-named witnesses who were sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in the aforementioned cause of action and that the foregoing is a true and accurate record as taken by me by means of computer-aided machine shorthand. I further certify that I am a disinterested person in the event or outcome of the aforementioned cause of action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my tand this 5th day of May, 2013. Joanne P. Alley Court Reporter/Notary Public
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	due on the 17th, this is based on the evidence in the record. There's no opportunity to present additional evidence, correct? HEARING OFFICER: The closing briefs will be consistent with and I'm trying to find it here will be consistent with Chapter 3, Section 23, post-hearing brief and proposed findings. That section says that all parties have a right to submit briefs and proposed findings of fact in writing after the close of the hearing and the record, within such time as specified by me. In this case I am providing for an opportunity for all of the parties to submit their closing briefs by May 17th and I am providing all the parties an opportunity to provide reply briefs in reply to any comments made in the closing briefs by May 24th. So with the outline of the procedures set forth, this hearing is closed and thank you all again for this hearing was almost closed. Go ahead Mr. Katsiaficas. MR. KATSIAFICAS: I apologize for keeping this open. There was a question asked by Ms. Loyzim of Mr. Mayo, and I think he misunderstood the question and we'd like to try to get a full answer to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CERTIFICATE I, Joanne P. Alley, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that on the 10th day of April, 2012, personally appeared before me the within-named witnesses who were sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in the aforementioned cause of action and that the foregoing is a true and accurate record as taken by me by means of computer-aided machine shorthand. I further certify that I am a disinterested person in the event or outcome of the aforementioned cause of action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 5th day of May, 2013.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	due on the 17th, this is based on the evidence in the record. There's no opportunity to present additional evidence, correct? HEARING OFFICER: The closing briefs will be consistent with and I'm trying to find it here will be consistent with Chapter 3, Section 23, post-hearing brief and proposed findings. That section says that all parties have a right to submit briefs and proposed findings of fact in writing after the close of the hearing and the record, within such time as specified by me. In this case I am providing for an opportunity for all of the parties to submit their closing briefs by May 17th and I am providing all the parties an opportunity to provide reply briefs in reply to any comments made in the closing briefs by May 24th. So with the outline of the procedures set forth, this hearing is closed and thank you all again for this hearing was almost closed. Go ahead Mr. Katsiaficas. MR. KATSIAFICAS: I apologize for keeping this open. There was a question asked by Ms. Loyzim of Mr. Mayo, and I think he misunderstood the question out of respect to the panel. Would that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	CERTIFICATE I, Joanne P. Alley, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that on the 10th day of April, 2012, personally appeared before me the within-named witnesses who were sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in the aforementioned cause of action and that the foregoing is a true and accurate record as taken by me by means of computer-aided machine shorthand. I further certify that I am a disinterested person in the event or outcome of the aforementioned cause of action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my tand this 5th day of May, 2013. Joanne P. Alley Court Reporter/Notary Public
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	due on the 17th, this is based on the evidence in the record. There's no opportunity to present additional evidence, correct? HEARING OFFICER: The closing briefs will be consistent with and I'm trying to find it here will be consistent with Chapter 3, Section 23, post-hearing brief and proposed findings. That section says that all parties have a right to submit briefs and proposed findings of fact in writing after the close of the hearing and the record, within such time as specified by me. In this case I am providing for an opportunity for all of the parties to submit their closing briefs by May 17th and I am providing all the parties an opportunity to provide reply briefs in reply to any comments made in the closing briefs by May 24th. So with the outline of the procedures set forth, this hearing is closed and thank you all again for this hearing was almost closed. Go ahead Mr. Katsiaficas. MR. KATSIAFICAS: I apologize for keeping this open. There was a question asked by Ms. Loyzim of Mr. Mayo, and I think he misunderstood the question and we'd like to try to get a full answer to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CERTIFICATE I, Joanne P. Alley, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that on the 10th day of April, 2012, personally appeared before me the within-named witnesses who were sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in the aforementioned cause of action and that the foregoing is a true and accurate record as taken by me by means of computer-aided machine shorthand. I further certify that I am a disinterested person in the event or outcome of the aforementioned cause of action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my tand this 5th day of May, 2013. Joanne P. Alley Court Reporter/Notary Public

\$	355:17, 355:22,	22,400 [1] - 360:22	41 [1] - 343:5	9
Ψ	355:25, 358:10,	23 [2] - 303:10, 369:7	42 [2] - 341:18, 341:25	5
\$15 [1] - 327:11	358:19, 365:24	24 [3] - 292:15,	45 [2] - 302:17, 354:19	90,000 [3] - 300:4,
\$20 [1] - 336:11	175 [5] - 290:11,	292:17, 308:17	450,000 [3] - 315:23,	300:6, 300:11
\$450,000 [1] - 327:6	293:19, 293:23,	24th [2] - 368:10,	320:24, 327:11	91,000 [6] - 285:3,
	294:13, 297:22	369:17		315:20, 315:25,
\$51 [1] - 335:14	17th [3] - 368:9, 369:2,		4th [1] - 308:16	
\$67 [1] - 335:18	369:14	25 [4] - 276:6, 331:18,	_	316:1, 318:22, 319:9
	18 [1] - 331:14	346:22, 353:11	5	93,000 [3] - 347:10,
1		2845 [1] - 325:14	5 [5] - 276:20, 280:7,	353:14, 360:6
4 247.2	187 [1] - 276:2	29,000 [1] - 318:25	3 [5] - 270.20, 280.7, 283:11, 284:2,	95 [7] - 338:22,
1 [1] - 347:2	19 [1] - 323:25	•	285:11, 204.2, 285:16	338:23, 339:10,
1,818 [1] - 320:21	197 [1] - 341:2	3		339:12, 341:21,
1-1 [1] - 360:23	1987 [1] - 346:18	9 (5) 000:11 004:5	5,000 [1] - 288:15	341:24, 361:16
1.2 [2] - 315:22,	199 [2] - 325:23,	3 [5] - 283:11, 284:5,	5.1 [1] - 352:21	98 [1] - 338:24
320:25	325:24	322:9, 323:24, 369:7	5.2 [1] - 352:21	9:00 [2] - 272:21,
1.37 [2] - 315:24,	1:00 [3] - 344:2, 344:4,	3.1(c [1] - 283:16	5.7 [1] - 352:21	273:4
327:5	344:5	3.5 [1] - 362:22	50 [3] - 303:6, 309:7,	9th [1] - 309:4
10 [3] - 272:20, 273:4,	1:40 [1] - 370:20	30 [5] - 275:22,	313:2	
338:8	-	288:15, 324:22,	50,000 [6] - 284:1,	Α
100 [2] - 318:23, 343:5	2	324:24, 342:15	285:15, 314:22,	070.01
100,000 [2] - 277:1,	0	30,000 [23] - 276:23,	316:2, 320:18, 321:3	a.m [6] - 272:21,
277:4	2 [3] - 353:25, 354:24,	277:5, 277:13,	55,600 [1] - 361:3	273:4, 322:9,
100-year [1] - 303:11	355:3	277:16, 278:1,	59 [1] - 309:13	322:10, 364:12,
103,300 [1] - 361:1	2,900 [1] - 318:24	278:10, 283:16,	5:30 [1] - 340:22	364:13
105,500 [1] - 361:3	2,975 [1] - 362:1	284:6, 284:11,	5th [1] - 371:17	Abbey [1] - 329:6
10:00 [1] - 311:24	2.13 [1] - 308:17	284:13, 284:20,	_	ability [3] - 318:6,
10:45 [1] - 323:4	2.4 [2] - 338:20,	285:9, 287:17,	6	357:7, 357:11
10th [1] - 371:4	361:14	288:17, 288:20,		able [6] - 288:8,
111 [2] - 297:18, 298:6	2.5 [1] - 362:22	290:15, 290:17,	6 [2] - 343:7, 364:12	288:11, 290:13,
11:00 [1] - 322:10	20 [7] - 296:16,	294:11, 300:4,	60 [5] - 338:22,	301:10, 322:23,
11:04 [1] - 337:25	304:25, 305:12,	300:9, 300:11,	338:23, 339:1,	332:9
11:15 [2] - 338:1,	305:14, 328:20,	314:21, 317:24	341:21, 341:23	ably [1] - 281:7
338:3	329:1, 342:15	300,000 [1] - 276:7	60,500 [1] - 361:1	above-named [1] -
12 [1] - 303:16	20,000 [1] - 314:20	30th [5] - 290:2,	60-year [1] - 343:8	370:19
123,000 [6] - 319:1,	20-year [1] - 303:12	346:24, 350:24,	63,000 [1] - 294:10	absent [1] - 280:12
319:6, 319:11,	2000 [2] - 275:21,	352:10, 368:13		accelerates [1] - 306:6
319:14, 320:17,	276:4	31 [1] - 311:25	7	accept [7] - 273:12,
321:11	2001 [1] - 279:17	32,000 [1] - 319:10		280:24, 280:25,
125 [2] - 316:5, 321:16	2003 [4] - 307:11,	32,500 [1] - 280:5	7 [2] - 354:17, 364:13	313:11, 322:23,
12:00 [2] - 274:3,	307:19, 307:24,	365 [1] - 294:3	7.4 [3] - 282:16,	346:7, 360:3
322:11	308:2	37 [1] - 308:21	282:22, 296:8	Accept [1] - 313:24
13 [2] - 303:16, 346:20	2004 [1] - 309:4	38 [1] - 312:15	7.5 [1] - 287:5	ACCEPT [1] - 272:8
13.5 [1] - 308:22	2007 [1] - 304:15	3rd [3] - 307:24,	701,000 [1] - 320:22	acceptable [2] -
136 [2] - 272:19, 273:3	2009 [1] - 313:2	368:7, 368:8	71 [1] - 292:16	320:10, 352:20
13th [1] - 308:2	2010 [1] - 321:19		72 [1] - 303:13	acceptance [1] -
14 [2] - 338:19, 341:17	2011 [3] - 285:2,	4	75 [5] - 304:8, 304:18,	309:15
140 [1] - 290:18	360:22, 361:25		305:5, 305:14, 329:3	accepting [1] - 289:8
15 [4] - 275:1, 281:14,	2012 [10] - 277:7,	4 [8] - 279:20, 284:1,		accepts [1] - 284:14
281:24, 281:25	346:24, 347:2,	284:5, 285:16,	8	access [5] - 326:12,
16 [4] - 309:14,	348:15, 350:25,	308:4, 322:9, 327:2,		326:20, 326:23,
325:22, 341:2,	352:10, 356:13,	364:13	8 [3] - 286:7, 286:17,	363:14, 364:1
361:15	360:13, 360:24,	4.11 [2] - 363:23,	364:12	accomplish [1] -
1626 [1] - 307:25	371:5	364:1	8.1(a [1] - 286:18	314:1
17 [1] - 371:23	2013 [6] - 272:20,	4.2 [1] - 364:10	80,000 [4] - 315:19,	accomplished [3] -
17,500 [1] - 279:18	273:4, 335:13,	4.6 [1] - 363:14	315:24, 316:1, 327:4	313:7, 315:4, 315:12
17,500 [1] - 279.18 170,000 [15] - 317:16,	347:2, 354:5, 371:17	4.8 [1] - 362:22	81,800 [1] - 360:22	accomplishes [2] -
	2015 [1] - 371:23	4.9 [1] - 363:20	813 [1] - 361:25	315:7, 320:16
317:19, 321:7, 346:23, 348:5	2017 [1] - 335:17	40 [6] - 290:19, 313:3,	85 [3] - 304:6, 339:2,	accordance [1] -
346:23, 348:5, 340:3, 340:15	2018 [1] - 336:7	342:16, 346:4,	340:23	332:7
349:3, 349:15, 355:4, 355:7	21 [1] - 342:10	349:18, 354:19	86.9 [1] - 342:10	according [3] -
355:4, 355:7,	- (-) - -			U 101

341:24, 360:23,	affiliation [1] - 323:16	293:9, 293:16,	amended [4] - 309:6,	308:25
361:8	affirm [3] - 274:19,	293:24, 293:25,	317:13, 318:1, 318:3	applicant [6] - 295:23,
accuracy [1] - 370:14	344:18, 344:19	294:13, 296:8,	amendment [11] -	296:2, 309:16,
accurate [1] - 371:9	afforded [2] - 321:2,	296:22, 297:17,	283:23, 284:3,	324:16, 324:21,
accurately [3] -	325:2	297:20, 298:7,	309:12, 314:14,	364:16
322:16, 332:9,	affords [1] - 319:6	298:12, 301:2,	317:22, 346:6,	applicant's [5] -
338:16		301:7, 301:9,	352:12, 354:21,	282:17, 324:10,
	aforementioned [2] -	301:12, 301:14,	360:3, 365:23, 368:5	360:24, 361:9,
achieve [1] - 308:19	371:8, 371:13	301:16, 301:21,		362:23
achieved [1] - 350:1	afternoon [10] - 344:9,	301:22, 301:24,	AMENDMENT [1] -	
achieves [1] - 348:2	344:17, 345:6,	308:22, 314:13,	272:8	applicants [5] - 361:14, 361:23,
acknowledges [1] -	345:9, 350:16,	315:3, 317:24,	Amendment [2] -	, ,
352:18	358:5, 358:6,	350:23, 350:25,	313:24, 344:11	365:20, 366:24,
action [2] - 371:8,	359:13, 367:5,	351:1, 351:9,	America [1] - 303:21	366:25
371:14	367:11	351:13, 351:14,	amount [15] - 277:23,	Applicants [1] -
actions [1] - 364:6	agencies [2] - 355:19,	351:22, 351:24,	287:9, 318:16,	366:11
active [4] - 329:13,	356:5	352:1, 352:10,	347:12, 347:15,	APPLICATION [1] -
338:21, 343:2,	Agency [1] - 304:17	353:16, 353:17,	347:17, 347:22,	272:8
362:24	agendas [1] - 358:22	353:10, 353:17, 353:17, 353:19, 354:7,	349:7, 350:1,	application [69] -
actively [4] - 299:12,	agent [1] - 273:10	353.19, 354.7, 354:9, 354:12,	353:13, 360:9,	273:8, 276:16,
349:12, 349:16,	aggressively [1] -		360:21, 363:9,	278:2, 278:12,
355:5	278:21	354:20	363:11, 366:4	282:18, 283:14,
added [2] - 306:5,	aggrieved [1] - 311:13	agreements [3] -	amounts [7] - 303:3,	283:18, 286:1,
321:15	ago [4] - 306:22,	276:22, 288:10,	303:24, 304:11,	296:9, 299:8, 304:4,
addition [4] - 278:4,	309:4, 345:13, 358:9	316:9	360:25, 361:2,	311:1, 311:20,
285:19, 301:23,	agree [12] - 285:23,	agrees [3] - 308:18,	361:7, 363:6	314:15, 315:4,
349:20	286:25, 296:11,	308:23, 352:24	anaerobic [2] - 303:5,	317:12, 317:13,
additional [14] -	326:11, 333:22,	ahead [1] - 369:20	304:2	318:1, 318:3, 318:8,
279:8, 280:5, 281:9,	334:7, 340:14,	aided [1] - 371:10	AND [1] - 272:7	318:10, 318:11,
298:23, 300:15,	343:11, 351:8,	Air [1] - 304:14	anecdotal [1] - 358:18	319:8, 320:19,
310:14, 315:23,	351:12, 352:15,	air [8] - 310:23, 331:8,	animals [1] - 363:14	322:18, 327:19,
315:25, 336:21,	355:6	332:15, 333:3,	annual [4] - 279:20,	346:6, 346:8, 346:9,
348:13, 348:22,	agreed [5] - 280:4,	334:5, 334:6,	320:20, 320:21,	347:9, 347:16,
363:18, 369:3,	292:4, 309:9,	338:19, 341:17	321:19	348:1, 348:11,
370:15	313:12, 353:21	Alley [4] - 273:25,	annually [3] - 276:8,	348:24, 349:15,
address [7] - 279:2,	Agreement [2] -	371:3, 371:20	320:24, 347:18	350:6, 351:19,
321:13, 321:22,	308:15, 365:8	allotted [2] - 324:22,	answer [9] - 286:5,	352:2, 352:6, 353:5,
340:13, 340:25,	agreement [90] -	338:8	293:6, 294:19,	353:23, 354:1,
363:4, 366:24	276:19, 276:21,	allow [5] - 277:11,	299:22, 300:12,	355:4, 355:8,
addressed [3] - 312:4,	276:23, 276:24,	277:14, 283:14,	317:11, 325:14,	355:22, 356:10,
362:7, 362:20	276:25, 277:23,	284:7, 318:4	355:14, 369:24	356:17, 357:6,
addressing [2] -	278:5, 278:9,	allowed [5] - 279:14,	answered [3] -	358:14, 360:3,
321:11, 321:21	278:13, 279:7,	297:21, 339:10,	300:20, 300:23,	360:5, 360:19,
adequate [2] - 281:5,	279:8, 279:16,	339:25, 355:25	370:4	360:24, 361:14,
365:1	279:21, 280:3,	allowing [1] - 310:13	anticipating [1] -	362:13, 362:23,
adequately [1] - 315:7	280:12, 282:8,	allows [3] - 278:21,	352:17	363:8, 363:15,
adhering [1] - 312:19	282:9, 282:12,	306:4, 352:6	AP [2] - 341:18,	363:24, 364:11,
administrative [1] -	282:16, 283:13,	almost [1] - 369:19	341:25	365:3, 365:21,
283:6	283:22, 284:23,	alternative [8] -	AP-42 [1] - 338:20	366:8, 366:11,
adopted [1] - 312:18	285:15, 285:20,	318:11, 318:12,	apart [1] - 330:8	366:21, 368:6
adoption [1] - 312:8	285:24, 286:4,	318:15, 318:18,	apologize [3] -	Application [2] -
advance [1] - 309:24	286:7, 286:10,	319:8, 322:20,	275:16, 284:19,	313:23, 344:11
advantageous [3] -	286:15, 286:16,	336:7, 336:9	369:21	applications [2] -
300:17, 319:15,	286:19, 286:20,	alternatives [3] -	apparent [2] - 279:4,	321:5, 321:9
320:17	286:23, 287:3,	318:8, 318:12,	279:16	applied [2] - 308:14,
advising [1] - 359:20	287:6, 287:13,	322:18	appeal [3] - 320:4,	334:4
advocate [1] - 347:24	287:25, 288:7,	Alton [1] - 325:15	320:6, 320:8	apply [1] - 309:3
affect [1] - 347:19	288:16, 289:4,	ambient [1] - 332:2	appear [2] - 312:20,	appointed [2] -
affected [2] - 366:17	289:17, 289:20,	ambiguity [1] - 312:17	317:18	345:24, 359:14
affiliated [1] - 324:3	290:1, 290:4, 290:9,	Amend [1] - 273:11	appeared [1] - 371:5	approach [1] - 312:12
affiliates [1] - 348:19	290:16, 292:1,	amend [1] - 286:1	applicable [1] -	appropriate [5] -

05/07/2013 01:06:37 PM

288:6, 305:1, 323:2,	364:25	bag [2] - 337:4, 367:19	Bennoch [6] - 311:13,	353:17
332:5, 370:1	atmosphere [2] -	Baird [1] - 282:3	325:15, 325:21,	birds [1] - 363:14
appropriately [1] -	303:14, 303:15	ballpark [1] - 335:16	325:24, 326:7,	bit [2] - 300:9, 345:15
367:8	atmospheric [1] -	barred [1] - 280:25	326:11	blame [2] - 299:23,
approval [8] - 283:23,	332:24	based [11] - 295:9,	best [12] - 296:18,	312:21
311:1, 311:2,	attach [1] - 362:8	304:16, 305:6,	304:9, 304:24,	blatant [2] - 314:9,
313:13, 346:9,	attached [1] - 351:4	305:11, 312:14,	305:10, 306:24,	314:23
358:13, 362:8, 366:8	attempt [2] - 312:5,	314:7, 314:17,	308:18, 309:9,	Board [1] - 304:14
approvals [1] - 365:23	312:25	335:22, 362:10,	334:12, 336:6,	bodies [1] - 283:6
approved [6] - 278:2,	attempts [1] - 364:16	368:20, 369:2	336:22, 336:25,	Bogner [6] - 328:12,
278:13, 283:15,	attend [1] - 283:2	bases [1] - 328:24	353:7	328:18, 329:10,
311:20, 332:4, 365:3	attendance [1] -	basis [15] - 277:12,	better [7] - 275:7,	329:18, 330:10,
April [6] - 272:20,	282:24	279:20, 288:8,	300:4, 300:11,	334:11
273:3, 290:2, 309:4,	attested [1] - 305:12	290:10, 290:15,	305:2, 317:10,	borders [5] - 316:4,
368:13, 371:5	attorney [5] - 275:5,	293:19, 305:6,	327:17, 327:24	317:16, 317:20,
area [2] - 348:20,	282:2, 334:22,	305:9, 308:7,	between [22] - 279:18,	321:7, 366:1
362:12	350:20, 359:7	310:18, 317:3,	280:19, 284:1,	bound [1] - 353:4
areas [1] - 363:16	Attorney [1] - 273:20	328:22, 342:6,	285:16, 288:7,	boundaries [1] - 348:8
arguably [1] - 324:11	attributable [1] -	343:11, 355:21	294:23, 296:21,	Bower [3] - 282:2,
argue [2] - 312:24,	362:3	Bath [1] - 346:3	308:15, 314:11,	296:7, 350:19
313:16		bears [1] - 306:19	316:10, 318:4,	BOWER [54] - 281:21,
argument [1] - 334:14	audience [1] - 329:7 Augusta [4] - 272:20,	beats [1] - 338:17	319:5, 326:18,	282:1, 282:7,
arise [3] - 362:22,	0 11 /	became [3] - 307:25,	339:15, 340:19,	282:11, 282:15,
363:5, 365:7	273:3, 275:6, 307:24 author [1] - 328:12	308:12, 309:7	341:9, 341:21,	282:20, 282:22,
arisen [2] - 298:24,		become [4] - 283:13,	350:23, 353:17,	283:10, 283:20,
366:13	authorized [1] -	314:8, 333:1, 347:6	354:8, 361:16, 365:8	283:25, 284:5,
arrangement [1] -	307:25	becomes [2] - 288:15,	beyond [5] - 316:4,	284:17, 285:1,
367:17	authors [1] - 328:10	305:20	317:19, 321:7,	285:8, 285:14,
arriving [1] - 288:18	automatically [1] -	becoming [2] -	343:2, 366:1	285:18, 286:6,
ash [10] - 296:17,	280:21	309:25, 346:1	BGS/NEWSME [2] -	286:14, 286:17,
311:5, 347:13,	availability [1] - 365:2	began [3] - 307:11,	331:14, 342:10	286:23, 287:5,
360:15, 361:2,	available [11] - 274:9,	323:24, 347:2	bias [1] - 305:8	287:21, 287:24,
361:5, 362:5,	275:11, 280:22,	begin [8] - 274:1,	bid [1] - 308:13	288:19, 288:24,
363:10, 365:15,	304:10, 304:24, 219:0, 224:19	274:24, 274:25,	Biddeford [39] -	289:6, 289:16,
365:17	318:9, 334:18,	302:9, 302:19,	273:15, 277:7,	289:25, 290:3,
aspects [2] - 308:24,	336:22, 347:6, 347:7, 348:23	303:17, 304:1,	309:20, 344:3,	290:8, 290:13,
321:13	,	344:22	344:6, 344:13,	290:20, 290:24,
assert [1] - 279:7	average [2] - 304:8, 337:5	beginning [8] -	344:23, 345:8,	299:2, 350:11,
assertion [3] - 279:15,		272:20, 273:4,	345:10, 345:12,	350:16, 350:19,
280:15, 292:23	averages [1] - 290:11	279:17, 307:15,	345:25, 346:2,	351:4, 351:8,
asset [1] - 311:2	aware [13] - 330:19,	324:21, 347:2,	346:5, 346:8,	351:12, 351:20,
Assistant [1] - 273:19	334:1, 334:3, 335:8, 335:12, 335:15	348:14, 354:4	346:13, 346:16,	352:8, 352:16,
associated [2] -	335:12, 335:15, 335:18, 346:13	Beginning [1] - 307:8	346:19, 346:25,	353:15, 353:24,
367:13, 367:23	335:18, 346:13, 358:2, 365:10	begun [1] - 336:17	347:2, 347:4, 347:7,	354:20, 354:24,
assume [6] - 282:8,	358:2, 365:19, 367:6, 367:16,	behalf [4] - 275:6,	347:16, 347:21,	355:2, 355:21,
328:23, 329:5,	367:23	324:4, 325:11,	347:23, 348:15,	356:2, 356:6,
328.23, 329.3, 333:3, 348:21,	307.23	345:10	349:21, 349:23,	356:13, 356:16,
357:19	В	belief [3] - 348:10,	350:5, 350:9,	356:20
assumed [2] - 305:5,	D	354:1, 358:10	350:24, 353:3,	bracket [1] - 292:10
329:3	backfill [5] - 278:18,	below [4] - 278:22,	353:18, 354:5,	bracketing [1] - 293:8
assumes [3] - 304:7,	292:20, 293:1,	306:8, 308:6, 313:3	354:8, 356:23,	brakes [2] - 339:9,
304:17, 338:13	293:10, 293:17	bene [1] - 289:7	356:24, 357:7,	361:21
assuming [3] -	backfilling [1] -	beneficial [5] - 277:9,	359:1, 360:16	braking [1] - 361:21
278:12, 327:7, 335:2	298:10	289:5, 289:8,	Biddeford's [4] -	breach [5] - 357:7,
assumption [9] -	background [1] -	301:10, 301:25	348:10, 348:18,	357:12, 357:13,
293:7, 295:5, 295:9,	275:21	benefit [4] - 300:18,	354:1, 356:8	357:17, 357:22
295:12, 304:20,	backtracking [1] -	310:21, 311:15,	bidder [1] - 308:12	breaches [1] - 306:7
295.12, 304.20, 304:23, 305:9,	300:8	321:15	Bill [2] - 359:10,	break [5] - 274:2,
318:20, 327:12	backwards [1] -	benefits [2] - 346:10,	359:13	274:4, 287:20,
assure [2] - 362:11,	316:24	349:24	binding [2] - 353:2,	323:2, 323:7
[2] 002.11,	/	· · · · - ·		

