

**PLAINFIELD TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING**

May 31st, 2018

A special meeting of the Plainfield Township Planning Commission was held on Thursday, May 31st, 2018 at the Plainfield Township Volunteer Fire Company Banquet Facility located at 6480 Sullivan Trail, Wind Gap, PA, 18091.

Chairman, Paul Levits, called the meeting to order at 6:59 P.M.

The Pledge of Allegiance was performed.

ROLL CALL:

The following Commissioners answered roll call: Chairman, Paul Levits, Vice Chairman, Robert Simpson, Robin Dingle, Jeffrey Beavan, Terry Kleintop and Secretary, Paige Gerstenberg.

Also present were Township Manager, Tom Petrucci, Zoning Officer, John Lezoche, Solicitor, David Backenstoe, Esq., Special Environmental Legal Counsel, John Embick, Esq., Special Environmental Engineering Consultant, Michael Brunamonti, P.E., Alternate Township Engineer, Farley Fry, P.E., and Alternate Township Engineer, Robert Lynn, P.E.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

No minutes were to be approved at this time.

TIME EXTENSIONS:

1. GRAND CENTRAL SANITARY LANDFILL, INC. (PEN ARGYL ROAD, PEN ARGYL, PA 18072) SLATE BELT HEAT RECOVERY CENTER:

Attorney Matthew Goodrich stated that at this time, he would like the scheduling to take place on a month-by-month basis. An extension of time will not be requested by the applicant at this time. The current Extension of Time was confirmed for the record through August 31, 2018.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. GRAND CENTRAL SANITARY LANDFILL, INC. (PEN ARGYL ROAD, PEN ARGYL, PA 18072) SLATE BELT HEAT RECOVERY CENTER SITE PLAN REVIEW; (APPLICATION RECEIVED FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 23RD, 2018 and EXPIRES FRIDAY, AUGUST 31ST, 2018):

Chairman, Paul Levits, stated the main objective of the applicant is to construct a center for biosolids production. Plainfield Township Solicitor, David Backenstoe, named the

members and representatives in attendance at the meeting on behalf of Plainfield Township. Attorney Backenstoe noted the rules to be followed throughout the meeting and the order of the presentation. Attorney Backenstoe added that the purpose for this meeting is to review the Slate Belt Heat Recovery Center Preliminary Land Development Plan/Major Subdivision submitted by Grand Central Landfill, Inc. The operator of the plant would be Synagro. Attorney Backenstoe noted that this review is to ensure full compliance with the Township's regulations. Attorney Layman from Pen Argyl Borough stated that he would like to be involved with all correspondence relating to this application submission.

Following the brief discussion, Chairman, Paul Levits, allowed representative, Robert Lynn, P.E., CSI from Hanover Engineering to read over the review letter dated May 30, 2018. The Hanover Engineer review letter is hereby incorporated for reference in these minutes as though it were more fully set forth at length as "Exhibit A".

Environmental Concerns:

It was asked by Mr. Lynn that the applicant address and clarify information on the proposed trailers which are to be used for transplanting biosolids to the facility and backhaul process wastewater. Synagro's Vice President of Project Development, Pam Racey, stated that the primary plan for wastewater is to go to the generator. She added that the largest disposal site is the Passaic Valley in New Jersey along with other plants similar to the one in New Jersey. Ms. Racey added that part of the contract with the plant in New Jersey would include the backhaul procedures and the possible facilities lined up in case the facility in New Jersey is maxed out on its intake. Ms. Racey stated that there is no contract in place currently. Commissioner, Terry Kleintop, questioned about the ammonia count at the proposed facility and stated his concerns on the matter. Ms. Racey responded by stating that there will be specific procedures in place in order to regulate these issues such as ammonia.

In regards to the environmental concerns articulated within number #8 of the review letter, the applicant stated that the trucks being used for transportation will be licensed. Mr. Robert Lynn requested that the applicant provide examples of what the proposed trucks for transportation looks like. Ms. Racey stated that this information will be provided. Question #9 of the review letter stated multiple questions at length for the applicant to address. Ms. Racey stated that she will respond to these questions at a later time in order to give accurate and detailed information.

