

PLAINFIELD TOWNSHIP  
SPECIAL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
FEBRUARY 26, 2025

The special meeting of the Plainfield Township Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, February 26, 2025, at the Plainfield Township Fire Hall, located at 6480 Sullivan Trail, Nazareth, PA 18064.

Chairman, Paul Levits, called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

The Pledge of Allegiance was performed.

**ROLL CALL:**

The following Commissioners answered roll call: Paul Levits, Glenn Geissinger, Allen Shafer, Terry Kleintop and Robin Dingle

Also present were Administrative Assistant, Amy Kahler, Doreen Curtin, Zoning Officer, Solicitor, David Backenstoe, and Dave Crowther, Keystone Consulting Engineers.

**CURRENT/NEW BUSINESS:**

1. Grand Central Sanitary Landfill, Inc. and Slate Spring Farms, LLC.- Waste Management-Zoning Amendment Application- *Rezoning Request*

Chairman, Paul Levits, reviewed prior meetings and asked Waste Management Representatives if they wanted to proceed.

Attorney, Craig Davis, reviewed questions and answers from the January 29, 2025 Planning Commission meeting and a follow up letter dated February 10<sup>th</sup> which was submitted to the Planning Commission.

Chairman, Paul Levits, indicated that we will most likely be having at least 1 more meeting and then possibly moving forward with a decision. Mr. Levits asked about the health assessment and how PFAS can have an impact on this study. Waste Management Representative responded that we have the most current system which processes any of the PFAS that might be on site. This is the reverse osmosis, and the system is checked on a regular basis and filters are changed on a routine basis.

Chairman, Paul Levits, questioned if the runoff that is discharging into the creek has been tested? Waste Management Representative indicated that it has not. There is no regulation for testing the runoff.

Commissioner, Terry Kleintop, asked Waste Management if the runoff is not being tested how do we know that the reverse osmosis system is working. Waste Management Representative

advised that they are following the regulations and requirements, the runoff into the creek is not required to be tested. Waste Management reviews the required numbers during the discharge stage and all the reports are filed with the DEP. If the request is approved, we would have to comply with the NPDES permitting requirements. The state will identify what we need to monitor, and they will review our reports. Commissioner, Robin Dingle, inquired if Waste Management would be able to report/provide the before and after reports, including percentage removed due to the creek water not being tested? Waste Management Representative. Stated that the reports are sent to DEP and the Township for review monthly, the reports have been trending the same. If the percentage of the runoff testing increases, Waste Management will receive notification from DEP that additional information would be required or that we would need to stop the processing.

Chairman, Paul Levits, requested confirmation of the Tri-color Bat species being endangered. The Waste Management Representative specified that when the study was completed, there were no species found.

Chairman, Paul Levits, inquired about the size of the slope (height, what is on it) and if this portion would be developed later. Waste Management Representative advised that the response was provided within the letter, and that the grading will occur around the basin just as previously completed on the current landfill. Waste Management advised that a full explanation of the grade design will be submitted if the rezoning is approved and when the Land Development is submitted.

Chairman, Paul Levits, inquired if Waste Management currently accepts radioactive waste, and how much is from out of state. The Waste Management Representative advised that they accept medical waste, and with that comes testing and that is completed every time. If it is discovered to be within a certain load, those trucks are isolated until it is determined what exactly it is and how to dispose of it. Waste Management Representative advised that since lowering the tonnage amount, about 60% of the trash comes from within the state and 40% from out of state.

Chairman, Paul Levits, inquired if the rezoning is approved will the same gas collection system be placed in the new proposed landfill and will the system run underground from the old landfill. Waste Management Representative indicated that there are miles of pipe located within the current landfill. Every time a new cell is installed more pipes are also installed. With the potential for approval, we will be looking at installing a booster, which will also help with the expelling of gases.

Chairman, Paul Levits inquired about the breakdown of charitable contributions that have been provided by Waste Management. If the rezoning is not approved what percentage of employment would be lost and has it been investigated what the net loss would be. He also inquired if it has been thought about placing a transfer station at the potential new lot. Waste Management Representative responded and advised that there could potentially be only 1 employee within the office monitoring the system, which would be a loss of approximately 150 jobs.

Chairman, Paul Levits, inquired the specifics of the current agreement. Waste Management is asking for a change in zoning district, this will greatly impact the community. Solicitor

Backenstoe, advised per Act 101, the decision is under review by the Board of Supervisors, Mr. Backenstoe cautions the discussion of information due to negotiations currently with Waste Management. Waste Management advised that a discussion of agreements can takeplace when the time is right.

Commissioner, Robin Dingle, implied that we have received clarification on some of the questionable items, but the Planning Commission still is unclear on how some of the reports can be 5+ years old. Ms. Dingle asked for further information regarding the PFAS processing and equipment information. Ms. Dingle recommended looking at different noise concepts, other than the beeping to alert. Waste Management Representatives reviewed the information about the alerting of truck vehicles, that there are different options and they are just not economically suitable, they do not last as long and would be harsher on the equipment always out of commission if it does not work. Waste Management advised that they cannot currently expand the current Landfill as is, due to air space being depleted as of August 1, 2028, DEP expressed that it could possibly take 4 years to have the permitting approved and/or completed.

Commissioner, Terry Kleintop, requested information for each of the municipalities, Waste Management, indicated that this information is put out every year in their mailers. Mr. Kleintop also questioned the use of the buffer of the potential new rezoning parcel and complying with the Conservation District's easements. Waste Management advised that we're complying with the parcel lines, if we were to comply and follow the easements, they would reshape the property. Waste Management indicated that they are taking into consideration the surrounding farmland along with the rental properties already on the existing areas.

Commissioner, Glenn Geissinger, asked Waste Management if they could review what they use and the process of odor remediation that they currently utilize. Waste Management Representative provided the review of the process and installation of pipes, which includes vacuums, neutralizing systems which can be transported around the landfill if there is a large amount of smell.

Commissioner, Terry Kleintop asked Solicitor Backenstoe about fair share. Solicitor Backenstoe advised that the landfill and Plainfield Township does not have a fair share agreement. Mr. Backenstoe advised that these agreements are usually with apartment buildings. Once comprehensive plans are reviewed, updated, and approved by the Board of Supervisors.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT – AGENDA/NON-AGENDA ITEMS:**

- **Jane Mellert**

Resident, Jane Mellert, handed out a packet to all Commissioners. Ms. Mellert read over a letter and reviewed land areas. Plainfield Township took the time over the years to preserve the land. Ms. Mellert expressed how the farmers can not afford to out bid companies wanting to purchase their land to build warehouses etc., and not maintain preserved farmland. Ms. Mellert feels that there are many residents that will not speak out of fear of retaliation. This will not be the end.

- **JR Renna**

Resident, JR Renna voiced his opinion as how the Township has saved \$14 million and that he feels that there is no reason the landfill needs to remain in Plainfield Township. Mr. Renna expressed that there are many more years to come with the current landfill, and Plainfield Township has time to adjust the budget. Mr. Renna indicated that Waste Management probably does not contribute to the community out of their own good hearts. Waste Management cannot wait to expand and build a mound over what they contribute money to make nice. Articles and reports indicate that Waste Management helps everyone, so they should be able to assist their own employees to look for new employment. Mr. Renna expressed that the odor and quality of life is being harmed. Mr. Renna asked how other communities that do not have landfills still maintain recreational fields, trails, buildings etc.

- **Maria Multisch**

Ms. Maria Multisch advised that she is a neighbor to the landfill and is probably the closest. Ms. Maria supports the rezoning, indicating that Waste Management has been a part of Plainfield Township and surrounding communities since the 1950's. Waste Management maintains the largest contributor to all areas, does not request anything back. Ms. Multisch indicated that they do not have too, other companies do not. If rezoning is denied, all the employees will lose their jobs.

- **Wayne Muller-**

Mr. Muller advised that he reviews numbers along with statistics and wants new information. Mr. Muller provided some of the following questions when looking at a rezoning request: Who has indicated how long the actual landfill will remain open, how has the new landfill been looked at, income, mills, what is the benefit for the residents to expand the landfill? What is the decay time frame of radioactive waste? Mr. Muller feels these items should be reviewed and taken under advisement. Since our taxes were raised, we should expect a bigger return, the residents need answers.

- **Paul Romano-**

Mr. Romano revealed that he supports the rezoning of the landfill. The world is changing. How many of us throw items in the trash that probably should not be? Mr. Romano indicated that anyone could go and take a tour, they report on anything and everything, like if a vehicle is broken, something is not working etc. Residents are speaking about the trash blowing around, yes of course it is blowing everywhere and anywhere. When your trash is blowing down the road, are you going to pick it up, no but Waste Management does. Waste Management cleans up the fields, with permission to enter properties. Mr. Romano indicated that Waste Management does so much for our community without asking sometimes. Residents and Boards allow warehouses to come in and are tax free for 5 years, but you don't hear anyone complaining about that.

- **Millie Beahn**

Ms. Beahn indicated that Waste Management provides all the information that we already know. In 2000 Plainfield Township voted to not make the hill into a mountain. Ms. Beahn questioned if we are all going to sit here and argue overpaying the garbage bill over our own health. Ms. Beahn indicated that we are sacrificing zones. Green Knight Economical Development is a good company and yes, they all provide jobs, but we have provided a landfill for years, now it needs to move.

- **Joe Barabas**

Mr. Barabas asked if Plainfield Township has looked at the plans, reviewed the information, and the impact that it will have on Residents and surrounding Towns/Municipalities. Mr. Barabas supports Waste Management and their rezoning request, they do a great job maintaining their business, just like anyone else. Mr. Barabas asked the Planning Commissioners if they have thought of a plan to suggest to the Board of Supervisors if Waste Management is shut down.

- **Andrew Nechetsky**

Mr. Nechetsky stated that Green Knight Economic Company is doing great things, they are funded by Waste Management. Mr. Nechetsky indicated that he is a board member, coach, Officer of a Lodge, Volunteer Fire Fighter, and sees what the importance of the assistance of having Waste Management in our neighborhood does. Mr. Nechetsky reported that he has lived in other places and continues to come back. Mr. Nechetsky has played on the Green and White Fields and continues to coach on them. The cost of living has gone up, but what will you do if Waste Management closes. Who is going to assist in the cost of maintaining the fields, keeping the cost of sports down so our next generations can benefit from them? Waste Management does not question if a league needs help, they assist and give it to them. They also give to other municipalities; they assist with maintaining our current playgrounds and building new ones. The landfill operation has been in effect since 1951, and we knew it when we all moved here and no one has moved away. Mr. Andrew Nechetsky advised that he currently works at a Natural Gas company and the operations are more heavily regulated than that. If the landfill is not granted this rezoning, the impact will affect millions of lives.

- **Tighe Scott**

Mr. Scott advised that he feels that we need an Engineer that can complete an in-depth study on the information and the background of the landfill. Mr. Scott recommended that everyone should take a tour of the landfill. Mr. Scott does not feel that we have the appropriate staff to make an educated decision on the rezoning of Farm & Forest zoning.

- **Justin Huratiak**

Mr. Huratiak advised that Washington Township has not made a formal approach, and that the Planning Commission is an advisory board. Mr. Huratiak advised that Plainfield Township is not the only Municipality that the Landfill effects. Mr. Huratiak voiced that there is no accountability, and the residents need to move forward by acting ourselves.

Chairman, Paul Levits, indicated that this is the last call for anyone to speak that has not yet.

Resident, Jane Mellert, requested that the Commissioners review the trials and full information. The information that is being reported does not match what was reported in 1997.

Chairman, Paul Levits, asked the Commission members how they would recommend moving forward with either tabling the rezoning or move forward with a vote?

Commissioner, Robin Dingle, requested that the matter be tabled due to the Board of Supervisors currently waiting for a document from the auditor that was previously requested.

Solicitor Backenstoe, indicated that the Board of Supervisors had previously asked to have a study completed and a vote was completed.

Chairman, Paul Levits, indicated that I am making a motion to table the Waste Management rezoning request and schedule another meeting in a couple weeks, possibly after the report has been received from the Board of Supervisors.

Commissioner, Robin Dingle, asked Solicitor Backenstoe if Plainfield Township could conduct a poll. Ms. Dingle advised that the information that was submitted seems to be old. Waste Management Representative indicated that the State, or Pennsylvania Game and Wildlife, is not requiring new studies to be completed. Ms. Dingle advised that once the approval of the rezoning district is completed there is less leverage over the plan submissions.

**ACTION: Motion was made by Glenn Geissinger and seconded by Robin Dingle to table the Grand Central Sanitary Landfill, Inc. and Slate Spring Farms, LLC. Waste Management- Zoning Amendment Application- Rezoning Request. Prior to the vote, Chairman, Paul Levits, asked if there were any comments from the governing body or the public. Motion approved. Vote 5-0.**

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Having no further business to come before the Planning Commission, a motion was made by Glenn Geissinger and seconded by Terry Kleintop to adjourn the meeting. Motion approved. Vote 5-0.

The meeting adjourned at 9:26 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,



Amy Kahler  
Secretary  
Plainfield Township

**PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES FEBRUARY 26, 2025**

APPEARANCES:

PAUL LEVITS

GLENN GEISSINGER

TERRY KLEINTOP

ROBIN DINGLE

ALLEN SCHAFER

-----  
DIGITALLY RECORDED BY THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

1                   MR. LEVITS: Please rise for the  
2 Pledge of Allegiance.

3                   (Everyone says the pledge.)

4                   MR. LEVITS: All right. Welcome to  
5 the -- welcome to the February 26th special meeting  
6 for the Waste Management application for zoning  
7 amendment. First meeting, Waste Management  
8 primarily made a presentation, second meeting, the  
9 Planning Commission primarily responded with other  
10 questions. Tonight, I think it's going to be a  
11 little more back and forth. And with time for --  
12 hopefully a lot of time for the public to make  
13 comments or ask questions also.

14                  Again, we have a time frame here that  
15 we have to be out of here by, so I will have to  
16 adhere to that and move in that direction. So to  
17 get it started, is there anything Waste Management  
18 would like to say? Just a couple minutes.

19                  WASTE MANAGEMENT: So --

20                  MR. LEVITS: Go ahead.

21                  WASTE MANAGEMENT: -- in follow-up to  
22 the January 29th meeting, we submitted a letter  
23 dated February 10th to the Planning Commission. I  
24 don't know if you had a chance to read that. We're  
25 happy to walk through that if you had any questions



1 in follow-up to the additional information we  
2 provide.

3 MR. LEVITS: Yes, I think that's one  
4 thing we'll be taking a look at, I think, is the  
5 response letters -- the response to the questions at  
6 this point and see how it goes.

7 WASTE MANAGEMENT: You want to start  
8 there?

9 MR. LEVITS: Yes, we'll start right  
10 there, right on that information. First question  
11 was for the -- clarify what is being done in the  
12 designated support area. And you guys would like to  
13 respond to that how? So the public can understand  
14 what's going on. Anybody?

15 WASTE MANAGEMENT: You're looking  
16 for --

17 MR. LEVITS: January 10th.

18 MS. FORS: Oh, he's looking for  
19 January 10th.

20 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Oh. Yeah, the  
21 January 10th would have followed the December  
22 meeting.

23 MS. FORS: Oh.

24 (Recording cut out.)

25 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Solid waste berm

1 boundary will include typical landfill support  
2 systems and equipment, including storm water  
3 management controls, access roads, leachate pump  
4 houses, (indecipherable) pump stations,  
5 landfill-related utilities, and site monitoring  
6 system components, gas drones, groundwater wells,  
7 things of that nature. Additional units will also  
8 be used for equipment parking and  
9 construction-related materials, stockpiles, and  
10 storage.

11 MR. LEVITS: Okay. Anybody have any  
12 questions on their response? Comments? Questions  
13 from the audience?

14 (No response.)

15 MR. LEVITS: Just, I should add, this  
16 will -- this is probably not our last meeting, but  
17 this is going to be our last informational meeting.  
18 I think we'll have one more, and we'll probably try  
19 to come to a conclusion and a recommendation to the  
20 Board of Supervisors at that time. So tonight will  
21 be it to get your points out and your positions.

22 Health risk assessment, basically with  
23 the PFAS, I want to ask a couple questions before we  
24 proceed on there. I noticed that at the last  
25 meeting, Mr. Perin made a comment that you check for

1       them or filtered for them?

2                   WASTE MANAGEMENT: Yeah, for the  
3       leachate treatment plant, we actually have reverse  
4       osmosis units -- or a reverse osmosis unit on site.  
5       And the filtration system is a high power -- high  
6       pressure I should say, filtration unit. And the  
7       filter membranes themselves are capable of removing  
8       almost all PFAS both long and short-chain strains of  
9       PFAS just for that process.

10                  MR. LEVITS: And how are those filters  
11       maintained? Is it a life, so many hours, so many  
12       months?

13                  WASTE MANAGEMENT: So we monitor the  
14       differential pressure across those --

15                  MR. LEVITS: Pressure.

16                  WASTE MANAGEMENT: -- continuously.  
17       So if the pressure changes for any reason, we know  
18       we might have a breakthrough on the pillar membrane  
19       or the pressure continues to rise and we're not  
20       seeing as much what we call permeate, or liquid  
21       coming out the back end, that means the filters  
22       themselves are probably starting to plug and that  
23       would need to be replaced. We do typically keep a  
24       spare set of filters on-site, around the treatment  
25       plant, so if that happens, we can change them out.

1                   MR. LEVITS: How often are they  
2 normally -- what's their normal life expectancy?

3                   WASTE MANAGEMENT: Anywhere from 18  
4 months to 2 years, technically.

5                   MR. LEVITS: All right. And so  
6 basically, you're using pressure differential for  
7 inspection. That's your primary --

8                   WASTE MANAGEMENT: In inflow.

9                   MR. LEVITS: Okay. Has any of the  
10 runoff into the creeks been tested for PFAS? Do you  
11 test for any of that?

12                  WASTE MANAGEMENT: No, because there's  
13 no standard for us to test it.

14                  MR. LEVITS: No standard. Is there  
15 anything else anybody would like to question on the  
16 PFAS? Up here?