28 of 46 sheets

Brewer [1] - 364:21	candidly [1] - 301:24	354:14, 355:12,	cited [1] - 328:9	357:15
Brian [1] - 325:9	cannot [2] - 310:24,	357:16, 362:18,	cities [8] - 344:3,	clear [6] - 279:4,
brief [2] - 323:7, 369:8	317:6	362:21, 365:8,	344:13, 344:23,	305:20, 307:14,
briefly [1] - 302:20	capacities [1] - 323:22	366:11	345:11, 350:8,	312:8, 317:2, 366:9
briefs [9] - 368:8,	capacity [11] - 277:12,	Casella's [5] - 282:17,	356:23, 356:24,	clearly [2] - 312:2,
368:9, 368:15,	278:20, 279:14,	285:1, 285:25,	359:1	312:3
369:1, 369:5,	279:24, 280:10,	306:10, 306:19	Citizen [14] - 302:7,	Climate [2] - 305:13,
369:10, 369:14,	284:10, 296:16,	Casella/PERC [4] -	302:10, 302:17,	328:11
369:16, 369:17	296:19, 309:22,	277:23, 278:5,	322:25, 323:3,	climate [2] - 303:9,
bring [4] - 317:23,	350:3, 365:5	285:19, 285:24	323:8, 323:19,	303:19
321:2, 321:5, 339:10	capped [1] - 305:25	cases [1] - 328:20	324:20, 337:18,	close [5] - 289:22,
bringing [2] - 311:5,	capture [11] - 300:15,	categories [2] -	337:19, 338:7,	324:15, 326:13,
311:7	304:5, 304:8,	283:25, 285:16	341:13, 341:15,	343:24, 369:11
brings [1] - 280:8	304:17, 305:11,	category [4] - 279:20,	343:23	closed [7] - 277:7,
broader [1] - 288:4	305:14, 328:6,	280:7, 284:1, 314:2	citizens [3] - 311:16,	342:19, 352:23,
broadly [1] - 277:22	328:19, 328:24,	caught [1] - 370:2	322:5, 349:9	368:11, 369:18,
brought [5] - 300:3,	338:22, 342:5	caused [1] - 361:10	City [1] - 359:20	369:20, 370:18
339:7, 340:10,	captured [1] - 304:11	causes [1] - 361:18	city [58] - 345:7,	closely [1] - 364:25
358:12, 358:13	carbon [2] - 303:1,	ceased [1] - 347:1	345:8, 345:9,	closer [3] - 311:15,
Bubia [1] - 350:17	303:8	cell [1] - 331:3	345:11, 345:12,	325:7, 326:24
Bubier [8] - 345:11,	care [2] - 315:15,	cellular [1] - 274:15	345:24, 345:25,	closing [8] - 281:8,
345:24, 350:13,	319:6	Center [1] - 304:13	346:2, 346:5, 346:8,	311:8, 352:22,
350:16, 350:17,	careful [2] - 296:24,	century [1] - 303:15	346:13, 346:16,	368:8, 369:1, 369:5,
350:18, 357:4, 358:5	314:19	certain [4] - 291:13,	346:25, 350:24,	369:14, 369:16
BUBIER [26] - 345:19,	carry [1] - 301:12	351:13, 351:22,	351:18, 352:2,	closure [6] - 273:14,
345:23, 350:18,	carrying [1] - 361:25	362:10	353:2, 353:4,	284:20, 348:2,
351:3, 351:7,	case [7] - 280:23,	certainly [8] - 275:11,	353:10, 353:18,	355:7, 360:19,
351:11, 351:16,	281:6, 305:19,	292:18, 309:1,	353:21, 354:12,	365:22
351:25, 352:14,	324:6, 324:13,	310:4, 313:15,	355:16, 357:7,	Club [3] - 330:24,
353:4, 353:19,	355:11, 369:12	317:20, 322:3,	357:25, 359:3,	334:12, 342:17
354:11, 354:23,	Casella [67] - 276:21,	336:13	359:8, 359:9, 250:10, 250:14	CO2 [4] - 303:11,
354:25, 355:10,	276:25, 278:17,	CERTIFICATE [1] -	359:10, 359:14,	303:13, 303:14,
355:24, 356:4,	278:18, 279:18,	371:1	359:15, 359:18, 359:22, 359:24,	304:7
356:11, 356:15,	279:20, 279:23,	certify [2] - 371:4,	360:2, 360:11,	Coffman [2] - 302:11,
356:19, 357:10,	280:4, 280:7,	371:12	361:12, 361:22,	339:25
357:13, 357:19,	281:11, 284:23,	cessation [1] - 360:20	362:1, 362:15,	Coffman's [1] - 341:6
358:3, 358:6, 358:16	285:15, 286:9,	cetera [2] - 275:25,	362:17, 363:6,	collected [1] - 338:25
bullet [1] - 307:21	286:24, 287:7, 288:7, 288:10,	330:9	363:12, 364:7,	collection [14] -
Bureau [3] - 273:9,	289:19, 292:4,	CH4 [1] - 304:18	364:16, 364:21,	275:25, 304:20, 305:5, 305:6,
273:21, 322:2	292:12, 292:17,	change [9] - 303:9,	364:24, 365:4,	
BUREAU [1] - 272:7 buried [1] - 313:3	293:9, 294:1,	303:19, 307:11, 334:5, 360:10,	366:3, 366:10,	305:18, 329:13, 329:19, 329:20,
buried [1] - 313:3 bury [1] - 313:15	294:23, 296:15,	, ,	366:16, 366:22,	330:7, 338:21,
burying [1] - 313:19	297:18, 298:18,	360:11, 360:17, 361:11, 366:20	367:3, 367:13, 368:1	341:19, 342:9,
business [3] - 300:16,	299:19, 301:7,	Change [2] - 305:13,	city's [3] - 361:12,	343:6, 354:7
308:24, 366:14	301:22, 304:4,	328:11	362:7, 362:20	combination [2] -
businessman [1] -	304:10, 308:11,	changes [2] - 313:12,	civic [1] - 366:15	276:1, 318:2
288:22	308:16, 308:18,	363:1	claim [1] - 279:10	combine [2] - 281:23,
buyer [2] - 352:24	308:22, 309:2,	chapter [1] - 328:10	claimed [2] - 316:4,	332:24
bypass [5] - 309:17,	309:5, 309:9,	Chapter [2] - 323:24,	321:5	combined [1] - 332:20
353:10, 360:15,	309:24, 314:11,	369:7	clarification [1] -	combusted [5] -
365:16, 365:17	314:21, 314:24,	charge [1] - 281:1	291:13	292:16, 315:12,
	316:10, 316:12,	checked [1] - 333:4	clarify [8] - 276:19,	317:7, 348:6, 365:25
С	317:23, 318:4,	chief [2] - 324:6,	285:9, 286:8,	combustion [1] -
	321:1, 321:4, 322:1,	324:14	294:18, 320:9,	318:17
calculation [1] - 327:8	327:21, 327:22,	choose [2] - 280:19,	324:18, 332:12, 341:8	coming [11] - 284:20,
calendar [1] - 360:13	327:25, 335:6, 348:18, 350:24	324:15	clarifying [1] - 358:8	290:3, 302:11,
California [1] - 304:14	348:18, 350:24, 351:18, 352:11	choosing [1] - 281:3		303:23, 325:20,
campus [2] - 306:20,	351:18, 352:11, 353:18, 354:12,	circumstances [1] -	Clark [1] - 273:22 clause [2] - 299:11,	327:11, 339:10,
363:3	000. IU, 00 4 . IZ,	324:2	Ciause [2] - 299.11,	339:12, 342:21,

355:17	complaints [5] -	351:23, 352:11,	286:9, 288:14,	correcting [1] - 305:14
commence [2] -	362:16, 362:22,	352:21, 357:20,	292:19, 296:15,	correction [1] - 305:2
348:15, 354:5	364:10, 367:8	357:23, 358:17	298:18, 299:11,	correctly [5] - 293:21,
comment [3] - 304:23,	complete [2] - 299:22,	conduct [2] - 308:24,	308:3, 308:6,	312:6, 321:22,
323:22, 354:6	311:25	334:18	309:21, 310:1,	341:19, 341:20
comments [5] -	completed [1] -	confer [2] - 337:23,	314:10, 314:18,	correlate [1] - 294:11
288:25, 346:6,	313:10	338:2	318:3, 327:21,	correlation [2] -
360:2, 368:12,	completely [1] -	conference [2] -	352:7, 357:8,	294:21, 294:22
369:16	355:11	323:18, 323:23	357:12, 357:13,	corresponding [1] -
commercial [4] -	compliance [3] -	confirm [1] - 352:9	357:20, 357:22,	349:6
293:17, 295:1,	308:25, 310:2, 334:6	consent [1] - 287:3	358:1, 358:2,	cost [5] - 335:13,
340:18, 341:3	component [2] -	conservative [1] -	358:19, 362:19,	335:18, 336:21,
commercially [1] -	296:13, 333:5	343:7	364:2, 370:6, 370:13	367:13, 367:23
280:4	composite [1] -	consider [1] - 306:9	contracted [1] - 280:2	costs [4] - 276:14,
commission [1] -	330:12	considerably [1] -	contractual [2] -	320:10, 336:10
371:23	compost [1] - 308:10	340:20	288:10, 352:3	Council [1] - 359:21
Commissioner [2] -	composted [1] - 317:7	consideration [2] -	contractually [1] -	counsel [1] - 273:20
283:4, 320:5	compromise [6] -	350:6, 368:5	314:25	count [2] - 320:20,
Commissioner's [1] -	319:4, 319:13,	considerations [1] -	contributing [1] -	340:23
320:8	320:15, 321:1,	336:20	366:14	COUNTY [1] - 272:9
commitment [1] -	321:8, 327:4	considered [3] -	control [8] - 338:21,	couple [3] - 299:10,
337:3	computer [1] - 371:10	288:4, 309:12,	361:6, 362:24,	345:13, 358:9
committed [1] - 277:1	computer-aided [1] -	365:18	363:21, 363:24,	Court [1] - 371:21
Committee [1] -	371:10	considering [1] -	363:25, 364:3, 364:6	court [1] - 273:25
307:19	conceded [1] - 358:23	303:8	Control [1] - 364:3	covenants [1] -
commodity [1] -	concept [1] - 366:3	consistent [13] -	conventional [1] -	308:23
293:13	concern [5] - 303:3,	278:5, 283:8,	304:15	cover [12] - 306:4,
commonly [2] - 303:9,	328:3, 328:23,	285:20, 285:24,	conversation [1] -	306:7, 332:4, 332:5,
329:3	328:24, 362:15	286:2, 308:7,	348:22	333:21, 334:9,
communications [1] -	concerned [3] -	309:15, 315:10,	cooperation [1] -	343:6, 363:15,
283:3	289:14, 316:18,	324:22, 346:10,	276:13	363:18, 363:21,
communities [15] -	359:24	349:9, 369:6, 369:7	copy [1] - 351:6	363:25
276:3, 278:15,	concerning [1] -	consolidation [1] -	corporation [2] -	covered [3] - 304:1,
278:16, 278:21,	302:24	276:22	311:18, 311:19	338:16, 342:3
289:14, 292:3,	concerns [11] -	constraints [1] -	correct [50] - 283:18,	covers [2] - 330:12,
292:6, 292:13,	325:17, 360:11,	300:12	283:19, 283:23, 284:3, 284:4,	330:16
292:14, 299:12, 299:15, 346:20,	361:11, 361:12,	consumption [1] -	284:15, 284:16,	create [2] - 327:5,
299.15, 340.20, 346:21, 347:8,	362:7, 363:12,	320:11 contact [1] - 357:17	285:13, 285:16,	362:13
349:25	364:21, 365:5,	contains [1] - 278:13	285:17, 286:9,	created [1] - 315:22
community [8] -	365:7, 366:22, 366:24	contemplated [1] -	286:15, 287:3,	cross [26] - 275:11,
322:15, 336:23,	concluded [3] -	348:24	287:4, 289:2,	281:17, 281:19,
337:1, 337:12,	290:22, 342:9,	contend [1] - 311:1	289:21, 295:4,	281:20, 290:23, 291:2, 291:15,
346:16, 359:22,	370:20	content [2] - 303:22,	295:9, 295:11,	291.2, 291.15, 291:16, 291:18,
359:23, 366:14	concludes [5] -	331:5	296:1, 300:7,	295:19, 297:1,
compacting [1] -	278:25, 302:4,	contingent [3] -	305:11, 320:12,	297:2, 297:15,
363:20	343:22, 359:1,	283:22, 284:2,	325:15, 325:16,	298:11, 298:23,
companies [1] -	367:25	354:21	325:22, 326:1,	323:2, 323:8,
275:23	conclusion [2] -	continuance [1] -	326:8, 326:9,	323:10, 324:20,
Company [1] - 275:7	365:21, 368:10	301:6	327:12, 328:7,	334:18, 337:17,
company [2] - 286:11,	concurrent [1] -	continue [5] - 301:25,	328:12, 328:20,	338:10, 340:4,
354:14	329:20	310:6, 331:24,	328:21, 329:10,	350:8, 356:22, 367:3
compelling [1] -	condition [4] - 331:21,	336:3, 362:24	329:16, 329:23,	cross-examination [1]
310:17	352:5, 352:12, 362:8	continued [1] - 301:21	330:13, 330:17,	- 281:19
compete [3] - 281:4,	conditioned [1] -	continuing [2] -	334:24, 334:25,	cross-examine [1] -
281:7, 299:11	283:18	301:12, 322:10	335:25, 336:1,	356:22
competition [1] -	conditioning [1] -	continuous [1] -	341:22, 342:25,	crossed [1] - 339:22
312:21	310:23	365:13	353:18, 356:14, 356:18, 356:10	cubic [7] - 353:14,
Competitive [1] -	conditions [8] -	contract [30] - 278:24,	356:18, 356:19, 369:4	360:22, 360:23,
304:13	282:13, 351:13,	279:17, 282:19,	JUJ. T	361:1, 361:3