Mr. Robert Lynn mentioned an issue where the applicant noted that there was an investigation by the University of Hawaii on the odors present at the plant located in Honolulu. Mr. Lynn expressed concern with this issue. Ms. Racey stated that this statement is correct, however, they needed to do this investigation in order to do a third

party review and the study was for regrowth in the pellets, not odors. Such review confirmed that there were no regrowth in the pellets present.

Further, the Hanover Engineering Review letter requested information regarding the sources and quality of the biosolids that would be processed at the proposed facility. Ms. Racey stated that they will provide an analysis that the plan was designed around inbound quality and will essentially be regulated by the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP). Mr. Thomas Pullar, P.E. of EarthRes Group stated that he will clarify their response to a question on the application as there was a typo within that section of their submission. Mr. Pullar explained that they cannot test all of the parameters such as metals. He noted that they use a third party laboratory to conduct the testing gathered from their sites. The Planning Commission questioned whether the applicant would be willing to have a testing program. The applicant stated that they are willing to consider the possibility of a regular testing program. Commissioner, Robert Simpson, questioned the time frame for the possible testing. The applicant added that there can be a sample taken once a week and a month by month lab analysis can be conducted. Ms. Racey stated that this is not an area for concern as these samples are regulated by the EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) and the Section 503 report is required to be conducted and submitted by the EPA.

With respect to #12 within the review letter, Mr. Lynn noted that there were two locations currently being constructed which uses are a biosolids plant. Ms. Racey stated that the one being constructed in Howard County, Maryland is being operated by the municipality itself. Additionally, she added that the plant located within Pinellas County, Florida will be owned by another private company. Mr. Lynn responded by requesting additional information on these plants that are currently being constructed. For the following item number, #13, Ms. Racey stated that corrections to this section will be resubmitted to the DEP.

More information was requested by Mr. Robert Lynn in regards to the food-grade glycerin based coating for dust control. With respect to the odor control system, confirmation was requested by Mr. Lynn that the unloading area will not be enclosed and will not be exposed to negative pressure. He also added whether there will be any pelletizing facilities in the United States equipped with enclosed unloading areas with negative pressure to control odors. Ms. Racey stated that she will provide additional information to the Planning Commission at a later time. Representative, Brian Cataldo, provided that the first receiving units will be covered. He added that the receiving hoppers are regulated with odor control. Mr. Lynn questioned about the possible odors emanating from the trucks. Ms. Racey stated that she will provide additional information at a later date.

Mr. Lynn requested that the applicant project the use of waste heat from the landfill gas to energy versus natural gas over the next 20 years. Synagro's Project Manager, Jim Hecht, added that the intent is to use all of the energy available by the Green Knights. The applicant will be more than happy to use a full 100% however, Mr. Hecht does not

believe that Green Knights will be able to supply a full 100%. Commissioner, Terry Kleintop, questioned why the project was based on a 20 year life cycle when it seems to be more of a 9 to 12 year life cycle per Mr. Kleintop's calculations. Mr. Hecht added that the applicant is still unsure of the exact time that the proposed facility will remain open. Mr. Kleintop questioned who provided these projections. Mr. Hecht stated that Waste Management provided the life cycle timeline for the proposed facility.

In regards to federal regulations, Project Manager, Jim Hecht, stated that the EPA conducts reviews every year in order to investigate whether there are any health or environmental concerns in regards to these types of facilities. If any concerns were found, the regulations would then change in order to rectify that hazard. Following that change, the facilities would also need to change their operations to comply with the new regulations. Commissioner, Robin Dingle, questioned whether Synagro would be subject to testing the baseline and regulating for pharmaceuticals. Commissioner, Robert Simpson, noted that he would like to see the analysis from Synagro that he requested at the last meeting.

Mr. Robert Lynn noted within #32 of the review letter that the applicant should provide a detailed geotechnical report for the site/facility. Further questions regarding this matter were also included following the original comment. Because of the length of the information being requested, Ms. Racey stated that she will provide a detailed answer at a later time.

New Environmental Comments:

After further review of the NPDES Permit Application along with the DEP application as submitted by the applicant, new environmental comments were incorporated into the new review letter within this section of the review.