17                  MR. KLEINTOP: Yeah. So, if you're  
18 not testing when it's being discharged,  
19 (indecipherable), how do you know how successful  
20 your reverse osmosis is working?

21                  WASTE MANAGEMENT: Yeah, so we have a  
22 Dynatec system at the site. And the manufacturer is  
23 well familiar with PFAS removal because some states  
24 have actually adopted requirements and limits, and  
25 we've sought information from them regarding the

1 removal efficiency for certain PFAS drains. So  
2 we're relying somewhat on their data. But you are  
3 correct, we don't have any site-specific landfill  
4 data for Grand Central, but the technology is proven  
5 and it is one of the two chosen technologies chosen  
6 for PFAS removal.

7 MR. KLEINTOP: If it was granted, the  
8 rezoning, that could be put in as a municipal  
9 condition.

10 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Well, keep in mind,  
11 if the department decides to -- if the state decides  
12 to adopts limits as a permit holder, as a MPDS  
13 permit holder, we're going to be required to modify  
14 the plants operations to treat for it. So, we think  
15 we're in a good position because we have reverse  
16 osmosis equipment at the site. Because of the  
17 exceptional value strength of the discharge  
18 (indecipherable) being Little Bushkill, we already  
19 have to treat to pretty low standards, so our low  
20 concentrations are able to discharge from our plant.

21 We don't think we're going to have to  
22 take any further action to meet a new permit limit  
23 if it's required, but that's something that'll come  
24 through the state through a permit mandate. It will  
25 more likely come through the Delaware River Basin

1 Commission as well as PADB.

2 MR. KLEINTOP: Oh, I agree, but all  
3 I'm saying is if the state didn't -- if the state  
4 didn't bring down the requirements that we'd like to  
5 see in place, we as the municipality would have a  
6 right to put that in as a condition. We don't  
7 always have to follow what DEP's regulations are  
8 because this isn't a permitted use at this point in  
9 time. So if the Township was going to make it a  
10 permitted use, then we would have all the right in  
11 the world to include conditions that could be up and  
12 beyond what the DEP or DRBC would be requesting.  
13 That would be on us.

14 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Yeah, I'm not sure  
15 the Township actually has the flexibility to do  
16 that, Terry, quite frankly, but regardless, we'll  
17 continue to monitor what the state's going to do and  
18 what the DRBC is going to do and move in that  
19 direction if that's required.

20 MR. KLEINTOP: Why do you think that  
21 the municipality wouldn't have the right to make  
22 that?

23 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Well, how are you  
24 going to set a limit without understanding what the  
25 state's limits are? The state's limits are going to

1 set what the requirements are for --

2 MS. DINGLE: Based on science and  
3 other states that have (indecipherable).

4 MR. KLEINTOP: Right.

5 MS. DINGLE: I think we should be able  
6 to --

7 WASTE MANAGEMENT: The state  
8 regulatory agency implemented those.

9 MS. DINGLE: But that's what I'm  
10 saying. We can use that same -- even though our  
11 state, PA, hasn't -- we could use the data --

12 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Well, PA state  
13 could take a more stringent approach than the EPA  
14 could.

15 MR. KLEINTOP: Yeah.

16 MS. DINGLE: They could.

17 WASTE MANAGEMENT: And we would be  
18 obligated to follow that, but it's not dictated down  
19 to the township municipal level.

20 MS. DINGLE: I do think data regarding  
21 before and after your -- what did you call it, the  
22 RO system, it would be nice to understand that. So  
23 get some data on actual samples going into that  
24 process, and then after. I'd like to see the  
25 (indecipherable) PFAS through that process, so then

1 we'll understand better how it works and what  
2 percent is removed.

3 MR. KLEINTOP: 'Cause there's really  
4 no kind of water testing taking place at this point  
5 in --

6 MS. DINGLE: No.

7 MR. KLEINTOP: -- time, period.

8 WASTE MANAGEMENT: But we'll have  
9 water (indecipherable), Terry. I mean, there's a  
10 lot of (indecipherable) on site for water discharge.

11 MR. KLEINTOP: No, but I'm --

12 WASTE MANAGEMENT: It's just not  
13 specific to PFAS.

14 MR. KLEINTOP: But I mean, other  
15 than -- other than the annual --

16 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Well, there's  
17 quarterly groundwater monitoring (indecipherable) --

18 MR. KLEINTOP: Look at the annual --

19 WASTE MANAGEMENT: -- semi-annual  
20 (indecipherable) --

21 MR. KLEINTOP: -- (indecipherable)  
22 indicating what the stream health is.

23 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Well, then I'll say  
24 we also have the macro and (indecipherable) rate  
25 studies --



1                   MR. KLEINTOP: Well, that's what I  
2 just said. That's the only study -- that's the only  
3 study we really have at the current time  
4 (indecipherable) --

5                   WASTE MANAGEMENT: Terry, hear what  
6 I'm saying. You have a lot of data and the Township  
7 is included in the submission of that data. You  
8 have quarterly groundwater sampling data, you have  
9 monthly DMR discharge data from the treatment plant,  
10 and you have semi-annual storm water discharge data  
11 from the site, and you have it for almost 20  
12 years -- or 30 years.

13                  MR. KLEINTOP: Has the water quality  
14 not been bad? The macro studies are not good at  
15 all. Ours are (indecipherable).

16                  WASTE MANAGEMENT: Well, we talked  
17 about this in the last meeting. They're consistent  
18 with where they have been with the storm transient.  
19 They have not been impacted by the landfill.

20                  MR. LEVITS: All right. Okay. We'll  
21 move on from that. It's somewhat open on each side,  
22 I think, at this point in time.

23                  There was a lot of reference to a lot  
24 of the studies that were done and you specified the  
25 date and what that covered. I don't think we

1       need -- unless somebody feels otherwise, we need to  
2       go over them again tonight. I'll move forward if  
3       nobody objects.

4               The next question was the issue about  
5       the bat, the tricolored bat on being a threatened  
6       and endangered species. And you guys have said that  
7       there was no identification of that particular  
8       mammal in the study.

9               WASTE MANAGEMENT: That's correct.

10              MR. LEVITS: Okay.

11              WASTE MANAGEMENT: That was not.

12              MR. LEVITS: All right. Moving -- any  
13       other questions regarding that?

14              (No response.)

15              MR. LEVITS: All right. Moving on to  
16       the next item that you addressed, the slope of the  
17       area to be developed. This should take a little  
18       more explanation, I think, because I know it was  
19       brought up on this side of the table. And you want  
20       to give us a review on that at this point in time?  
21       Somebody? You know, represent it.

22              WASTE MANAGEMENT: You just -- are you  
23       saying you just want us to make a run through the  
24       response?

25              MR. LEVITS: Run through your response

1 and if you can show anything up there on the screen  
2 at this time it would be beneficial, I think, if you  
3 have anything. But explain your response a little  
4 more, because I know we questioned it. It was  
5 questioned from this side.

6 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Okay. I don't  
7 believe we have anything on the drawing that shows  
8 specific slopes, but we do have some information in  
9 this response. So the existing grade varies across  
10 the post-development area of the landfill footprint  
11 within the post-disposal footprint. Approximately  
12 49 percent of the existing grade falls within 0 to  
13 10 percent. Approximately 42 percent of the area  
14 falls within 10 to 20 percent grade or slope. About  
15 7 percent falls within the 20 to 30 percent slope.  
16 And less than a half a percent is greater than 30  
17 percent slope.

18 However, significant grading will  
19 occur within an immediately surrounding post-waste  
20 disposal footprint with construction of the  
21 perimeter bund, landfill subgrade, ancillary support  
22 features, and storm water basins, and they're  
23 associated discharge outfalls. A detailed  
24 engineering design will be completed and submitted  
25 as part of the PADEP solid waste permitting process,

1 as well as Plainfield Township land development if  
2 rezoning as granted. The landfill grades will be  
3 compliant with current PADEP criteria.

4 It's anticipated that landfill  
5 leachate from the proposed expansion footprint will  
6 be pumped from the landfill sumps across Pen Argyl  
7 roads to the existing leachate treatment plant.  
8 Storm water management controls will discharge --  
9 infiltrate within the Waltz Creek watershed, which  
10 is where the base currently drains now. Additional  
11 detail is provided in appendix K of the rezoning.

12 Construction walls will be phased so  
13 that the appropriate ENS controls are in place to  
14 account for corresponding earth disturbance. NL  
15 pumps and force mains, which will be consisting of  
16 dual-wall piping, will be sized to count for  
17 elevation head changes and anticipated flow volumes,  
18 in conjunction with the (indecipherable) to the  
19 existing infrastructure, the storage tanks, the  
20 leachate treatment plant, and such.

21 MR. LEVITS: A little side question  
22 right here, does the -- do you currently take  
23 radioactive waste at all, low level, high level,  
24 mid-level, anything at all?

25 WASTE MANAGEMENT: So we do have

1 radiation monitoring equipment in place at the site.  
2 We are actually allowed to accept certain medical  
3 isotopes, so like Iodine-131 as a good example,  
4 which would be a typical stress test isotope, but as  
5 long as it has 65-day or less half-life as a medical  
6 isotope. I think we have an exemption for Iodine  
7 and one other. That if it comes across the  
8 radiation detectors in (indecipherable), we scan it  
9 for the strength of the -- of the isotope and we  
10 document it and we fill out the paperwork, and it's  
11 available for the department to review.

12 We don't accept any other radiation  
13 sources. If any other type of radiation source were  
14 to come across the scale, we isolate the load and we  
15 actually call the Bureau of Radiation Protection.  
16 They come out along with our health physicist to  
17 find the item in the load and remove it.

18 MR. LEVITS: How often does that  
19 happen? Once a month, every couple of days?

20 WASTE MANAGEMENT: A couple times a  
21 year. Yeah, maybe two, three times a year where we  
22 ask the to remove a source.

23 MR. LEVITS: Okay.

24 WASTE MANAGEMENT: So one thing to add  
25 there. So initially when Pennsylvania DEP adopted

1 the Radiation Protection Plan requirements, they  
2 made all landfills have that, but New Jersey,  
3 Pennsylvania, and other states all adopted similar  
4 plans. The transfer stations -- transfer stations  
5 location actually have that there as well, the  
6 detection equipment. So they're actually removing  
7 the source before it gets to us. Mostly what we see  
8 is drivers coming across the scale went for a stress  
9 test where they blew their nose in a tissue after a  
10 stress test and that's what sets off the alarm.

11 MR. LEVITS: How much -- how much of  
12 the waste you're accepting is out of state?

13 WASTE MANAGEMENT: About 60/40, out of  
14 state to in state. And now with waste reduction,  
15 it's primarily all local.

16 MR. LEVITS: So when you say 60 coming  
17 from out of state, is that mostly New York and New  
18 Jersey.

19 WASTE MANAGEMENT: New Jersey.  
20 Nothing from New York.

21 MR. LEVITS: Nothing from New York.

22 WASTE MANAGEMENT: And it's 40 percent  
23 out of state.

24 WASTE MANAGEMENT: I'm sorry, yes.

25 MR. LEVITS: Okay.

1 MS. DINGLE: (Indecipherable) slopes,  
2 the maximum height of the landfill would be 980 --

3 WASTE MANAGEMENT: 980 NSL.

4 MS. DINGLE: Right. Can you give us  
5 an idea of what the, I guess, adjacent or  
6 surrounding point is?

7 WASTE MANAGEMENT: In the existing  
8 landfill is just about at 980.

9 MS. DINGLE: Well, I know that.  
10 Besides that though. I mean, we're looking at about  
11 a 200-foot difference surrounding landscape. So  
12 you're going to need 200 feet taller than any  
13 existing land (indecipherable) other than the  
14 existing landfill. Is that about accurate? I just  
15 want the residents to have an idea of what this will  
16 look like.

17 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Yeah, I mean --  
18 look in the application itself, there's a pretty  
19 in-depth line-of-sight analysis that was done from  
20 varying vantage points within the municipality to  
21 help address that concern, Robin, so I would  
22 recommend if they want to see the information, stop  
23 in the Township building and view the application.

24 MS. DINGLE: Well, I think it's  
25 important for you to give the public a general idea

1 of what that is. I mean --

2 WASTE MANAGEMENT: The closest I can  
3 give you is the existing landfill.

4 MS. DINGLE: Okay.

5 WASTE MANAGEMENT: I don't know if  
6 there's any other reference points.

7 MS. DINGLE: So -- yeah, there's no  
8 other reference points I don't think that are as  
9 tall --

10 WASTE MANAGEMENT: I mean, you can  
11 strike a line over into Pen Argyl borough and pick a  
12 building off the side of mountain and say it's  
13 roughly there.

14 MS. DINGLE: Well, yeah, but that's  
15 what I mean, we're starting to go up the mountain,  
16 none of the existing topography. So basically --

17 MR. LEVITS: The gas collection system  
18 that you would be installing, you would be running  
19 quite a distance, how many linear feet in the system  
20 now and what do you expect to be installed and plus  
21 the fact that you're going to be crossing the road  
22 to get to the energy plant, you know, I'm assuming  
23 underground. So what would the linear feet then be  
24 into the new system compared to what you have now?

25 WASTE MANAGEMENT: I mean, we have



1 miles of pipeline in the waste basin around the  
2 perimeter of the landfill between bearing system of  
3 upper grade. That grade (indecipherable) laterals.  
4 I mean, if I had to put a number on the pipe, a  
5 better part of 40 to 50 miles of piping in the  
6 landfill at minimum. Because the footprint is a  
7 little smaller, it might a be a little bit less in  
8 the expansion, but, you know, you're probably, what  
9 Paul, 1,500 to 2,000 feet for a crossing to push the  
10 (indecipherable) from the expansion area to the  
11 existing gas collection system, so it can then in  
12 turn be grounded down to the Green Energy Center.

13 MR. LEVITS: Further the mile at least  
14 in the new landfill area to where the system exists,  
15 you're saying -- it's across the road?

16 WASTE MANAGEMENT: I'm not -- yeah,  
17 it's probably a good rough kinda ballpark, I would  
18 think so.

19 MR. LEVITS: All right.

20 WASTE MANAGEMENT: There would be a  
21 booster compressor station there, Paul, to actually  
22 supplement the vacuum to be able to draw on the gas  
23 system.

24 MR. LEVITS: Okay.

25 WASTE MANAGEMENT: So I think we said

1 at the last meeting, the entire gas system is under  
2 negative vacuum. That's how we extract the gas from  
3 the waste mess itself and (indecipherable) back into  
4 the system. That should draw it out.

5 MR. LEVITS: All right. We requested  
6 a breakdown of charitable contributions which you  
7 provided. Would you want to make any comments to  
8 that or just the fact that you provided the data?

9 WASTE MANAGEMENT: I think that's  
10 relevant, so.

11 MR. LEVITS: Yeah. Employment  
12 figures, what you provided, but one of my questions,  
13 or -- well, an additional question is, if this  
14 didn't go through, how would that negatively impact  
15 employment overall? Because you wrote down by  
16 drivers and office and everything else. How many  
17 people would you -- I mean -- and you're gonna be  
18 adding people there, I'm assuming, with the material  
19 resource recovery facility. So how -- what would  
20 your net -- your anticipated net loss be?

21 WASTE MANAGEMENT: So we tried to  
22 break this into three categories, the hauling  
23 company, the landfill, and material recovery  
24 facility. That's what requested at the last  
25 meeting, two meetings ago. So as you can see from

1 the chart we put together, nothing materially  
2 changes with the material recovery facility. If the  
3 landfill closes, those positions will remain and  
4 that operation will continue to run.

5           There's a considerable number of  
6 positions, both direct and indirect, at the  
7 landfill. So if you total it all up, you're  
8 probably around 150 positions total depending on  
9 construction season, contractor work,  
10 (indecipherable). As you can see in the enclosure,  
11 almost all of that goes away. There's really only  
12 one person and it's probably going to be a floating  
13 person in our environmental management group.  
14 That's the folks that actually manage these closing  
15 facilities when they go into closure. They will be  
16 on-site periodically. This site is set up with  
17 automatic data collection systems and scanning  
18 systems we talked about, I think, at the last  
19 meeting, so everything is already automated. All of  
20 our guys can dial in remotely from home, make  
21 changes, fix issues, identify and troubleshoot  
22 before getting on-site. So you'd see just in that  
23 section alone significant reduction in direct and  
24 indirect paper. And a lot of the contracts are  
25 local that we no longer have to work at the site if

1 the facility were to close.

2 MS. DINGLE: So, I have questions on  
3 this new one you've provided. So the -- I guess  
4 what we're trying to get at is what -- who is on  
5 your payroll? I mean, the consultants, yes, they  
6 have a contract, they work for you, however, they  
7 also work for another company. They get paid by  
8 somebody else. So if they lose that contract, that  
9 company is then going to be paying them to work  
10 somewhere else, find other jobs, correct? Same for  
11 the haulers, how many of those are you actually  
12 paying? Those are contractors, correct?

13 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Well, the drivers  
14 and helpers, those are our folks. That's --

15 MS. DINGLE: The drivers and helpers  
16 are your --

17 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Yeah, those are  
18 direct waste employees.

19 MS. DINGLE: Those are your employees.

20 WASTE MANAGEMENT: And what I  
21 mentioned at the last meeting, I wrote a note in  
22 here because we don't have a landfill to bring our  
23 volume in and internalize it, no one knows what will  
24 happen.

25 MS. DINGLE: All right. So again,

1     those people can -- well, okay. So haulers are  
2     yours, the contractors which are big numbers in your  
3     landfill aren't really your employees per se. Yes,  
4     you give them a lot of work, but they're not your  
5     employees. You're not paying them. All right. So  
6     I just wanted to verify, the haulers -- so all the  
7     people under the hauling are directly under your  
8     payroll.

9                     WASTE MANAGEMENT: Yeah, I think to  
10    maybe change that summary a little bit, Robin. I  
11    mean, you're still talking about 40 full-time  
12    employee positions that are lost that are our  
13    employees with the closure of the landfill. So it's  
14    still pretty significant and odds are the  
15    contractors, you know, they may have work to support  
16    those folks or they may have to lay them off. In  
17    many cases, the contractors have been on-site for  
18    many years.