curbside [5] - 303:24,	318:15	306:4	336:10, 336:23,	296:20, 297:1,
348:15, 354:5,	delivered [12] - 279:9,	determination [2] -	336:25, 346:19,	297:4, 297:7,
354:15, 367:20	279:13, 279:19,	274:4, 274:11	348:11, 350:2,	297:10, 325:5,
cure [1] - 324:14	280:11, 280:12,	determine [2] -	354:2, 354:7, 363:5,	368:23, 369:1
current [6] - 278:17,	284:21, 309:20,	298:13, 339:17	365:1, 365:9,	Doyle's [1] - 357:6
301:21, 304:9,	309:21, 314:21,	devalue [1] - 311:3	365:10, 366:7	drafted [1] - 351:15
352:5, 354:17, 357:8	353:6, 363:10,	development [5] -	dispose [4] - 309:16,	driven [1] - 320:22
cut [1] - 310:10	363:11	316:6, 321:17,	335:1, 335:13, 365:6	drivers [1] - 320:22
Cyndi [1] - 273:24	delivery [4] - 276:23,	348:12, 349:22,	disposed [11] -	driveway [1] - 340:23
	283:2, 288:5, 364:14	354:3	277:25, 347:11,	due [8] - 302:1,
D	demonstrably [1] -	devices [2] - 274:15,	347:13, 347:18,	310:24, 314:5,
_	304:24	274:16	347:22, 349:7,	343:23, 362:13,
daily [9] - 290:9,	demonstrates [1] -	diesel [2] - 320:10	360:7, 360:9,	368:9, 369:2
290:14, 310:18,	364:5	difference [2] -	360:21, 365:16,	duly [1] - 359:14
332:5, 333:21,	demonstration [1] -	296:21, 339:15	366:5	during [5] - 303:4,
334:9, 363:15,	368:17	different [2] - 284:22,	disposing [1] - 306:24	310:23, 323:18,
363:21, 363:25	denied [1] - 327:20	332:23	disregard [2] - 314:9,	323:22
dangerous [1] - 303:7	denies [1] - 355:17	dioxide [2] - 303:1,	322:14	duties [1] - 359:18
Darling [1] - 273:24	DEP [19] - 273:24,	303:8	distance [1] - 361:17	aanoo [i] - 000.10
data [2] - 314:17,	285:2, 299:4, 299:7,		disturbing [1] -	E
318:9	285.2, 299.4, 299.7, 309:5, 309:13,	direct [3] - 279:6,	361:22	E
date [4] - 289:22,	313:8, 316:10,	283:10, 346:9	diversion [4] - 305:2,	early [3] - 281:8,
	, ,	direction [1] - 326:5	348:3, 349:4, 349:14	322:9, 365:11
289:23, 289:25,	327:22, 331:9,	directives [1] - 312:19	, ,	-
313:5 datad w 250:24	355:9, 356:17,	directly [2] - 335:5,	divert [1] - 317:24	ecomaine [8] -
dated [1] - 350:24	357:3, 362:8, 363:3,	335:9	diverted [11] - 314:9,	279:11, 281:19,
David [1] - 310:9	364:24, 366:6,	director [2] - 273:16,	314:22, 318:17,	281:23, 282:4,
David's [1] - 341:5	366:23, 367:6	273:21	318:22, 318:23,	318:16, 318:25,
days [3] - 294:3,	DEP's [3] - 363:7,	Director [1] - 273:23	318:24, 318:25,	350:9, 350:20
294:6, 322:9	364:5, 364:7	disagree [2] - 343:9,	319:9, 319:10,	economic [2] -
deal [1] - 284:24	DEPARTMENT [1] -	343:11	319:14, 321:12	300:10, 349:22
dealt [1] - 364:22	272:2	discards [1] - 305:19	diverting [4] - 305:19,	economics [3] -
December [2] - 277:7,	Department [14] -	discretion [1] - 368:16	314:11, 315:19,	288:5, 288:17,
360:24	273:7, 273:11,	discuss [1] - 337:20	349:1	288:20
decides [1] - 357:25	273:17, 273:20,	discussed [2] - 324:1,	dividends [1] - 319:13	effect [4] - 301:17,
decision [1] - 368:20				
accionari [1] - 000.20	283:4, 312:23,	329:9	dividing [1] - 327:11	306:10, 323:25,
decline [2] - 360:25,	283:4, 312:23, 316:6, 321:17,	329:9	dividing [1] - 327:11 Division [1] - 273:23	•••
		329:9 discussion [3] -	_	306:10, 323:25,
decline [2] - 360:25, 361:3	316:6, 321:17,	329:9 discussion [3] - 289:20, 323:19,	Division [1] - 273:23	306:10, 323:25, 333:2
decline [2] - 360:25,	316:6, 321:17, 321:25, 323:24,	329:9 discussion [3] - 289:20, 323:19, 358:22	Division [1] - 273:23 document [5] - 309:8,	306:10, 323:25, 333:2 effective [2] - 283:13,
decline [2] - 360:25, 361:3 declining [1] - 342:13 decommissioned [2] -	316:6, 321:17, 321:25, 323:24, 343:19, 367:4,	329:9 discussion [3] - 289:20, 323:19, 358:22 discussions [6] -	Division [1] - 273:23 document [5] - 309:8, 309:13, 313:22, 317:1, 317:22	306:10, 323:25, 333:2 effective [2] - 283:13, 289:18
decline [2] - 360:25, 361:3 declining [1] - 342:13 decommissioned [2] - 306:3, 315:16	316:6, 321:17, 321:25, 323:24, 343:19, 367:4, 368:13, 368:21	329:9 discussion [3] - 289:20, 323:19, 358:22 discussions [6] - 290:5, 324:22,	Division [1] - 273:23 document [5] - 309:8, 309:13, 313:22, 317:1, 317:22 documents [3] -	306:10, 323:25, 333:2 effective [2] - 283:13, 289:18 effects [1] - 303:13
decline [2] - 360:25, 361:3 declining [1] - 342:13 decommissioned [2] - 306:3, 315:16 decomposable [1] -	316:6, 321:17, 321:25, 323:24, 343:19, 367:4, 368:13, 368:21 Department's [1] -	329:9 discussion [3] - 289:20, 323:19, 358:22 discussions [6] - 290:5, 324:22, 355:18, 358:18,	Division [1] - 273:23 document [5] - 309:8, 309:13, 313:22, 317:1, 317:22	306:10, 323:25, 333:2 effective [2] - 283:13, 289:18 effects [1] - 303:13 efficiencies [5] -
decline [2] - 360:25, 361:3 declining [1] - 342:13 decommissioned [2] - 306:3, 315:16 decomposable [1] - 305:19	316:6, 321:17, 321:25, 323:24, 343:19, 367:4, 368:13, 368:21 Department's [1] - 368:5	329:9 discussion [3] - 289:20, 323:19, 358:22 discussions [6] - 290:5, 324:22, 355:18, 358:18, 358:20	Division [1] - 273:23 document [5] - 309:8, 309:13, 313:22, 317:1, 317:22 documents [3] - 318:2, 318:10, 355:12	306:10, 323:25, 333:2 effective [2] - 283:13, 289:18 effects [1] - 303:13 efficiencies [5] - 328:19, 328:24,
decline [2] - 360:25, 361:3 declining [1] - 342:13 decommissioned [2] - 306:3, 315:16 decomposable [1] - 305:19 decompose [1] -	316:6, 321:17, 321:25, 323:24, 343:19, 367:4, 368:13, 368:21 Department's [1] - 368:5 dependent [1] - 276:15	329:9 discussion [3] - 289:20, 323:19, 358:22 discussions [6] - 290:5, 324:22, 355:18, 358:18, 358:20 disinterested [1] -	Division [1] - 273:23 document [5] - 309:8, 309:13, 313:22, 317:1, 317:22 documents [3] - 318:2, 318:10, 355:12 dollar [1] - 321:16	306:10, 323:25, 333:2 effective [2] - 283:13, 289:18 effects [1] - 303:13 efficiencies [5] - 328:19, 328:24, 329:19, 338:22, 342:5
decline [2] - 360:25, 361:3 declining [1] - 342:13 decommissioned [2] - 306:3, 315:16 decomposable [1] - 305:19 decompose [1] - 304:2	316:6, 321:17, 321:25, 323:24, 343:19, 367:4, 368:13, 368:21 Department's [1] - 368:5 dependent [1] -	329:9 discussion [3] - 289:20, 323:19, 358:22 discussions [6] - 290:5, 324:22, 355:18, 358:18, 358:20 disinterested [1] - 371:12	Division [1] - 273:23 document [5] - 309:8, 309:13, 313:22, 317:1, 317:22 documents [3] - 318:2, 318:10, 355:12 dollar [1] - 321:16 dollars [3] - 315:22,	306:10, 323:25, 333:2 effective [2] - 283:13, 289:18 effects [1] - 303:13 efficiencies [5] - 328:19, 328:24, 329:19, 338:22, 342:5 efficiency [4] - 304:20,
decline [2] - 360:25, 361:3 declining [1] - 342:13 decommissioned [2] - 306:3, 315:16 decomposable [1] - 305:19 decompose [1] - 304:2 decomposition [2] -	316:6, 321:17, 321:25, 323:24, 343:19, 367:4, 368:13, 368:21 Department's [1] - 368:5 dependent [1] - 276:15 derived [3] - 300:9, 303:11, 366:7	329:9 discussion [3] - 289:20, 323:19, 358:22 discussions [6] - 290:5, 324:22, 355:18, 358:18, 358:20 disinterested [1] - 371:12 dismally [1] - 298:4	Division [1] - 273:23 document [5] - 309:8, 309:13, 313:22, 317:1, 317:22 documents [3] - 318:2, 318:10, 355:12 dollar [1] - 321:16 dollars [3] - 315:22, 316:5, 327:5	306:10, 323:25, 333:2 effective [2] - 283:13, 289:18 effects [1] - 303:13 efficiencies [5] - 328:19, 328:24, 329:19, 338:22, 342:5 efficiency [4] - 304:20, 305:4, 305:6, 342:9
decline [2] - 360:25, 361:3 declining [1] - 342:13 decommissioned [2] - 306:3, 315:16 decomposable [1] - 305:19 decompose [1] - 304:2 decomposition [2] - 303:5, 306:6	316:6, 321:17, 321:25, 323:24, 343:19, 367:4, 368:13, 368:21 Department's [1] - 368:5 dependent [1] - 276:15 derived [3] - 300:9, 303:11, 366:7 described [3] -	329:9 discussion [3] - 289:20, 323:19, 358:22 discussions [6] - 290:5, 324:22, 355:18, 358:18, 358:20 disinterested [1] - 371:12 dismally [1] - 298:4 displace [6] - 277:14,	Division [1] - 273:23 document [5] - 309:8, 309:13, 313:22, 317:1, 317:22 documents [3] - 318:2, 318:10, 355:12 dollar [1] - 321:16 dollars [3] - 315:22, 316:5, 327:5 done [2] - 295:16,	306:10, 323:25, 333:2 effective [2] - 283:13, 289:18 effects [1] - 303:13 efficiencies [5] - 328:19, 328:24, 329:19, 338:22, 342:5 efficiency [4] - 304:20, 305:4, 305:6, 342:9 efficiently [1] - 328:6
decline [2] - 360:25, 361:3 declining [1] - 342:13 decommissioned [2] - 306:3, 315:16 decomposable [1] - 305:19 decompose [1] - 304:2 decomposition [2] - 303:5, 306:6 decrease [1] - 347:14	316:6, 321:17, 321:25, 323:24, 343:19, 367:4, 368:13, 368:21 Department's [1] - 368:5 dependent [1] - 276:15 derived [3] - 300:9, 303:11, 366:7 described [3] - 283:21, 342:11,	329:9 discussion [3] - 289:20, 323:19, 358:22 discussions [6] - 290:5, 324:22, 355:18, 358:18, 358:20 disinterested [1] - 371:12 dismally [1] - 298:4 displace [6] - 277:14, 280:7, 284:7,	Division [1] - 273:23 document [5] - 309:8, 309:13, 313:22, 317:1, 317:22 documents [3] - 318:2, 318:10, 355:12 dollar [1] - 321:16 dollars [3] - 315:22, 316:5, 327:5 done [2] - 295:16, 345:16	306:10, 323:25, 333:2 effective [2] - 283:13, 289:18 effects [1] - 303:13 efficiencies [5] - 328:19, 328:24, 329:19, 338:22, 342:5 efficiency [4] - 304:20, 305:4, 305:6, 342:9 efficiently [1] - 328:6 efforts [11] - 280:5,
decline [2] - 360:25, 361:3 declining [1] - 342:13 decommissioned [2] - 306:3, 315:16 decomposable [1] - 305:19 decompose [1] - 304:2 decomposition [2] - 303:5, 306:6 decrease [1] - 347:14 decreased [1] - 278:3	316:6, 321:17, 321:25, 323:24, 343:19, 367:4, 368:13, 368:21 Department's [1] - 368:5 dependent [1] - 276:15 derived [3] - 300:9, 303:11, 366:7 described [3] - 283:21, 342:11, 368:15	329:9 discussion [3] - 289:20, 323:19, 358:22 discussions [6] - 290:5, 324:22, 355:18, 358:18, 358:20 disinterested [1] - 371:12 dismally [1] - 298:4 displace [6] - 277:14, 280:7, 284:7, 284:11, 284:21,	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{Division} \ [1] - 273:23\\ \textbf{document} \ [5] - 309:8,\\ 309:13, 313:22,\\ 317:1, 317:22\\ \textbf{documents} \ [3] -\\ 318:2, 318:10,\\ 355:12\\ \textbf{dollar} \ [1] - 321:16\\ \textbf{dollars} \ [3] - 315:22,\\ 316:5, 327:5\\ \textbf{done} \ [2] - 295:16,\\ 345:16\\ \textbf{down} \ [9] - 287:20, \end{array}$	306:10, 323:25, 333:2 effective [2] - 283:13, 289:18 effects [1] - 303:13 efficiencies [5] - 328:19, 328:24, 329:19, 338:22, 342:5 efficiency [4] - 304:20, 305:4, 305:6, 342:9 efficiently [1] - 328:6 efforts [11] - 280:5, 282:25, 293:17,
decline [2] - 360:25, 361:3 declining [1] - 342:13 decommissioned [2] - 306:3, 315:16 decomposable [1] - 305:19 decompose [1] - 304:2 decomposition [2] - 303:5, 306:6 decrease [1] - 347:14 decreased [1] - 278:3 defined [2] - 312:2,	316:6, 321:17, 321:25, 323:24, 343:19, 367:4, 368:13, 368:21 Department's [1] - 368:5 dependent [1] - 276:15 derived [3] - 300:9, 303:11, 366:7 described [3] - 283:21, 342:11, 368:15 design [2] - 332:5,	329:9 discussion [3] - 289:20, 323:19, 358:22 discussions [6] - 290:5, 324:22, 355:18, 358:18, 358:20 disinterested [1] - 371:12 dismally [1] - 298:4 displace [6] - 277:14, 280:7, 284:7, 284:11, 284:21, 285:11	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{Division [1] - 273:23} \\ \textbf{document [5] - 309:8,} \\ 309:13, 313:22, \\ 317:1, 317:22 \\ \textbf{documents [3] -} \\ 318:2, 318:10, \\ 355:12 \\ \textbf{dollar [1] - 321:16} \\ \textbf{dollars [3] - 315:22,} \\ 316:5, 327:5 \\ \textbf{done [2] - 295:16,} \\ 345:16 \\ \textbf{down [9] - 287:20,} \\ 310:7, 314:2, \\ \end{array}$	306:10, 323:25, 333:2 effective [2] - 283:13, 289:18 effects [1] - 303:13 efficiencies [5] - 328:19, 328:24, 329:19, 338:22, 342:5 efficiency [4] - 304:20, 305:4, 305:6, 342:9 efficiently [1] - 328:6 efforts [11] - 280:5, 282:25, 293:17, 308:19, 309:9,
decline [2] - 360:25, 361:3 declining [1] - 342:13 decommissioned [2] - 306:3, 315:16 decomposable [1] - 305:19 decompose [1] - 304:2 decomposition [2] - 303:5, 306:6 decrease [1] - 347:14 decreased [1] - 278:3 defined [2] - 312:2, 312:3	316:6, 321:17, 321:25, 323:24, 343:19, 367:4, 368:13, 368:21 Department's [1] - 368:5 dependent [1] - 276:15 derived [3] - 300:9, 303:11, 366:7 described [3] - 283:21, 342:11, 368:15 design [2] - 332:5, 347:19	329:9 discussion [3] - 289:20, 323:19, 358:22 discussions [6] - 290:5, 324:22, 355:18, 358:18, 358:20 disinterested [1] - 371:12 dismally [1] - 298:4 displace [6] - 277:14, 280:7, 284:7, 284:11, 284:21, 285:11 displacing [2] -	Division $[1] - 273:23$ document $[5] - 309:8$, 309:13, $313:22$, 317:1, $317:22documents [3] -318:2$, $318:10$, 355:12 dollar $[1] - 321:16$ dollars $[3] - 315:22$, 316:5, $327:5done [2] - 295:16,345:16down [9] - 287:20,310:7$, $314:2$, 321:23, $356:3$,	$\begin{array}{c} 306:10,\ 323:25,\\ 333:2\\ \textbf{effective}\ [2]\ -\ 283:13,\\ 289:18\\ \textbf{effects}\ [1]\ -\ 303:13\\ \textbf{efficiencies}\ [5]\ -\ 328:19,\ 328:24,\\ 329:19,\ 338:22,\\ 342:5\\ \textbf{efficiency}\ [4]\ -\ 304:20,\\ 305:4,\ 305:6,\ 342:9\\ \textbf{efficiently}\ [1]\ -\ 328:6\\ \textbf{efforts}\ [11]\ -\ 280:5,\\ 282:25,\ 293:17,\\ 308:19,\ 309:9,\\ 348:25,\ 349:6,\\ \end{array}$
decline [2] - 360:25, 361:3 declining [1] - 342:13 decommissioned [2] - 306:3, 315:16 decomposable [1] - 305:19 decompose [1] - 304:2 decomposition [2] - 303:5, 306:6 decrease [1] - 347:14 decreased [1] - 278:3 defined [2] - 312:2, 312:3 definition [1] - 314:6	316:6, 321:17, 321:25, 323:24, 343:19, 367:4, 368:13, 368:21 Department's [1] - 368:5 dependent [1] - 276:15 derived [3] - 300:9, 303:11, 366:7 described [3] - 283:21, 342:11, 368:15 design [2] - 332:5, 347:19 designated [1] -	329:9 discussion [3] - 289:20, 323:19, 358:22 discussions [6] - 290:5, 324:22, 355:18, 358:18, 358:20 disinterested [1] - 371:12 dismally [1] - 298:4 displace [6] - 277:14, 280:7, 284:7, 284:11, 284:21, 285:11 displacing [2] - 277:20, 300:5	Division $[1] - 273:23$ document $[5] - 309:8$, 309:13, 313:22, 317:1, 317:22 documents $[3] -$ 318:2, 318:10, 355:12 dollar $[1] - 321:16$ dollars $[3] - 315:22$, 316:5, 327:5 done $[2] - 295:16,$ 345:16 down $[9] - 287:20,$ 310:7, 314:2, 321:23, 356:3, 356:5, 356:14,	$\begin{array}{c} 306:10,\ 323:25,\\ 333:2\\ \textbf{effective}\ [2]\ -\ 283:13,\\ 289:18\\ \textbf{effects}\ [1]\ -\ 303:13\\ \textbf{efficiencies}\ [5]\ -\ 328:19,\ 328:24,\\ 329:19,\ 338:22,\\ 342:5\\ \textbf{efficiency}\ [4]\ -\ 304:20,\\ 305:4,\ 305:6,\ 342:9\\ \textbf{efficiently}\ [1]\ -\ 328:6\\ \textbf{efforts}\ [11]\ -\ 280:5,\\ 282:25,\ 293:17,\\ 308:19,\ 309:9,\\ 348:25,\ 349:6,\\ 349:14,\ 353:1,\\ \end{array}$
$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{decline} \ [2] - 360:25, \\ 361:3 \\ \textbf{declining} \ [1] - 342:13 \\ \textbf{decommissioned} \ [2] - \\ 306:3, \ 315:16 \\ \textbf{decomposable} \ [1] - \\ 305:19 \\ \textbf{decompose} \ [1] - \\ 304:2 \\ \textbf{decomposition} \ [2] - \\ 303:5, \ 306:6 \\ \textbf{decrease} \ [1] - \ 347:14 \\ \textbf{decreased} \ [1] - \ 314:7 \\ \textbf{defined} \ [2] - \ 312:2, \\ 312:3 \\ \textbf{definition} \ [1] - \ 314:6 \\ \textbf{definitions} \ [4] - \ 305:7, \\ \end{array}$	316:6, 321:17, 321:25, 323:24, 343:19, 367:4, 368:13, 368:21 Department's [1] - 368:5 dependent [1] - 276:15 derived [3] - 300:9, 303:11, 366:7 described [3] - 283:21, 342:11, 368:15 design [2] - 332:5, 347:19 designated [1] - 323:14	329:9 discussion [3] - 289:20, 323:19, 358:22 discussions [6] - 290:5, 324:22, 355:18, 358:18, 358:20 disinterested [1] - 371:12 dismally [1] - 298:4 displace [6] - 277:14, 280:7, 284:7, 284:11, 284:21, 285:11 displacing [2] - 277:20, 300:5 disposal [30] - 276:10,	Division $[1] - 273:23$ document $[5] - 309:8$, 309:13, $313:22$, 317:1, $317:22documents [3] -318:2$, $318:10$, 355:12 dollar $[1] - 321:16$ dollars $[3] - 315:22$, 316:5, $327:5done [2] - 295:16,345:16down [9] - 287:20,310:7$, $314:2$, 321:23, $356:3$, 356:5, $356:14$, 356:18, $364:19$	$\begin{array}{c} 306:10,\ 323:25,\\ 333:2\\ \textbf{effective}\ [2]\ -\ 283:13,\\ 289:18\\ \textbf{effects}\ [1]\ -\ 303:13\\ \textbf{efficiencies}\ [5]\ -\ 328:19,\ 328:24,\\ 329:19,\ 338:22,\\ 342:5\\ \textbf{efficiency}\ [4]\ -\ 304:20,\\ 305:4,\ 305:6,\ 342:9\\ \textbf{efficiently}\ [1]\ -\ 328:6\\ \textbf{efforts}\ [11]\ -\ 280:5,\\ 282:25,\ 293:17,\\ 308:19,\ 309:9,\\ 348:25,\ 349:6,\\ 349:14,\ 353:1,\\ 363:4,\ 367:14\\ \end{array}$
$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{decline} \ [2] - 360:25, \\ 361:3 \\ \textbf{declining} \ [1] - 342:13 \\ \textbf{decommissioned} \ [2] - \\ 306:3, \ 315:16 \\ \textbf{decomposable} \ [1] - \\ 305:19 \\ \textbf{decompose} \ [1] - \\ 304:2 \\ \textbf{decomposition} \ [2] - \\ 303:5, \ 306:6 \\ \textbf{decrease} \ [1] - \ 347:14 \\ \textbf{decreased} \ [1] - \ 314:7 \\ \textbf{definition} \ [1] - \ 314:6 \\ \textbf{definitions} \ [4] - \ 305:7, \\ 305:11, \ 313:7, \end{array}$	$316:6, 321:17, \\ 321:25, 323:24, \\ 343:19, 367:4, \\ 368:13, 368:21 \\ \hline \begartment's [1] - \\ 368:5 \\ \hline \dependent [1] - \\ 276:15 \\ \hline \derived [3] - 300:9, \\ 303:11, 366:7 \\ \hline \described [3] - \\ 283:21, 342:11, \\ 368:15 \\ \hline \design [2] - 332:5, \\ 347:19 \\ \hline \designated [1] - \\ 323:14 \\ \hline \desirable [1] - 317:19 \\ \hline \end{tabular}$	329:9 discussion [3] - 289:20, 323:19, 358:22 discussions [6] - 290:5, 324:22, 355:18, 358:18, 358:20 disinterested [1] - 371:12 dismally [1] - 298:4 displace [6] - 277:14, 280:7, 284:7, 284:11, 284:21, 285:11 displacing [2] - 277:20, 300:5 disposal [30] - 276:10, 276:17, 280:20,	Division $[1] - 273:23$ document $[5] - 309:8$, 309:13, $313:22$, 317:1, $317:22documents [3] -318:2$, $318:10$, 355:12 dollar $[1] - 321:16$ dollars $[3] - 315:22$, 316:5, $327:5done [2] - 295:16,345:16down [9] - 287:20,310:7$, $314:2$, 321:23, $356:3$, 356:5, $356:14$, 356:18, $364:19downtown [2] -$	$\begin{array}{c} 306:10,\ 323:25,\\ 333:2\\ effective\ [2]\ -\ 283:13,\\ 289:18\\ effects\ [1]\ -\ 303:13\\ efficiencies\ [5]\ -\ 328:19,\ 328:24,\\ 329:19,\ 338:22,\\ 342:5\\ efficiency\ [4]\ -\ 304:20,\\ 305:4,\ 305:6,\ 342:9\\ efficiently\ [1]\ -\ 328:6\\ efforts\ [11]\ -\ 280:5,\\ 282:25,\ 293:17,\\ 308:19,\ 309:9,\\ 348:25,\ 349:6,\\ 349:14,\ 353:1,\\ 363:4,\ 367:14\\ egress\ [1]\ -\ 340:12\\ \end{array}$
$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{decline} \ [2] - 360:25, \\ 361:3 \\ \textbf{declining} \ [1] - 342:13 \\ \textbf{decommissioned} \ [2] - \\ 306:3, \ 315:16 \\ \textbf{decomposable} \ [1] - \\ 305:19 \\ \textbf{decompose} \ [1] - \\ 304:2 \\ \textbf{decomposition} \ [2] - \\ 303:5, \ 306:6 \\ \textbf{decrease} \ [1] - \ 347:14 \\ \textbf{decreased} \ [1] - \ 314:7 \\ \textbf{defined} \ [2] - \ 312:2, \\ 312:3 \\ \textbf{definition} \ [1] - \ 314:6 \\ \textbf{definitions} \ [4] - \ 305:7, \\ 305:11, \ 313:7, \\ 316:20 \\ \end{array}$	316:6, 321:17, 321:25, 323:24, 343:19, 367:4, 368:13, 368:21 Department's [1] - 368:5 dependent [1] - 276:15 derived [3] - 300:9, 303:11, 366:7 described [3] - 283:21, 342:11, 368:15 design [2] - 332:5, 347:19 designated [1] - 323:14 desirable [1] - 317:19 desirable [1] - 313:1	329:9 discussion [3] - 289:20, 323:19, 358:22 discussions [6] - 290:5, 324:22, 355:18, 358:18, 358:20 disinterested [1] - 371:12 dismally [1] - 298:4 displace [6] - 277:14, 280:7, 284:7, 284:11, 284:21, 285:11 displacing [2] - 277:20, 300:5 disposal [30] - 276:10, 276:17, 280:20, 282:8, 285:14,	Division $[1] - 273:23$ document $[5] - 309:8$, 309:13, $313:22$, 317:1, $317:22documents [3] -318:2$, $318:10$, 355:12 dollar $[1] - 321:16$ dollars $[3] - 315:22$, 316:5, $327:5done [2] - 295:16,345:16down [9] - 287:20,310:7$, $314:2$, 321:23, $356:3$, 356:5, $356:14$, 356:18, $364:19downtown [2] -349:22$, $356:8$	306:10, 323:25, 333:2 effective [2] - 283:13, 289:18 effects [1] - 303:13 efficiencies [5] - 328:19, 328:24, 329:19, 338:22, 342:5 efficiency [4] - 304:20, 305:4, 305:6, 342:9 efficiently [1] - 328:6 efforts [11] - 280:5, 282:25, 293:17, 308:19, 309:9, 348:25, 349:6, 349:14, 353:1, 363:4, 367:14 egress [1] - 340:12 eight [3] - 305:17,
$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{decline} \ [2] - 360:25, \\ 361:3 \\ \textbf{declining} \ [1] - 342:13 \\ \textbf{decommissioned} \ [2] - \\ 306:3, \ 315:16 \\ \textbf{decomposable} \ [1] - \\ 305:19 \\ \textbf{decompose} \ [1] - \\ 304:2 \\ \textbf{decomposition} \ [2] - \\ 303:5, \ 306:6 \\ \textbf{decrease} \ [1] - \ 347:14 \\ \textbf{decreased} \ [1] - \ 314:7 \\ \textbf{defined} \ [2] - \ 312:2, \\ 312:3 \\ \textbf{definition} \ [1] - \ 314:6 \\ \textbf{definitions} \ [4] - \ 305:7, \\ 305:11, \ 313:7, \\ 316:20 \\ \textbf{definitively} \ [1] - \end{array}$	$316:6, 321:17, \\ 321:25, 323:24, \\ 343:19, 367:4, \\ 368:13, 368:21 \\ \hline \begin{tabular}{lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	329:9 discussion [3] - 289:20, 323:19, 358:22 discussions [6] - 290:5, 324:22, 355:18, 358:18, 358:20 disinterested [1] - 371:12 dismally [1] - 298:4 displace [6] - 277:14, 280:7, 284:7, 284:11, 284:21, 285:11 displacing [2] - 277:20, 300:5 disposal [30] - 276:10, 276:17, 280:20, 282:8, 285:14, 286:7, 287:6,	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{Division} [1] - 273:23\\ \textbf{document} [5] - 309:8,\\ 309:13, 313:22,\\ 317:1, 317:22\\ \textbf{documents} [3] -\\ 318:2, 318:10,\\ 355:12\\ \textbf{dollar} [1] - 321:16\\ \textbf{dollars} [3] - 315:22,\\ 316:5, 327:5\\ \textbf{done} [2] - 295:16,\\ 345:16\\ \textbf{down} [9] - 287:20,\\ 310:7, 314:2,\\ 321:23, 356:3,\\ 356:5, 356:14,\\ 356:18, 364:19\\ \textbf{downtown} [2] -\\ 349:22, 356:8\\ \textbf{Doyle} [4] - 293:3,\\ \end{array}$	306:10, 323:25, 333:2 effective [2] - 283:13, 289:18 effects [1] - 303:13 efficiencies [5] - 328:19, 328:24, 329:19, 338:22, 342:5 efficiency [4] - 304:20, 305:4, 305:6, 342:9 efficiently [1] - 328:6 efforts [11] - 280:5, 282:25, 293:17, 308:19, 309:9, 348:25, 349:6, 349:14, 353:1, 363:4, 367:14 egress [1] - 340:12 eight [3] - 305:17, 346:1, 346:3
$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{decline} \ [2] - 360:25, \\ 361:3 \\ \textbf{declining} \ [1] - 342:13 \\ \textbf{decommissioned} \ [2] - \\ 306:3, \ 315:16 \\ \textbf{decomposable} \ [1] - \\ 305:19 \\ \textbf{decompose} \ [1] - \\ 304:2 \\ \textbf{decomposition} \ [2] - \\ 303:5, \ 306:6 \\ \textbf{decrease} \ [1] - \ 347:14 \\ \textbf{decreased} \ [1] - \ 278:3 \\ \textbf{defined} \ [2] - \ 312:2, \\ 312:3 \\ \textbf{definition} \ [1] - \ 314:6 \\ \textbf{definitions} \ [4] - \ 305:7, \\ 305:11, \ 313:7, \\ 316:20 \\ \textbf{definitively} \ [1] - \\ 355:14 \\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 316:6,\ 321:17,\\ 321:25,\ 323:24,\\ 343:19,\ 367:4,\\ 368:13,\ 368:21\\ \hline \begin{array}{c} \textbf{Department's} \ [1] -\\ 368:5\\ \hline \begin{array}{c} \textbf{dependent} \ [1] -\\ 276:15\\ \hline \begin{array}{c} \textbf{derived} \ [3] -\\ 300:9,\\ 303:11,\ 366:7\\ \hline \begin{array}{c} \textbf{described} \ [3] -\\ 283:21,\ 342:11,\\ 368:15\\ \hline \begin{array}{c} \textbf{design} \ [2] -\\ 332:5,\\ 347:19\\ \hline \begin{array}{c} \textbf{designated} \ [1] -\\ 323:14\\ \hline \begin{array}{c} \textbf{desirable} \ [1] -\\ 313:1\\ \hline \begin{array}{c} \textbf{desireg} \ [1] -\\ 317:25\\ \hline \end{array} \end{array}$	329:9 discussion [3] - 289:20, 323:19, 358:22 discussions [6] - 290:5, 324:22, 355:18, 358:18, 358:20 disinterested [1] - 371:12 dismally [1] - 298:4 displace [6] - 277:14, 280:7, 284:7, 284:11, 284:21, 285:11 displacing [2] - 277:20, 300:5 disposal [30] - 276:10, 276:17, 280:20, 282:8, 285:14, 286:7, 287:6, 289:19, 290:9,	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{Division} [1] - 273:23\\ \textbf{document} [5] - 309:8,\\ 309:13, 313:22,\\ 317:1, 317:22\\ \textbf{documents} [3] -\\ 318:2, 318:10,\\ 355:12\\ \textbf{dollar} [1] - 321:16\\ \textbf{dollars} [3] - 315:22,\\ 316:5, 327:5\\ \textbf{done} [2] - 295:16,\\ 345:16\\ \textbf{down} [9] - 287:20,\\ 310:7, 314:2,\\ 321:23, 356:3,\\ 356:5, 356:14,\\ 356:18, 364:19\\ \textbf{downtown} [2] -\\ 349:22, 356:8\\ \textbf{Doyle} [4] - 293:3,\\ 296:2, 296:24,\\ \end{array}$	306:10, 323:25, 333:2 effective [2] - 283:13, 289:18 effects [1] - 303:13 efficiencies [5] - 328:19, 328:24, 329:19, 338:22, 342:5 efficiency [4] - 304:20, 305:4, 305:6, 342:9 efficiently [1] - 328:6 efforts [11] - 280:5, 282:25, 293:17, 308:19, 309:9, 348:25, 349:6, 349:14, 353:1, 363:4, 367:14 egress [1] - 340:12 eight [3] - 305:17, 346:1, 346:3 either [4] - 312:24,
$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{decline} \ [2] - 360:25, \\ 361:3 \\ \textbf{declining} \ [1] - 342:13 \\ \textbf{decommissioned} \ [2] - \\ 306:3, \ 315:16 \\ \textbf{decomposable} \ [1] - \\ 305:19 \\ \textbf{decompose} \ [1] - \\ 305:19 \\ \textbf{decompose} \ [1] - \\ 304:2 \\ \textbf{decomposition} \ [2] - \\ 303:5, \ 306:6 \\ \textbf{decrease} \ [1] - 347:14 \\ \textbf{decreased} \ [1] - 347:14 \\ \textbf{decreased} \ [1] - 278:3 \\ \textbf{defined} \ [2] - 312:2, \\ 312:3 \\ \textbf{definition} \ [1] - 314:6 \\ \textbf{definitions} \ [4] - 305:7, \\ 305:11, \ 313:7, \\ 316:20 \\ \textbf{definitively} \ [1] - \\ 355:14 \\ \textbf{defunct} \ [1] - 312:22 \\ \end{array}$	$316:6, 321:17, \\ 321:25, 323:24, \\ 343:19, 367:4, \\ 368:13, 368:21 \\ \hline \begartment's [1] - \\ 368:5 \\ \hline \dependent [1] - \\ 276:15 \\ \hline \derived [3] - 300:9, \\ 303:11, 366:7 \\ \hline \described [3] - \\ 283:21, 342:11, \\ 368:15 \\ \hline \design [2] - 332:5, \\ 347:19 \\ \hline \designated [1] - \\ 323:14 \\ \hline \desirable [1] - 317:19 \\ \hline \desired [1] - 317:19 \\ \hline \desired [1] - 317:25 \\ \hline \destrog [1] - 338:24 \\ \hline \end{tabular}$	329:9 discussion [3] - 289:20, 323:19, 358:22 discussions [6] - 290:5, 324:22, 355:18, 358:18, 358:20 disinterested [1] - 371:12 dismally [1] - 298:4 displace [6] - 277:14, 280:7, 284:7, 284:11, 284:21, 285:11 displacing [2] - 277:20, 300:5 disposal [30] - 276:10, 276:17, 280:20, 282:8, 285:14, 286:7, 287:6, 289:19, 290:9, 290:15, 292:5,	Division $[1] - 273:23$ document $[5] - 309:8$, 309:13, $313:22$, 317:1, $317:22documents [3] -318:2$, $318:10$, 355:12 dollar $[1] - 321:16$ dollars $[3] - 315:22$, 316:5, $327:5done [2] - 295:16,345:16down [9] - 287:20,310:7$, $314:2$, 321:23, $356:3$, 356:5, $356:14$, 356:18, $364:19downtown [2] -349:22$, $356:8Doyle [4] - 293:3,296:2$, $296:24$, 368:25	$\begin{array}{c} 306:10,\ 323:25,\\ 333:2\\ effective\ [2]\ -\ 283:13,\\ 289:18\\ effects\ [1]\ -\ 303:13\\ efficiencies\ [5]\ -\ 328:19,\ 328:24,\\ 329:19,\ 338:22,\\ 342:5\\ efficiency\ [4]\ -\ 304:20,\\ 305:4,\ 305:6,\ 342:9\\ efficiently\ [1]\ -\ 328:6\\ efforts\ [11]\ -\ 280:5,\\ 282:25,\ 293:17,\\ 308:19,\ 309:9,\\ 348:25,\ 349:6,\\ 349:14,\ 353:1,\\ 363:4,\ 367:14\\ egress\ [1]\ -\ 340:12\\ eight\ [3]\ -\ 305:17,\\ 346:1,\ 346:3\\ either\ [4]\ -\ 312:24,\\ 325:13,\ 339:22,\\ \end{array}$
$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{decline} \ [2] - 360:25, \\ 361:3 \\ \textbf{declining} \ [1] - 342:13 \\ \textbf{decommissioned} \ [2] - \\ 306:3, \ 315:16 \\ \textbf{decomposable} \ [1] - \\ 305:19 \\ \textbf{decompose} \ [1] - \\ 304:2 \\ \textbf{decomposition} \ [2] - \\ 303:5, \ 306:6 \\ \textbf{decrease} \ [1] - \ 347:14 \\ \textbf{decreased} \ [1] - \ 278:3 \\ \textbf{defined} \ [2] - \ 312:2, \\ 312:3 \\ \textbf{definition} \ [1] - \ 314:6 \\ \textbf{definitions} \ [4] - \ 305:7, \\ 305:11, \ 313:7, \\ 316:20 \\ \textbf{definitively} \ [1] - \\ 355:14 \\ \end{array}$	$316:6, 321:17, \\ 321:25, 323:24, \\ 343:19, 367:4, \\ 368:13, 368:21 \\ \hline Department's [1] - \\ 368:5 \\ dependent [1] - \\ 276:15 \\ derived [3] - 300:9, \\ 303:11, 366:7 \\ described [3] - \\ 283:21, 342:11, \\ 368:15 \\ design [2] - 332:5, \\ 347:19 \\ designated [1] - \\ 323:14 \\ desirable [1] - 317:19 \\ desired [1] - 317:19 \\ desired [1] - 317:25 \\ destined [1] - 318:13 \\ destinal [1] - 318:13 \\$	329:9 discussion [3] - 289:20, 323:19, 358:22 discussions [6] - 290:5, 324:22, 355:18, 358:18, 358:20 disinterested [1] - 371:12 dismally [1] - 298:4 displace [6] - 277:14, 280:7, 284:7, 284:11, 284:21, 285:11 displacing [2] - 277:20, 300:5 disposal [30] - 276:10, 276:17, 280:20, 282:8, 285:14, 286:7, 287:6, 289:19, 290:9, 290:15, 292:5, 296:16, 309:15,	Division $[1] - 273:23$ document $[5] - 309:8$, 309:13, $313:22$, 317:1, $317:22documents [3] -318:2$, $318:10$, 355:12 dollar $[1] - 321:16$ dollars $[3] - 315:22$, 316:5, $327:5done [2] - 295:16,345:16down [9] - 287:20,310:7$, $314:2$, 321:23, $356:3$, 356:5, $356:14$, 356:18, $364:19downtown [2] -349:22$, $356:8Doyle [4] - 293:3,296:2$, $296:24$, 368:25 DOYLE $[13] - 295:21$,	$\begin{array}{c} 306:10,\ 323:25,\\ 333:2\\ effective\ [2]\ -\ 283:13,\\ 289:18\\ effects\ [1]\ -\ 303:13\\ efficiencies\ [5]\ -\ 328:19,\ 328:24,\\ 329:19,\ 338:22,\\ 342:5\\ efficiency\ [4]\ -\ 304:20,\\ 305:4,\ 305:6,\ 342:9\\ efficiently\ [1]\ -\ 328:6\\ efforts\ [11]\ -\ 280:5,\\ 282:25,\ 293:17,\\ 308:19,\ 309:9,\\ 348:25,\ 349:6,\\ 349:14,\ 353:1,\\ 363:4,\ 367:14\\ egress\ [1]\ -\ 340:12\\ eight\ [3]\ -\ 305:17,\\ 346:1,\ 346:3\\ either\ [4]\ -\ 312:24,\\ 325:13,\ 339:22,\\ 357:21\\ \end{array}$
$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{decline} \ [2] - 360:25, \\ 361:3 \\ \textbf{declining} \ [1] - 342:13 \\ \textbf{decommissioned} \ [2] - \\ 306:3, \ 315:16 \\ \textbf{decomposable} \ [1] - \\ 305:19 \\ \textbf{decompose} \ [1] - \\ 305:19 \\ \textbf{decompose} \ [1] - \\ 304:2 \\ \textbf{decomposition} \ [2] - \\ 303:5, \ 306:6 \\ \textbf{decrease} \ [1] - 347:14 \\ \textbf{decreased} \ [1] - 347:14 \\ \textbf{decreased} \ [1] - 278:3 \\ \textbf{defined} \ [2] - 312:2, \\ 312:3 \\ \textbf{definition} \ [1] - 314:6 \\ \textbf{definitions} \ [4] - 305:7, \\ 305:11, \ 313:7, \\ 316:20 \\ \textbf{definitively} \ [1] - \\ 355:14 \\ \textbf{defunct} \ [1] - 312:22 \\ \end{array}$	$316:6, 321:17, \\ 321:25, 323:24, \\ 343:19, 367:4, \\ 368:13, 368:21 \\ \hline \begattment's [1] - \\ 368:5 \\ \hline \dependent [1] - \\ 276:15 \\ \hline \derived [3] - 300:9, \\ 303:11, 366:7 \\ \hline \described [3] - \\ 283:21, 342:11, \\ 368:15 \\ \hline \design [2] - 332:5, \\ 347:19 \\ \hline \designated [1] - \\ 323:14 \\ \hline \desirable [1] - 317:19 \\ \hline \desired [1] - 313:1 \\ \hline \desires [1] - 352:23 \\ \hline \destined [1] - 317:25 \\ \hline \destroy [1] - 338:24 \\ \hline \details [1] - 318:13 \\ \hline \details [1] - 330:8 \\ \hline \end{tabular}$	329:9 discussion [3] - 289:20, 323:19, 358:22 discussions [6] - 290:5, 324:22, 355:18, 358:18, 358:20 disinterested [1] - 371:12 dismally [1] - 298:4 displace [6] - 277:14, 280:7, 284:7, 284:11, 284:21, 285:11 displacing [2] - 277:20, 300:5 disposal [30] - 276:10, 276:17, 280:20, 282:8, 285:14, 286:7, 287:6, 289:19, 290:9, 290:15, 292:5, 296:16, 309:15, 310:14, 317:6,	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{Division} [1] - 273:23\\ \textbf{document} [5] - 309:8,\\ 309:13, 313:22,\\ 317:1, 317:22\\ \textbf{documents} [3] -\\ 318:2, 318:10,\\ 355:12\\ \textbf{dollar} [1] - 321:16\\ \textbf{dollars} [3] - 315:22,\\ 316:5, 327:5\\ \textbf{done} [2] - 295:16,\\ 345:16\\ \textbf{down} [9] - 287:20,\\ 310:7, 314:2,\\ 321:23, 356:3,\\ 356:5, 356:14,\\ 356:18, 364:19\\ \textbf{downtown} [2] -\\ 349:22, 356:8\\ \textbf{Doyle} [4] - 293:3,\\ 296:2, 296:24,\\ 368:25\\ \textbf{DOYLE} [13] - 295:21,\\ 295:23, 296:4,\\ \end{array}$	306:10, 323:25, 333:2 effective [2] - 283:13, 289:18 effects [1] - 303:13 efficiencies [5] - 328:19, 328:24, 329:19, 338:22, 342:5 efficiency [4] - 304:20, 305:4, 305:6, 342:9 efficiently [1] - 328:6 efforts [11] - 280:5, 282:25, 293:17, 308:19, 309:9, 348:25, 349:6, 349:14, 353:1, 363:4, 367:14 egress [1] - 340:12 eight [3] - 305:17, 346:1, 346:3 either [4] - 312:24, 325:13, 339:22, 357:21 electrical [1] - 279:25
$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{decline} \ [2] - 360:25, \\ 361:3 \\ \textbf{declining} \ [1] - 342:13 \\ \textbf{decommissioned} \ [2] - \\ 306:3, \ 315:16 \\ \textbf{decomposable} \ [1] - \\ 305:19 \\ \textbf{decompose} \ [1] - \\ 305:19 \\ \textbf{decompose} \ [1] - \\ 304:2 \\ \textbf{decomposition} \ [2] - \\ 303:5, \ 306:6 \\ \textbf{decrease} \ [1] - 347:14 \\ \textbf{decreased} \ [1] - 347:14 \\ \textbf{decreased} \ [1] - 278:3 \\ \textbf{defined} \ [2] - 312:2, \\ 312:3 \\ \textbf{definition} \ [1] - 314:6 \\ \textbf{definition} \ [4] - 305:7, \\ 305:11, \ 313:7, \\ 316:20 \\ \textbf{definitively} \ [1] - \\ 355:14 \\ \textbf{defunct} \ [1] - 312:22 \\ \textbf{degree} \ [1] - 276:13 \\ \end{array}$	$316:6, 321:17, \\ 321:25, 323:24, \\ 343:19, 367:4, \\ 368:13, 368:21 \\ \hline Department's [1] - \\ 368:5 \\ dependent [1] - \\ 276:15 \\ derived [3] - 300:9, \\ 303:11, 366:7 \\ described [3] - \\ 283:21, 342:11, \\ 368:15 \\ design [2] - 332:5, \\ 347:19 \\ designated [1] - \\ 323:14 \\ desirable [1] - 317:19 \\ desired [1] - 317:19 \\ desired [1] - 317:25 \\ destined [1] - 318:13 \\ destinal [1] - 318:13 \\$	329:9 discussion [3] - 289:20, 323:19, 358:22 discussions [6] - 290:5, 324:22, 355:18, 358:18, 358:20 disinterested [1] - 371:12 dismally [1] - 298:4 displace [6] - 277:14, 280:7, 284:7, 284:11, 284:21, 285:11 displacing [2] - 277:20, 300:5 disposal [30] - 276:10, 276:17, 280:20, 282:8, 285:14, 286:7, 287:6, 289:19, 290:9, 290:15, 292:5, 296:16, 309:15,	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{Division} [1] - 273:23\\ \textbf{document} [5] - 309:8,\\ 309:13, 313:22,\\ 317:1, 317:22\\ \textbf{documents} [3] -\\ 318:2, 318:10,\\ 355:12\\ \textbf{dollar} [1] - 321:16\\ \textbf{dollars} [3] - 315:22,\\ 316:5, 327:5\\ \textbf{done} [2] - 295:16,\\ 345:16\\ \textbf{down} [9] - 287:20,\\ 310:7, 314:2,\\ 321:23, 356:3,\\ 356:5, 356:14,\\ 356:18, 364:19\\ \textbf{downtown} [2] -\\ 349:22, 356:8\\ \textbf{Doyle} [4] - 293:3,\\ 296:2, 296:24,\\ 368:25\\ \textbf{DOYLE} [13] - 295:21,\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 306:10,\ 323:25,\\ 333:2\\ effective\ [2]\ -\ 283:13,\\ 289:18\\ effects\ [1]\ -\ 303:13\\ efficiencies\ [5]\ -\ 328:19,\ 328:24,\\ 329:19,\ 338:22,\\ 342:5\\ efficiency\ [4]\ -\ 304:20,\\ 305:4,\ 305:6,\ 342:9\\ efficiently\ [1]\ -\ 328:6\\ efforts\ [11]\ -\ 280:5,\\ 282:25,\ 293:17,\\ 308:19,\ 309:9,\\ 348:25,\ 349:6,\\ 349:14,\ 353:1,\\ 363:4,\ 367:14\\ egress\ [1]\ -\ 340:12\\ eight\ [3]\ -\ 305:17,\\ 346:1,\ 346:3\\ either\ [4]\ -\ 312:24,\\ 325:13,\ 339:22,\\ 357:21\\ \end{array}$