In regards to the wastewater characteristics, more detail of the process of the wastewater was requested. Representative, Brian Cataldo, stated that the site will have a pump system with no agitation within the tank. Mr. Lynn questioned whether there would be any additional build up. Mr. Cataldo stated that that he does not anticipate any build up beyond what the pump is capable of withstanding. Additionally, there were be proper access, inspections and maintenance of the tank in order to ensure that the tank is OSHA compliant.

The remaining items were read aloud by Mr. Robert Lynn. No additional comments/responses were provided by the applicant at this time with respect to the remaining new environmental comments.

Zoning:

Before the discussion of the Zoning comment section of the Hanover Review Letter, Attorney, Matthew Goodrich, supplied the Planning Commission and the remaining attendees on behalf of Plainfield Township a legal letter of correspondence dated May 31, 2018 with respect to several variance issues from the Zoning Officer Review Letter dated

March 20, 2018. Mr. Goodrich requested that all attendees on behalf of the Township review the memorandum at length. Attorney Elizabeth Witmer stated that there are two uses that are permitted within this zoning district. She added that she would like to meet with representatives of the Township if there are any continued concerns. The applicant also reconciled a list of issues that have not currently been addressed and will streamline any issues considering the overlap between the review letters that were provided to the applicant.

Mr. Robert Lynn moved on to the review letter and stated that the noise abatement does not seem to be addressed with regards to the backup alarm for trucks. Modifications to the plan and review comments will be resubmitted as stated by the applicant. Such submission will likely take place in June in order to be addressed at the regular July 2018 Planning Commission meeting. All items will be address and a chart will also be utilized for further clarity.

Line item numbers 1 through 12 will be corrected and submitted. With regard to line item #13 and the easement issue, there will be two users on the lot. There will be a lessee which will be Synagro and the owner will be Waste Management. Ms. Witmer stated that the easement between the Township and Waste Management is through Waste Management. Ms. Witmer stated that Waste Management would not be giving themselves an easement to use the access drive and essentially, the lessee will have the authority to use such access drive.

Stormwater Management:

With respect to the stormwater management plans, Ms. Elizabeth Witmer, on behalf of the applicant, requested that a meeting be held between representatives of Hanover Engineering, Plainfield Township, and the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission in order to discuss this matter in a more detailed manner and address all concerns that were raised. It was noted within the review letter from the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission that the current stormwater plans are not in compliance with the Bushkill Creek Watershed Act 167 Stormwater Management Ordinance requirements. Line items #7 through #13 of the plan requirements can be addressed within the subsequent revised plan submission.

Planning Commissioner's Comments:

Chairman, Paul Levits, gave the opportunity for Planning Commission members to ask any questions they may have. Mr. Levits also requested that all plans be clear and legible for the engineer's review with any future submission from the applicant.

Commissioner, Robert Simpson, questioned whether the applicant will be doing a traffic study. Attorney, Elizabeth Witmer, noted that they will consult with professionals and sit down with the engineer in order to make sure that all individuals are on the same page. Mr. Simpson also requested a plan that clearly shows the inflow and outflow of the traffic at the proposed facility. Ms. Witmer stated that they may have that for the next Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Simpson also brought attention to the stormwater basin #2. He

asked the applicant if they will be submitting a plan on how the basin will be managed at the site providing that this basin will not impact the ground water.

Commissioner, Terry Kleintop, brought up the road issue that employees of Synagro will be using. Mr. Goodrich and the Planning Commission do not agree on the access point of entrance at the facility, the setbacks from the stormwater basin and the classification of the access drive. Attorney Backenstoe, on behalf of Plainfield Township, noted that there is a difference in opinion on the matter. He noted that every principle building should be placed off of the public street. Attorney Backenstoe added that the issue lies with the extra requirements for the separation facility. The Plainfield Township Zoning Officer determined that either an arterial or collector road must be located at the proposed site for use. Attorney Backenstoe reviewed the ordinance with respect to the road issue. By definition, the proposed site does not have access to a collector or arterial road directly from the facility. Attorney Backenstoe added that if this issue was not a fact, there would not be a discussion on the matter at these Planning Commission meetings. At this point in time, the proposed facility does not have frontage on an arterial or collector road. Such frontage on these two types of roads are required for this type of facility.