19                    MS. DINGLE: Right.

20                    WASTE MANAGEMENT: And they've had the  
21    same crew working on that site because they know the  
22    work is there.

23                    MS. DINGLE: Right. But they also --  
24    yeah -- it's not like they're specialists for the  
25    landfill. They have skills that the landfill has

1       used, but they can find jobs or other projects.

2               MR. LEVITS:   Would you anticipate --  
3       or what do you think the probability is that the  
4       landfill, if being shut down, that you would look at  
5       putting in a transfer station there?  You got the  
6       property, you got the zoning, maybe not your best  
7       option in your opinion, but it'd certainly be an  
8       option given that you have the land and have  
9       everything right there.

10              WASTE MANAGEMENT:  Well, it's pretty  
11      limited as far as space availability to do that,  
12      Paul, because we had to restrict development of the  
13      transfer station in the commercial industrial parcel  
14      that we now own on 512.  We did that in conjunction  
15      with our cooperation agreement with Pen Argyl.  So  
16      there really isn't space on that site to site a  
17      transfer station.

18              MR. LEVITS:  Well, how many acres are  
19      there at your unit, because you just put in your --

20              WASTE MANAGEMENT:  On that side of the  
21      street, it's probably around -- it's called rough  
22      (indecipherable), probably around 325 acres, but  
23      we're fully built out right up there where we can be  
24      with the wetland setbacks and features on the  
25      landfill parcel (indecipherable) -- excuse me, on

1 the north side of the trail up until the education  
2 center along, you know, Grand Central and Pen Argyl  
3 Rail.

4 MR. LEVITS: So when you say you're  
5 fully built out, what are you fully built out with  
6 then, specifically? Let's talk structure.

7 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Disposal area  
8 space, primarily.

9 MR. LEVITS: What?

10 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Disposal area space  
11 primarily. So by buying the area to dispose of the  
12 trash.

13 MR. LEVITS: Okay. But what I'm  
14 asking -- okay. All right.

15 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Yeah, I think a lot  
16 of people, when they look at the site, they also  
17 pull in the industrial commercial property, which is  
18 roughly 100 acres. Which is the bund wall, 512, and  
19 where we just constructed the MRF, but there is a  
20 specific restriction to develop the transportation  
21 in that parcel.

22 MR. LEVITS: Okay. That was -- and  
23 when you say your agreement with Pen Argyl, what did  
24 that encompass and entail then?

25 WASTE MANAGEMENT: There's the, what

1 we call the facility cooperation grade.

2 MR. LEVITS: Okay.

3 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Which included the  
4 royalties that they received for the landfill.

5 MR. LEVITS: Okay.

6 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Ancillary items  
7 that were included in that agreement.

8 MR. LEVITS: Okay. All right. One  
9 thing I'd like to make a case for, and I didn't  
10 really think there was much exposure to the question  
11 is, the cost versus benefits to the community. Your  
12 response was you would negotiate with the  
13 supervisors, but a project of this scope and this  
14 magnitude and then the generational impact that will  
15 have on the community -- multi-generational impact  
16 it will have on the community. For me to be  
17 comfortable, I have to know what you're giving us.  
18 And I'll use maybe not a great example, but an  
19 example -- and I don't think you would do this  
20 either. I wouldn't take \$50,000 and go to a car  
21 dealership and give them \$50,000 for them to pick a  
22 car and give it back to me, what they want to give  
23 me. You're asking us to change zoning from farm and  
24 forest of what this community has pushed for, for  
25 decades, you know, rural status, to change that into



1 something that it will never, ever be farm and  
2 forest again. And you're asking us to do it blindly  
3 in the sense of a cost-benefit basis. So what could  
4 we expect from Waste Management to make the pot good  
5 for us for the future, for our future generations?

6 MR. BACKENSTOE: Paul, let me just  
7 caution you a little bit there.

8 MR. LEVITS: Okay.

9 MR. BACKENSTOE: At the last meeting,  
10 I think you properly asked if there's a new  
11 facility, will there be a new host agreement. And  
12 they answered, yes, there would. That's under Act  
13 101 and that clearly would be within the purview of  
14 the Board of Supervisors, not so much the Planning  
15 Commission.

16 And you're looking at zoning, you're  
17 looking at zoning amendment under section 807 of the  
18 zoning ordinance, and I would just caution you that  
19 I don't know that you can really (indecipherable)  
20 that precipice. That's really up to the board. I  
21 think it's appropriate for you to ask at the last  
22 meeting so that you know, so the residents know, if  
23 there's gonna be a new landfill, would there be a  
24 new host agreement, and the answer's yes. But I  
25 honestly don't think that the Planning Commission

1 has the wherewithal to try to negotiate that with  
2 Waste Management. That would be my thought.

3 MR. LEVITS: All right. So, okay.  
4 All right.

5 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Paul, if I could  
6 address something because I don't (indecipherable)  
7 of the terminology you used there, but  
8 (indecipherable) blindly. I mean, when we went to  
9 the last expansion and we campaigned for Grand  
10 Central Southern Expansion as a community partner,  
11 we negotiated the amended host agreement in good  
12 faith that brought new financial terms and  
13 conditions from one of the existing  
14 (indecipherable). I think it was amended and  
15 updated in, if I recall, 2004. Mr. Backenstoe, do  
16 you remember the date?

17 MR. BACKENSTOE: I don't remember the  
18 date.

19 WASTE MANAGEMENT: You know, I think I  
20 indicated at the last meeting we would expect the  
21 same process for this one.

22 MR. LEVITS: Okay. All right. Okay.  
23 Anybody here have questions?

24 WASTE MANAGEMENT: I'm sorry. It was  
25 actually amended in 2005. Thank you.

1                   MR. LEVITS: I'll get to the audience  
2 shortly. Okay.

3                   MS. DINGLE: I have some questions on  
4 the February 10th letter just to follow-up. So we  
5 talked about the (indecipherable) and we talked  
6 about the updated letter from the US official online  
7 service. It does indicate -- I did see that  
8 negative back surveys are good for five years. So  
9 that's why they allowed (indecipherable). However,  
10 in five years for that (indecipherable) kinda  
11 inspiring.

12                   We did go over the employment stuff.  
13 Thank you for the clarification on that. We talked  
14 about the PFAS compounds and process for that, but I  
15 think I specifically requested information regarding  
16 the specs, the manufacturers. So like when you put  
17 together an engineering thing, you provide specs and  
18 (indecipherable) and whatever and design. You would  
19 actually pull together the main specs and design. I  
20 want to know more about that process and what you're  
21 actually using. So I think that's something that  
22 can be readily pulled off of your website or  
23 whatever you purchased or whenever you have  
24 installed. I just want information on it, the  
25 actual unit you put in.

1                   Number five was talking about the  
2                   noise from the landfill. I know that's a major  
3                   concern in addition to the smell, but the landfill  
4                   noise, you talked about OSHA and the requirement for  
5                   backup alarms. I agree that it's a requirement.  
6                   However, again, a little research has indicated that  
7                   there's other OSHA-approved noise backups that are a  
8                   lot less intrusive and white noise alarms are one of  
9                   the new things being assessed. So I think  
10                  additional research regarding some alternatives that  
11                  may be less annoying, but intuitive to the  
12                  surrounding rural character, that would be helpful  
13                  to get some information on.

14                 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Robin, maybe before  
15                 (indecipherable) so I can address it right away.

16                 MS. DINGLE: Sure.

17                 WASTE MANAGEMENT: So we tried some of  
18                 those other backup (indecipherable) technologies.

19                 MS. DINGLE: Okay.

20                 WASTE MANAGEMENT: And what I would  
21                 tell you is that they do not last in field  
22                 applications like working the landfill. So where we  
23                 would normally get like two or three years of  
24                 service life out of a typical backup alarm, the  
25                 white noise alarms, the automatic testing alarms, if

1 something gets within close proximity, they  
2 typically last two or three months. And then we  
3 have to put the machine out of service every time we  
4 have to change one of those out in order to meet our  
5 safety standards and we won't run a machine without  
6 it. So we don't use them currently and we're hoping  
7 technology gets better, but we're all familiar with  
8 all of that. I don't think any additional research  
9 is required. We know they're there. They just need  
10 to be more reliable.

11 MS. DINGLE: Well, again, if it's a  
12 cost thing for you then perhaps --

13 WASTE MANAGEMENT: It's not a cost  
14 thing actually. They're almost comparable in price.

15 MS. DINGLE: No. No. But I'm  
16 saying --

17 WASTE MANAGEMENT: It's a machine  
18 service thing.

19 MS. DINGLE: -- it's the longevity of  
20 it. So you have to --

21 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Right.

22 MS. DINGLE: Well, again, my  
23 understanding is that you can replace them fairly  
24 quickly on a piece of equipment so it shouldn't be  
25 down much. So I'm just saying in terms of the

1 surrounding area, the neighborhood, and the public,  
2 that may be something that even if they only last  
3 two or three months versus two or three years --  
4 it's an additional cost, I understand, but it's a  
5 lot less intrusive environment --

6 WASTE MANAGEMENT: One thing we've  
7 actually found, you know, that fans out a little  
8 better as well is, we typically try to go around the  
9 outer perimeter of the landfill as we go up, just  
10 that natural barrier of that waste is initially  
11 placed outside before we work inside acts as that  
12 same barrier. Drives the noise up. So not only is  
13 it the equipment itself, but the practices we use  
14 for filling the landfill also help divert the noise.

15 MS. DINGLE: The noises, you can hear  
16 it, right?

17 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Yeah, I don't think  
18 so, Robin, 'cause we've been out there and you  
19 know --

20 MS. DINGLE: I can hear it at my  
21 property Saturday morning when I'm out at 6:00 a.m.,  
22 I mean, I can. So I hear the noises constantly from  
23 the landfill. It's disturbing when I'm out trying  
24 to have a BBQ with company and I hear it. I'm just  
25 letting you know it does and I'm like way up over

1 and in the back. So that's what I --

2 (Recording cut out.)

3 MS. DINGLE: I had some other general  
4 questions. Can I get those out?

5 MR. LEVITS: Yes, go ahead.

6 MS. DINGLE: I was going through the  
7 material submitted and I did not see anything  
8 related to timeline regarding sort of the permitting  
9 process and why we're kind of being in this process  
10 right now, and everything else. So, I took it upon  
11 myself to call the DEP and get familiar with the  
12 landfill permitting process and where exactly it  
13 stands. And I spoke to someone very familiar with  
14 the landfill and he explained that your air space  
15 permit expires August 1, 2028.

16 WASTE MANAGEMENT: That's the  
17 operating permit.

18 MS. DINGLE: The operating permit.

19 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Okay.

20 MS. DINGLE: And to renew that, he  
21 said typically, it's a one-year process.

22 WASTE MANAGEMENT: I think we have to  
23 have a renewal application in probably two months  
24 before it expires.

25 MS. DINGLE: August 1, 2027. So

1     that's one year. He said a lot of times, the  
2     expansion permits will be submitted concurrently  
3     with that. However, then we went through what is a  
4     typical time frame, again, in expansion, he said  
5     Chrin in 2018 took one and a half years to get  
6     theirs --

7                   WASTE MANAGEMENT: I'm sorry, how  
8     long?

9                   MS. DINGLE: One and a half years to  
10    get their expansion. Bethlehem, he said, they had  
11    two, one for three years and another one for one  
12    year. He said the average for landfill approval is  
13    one to three years. So, if you took the one and a  
14    half year, year process or time frame, we're looking  
15    at this not even becoming an issue until 2026.

16                  WASTE MANAGEMENT: So Robin, the last  
17    expansion we went through took eight years. So I  
18    don't know where they're coming up with these  
19    statistics, but they're not accurate. I know your  
20    (indecipherable) worked on other competing  
21    landfills, Chrin's --

22                  MS. DINGLE: This is directly from the  
23    DEP. This is not --

24                  WASTE MANAGEMENT: Well, that's their  
25    prescribed schedule, but we don't follow it.



1 MS. DINGLE: This is --

2 WASTE MANAGEMENT: And I know you guys  
3 complain a lot about the department (indecipherable)  
4 but it's the same concern we have about --

5 MR. LEVITS: All right. Let's hang on  
6 because nobody can hear the question or the answers.  
7 So just respectfully one at a time.

8 MS. DINGLE: This is what the DEP told  
9 me they -- from the time the applications was  
10 submitted to when they approved and issued a permit.  
11 This is the time frame they told me at local  
12 landfills in this area. So if it took you that long  
13 to do it, there were obviously issues and questions  
14 (indecipherable). But I'm just saying, at this  
15 point, it seems that we as a community and Township  
16 and Board of Supervisors have more time. We could  
17 be putting this off for another 12 to 18 months in  
18 order to get our financials in order to understand  
19 the process and to do some additional maybe economic  
20 development to sort of figure out ways -- I'm just  
21 saying this seems like we're being pushed into an  
22 expedited rushed process based on the information I  
23 got directly from the DEP solid landfill permitting  
24 department.

25 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Robin, did they

1 give you actual physical dates from the date they  
2 had the applications submitted --

3 MS. DINGLE: No. But why would they  
4 lie to me? I talked to --

5 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Because they're not  
6 accurate. That is not accurate.

7 Robin, with all due respect --

8 MR. KLEINTOP: Robin, it was Roger  
9 Bellis.

10 MS. DINGLE: It was Roger Bellis. He  
11 was very familiar with you.

12 WASTE MANAGEMENT: I know he's very  
13 familiar with us.

14 MS. DINGLE: He knows the process and  
15 he gave me this information.

16 WASTE MANAGEMENT: We just talked to  
17 Roger about another application and he told us that  
18 they had to put -- they paused the keystone review  
19 for two full years. So it was not a one-year deal.  
20 They may not be --

21 MS. DINGLE: Keystone (indecipherable)  
22 for seven years because of a health -- human health  
23 risk assessment.

24 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Which we've  
25 completed and they had not.

1 MS. DINGLE: Well, no, again, the  
2 human health risk assessment, you say in the letter  
3 here that you'll do a new one for the new landfill.

4 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Correct.

5 MS. DINGLE: So I'm just saying you --  
6 it's -- this process we're being pushed into is not  
7 something that should be -- your emergency should  
8 not become our problem or what you consider an  
9 urgent issue based on DEP should not be -- if you  
10 have a clear-cut expansion that doesn't have any  
11 issues, it should only take a year and a half to do.  
12 What you're saying is you're anticipating problems,  
13 which means your application process and permit may  
14 not be as clear-cut and clean as you expect them to  
15 be.

16 WASTE MANAGEMENT: We anticipate the  
17 state department will take that much longer and we  
18 also know the local approval process is not -- I  
19 mean, we're already at the 90-day extension and  
20 original 120-review-day application. So, as you can  
21 tell --

22 MS. DINGLE: I'm just saying --

23 WASTE MANAGEMENT: -- the schedule  
24 flipped to --

25 MS. DINGLE: I'm just saying that this

1 can be extended out to late 2026 before you reach  
2 your time frame based on information from the state  
3 department.

4 MS. FORS: I would like to add that  
5 Lehigh Valley Live is actually here tonight. I  
6 looked up their article, the DEP allowed Chrin  
7 landfill to expand -- this article actually shows --  
8 states that they submitted in -- for their --  
9 applied for their expansion in 2015 and they did not  
10 get it until 2020. This article was published  
11 January 9, 2020 and it was by Steve Novack. So this  
12 does show five years for Chrin. Just letting you  
13 know. So, Scott might be right, but that -- that  
14 timeline is less than may be anticipated but it  
15 wasn't the actual (indecipherable).

16 MR. KLEINTOP: How long are you  
17 expecting it to take? I mean, I appreciate  
18 (indecipherable).

19 WASTE MANAGEMENT: I think their  
20 (indecipherable) to their posted schedule is 12 to  
21 18 months, which is comical because they've never  
22 ever, in my history of dealing with the department,  
23 stuck with their prescribed schedule.

24 MR. KLEINTOP: No, but what are you  
25 going to anticipate, is what I'm asking?

1                   WASTE MANAGEMENT: At least four years  
2 at a minimum. It's why we're here.

3                   MS. DINGLE: And then another -- I  
4 know in most state permits, you have to identify  
5 whether or not you have any outstanding violations.  
6 I understand you do still have a violation on your  
7 location. I think it would be beneficial for us and  
8 the board to have information regarding the status  
9 of that, a summary of the incident, the actions  
10 taken, why it has not been resolved, and how it will  
11 be resolved prior to moving forward with anything.

12                  WASTE MANAGEMENT: To be clear,  
13 there's no violation with the department. That was  
14 settled through a consent assessment probably three  
15 years ago.

16                  MS. DINGLE: We just last month said  
17 there were still outstanding litigations.

18                  WASTE MANAGEMENT: No, there is a  
19 separate litigation but it's not tied to a  
20 (indecipherable) violation.

21                  MR. KLEINTOP: It's a 2017 lawsuit,  
22 isn't it?

23                  WASTE MANAGEMENT: The litigation is  
24 ongoing. We're not going to comment on litigation  
25 this evening. Those are public documents. We --

1 MS. DINGLE: I'm not saying comment  
2 tonight. We'd like a summary of it though. If  
3 they're public documents, you can provide us with a  
4 summary. There's no legal restrictions.