electropic (4) 274:15	optor (1) 206:5	368:3, 368:4,		factual w 205:6
electronic [1] - 274:15 elements [2] - 319:18,	enter [1] - 306:5 entered [4] - 276:20,	368:19, 368:21,	experience [2] - 298:2, 362:20	factual [1] - 305:6
,	,		,	fail [1] - 321:13
319:22	281:10, 290:6,	369:2, 369:4 exactly [2] - 315:13,	expiration [2] -	fair [1] - 316:18
elevate [1] - 354:17	317:24	321:10	289:23, 289:25	fairly [2] - 292:6,
eliminate [1] - 314:5	entering [2] - 322:6,	examination [21] -	expire [2] - 289:20, 301:2	322:21
eliminated [3] -	362:6 entirety [2] - 284:14,	275:12, 281:17,		falling [1] - 278:22
349:21, 356:8, 356:9 eliminates [5] -	285:11 285:11	281:19, 281:20,	expires [1] - 371:23 explain [3] - 289:7,	falls [1] - 324:11 false [2] - 279:16,
320:18, 349:15,	entities [3] - 280:3,	290:23, 291:16,	305:22, 312:15	293:8
355:4, 355:7, 355:22	312:20, 318:20	291:18, 297:1,	explained [2] - 324:8,	falsely [1] - 291:25
elimination [2] -	entitle [1] - 280:21	297:2, 297:15,	343:6	familiar [4] - 282:9,
315:11, 349:3	entitled [1] - 313:22	298:11, 298:23,	explains [1] - 304:23	282:13, 331:8,
emission [1] - 334:13	entrance [4] - 340:16,	302:5, 323:3, 323:8,	exposure [1] - 364:7	355:11
emissions [9] -	340:17, 340:19,	323:11, 324:20,	express [1] - 328:3	family [1] - 337:6
303:16, 304:6,	341:9	334:19, 338:10,	expressed [3] - 279:5,	far [8] - 274:4, 296:25,
304:9, 305:16,	environment [3] -	340:5, 350:8	319:7, 365:5	303:7, 306:13,
306:17, 328:4,	304:2, 316:22, 322:6	examine [6] - 291:2,	expressly [1] - 323:20	306:14, 330:8,
329:15, 330:11,	environmental [2] -	291:15, 295:19,	extend [1] - 290:4	340:16, 370:11
363:1	306:10, 310:13	337:17, 356:22,	extended [1] - 343:25	fault [1] - 312:18
emitted [3] - 303:4,	ENVIRONMENTAL [1]	367:3	extended [1] - 343.25 extent [6] - 307:23,	favors [2] - 278:7,
305:25, 342:22	- 272:2	example [3] - 281:6,	330:8, 331:11,	285:21
enabled [1] - 365:22	Environmental [8] -	332:25, 333:11	352:22, 353:22,	fear [1] - 278:22
encourage [1] -	273:8, 273:17,	exceed [1] - 362:10	364:18	February [1] - 308:16
349:13	283:5, 304:16,	exceeds [1] - 321:8	extracted [1] - 306:14	Federle [1] - 275:5
encourages [2] -	312:23, 316:7,	except [2] - 332:11,	extraction [1] - 306:2	fee [3] - 336:14,
349:17, 355:5	321:18, 322:1	352:24		336:16, 367:21
end [17] - 301:2,	environmentally [2] -	exception [2] -	F	feelings [1] - 337:6
305:21, 307:23,	276:9, 317:6	368:11, 368:14	•	feet [1] - 340:23
308:11, 308:21,	EPA [6] - 304:7,	excerpt [1] - 304:12	face [2] - 314:17,	fencing [1] - 363:21
309:1, 309:11,	304:11, 304:23,	excess [1] - 309:21	317:18	FEPR [5] - 360:25,
309:23, 317:8,	317:1, 329:3, 341:18	excluded [1] - 315:3	facilitating [2] -	362:4, 363:16,
324:23, 347:1,	EPA's [1] - 305:5	excuse [5] - 275:21,	348:12, 354:2	365:15, 365:17
347:12, 351:9,	equal [3] - 278:18,	315:2, 317:12,	facilities [9] - 275:24,	few [8] - 281:13,
356:13, 360:13,	317:15, 338:14	318:5, 339:22	287:10, 287:15,	282:7, 312:23,
360:14	equals [1] - 342:14	executive [1] - 304:15	288:2, 298:3,	316:12, 316:17,
energy [13] - 273:15,	equitably [1] - 322:22	exhaust [1] - 322:7	304:19, 347:23,	334:22, 337:19,
275:24, 276:5,	equivalent [2] -	exhausted [1] -	348:20, 348:23	350:21
276:18, 287:15,	318:17, 332:4	313:21	facility [24] - 273:15,	fewer [2] - 306:17,
288:2, 306:14,	escape [2] - 333:2,	exhibit [3] - 342:10,	276:5, 276:18,	361:23
306:18, 307:1,	357:14	343:5, 351:6	277:6, 278:17,	field [1] - 305:3
330:25, 331:2,	escapes [1] - 306:6	Exhibit [3] - 331:14,	281:12, 287:11,	figure [6] - 284:17,
338:17, 365:14	escaping [1] - 338:17	342:10, 351:5	288:6, 314:12,	285:6, 287:17,
Energy [18] - 275:7,	ESCO [1] - 286:12	exhibits [2] - 285:2,	315:16, 346:22,	297:22, 335:16,
309:19, 346:17,	essentially [2] -	330:23	346:25, 347:1,	360:23
346:18, 346:25,	299:19, 352:7	exist [1] - 301:22	347:3, 347:6, 348:3,	filed [20] - 275:10,
347:8, 347:11, 348:3, 348:7,	establish [2] - 354:14,	existing [4] - 276:22,	353:8, 354:10, 356:1, 356:2, 356:4	310:7, 322:24,
	354:15	301:22, 310:3,	356:1, 356:2, 356:4, 358:11, 360:17	322:25, 325:18,
355:16, 360:8, 360:16, 360:20,	establishes [1] -	361:13	358:11, 360:17, 364:4	328:4, 329:25,
362:5, 365:14,	308:9	Exit [1] - 341:2	Facility [1] - 346:17	330:3, 330:20,
365:22, 365:25	estimates [2] - 338:21,	exit [4] - 325:21,	fact [6] - 310:22,	330:24, 334:1,
engine [2] - 322:8,	341:19	325:25, 326:7, 326:20	312:6, 323:18,	335:23, 340:3,
361:21	et [2] - 275:25, 330:9	326:20	329:2, 354:4, 369:10	340:4, 340:5,
enjoy [1] - 341:7	evaluate [1] - 368:19	expansion [1] - 282:25	factor [2] - 341:18,	345:12, 353:25,
enjoying [1] - 310:22	evening [1] - 323:14	expect [2] - 316:13,	341:25	359:9 filling rat 320:21
ensure [4] - 348:5,	event [1] - 371:13	368:6	factors [5] - 300:10,	filling [2] - 329:21, 365:11
365:13, 366:6,	events [1] - 366:15	expectancy [1] -	310:17, 311:10,	final [3] - 288:18,
366:23	eventually [1] - 306:8	347:19	317:14, 317:18	313:19, 343:5
ensures [1] - 276:13	evidence [11] -	expectation [2] -	facts [2] - 314:10,	finally [5] - 277:16,
ensuring [1] - 347:5	304:24, 305:10, 324:5, 324:12,	366:23, 366:25	314:16	287:5, 316:21,
	JZ4.0. JZ4.1Z.	000.20, 000.20		201.0, 010.21,

	-	-		
356:6, 366:9	369:18	332:1, 333:11	hanny (0) 305-10	368:11, 368:14,
financial [2] - 276:12,	forward [6] - 302:8,	General [3] - 273:9,	happy [2] - 325:13, 357:15	369:8, 369:11,
	,	•••		
277:17	315:6, 316:25,	273:20, 322:2	harm [1] - 362:13	369:18, 369:19,
financially [1] - 300:17	344:24, 352:2, 359:4	GENERAL [1] - 272:7	harmful [1] - 304:7	370:18, 370:19
findings [2] - 369:8,	four [1] - 316:21	general [4] - 286:13,	Harry [1] - 291:4	Hearing [12] - 273:2,
369:10	frankly [1] - 358:16	290:5, 348:21,	haul [1] - 361:13	275:2, 275:9,
fine [3] - 291:20,	free [2] - 280:18,	349:24	hauling [1] - 361:15	281:21, 287:18,
345:17, 352:9	281:14	generated [6] -	head [2] - 326:7,	291:12, 295:7,
firm [2] - 282:2, 313:9	frequent [1] - 329:21	304:19, 312:13,	326:24	295:21, 297:14,
first [11] - 275:15,	Friday [1] - 364:12	314:2, 314:5, 314:8,	headed [1] - 275:16	325:10, 359:5,
277:10, 278:9,	FROM [1] - 272:9	365:9	health [1] - 359:24	368:23
279:4, 281:17,	front [6] - 285:7,	generating [3] - 292:4,	hear [9] - 293:21,	hearings [2] - 283:1,
287:24, 302:22,	302:12, 328:15,	363:17, 365:2	311:9, 311:10,	344:12
315:8, 315:18,	331:15, 347:12,	generation [3] - 331:6,	322:6, 325:4, 341:6,	heat [1] - 306:20
318:12, 339:20	360:14	342:18, 343:8	341:10, 341:19	HEATHER [1] - 272:15
fit [2] - 311:6, 325:14	front-end [2] - 347:12,	generators [1] -	heard [4] - 303:7,	Heather [3] - 273:1,
five [6] - 281:19,	360:14	280:18	316:11, 316:14,	273:16, 344:10
291:18, 292:3,	fuel [3] - 314:24,	geomembrane [2] -	329:17	held [3] - 272:18,
296:3, 297:12,	320:10, 363:2	330:12, 330:16	HEARING [69] -	273:1, 345:22
340:23		George [1] - 307:16		Hello [1] - 299:9
	full [3] - 279:24, 280:9,	- · · ·	272:13, 272:15,	help [1] - 362:11
fix [1] - 322:19	369:24	given [2] - 327:15,	273:6, 274:23,	
flare [2] - 330:7, 363:1	fully [1] - 324:8	357:2	281:16, 281:25,	helped [1] - 316:5
flares [1] - 338:24	fumes [2] - 310:20,	glass [1] - 296:17	287:22, 290:22,	helpful [1] - 316:18
flaring [1] - 304:6	310:25	goals [2] - 308:19,	291:1, 291:6, 291:9,	helps [3] - 277:21,
fly [1] - 290:14	functional [2] -	348:2	291:17, 292:8,	321:15
focus [2] - 319:7,	305:24, 310:4	Governor [3] - 272:19,	292:11, 294:20,	Henry [1] - 282:3
332:15	fundamentally [1] -	273:2, 283:5	295:10, 295:15,	hereby [1] - 371:4
focused [2] - 315:14,	305:7	grab [1] - 350:11	295:18, 295:22,	hereto [1] - 286:19
341:23	funds [1] - 353:9	granting [1] - 362:12	295:25, 296:24,	hereunto [1] - 371:16
focusing [1] - 315:14	future [3] - 316:5,	graph [1] - 342:11	297:11, 298:21,	hierarchy [36] - 278:6,
fogging [1] - 362:25	321:16, 362:1	greater [5] - 304:25,	299:4, 300:25,	279:12, 280:16,
follow [6] - 300:21,	fuzzy [2] - 316:19,	305:12, 311:17,	302:4, 302:14,	280:20, 281:3,
305:1, 332:9, 333:6,	316:20	311:18, 349:5	307:3, 310:6,	285:21, 285:25,
333:17, 342:13		greatest [2] - 307:22,	311:22, 311:24,	286:2, 287:7, 287:8,
follow-up [2] - 333:17,	G	364:17	319:22, 320:3,	289:11, 289:12,
342:13	0	greatly [1] - 303:19	320:13, 322:23,	300:19, 306:12,
followed [3] - 281:19,	garbage [2] - 303:24,	greenhouse [6] -	323:6, 324:19,	307:11, 307:15,
307:16, 357:20	306:15	302:25, 303:8,	334:17, 337:16,	307:22, 308:8,
	Gardner [1] - 282:3		337:25, 338:6,	308:14, 308:18,
following [18] - 279:3,		303:21, 304:22,	339:4, 339:13,	308:21, 309:2,
297:14, 304:12,	gas [34] - 303:8, 304:7, 304:18,	305:16, 306:17	339:23, 340:2,	309:11, 309:25,
308:9, 308:16,		grit [1] - 296:17	340:9, 341:12,	309.11, 309.25, 311:7, 313:1,
308:19, 308:20,	305:4, 305:5,	group [3] - 311:17,	343:16, 343:19,	, ,
309:10, 309:18,	305:16, 305:18,	311:19, 337:20	343:22, 344:9,	313:18, 314:3,
310:5, 312:14,	306:2, 306:6,	grouping [1] - 323:19	344:22, 345:4,	315:10, 315:17,
312:25, 317:1,	306:17, 306:20,	guess [2] - 287:24,		315:21, 321:14,
320:16, 346:5,	328:6, 328:19,	364:23	345:14, 345:17, 245:21, 250:7	321:24, 322:21,
352:22, 358:7, 360:2	329:13, 329:20,	guesses [1] - 305:9	345:21, 350:7,	335:25, 349:11
follows [2] - 361:12,	330:7, 330:25,	guise [1] - 313:4	350:13, 356:21,	Hierarchy [1] - 307:8
362:18	331:2, 332:3, 332:7,		357:2, 358:25,	high [5] - 276:13,
forced [1] - 280:1	332:18, 332:20,	Н	359:12, 359:16,	304:20, 305:22,
foregoing [1] - 371:9	332:22, 333:2,		367:2, 367:25,	314:4, 341:24
form [1] - 301:12	333:20, 333:22,	half [2] - 302:21, 361:6	368:25, 369:5,	higher [4] - 277:22,
formally [1] - 290:7	334:9, 338:21,	hand [8] - 274:19,	370:2, 370:14	296:22, 297:4,
format [1] - 312:25	341:19, 342:21,	302:16, 342:12,	hearing [21] - 272:18,	303:22
formation [1] - 331:25	343:6, 362:25,	344:18, 345:22,	273:1, 273:7,	Hill [2] - 272:19, 273:2
	363:1, 363:2	355:13, 359:10,	273:18, 274:1,	historically [1] - 284:9
former 131 - 306:25	,			
former [3] - 306:25, 313:8_316:11	gas-to-energy [1] -		295:6, 307:24,	history [2] - 312:24,
313:8, 316:11		371:17	295:6, 307:24, 323:7, 323:20,	history [2] - 312:24, 314:7
313:8, 316:11 formerly [1] - 277:6	gas-to-energy [1] -	371:17 hand-held [1] - 345:22		314:7
313:8, 316:11	gas-to-energy [1] - 331:2	371:17	323:7, 323:20,	