It was noted that the access drive is excluded from street definition within the ordinance. The access drive, which fronts the proposed facility cannot be used for access to this site. Since this access drive which is privately owned is not a street, this cannot be considered as an arterial or collector road.

The second issue is with the easement agreement with respect to the access drive. Back in March of 1997, Plainfield Township entered into an easement agreement with Waste Management. The easement essentially allows Waste Management to use this access drive which is owned by Plainfield Township. This easement agreement is temporary in nature, as stated by Attorney Backenstoe. Attorney Backenstoe added that within paragraph six of the easement agreement, it specifically states that the Township does not in any way intend to abandon this access drive. At some point in time, this easement will cease once the landfill is no longer operating once it has reached the overall threshold. This access drive simply provides access to the landfill only. Attorney Backenstoe does not believe that the Township feels that Grand Central can automatically use the access drive with other companies located within the area.

Attorney Backenstoe added that the applicant has the right to challenge the ordinance before the Plainfield Township Zoning Hearing Board. The applicant has every right to receive zoning relief. The applicant also has the option to file a land use appeal on the matter. Commissioner, Terry Kleintop, reviewed the Board of Supervisors meeting minutes from that time period and the Board made a comment about using the access drive for the Appalachian Trail connection. Mr. Kleintop added that everyone anticipated that the landfill had a certain life cycle and the Board assumed the access drive would be used later for more connections of trail to other municipalities. Mr. Jim Hecht noted to the Planning Commission that Waste Management understands the Commissions desires

and offered to have a discussion on the matter. Attorney Goodrich requested that the Planning Commission review the memorandum that was given earlier this evening.

Mr. Levits moved the discussion over to Attorney Peter Layman whom represents Pen Argyl Borough. Attorney Layman asked for copies of all review letters that have been received by the Plainfield Township Planning Commission. Attorney Layman questioned the back haul issue of the process water and wash water at the proposed plant. Attorney Layman understands that the plan is to haul back the same percentage of wash water to whoever submitted the cake. He noted that this will essentially go into one pot and will have the same concentration no matter where it goes to. He added that the various sewer plants will have different limits to what they can treat. Attorney Layman noted to the applicant that it may be logical that they simply cannot receive the same amount as they give to another facility. Attorney Layman stated that he is concerned that there might be a candidate where the wastewater cannot go back to the same facility that cake was received from.

Attorney Layman also questioned whether the contracts that Synagro would have with other companies would have some type of requirement that they need to take back the same amount of wastewater as the amount of cake that was delivered. Ms. Pam Racey stated that there may be times where the company may not be able to fulfill those requirements but they will put a back-up plan within the contract in the event that this happens. She added that typically, the limits are stricter in summer than in the winter. Attorney Layman asked whether there are alternate sites that Synagro will utilize for cake and wastewater other than the two that were previously given. Attorney Witmer stated that she will provide a list of acceptable conditions that the applicant would be willing to consider in terms of possible contracts, testing, etc. for the plan approval.

Members of the Planning Commission stated that when the cake arrives at the proposed facility and is placed within the receiving pits, it was unclear whether the conveyer would be closed. Ms. Racey stated that the conveyer will be a pump and it will be closed. This pump is within the pumping line and there will be a concrete chamber with access ports in it at the receiving location. Representative of Synagro, Brian Cataldo, added that there are two primary structures. As part of the receiving unit, there is a pump gallery which pumps below grade. The receiving unit will transport solids into hoppers that feed pumps. The pipeline will be located in an occupied concrete space below grade which will then travel above ground. Mr. Cataldo added that the dryer building is also above grade.

Ms. Pam Racey stated that Synagro has a drying facility located in another country which is a drum dryer, unlike a belt dryer that is being proposed for this project. Ms. Racey stated that there are plenty of belt dryers located at various plants within the United States, although none of them are manufactured by Haarslev. Representative, Jim Hecht, can report back to the Planning Commission with the names of the other plants.

Other questions were brought up by the Planning Commission including the insulation of the buildings that will be used, the parameters/controls, the method being used to monitor

odors and their nuisance standard. Information on these topics will be provided at a later date and in more detail.