5 WASTE MANAGEMENT: So you're not going  
6 to get information like conversations we've had with  
7 the litigants about resolving --

8 MS. DINGLE: No, I just want to know  
9 what it is, what actions have been taken, and why it  
10 hasn't been resolved. I mean --

11 WASTE MANAGEMENT: That's all --

12 MS. DINGLE: -- this is for the  
13 general public.

14 WASTE MANAGEMENT: That's all publicly  
15 available and that's --

16 MS. DINGLE: And I'm asking you as the  
17 applicant.

18 WASTE MANAGEMENT: I'm just trying --  
19 I didn't finish my sentence. That's fine.

20 MR. KLEINTOP: I mean, it's multiple  
21 municipalities involved, right? In the lawsuit?

22 WASTE MANAGEMENT: No. There's no  
23 municipalities. It's individuals.

24 MR. KLEINTOP: Oh, yes. Okay.

25 WASTE MANAGEMENT: And you are correct

1       that when you submit to DEP, you have to provide  
2       compliance history, but the compliance history and  
3       litigation are two completely separate --

4               MS. DINGLE:   Okay.   So the violation  
5       has been addressed?

6               WASTE MANAGEMENT:   Correct.

7               MS. DINGLE:   However, the litigation  
8       is still out there in terms of the resident --  
9       public did not feel it resolved in a manner that was  
10      acceptable?

11              WASTE MANAGEMENT:   I don't want to  
12      speak for them and I won't.

13              MS. DINGLE:   Right.   Okay.   But --  
14      okay.

15              WASTE MANAGEMENT:   As far as actual  
16      violation itself for the odors in 2018, as far as  
17      the department is concerned, that issue is closed.

18              MS. DINGLE:   Okay.

19              MR. LEVITS:   Robin, anything else?

20              MS. DINGLE:   No.

21              MR. LEVITS:   Terry, give Robin a rest.  
22      Do you have something?

23              MR. KLEINTOP:   Maybe I was  
24      misunderstood, but in the December meeting I had  
25      asked if we could be provided a reconciliation --

1 and preferably '20 through '25, a reconciliation of  
2 your contractual obligations to each of the  
3 municipalities involved with the landfill --

4 (Working on the microphone.)

5 MR. KLEINTOP: In other words, I was  
6 asking for a reconciliation of your contractual  
7 obligations on an annual basis to each of the  
8 municipalities involved with the landfill, i.e.  
9 Wind Gap, Pen Argyl, and Plainfield Township.

10 MS. FORS: Terry, it's actually --  
11 that is part of our mailer every year. So you  
12 should be getting that mailer. A new mailer is  
13 actually coming out. Every year for the last four  
14 or five years I've been sending out a mailer to let  
15 residents know for Plainfield, Pen Argyl, and Wind  
16 Gap. So that will be coming out. I actually  
17 brought a couple copies of like the -- or just a  
18 paper copy, not the actual mailer itself. Grab one  
19 so you can see that, but that's part of that.

20 And then the agreement, I think, might  
21 be the other aspect of what you're asking for. The  
22 agreements are actually (indecipherable). I'll  
23 double check.

24 WASTE MANAGEMENT: They are on the  
25 website, Terry, and actually the Township itself has



1 a copy of the Southern Expansion application  
2 compliments of the final application. All the host  
3 agreements for all the communities are in that  
4 application package.

5 MR. KLEINTOP: I'm just looking for a  
6 comparison of what Wind Gap is being paid each year,  
7 what Plainfield is being paid, and (indecipherable).

8 WASTE MANAGEMENT: The benefit fact --  
9 the way that's put together, Terry is that, it also  
10 pulls in the value of the pretrash collections  
11 disposal --

12 MS. FORS: That's correct.

13 WASTE MANAGEMENT: -- for the two  
14 communities on top of the royalty payment per ton.

15 MS. FORS: That should be hitting  
16 mailboxes hopefully in the next two weeks.

17 MR. KLEINTOP: Okay. Thank you.

18 MR. LEVITS: Terry, anything else?

19 MR. KLEINTOP: I have a question on  
20 the buffer, area, what you're going to do with the  
21 buffer area, which is -- turns out to be 192 acres.

22 MS. FORS: I'm sorry?

23 MR. KLEINTOP: I believe it's 192  
24 acres in total, the buffer area?

25 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Yes.

1                   MR. KLEINTOP: My question is this,  
2     why is 78 -- since it's being identified as a buffer  
3     area, why are 78 acres of the 192 being asked -- why  
4     are you asking to rezone 78 as a buffer area --  
5     acres?

6                   WASTE MANAGEMENT: Typically, for --  
7     it just typically through zoning areas you go to  
8     physical boundaries, so roadways. So the 211 acres  
9     go to the three roadways and then to the old railway  
10    bank (indecipherable). So there's physical features  
11    that the zoning district would follow.

12                  MR. KLEINTOP: But if it's a buffer  
13    area anyway, why not just allow it to be part of the  
14    buffer area? I mean, once we -- once it would be  
15    approved to be solid waste, that opens the door for  
16    even further expansion, doesn't it?

17                  WASTE MANAGEMENT: No. Absolutely  
18    not. I mean, primarily to the east it's wetlands  
19    and the 300 for the setback from those exceptional  
20    value wetlands, so that does not rezone that land.

21                  MR. KLEINTOP: How does the Township  
22    protect itself from you deciding 10 years down the  
23    road --

24                  MR. GEISSINGER: Try it again.

25                  MR. KLEINTOP: How does the Township

1 protect itself 10 years down the road from you  
2 possibly deciding you want to expand further and you  
3 want to continue for another 10 years? I mean, the  
4 obligation you're asking for at this point in time  
5 is 20 more years in operations, correct?

6 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Correct. So, it  
7 might limit it to 25 years. Typically, the  
8 requirements and -- for any of the (indecipherable).  
9 I don't see anyone in the foreseeable future,  
10 whether it's 10, 20 years, reducing setbacks from  
11 the exceptional value wetlands. If, anything, I see  
12 it getting more strict.

13 MR. KLEINTOP: We've been in the  
14 landfill business now for 70 years. Until we get to  
15 '28 it will be 73, 20 more years it will be 93, and  
16 a lot of residents are very, very concerned about if  
17 the landfill will ever go away. I mean, 93 years  
18 (indecipherable) for all intents and purposes.

19 So we know what happened with the  
20 current landfill. I mean, you ended up going  
21 through litigations and giving up setbacks so that  
22 the landfill could continue to operate. And I don't  
23 think the residents want to see that happen again.  
24 So, that's the reason for my question. So if that  
25 78 acres isn't included in solid waste and just is

1 recognized as a buffer, because that's probably what  
2 it's going to be anyway, then it definitely can't be  
3 expanded into (indecipherable) point in time.

4 WASTE MANAGEMENT: So we need the  
5 wetlands per say -- so Terry, when we set the zoning  
6 district, we went to the physical boundaries. We  
7 also did our due diligence and that included  
8 delineations of the wetlands. So I think the zoning  
9 district area was set for (indecipherable) those  
10 wetlands and setbacks there. That being said, the  
11 land is restrictive from being developed into the  
12 eastern area towards Waltz Creek and wetlands.  
13 That's a fact and that's not changing whether it's  
14 only (indecipherable) there or not.

15 The shape of the development area is  
16 set based on those setbacks. We're up against the  
17 setbacks. There's no other room. We've got minimal  
18 amount of room available for the support areas, the  
19 storm water basins, the things we mentioned in the  
20 letter.

21 MR. KLEINTOP: I mean, we are -- all  
22 we can do is be advisory, but we certainly will be  
23 looking for a conservation easement on that property  
24 so that it's definitely protected from anything  
25 happening in the future. As far as expansion -- I'm

1     hearing what you're saying, I'm just saying that  
2     probably will be part of the Planning Commission's  
3     recommendation. Doesn't mean the Supervisors have  
4     to agree with us, but from a realistic standpoint, I  
5     think we owe that to the residents.

6                 MR. LEVITS: All right. Robin, do you  
7     have anything?

8                 MS. DINGLE: No.

9                 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Terry, just to  
10    finish that point. It's a little more complicated  
11    than we're sort of making it. In order to make the  
12    property or zoning to go anywhere but those  
13    boundaries that Dave mentioned, we have to carve up  
14    those properties in some odd way, and reshape that  
15    and reshape the district. All we're doing now is to  
16    the properties that we're acquiring, we're taking  
17    the zoning district to the natural boundary of those  
18    properties. That's why that makes sense. And what  
19    I mentioned before at the last meeting was, there's  
20    a way to restrict development of those properties,  
21    which we're willing to do, by way of -- we can  
22    address that in the development agreement.

23                What's happening now there today is  
24    that we've got -- there's some farmland actually  
25    being farmed, we've got some rental properties,

1 people are living there. It's not a one size fits  
2 all. If these were all open forests and all  
3 wetlands, we would -- absolutely, it'd be no issue  
4 subjecting them to conservations. We don't have  
5 that. This is not a one-size-fits-all situation.  
6 So we can make it work and we will, but it may just  
7 not be how you may want it or envisioned it being  
8 done. Does that make sense?

9 MR. KLEINTOP: It will be a point of  
10 discussion.

11 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Okay.

12 MR. LEVITS: Okay. Robin, you have  
13 something else?

14 MS. DINGLE: No, I'm good. Thank you.

15 MR. LEVITS: Over here, gentlemen?

16 MR. GEISSINGER: So just one real  
17 quick question and I apologize if I'm asking you to  
18 repeat yourself from an earlier meeting, but would  
19 you review your odor remediation steps?

20 WASTE MANAGEMENT: So listen, there  
21 are basically two categories that are associated  
22 with a landfill. So working phase odor, which I  
23 would categorize as fresh trash zone. You open up  
24 your garbage can in your home and get a whiff of  
25 what you throw out every day, that's sort of the

1 working phase odor. Then there's the landfill gas  
2 odor, which comes about through the natural  
3 decomposition of the waste. And as that decomposes,  
4 it generates a landfill gas which is released that  
5 we subsequently collect, control and destroy.

6 So we talked about a little earlier,  
7 there's a pretty sizable network of pipes with  
8 vertical gas wells, which we call horizontal loops,  
9 which is like a vertical gas well laid sideways that  
10 we place in the waste as we fill. One of the things  
11 that we recently changed within the last four years  
12 is we started doing that from the very day we build  
13 the cell and we certified the opening to receive  
14 waste, so actually landfill gas collection in the  
15 cell before a piece of waste goes in that cell. And  
16 then what we do, as the landfill fills over time, we  
17 expand that network, we drill new wells, we use  
18 what's called a sitwell casing where we actually  
19 build the well from the ground up where we actually  
20 plant a 36-inch casing of a stone target and as we  
21 fill up vertically, we pull that casing up through  
22 the waste, always keeping accurate vacuum log so we  
23 can extract the gas as it's being developed from the  
24 landfill.

25 Generally speaking, in our climate

1 area, we would expect to see between 45 and 40  
2 inches of rainfall. Based off that, we typically  
3 see gas generation from a fresh piece of waste going  
4 into the landfill within 12 to 18 months. So our  
5 objective and our goal in the way we base our gas  
6 system expansion, is to expand it over that new  
7 waste within that 12 to 18-month time frame so that  
8 the minute it starts generating landfill gas, we're  
9 collecting it and controlling it.

10 Now for Grand Central, our destruction  
11 devices for landfill gas and flares for the Green  
12 Energy Center, the bulk of the landfill gas we  
13 generate from that site is actually directed to the  
14 Green Energy Center and processed through the three  
15 turbines that generate electricity and put out on  
16 the public grid for consumption and use. Any excess  
17 gas or balance gas is then flared across two flare  
18 units on-site, but they're primarily there for  
19 backup more than anything, so.

20 The working phase odors, we do use a  
21 wet odor neutralizer system, we call it, so we do  
22 introduce an odor-neutralizing chemical in the  
23 water, although it's primarily water. It's about 95  
24 percent water. The reason why we do that is that  
25 the odor chemical in water that particulates at the



1 molecule can actually grab a particle odor in the  
2 working phase, and drag it through the ground up.  
3 So, if you visit the site, you would see that there  
4 are at least two mobile portable -- or portable  
5 water control systems that are at the working phase.

6 We went with those several years ago  
7 and we moved off of the old (indecipherable) that  
8 were along Pen Argyl Road and you can see sort of  
9 the water stream coming off those. We did that  
10 because we found it to be more effective to have  
11 those odor control units right at the working phase  
12 and they're portable so we can move them based on  
13 wind direction, speed, and filling location.

14 MR. GEISSINGER: Okay. All right.  
15 Thank you.

16 MR. LEVITS: The existing landfill,  
17 how many acres is that?

18 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Are you looking the  
19 line footprint area total --

20 MR. LEVITS: Total acreage you have.

21 WASTE MANAGEMENT: 500 not including  
22 the core property in the --

23 MR. LEVITS: Okay. And this new  
24 property is what? How much, 200 and?

25 WASTE MANAGEMENT: 325 in total.

1 MR. LEVITS: 325.

2 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Rezoning 211,  
3 constructing 81 acres disposable print.

4 MR. LEVITS: So we're going with 862  
5 acres. Do you know what the total acreage is in the  
6 Township by any chance? Anybody? I did know it but  
7 I forgot what it is.

8 WASTE MANAGEMENT: I kind of remember  
9 25 square miles. It said that in something I read  
10 recently.

11 MR. LEVITS: Yeah, I can't remember.

12 WASTE MANAGEMENT: So it's pretty  
13 sizable.

14 MR. LEVITS: The Township?

15 WASTE MANAGEMENT: 25 square miles I  
16 think is what I read.

17 MR. LEVITS: All right. I wonder what  
18 the percentage of the Township is going to -- if  
19 this goes through, what percentage is going to be  
20 solid waste compared to all the property available.

21 MS FORS: That's not solid waste.  
22 That's just total acreage that we own.

23 MR. LEVITS: No, that's what I'm  
24 asking for because that's what would be zoned.

25 WASTE MANAGEMENT: So the solid waste

1 footprint is smaller than that.

2 MR. LEVITS: Understood, but you still  
3 own a total acreage. Even if you put in for a  
4 housing development or any kind of development, if  
5 you have wetlands, it's still going to be zoned for  
6 that --

7 WASTE MANAGEMENT: But the solid waste  
8 zoning district for the landfill is probably around  
9 325.

10 MR. LEVITS: Okay.

11 WASTE MANAGEMENT: We have 130 acres  
12 of that actually built for interspace based on site  
13 features and setbacks.

14 MR. LEVITS: Okay.

15 WASTE MANAGEMENT: We would only --  
16 we'll be adding 211 acres.

17 MR. KLEINTOP: Yeah, 300.

18 WASTE MANAGEMENT: 500 in total is the  
19 right number for solid waste zoning district.  
20 Because the commercial industrial property is not in  
21 the solid waste district. That's 180 acres.

22 MS. DINGLE: Plainfield Township is  
23 much smaller than most (indecipherable), especially  
24 the ones that support landfills -- other landfills  
25 in the state. And Northampton County is definitely

1 (indecipherable). But definitely Plainfield  
2 Township, when you look at the size and  
3 distribution, is much smaller than other --

4 MR. LEVITS: All right. Any other  
5 questions from the board?

6 (No response.)

7 MR. LEVITS: All right.

8 MR. KLEINTOP: Paul. I have -- would  
9 you mind giving an explanation of Fair Share  
10 Doctrine? I mean -- 'cause that's -- I mean,  
11 we're --

12 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Well, Fair Share  
13 Doctrine provides -- and it comes up in many  
14 different instances. Ordinarily, the Fair Share  
15 Doctrine comes up with regards to housing apartments  
16 and things like that, you have to host your fair  
17 share. I don't know that that's applicable here.  
18 You have a landfill. I understand some people do  
19 not want it to expand, other people may want it to  
20 expand, but I don't know that you have a Fair Share  
21 issue here. I don't think you have to take the  
22 landfill 'cause of a Fair Share issue and I also  
23 don't think you're limited to expanding the landfill  
24 based on Fair Share.

25 Fair Share is -- you know, based on 33

1 coming down and you don't have any apartments and  
2 somebody wants to develop that and they file and  
3 exclusionary zoning challenge and they're arguing  
4 you don't take your fair share of apartments  
5 throughout the Township. There's not a Fair Share  
6 argument here. There's a, we have Waste management  
7 and they're requesting an expansion. You may not  
8 want to expand, but there's not a fair share issue,  
9 I don't believe.

10 MR. KLEINTOP: Okay. Now let me try  
11 to ask the question -- try to ask the question  
12 another way.

13 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Sure.

14 MR. KLEINTOP: If we don't have a fair  
15 share issue because we've offered the use for 30  
16 something years now --

17 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Right.

18 MR. KLEINTOP: -- and they're at  
19 capacity --

20 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Right.

21 MR. KLEINTOP: -- and that capacity  
22 has been agreed to in an agreement that was struck  
23 back in 1980.

24 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Right.

25 MR. KLEINTOP: If we've done all that,

1       then would the residents -- would the residents  
2       possibly have a lawsuit against Plainfield Township  
3       if the supervisor were to decide to rezone?

4               WASTE MANAGEMENT: Well, again, you're  
5       asking off the cuff. I haven't researched --

6               MR. KLEINTOP: Right.

7               WASTE MANAGEMENT: -- this issue in a  
8       while. However, I will tell you that zoning is  
9       strictly in the prerogative of the Board of  
10      Supervisors --

11              MR. KLEINTOP: Right.

12              WASTE MANAGEMENT: -- or Borough  
13      Council. It's a legislative act. It's been  
14      prescribed case after case after case to be a  
15      legislative act, and the Board of Supervisors has  
16      sole discretion really whether or not they want to  
17      expand a particular zoning district or change their  
18      zoning. I mean, look at all the townships that  
19      after a couple of years do a -- do a comprehensive  
20      plan and based on that comprehensive plan, they  
21      change the zoning considerably.

22              MR. KLEINTOP: Right.

23              WASTE MANAGEMENT: You know, it puts  
24      an industrial over here and puts some, you know,  
25      solid waste over here and they'll build a center

1 over here with predominantly residential over here.  
2 And supervisors do that all the time and that's not  
3 a fair share issue. That's a legislative issue  
4 (indecipherable).

5 MR. KLEINTOP: But is that something  
6 that could be of concern?

7 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Well, I hate to use  
8 the old adage -- anybody can file a lawsuit for  
9 anything, we've seen that.

10 MR. KLEINTOP: Right.

11 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Do I think that's  
12 an issue as we sit here right now, no, I don't.