holidays [1] - 294:8	improve [1] - 329:18	348:25, 349:6,	347:5, 347:21, 353:7	361:10, 362:20,
_				
home [4] - 310:22,	improving [1] - 347:24	360:8, 360:22,	interested [3] -	363:4, 363:13,
311:2, 337:12,	IN [2] - 272:7, 371:16	361:25, 362:7,	292:25, 301:11,	364:8, 366:12
340:11	in-state [22] - 276:24,	363:10	311:19	item [1] - 323:9
honor [1] - 279:24	277:4, 277:5,	increased [2] -	Intergovernmental [1]	itself [2] - 323:17,
hope [3] - 289:23,	277:13, 277:16,	362:13, 363:6	- 328:11	355:7
292:18, 335:5	281:10, 284:6,	increases [3] - 305:15,	interim [9] - 289:17,	
hopefully [1] - 276:4	289:1, 289:5, 289:8,	320:23	290:4, 293:23,	J
horizontal [2] -	289:15, 292:15,	increasing [1] - 350:1	293:25, 297:17,	
329:20, 330:9	292:17, 292:21,	indicate [2] - 301:5,	301:2, 301:9,	JACQUES [4] - 345:2,
host [4] - 334:21,	296:21, 296:23,	324:25	301:21, 301:24	345:6, 345:16, 357:1
346:16, 359:22,	297:5, 298:13,	indicated [2] - 297:21,	intermediate [5] -	Jacques [2] - 345:3,
359:23	300:15, 348:4,	301:1	332:4, 333:21,	345:7
hostile [1] - 297:3	349:5, 365:18	indicates [1] - 364:2	334:8, 363:18,	jake [2] - 339:9,
hour [1] - 343:25	Inc [1] - 362:19	indicators [1] - 318:7	363:25	361:21
hours [3] - 364:11,	inception [1] - 280:17	indirect [1] - 346:10	International [1] -	January [1] - 347:2
364:15, 364:17	incinerate [1] - 308:11	individual [3] -	305:13	Jean [1] - 328:12
house [6] - 311:3,	incinerated [2] -	311:18, 311:20,	interruptible [1] -	Jensen [1] - 282:3
•••	285:5, 358:11	323:21	309:20	Jeremy [1] - 364:21
326:17, 326:25,	incinerating [3] -		Interstate [1] - 361:16	Jim [1] - 359:6
340:17, 340:19,	011	individual's [1] -	interstate [1] - 301.10	Joanne [3] - 273:25,
341:5	306:14, 314:3,	324:9	,	371:3, 371:20
household [1] - 335:2	338:18	individuals [1] -	340:14, 341:4	
huge [1] - 319:16	incineration [7] -	323:15	intervenors [23] -	Joe [1] - 351:5
hum [3] - 329:11,	275:25, 278:7,	industry [1] - 275:22	279:11, 291:2,	John [2] - 345:11,
335:11, 356:15	280:1, 285:22,	Industry [1] - 304:14	295:19, 296:1,	345:23
hundred [1] - 314:20	306:13, 306:18,	inefficient [2] -	296:2, 302:7,	JRL [66] - 279:15,
	360:20	349:20, 356:7	302:10, 302:17,	304:1, 304:6,
	incinerator [20] -	inert [2] - 361:5,	323:1, 323:3, 323:9,	308:12, 309:25,
	309:18, 309:19,	363:10	323:16, 323:19,	310:20, 311:5,
l's [1] - 340:11	311:5, 335:6,	information [4] -	323:20, 324:9,	311:7, 311:8,
I-95 [2] - 325:20, 341:1	347:13, 349:21,	302:24, 304:10,	324:21, 337:17,	311:11, 311:15,
idea [1] - 337:8	356:7, 356:9,	323:12, 370:15	337:18, 337:19,	313:6, 313:10,
identified [2] - 281:18,	356:14, 360:14,	infrastructure [1] -	338:8, 341:13,	313:19, 314:9,
331:1	360:15, 360:16,	332:7	341:15, 343:23	315:1, 316:23,
idle [1] - 313:9	361:2, 361:4, 362:4,	infusion [1] - 277:8	introduce [2] - 275:12,	317:11, 317:18,
imaginary [1] - 341:9	362:5, 363:10,	inherent [1] - 318:19	292:5	317:25, 318:23,
immediately [1] -	365:15, 365:16,	initial [5] - 278:25,	introducing [2] -	319:1, 319:11,
301:11	365:17	289:11, 317:12,	303:24, 323:11	320:20, 322:7,
impact [5] - 277:17,	incinerators [8] -	317:25, 318:2	inventory [1] - 292:21	325:19, 326:12,
-	279:14, 280:19,	'	investment [1] -	329:25, 330:5,
301:10, 303:18, 311:17, 315:5	280:22, 281:1,	install [1] - 310:23	276:12	330:16, 331:9,
311:17, 315:5	281:4, 281:7,	installation [3] -	involve [1] - 305:2	333:9, 333:18,
impacted [2] - 311:14,	281:13, 309:22	329:19, 330:12,	involved [7] - 275:20,	338:13, 338:15,
366:19	include [5] - 282:24,	332:6	276:3, 288:5,	338:19, 340:16,
impacting [1] - 350:3	308:6, 329:19,	instance [1] - 292:14		340:17, 340:19,
impacts [3] - 310:13,		instances [1] - 367:7	300:10, 302:1,	341:10, 342:2,
319:16, 359:25	330:11, 332:1	instant [1] - 342:1	318:5, 336:16	347:6, 358:14,
implement [1] -	included [4] - 307:9,	instead [2] - 315:14,	involves [1] - 363:9	359:23, 360:1,
312:11	315:2, 330:23,	315:23	irrelevant [1] - 337:7	
implementing [1] -	331:13	instructions [1] -	issue [6] - 285:23,	360:5, 360:9, 360:13, 360:21
329:13	includes [3] - 276:2,	275:9	319:24, 324:14,	360:13, 360:21,
implication [1] - 349:8	328:18, 363:24	integrated [2] -	327:22, 337:5,	361:16, 361:17,
implicit [1] - 314:15	including [7] - 276:12,	296:14, 312:11	346:19	362:6, 362:17,
import [2] - 280:1,	280:22, 284:1,	intend [1] - 293:14	issued [3] - 308:2,	362:19, 362:25,
347:25	313:3, 318:10,	intending [1] - 291:14	309:5, 331:9	363:5, 363:11,
important [4] -	318:11, 362:25	intent [4] - 307:20,	issues [17] - 279:2,	364:2, 364:10,
317:14, 321:4,	incorrect [1] - 305:7	312:9, 312:16,	279:3, 297:14,	365:6, 365:10,
322:5, 329:14	increase [14] - 317:17,	312:17	328:5, 338:9,	365:16, 365:23,
imported [2] - 312:13,	317:20, 331:4,	interchange [1] -	346:14, 353:22,	366:6, 366:7, 367:7
365:13	331:5, 335:18,	361:16	359:19, 359:21,	JRL's [1] - 333:5
imposed [1] - 291:16	336:10, 347:17,	interest [4] - 301:6,	361:6, 361:8,	July [3] - 348:15,

354:4, 371:23	306:3, 307:14,	largest [1] - 303:20	278:18	locations [2] - 319:15,
jumping [1] - 352:8	307:20, 308:3,	last [11] - 275:17,	Lewiston [1] - 348:20	320:18
June [2] - 307:24,	308:7, 308:11,	281:13, 292:3,	license [15] - 283:23,	long-term [2] -
308:2	308:20, 308:23,	292:16, 313:19,	286:2, 309:7,	301:25, 310:13
JUNIPER [1] - 272:8	308:25, 309:6,	321:23, 323:13,	309:12, 310:3,	look [8] - 292:1,
Juniper [33] - 273:14,	309:10, 310:1,	331:10, 351:10,	331:9, 331:13,	318:21, 319:8,
277:25, 278:4,	310:4, 310:11,	353:11, 368:1	332:15, 333:23,	331:12, 331:18,
278:11, 283:14,	310:25, 316:6,	lastly [1] - 338:19	334:5, 334:6,	339:16, 342:17,
284:2, 286:1,	317:5, 321:16,	lasts [1] - 303:14	338:20, 341:17,	364:23
287:12, 302:23,	322:13, 325:20,	late [1] - 322:10	352:12, 354:22	looked [2] - 293:15,
303:23, 306:11,	326:3, 326:24,	latter [2] - 312:5,	licensing [1] - 368:20	315:5
306:21, 307:8,	328:6, 328:19,	342:24	life [4] - 306:1, 342:25,	looking [2] - 313:18,
308:1, 310:19,	329:13, 330:25,	Laura [1] - 291:8	343:3, 347:19	320:1
313:25, 315:6,	331:4, 331:5,	law [3] - 282:2, 310:1,	lifetime [7] - 303:4,	looks [1] - 328:14
316:2, 316:24,	331:25, 332:2,	365:19	305:10, 328:19,	loser [1] - 320:25
331:23, 344:11,	332:3, 332:6,	lawfully [2] - 280:24,	342:6, 342:9,	losing [1] - 311:3
347:5, 347:9,	332:18, 333:2,	280:25	342:14, 343:8	loud [1] - 322:7
347:14, 347:18,	333:19, 333:20,	laws [1] - 308:25	likely [2] - 314:7,	Lounder [2] - 299:23,
347:20, 348:4,	333:21, 334:10,	lay [1] - 307:9	337:7	299:25
349:7, 350:2,	338:16, 339:3,	layer [1] - 360:15	likewise [2] - 280:16,	low [2] - 328:20,
352:12, 354:21,	342:19, 342:25,	LD [1] - 307:24	306:16	343:13
359:20, 359:23	343:3, 362:16,	leachate [6] - 333:4,	limit [2] - 291:15,	lower [1] - 277:21
	363:2, 365:11,	333:6, 364:19,	336:24	lower-priced [1] -
K	366:13	364:25, 365:2,	limitation [1] - 282:24	277:21
	Landfill [24] - 273:11,	366:19	limited [3] - 297:12,	LOYZIM [13] - 301:1,
KATSIAFICAS [2] -	273:14, 277:25,	lead [3] - 296:25,	332:1, 350:10	301:5, 301:14,
359:5, 369:21	278:4, 283:15,	328:12, 365:10	limiting [2] - 291:18,	301:19, 302:3,
Katsiaficas [2] -	284:3, 286:1,	leak [1] - 306:8	347:25	358:5, 358:7,
359:6, 369:20	287:12, 302:23, 206:21, 207:0	leaks [2] - 329:22,	LINCOLN [2] - 310:9,	358:24, 367:11,
Kazar's [1] - 351:5	306:21, 307:9, 207:12, 208:1	333:3	339:6	367:17, 367:24,
keep [2] - 279:14,	307:12, 308:1, 310:10, 313:23	least [5] - 277:5,	Lincoln [1] - 310:9	370:8, 370:12
280:9	310:19, 313:23, 313:25, 316:24,	277:25, 278:9,	line [1] - 341:9	Loyzim [2] - 273:21,
keeping [2] - 315:20, 369:21	325:11, 331:23,	313:16, 315:21	liner [1] - 306:7	369:22
	344:11, 347:14,	leave [2] - 321:7,	liquid [1] - 333:1	lunch [4] - 274:3,
keeps [1] - 278:19 KEITH [1] - 345:2	349:8, 359:20,	365:24	listed [1] - 308:6	274:5, 344:1, 344:4
Keith [2] - 345:3,	359:23	leaving [1] - 317:19	litter [6] - 363:8,	LUNCH [1] - 344:7
345:7	LANDFILL [2] - 272:7,	left [4] - 275:4, 275:17,	363:13, 363:21,	lunchtime [1] - 343:25
kept [2] - 316:1, 316:2	272:8	313:20, 326:7	363:22, 364:6,	
Kevin [3] - 275:8,	landfill's [1] - 305:15	legislation [1] -	366:19	М
275:14, 275:18	landfilled [3] - 278:11,	312:10	live [8] - 310:10,	machine [1] - 371:10
key [3] - 317:9, 318:6	303:4, 305:4	legislative [1] - 313:13	311:15, 325:14,	
Kirkland [1] - 335:5	landfilling [8] - 278:8,	legislators [1] - 283:3	334:24, 341:8, 345:10, 362:12	machinery [1] - 322:13
knowledge [1] -	285:22, 306:13,	Legislature [6] -	345:19, 362:12, 364:9	MACIROWSKI [2] -
343:12	314:4, 315:5,	312:7, 312:16,	lived [6] - 322:11,	297:2, 323:13
known [4] - 275:7,	315:15, 316:23,	312:18, 313:1,	322:12, 322:13,	Macirowski [2] -
308:1, 308:13,	317:10	313:11, 313:13	322:12, 322:13, 322:14, 346:15	273:19, 323:11
335:21	landfills [13] - 280:19,	less [11] - 290:14,	living [1] - 311:12	Madam [8] - 275:2,
	280:23, 287:11,	292:4, 295:1, 295:2, 297:24, 298:2	LLC [3] - 272:7,	281:21, 287:18,
L	303:20, 304:20,	297:24, 298:2, 298:4, 304:7,	273:11, 313:24	291:12, 295:7,
	306:8, 313:4, 317:2,	298.4, 304.7, 321:24, 340:17,	load [1] - 320:20	297:13, 325:9,
L-A-U-R-A [1] - 291:8	317:5, 328:5, 328:6,	340:20	loaded [1] - 361:19	368:23
Labbe [1] - 364:21	331:1	letter [6] - 350:23,	loads [3] - 361:23,	madam [1] - 295:21
lack [1] - 343:12	large [4] - 277:17,	350:25, 352:5,	362:6, 362:9	MAHONEY [12] -
laden [2] - 331:25,	288:17, 303:17,	352:10, 352:14,	lobbied [1] - 313:11	275:2, 287:18,
332:18	329:2	353:21	lobbying [1] - 313:9	291:12, 295:6,
	1 040 C			
landfill [54] - 296:13,	largely [2] - 313:6,	level [5] - 277:22,	local [2] - 276:16,	297:13, 297:20,
304:8, 304:17,	361:5	level [5] - 277:22, 314:4, 315:21,	local [2] - 276:16, 307:12	297:13, 297:20, 297:24, 298:1,
304:8, 304:17, 305:3, 305:20,	361:5 larger [3] - 276:25,	••	••	
304:8, 304:17,	361:5	314:4, 315:21,	307:12	297:24, 298:1,

Mahoney [2] - 275:5	305:15	294:9, 316:20	284:20, 293:20,	minimize [5] - 331:24,
main [2] - 277:19,	man-made [4] -	matter [4] - 282:4,	299:12, 299:15,	333:18, 333:20,
277:20	303:19, 303:21,	346:6, 350:21, 360:3	313:18, 314:19,	363:13, 363:22
MAINE [4] - 272:1,	304:22, 305:15	maximize [1] - 349:14	314:22, 315:12,	minimizing [1] - 332:2
272:7, 272:9, 272:9	manage [1] - 322:17	maximum [2] - 287:9,	315:16, 315:20,	minimum [2] - 278:22,
Maine [80] - 272:20,	managed [1] - 363:13	296:19	315:22, 317:11,	315:19
273:3, 273:9,	management [32] -	mayo [1] - 367:11	317:15, 318:16,	Minnesota [1] -
273:13, 276:2,	276:16, 296:14,	Mayo [5] - 359:10,	318:22, 318:23,	275:17
276:5, 280:9,	304:5, 307:22,	359:14, 367:5,	318:24, 318:25,	minute [2] - 295:12,
280:24, 283:4,	308:8, 308:9,	369:23, 370:3	319:6, 319:9,	295:15
283:6, 286:14,	308:18, 308:21,	MAYO [8] - 359:13,	319:10, 319:14,	minutes [16] - 275:1,
287:10, 287:11,	309:11, 310:12,	359:18, 367:9,	320:17, 321:11,	281:15, 281:18,
289:13, 289:15,	312:1, 312:12,	367:16, 367:19,	354:10, 355:7,	281:20, 281:24,
295:3, 298:2,	313:5, 315:9,	370:4, 370:9, 370:13	356:13, 358:11	291:19, 296:3,
306:20, 306:25,	316:15, 316:25,		MERC's [2] - 306:25,	
307:10, 309:19,	317:4, 332:7, 332:8,	McBrady [15] - 334:20,	315:6	297:12, 302:17,
309:23, 310:12,	333:22, 334:9,	334:21, 335:1,	merely [1] - 279:22	307:4, 311:25,
311:6, 312:2, 312:7,	346:11, 346:15,	335:7, 335:12,	Methane [1] - 302:23	324:22, 324:24,
312:22, 312:23,	346:19, 348:10,	335:17, 335:22, 336:2, 336:8	methane [27] - 303:3,	338:8, 344:25, 350:10
313:6, 313:8,	349:10, 349:11,	336:2, 336:8, 336:13, 336:18	303:5, 303:7, 303:9,	
313:23, 313:25,	349.10, 349.11, 357:9, 364:19,	336:13, 336:18, 336:24, 337:10	303:5, 303:7, 303:9, 303:12, 303:15,	misguided [1] -
314:1, 314:2, 314:6,	365:12, 366:3, 366:5	336:24, 337:10,	303:12, 303:15, 303:25,	280:16
314:1, 314:2, 314:0, 314:8, 316:6,	Management [3] -	337:14, 343:18	304:3, 304:6, 304:9,	misleading [1] -
316:10, 316:14,	273:22, 273:23,	McDonald [1] - 307:16	304:11, 304:18,	314:17
321:17, 322:5,	307:17	means [5] - 294:18,	305:25, 306:16,	misrepresentation [2]
345:25, 346:3,	manager [11] - 307:17,	336:25, 339:11,	307:6, 328:4,	- 314:10, 314:16
346:7, 346:11,	345:11, 345:24,	360:20, 371:10	330:11, 331:5,	misstated [1] - 291:25
346:17, 346:18,	345:25, 346:2,	measure [3] - 318:6,	333:1, 333:5,	mistaken [2] - 289:2, 304:11
346:20, 346:21,	357:5, 359:10,	322:16, 329:15	334:13, 338:14,	
346:25, 347:4,	359:14, 359:18,	measured [1] - 342:2	338:17, 338:25,	misunderstanding [1]
347:7, 347:8,	367:6	measurement [1] -	342:18, 342:22	- 279:5
347:11, 347:23,	Manager [1] - 299:7	318:4	method [2] - 331:3,	misunderstood [2] -
348:1, 348:2, 348:7,	managers [1] - 322:3	measurements [1] -	336:2	369:23, 370:5
349:2, 349:9,	managing [1] - 357:16	305:4	Michael [2] - 273:24,	mitigation [1] - 329:14
349:10, 349:24,	mandate [1] - 327:22	measures [3] -	368:13	mix [1] - 333:1
349:25, 350:4,	mandates [1] - 279:12	329:18, 330:11,	microphone [5] -	MMWAC [8] - 279:11,
353:9, 355:15,	mandatory [1] -	362:24	302:13, 345:5,	281:18, 281:23,
360:4, 360:7,	314:25	measuring [1] - 318:5	350:12, 359:11,	282:4, 318:16,
360:16, 360:19,	manipulated [1] -	medical [1] - 275:24	359:17	318:24, 350:9,
362:5, 363:2, 365:8,	312:3	meet [3] - 280:20,	might [6] - 302:15,	350:20
365:14, 365:18,		288:11, 315:17	332:24, 337:5,	Modern [1] - 364:3
365:22, 365:25,	manipulation [1] -	meets [2] - 321:8,	362:8, 363:5, 367:12	moisture [5] - 306:5,
371:4	313:7 manner (4) 317:8	322:20	Mike [4] - 275:4,	331:4, 332:2, 232:10, 224:10
Maine's [19] - 278:5,	manner [1] - 317:8 Mansion [2] - 272:19,	megawatts [1] - 276:6	299:7, 357:5, 367:6	333:19, 334:10
279:12, 280:15,	273:3	Melanie [2] - 273:21,	mike [2] - 302:16,	moment [3] - 290:20,
281:1, 281:12,		300:25	345:22	337:23
285:20, 306:11,	March [2] - 297:17,	member [6] - 292:2,	mile [5] - 326:11,	moments [2] - 337:20,
310:3, 316:4,	298:6 Mark (a) 282:2	292:6, 292:13,	340:15, 340:18,	358:9
317:16, 317:20,	Mark [2] - 282:2,	298:17, 324:2, 324:3	340:20, 361:18	Monday [1] - 364:12
321:7, 321:21,	350:19	members [4] - 274:6,	mileage [3] - 319:17,	monitoring [2] -
322:5, 348:8, 348:9,	market [1] - 292:5	276:10, 325:10,	320:9, 320:22	329:21, 359:19
366:1, 366:2, 366:5	marketing [1] - 293:12 marketplace [1] -	337:11 Members (a) - 275:2	miles [4] - 319:25,	month [4] - 297:17,
maintain [1] - 279:24	281:5	Members [2] - 275:3,	320:7, 320:22,	297:22, 298:6, 301:3
Maintaining [1] -		359:6	339:15	months [4] - 281:14,
276:14	markets [1] - 292:13	mention [1] - 325:18	mill [2] - 307:13, 309:6	298:1, 310:24, 262:10
maintains [1] - 364:2	massive [1] - 303:24	mentioned [1] - 327:3	mill's [1] - 307:13	363:19
maintenance [1] -	matches [1] - 319:2	mentioning [1] -	million [6] - 315:22,	morning [22] - 273:6,
332:6	material [1] - 361:5	306:19	315:24, 316:5,	274:5, 275:2, 275:8,
man [4] - 303:19,	materials [2] - 353:10,	MERC [33] - 273:15,	320:25, 321:16,	275:14, 282:4,
303:21, 304:22,	353:13	277:6, 279:13,	327:5	282:6, 288:25, 201:22
	math [3] - 290:14,	281:9, 283:17,		291:22, 291:23,