Following up on those topics, the DEP standard was discussed at the April 4, 2018 meeting. Members of the Planning Commission wanted to make sure that the applicant is not designing the plant on a lesser standard than the standard that does not apply. The applicant stated that they are designing the plant based on a no nuisance standard. Attorney Layman expressed concern with this no nuisance standard as the definition can vary. Ms. Racey stated that she will contact the expert and get back to the Planning Commission on the requested information as the expert is not in attendance at the meeting.

The noise level in reference to the measurements were also discussed. The measurements were taken 5 feet from the dryer which was manufactured by Germany, but was not specifically a Haarslev dryer. Ms. Racey stated that she had previously requested additional information from the company and will notify the Planning Commission once she has received the requested information. Attorney Layman also requested to be notified of the information about the dryer.

In addition, the truck lane process was also discussed in terms of the weight of the trucks entering and exiting the facility. More of a detailed explanation of the plan for the truck traffic and weighing was requested by the Planning Commission. Ms. Racey added that the tarp will be on the trucks as they are making trips in and out of the facility. It was also questioned whether the trucks will be washed inside a building or outside. Mr. Brian Cataldo noted that the washing would take place outside in the open air. Attorney Layman of Pen Argyl Borough questioned the applicant on how they plan to minimize the odors at the time of washing the trucks. Mr. Cataldo stated that there will not be much solids left within the truck that will need to be washed off. He added that the cleaning starts directly after the tipping of the cake. Mr. Layman asked whether the applicant is committing to the fact that there will only be one truck being washed at a time. Attorney Witmer stated that this matter will be addressed at a later time.

Attorney Layman asked one more question in regards to the trucks and whether they would be sitting at the facility over the weekend waiting to be processed. Ms. Racey stated that they will not be receiving trucks on Sundays. Saturdays in terms of truck deliveries will be the same as during the week. It is the intent of the applicant that the plant runs 24/7 from a process standpoint but not a receiving standpoint.

Commissioner, Robert Simpson, had one follow up question in regards to Pinellas County. Mr. Simpson questioned whether there were any complaints at this location and how the complaints are documented. Ms. Racey stated that she was unsure of whether there were any complaints and will look into this further. Mr. Simpson questioned whether any of Synagro's other plants are located next to a landfill. Mr. Simpson noted that if Synagro has one that is not located next to a landfill, would the applicant be able to give a log notating the last year for any complaints of truck traffic or smells emanating

from the location. Mr. Simpson was curious as to how complaints would be addressed at a plant that does not have a landfill located directly next to it versus a plant that is located directly next to a landfill.

Commissioner, Terry Kleintop, asked whether the applicant would need to have approximately 600 ton in the hopper to carry operations through Monday's first shipment. Mr. Jim Hecht added that he has created a chart which reflects all of the questions asked by Mr. Kleintop at the previous meeting. Mr. Hecht stated that the highest level will be 500 tons on Fridays. This is designed in order to accommodate strict compliance. He added that the odor control will run 24/7. Mr. Kleintop noted that the odor control is very important because of the location of the quarry.

Chairman, Paul Levits, brought up the issue where the backhaul may not go back to originator of the cake shipment. Mr. Levits asked if the 3rd party receiver tests the wastewater and determines the liquid to be a hot load and that the plant will not be able to accept the shipment, he asked what will happen in that event. Ms. Racey stated that the main location located within New Jersey that they will be receiving cake from accepts almost anything and that she does not foresee any future issues.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Gerald Lennon- Mr. Lennon stated that biosolids can and are tested through a coffee filter. Ms. Racey stated that the technical term for this was the Payne Filter Test. Mr. Lennon added that he does not recall the basins. He stated that he was told that one out of the two basins had a baseline test. Mr. Lennon questioned the board on how to make this happen consistently. He stated that he is concerned about the environment and contaminating the water. Mr. Lennon asked the applicant if this product is pathogen free. Ms. Racey stated that the biosolids are rated as Class A as determined by the EPA. Mr. Lennon questioned whether a dryer at 185 degrees will be enough to kill any viruses present in the sludge. Ms. Racey responded by stating that the product will be discarded into the landfill. Mr. Lennon wanted to know what would happen to that sludge if the landfill would not accept it. Mr. Lennon expressed a lot of concern of the dryer temperatures as these must be at 185 degrees to kill viruses including HPV. Mr. Lennon added that there are many sicknesses around in the area and noted that there must be more regulations with the testing at the plant.