13 MR. KLEINTOP: Okay.

14 WASTE MANAGEMENT: I mean, I  
15 understand that there were studies done in 1988, and  
16 at that time it was determined that this was an  
17 appropriate site and, you know, the acreage was  
18 appropriate. I understand that, but I don't believe  
19 that means that the board is prohibited by law --  
20 (indecipherable) you're asking, I don't believe the  
21 board is prohibited by law from rezoning a  
22 particular area. I just don't, off the cuff without  
23 researching --

24 MR. KLEINTOP: No, that's -- that's  
25 fine.

1 WASTE MANAGEMENT: That's where I am.

2 MR. KLEINTOP: Okay. Thank you.

3 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Sure.

4 MR. LEVITS: Okay. All right. I'm  
5 going to move to the public now. Jane, you asked to  
6 have some time to do a presentation. You want to do  
7 that?

8 MS. MELLERT: (Indecipherable).

9 MR. LEVITS: What?

10 MS. MELLERT: First?

11 MR. LEVITS: Yes, it's your turn.

12 WASTE MANAGEMENT: So, I just want to  
13 ask, Paul, we have public comment, is this something  
14 different than public comment?

15 MR. LEVITS: No, not really.

16 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Dave, can I ask a  
17 follow-up question?

18 MR. BACKENSTOE: Sure.

19 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Will this be new  
20 information?

21 MR. BACKENSTOE: I mean, I don't know.  
22 I don't know what it is.

23 WASTE MANAGEMENT: (Indecipherable)  
24 we're going to be hearing the same thing.

25 MR. BACKENSTOE: Yes, the Planning



1 Commission's allowed public comment each time, so I  
2 don't know if this is different. I mean, I think  
3 Ms. Mellert's presenting (indecipherable).

4 MS. MELLERT: There is --

5 MR. LEVITS: Is there a mic there,  
6 Jane?

7 MS. MELLERT: There is another copy of  
8 this map on the back table --

9 MR. LEVITS: Jane, you're not --

10 MS. MELLERT: If anybody wants --

11 RESIDENTS: We can't hear you.

12 MR. LEVITS: Hang on, Jane.

13 MS. MELLERT: I'm just going to say,  
14 while it appears that the waste industry has  
15 strategically planned for the future of the business  
16 in our area --

17 (Fixing the microphone.)

18 MS. MELLERT: Can you hear me now?

19 RESIDENTS: Yes.

20 MS. MELLERT: While it appears that  
21 the waste industry has strategically planned for the  
22 future of the business in our area, in the interest  
23 of their companies, the area municipal leaders,  
24 (indecipherable) not been prepared to take measures  
25 in the interest of the residents, the public, their

1 health, and what it would mean to the town, school  
2 district, environment, and future. The approach has  
3 been reactionary with decisions trying to be made in  
4 short time frames about issues that will forever  
5 change the area from what was planned.

6 In the past, Plainfield Township  
7 officials, staff, and committees put in a great deal  
8 of time to develop comprehensive plans, zoning  
9 districts, open space plans, subdivision land  
10 development, ordinances, farmland preservations,  
11 Little Bushkill Creek studies, official maps, all  
12 were done to create a vision and plan on how the  
13 lands in Plainfield Township could be developed and  
14 protected.

15 RESIDENTS: Still can't hear you.

16 MS. MELLERT: Comprehensive plans --

17 MR. LEVITS: It's not on.

18 MR. KLEINTOP: It's not on.

19 (Working on the microphone.)

20 MS. MELLERT: Okay. I'll just go back  
21 a short distance here. The comprehensive plans,  
22 studies, maps, zoning documents were the blueprint  
23 for the Township to preserve the rural nature while  
24 still allowing for development. This proactive  
25 approach allowed for all uses with restrictions.

1 The application for a second new solid waste  
2 processing and disposal district goes against the  
3 planning that was previously done. I believe a  
4 visual review of the Township land area can help  
5 provide the opportunity for the Township to take a  
6 new proactive approach for planning. In order to  
7 support this statement, I would like to present the  
8 following for your review. You can follow along in  
9 your packet. I think that's the map. It does lists  
10 all the documents that are attached. I put a lot of  
11 time into this. I'm going to go to the land areas.

12 The map presented indicates a large  
13 portion of the farmland being purchased is owned by  
14 Slate Spring Farms, LLC, Justine and Gary Perin as a  
15 managing share holder. Thirty-six of the parcels  
16 are in Waste Management's GCS application requesting  
17 land to be rezoned. Slate Spring Farms, LLC owns  
18 additional (indecipherable) in the Township. The  
19 Nazareth Borough Municipal Sewer Authority purchased  
20 the preserved power farm when I was  
21 (indecipherable).

22 So if you look at this area, right  
23 here was the solid waste zone district. This, the  
24 yellow area is all DCSL owned property. And this  
25 was the original (indecipherable) district. This is

1 a graveyard right here. All of this deeper pink  
2 area over here (indecipherable). They have 36  
3 parcels. That didn't happen overnight. I made this  
4 point because Plainfield Township did a great deal  
5 of work in order to determine what we wanted the  
6 character of the Township to be.

7 September of 2020, the Mack Farm,  
8 here, was purchased, and it was sold to Slate Spring  
9 Farms LLC, Gary Perin. The farm is not preserved.  
10 November of 2021, the Howard Farm located on Howard  
11 Road, which is preserved farmland, was sold to the  
12 Nazareth Borough Municipal Authority. That's right  
13 here. There is a great deal of detail in your  
14 packet on that that you can read. I won't go over  
15 the whole thing.

16 January of 2024, you see that this  
17 area was purchased. It was a farm and it still is a  
18 farm. That was the Achenbach Farm located on Pen  
19 Argyl Road (indecipherable) for auction. This land  
20 is preserved farmland. There were local people and  
21 people from out of the area present at the auction  
22 that wanted to buy the farm and run the land. None  
23 of the bidders could offer higher than Chrin Acres  
24 LLC's bid of 2 million 40 thousand. The owner of  
25 Chrin Acres LLC wasn't present at the sale. A

1 representative was on the phone.

2 In September of 2024, this parcel was  
3 purchased. Another Achenbach Farm located on Pen  
4 Argyl Road was purchased by Chrin Acres LLC. It's a  
5 1,572 square foot home and 46.15 acres. The  
6 property was purchased for 1 million 10 thousand.

7 The point is, we are largely farming  
8 forest. The parcels that are being purchased, okay,  
9 a great deal of those farmers are being outbid and  
10 they are purchased. It's going to Slate Spring  
11 Farms, Chrin Acres, the Nazareth Borough Sewer  
12 Authority. Nazareth Borough Sewer Authority  
13 purchased the land for this specific reason while  
14 spreading (indecipherable). Slate Spring Farms  
15 obviously, must have planned this as a way so that  
16 they have this large area all together for Gary  
17 Perin to sell to Waste Management. As we all know,  
18 Gary Perin was one of the original owners of Grand  
19 Central Sanitation.

20 In the past, the Township was  
21 (indecipherable) in supporting farmland preservation  
22 as a way of protecting the area from being overly  
23 developed and help the farmers to be able to  
24 continue to run their farms. We have all heard and  
25 read the phrase no farms, no food. Today,

1 Plainfield Township has a total of 51 farms  
2 preserved. Ten of them are partial easements,  
3 (indecipherable) boundaries for a total of 3,405  
4 acres. Municipal leaders believed this was part of  
5 the protection necessary for the future to retain  
6 the rural nature of the (indecipherable) and to make  
7 it easier for farms to be able to continue.  
8 Unfortunately, some of the organizations purchasing  
9 the farmland don't have the same vision and want to  
10 utilize it to resell for new landfills and dispose  
11 of the waste.

12                   The Borough of Pen Argyl, right here,  
13 is 1.4 square miles, the equivalent of 896 acres of  
14 land. Plainfield Township is 24.98 square miles.  
15 Two percent fair share of land area which is noted  
16 in the 1988 comprehensive plan study is equivalent  
17 of 319.74 acres. The current solid waste zoning  
18 district is based on the two percent of the Township  
19 land area. According to Waste Management permits  
20 and data, there are 477 PA DEP-permitted acres and a  
21 total of 805 facility acres. If Waste Management  
22 GCSL's rezoning request is approved, the land area  
23 owned by Waste Management GCSL with the addition of  
24 325 acres would be approximately 26 percent larger  
25 than the Borough of Pen Argyl.

1 Washington Township is a very short  
2 distance away, right here. Many residents deal with  
3 the odor issues from the landfill. The Green Wall  
4 Trout Hatchery and Nestle Waters are also a short  
5 distance away. The facilities are (indecipherable)  
6 the Delaware Road area. So, here's Delaware Road,  
7 you just go out a very short distance and it's  
8 Nestle Waters and if you want Trout Hatchery.

9 (Indecipherable) comprehensive plan in  
10 1988 and that created solid waste disposal  
11 processing district. In 2004, a joint comprehensive  
12 plan was done between Pen Argyl, Wind Gap, and  
13 Plainfield Township. It was adopted by the Board of  
14 Supervisors. The work group was 2002 to 2004. In  
15 2018 to 2024, the Township was in part working on  
16 another comprehensive plan with Plan Slate Belt that  
17 comprised of 10 municipalities.

18 In 2004, the Board of Supervisors  
19 voted to withdraw from the plan and create a  
20 separate comprehensive plan for Plainfield. At this  
21 time, the plan hasn't been started. During the  
22 process for Plan Slate Belt, Plainfield Township  
23 thoroughly reviewed and discussed the solid waste  
24 issue. The Township put in writing to the ten  
25 municipalities and Lehigh Valley Planning Commission

1     that the current solid waste disposal processing  
2     district is the Township's Fair Share for use.  
3     Language was worked on to include a Plan Slate Belt  
4     document to protect the Township.

5             During that time, Plainfield Township  
6     Board of Supervisors wanted the Township protected  
7     from another solid waste district. Due to the  
8     withdraw from Plan Slate Belt, a new comprehensive  
9     plan needs to be developed along with the proper  
10    studies. The maps located on the wall at the  
11    Plainfield Township Municipal Building, clearly  
12    indicate the research done in the past. The maps  
13    are marked with medium and high areas to consider  
14    for conservation. The official map is also on the  
15    wall.

16            It isn't time to approve a new zoning  
17    district, 325 acres for one company to use. It is  
18    time to go back to the workshops to strategically  
19    plan and develop an updated comprehensive plan to  
20    lead us into the future for all residents. The Pen  
21    Argyl Area School District Alma Mater was always a  
22    word considered of our area.

23            Nestled in the Blue Ridge Mountains  
24    beneath the azure sky rests our noble Alma Mater  
25    rests Pen Argyl High. Lofty tower of shining white



1     amid the hills of green Stands a Stalwart Sentinel  
2     that ever can be seen. You know, I used to always  
3     go down the road from Pen Argyl and you could  
4     immediately see the school. That was beautiful.  
5     You really can't. You're looking at a mountains of  
6     waste. The people that live near this and I don't  
7     think you could convince me they don't have odor  
8     issues 'cause I've smelled it many, many, many times  
9     myself. Two miles away in the morning when you  
10    walk, you can smell the neutralizer.

11                There are many people that aren't  
12    going to come to -- they're not going to speak.  
13    Much to my surprise, they're still afraid of  
14    (indecipherable). And so, I'm coming to you and I'm  
15    speaking for their behalf. I have a lot more I  
16    could say, but I don't want to take everybody's  
17    time. I know there's plenty of others that would  
18    like to speak.

19                I completely believe if this is  
20    approved, this will not be the end. You need to  
21    take a look at what's taking place and how  
22    Plainfield Township -- in the 1980's, Plainfield  
23    Township was being targeted and our area was being  
24    very targeted by (indecipherable). You know, they  
25    wanted, you know, needed a place to dump the waste

1     for most. Once again, we're in that position. We  
2     have more than one, you know, Nazareth Borough Sewer  
3     Authority and the new solid waste processing  
4     district -- we're being targeted and you need to  
5     take it seriously for the future of this  
6     municipality.

7                 It's a beautiful place to live and we  
8     want to keep it that way. We've always thought that  
9     this was going to be the area it was contained to  
10    and it wasn't going to grow. And the people that  
11    live on the outskirts of this -- actually, it's  
12    easier to get a solid waste zoning district than it  
13    is to go through some of the zoning hearings where  
14    you have to put every -- mail to every property  
15    owner at a certain radius a certified letter so that  
16    they can attend the meeting and know what's going  
17    on. They don't have to do this for a new solid was  
18    zoning district. Thank you so much for allowing me  
19    to give my input.

20                MR. LEVITS: All right, Jane. Thank  
21    you.

22                All right. I have four Plainfield  
23    Township residents, if you'd like to speak, I'll go  
24    down the list. J.R. Renna.

25                MR. RENNA: Thank you for your time.

1     Wow. Those trends that Jane outlined certainly are  
2     disturbing and I want to thank her for helping  
3     illustrate them for the public.

4             At the last Planning Commission  
5     Meeting, every single public comment, including  
6     myself, spoke out against the expansion. Now I  
7     imagine Waste Management has recruited some voices  
8     to speak on their behalf here tonight since the  
9     sentiments were so overwhelmingly negative last  
10    time. But I happen to know that several of those  
11    other commenters at the meeting are probably at the  
12    complete opposite end of the political spectrum from  
13    me. So even though we might not agree on anything  
14    politically, we have this in common. Opposition to  
15    expansion is a bi-partisan issue in which it's most  
16    certainly one of the most polarized periods of our  
17    lifetime. And that is really remarkable and worth  
18    applause for consideration.

19            Plainfield Township has planned for  
20    the moment before us and has saved 14 million so far  
21    in a trust to buffer the economic impact to the  
22    community from the closure of the dump for several  
23    years. In fact, you can do the math right from the  
24    handout that Waste Management provided. If the dump  
25    closed tomorrow, the trust can buffer the impact to

1 Plainfield Township for seven years. By the time of  
2 their projected closure, we're probably looking at  
3 closer to nine to ten years. During that time, new  
4 businesses will come to the Township. Indeed,  
5 several have plans already submitted. Along with  
6 them will come new tax revenue. Thanks to the trust  
7 and the planning of previous supervisors, we have a  
8 long runway to plan for and adjust budgets to fit  
9 our future.

10 Some folks believe there's no way  
11 forward without Waste Management involved in our  
12 community. What would we do if we didn't have Waste  
13 Management who donated money to maintain our  
14 athletic fields or sponsor community projects some  
15 asked. I want to recognize that folks with these  
16 concerns are good people and they are well-meaning  
17 people, but I do think their sentiments are a result  
18 of a strong and effective PR campaign pursued by  
19 Waste Management.

20 Does Waste Management donate to our  
21 community out of the goodness of their hearts? Hey,  
22 let's give them the benefit of the doubt. Maybe you  
23 do. But approving such expenditures would not  
24 happen unless it wasn't also a savvy business  
25 decision for them. We're not partners with Waste

1 Management. We're just a strategic investment to  
2 them. And they invest in the community and those  
3 investments might be significant from our  
4 perspective.

5 Sure, they look great on this paper.  
6 And you know what -- but they're just enough.  
7 They're just enough to buy your goodwill and get  
8 your support for their operation so they can  
9 continue to expand and extract exponentially more in  
10 profits by creating another giant mound of trash  
11 right next to those fields they kicked in an extra  
12 couple of bucks to help us maintain. This bargain  
13 is not worth it.

14 Their contributions are the adult  
15 equivalent of jiggling keys in front of a baby to  
16 capture their attention. Don't take the bait. We  
17 have before us the potential for a community that is  
18 free of the stink and the noise and the risks that  
19 come along with taking on more waste. But more  
20 importantly, we have the potential to be free of  
21 this toxic and unhealthy relationship where we're a  
22 pawn in Waste Management's quest to extract profits  
23 for their shareholders.

24 I've heard nothing bad will happen  
25 because landfills are a highly-regulated industry.

1 Well, you know what, so was oil drilling and in  
2 spite of that industry being highly regulated, we  
3 have instances like the Exxon (indecipherable) or BP  
4 oil spills inflicting irreputable harm to people,  
5 animals, and the environment. Even highly regulated  
6 industries bring with them inherent risks. So I ask  
7 you, how long do we want to keep extending our  
8 exposure to that kind of risk in our own backyard?

9 And I also want to reiterate my  
10 support for Waste Management employees. My uncle  
11 drove a garbage truck for GCS when I was growing up,  
12 okay. I know where you're coming from. And Waste  
13 Management can easily retain and reassign a few  
14 dozen staff that they would expect to be impacted by  
15 the closure. Trucks will still need to drive  
16 throughout neighborhoods and pick up trash each  
17 week, even if they deposit that trash somewhere  
18 else. We cannot allow the future of thousands of  
19 residents to be held hostage by Waste Management if  
20 they do choose to layoff those workers.

21 In 2023 the Plainfield Township  
22 Supervisors election, candidates who ran on a  
23 platform opposing expansion won the most votes in  
24 the Plainfield Ballotable area immediately  
25 surrounding the dump by a significant margin. Those

1     who don't live in smell range chose other candidates  
2     and ultimately decided that race, but the message  
3     was clear. People who live by the dump have had  
4     enough and voted as such. If we allow Waste  
5     Management to expand the dump, the number of people  
6     in that vote will only grow.

7             Despite Waste Management's mitigation  
8     efforts, and I hear that you guys really are trying,  
9     the persistent odor from the dump is a significant  
10    nuisance and the quality-of-life issue of our  
11    residents is unavoidable. Whatever efforts you are  
12    making to mitigate that smell, double it, triple it,  
13    or, shoot, maybe no matter how much you do it, it  
14    won't be sufficient to mask the smell because after  
15    all, it is trash and it stinks and we shouldn't have  
16    to be nose blind to it.

17            You know, all communities create  
18    trash, but not all communities have landfills. And  
19    somehow, those communities without landfills,  
20    somehow they manage to maintain their parks and  
21    athletic fields for their children to play at, fire  
22    departments that respond to emergencies, and  
23    community events and traditions. So if those  
24    communities can do it, so can we. We should be  
25    clear on it. And this transition may have

1 challenges, but sometimes folks, we need to make  
2 hard decisions for the greater good. This is one of  
3 those times. Thank you.