296:4, 296:6, 299:6,	292:12, 292:25,	329:11, 329:12,	358:3, 358:4, 358:6,	363:6, 363:11,
300:3, 323:6, 325:9,	293:3, 293:6,	329:16, 329:17,	358:16, 359:5,	363:12, 363:16,
				, ,
325:12, 327:3,	293:12, 293:15,	329:23, 329:24,	359:13, 359:18,	365:12, 365:19,
327:15, 334:20,	293:18, 293:22,	330:2, 330:3, 330:6,	367:5, 367:9,	365:25, 366:7
334:23, 340:22	293:25, 294:2,	330:10, 330:14,	367:10, 367:16,	multi [1] - 307:14
Morrisette [1] - 273:25	294:3, 294:5, 294:6,	330:15, 330:18,	367:19, 368:23,	multi-waste [1] -
most [11] - 276:9,	294:7, 294:9,	330:19, 330:21,	369:1, 369:21,	307:14
303:22, 305:24,	294:12, 294:15,	330:22, 331:7,	370:4, 370:9, 370:13	multiple [2] - 277:10,
311:2, 311:13,	294:17, 294:22,	331:8, 331:11,	MRC [7] - 276:2,	279:10
311:16, 319:15,	295:6, 295:8,	331:12, 331:16,	276:8, 278:16,	Municipal [2] -
320:17, 326:2,	295:14, 295:16,	331:18, 331:20,	278:21, 300:14,	302:22, 313:24
326:4, 329:14	295:21, 295:23,	331:21, 332:11,	334:18, 334:22	municipal [29] -
mouthful [1] - 332:10	296:4, 296:6, 296:7,	332:13, 332:14,	MS [29] - 297:2, 301:1,	273:12, 277:1,
move [13] - 274:5,	296:10, 296:11,	332:16, 332:19,	301:5, 301:14,	
• •	296:13, 296:20,	332:20, 332:23,		277:5, 277:9,
281:17, 314:19,			301:19, 302:3,	277:13, 277:15,
316:24, 316:25,	297:1, 297:4, 297:6,	333:7, 333:10,	323:13, 334:20,	277:16, 277:24,
323:10, 324:19,	297:7, 297:9,	333:13, 333:15,	335:1, 335:7,	278:10, 278:19,
337:20, 339:19,	297:10, 297:13,	333:16, 333:24,	335:12, 335:17,	283:14, 284:7,
341:14, 356:24,	297:19, 297:20,	333:25, 334:3,	335:22, 336:2,	284:8, 310:14,
357:3, 359:2	297:23, 297:24,	334:7, 334:14,	336:8, 336:13,	316:23, 317:4,
moved [1] - 314:6	297:25, 298:1,	334:15, 334:25,	336:18, 336:24,	346:7, 347:10,
movement [1] - 352:2	298:4, 298:5, 298:8,	335:3, 335:11,	337:10, 337:14,	347:22, 348:4,
moves [1] - 314:1	298:9, 298:15,	335:15, 335:20,	343:18, 358:5,	348:12, 348:13,
moving [2] - 321:23,	298:16, 298:17,	336:1, 336:6,	358:7, 358:24,	349:1, 349:5, 350:3,
350:8	298:19, 299:2,	336:12, 336:14,	367:11, 367:17,	354:3, 360:4, 360:6,
MR [345] - 275:2,	299:6, 299:9,	336:19, 337:2,	367:24, 370:8,	367:19
275:14, 281:21,	299:10, 299:14,	337:13, 337:24,	370:12	MUNICIPAL [1] -
	299:16, 299:17,	338:12, 339:6,	MSW [75] - 279:12,	272:8
282:1, 282:6, 282:7,	299:18, 299:20,	339:19, 339:25,	279:21, 280:1,	
282:10, 282:11,	299:21, 299:25,	340:6, 340:10,	280:7, 280:18,	municipalities [3] -
282:14, 282:15,	300:2, 300:8,	341:16, 341:22,	280:23, 280:25,	280:18, 281:2,
282:19, 282:20,	300:20, 301:4,	341:23, 342:1,		348:25
282:21, 282:22,		342:4, 342:7, 342:8,	281:6, 281:10,	must [3] - 274:8,
283:9, 283:10,	301:8, 301:18,		281:12, 297:18,	281:4, 312:14
283:19, 283:20,	301:24, 302:11,	342:11, 342:23,	298:2, 302:25,	mutual [1] - 286:20
283:24, 283:25,	302:13, 302:19,	343:2, 343:4,	303:4, 303:6,	
284:4, 284:5,	307:5, 310:9,	343:10, 343:14,	303:22, 303:25,	Ν
284:16, 284:17,	311:23, 312:1,	343:21, 345:2,	306:11, 306:13,	
284:19, 285:1,	319:18, 319:20,	345:6, 345:16,	306:25, 309:15,	name [20] - 273:15,
285:6, 285:8,	319:24, 320:9,	345:19, 345:23,	309:17, 309:22,	275:4, 275:14,
285:13, 285:14,	320:12, 320:14,	350:11, 350:16,	310:15, 311:7,	275:18, 282:1,
285:17, 285:18,	320:15, 325:3,	350:18, 350:19,	313:3, 313:15,	291:3, 291:4, 291:7,
286:3, 286:6,	325:5, 325:6, 325:7,	351:3, 351:4, 351:7,	313:18, 314:11,	310:9, 325:9,
286:11, 286:14,	325:8, 325:16,	351:8, 351:11,	314:19, 314:22,	334:21, 340:7,
286:16, 286:17,	325:17, 325:23,	351:12, 351:16,	315:6, 315:16,	344:10, 345:2,
286:22, 286:23,	325:24, 326:1,	351:20, 351:25,	315:20, 316:1,	345:6, 345:23,
287:4, 287:5,	326:2, 326:4, 326:6,	352:8, 352:14,	317:4, 317:5,	350:19, 357:5,
287:18, 287:21,	326:9, 326:10,	352:16, 353:4,	317:10, 317:19,	359:6, 359:13
287:24, 288:3,	326:13, 326:15,	353:15, 353:19,	317:25, 318:17,	named [2] - 370:19,
	326:16, 326:17,	353:24, 354:11,	318:22, 318:23,	•••
288:19, 288:22,	326:19, 326:20,	354:20, 354:23,	318:24, 318:25,	371:6
288:24, 289:3,	326:21, 326:22,	354:24, 354:25,		Nancy [3] - 273:19,
289:6, 289:10,	327:1, 327:2,	355:2, 355:10,	319:9, 319:10, 310:15, 321:12	323:11, 334:21
289:16, 289:22,			319:15, 321:12, 227:15, 225:0	Natural [1] - 307:19
289:25, 290:2,	327:10, 327:13, 327:17, 327:10	355:21, 355:24, 356:2, 356:4, 356:6	327:15, 335:9,	nature [3] - 360:10,
290:3, 290:5, 290:8,	327:17, 327:19,	356:2, 356:4, 356:6,	335:14, 336:3,	360:18, 366:20
290:11, 290:13,	327:24, 328:1,	356:11, 356:13,	338:13, 339:11,	near [4] - 277:12,
290:17, 290:20,	328:2, 328:3, 328:8,	356:15, 356:16,	354:2, 357:9,	278:20, 324:23,
290:24, 291:4,	328:9, 328:13,	356:19, 356:20,	357:16, 358:10,	364:9
291:8, 291:12,	328:14, 328:16,	357:1, 357:4,	360:15, 360:16,	nearly [1] - 361:8
291:20, 291:23,	328:17, 328:21,	357:10, 357:11,	360:20, 360:21,	necessary [3] -
291:24, 292:9,	328:22, 329:1,	357:13, 357:14,	361:7, 361:19,	313:10, 327:20,
	329:5, 329:8, 329:9,	357:19, 357:24,	361:25, 362:5,	

05/07/2013 01:06:37 PM

362:4	337:18, 341:14,	nuance [1] - 324:7	274:23, 281:16,	276:20, 280:13,
need [14] - 285:10,	356:23, 367:4	nuisance [5] - 310:17,	281:25, 287:22,	285:1, 287:20,
		•••	201.25, 207.22, 290:22, 290:22, 291:1,	287:23, 290:20,
285:12, 287:2, 291:10, 293:13,	noontime [1] - 343:24	322:12, 339:6,	290.22, 291.1, 291:6, 291:9,	297.23, 290.20, 292:2, 295:3,
291:10, 293:13, 296:16, 302:13,	NORDBY [61] -	339:7, 339:9	291.6, 291.9, 291:17, 292:8,	292.2, 295.3, 295:12, 295:15,
	275:14, 282:6,	number [18] - 278:18,	291.17, 292.8, 292:11, 294:20,	
313:15, 324:24,	282:10, 282:14,	283:3, 288:18,	, ,	298:9, 300:21,
337:19, 337:22,	282:19, 282:21,	303:11, 316:21,	295:10, 295:15,	305:23, 307:5,
344:14, 345:19,	283:9, 283:19,	318:14, 319:5,	295:18, 295:22,	307:20, 313:16,
345:21	283:24, 284:4,	325:23, 327:10,	295:25, 296:24,	314:1, 314:2,
needed [1] - 313:14	284:16, 284:19,	328:10, 338:12,	297:11, 298:21,	316:18, 318:14,
needs [5] - 280:20,	285:6, 285:13,	338:14, 353:7,	299:4, 300:25,	319:5, 320:16,
281:10, 293:2,	285:17, 286:3,	361:24, 362:6,	302:4, 302:14,	320:25, 322:18,
296:13, 368:18	286:11, 286:16,	362:9, 365:4	307:3, 310:6,	324:8, 324:9,
negative [2] - 303:13,	286:22, 287:4,	numbers [4] - 294:10,	311:22, 311:24,	325:13, 325:17,
360:1	288:3, 288:22,	319:17, 320:15,	319:22, 320:3,	328:5, 328:9,
neglected [1] - 332:25	289:3, 289:10,	362:10	320:13, 322:23,	328:12, 328:23,
negotiate [2] - 318:21,	289:22, 290:2,		323:6, 324:19,	329:12, 330:23,
322:20	290:5, 290:11,	0	334:17, 337:16,	330:25, 331:21,
negotiated [2] - 288:7,	290:17, 291:23,		337:25, 338:6,	337:4, 338:12,
327:14	292:25, 293:6,	object [1] - 366:10	339:4, 339:13,	340:21, 355:13,
negotiating [1] -	293:15, 293:22,	Objection [2] -	339:23, 340:2,	357:6, 357:21,
327:21	294:2, 294:5, 294:7,	287:18, 319:18	340:9, 341:12,	359:18, 364:20
negotiation [2] -	294:12, 294:17,	objection [1] - 339:19	343:16, 343:19,	one-time [1] - 305:23
300:10, 300:15	296:6, 296:10,	objectives [2] -	343:22, 344:9,	ongoing [2] - 276:17,
negotiations [4] -	296:13, 297:6,	276:14, 321:9	344:22, 345:4,	279:22
281:11, 290:6,	297:9, 297:19,	obligated [1] - 282:16	345:14, 345:17,	open [2] - 310:24,
318:19, 356:5	297:23, 297:25,	obligation [4] -	345:21, 350:7,	369:22
neighbors [1] - 322:14	298:4, 298:8,	279:23, 288:11,	350:13, 356:21,	opens [2] - 315:1,
net [3] - 317:17,	298:15, 298:17,	352:3, 352:4	357:2, 358:25,	317:9
335:13, 336:10	299:9, 299:14,	obligations [1] -	359:12, 359:16,	operate [7] - 277:11,
never [5] - 275:4,	299:17, 299:20,	279:25	367:2, 367:25,	284:10, 288:8,
321:5, 333:4,	299:25, 300:8,	obtain [1] - 352:11	368:25, 369:5,	294:3, 308:19,
340:16, 353:16	301:4, 301:8,	obvious [1] - 318:15	370:2, 370:14	308:23, 309:10
new [4] - 277:8,	301:18, 301:24	occasional [1] -	officer [2] - 273:18,	operated [4] - 275:23,
320:23, 327:21	Nordby [18] - 275:8,	364:10	323:20	280:17, 296:18,
news [2] - 317:20,	275:10, 275:12,	occasionally [1] -	Officer [11] - 273:2,	308:7
317:21	275:15, 275:18,	361:21	275:3, 281:22,	Operating [2] -
NEWSME [7] - 272:7,	281:16, 282:5,	occur [1] - 364:15	287:19, 291:12,	308:15, 365:7
273:10, 313:23,	291:15, 291:21,	occurred [1] - 355:19	295:7, 295:21,	operating [4] - 278:20,
325:11, 362:18,	295:24, 296:5,	occurring [1] - 343:8	297:14, 325:10,	286:11, 315:3,
	297:16, 299:6,	occurs [1] - 342:24	359:5, 368:23	331:24
362:21, 366:11	301:1, 302:6, 327:7,		Officer's [1] - 275:9	operation [6] - 332:6,
newspaper [1] - 340:22	327:13, 327:18	odor [10] - 310:24, 361:5, 361:7,	officials [1] - 283:6	359:19, 364:12,
	north [2] - 325:20,		okayed [1] - 364:22	364:15, 364:17,
next [4] - 335:7, 352:8,	326:7	362:15, 362:21, 362:25, 363:4	Old [25] - 272:9,	366:13
352:17, 355:2	North [1] - 303:21	362:25, 363:4, 363:17, 367:8	306:11, 307:12,	operational [1] - 363:1
night [3] - 275:17,	Notary [1] - 371:3	363:17, 367:8	311:12, 311:13,	OPERATIONS [1] -
322:11, 361:17	note [2] - 321:4,	odorous [1] - 310:20	311:14, 334:24,	272:7
nine [2] - 305:17,	339:13	odors [1] - 366:18	335:2, 335:4, 335:9,	operations [4] -
309:4	noted [1] - 361:13	OF [4] - 272:1, 272:2,	335:13, 359:3,	277:18, 280:9,
NMOCs [1] - 338:25	notes [1] - 361:23	272:7	359:8, 359:9,	347:1, 365:14
nobody [1] - 339:22	nothing [5] - 274:21,	OFF [2] - 323:5, 338:4	359:15, 359:20,	Operations [3] -
nods) [1] - 330:14	280:12, 299:2,	offer [5] - 311:8,	359:22, 360:11,	273:11, 313:24,
noise [11] - 310:25,	344:20, 371:7	321:10, 321:14,	364:9, 366:15,	
322:11, 322:13,		324:16, 339:21	366:16, 367:3,	325:11
339:9, 339:12,	Notice [1] - 272:18	offers [2] - 346:5,	367:13, 368:1	operator [10] - 273:10,
339:16, 341:11,	notify [1] - 357:17	360:2	once [2] - 303:25,	308:12, 309:25,
361:20, 364:9,	November [5] -	Office [3] - 307:18,	306:24	313:10, 316:3,
364:10, 366:18	331:10, 346:24, 250:24, 251:10	312:22, 321:25	Once [1] - 326:6	316:23, 317:13,
none [7] - 295:20,	350:24, 351:10,	OFFICER [68] -	one [45] - 275:19,	321:12, 342:19,
311:14, 323:1,	352:10	272:15, 273:6,	Une [40] - 270.18,	362:19

				
operators [5] - 304:8,	315:11, 316:3,	359:6	291:14, 311:17,	288:7, 290:8, 291:2,
304:17, 308:3,	317:15, 318:18,	panel [3] - 302:17,	311:19, 324:3,	293:2, 295:19,
331:2, 331:4	320:18, 321:3,	325:10, 369:25	324:6, 324:13,	296:13, 297:12,
opportunities [1] -	321:6, 346:24,	paper [8] - 274:9,	358:17	297:17, 298:3,
353:8	347:25, 348:6,	274:10, 304:12,	pass [3] - 302:16,	298:7, 298:22,
	349:4, 355:5, 355:8,	305:22, 307:12,	310:7, 361:15	299:5, 299:11,
opportunity [10] - 278:15, 281:9,	358:12, 358:22,	309:6, 328:18	passed [1] - 312:9	299:14, 300:14,
	358:23, 365:4,		-	301:11, 301:14,
298:22, 298:25,	365:6, 365:24,	papers [1] - 328:9	passing [1] - 361:19	301:22, 302:5,
321:2, 324:16,	366:4, 366:7	paperwork [1] -	past [5] - 280:2,	309:18, 309:21,
338:2, 369:3,		313:11	321:20, 326:17,	314:11, 314:12,
369:13, 369:15	outcome [2] - 356:10, 371:13	paragraph [1] - 352:18	348:17, 362:11	314:19, 314:21,
oppose [1] - 352:25		parameters [1] -	Paula [1] - 273:22	314:23, 315:20,
opposed [3] - 289:9,	outdated [2] - 349:20, 356:7	364:25	pay [7] - 288:12,	315:23, 315:25,
339:2, 366:10	outline [1] - 369:17	paren [2] - 352:22,	335:3, 336:25,	317:23, 318:1,
option [2] - 313:20,		352:24	337:4, 367:19,	318:4, 318:15,
357:22	output [1] - 279:25	PARENT [1] - 272:15	370:7, 370:9	318:16, 319:10,
options [3] - 313:20,	outside [4] - 317:16,	Parent [4] - 273:2,	pays [1] - 319:13	320:24, 321:3,
315:14, 317:10	348:7, 355:13,	273:16, 344:10,	penalty [2] - 357:25,	320.24, 321.3, 327:4, 327:6, 327:8,
Order [2] - 273:11,	364:15	359:5	358:2	327:4, 327:6, 327:6, 327:21, 335:6,
320:4	overall [2] - 362:2,	PARKER [18] - 299:6,	pending [9] - 278:1,	335:10, 335:14,
order [11] - 273:7,	362:6	299:10, 299:16,	278:12, 282:17,	336:4, 336:15,
273:12, 279:24,	overlooked [1] - 312:4	299:18, 299:21,	283:13, 283:18,	336:20, 360:17
280:9, 281:5, 284:9,	own [2] - 307:25,	300:2, 300:20,	289:18, 355:9,	PERC/Casella [3] -
303:10, 304:5,	324:4	302:11, 320:12,	356:10, 356:17	279:6, 286:4, 301:16
312:14, 320:5,	owned [4] - 307:12,	325:7, 343:21,	PENOBSCOT [1] -	percent [31] - 292:15,
363:13	307:14, 310:4, 347:5	357:4, 357:11,	272:9	• • • • •
orders [1] - 339:17	owner [12] - 309:7,	357:14, 357:24,	Penobscot [1] - 275:7	292:16, 292:18,
organic [3] - 303:6,	314:12, 315:5,	358:4, 367:5, 367:10	people [3] - 316:22,	303:6, 304:6, 304:8,
303:22	315:12, 315:14,	Parker [6] - 273:24,	337:7, 344:15	304:18, 304:22, 304:25, 305:5,
organizations [1] -	315:18, 316:3,	299:7, 320:1, 357:5,	per [22] - 275:9, 277:2,	
366:15	317:12, 321:4,	367:6, 368:13	278:1, 297:22,	305:14, 305:17,
original [4] - 309:6,	321:8, 321:12,	Part [1] - 323:25	306:18, 320:21,	313:2, 313:3,
351:16, 351:25,	342:20	part [23] - 276:20,	327:9, 335:14,	328:20, 329:1,
352:4	owner's [1] - 314:13	276:21, 276:22,	335:18, 347:10,	329:4, 338:23, 338:24, 339:1,
originate [1] - 277:3	owner/operator [6] -	288:17, 301:15,	350:2, 360:6, 361:1,	
originated [1] - 365:20	314:18, 317:22,	302:22, 303:2,	361:2, 361:4,	339:2, 341:21, 241:22, 241:24
Orono [1] - 363:3	319:2, 319:7,	307:7, 309:9, 320:5,	361:24, 362:1,	341:23, 341:24, 342:10, 343:7,
Orrington [4] - 276:5,	319:12, 321:10	320:6, 323:13,	362:9, 362:10,	349:18, 354:17,
309:19, 335:6,	ownership [1] -	324:6, 324:13,	367:19	354:19 354:19
360:17	276:11	333:1, 338:16,	PERC [90] - 274:2,	
OSA [1] - 309:8	owning [1] - 307:20	342:24, 351:1,	274:25, 275:8,	percentage [1] -
otherwise [3] -	owns [1] - 312:18	352:3, 354:9,	275:9, 275:18,	305:23
278:11, 308:24,		354:11, 366:8,	275:19, 276:1,	perfect [1] - 292:11
313:16	Р	370:15	276:4, 276:11,	perform [1] - 277:22
out-of-state [52] -		participate [1] - 335:3	277:2, 277:9,	performance [1] -
277:15, 277:21,	AA 4 4 6	• • • • •		318.7
211.10, 211.21,	p.m [3] - 364:12,	participation [3] -	277:10, 277:14,	318:7
279:9, 279:19,	364:13, 370:20	participation [3] - 368:2, 368:4, 370:17	277:10, 277:14, 277:18, 278:10,	perhaps [5] - 302:15,
	364:13, 370:20 page [15] - 283:11,	participation [3] - 368:2, 368:4, 370:17 particular [1] - 324:17	277:10, 277:14, 277:18, 278:10, 278:19, 278:24,	perhaps [5] - 302:15, 312:4, 315:19,
279:9, 279:19,	364:13, 370:20 page [15] - 283:11, 308:4, 308:17,	participation [3] - 368:2, 368:4, 370:17 particular [1] - 324:17 particularly [1] - 313:6	277:10, 277:14, 277:18, 278:10, 278:19, 278:24, 279:9, 279:18,	perhaps [5] - 302:15, 312:4, 315:19, 333:3, 362:8
279:9, 279:19, 280:1, 280:6, 280:8,	364:13, 370:20 page [15] - 283:11, 308:4, 308:17, 308:21, 309:7,	participation [3] - 368:2, 368:4, 370:17 particular [1] - 324:17	277:10, 277:14, 277:18, 278:10, 278:19, 278:24, 279:9, 279:18, 279:19, 279:23,	perhaps [5] - 302:15, 312:4, 315:19, 333:3, 362:8 period [3] - 303:12,
279:9, 279:19, 280:1, 280:6, 280:8, 280:11, 280:13,	364:13, 370:20 page [15] - 283:11, 308:4, 308:17, 308:21, 309:7, 309:13, 327:2,	participation [3] - 368:2, 368:4, 370:17 particular [1] - 324:17 particularly [1] - 313:6	277:10, 277:14, 277:18, 278:10, 278:19, 278:24, 279:9, 279:18, 279:19, 279:23, 279:25, 280:2,	perhaps [5] - 302:15, 312:4, 315:19, 333:3, 362:8 period [3] - 303:12, 343:8, 354:18
279:9, 279:19, 280:1, 280:6, 280:8, 280:11, 280:13, 284:8, 284:12,	364:13, 370:20 page [15] - 283:11, 308:4, 308:17, 308:21, 309:7, 309:13, 327:2, 331:17, 331:18,	participation [3] - 368:2, 368:4, 370:17 particular [1] - 324:17 particularly [1] - 313:6 parties [13] - 286:10,	277:10, 277:14, 277:18, 278:10, 278:19, 278:24, 279:9, 279:18, 279:19, 279:23, 279:25, 280:2, 280:6, 280:8,	perhaps [5] - 302:15, 312:4, 315:19, 333:3, 362:8 period [3] - 303:12, 343:8, 354:18 periods [1] - 363:19
279:9, 279:19, 280:1, 280:6, 280:8, 280:11, 280:13, 284:8, 284:12, 284:14, 284:21,	364:13, 370:20 page [15] - 283:11, 308:4, 308:17, 308:21, 309:7, 309:13, 327:2, 331:17, 331:18, 338:19, 341:17,	participation [3] - 368:2, 368:4, 370:17 particular [1] - 324:17 particularly [1] - 313:6 parties [13] - 286:10, 286:19, 322:21, 323:17, 356:22, 357:21, 367:3,	277:10, 277:14, 277:18, 278:10, 278:19, 278:24, 279:9, 279:18, 279:19, 279:23, 279:25, 280:2, 280:6, 280:8, 280:11, 280:17,	perhaps [5] - 302:15, 312:4, 315:19, 333:3, 362:8 period [3] - 303:12, 343:8, 354:18 periods [1] - 363:19 Perkins [1] - 359:7
279:9, 279:19, 280:1, 280:6, 280:8, 280:11, 280:13, 284:8, 284:12, 284:14, 284:21, 284:24, 285:4,	364:13, 370:20 page [15] - 283:11, 308:4, 308:17, 308:21, 309:7, 309:13, 327:2, 331:17, 331:18, 338:19, 341:17, 352:17, 353:25,	participation [3] - 368:2, 368:4, 370:17 particular [1] - 324:17 particularly [1] - 313:6 parties [13] - 286:10, 286:19, 322:21, 323:17, 356:22,	277:10, 277:14, 277:18, 278:10, 278:19, 278:24, 279:9, 279:18, 279:19, 279:23, 279:25, 280:2, 280:6, 280:8, 280:11, 280:17, 280:22, 281:4,	perhaps [5] - 302:15, 312:4, 315:19, 333:3, 362:8 period [3] - 303:12, 343:8, 354:18 periods [1] - 363:19 Perkins [1] - 359:7 permit [3] - 309:5,
279:9, 279:19, 280:1, 280:6, 280:8, 280:11, 280:13, 284:8, 284:12, 284:14, 284:21, 284:24, 285:4, 285:10, 289:1,	364:13, 370:20 page [15] - 283:11, 308:4, 308:17, 308:21, 309:7, 309:13, 327:2, 331:17, 331:18, 338:19, 341:17, 352:17, 353:25, 354:24, 355:3	participation [3] - 368:2, 368:4, 370:17 particular [1] - 324:17 particularly [1] - 313:6 parties [13] - 286:10, 286:19, 322:21, 323:17, 356:22, 357:21, 367:3,	277:10, 277:14, 277:18, 278:10, 278:19, 278:24, 279:9, 279:18, 279:19, 279:23, 279:25, 280:2, 280:6, 280:8, 280:11, 280:17, 280:22, 281:4, 281:8, 281:17,	perhaps [5] - 302:15, 312:4, 315:19, 333:3, 362:8 period [3] - 303:12, 343:8, 354:18 periods [1] - 363:19 Perkins [1] - 359:7 permit [3] - 309:5, 309:14, 364:22
279:9, 279:19, 280:1, 280:6, 280:8, 280:11, 280:13, 284:8, 284:12, 284:14, 284:21, 284:24, 285:4, 285:10, 289:1, 289:9, 292:20,	364:13, 370:20 page [15] - 283:11, 308:4, 308:17, 308:21, 309:7, 309:13, 327:2, 331:17, 331:18, 338:19, 341:17, 352:17, 353:25, 354:24, 355:3 pages [2] - 284:5,	participation [3] - 368:2, 368:4, 370:17 particular [1] - 324:17 particularly [1] - 313:6 parties [13] - 286:10, 286:19, 322:21, 323:17, 356:22, 357:21, 367:3, 368:3, 368:9, 369:9,	277:10, 277:14, 277:18, 278:10, 278:19, 278:24, 279:9, 279:18, 279:19, 279:23, 279:25, 280:2, 280:6, 280:8, 280:11, 280:17, 280:22, 281:4, 281:8, 281:17, 282:16, 283:1,	perhaps [5] - 302:15, 312:4, 315:19, 333:3, 362:8 period [3] - 303:12, 343:8, 354:18 periods [1] - 363:19 Perkins [1] - 359:7 permit [3] - 309:5, 309:14, 364:22 permits [3] - 274:13,
279:9, 279:19, 280:1, 280:6, 280:8, 280:11, 280:13, 284:8, 284:12, 284:14, 284:21, 284:24, 285:4, 285:10, 289:1, 289:9, 292:20, 292:23, 293:2,	364:13, 370:20 page [15] - 283:11, 308:4, 308:17, 308:21, 309:7, 309:13, 327:2, 331:17, 331:18, 338:19, 341:17, 352:17, 353:25, 354:24, 355:3	participation [3] - 368:2, 368:4, 370:17 particular [1] - 324:17 particularly [1] - 313:6 parties [13] - 286:10, 286:19, 322:21, 323:17, 356:22, 357:21, 367:3, 368:3, 368:9, 369:9, 369:13, 369:15,	277:10, 277:14, 277:18, 278:10, 278:19, 278:24, 279:9, 279:18, 279:19, 279:23, 279:25, 280:2, 280:6, 280:8, 280:11, 280:17, 280:22, 281:4, 281:8, 281:17, 282:16, 283:1, 284:7, 284:14,	perhaps [5] - 302:15, 312:4, 315:19, 333:3, 362:8 period [3] - 303:12, 343:8, 354:18 periods [1] - 363:19 Perkins [1] - 359:7 permit [3] - 309:5, 309:14, 364:22 permits [3] - 274:13, 309:1, 365:23
279:9, 279:19, 280:1, 280:6, 280:8, 280:11, 280:13, 284:8, 284:12, 284:14, 284:21, 284:24, 285:4, 285:10, 289:1, 289:9, 292:20, 292:23, 293:2, 293:10, 295:4,	364:13, 370:20 page [15] - 283:11, 308:4, 308:17, 308:21, 309:7, 309:13, 327:2, 331:17, 331:18, 338:19, 341:17, 352:17, 353:25, 354:24, 355:3 pages [2] - 284:5, 302:21 paid [1] - 367:21	participation [3] - 368:2, 368:4, 370:17 particular [1] - 324:17 particularly [1] - 313:6 parties [13] - 286:10, 286:19, 322:21, 323:17, 356:22, 357:21, 367:3, 368:3, 368:9, 369:9, 369:13, 369:15, 370:17	277:10, 277:14, 277:18, 278:10, 278:19, 278:24, 279:9, 279:18, 279:19, 279:23, 279:25, 280:2, 280:6, 280:8, 280:11, 280:17, 280:22, 281:4, 281:8, 281:17, 282:16, 283:1, 284:7, 284:14, 285:5, 286:9,	perhaps [5] - 302:15, 312:4, 315:19, 333:3, 362:8 period [3] - 303:12, 343:8, 354:18 periods [1] - 363:19 Perkins [1] - 363:19 Perkins [1] - 309:5, 309:14, 364:22 permits [3] - 274:13, 309:1, 365:23 persists [1] - 303:15
279:9, 279:19, 280:1, 280:6, 280:8, 280:11, 280:13, 284:8, 284:12, 284:14, 284:21, 284:24, 285:4, 285:10, 289:1, 289:9, 292:20, 292:23, 293:2, 293:10, 295:4, 296:21, 297:7,	364:13, 370:20 page [15] - 283:11, 308:4, 308:17, 308:21, 309:7, 309:13, 327:2, 331:17, 331:18, 338:19, 341:17, 352:17, 353:25, 354:24, 355:3 pages [2] - 284:5, 302:21 paid [1] - 367:21 Panel [4] - 275:3,	participation [3] - 368:2, 368:4, 370:17 particular [1] - 324:17 particularly [1] - 313:6 parties [13] - 286:10, 286:19, 322:21, 323:17, 356:22, 357:21, 367:3, 368:3, 368:9, 369:9, 369:13, 369:15, 370:17 partner [1] - 286:13	277:10, 277:14, 277:18, 278:10, 278:19, 278:24, 279:9, 279:18, 279:19, 279:23, 279:25, 280:2, 280:6, 280:8, 280:11, 280:17, 280:22, 281:4, 281:8, 281:17, 282:16, 283:1, 284:7, 284:14, 285:5, 286:9, 286:25, 287:10,	perhaps [5] - 302:15, 312:4, 315:19, 333:3, 362:8 period [3] - 303:12, 343:8, 354:18 periods [1] - 363:19 Perkins [1] - 363:19 Perkins [1] - 359:7 permit [3] - 309:5, 309:14, 364:22 permits [3] - 274:13, 309:1, 365:23 persists [1] - 303:15 person [1] - 371:13
279:9, 279:19, 280:1, 280:6, 280:8, 280:11, 280:13, 284:8, 284:12, 284:14, 284:21, 284:24, 285:4, 285:10, 289:1, 289:9, 292:20, 292:23, 293:2, 293:10, 295:4, 296:21, 297:7, 298:13, 300:5,	364:13, 370:20 page [15] - 283:11, 308:4, 308:17, 308:21, 309:7, 309:13, 327:2, 331:17, 331:18, 338:19, 341:17, 352:17, 353:25, 354:24, 355:3 pages [2] - 284:5, 302:21 paid [1] - 367:21	participation [3] - 368:2, 368:4, 370:17 particular [1] - 324:17 particularly [1] - 313:6 parties [13] - 286:10, 286:19, 322:21, 323:17, 356:22, 357:21, 367:3, 368:3, 368:9, 369:9, 369:13, 369:15, 370:17 partner [1] - 286:13 partners [4] - 275:19,	277:10, 277:14, 277:18, 278:10, 278:19, 278:24, 279:9, 279:18, 279:19, 279:23, 279:25, 280:2, 280:6, 280:8, 280:11, 280:17, 280:22, 281:4, 281:8, 281:17, 282:16, 283:1, 284:7, 284:14, 285:5, 286:9,	perhaps [5] - 302:15, 312:4, 315:19, 333:3, 362:8 period [3] - 303:12, 343:8, 354:18 periods [1] - 363:19 Perkins [1] - 369:7 permit [3] - 309:5, 309:14, 364:22 permits [3] - 274:13, 309:1, 365:23 persists [1] - 303:15