4 MR. LEVITS: All right. Thank you.  
5 Next on the list is either Mary or Mari, Grand  
6 Central Road.

7 MS. MULTISCH: Good evening. Thank  
8 you to the Planning Commission for allowing me to  
9 speak tonight. As a resident of Plainfield Township  
10 and likely the closest neighbor to Grand Central  
11 Landfill, I feel that it's important to share my  
12 perspective on this matter. I have spoken at  
13 previous meetings and my position remains the same.  
14 I support the rezoning of the property to allow for  
15 the future expansion of the landfill.

16 Waste Management is a necessity. And  
17 while landfills can be a source of debate, Grand  
18 Central Landfill has been a part of this community  
19 since the 1950's. Over the years, it has expanded  
20 responsibly adapting to the major needs of region  
21 while incorporating the latest technology to manage  
22 waste in the safest and most efficient way possible.  
23 The reality is that this landfill exists because of  
24 all of us, each and every one of us in this room and  
25 in the community.



1           The average American throws away over  
2     five pounds of trash daily. And Waste Management  
3     has a responsibility of handling this waste in a  
4     safe, efficient, and environmentally-conscious way.  
5     Deficit (indecipherable) is not just about land use.  
6     It is about the long-term economic stability of our  
7     community. The revenue generated through taxes and  
8     host (indecipherable) along with the generous  
9     contributions from Waste Management directly  
10    supports the Slate Belts infrastructure, public  
11    services, and local organizations.

12           Beyond that, the landfill sustains  
13    hundreds of jobs. Jobs that extend beyond Waste  
14    Management employees, contractors, vendors, and  
15    local businesses that rely on this continued  
16    operation. At the same time, I recognize that the  
17    responsible waste management must balance economic  
18    and environmental consideration.

19           As we look towards the future, I  
20    encourage continued investment and sustainability  
21    initiatives and technologies that minimize  
22    environmental impact while ensuring the essential  
23    waste services remain viable. If this rezoning is  
24    denied, we risk not fully limiting future operations  
25    but also jeopardizing the livelihoods of many in our

1 community. I urge the Planning Commission to  
2 recommend this request and move it forward to the  
3 supervisors for final consideration. Thank you for  
4 your time.

5 MR. LEVITS: Okay. Thank you. Wayne  
6 Muller.

7 MR. MULLER: Good evening. Thank you  
8 for giving me the opportunity to speak tonight. My  
9 name is Wayne Muller. I've been a resident of the  
10 county of the Township for about 35 years. I was a  
11 science teacher. I taught Physics, Chemistry,  
12 Biology, and Environmental Science for 30 years. I  
13 just retired. That being said, I'm a numbers kind  
14 of guy. I'm the kind of guy that just came a little  
15 late. This is the first time I've ever spoken at a  
16 township meeting of any type. So being a teacher  
17 in -- in the science field, I'm a numbers kind of  
18 guy and I'm hearing about a study done in 1988 -- I  
19 need numbers, I need statistics that are fair and  
20 unbiased, you know, that's something that I really  
21 need to validate my position on anything. So that  
22 being said, I have a couple of questions that I hope  
23 the Planning Commission would ponder. And I'll just  
24 go through them and I'm not looking for answers  
25 tonight, but I just want you to think about them.

1                   Number one, who has determined how  
2 much time the landfill has left if this expansion is  
3 not approved? Has there been a study by EPA or any  
4 other agencies that regulate landfills? How do we  
5 know that four years is four years? I mean, I heard  
6 that at the last couple of meetings I went to, but I  
7 haven't seen anything. I haven't seen any numbers  
8 on that.

9                   Number two, how much -- how -- has it  
10 been studied how much the milage will need to be  
11 increased if the landfill does shut down? So, no  
12 one's told me how much our milage is going to go up.  
13 Although it just went up by two mils, by the way.  
14 Who is to say how long the 14 or 15 million dollar  
15 fund will last and by how much that would offset  
16 this increase in milage? I don't know. Again,  
17 maybe these answers have come about in the last  
18 couple of years, but I'm late in the game.

19                  Number four, what would be the benefit  
20 to the residents of the Township if we allow the  
21 expansion? Would we see free refuge pickup like  
22 some of our neighbors have? We have Plainfield  
23 Township and the biggest landfill in the area and we  
24 pay for our garbage. I don't know -- maybe I'm  
25 wrong, but does Pen Argyl pay for their garbage? I

1 mean, I understand it was negotiated but --

2 (Overlapping speakers.)

3 MR. MULLER: Yeah, and I think Wind  
4 Gap does, but I think --

5 RESIDENT: No.

6 MR. MULLER: No? They don't? But I  
7 think that's something that should be a leverage  
8 tool. And maybe this is directed towards the  
9 Supervisors not the Commission, but that should be a  
10 leverage tool that you go to the table and say,  
11 let's -- let's look at that.

12 Number five is really important to me.  
13 Has there been any impact studies done on the  
14 environmental consequences if this expansion  
15 proceeds? Many people don't care if it's not in  
16 their backyard, however, it is slowly creeping into  
17 our backyard. You mentioned PFAS and -- and --  
18 that's just one of the multitude of toxins that can  
19 come about in any landfill. You've got methane,  
20 you've got ammonia, you've got hydrosulfide, SO<sub>2</sub>,  
21 sulfur dioxide, you have dust, you have heavy  
22 metals, you have toxins of all sorts and they did  
23 mention a couple of things like the -- I didn't know  
24 about the radioactive waste. What's the half-life  
25 again for -- for Iodine 131?

1                   WASTE MANAGEMENT: I think it was the  
2     65 days.

3                   MR. MULLER: Okay. And then what's  
4     the (indecipherable)?

5                   WASTE MANAGEMENT: I don't know off  
6     the top of my head.

7                   MR. MULLER: Well, that's something to  
8     look at because it may pertain to something that is  
9     very harmful as well. It probably doesn't have as  
10    long of a half-life, but it's something you have to  
11    look at. And this is something that I think the  
12    community should be aware of. They really need to  
13    know. You know, hey, maybe it's just going to be  
14    detained in earth gas, who knows. And, you know,  
15    that's not too harmful for human population, but  
16    yeah, it should be looked at.

17                   And do we also have the studies to  
18    determine if there's any adverse health effects with  
19    the landfill being in our backyard? I have a close  
20    family recently diagnosed with thyroid cancer. I  
21    don't know if that's a connection and it certainly  
22    may not be, but are there any other types of  
23    illnesses or cancers that come about because we have  
24    this landfill in our backyard? That's just some of  
25    the things I wanted you guys to think about as

1     you're making your decision to recommend to the  
2     supervisors.

3                 So in closing, I'm very concerned with  
4     the direction our Township is headed in. For the  
5     taxes we pay now, and again, they just increased by  
6     two mils, I would expect a better return in our  
7     investment. Just a quick example, we have a  
8     cost-effective measure to pave the roads in our  
9     development, but they didn't repave it with asphalt.  
10    It looks like it was tarred and chipped. It's -- I  
11    mean, it -- it saved money. But again, we have a  
12    lot of money in this Township and you just raised  
13    our milage. And I think they did a half-hazard job  
14    with our paving of our road. And that's just one  
15    example.

16                So as you figured out, I'm not in  
17    favor of this expansion. Especially, in the absence  
18    of the numbers I have not seen. It was about 45  
19    minutes it took me to get over 20 signatures in my  
20    development. I basically just went on my street and  
21    I submitted a petition of those signatures to folks  
22    at the Township building. And I could have probably  
23    got every signature almost in my development just  
24    walking around. I spent 20 minutes going up and  
25    down my street and got those -- those signatures.

1                   So, vote so the commissioners seek  
2                   real answers to my questions and not just listen to  
3                   Waste Management. I think we all know where they  
4                   stand, so. Thank you.

5                   MR. LEVITS: All right. Thank you.  
6                   All right. Konrad Mellert.

7                   MR. MELLERT: No.

8                   MR. LEVITS: No, you're good? Okay.  
9                   Colleen --

10                  MS. TROIANI: I didn't -- I didn't  
11                  mean to sign that to speak. Sorry.

12                  MR. LEVITS: Not speaking? No?

13                  MS. TROIANI: No.

14                  MR. LEVITS: Okay. All right.

15                  MS. TROIANI: Sorry.

16                  MR. LEVITS: It's okay. That's fine.  
17                  Paul Romano?

18                  MR. ROMANO: Thank you for letting me  
19                  speak. I support the landfill. (Indecipherable)  
20                  I'm only a half mile away. I bought my house 55  
21                  years ago. I knew what I was getting myself  
22                  involved in. The only thing I don't understand is  
23                  when the township saves money, where does it go? To  
24                  the only place that has it. The world's changing.  
25                  All these farms -- let me ask y'all something, if

1     you had to farm 300 acres, a developer came in and  
2     said, hey, I'll give you 45 million, are you gonna  
3     say no? Come on. Get real people.

4                     Waste Management plays by the rules.  
5     I know a lot of you don't even know anything about  
6     garbage. I was in the garbage business for 20  
7     years. You're worried about the atmosphere, how  
8     many of you have disposed of things in your garbage  
9     that weren't supposed to be there? How many people  
10    use Roundup? How many people put fertilizer on  
11    their yard? You're worried about the -- all the  
12    water runoff. Think about everything that we do  
13    that we shouldn't be doing. You're worried about  
14    the dust, what about when the farmers are in the  
15    field and they're turned over, it's a dusty day.  
16    Op, it's Waste Management's fault. Bangor American  
17    Road, sulfur problem, op, it's Grand Central.  
18    They're putting cow shit on the field, must be Grand  
19    Central. If Grand Central goes out, I'm sorry,  
20    people, but we have nothing else to talk about.  
21    That's why I support the landfill. I think maybe  
22    some -- a lot of these people should go to the  
23    landfill and see how it operates. It's not a crappy  
24    job. They run it by the book.

25                     If it's windy, garbage blows out,



1       they're there picking it up. I mean, ask everybody  
2       else something. You put your garbage out, the cans  
3       blow over, do you go pick it up? Oh no, we'll let  
4       them blow down the road, but if Grand Central does  
5       it, it's different. I'm just saying, think before  
6       you make the decision. They are superb. They give  
7       money to the community and, like the gentleman said,  
8       I live in Plainfield Township, I gotta pay for  
9       garbage. Wind Gap gets it for nothing. Pen Argyl  
10      gets it for nothing.

11                   What happens if Waste Management goes  
12      out? Pen Argyl gets nothing, Wind Gap gets nothing.  
13      Then that gives somebody else something to complain  
14      about. I'm just saying. And they do a lot for the  
15      community. There is no other business. It's all  
16      I'm saying, we don't have it. You either complain  
17      about the landfill or we have warehouses. And you  
18      let them come in and they get five or ten years tax  
19      free. Are we getting anything? Nothing. Thank  
20      you.

21                   MR. LEVITS: Okay. Donald Renwer?

22                   MR. RENWER: Oh no. I didn't know it  
23      was to speak.

24                   MR. LEVITS: That's okay. All right.  
25      Millie?

1 MS BEAHN: Good evening. Now is this  
2 on? Is it loud enough?

3 MR. GEISSINGER: No, you have to use  
4 the other one.

5 MS. BEAHN: Okay. I'll try to keep it  
6 close enough because if you don't, you can't hear  
7 me. First of all, Planning Commission, what are you  
8 supposed to review to make a difference? Can  
9 anybody tell me what you're supposed to review about  
10 this issue that's going to make a difference?  
11 Because people have their minds made up, either they  
12 want it or they don't.

13 For a long time, in 20 -- 2000, they  
14 took the Planning Commission to the court for an  
15 expansion. They got the expansion because they made  
16 the area where they were bigger. Bigger around,  
17 higher, made it bigger, bigger, bigger, got a lot  
18 more room to put more garbage. So now it's not just  
19 a hill, it's a mountain. So that was 20 years ago.  
20 Now we are 20 years later and here we are. In 20 --  
21 in all the articles -- here's rezoning area, same  
22 thing over and over and over and over with rezoning.

23 So they said Waste Management seeks  
24 rezoning for a 42 million dollar expansion for Slate  
25 Belt landfill. This was in 2020 but they wanted it

1 way back long before that too. And they got it for  
2 another 20 years. So then in 2024 it says,  
3 Plainfield Supervisors acted properly in rejecting  
4 landfill rezoning. Grand Central seeks again to  
5 expand over again. Here we are again. The third  
6 time, here we are again. Spending all these  
7 people's time and everybody's nerve -- mine are  
8 shot. My nerves are shot, but, you know, here we  
9 are because I care about the community, okay. I  
10 care about the people of Pen Argyl, and Wind Gap,  
11 and Plainfield, and I don't give a damn about a  
12 garbage bill. Plainfield has to pay it, big deal.  
13 Pen Argyl and Wind Gap have to pay sewer and water  
14 bills, Plainfield doesn't, I guess. So are we gonna  
15 argue about a garbage bill over our future and our  
16 health. Where is the health analysis? I'd like to  
17 know.

18 So here we are, they made a solid  
19 waste district years ago. We -- we -- we filled --  
20 fulfilled our obligation. They made a solid waste  
21 district. We did it. It's done. I don't know why  
22 we have to do more.

23 Now, here's something else  
24 interesting, do you know what a sacrifice zone is?  
25 It is an area that is targeted for (indecipherable)

1 or toxic land uses in order to protect areas  
2 considered more worthy for these uses. Sacrifice  
3 zones often give the toxic land uses, but do not get  
4 the benefits from these uses. They do not share the  
5 wealth created. Well, yeah, we get more money from  
6 Waste Management, they help with all kinds of little  
7 things. But you know what, we also have the Green  
8 Knight Economic Development Corporation and their  
9 mission statement was, providing economic relief for  
10 poor and distressed land to local citizens. They  
11 were supposed to put up that building, provide --  
12 take that money from the (indecipherable) and --  
13 take that money and use it to help the community.  
14 Let them give the grants and the -- and the  
15 scholarships for the school. I know they've given  
16 some, I don't know how much, but we should not be  
17 looking to Waste Management to supplement our  
18 community for some scholarships.

19 (Indecipherable) Green Knight Economic  
20 Development provides economic relief for poor and  
21 distressed local citizens. Boy, does that say --  
22 what does that say to me? And this whole thing that  
23 I read about sacrifice zones, what does that tell  
24 us? Here it says, one of the reasons -- I deal with  
25 (indecipherable) in Carbon County a lot, they're up

1       there fighting for the same thing we are. It says,  
2       to protect our county from being an easy target for  
3       these toxic land uses, when we fight back we are  
4       less attractive as a sacrifice zone. When we stay  
5       vigilant and identify these proposed uses before  
6       they become a reality, we are less attractive as a  
7       sacrifice zone. Carbon County has fought and won  
8       against those and they're fighting and they continue  
9       to fight. Now, all these folks with all your big  
10      piles of books, you were here before. You were here  
11      before. You were here before.

12               The supervisors are in there now a  
13      couple of them (indecipherable) my sister  
14      (indecipherable) they could taste it. I had  
15      somebody look at me in the face and say everybody  
16      hates her. Why, because she cares about our  
17      community for the last 30 years? Give me a break.

18               Green Knight Developing Corporation,  
19      it's a business. They build things, they're working  
20      on things, they're trying to do make jobs just like  
21      Waste Management. But Waste Management is too close  
22      to town. It should have never been allowed to  
23      expand next to Pen Argyl. The people in Pen  
24      Argyl -- you know, it's just ridiculous. Why would  
25      anybody want to justify expanding a zone two

1 miles -- a mile from the town right up to the back  
2 door? So, I don't know what you think this can --  
3 this Planning Commission can do. Just like I said  
4 in the beginning, what are you supposed to do -- to  
5 review to make a difference? You can sit here and  
6 justify for days on end and ask questions about all  
7 the thing that they're telling you. I don't doubt  
8 that they want to do a good job. I don't doubt it  
9 for a minute, but it's too close to town and too  
10 close to people's homes. And yes, Gary Perin, he  
11 continues to buy more and more and more properties  
12 and Waste Management wants to buy them all so they  
13 can get a bigger landfill. And then he bought the  
14 Mack Farm on the other side of the road. So what's  
15 he gonna do? In 20 years, he's gonna want to do the  
16 other side of the road so the whole area is nothing  
17 but a dump. Is that what you want to tell me?

18 MR. LEVITS: Okay. Thank you. All  
19 right. Dave Jones?

20 (No response.)

21 MR. LEVITS: No Dave Jones. Okay.  
22 Brenda Stoudt?

23 (No response.)

24 MR. LEVITS: No. Okay. Ron DeCesare?

25 (No response.)

1                   MR. LEVITS: Is he here still? I saw  
2 him here. Did he go?

3                   RESIDENT: He left.

4                   MR. LEVITS: Nothing. Okay. Jeff  
5 Stoudt?

6                   MR. STOUDT: I'll pass.

7                   MR. LEVITS: Pass. Okay. Tim and  
8 Judy Mellert?

9                   MR. MELLERT: No.

10                  MR. LEVITS: Pass. Okay. Joe  
11 Barabas, 1097 Mill Road.

12                  MR. BARABAS: Yes, sir. My name is  
13 Joe Barabas. I've been in the Township for 45 years  
14 on Mill Road, same place. A question first for the  
15 Planning Commission. I know you're an advisory  
16 board to the Board of Supervisors. When you look at  
17 a plan of the applicant, you don't just look at the  
18 plan. Obviously, you look at the impact of all the  
19 properties and around it and the Township itself, is  
20 that correct?

21                  MR. LEVITS: We try.

22                  MR. BARABAS: Okay. Yeah, you're in a  
23 tough spot. Okay. I -- I -- it's hard to say this,  
24 but I have to agree with a couple of the folks  
25 supporting Grand Central not -- or Waste Management,

1 not the expansion. When I moved here many years  
2 ago, obviously, I didn't know there was a landfill.  
3 It was a lot smaller. But I'm glad Waste Management  
4 took it over because it (indecipherable). When  
5 there was an expansion, I told my wife, they're  
6 going to get it because they do a good job.  
7 However, that's not a reason to let them expand.