personally [2] -336:21, 371:5 persons [2] - 273:18, 274:17 Pest [1] - 364:3 picked [1] - 335:4 picking [1] - 336:15 pickup [2] - 354:15, 367:20 picture [1] - 276:25 piece [2] - 340:18, 370:15 pieces [1] - 274:10 pile [2] - 306:5, 306:15 Pine [3] - 354:8, 354:13, 357:8 pipes [1] - 330:9 place [5] - 293:9, 295:3, 315:8, 335:4, 362.24 placed [1] - 363:19 placement [4] -363:15, 363:18, 363:21, 363:25 places [2] - 319:14, 320:16 plan [5] - 274:2, 306:10, 306:19, 312:11, 344:16 Planning [3] - 307:18, 312:22, 321:25 planning [1] - 348:19 plans [1] - 321:22 plant [1] - 296:18 plants [2] - 307:1, 331:2 played [1] - 288:17 point [4] - 291:13, 305:24, 308:12, 357:18 pointed [2] - 321:18, 341:16 pointing [1] - 317:14 points [1] - 307:21 policies [5] - 276:17, 310:12, 312:19, 322:20, 346:12 policy [11] - 273:16, 307:10, 310:5, 312:2, 312:3, 312:10, 315:17, 316:15, 346:14, 349:10, 349:12 poor [1] - 305:18 portion [5] - 277:3, 277:14, 284:8, 285:11. 324:9 portions [1] - 320:6 posed [1] - 358:9 poses [1] - 303:12

posing [1] - 361:5 position [1] - 281:12 positive [3] - 303:17, 349:8, 360:1 possible [8] - 287:9, 287:14, 288:1, 289:2, 298:5, 307:23, 318:9, 364.18 post [2] - 368:14, 369:8 post-hearing [2] -368:14, 369:8 potential [8] - 303:10, 324:14, 338:14, 349:17, 361:7, 361:10, 363:17, 364:3 potentially [1] -354:18 power [1] - 276:6 practices [3] - 331:24, 332:1, 334:12 pre [19] - 275:10, 300:20, 310:7, 322:24, 322:25, 325:18, 328:4, 329:25, 330:3, 330:20, 330:24, 334:1, 335:23, 340:3, 340:4, 340:5, 345:12, 353:25, 359:9 pre-answered [1] -300:20 pre-filed [18] - 275:10, 310:7, 322:24, 322:25, 325:18, 328:4, 329:25, 330:3, 330:20, 330:24, 334:1, 335:23, 340:3, 340:4, 340:5, 345:12, 353:25, 359:9 precedent [3] -351:14, 351:23, 352:13 prefer [2] - 288:23, 289.1preferable [1] - 306:13 preference [1] -287.11 preferences [1] -337.11 preferred [3] - 288:20, 336:2, 336:9 prehearing [2] -323:18, 323:23 prepared [3] - 273:9,

302:7, 337:21 present [11] - 273:19, 274:10, 275:1, 281:6, 302:7, 310:11, 310:16, 323:10, 359:8, 361:7, 369:3 presented [4] - 281:9, 302:24, 304:13, 318:14 presenting [2] - 368:3, 368:4 presents [1] - 366:22 president [1] - 275:18 presiding [1] - 273:18 pretty [2] - 300:14, 302:14 preventing [1] -334:10 previous [2] - 339:8, 339:16 previously [7] -279:13, 315:11, 324:8, 347:8, 347:11, 348:6, 360:7 price [4] - 281:2, 296:23, 297:4, 327:9 priced [2] - 276:17, 277:21 pricing [2] - 300:13, 302:1 primarily [1] - 359:24 priority [2] - 308:9, 312:15 private [4] - 275:19, 276:1, 286:16, 288:22 privately [1] - 352:25 problem [1] - 323:17 problematic [1] -288:16 problems [4] - 292:2, 318:19, 321:21, 330:25 procedural [3] -323:9, 323:12, 339.17 Procedural [1] - 320:4 procedure [1] - 303:2 procedures [2] -338:15, 369:18 proceed [3] - 323:8, 337:22, 338:11 proceeding [3] -285:23, 289:18, 324:3 proceedings [1] -289:16 process [3] - 276:7, 307:11, 360:14

processed [7] -287:10, 287:14, 288:2, 317:8, 348:6, 365:25, 366:4 processing [5] -288:13, 309:22, 347:13, 367:22, 370.11 processor [1] - 346:23 produce [3] - 276:6, 303:25, 337:8 produced [3] - 302:25, 303:5, 306:16 producing [2] - 295:2, 304:3 production [1] -306:18 profession [1] - 346:4 professional [1] -321:24 program [5] - 348:16, 354:6, 354:16, 367:21 programs [4] - 348:13, 348:14, 348:23, 354:3 progressed [1] -306:21 prohibited [1] -288:10 prohibits [1] - 365:9 project [7] - 275:20, 277:22, 300:17, 350:14, 357:5, 367:6 Project [1] - 299:7 promise [1] - 321:6 promote [1] - 349:13 proper [1] - 332:5 properly [1] - 322:17 property [3] - 340:19, 341:6, 341:7 proposal [1] - 309:16 proposals [2] - 308:3, 313.12 propose [2] - 361:23, 362:23 proposed [8] - 315:18, 360:18, 361:11, 361:25, 366:11, 366:21.369:8. 369:10 proposes [5] - 347:9, 360:5, 363:15, 363:17, 363:20 proposing [1] -306:22 PROTECTION [1] -272:2 Protection [8] - 273:8, 273:17, 283:5,

304:17, 312:23, 316:7, 321:18, 322:1 prove [1] - 312:5 proven [2] - 295:2, 336:22 proves [1] - 321:25 provide [9] - 276:9, 276:23, 293:16, 317:5, 324:5, 337:23, 340:3, 353:8, 369:15 provided [5] - 288:21, 301:15, 324:6, 324:13, 368:7 provides [9] - 277:10, 278:14, 282:23, 283:16, 286:18, 287:13, 288:1, 297:21.346:9 providing [4] - 275:10, 285:15, 369:12, 369:14 provision [13] -286:18, 286:21, 287:7, 296:8, 296:12, 298:11, 331:13, 331:22, 332:17, 333:14, 333:18, 334:1, 341:18 provisions [1] -357:20 proximity [3] - 310:19, 311:11, 340:12 Public [2] - 371:3, 371:21 public [11] - 274:6, 282:23. 282:25. 323:15, 323:22, 324:1, 324:2, 324:4, 344:12, 365:1, 368.12 PUBLIC [1] - 272:13 publicly [2] - 282:16, 352:25 purchase [6] - 351:1, 351:14, 351:23, 351:25, 352:13, 354:9 purchased [2] -346:25, 353:9 purported [2] - 315:8, 315:13 purpose [4] - 301:9, 345:8, 351:12, 351.22 pursuant [2] - 272:18, 279.17 pursue [1] - 278:21 pursuing [1] - 301:6

purview [1] - 355:20	305:14, 313:2, 327:9	reasonable [5] -	349:6, 349:17,	regulatory [1] - 355:19
put [2] - 315:6, 337:3	rates [2] - 305:11,	280:4, 282:23,	349:18, 354:3,	reinforces [1] - 306:12
putting [1] - 306:15	305:23	283:2, 293:16,	354:6, 354:7,	relate [3] - 310:12,
	rather [7] - 276:18,	348:21	354:15, 354:16,	311:11, 318:8
	278:13, 281:3,	reasonably [2] -	354:17, 355:6,	related [3] - 310:17,
Q		276:17, 283:2	367:14	••
augurun la (J) 261/9	285:25, 290:19,			320:7, 362:16
quadruple [1] - 361:8	327:6, 355:8	reasons [3] - 350:5,	Recycling [1] - 307:17	relates [3] - 325:18,
qualify [1] - 336:12	ratio [1] - 354:18	353:7, 366:22	redirect [15] - 297:12,	328:5, 351:18
quantities [1] - 361:4	raw [3] - 280:24,	rebuttal [1] - 279:1	298:20, 298:24,	relatively [2] - 303:18,
quarter [1] - 288:12	280:25, 363:11	receive [6] - 280:22,	324:17, 337:21,	363:9
quarterly [2] - 338:15,	Rayback [3] - 325:9,	311:14, 347:9,	337:22, 338:7,	release [1] - 331:25
342:2	340:8, 340:9	360:6, 368:8, 368:12	338:9, 339:5,	released [3] - 306:17,
questions [33] - 274:7,	RAYBACK [56] -	received [2] - 297:18,	339:21, 340:1,	338:14, 352:4
274:8, 274:11,	319:18, 319:24,	360:14	341:13, 356:24,	releases [2] - 332:3,
274:13, 274:24,	320:9, 320:14,	receiving [3] - 277:15,	357:1, 357:3	333:20
282:7, 287:19,	325:3, 325:6, 325:8,	293:22, 363:16	redirects [1] - 278:9	relevance [1] - 274:12
287:22, 290:21,	325:17, 325:24,	recess [1] - 344:1	redistribute [1] -	relevant [2] - 283:7,
290:25, 293:4,	326:2, 326:6,	RECESS [1] - 344:7	306:25	339:18
295:13, 295:23,	326:10, 326:15,	recessing [1] - 344:4	reduce [9] - 277:23,	reliable [1] - 276:15
298:23, 299:5,	326:17, 326:20,	recognition [1] -	294:23, 308:10,	remain [2] - 348:7,
299:10, 300:21,	326:22, 327:2,	-	329:15, 330:11,	•••
300:24, 325:1,	327:13, 327:19,	279:22	334:13, 337:9,	356:18
300.24, 325.1, 325:13, 334:16,		recognized [1] - 281:8	348:11, 354:2	remainder [3] -
	328:1, 328:3, 328:9,	recognizes [2] -		284:10, 284:11,
334:22, 337:15,	328:14, 328:17,	281:3, 349:12	reduced [3] - 317:7,	284:18
343:15, 343:20,	328:22, 329:5,	recollection [1] -	332:14, 361:6	remarks [1] - 350:22
350:15, 350:21,	329:9, 329:12,	285:3	reduces [3] - 319:16,	Remediation [1] -
356:20, 357:3,	329:17, 329:24,	reconvene [2] - 323:4,	320:20, 320:21	273:22
358:8, 366:12, 367:4	330:3, 330:10,	338:1	reducing [6] - 303:16,	remediation [1] -
quickly [3] - 294:10,	330:15, 330:19,	reconvening [2] -	303:19, 315:9,	329:21
297:13, 370:4	330:22, 331:8,	338:7, 344:12	319:16, 336:4, 366:4	remedies [1] - 305:1
quite [2] - 281:14,	331:12, 331:18,	record [14] - 291:6,	reduction [11] - 278:2,	remember [1] - 306:7
288:15	331:21, 332:13,	291:11, 301:15,	292:15, 321:13,	renewable [1] - 276:6
quote [22] - 283:12,	332:16, 332:20,	324:15, 338:6,	322:4, 348:9,	reopen [1] - 368:16
287:8, 293:3,	333:7, 333:13,	344:10, 368:10,	349:13, 362:2,	reopened [1] - 368:18
305:21, 307:21,	333:16, 333:25,	368:16, 368:18,	362:3, 363:9, 366:2,	
307:23, 308:5,	334:7, 334:15,	368:20, 369:3,	366:6	repeat [2] - 338:23,
308:11, 308:17,	339:19, 341:16,	369:11, 370:16,	reductions [1] -	344:18
308:21, 308:22,	341:23, 342:4,	371:9	321:14	repetitive [1] - 274:12
309:1, 309:8,	342:8, 342:23,	RECORD [2] - 323:5,	reference [5] - 279:21,	reply [3] - 368:9,
309:11, 309:14,	343:4, 343:14		289:17, 293:1,	369:15, 369:16
309:23, 312:10,	RE [1] - 272:7	338:4	351:6, 356:6	report [3] - 285:2,
317:1, 317:3, 317:8,	reach [1] - 321:15	Recovery [2] - 275:7,	referenced [3] -	321:19, 330:24
329:10, 338:20	reachable [1] - 349:18	346:17		reported [4] - 320:24,
020.10, 000.20	reached [1] - 327:10	recross [5] - 298:22,	283:12, 298:11, 301:16	329:3, 362:17
D		299:1, 341:14,	301:16	reporter [1] - 273:25
R	read [10] - 294:13,	343:17	referred [1] - 306:2	Reporter/Notary [1] -
rafters [2] - 288:23,	302:20, 314:19, 219:12, 210:20	recycle [2] - 278:16,	referring [2] - 353:20,	371:21
327:16	318:13, 319:20,	308:10	354:6	represent [9] - 282:3,
	332:9, 333:17,	recycled [2] - 316:8,	reflect [1] - 338:17	291:5, 291:21,
rain [1] - 306:5	340:7, 341:17,	317:7	regard [3] - 309:14,	292:22, 310:15,
rainwater [1] - 342:21	364:19	recycling [31] -	347:23, 348:14	327:25, 347:17,
raise [2] - 274:19,	reading [1] - 341:20	275:24, 278:7,	regarding [9] - 279:6,	360:8, 360:10
344:17	reads [1] - 308:22	278:14, 278:15,	279:15, 279:16,	representations [1] -
raised [2] - 328:5,	ready [1] - 368:7	278:22, 283:21,	311:8, 350:22,	291:25
338:10	realize [1] - 330:4	285:21, 298:10,	358:8, 359:19,	representative [1] -
Ralph [1] - 341:6	realized [1] - 330:6	312:10, 313:2,	362:17, 366:13	•
ramifications [1] -	really [7] - 286:3,	313:5, 336:5,	regardless [2] - 356:9,	337:11
346:15	286:4, 286:24,	336:17, 347:24,	356:16	representatives [3] -
range [3] - 341:20,	312:2, 315:5,	348:13, 348:14,	regards [1] - 322:18	283:1, 314:14,
353:14, 354:19	342:15, 355:14	348:16, 348:20,	regulations [2] -	316:12
rate [4] - 290:18,	reason [1] - 277:20		309:1, 332:8	represented [3] -
		348:22, 348:25,	000.1, 002.0	286:12, 289:3, 343:5
• · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				

representing [3] -	resulting [4] - 348:8,	rules [2] - 323:24,	319:13, 320:16,	sense [1] - 288:4
345:9, 350:20, 359:7	365:15, 365:17,	323:25	321:1, 327:5	sent [3] - 298:3, 298:6,
represents [1] -	366:1	run [1] - 290:18	schedule [3] - 288:9,	353:10
366:16	results [2] - 360:19,		288:13, 368:15	sentence [1] - 312:9
request [2] - 281:22,	365:19	S	scheduling [1] -	separate [2] - 279:17,
308:2	resume [1] - 344:1		343:24	332:22
requested [1] - 365:23	resumed [1] - 323:7	S-020700-WD-N-A [1]	scientific [2] - 338:18,	served [3] - 346:18,
require [3] - 293:10,	retarder [1] - 322:8	- 272:10	343:10	346:22, 347:8
314:24, 361:15	reuse [1] - 308:10	S-20700-WC-N-A [1] -	scope [2] - 308:4,	service [1] - 276:15
required [1] - 352:1	reusing [1] - 336:4	273:12	308:5	serviced [1] - 353:9
requirement [1] -	reveals [1] - 314:20	Saco [9] - 344:4, 344:6, 344:14,	seagulls [1] - 364:1	SERVICES [1] - 272:7
352:7	revenue [4] - 315:23,	344:24, 345:10,	seats [1] - 338:3	Services [4] - 273:9,
requires [2] - 310:2, 318:19	315:25, 320:23,	350:9, 356:23,	second [9] - 277:12, 278:13, 279:9,	308:15, 322:2, 365:7
requiring [1] - 334:2	327:5 review [5] - 274:11,	356:25, 359:2	306:2, 307:7,	services [3] - 276:10, 308:4, 308:5
rescinded [1] - 353:16	363:7, 364:5, 364:8,	safety [1] - 359:25	342:18, 342:23,	serving [1] - 305:8
residences [2] -	364:24	sale [7] - 351:1,	352:17, 352:18	session [3] - 274:5,
294:25, 361:19	revised [8] - 360:24,	351:14, 351:23,	secondly [1] - 288:6	323:13, 323:22
residents [9] - 311:12,	361:14, 362:23,	351:25, 352:13,	secret [1] - 316:9	set [6] - 313:2, 352:21,
311:14, 359:25,	363:15, 363:23,	354:9, 355:15	Section [18] - 276:20,	358:21, 369:18,
360:1, 361:22,	364:11, 365:21,	SANBORN [38] -	282:15, 282:22,	370:16, 371:16
362:11, 364:9,	366:8	291:4, 291:8,	283:11, 283:16,	settling [2] - 306:4,
365:5, 366:16	RFP [1] - 308:4	291:20, 291:24,	286:7, 286:17,	342:20
residual [2] - 276:18,	RIDGE [1] - 272:8	292:9, 292:12,	286:18, 287:5,	seven [3] - 294:8,
360:14	Ridge [33] - 273:14,	293:3, 293:12,	308:17, 323:25,	307:3, 322:9
residue [2] - 276:18,	277:25, 278:4,	293:18, 293:25, 294:3, 294:6, 294:9,	338:20, 352:21,	several [4] - 275:23,
347:13	278:12, 283:15,	294:3, 294:0, 294:9, 294:15, 294:22,	361:14, 363:20, 363:23, 364:10,	287:19, 323:15,
resource [1] - 365:12	284:2, 286:1, 287:12, 302:23,	295:8, 295:14,	369:7	346:9
Resources [2] - 304:14, 307:19	303:23, 306:11,	295:16, 311:23,	section [9] - 278:14,	shall [7] - 282:23, 309:16, 324:4,
respect [3] - 340:4,	306:21, 307:8,	312:1, 319:20,	283:8, 283:17,	324:5, 331:23,
351:19, 369:25	308:1, 310:19,	320:15, 325:16,	283:21, 283:22,	352:19, 359:10
respects [1] - 277:10	313:25, 315:6,	325:23, 326:1,	352:1, 363:14,	shared [1] - 276:14
respond [3] - 274:22,	316:2, 316:24,	326:4, 326:9,	364:1, 369:9	short [1] - 303:18
279:10, 350:14	331:23, 344:11,	326:13, 326:16,	Sections [1] - 362:22	shorter [1] - 307:6
responded [2] -	347:6, 347:9,	326:19, 326:21,	secure [2] - 281:5,	shorthand [1] -
295:11, 367:8	347:14, 347:18,	327:1, 327:10,	281:9	371:10
responds [1] - 344:21	347:20, 348:4,	327:17, 327:24, 339:25, 340:6,	secured [1] - 281:11	shoulder [1] - 312:21
response [1] - 320:8	349:8, 350:2,	340:10	see [11] - 292:1, 322:6,	show [2] - 288:15,
responsibility [3] -	352:12, 354:21,	Sanborn [5] - 291:4,	325:14, 332:17,	334:21
298:12, 298:16,	359:20, 359:23 risk [1] - 300:8	291:14, 292:8,	333:4, 336:6, 336:8, 240:21, 241:6	shows [2] - 306:22,
305:15	road [4] - 326:12,	294:12, 295:10	340:21, 341:6, 341:10	339:1
responsible [4] - 276:10, 304:21,	326:20, 326:23,	Sanborns [3] - 279:5,	seeing [6] - 295:20,	shut [2] - 356:14,
276:10, 304:21, 352:19, 366:14	361:22	279:7, 325:12	323:1, 337:18,	356:18 shutting [2] - 356:3,
responsibly [1] -	Road [7] - 311:13,	Sanborns' [1] - 279:15	341:14, 356:23,	356:5
289:15	325:15, 325:21,	satisfaction [1] -	367:4	side [1] - 341:8
responsive [2] -	325:24, 326:8,	352:20	seek [1] - 362:19	Sierra [3] - 330:24,
362:21, 366:12	326:11, 335:5	satisfactorily [1] -	seem [2] - 294:11,	334:12, 342:16
rest [1] - 329:9	roadblocks [1] -	366:24 satisfied [4] - 352:23,	353:5	sign [3] - 282:12,
restricted [1] - 307:13	300:22	363:3, 363:6, 364:7	selection [1] - 305:8	306:22, 314:14
resubmit [1] - 322:19	robust [1] - 278:14	satisfy [2] - 285:10,	self [1] - 305:8	signatories [1] - 286:8
result [14] - 273:14,	rodents [1] - 364:3	353:1	self-serving [1] -	signatory [2] - 282:12,
278:3, 279:8,	round [2] - 277:12,	Saturday [1] - 364:13	305:8	314:13
280:10, 298:24,	294:10 Route [3] - 325:22,	save [1] - 316:5	seller [4] - 352:18, 352:19, 352:20,	signed [2] - 308:16,
327:20, 349:18,	341:2, 361:15	savings [1] - 321:16	352:19, 352:20, 352:23	354:8
355:13, 356:1, 356:2, 356:4	route [1] - 326:3	saw [2] - 293:16,	seller's [1] - 353:1	significant [3] - 348:9,
356:2, 356:4, 358:13, 363:5,	routes [1] - 361:13	329:7	send [1] - 353:13	349:22, 366:2
366:20	rule [1] - 313:12	scenario [5] - 301:20,	sending [1] - 327:4	signing [3] - 309:8, 351:9, 352:5
			•••	001.0, 002.0