8 So one of the things I'm going to have  
9 to do, if this happens to go through, is spend a lot  
10 of money on water tests because I live in an area  
11 and I'm concerned about the aquifer. So  
12 (undecipherable) that's personal, but I think I  
13 would recommend anybody in the area around this  
14 landfill, this expansion, to test their water on a  
15 regular basis. There's no system -- I don't care  
16 what the guarantees are that's 100 percent. So  
17 there's probably going to be some water that gets  
18 through. I don't know, but I have that concern.

19 And then, you look at the cost  
20 benefit. We lose farmland, loss of property  
21 values -- I know with Deer Park, which is old like  
22 BlueTriton down near off of (indecipherable) great  
23 water. I think they have the same (indecipherable),  
24 it's just super stuff. I'd hate to see it  
25 compromised with something that goes south at the



1 landfill. So you folks have a tough job.

2 And then, when I get to the township  
3 zoning by the township supervisors -- and this is a  
4 rhetorical question, what if they weren't coming  
5 forward with an expansion, they were going to shut  
6 down in five years, what would the supervisors do?  
7 They have to come up with a plan. So they need to  
8 look at it that way. That's not your purview but...  
9 Thank you and good luck.

10 MR. LEVITS: Thank you. Okay. That's  
11 all the Plainfield Township residents that had  
12 signed in. I'll move over to the Pen Argyl Borough.  
13 I have an Andrew -- I can't pronounce it -- on  
14 Schanck Avenue.

15 MR. NECHETSKY: Shouldn't have sat so  
16 far away from the podium. Hi everybody, good  
17 evening. Before I get started, I just wanted to  
18 mention that the Green Knight Economic Development  
19 Corporation people are referring to they're doing  
20 all these great things, that is funded in a nutshell  
21 directly through Waste Management operations, which  
22 contributed roughly three million dollars in  
23 scholarship money. In case anybody was wondering.

24 For those that don't know me, my name  
25 is Andrew Nechetsky. I'm a resident of Pen Argyl.

1 I'm a board member of the Green and White Youth  
2 Association and a representative here tonight, as  
3 well as a coach for flag football and T-ball. I'm  
4 also an officer of Pen Argyl watch number 594  
5 Freemasons, former volunteer firefighter lookout for  
6 the fire company in Pen Argyl.

7 I came here to speak about the  
8 importance of having Waste Management as our  
9 neighbor. I hear a lot of comments about people  
10 complaining about the smell and eyesore of the  
11 facility. I'm going to be honest here, I don't  
12 recall the last time I smelled the landfill. And I  
13 can see it from my house.

14 RESIDENTS: Are you kidding?

15 MR. LEVITS: No. All right. People.

16 MR. GEISSINGER: All right.

17 MR. LEVITS: People. People.

18 MR. NECHETSKY: I don't recall  
19 interrupting you.

20 MR. LEVITS: No.

21 RESIDENT: All right. That's fair.

22 MR. LEVITS: People, no.

23 RESIDENT: Let's go out there tonight.  
24 I'll drive you up.

25 MR. LEVITS: People.

1                   RESIDENT: I'll drive you up. All  
2 right.

3                   MR. LEVITS: Yo!

4                   MR. GEISSINGER: It's getting out of  
5 control.

6                   RESIDENT: Let's go. Let's go for a  
7 ride.

8                   MR. GEISSINGER: Everybody gets a  
9 chance to speak.

10                  RESIDENT: I'll take you up there  
11 right now.

12                  MR. GEISSINGER: You have to say  
13 something.

14                  MR. NECHETSKY: I live there. I can  
15 see it from my house. Anyway, we also practice on  
16 the baseball fields next to it. And last football  
17 season, I don't recall anybody smelling it in the  
18 three days a week we were there. Sure, it does  
19 happen every now and then, but it's rare. As far as  
20 an eyesore, once the -- once the current landfill is  
21 complete, it'll be vegetation, you won't even know  
22 it's there.

23                  We're talking about getting rid of a  
24 fantastic relationship over smell. We seem to  
25 forget everything else tied to such a drastic

1 conclusion. I live in Pen Argyl, as I said before.  
2 My parents are Plainfield residents. I grew up  
3 here. Hell, I spent most of my life here. I've  
4 lived in Allentown, Bethlehem, Texas when I  
5 enlisted, California, yet here I am. I'm back. My  
6 wife and I planned -- decided to plant our family's  
7 roots here eight years ago. We decided this is  
8 where we wanted to raise our family.

9 I grew up playing sports. How many of  
10 you here played sports at the Green and White? How  
11 many of you have kids that currently play on those  
12 fields? Sports are an incredible way to teach  
13 children valuable life lessons, leadership,  
14 sportsmanship, it builds confidence, so on and so  
15 forth. It (indecipherable) and away from staring at  
16 screens all day.

17 I don't know if you realize this, but  
18 the cost of living is quite out of hand. If you  
19 think it's hard to get by now, how hard do you think  
20 it's gonna be for organizations like us to get  
21 donors to help us out with keeping these youth  
22 sports programs going and keeping the fields usable?  
23 It's not easy getting people to help us and we don't  
24 see anybody chomping at the bit to help. But you  
25 know who has been consistently helping us, Waste

1 Management. They never bat an eye, they never  
2 question. They're so willing to assist us in  
3 bettering our kid's programs.

4 This year they're helping us pay to  
5 have one of our baseball fields completely redone.  
6 Years ago, they donated (indecipherable) so that we  
7 may expand. Something we're currently planning, we  
8 just approved the start of a feeder program for  
9 youth field hockey. We're hoping to expand in the  
10 land that was donated and give them a proper field  
11 to play on. They're even helping us plan the  
12 installation of a new playground on the property and  
13 helping us navigate grant writing. Waste Management  
14 has donated well over \$200,000 to our organization  
15 in various ways over the years.

16 Let's face it, the golden years of  
17 textile mills and slaves are long gone. Without  
18 this partnership in our community, we can face a  
19 serious decline in the communities, the surrounding  
20 communities as well. This decision we are here to  
21 discuss tonight is about rezoning property. Yes,  
22 all the land does reside in Plainfield Township.  
23 This 100 percent impacts the entire area, Pen Argyl  
24 and Wind Gap included.

25 Not only does Waste Management account

1 for over two million in taxes collected by the  
2 Township, but they also pay Pen Argyl Borough about  
3 a million dollars a year to be used towards projects  
4 and operating expenses. Not to mention the three  
5 plus million that I mentioned before in  
6 scholarships. They also donated roughly 1.1 million  
7 dollars in educational improvements in schools like  
8 Faith Christian and Holy Family Schools. They've  
9 been donating tens of thousands of dollars to Slate  
10 Belt Regional, Plainfield Fire, Wind Gap Fire, and  
11 Lookout Fire in Pen Argyl annually, as well as Weona  
12 Pool Pals. Who's going to fill this gap?

13 Let's talk about public safety. If  
14 extra funding for the three fire companies and the  
15 police goes away, what do you do? Now you're  
16 raising taxes just for that. Not including raising  
17 taxes to fill the gap for income tax and  
18 (indecipherable) budgets for the Boroughs and  
19 Township. Has anyone actually broken down the  
20 numbers of what this is ultimately going to cost?  
21 Waste Management closing would not only cripple our  
22 economy, but possibly our local governments. And if  
23 you don't have the extra funding for projects and  
24 maintenance that is being provided by Waste  
25 management, then you have to increase taxes that

1 people can't afford. What are you gonna to do?  
2 There's not a single person here -- oh nope, hold  
3 on.

4 This operation, and it wasn't Waste  
5 Management back then, but it's been an operation  
6 since 1951. A lot of us that moved here knew that  
7 when we bought our houses. We could have easily  
8 moved somewhere else, but we didn't. If it was so  
9 bad, why didn't you choose another town? I hear  
10 things about it being unsafe having a landfill here.  
11 Have you ever seen the regulations that landfills  
12 have to adhere to? I work in the natural gas  
13 industry and I thought we had it bad. It's one of  
14 the most regulated businesses in this country. It  
15 is that way for a reason, to make sure that we are  
16 protected and safe.

17 Listen, our trash needs to go  
18 somewhere. The other landfills in the area are  
19 almost at max capacity and looking for other  
20 solutions. Some have to close in the next five  
21 years or so because they can't expand. So the  
22 argument when people ask is, what about all the jobs  
23 if Waste Management goes away and people say, just  
24 go to another landfill. That's not really an  
25 option. So they're out of a job, can't support

1     their families, and need to find another place to  
2     ship garbage to. There aren't many other options  
3     that do not involve a seriously large price tag. I  
4     can't afford that, can you? We're sitting here  
5     talking about the future of our children and Waste  
6     Management is helping us provide an affordable,  
7     safe, educational, and even a fun future for our  
8     children.

9                     These people are an ally. Believe it  
10    or not, they actually care. They care because they  
11    live here and they work here. This rezoning impacts  
12    thousands of lives, thousands. Not just Plainfield,  
13    you have all of our futures in your hands tonight.  
14    My child's future. I pray to God that you do the  
15    right thing and submit your approval to the Board of  
16    Supervisors or your recommendation to allow the  
17    rezoning to go through, because if not, I really  
18    don't know how most of us will survive the aftermath  
19    of this. Thank you for your time.

20                    MR. LEVITS: All right. Thank you. I  
21    just want to say that I expect everybody to remain  
22    civil, pro or con. Everybody is entitled to their  
23    opinion and we have the public comment and that is  
24    for you to express your position.

25                    All right. Next on the list,



1 Tighe Scott.

2 MR. SCOTT: Do I have to push the  
3 button on this?

4 MR. GEISSINGER: It was on. The light  
5 should be on.

6 MR. SCOTT: I probably don't need it  
7 anyway. But listen, gentlemen and ladies of the  
8 Board or Planning Commission, I got all the respect  
9 for ya and thank you for putting up with everybody  
10 here tonight and listening to us. The Board of  
11 Supervisors or whatever, president of Plainfield  
12 Township, my respect for you too.

13 This is a tough deal you're up  
14 against. You've heard the good, the bad, and I'm  
15 going to tell you a couple of things that I'm -- I'm  
16 so concerned. We have -- how many of you are Waste  
17 Management employees, right at this table here? Can  
18 you raise your hand, please? Okay. And the other  
19 people representing them, how many -- where are you  
20 from, sir? You in the glasses right there.

21 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Bucks County.

22 MR. SCOTT: What do you do for Waste  
23 Management?

24 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Consultant.

25 MR. SCOTT: Pardon?

1                   WASTE MANAGEMENT: Engineering  
2 consultant.

3                   MR. SCOTT: Engineering consultant.  
4 Okay. You didn't raise your hand though. You don't  
5 work for them, right? You're subcontracted to them,  
6 right?

7                   WASTE MANAGEMENT: I am now.

8                   MR. SCOTT: But you're a professional  
9 representing them here tonight, is that right?

10                  (No verbal response.)

11                  MR. SCOTT: Okay. How about the  
12 gentlemen next to you?

13                  (Cross speaking. Unable to make out  
14 what is being said.)

15                  MR. SCOTT: No, I just wanted to know  
16 who I'm talking to here.

17                  WASTE MANAGEMENT: So this a --  
18 understood --

19                  MR. SCOTT: No --

20                  (Cross speaking. Unable to make out  
21 what is being said.)

22                  WASTE MANAGEMENT: I'll get to the  
23 point, but I need to put the point out here to the  
24 public because I'm gonna -- I'm gonna -- what I'm  
25 trying to explain is that this body -- we don't have

1 anyone here -- that these are people that gave their  
2 time to come here and they give their time,  
3 basically donate their time to represent the people  
4 of their -- citizens of their community. You  
5 understand that?

6 WASTE MANAGEMENT: I understand that.

7 MR. SCOTT: Okay. Now, with that  
8 said, is there anybody on this side of the table,  
9 this professional engineers or biologists or anyone  
10 here that's representing the people of -- your  
11 citizens?

12 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Our engineer is  
13 here.

14 MR. SCOTT: Okay. You're an engineer,  
15 now are you an engineer in landfills?

16 WASTE MANAGEMENT: No.

17 MR. SCOTT: Okay. That's what --  
18 that's the point I'm trying to make. We've had  
19 people questioning and we've had great people here  
20 asking questions to them about what they are telling  
21 us that they have, but boy, I'll tell you, I  
22 wouldn't want to go to court when this hits them  
23 because I'll tell you what happens is these people  
24 are professionals at their job. We have part-time  
25 people donating their time to represent the citizens

1 of this community without any equal representation  
2 for knowledge of what we're being asked to plan for  
3 the Planning Commission to give to the Board. So, I  
4 mean, what are we doing here? You know, I mean,  
5 these people are professionals. Now, Dave, I'm not  
6 taking anything away from you. You're an attorney.

7 MR. BACKENSTOE: Yes.

8 MR. SCOTT: But there ain't nobody  
9 doing what these people do. What Scott Perin does  
10 all his life. He does a good job at it. But -- but  
11 I mean --

12 MR. BACKENSTOE: They're here for a  
13 zoning expansion and they're presenting.

14 MR. SCOTT: No, I -- that's the point  
15 I'm trying to make. But -- and telling me about  
16 controlling smell. I don't know. Does that guy  
17 work for Waste Management that told me he can't  
18 smell that? Well, maybe. Is there anybody in here  
19 that works for Waste Management? In the audience  
20 here that works for Waste Management right now?

21 (No verbal response.)

22 MR. SCOTT: Okay. There you go. All  
23 right. So I'm trying to make a point here. I don't  
24 think the -- I don't think that the Planning  
25 Commission can fairly represent or make a decision

1 based on the information that you were provided for  
2 the questions you're asking from the information  
3 that they are giving you. I don't think without  
4 professional advice and having -- you would need at  
5 least two other professional engineers that are in  
6 this business that they are in. My father only went  
7 to ninth grade, but you know what he always said?  
8 He said, you don't have to know everything but you  
9 have to have somebody that works for you that knows  
10 what they're being asked. You can't -- it's not  
11 fair. This is not a fair shot. You guys are taking  
12 advantage of us and I don't like it.

13           Personally, it really irks me to sit  
14 here and listen to this testimony because I can't  
15 fathom this happening. And you -- and if somebody  
16 says that this doesn't smell -- I offered this to  
17 the board and I will do this again, I will pay for a  
18 bus and we will take the bus and we will park up on  
19 top of Pen Argyl Road and we will have lunch up  
20 there any time of day, day or night, and we'll sit  
21 there and we're going to eat. But bring your barf  
22 bags, because if the person can't smell it,  
23 something is wrong with his nostrils. I'll take him  
24 to the doctor, so then we get a professional opinion  
25 on his sense of smell. But it's just -- and then

1 we'll go down to Tullytown and we'll visit that  
2 community and we'll see what those people have  
3 experienced in their lifetime. And this fact here,  
4 you're going to be destroying parts of this  
5 community forever by the decision that's made here.  
6 And it's unfortunate it's put in front of you. I  
7 feel bad for you, I do.

8 I don't like to get up and talk and  
9 I'm not much of a talker, but I'm not going to sit  
10 quietly and see this thing go down the road without  
11 opening my mouth. Because I think this reeks of --  
12 of -- the couple bucks you're getting for this --  
13 and I'm going to Pen Argyl because Pen Argyl should  
14 be representing its citizens of Pen Argyl better  
15 than they are. And they're gonna impact the  
16 community if they don't have any representation  
17 either on a professional side and I'm going to  
18 remind them of that. And I will pay for the bus or  
19 Waste Management will pay for the bus to take us up  
20 to the -- and tour us around the property. Now, why  
21 don't you offer to do that if you're so good for our  
22 community. Just do that and we'll be glad to go for  
23 a ride in the bus.

24 (Cross speaking over one another.  
25 Could not make out what Waste Management said.)

1                   MR. SCOTT: Well, let's go. I mean,  
2 line them up and I'll --

3                   MS. FORS: The next one is April 16th.

4                   MR. SCOTT: But the two week -- I  
5 don't think at this time -- I think that this thing  
6 should be tabled until there's more discovery by  
7 some -- hire some professional people. We're in a  
8 meeting here where you get -- it's a shame that the  
9 host community who's making all the money that this  
10 gentlemen said, 14 million -- you got all this money  
11 coming -- we don't have a microphone that you can  
12 hear the questions or the answers without walking  
13 around with this thing. It's sad and people are --  
14 people in the public deserve to hear and get a  
15 little more knowledge. We're not getting educated  
16 at all here. I mean, if this were 1 to 12, we're  
17 not even out of first grade. So I mean, that's the  
18 point I'm trying to make.

19                   So I think with the information that  
20 we've been hearing and the questions that have been  
21 asked and the answers that they've been firing out  
22 here, I don't think you have enough information  
23 personally to make the decision to say yes. So,  
24 I'll rest my case. Not even discussing property  
25 values that we're gonna be effecting and you want to

1 worry about a couple mils or free garbage? That's a  
2 cheap dig. So anyway, thank you.

3 MR. LEVITS: Okay. I have a couple  
4 people that signed in from Wind Gap, Bob Krasnopora.  
5 Yes, no?

6 MR. KRASNOPORA: No, thanks.

7 MR. LEVITS: No. Okay. Mark Crossen  
8 is it? Mark on 721 -- or 72 Northern Lehigh --  
9 Northern Lehigh in Wind Gap? No? Okay.

10 I have another. Justin -- I'm not  
11 even going to try.

12 MR. HURATIAK: I don't wanna take up  
13 too much of your time, so I appreciate you letting  
14 me speak. Obviously, you know, Washington Township  
15 has not taken any approach here yet and you're  
16 probably going to argue that we don't have a legal  
17 basis to, but I think the testimony -- and when I  
18 say testimony, this is not legal, right, so this is  
19 an advisory committee so --

20 RESIDENT: Can't hear you.

21 MR. HURATIAK: This is an advisory  
22 committee, so I think it's appropriate to sit here  
23 and take Jane's statement, presentation and say,  
24 after seven years, you guys backed out of the Slate  
25 Belt Committee. You don't have -- all the planning



1 has shown that you had your Fair Share. The answers  
2 of spot zoning for this specific use or the  
3 financial benefit of this Township and for the  
4 direct benefit of the expansion is epic and clear.

5 The representation that Tighe talks  
6 about is also evident in that no one has said to you  
7 guys yet, make the negative recommendation and let  
8 this new Board of Supervisors reap the ramifications  
9 of their actions. Because in my opinion, this  
10 should be an injunction of some sort to stop it and  
11 say how does the Fair Share play in? How does the  
12 Northampton County Fair Share play in? And how does  
13 the decisions of the Supervisors (indecipherable)  
14 Washington Township that are contradicting every  
15 known legal method of planning, zoning, and mapping  
16 play out in the aftermath?

17 So they joked about the class action  
18 that, you know, they satisfied the smell, but the  
19 fact that your residents and your neighboring  
20 township residents had to take legal action 'cause  
21 Plainfield didn't act as well as the DEP. So the  
22 sulfur smell you spoke of (indecipherable) Bangor  
23 Road, I personally called DEP myself and said,  
24 listen, we have something going on here. I'm under  
25 agreement to buy that property. I haven't owned it,

1 the same owners have owned it for I don't even know  
2 how many years, same family, but that is going to be  
3 my headache from now on. I called them, they're not  
4 doing anything about it. The fact that they  
5 separated from Waste Management was the happiest  
6 moment of their lives because, you know, they can  
7 say there's another smell here that's not Waste  
8 Management. So --

9 (Residents laugh.)

10 MR. HURATIAK: -- it's flat out the  
11 truth. So, you know, the fact, again, the residents  
12 were left to fight the legal battle to go call DEP.  
13 We pay taxes, we do all this and we keep hearing  
14 about the benefits of the financial impact, but I  
15 say again, Washington Township -- and again, we're  
16 not perfect by no means, but we don't get huge  
17 financial donations, we don't get put on all the tax  
18 basis. We just give our police force the same 22  
19 percent increase in their contract, we take care of  
20 our fire department, we pave our roads, we have  
21 similar (indecipherable) than roads and road  
22 departments. We manage our budget. We don't spend  
23 more than we make, and there's zero accountability,  
24 especially when this Board of Supervisors just  
25 raised two mils.

1                   I pay a lot of property taxes in  
2 Plainfield township, although I live in Washington  
3 Township. So, you know, the fact of the matter if  
4 they're not managing their money now, who's to say  
5 they're going to manage it later? There's no  
6 accountability here.

7                   So I would actually ask you to make  
8 the negative recommendation, to say it doesn't meet  
9 your comprehensive plan, it doesn't even begin to  
10 cover the needed information necessary to make a  
11 positive recommendation and let your supervisors  
12 take the --

13                   (Recording cut out.)

14                   MR. LEVITS: Okay. Thank you. All  
15 right. I'll do a last call here for anybody that  
16 didn't sign up for public comment. Anybody at all  
17 interested?

18                   Jane, you've had a lot of time.

19                   (Can't hear what Jane said.)

20                   MR. LEVITS: But it's in the packet,  
21 is it not?

22                   (Can't hear what Jane said.)

23                   MR. LEVITS: Yeah, if it's in the  
24 packet, you know, let's --

25                   MS. MELLERT: I just wanted -- I want

1 to point out that this aerial photo in the packet is  
2 the Plainfield Township Recreation Trail that meets  
3 with Pen Argyl Road. There's an easement  
4 agreement -- if you have it right, you should -- and  
5 it was passed in 1997 that this was (indecipherable)  
6 because they just needed the (indecipherable). This  
7 is an aerial photo of Northampton County and the red  
8 lines are Plainfield Townships Recreation Trail  
9 easement and you can clearly see that the -- this  
10 crossover they were given is a full road that's  
11 paved. It's the entrance to the Green Knight  
12 Economic Development Center.

13 There's another roadway there and it  
14 doesn't match what was voted on at the 1997 meeting,  
15 which is what the public was told. It's what I was  
16 told. I did attach the meeting minutes where it  
17 said Chairman (indecipherable) reported that the  
18 work down the trail crossing easement agreement with  
19 GCS, which the township would have banned the use of  
20 the upper (indecipherable) trail until there is no  
21 more landfill. Once the landfill ceases to exist,  
22 at that time, it would revert back to the Township.  
23 In exchange for this, GCS has given the Township  
24 another section of railroad bed to use from the  
25 trail. This will revert back to GCS when there is

1 no more landfill. And it tells the motions and  
2 honestly, that's exactly what I was told by Chairman  
3 (indecipherable) who --

4 MR. LEVITS: Jane, I understand but  
5 we're talking, what, 30-year-old information here,  
6 right now and it --

7 MS. MELLERT: This is --

8 MR. LEVITS: -- doesn't -- have --

9 MS. MELLERT: -- this is --

10 MR. LEVITS: -- anything to do with  
11 the zoning. We have it in our packet. We'll review  
12 it.

13 MS. MELLERT: You have it in your  
14 packet. And it shows --

15 MR. LEVITS: All right.

16 MS. MELLERT: -- what we were told  
17 publicly. That's what the courts thought. This is  
18 the easement agreement, which is very different. I  
19 want you to see -- take advantage of how the Waste  
20 Management (indecipherable) GCS took and the use of  
21 this road --

22 MR. LEVITS: Okay.

23 MS. MELLERT: -- which was only  
24 supposed to be a crossover. Instead, they paved  
25 paradise. They couldn't -- not only a parking lot,

1 a whole paved roadway and I don't see how it would  
2 ever be able to revert back.

3 MR. LEVITS: Okay. All right. Thank  
4 you.

5 MS. MELLERT: Even though that was the  
6 agreement. Thank you.

7 MR. LEVITS: Okay. So I guess our  
8 options are to make a recommendation for our table  
9 tonight and make a recommendation at one more  
10 meeting.

11 MR. BACKENSTOE: They gave you 90  
12 days, so --

13 MR. LEVITS: Yeah.

14 MR. BACKENSTOE: -- you have to -- if  
15 you have another meeting, it has to be in that  
16 window.

17 MR. LEVITS: Yeah.

18 MR. BACKENSTOE: I don't think you're  
19 going to get any further extensions.

20 MR. LEVITS: What the -- what's the  
21 favor of the board here? Want to make a call  
22 tonight or do we want to get a chance to think  
23 everything through that was presented tonight and  
24 hold a public meeting to make our decision --  
25 present our decision?

1 MS. DINGLE: It's my understanding  
2 that the Board of Supervisors has contracted a board  
3 regarding the finances of the Township  
4 (indecipherable) the scenario with and without the  
5 landfill. I -- I understand it is soon to be ready  
6 for review and (indecipherable) official for this  
7 commission to review documents prior to making a  
8 decision to the Board (indecipherable).

9 MR. LEVITS: That's an excellent  
10 point.

11 MR. KLEINTOP: (Indecipherable) refer  
12 to (indecipherable) and report.

13 MR. SCHAFER: Well, there was a motion  
14 at a meeting, so it is what it is.

15 MR. KLEINTOP: I heard it referred to  
16 as a forensic study. Is that --

17 MR. SCHAFER: I don't want to  
18 characterize it.

19 MR. KLEINTOP: Okay.

20 MR. SCHAFER: There was a motion to  
21 get a study done at a meeting. I don't want to  
22 characterize it.

23 MR. KLEINTOP: Okay.

24 MR. LEVITS: All right.

25 MR. KLEINTOP: Is that in process?

1 MR. SCHAFER: Yes.

2 MR. LEVITS: What do you guys want to  
3 do?

4 MR. GEISSINGER: I think there's still  
5 some open questions that are worthwhile for us to  
6 let this sit a little longer.

7 MR. LEVITS: Okay.

8 MR. GEISSINGER: That's just my view.

9 MR. LEVITS: All right. Allen?

10 MR. SCHAFER: What? I'm personally  
11 ready to move forward, but...

12 MR. LEVITS: You guys want to get some  
13 more questions answered at this point?

14 (No verbal response.)

15 MR. LEVITS: Okay. All right. So,  
16 what we'll have to do is table tonight and set up  
17 another meeting and I would hope we would be able to  
18 come to a decision at that point in time -- a  
19 recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. That  
20 would be my opinion. So we don't -- anything other  
21 than tabling we're -- we're good, right?

22 (No verbal response.)

23 MR. LEVITS: Any last questions,  
24 comments?

25 MR. DAVIS: Any thoughts on when that



1 meeting might occur? Do we have dates in mind?

2 MR. LEVITS: Well, I don't have any  
3 dates. I mean, it's going to have to be coordinated  
4 when everybody can get together, you know, just like  
5 we have the past several meetings.

6 MS. DINGLE: I would recommend, Amy,  
7 when you're scheduling that we get that report and  
8 then schedule a couple of weeks after that report's  
9 available so we have time to receive and review that  
10 and incorporate our --

11 MR. SCHAFER: I mean, if it's done.

12 MS. DINGLE: Yeah, well, that's what I  
13 mean. I don't know the schedule on that, so that's  
14 one question that needs to be monitored. But it  
15 sounds like it should be within that timeframe of  
16 the --

17 MR. LEVITS: All right. I have a  
18 question in the back.

19 RESIDENT: How long is this going to  
20 go on? You're either going to make a decision or  
21 else you're not. (Indecipherable) 90 days, what are  
22 we doing here?

23 MR. LEVITS: We got a 90-day extension  
24 and we expect to be done within the 90-day  
25 extension. We're within that timeframe. Okay.

1       That's it. Mr. Scott?

2                   MR. SCOTT: In the meantime, would you  
3 consider getting a professional to view and help  
4 the --

5                   MR. LEVITS: Well, in order to do  
6 that, the supervisors would have to grant us money  
7 and you know I can't afford it.

8                   (Crowd laughing.)

9                   RESIDENT: (Indecipherable) for it.

10                  MR. LEVITS: Anything else? Motion --  
11 oh, I'm sorry.

12                  RESIDENT: Is it possible to take the  
13 whole -- get a community of folks and bring this to  
14 the supervisors? Do they care?

15                  MR. LEVITS: Well, there's been a lot  
16 of letters that have been submitted to the office,  
17 okay. And I guess -- to inquire, to look at that,  
18 do you have to do a right-to-know or that public --  
19 public information?

20                  MR. BACKENSTOE: No, I mean, you could  
21 file a right-to-know to get a copy of any letter  
22 that was submitted by any resident for or against.

23                  MR. LEVITS: So -- and there's been  
24 quite a few signatures on letters, so.

25                  MR. KLEINTOP: Paul, to her question,

1 she may not have been here when Dave addressed it.  
2 We tried to do that in reference to (indecipherable)  
3 that people vote on it.

4 MR. BACKENSTOE: Right.

5 MR. KLEINTOP: Maybe she never heard  
6 it, maybe she needs to understand we'd love to do  
7 that but we can't.

8 MR. BACKENSTOE: Because Pennsylvania  
9 is a representative form of government. Democracy  
10 represents your Supervisors or your Borough members,  
11 Borough Council or City Council, and referendums in  
12 Pennsylvania are limited, limited to very specific  
13 things which are spelled out in Pennsylvania  
14 legislature and statutorily. So, to give an example  
15 of one, well, if you wanted a EIT tax, your township  
16 you thought might be interested in doing an EIP tax.  
17 You put that on the ballot as an ordinance, wait 13  
18 Tuesdays before the next election and then you put  
19 it on the ballot. That's a binding referendum.  
20 Anything else in Pennsylvania law is called a  
21 nonbinding referendum and the election board is not  
22 even allowed to take it.

23 MS. DINGLE: My question is, can it be  
24 something less formal than a referendum. Just a  
25 public poll? Yes, it's a vote or whatever, but it's

1 not legally binding. It's just to let the board  
2 know. This is a very big decision that affects the  
3 community (indecipherable) 20 to 50 years.

4 MR. BACKENSTOE: That would be up to  
5 the Planning Commission or the Board.

6 MS. DINGLE: Okay. So it just -- it  
7 would be more --

8 MR. BACKENSTOE: The Planning  
9 Commission would (indecipherable), so I think it  
10 would be up to the Planning Commission.

11 MS. DINGLE: Okay.

12 MR. LEVITS: Okay. Anything else?

13 MR. KLEINTOP: Dave -- oh, I have one  
14 more question. I know you did a lot of work in  
15 moving up to the 2020 vote. Was an environmental  
16 impact statement or a health risk analysis done for  
17 the 2020 meeting? 'Cause if it was, I -- I know you  
18 haven't done anything current. (Indecipherable)  
19 request current information and you don't have it.  
20 Did you do those reports after 2020, and if so,  
21 could we at least get them?

22 MS. FORS: Scott.

23 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Yeah, I think we  
24 talked about this before, Terry, we've been doing  
25 five-year updates on the health risk assessment.

1 The most recent one was submitted for 2024, so in  
2 what, the December timeframe. So the one that would  
3 have been part of the application from 2020 would  
4 have been updated in 2018.

5 MS. DINGLE: I have another question.  
6 A lot of information that's being provided to us is  
7 dated and older and we're also getting a response  
8 well, that's how we do it or that will be part of  
9 the permit application. (Indecipherable) health  
10 assessment and additional information on  
11 environmental impacts. However, you're asking us to  
12 move forward with the rezoning. Can you not start  
13 the process -- the permitting process and these  
14 studies before we do the rezoning?

15 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Again, listen, the  
16 reality is I don't think any applicant would go  
17 through those expenses. We've already invested a  
18 considerable amount through this application, but we  
19 don't have a project until we get through the first  
20 step, which is the rezoning. So our thinking is --

21 MS. DINGLE: You're asking --

22 WASTE MANAGEMENT: -- (indecipherable)  
23 throughout.

24 MS. DINGLE: -- to rezone a piece of  
25 land, that once rezoned could then -- whether you

1     get your application or not -- someone else could  
2     come in and do. And there's no reason to rezone  
3     that and effect the land that -- so what I'm saying  
4     is one of us has to make a -- you know, and you're  
5     asking us to move forward on a rezoning when we  
6     don't have all the facts to make that rezoning  
7     decision because we don't know the potential impacts  
8     to the community. They're to come later after we  
9     rezone.

10                   WASTE MANAGEMENT: I don't think  
11     that's necessarily a zoning question, Robin, but, I  
12     mean, we've said all along -- we're back in front of  
13     this group for the land development application  
14     which will be more detailed, more specifics, you  
15     probably will see some more updates and reports once  
16     we get to that point. And then ultimately, the  
17     expansion goes to the PA DEP. The Township is  
18     copied on that.

19                   MS. DINGLE: Right.

20                   WASTE MANAGEMENT: And they've  
21     actually had an opportunity to review the  
22     application (indecipherable) in the past.

23                   MS. DINGLE: Right.

24                   WASTE MANAGEMENT: So.

25                   MS. DINGLE: And you and I both know

1 at that point, the responses will be, that's a DEP  
2 permit question, that's DEP's decision --

3 (Cross speaking.)

4 WASTE MANAGEMENT: Not necessarily, I  
5 mean, you know, look, we went through conditional  
6 use during the last application --

7 MS. DINGLE: I'm just saying, the  
8 reality is the process -- the Township has less  
9 control and comment on the process once it moves  
10 forward past the rezoning.

11 WASTE MANAGEMENT: I wouldn't view it  
12 that way --

13 MS. DINGLE: Well --

14 WASTE MANAGEMENT: -- 'cause we're  
15 back in front of you for a second round, so...

16 MS. DINGLE: But, I mean, if that was  
17 the case then you'd have no fear in moving forward  
18 with the application process.

19 WASTE MANAGEMENT: But we aren't.  
20 We're going to move forward with the PA DEP permit  
21 and land development application.

22 MS. DINGLE: After we rezone.

23 WASTE MANAGEMENT: After zoning.

24 MS. DINGLE: What I'm saying is, why  
25 can't you proceed to give us that --

1                   MR. SCHAFER: Will DEP even accept an  
2 application before rezoning?

3                   WASTE MANAGEMENT: They will not. You  
4 have to have rezoning --

5                   (Cross speaking.)

6                   MS. DINGLE: But you can start the  
7 process and do the studies --

8                   WASTE MANAGEMENT: But there's no  
9 reason to start. We can't submit anything until  
10 we're through with the rezoning.

11                  MS. DINGLE: -- the environmental  
12 assessments --

13                  WASTE MANAGEMENT: This is the start  
14 of it.

15                  MS. DINGLE: -- the updated health  
16 risk assessment, the environmental assessment, all  
17 the things we've been trying to get that are dated  
18 and we don't have. I'm just saying, it just seems  
19 like we're being pushed to make a decision on  
20 information that is not yet available to us and  
21 without understanding the overall risks, 'cause  
22 there is more detail that (indecipherable). So, I  
23 just --

24                  MR. LEVITS: All right.

25                  MS. DINGLE: -- wanted to ask if that



1       was something. But I understand you wouldn't want  
2       to make the financial commitment moving forward  
3       without the rezoning.

4               MR. LEVITS: All right. Do I have a  
5       motion to table?

6               MR. GEISSINGER: Motion.

7               MR. LEVITS: Do I have a second?

8               MS. DINGLE: I'll second.

9               MR. LEVITS: Any discussion,  
10       questions? Audience questions?

11               (No response.)

12               MR. LEVITS: All those in favor say I.

13               MR. GEISSINGER: I.

14               MR. SCHAFER: I.

15               MS. DINGLE: I.

16               MR. KLEINTOP: I.

17               MR. LEVITS: Opposed?

18               (No response.)

19               MR. LEVITS: Motion to adjourn?

20               MR. GEISSINGER: Moot.

21               MR. LEVITS: I have a motion. Do I  
22       have a second?

23               MR. KLEINTOP: Second.

24               MR. LEVITS: Second by Terry.

25       Questions?

1 (No response.)

2 MR. LEVITS: All those in favor, I.

3 MR. GEISSINGER: I.

4 (Meeting concluded.)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25