42 of 46 sheets

simple [1] - 317:2	319:5	331:20, 332:11,	291:3, 292:15,	station [1] - 367:22
simplistic [1] - 300:2	soon [1] - 306:23	332:14, 332:19,	292:17, 292:20,	statutes [2] - 307:9,
simply [3] - 321:23,	Sorry [1] - 287:21	332:23, 333:10,	292:21, 292:23,	309:2
352:6, 358:18	sorry [6] - 290:18,	333:15, 333:24,	293:2, 293:10,	stay [2] - 317:16,
single [10] - 303:20,	292:10, 299:14,	334:3, 334:14,	295:3, 295:4,	364:16
329:14, 340:21,	339:22, 351:20,	334:25, 335:3,	296:21, 296:23,	steep [1] - 342:12
348:16, 348:20,	357:10	335:11, 335:15,	297:5, 297:7,	step [1] - 302:8
348:22, 349:17,	sort [21] - 283:20,	335:20, 336:1,	298:13, 300:5,	steps [3] - 330:5,
354:5, 354:16, 355:6	287:2, 293:13,	336:6, 336:12,	300:7, 300:15,	334:8, 334:11
sitting [1] - 329:7	294:23, 294:25,	336:14, 336:19,	307:10, 307:14,	stewards [1] - 322:2
situation [1] - 351:18	298:10, 336:17,	337:2, 337:13,	307:22, 307:25,	still [12] - 281:7,
six [2] - 294:7, 363:19	342:24, 348:16,	337:24, 338:12,	308:15, 309:2,	293:13, 313:3,
slightly [1] - 307:6	348:20, 348:22,	341:22, 342:1,	309:7, 310:2, 310:3,	320:11, 336:8,
smell [2] - 311:9,	349:17, 354:6,	342:7, 342:11,	310:4, 310:5, 311:6,	341:10, 341:11,
322:13	354:16, 355:6,	343:2, 343:10	312:7, 312:11,	342:20, 353:12,
snapshot [1] - 305:23	367:14, 367:18,	Spencer [4] - 279:11,	312:13, 312:14,	353:17, 361:18
snow [1] - 275:16	367:21, 367:22,	328:1, 334:24,	312:19, 314:5,	stood [1] - 313:9
snowy [1] - 275:17	370:6, 370:10	341:16	314:22, 314:25,	stream [10] - 277:11,
soft [1] - 360:15	sought [1] - 348:16	spent [1] - 317:13	315:11, 316:3,	307:13, 315:1,
sole [1] - 308:12	sound [3] - 274:16,	SPO [5] - 307:20,	316:12, 317:15,	315:10, 320:24,
solely [2] - 352:19,	285:4, 317:6	308:2, 309:5, 313:8,	318:18, 319:12,	322:3, 337:9,
358:13	sounded [1] - 288:25	316:11	320:18, 321:3,	360:18, 361:11,
solicit [2] - 299:12,	sounds [1] - 343:12	stable [1] - 276:14	321:6, 342:20, 346:21, 346:24,	366:21
299:15	source [5] - 280:13,	staff [5] - 273:24,	340.21, 340.24, 347:5, 347:24,	streams [2] - 317:1,
solicitor [1] - 345:7	303:20, 309:17,	283:5, 299:5, 357:3,	347:25, 348:3,	332:22
SOLID [1] - 272:9	348:9, 366:2	367:7	348:4, 348:6, 348:7,	Street [2] - 272:19,
solid [63] - 273:12,	sources [9] - 273:13,	stand [2] - 274:18, 344:17	349:4, 349:5,	273:3
275:22, 275:25,	277:2, 277:4,	standard [3] - 364:11,	349:12, 349:16,	stress [1] - 289:4
276:7, 277:2, 277:5,	298:13, 309:18, 346:7, 349:14,	364:15, 364:17	349:25, 350:4,	stricken [4] - 319:23,
277:9, 277:13,	355:13, 360:4	standardized [1] -	353:25, 355:3,	320:7, 339:8, 339:24
277:16, 277:24,	Sources [1] - 313:25	288:8	355:5, 355:8,	strike [2] - 339:20, 355:15
278:6, 278:10,	SOURCES [1] - 272:9	standards [1] - 364:25	355:12, 355:18,	struck [5] - 319:19,
278:19, 278:23, 279:12, 280:15,	southerly [1] - 326:5	stands [1] - 332:12	355:19, 356:1,	319:21, 319:25,
283:14, 284:7,	southern [5] - 306:11,	start [7] - 301:9,	358:12, 358:13,	320:1, 320:11
284:8, 285:2,	314:2, 346:20,	313:17, 315:13,	358:22, 358:23,	structure [1] - 276:11
285:20, 287:8,	347:7, 349:23	325:12, 333:13,	365:4, 365:6, 365:8,	structured [1] - 287:8
287:9, 287:14,	span [2] - 303:12,	338:12, 342:12	365:11, 365:13,	study [2] - 331:1,
288:1, 296:14,	303:18	starting [2] - 322:9,	365:18, 365:20,	338:18
308:20, 309:10,	speaking [1] - 345:10	344:12	365:24, 366:4, 366:7	subject [4] - 310:18,
312:9, 312:12,	specific [5] - 280:20,	starts [1] - 304:15	State [8] - 272:19,	310:20, 353:20,
312:13, 316:23,	310:12, 331:21,	STATE [2] - 272:1,	273:3, 273:9,	358:14
317:3, 317:4, 332:8,	349:23, 361:12	272:7	307:18, 312:22, 313:23, 321:25,	submission [2] -
335:24, 346:7,	specifically [7] -	state [125] - 273:13,	371:4	314:16, 368:14
346:11, 346:14,	277:4, 279:7, 303:1,	276:16, 276:24,	state's [4] - 308:8,	submit [3] - 274:8,
346:19, 347:10,	305:3, 315:2, 315:3,	277:4, 277:5,	308:20, 309:10,	369:9, 369:13
347:18, 347:22,	355:17	277:13, 277:15,	349:11	submittals [1] - 361:9
348:1, 348:4,	specified [1] - 369:12	277:16, 277:21, 270:0, 270:10	state-owned [3] -	submitted [5] -
348:12, 349:1, 240:2, 240:5, 240:7	specifies [1] - 364:11	279:9, 279:19, 280:1, 280:6, 280:8,	307:14, 310:4, 347:5	273:10, 281:15,
349:2, 349:5, 349:7,	SPENCER [51] -	280:1, 280:6, 280:8, 280:11, 280:13,	state-wide [1] -	317:22, 330:20,
349:10, 349:11, 350:1, 350:3, 360:4	302:13, 302:19,	280.11, 280.13, 281:10, 283:12,	347:24	333:25
350:1, 350:3, 360:4, 360:6, 360:9,	307:5, 328:2, 328:8, 328:13, 328:16	284:6, 284:8,	statement [3] -	submitting [1] - 279:3
360:10, 365:11,	328:13, 328:16, 328:21, 329:1,	284:12, 284:14,	328:18, 343:11,	subsequent [1] -
366:5, 367:20	329:8, 329:11,	284:21, 284:24,	355:22	352:4
Solid [2] - 273:23,	329:16, 329:23,	285:4, 285:10,	statements [2] -	substance [1] - 324:25
302:23	330:2, 330:6,	285:18, 286:14,	304:16, 314:18	substantial [5] -
solution [4] - 306:24,	330:14, 330:18,	287:1, 287:2, 289:1,	states [5] - 287:7,	276:12, 277:3,
315:7, 319:4, 346:18	330:21, 331:7,	289:5, 289:8, 289:9,	316:7, 324:1,	347:4, 347:21,
somewhere [1] -	331:11, 331:16,	289:13, 289:15,	352:18, 364:14	349:24

aubtract (4) 204:7	333:22, 334:9,	281:15, 282:9,	title [1] - 312:15	281:24, 281:25,
subtract [1] - 294:7				
successful [1] -	348:10, 349:2,	283:7, 283:11,	titled [2] - 302:22,	302:20, 306:9,
293:13	362:25, 366:3, 366:5	284:6, 285:18,	307:7	332:14, 343:7,
successfully [2] -	systems [5] - 305:5,	291:21, 295:9,	TO [1] - 272:8	350:10, 361:23
281:11, 313:17	322:7, 322:8,	297:12, 298:25,	today [10] - 273:19,	totals [2] - 319:1,
succinct [1] - 312:8	329:20, 338:22	300:3, 302:5, 302:8,	274:1, 274:7, 275:6,	319:11
suffer [1] - 311:18	Systems [5] - 276:21,	302:9, 302:18,	283:7, 324:15,	toward [2] - 276:13,
suffering [1] - 311:16	298:18, 316:10,	302:20, 307:7,	326:14, 327:7,	326:24
sufficient [3] - 277:11,	348:19, 362:18	307:16, 310:7,	335:24, 367:12	town [8] - 310:16,
363:4, 364:6		310:11, 310:17,	together [5] - 281:23,	335:9, 336:7, 336:9,
suggest [4] - 294:12,	Т	311:25, 319:19,	332:21, 333:12,	336:16, 336:17,
312:5, 327:3, 354:25	•	320:6, 322:24,	354:13, 354:14	367:14, 367:18
suggesting [1] -	table [2] - 313:20,	322:25, 323:14,	ton [8] - 287:17,	Town [23] - 272:9,
353:13	344:25	324:1, 324:10,	306:14, 315:24,	306:11, 307:12,
	talks [2] - 287:6, 290:4	324:11, 324:17,	327:9, 327:11,	311:13, 311:14,
suggestions [2] -	target [1] - 319:12	325:18, 327:2,	335:14, 335:19,	334:24, 335:2,
316:16, 316:17	targeted [2] - 313:2,	328:4, 329:6,	336:11	335:4, 335:13,
sulfur [1] - 332:14	319:2	329:25, 330:4,		
summaries [2] -		330:20, 330:24,	tonnage [9] - 278:23,	359:3, 359:8, 359:9, 359:10, 359:15
310:8, 322:24	technically [1] -	334:1, 335:23,	279:20, 279:22,	359:10, 359:15,
summarize [1] -	365:18		280:6, 284:12,	359:20, 359:22,
302:18	techniques [1] - 304:5	335:24, 337:21,	290:8, 298:14,	360:12, 364:9,
summary [13] - 274:2,	telephones [1] -	338:9, 338:13,	319:3, 319:12	366:15, 366:16,
274:25, 275:1,	274:15	339:5, 339:8,	tons [72] - 276:7,	367:4, 367:13, 368:1
275:10, 302:8,	temporary [2] -	339:20, 339:21,	276:24, 277:1,	Town's [1] - 335:9
302:9, 304:15,	293:19, 302:1	339:23, 340:3,	277:4, 277:13,	town's [1] - 336:3
309:24, 322:25,	ten [4] - 281:18,	340:4, 340:5, 342:5,	277:16, 278:1,	towns [1] - 276:13
344:3, 344:5,	344:25, 348:17,	343:23, 344:3,	278:10, 278:18,	traffic [14] - 278:3,
344:13, 359:2	350:10	344:5, 344:13,	279:19, 280:5,	315:9, 317:18,
sums [1] - 317:2	tenth [5] - 326:11,	344:23, 345:1,	283:16, 284:1,	317:21, 319:16,
Sunday [1] - 364:13	340:15, 340:18,	345:13, 350:22,	284:6, 285:3,	319:24, 321:15,
_	340:20, 361:18	351:5, 353:2, 353:6,	285:16, 290:11,	322:4, 325:19,
suppliers [1] - 281:2	term [3] - 282:19,	353:24, 353:25,	290:15, 290:17,	339:11, 362:3,
supplies [1] - 281:5	301:25, 310:13	355:3, 359:1, 359:3,	293:19, 293:23,	362:4, 362:14,
supply [1] - 280:3	terminate [1] - 286:25	359:9, 368:1	294:10, 294:11,	366:18
support [16] - 282:17,		thereby [3] - 348:8,	294:13, 297:18,	transaction [1] -
282:23, 282:25,	terminated [3] -	349:1, 366:1	297:22, 298:6,	300:16
287:6, 296:8,	286:19, 286:24,	therefore [4] - 303:16,	300:4, 302:2,	
304:25, 305:12,	287:1	311:16, 314:15,		transcript [1] - 368:6
307:21, 335:24,	termination [4] -	360:2	314:20, 314:21,	transcription [1] -
346:11, 351:19,	286:7, 286:17,		314:22, 315:19,	291:10
352:2, 352:6,	286:21, 287:3	they've [1] - 295:2	315:20, 315:25,	transfer [2] - 347:3,
352:25, 353:5,	terms [13] - 282:13,	third [3] - 319:4,	316:1, 316:2,	367:22
353:22	284:12, 288:4,	319:13, 320:4	317:16, 317:19,	transport [1] - 362:4
supportive [1] - 283:3	288:12, 288:16,	Thompson [1] - 359:7	317:24, 318:22,	transportation [6] -
supports [3] - 346:8,	298:7, 300:2,	thoughts [1] - 321:22	318:23, 318:24,	300:13, 317:11,
350:5, 366:3	300:12, 300:16,	thousand [1] - 314:20	318:25, 319:1,	318:5, 318:7,
surface [1] - 342:3	349:23, 352:20,	threat [2] - 306:1,	319:6, 319:9,	361:13, 366:18
surprise [1] - 297:16	353:20, 357:6	307:6	319:10, 319:11,	transporting [1] -
surrounding [2] -	test [1] - 338:15	Threat [1] - 302:24	319:14, 320:17,	347:3
• • •	testified [3] - 323:15,	three [11] - 277:19,	320:18, 321:3,	travel [2] - 326:10,
346:14, 353:23	328:17, 330:15	284:24, 304:22,	321:7, 321:11,	340:15
suspect [1] - 353:11	testify [4] - 323:21,	305:17, 311:12,	327:4, 327:11,	traveling [4] - 325:20,
swapping [1] - 280:13	329:17, 339:20,	316:20, 318:2,	346:23, 347:10,	341:5, 361:20
swear [1] - 344:14	371:6	318:10, 318:12,	348:5, 349:4,	treats [1] - 322:21
sworn [4] - 274:18,		320:20, 340:23	349:15, 355:5,	
344:15, 344:16,	testifying [3] - 274:18,	thresholds [1] -	355:7, 355:17,	Tree [3] - 354:8,
371:6	344:17, 344:24	278:23	355:23, 355:25,	354:13, 357:8
synthetic [2] - 330:16,	testimony [84] - 274:2,		358:10, 358:19,	triggering [1] - 349:22
332:3	274:20, 274:25,	throughout [2] -		trips [2] - 339:15,
system [12] - 296:15,	275:1, 275:11,	281:13, 310:21	360:6, 365:24	362:9
317:4, 329:14,	276:20, 278:25,	throw [2] - 335:4,	top [1] - 308:5	TRS [4] - 331:25,
330:7, 332:7,	279:1, 279:3, 279:6,	337:4	total [9] - 279:18,	332:12, 332:17,
···· , ··· ·· ,				

332:18	335:11, 356:15	305:12, 311:4,	289:1, 289:5, 289:9,	365:6, 365:9,
truck [26] - 278:3,	umbrella [2] - 310:10	314:17, 317:18	289:12, 289:15,	365:10, 365:12,
306:10, 315:9,	under [22] - 278:23,	variation [1] - 329:2	289:19, 292:4,	365:14, 365:18,
317:17, 317:21,	280:3, 282:15,	variety [1] - 284:22	292:5, 292:16,	366:2, 366:4, 366:5,
319:16, 319:24,	280:3, 282:13, 282:22, 285:14,	various [2] - 277:2,	292:21, 292:24,	366:7, 366:20,
320:7, 320:20,	, ,	••	293:2, 293:10,	367:20
, ,	290:9, 290:15,	280:2	293:11, 293:17,	
320:22, 321:14,	292:19, 293:23,	vector [4] - 361:6,		Waste [15] - 273:22,
322:4, 322:6,	297:17, 298:7,	361:8, 363:24, 364:7	296:14, 296:22,	273:23, 276:21,
325:19, 339:6,	298:10, 298:12,	vectors [3] - 363:8,	296:23, 297:5,	298:18, 302:23,
339:7, 339:9, 320:11, 330:15	308:4, 308:5,	364:1, 366:19	297:8, 299:13,	304:13, 307:8,
339:11, 339:15,	309:20, 313:4,	vehicle [1] - 341:3	300:6, 300:16,	307:17, 313:25,
362:2, 362:3, 362:6,	331:21, 340:1,	vendors [2] - 284:22,	301:10, 303:6,	316:10, 348:19,
362:9, 362:14,	363:23, 365:18,	284:25	304:1, 306:12,	354:8, 354:13,
366:18	370:2	version [1] - 319:25	307:1, 307:10,	357:8, 362:18
trucking [1] - 302:25	undercut [1] - 299:19	view [1] - 289:8	307:13, 307:14,	waste-to-energy [8] -
trucks [15] - 311:1,	understood [1] -	vigorously [1] -	307:15, 307:21,	275:24, 276:5,
311:10, 320:21,	293:20	308:14	308:8, 308:10,	276:18, 287:15,
325:19, 326:2,	unfortunately [1] -	VOCs [1] - 338:25	308:14, 308:17,	288:2, 307:1,
326:4, 326:23,	346:22	volume [2] - 302:15,	308:20, 309:11,	338:17, 365:14
340:14, 340:21,	unique [3] - 276:11,	317:14	309:20, 309:21,	wastes [2] - 303:23,
340:23, 341:3,	278:14, 283:21		309:25, 310:5,	364:14
361:15, 361:18,	unit [1] - 306:18	W	310:14, 311:6,	watch [1] - 358:21
361:20, 361:24	University [2] -		312:1, 312:9,	water [1] - 342:21
true [4] - 282:15,	306:20, 363:2	waive [2] - 351:13,	312:12, 312:13,	wave [3] - 306:2,
283:15, 329:22,	unloaded [1] - 303:25	351:22	312:25, 313:5,	342:18, 342:23
371:9	unprocessed [2] -	waived [1] - 352:11	313:18, 314:2,	ways [2] - 275:4,
truth [8] - 274:20,	309:17, 310:14	walk [1] - 340:21	314:3, 314:5, 314:6,	315:16
274:21, 344:19,	unquote [1] - 312:15	Wanda [1] - 310:15	314:8, 314:23,	weak [1] - 312:25
344:20, 371:7	unsupported [1] -	warmer [1] - 310:23	315:1, 315:9,	Webb [2] - 328:17,
try [2] - 276:9, 369:24	305:8	warming [1] - 303:10	315:11, 315:17,	330:15
trying [2] - 289:4,	up [30] - 277:1, 279:2,	warranted [1] - 320:19	316:3, 316:15,	Webb's [4] - 329:6,
369:6	279:4, 284:1,	WASTE [1] - 272:9	316:24, 316:25,	329:25, 342:5, 343:4
turn [4] - 326:7,	284:13, 285:15,	waste [206] - 273:13,	317:3, 317:4, 317:6,	week [2] - 322:9,
326:23, 330:22,	288:15, 290:3,	275:22, 275:24,	317:15, 318:18,	337:5
345:4	294:13, 297:14,	275:25, 276:5,	320:19, 321:3,	weekly [1] - 290:10
turning [2] - 283:10,	297:22, 298:6,	276:7, 276:10,	321:6, 321:21,	weeks [1] - 345:13
286:6	300:6, 300:21,	276:16, 276:18,	322:3, 332:2, 332:8,	welcome [1] - 275:3
turns [1] - 304:7	302:11, 317:2,	276:24, 277:2,	332:24, 335:2,	welfare [1] - 359:25
twin [1] - 345:10	327:11, 333:17,	277:6, 277:9,	335:25, 336:15,	West [1] - 307:12
two [22] - 274:1,	335:4, 336:15,	277:11, 277:13,	336:23, 337:4,	Westbrook [2] -
276:1, 279:3,	339:7, 340:10,	277:15, 277:17,	337:8, 337:9,	314:7, 347:4
284:24, 286:10,	341:2, 342:13,	277:21, 277:24,	338:17, 346:7,	wet [1] - 331:3
292:2, 292:4,	345:14, 347:10,	278:6, 278:7,	346:11, 346:14,	whereby [1] - 299:11
294:11, 302:20,	349:17, 358:7,	278:10, 278:19,	346:19, 346:24,	WHEREOF [1] -
304:21, 305:16,	360:6, 362:18	278:23, 279:9,	347:3, 347:10,	371:16
312:19, 312:21,	upheld [2] - 320:5	279:12, 279:19,	347:18, 347:22,	whole [5] - 274:20,
314:4, 316:19,	upshifting [1] - 322:8	280:3, 280:6, 280:8,	347:25, 348:1,	283:22, 344:19,
317:14, 317:17,	upstate [1] - 365:9	280:11, 280:13,	348:4, 348:6, 348:9,	350:4, 371:7
318:14, 319:5,	upwards [1] - 354:18	280:15, 281:2,	348:12, 349:1,	wide [1] - 347:24
322:17, 322:19,	useful [1] - 306:1	283:14, 283:17,	349:2, 349:4, 349:5,	wide [1] - 347.24 wife [4] - 291:5,
338:15	uses [3] - 305:7,	284:1, 284:7, 284:8,	349:7, 349:10,	291:24, 310:15,
typed [1] - 302:21	330:16, 341:18	284:12, 284:14,	349:11, 349:13,	291.24, 310.15, 340:11
types [1] - 325:1	utilize [1] - 284:9	284:21, 284:24,	349:14, 349:16,	wife's [1] - 291:7
typical [1] - 305:10	utilized [1] - 279:13	285:2, 285:4,	350:1, 350:3, 355:5,	
typically [1] - 338:24	atilized [1] * 279.10	285:10, 285:20,	355:8, 358:22,	willing [1] - 318:20
	V	285:22, 287:8,	358:23, 360:4,	windows [1] - 310:24
U	v	287:9, 287:14,	360:7, 360:9,	winter [1] - 298:1
	vacuum [1] - 300:11	287:15, 288:1,	360:10, 360:18,	wire [1] - 370:3
U.S.A [1] - 286:12	valuable [1] - 311:2	288:2, 288:6,	361:11, 361:15,	wisdom [2] - 304:16,
um-hum [3] - 329:11,	value [5] - 304:25,	288:13, 288:23,	363:16, 363:18,	306:12
	ταίας _[0] - 00π.20,	,	363:20, 365:4,	wish [6] - 291:2,

299:1, 337:17, 356:22, 366:9, 367:3 withdraw [1] - 322:19 within-named [1] - 371:6 witness [4] - 296:25, 297:3, 324:17, 368:1	yesterday's [1] - 289:16 yup [3] - 326:16, 328:13, 330:21 Yup [1] - 328:8 Z
WITNESS [1] - 371:16	_
Witness [1] - 344:21 witness' [1] - 324:10 witnesses [2] - 274:8, 371:6 Witnesses [1] - 274:22 words [4] - 286:23, 293:7, 317:2, 327:22 workers [1] - 288:9 write [1] - 340:7 writing [3] - 274:9, 368:12, 369:10 written [2] - 286:20, 328:10 wrote [1] - 295:25	zero [13] - 292:5, 293:13, 294:23, 294:24, 298:10, 317:17, 336:16, 367:14, 367:18, 367:20, 367:22, 370:5, 370:10
Y	
yard [1] - 353:14 yards [6] - 360:22, 360:23, 361:1, 361:3, 361:4 year [25] - 275:21, 277:2, 277:12, 278:1, 280:2, 292:17, 294:4, 294:6, 308:17, 310:21, 320:21, 331:10, 347:10, 350:2, 351:10, 350:2, 351:10, 353:11, 360:6, 360:13, 361:1, 361:2, 361:4, 361:24, 362:1, 362:9, 362:10 year-round [1] - 277:12 years [19] - 275:23, 292:3, 296:16, 303:16, 306:22, 309:4, 322:15, 342:15, 342:16, 343:5, 346:1, 346:3, 346:4, 346:22, 348:1, 348:17, 353:11, 354:18 yesterday [10] - 281:22, 293:4, 299:21, 300:21, 309:5, 324:23, 328:18, 329:6, 342:4, 364:20	

293:13, 294:23, 294:24, 298:10, 317:17, 336:16, 367:14, 367:18, 367:20, 367:22, 370:5, 370:10	