Jenny Laubscher- Ms. Laubscher stated that common sense is telling the residents that the proposed plant does not belong in this location as the smell is already bad. She added that based on her research, there were already two landfills that cannot accept any more sewage because of violations and smell complaints. Ms. Laubscher stated that the applicant is constantly telling the story the way residents want to hear it and that the story has changed multiple times. She noted that there is no effort shown from the applicant and they have only been doing the minimum. Ms. Laubscher questioned whether the applicant can provide ways on how pathogens, odors, and metals are detected. Ms. Racey stated that the applicant is designing the odor control system well above what is strictly

required. Ms. Racey added that the most important aspect of this application process is the community and that Synagro Technologies, Inc. will become a part of the community if it were to be approved.

Lisa Perin- Ms. Perin stated that she lives very close to the proposed facility. Ms. Perin's grandfather was approached in order to open a landfill on his property. She noted that since the opening of Grand Central Landfill, this plant has provided tax revenue and many jobs for local residents. Ms. Perin questions whether this proposed plan will provide enough jobs to outweigh the negative factors. She added that the companies involved are getting a lot of money from this deal. Ms. Perin asked for consideration from the Planning Commission with respect to how easy it is to get an extension versus opening up a new plant at another location. She noted that the extensions are much easier to be granted. Ms. Perin added that she was also concerned about Ms. Pam Racey having 30 years of experience but then not providing the residents or the Planning Commission answers on specific questions. Ms. Racey stated that she wants to be accurate with her responses. Ms. Racey added that she operates over 500 projects and it is hard for her to know what is going on at every single plant.

Tom Carlo- Mr. Carlo questioned why the Green Knights and Waste Management do some good in the community and then team together with Synagro to propose a plant like this. Mr. Carlo noted that this would generate permanent cash flow to Synagro Technologies. Mr. Carlo added that the applicant is not listening to the community and what the residents truly want for this area. Mr. Carlo asked the applicant about the time frame for when the trucks will be arriving at the plant. He noted that the trucks at Waste Management line up quite early in the morning, especially before they open. Ms. Racey stated that they will be following Waste Management's hours of operation. Chairman, Paul Levits stated that this was a good point and should be discussed further at the next meeting. Mr. Carlo does not understand why this location is so important to Synagro. He also questioned about when the trucks are washed, if they are completely dry by the time they leave the facility. Mr. Carlo asked for the Board of Supervisors to consider placing a light on SR 512 as there is enough traffic as is. Mr. Levits stated that PennDOT would be in charge of that. John Hambrose of Waste Management added that the trucks cannot be on the property before 5:30 A.M and if residents have any issues, to call the Waste Management help line. Commissioner, Robin Dingle, questioned the applicant on whether they would have a hotline for residents to call and place complaints or concerns. Ms. Racey stated there would be some type of procedure set in place.

Tyler Walia- Mr. Walia stated that he has just moved into Plainfield Township recently. He noted concerns of the proximity of the proposed facility to homes of residents. He added that he agrees with members of the community and their concerns that they have also stated. Mr. Walia is very unsure of this proposal.

Lori Straka- Ms. Straka lives on Glass Street in Pen Argyl. She has a lot of concerns regarding the environment and her investment into her first home in the Slate Belt. Ms. Straka asked the applicant whether trucks were going to travel across the Township trail.

Mr. John Hambrose stated that the trucks would not be going over the trail. Ms. Straka also requested further classification on the testing requirements. She questioned whether the applicant would be protecting the community with respect to the metals. Mr. Hambrose stated that there are set limits on specific metals and the regulations that take place. Ms. Racey added that they are treating this proposal to the upmost possible standard that exists today and making the cake into an organic fertilizer. Ms. Straka disagreed with that comment and added that she wants to make sure that their future home life, the environment, and their home value stays safe. Ms. Racey added that this will not be an open facility. The proposed building will be enclosed which has negative pressure for odor control. Ms. Racey added that she would not work in this field if she did not believe in this. Mr. Jim Hecht added that the publication that they have will be subject to a public hearing. Residents will be able to attend where there will be experts from the DEP and public safety in order to answer any questions that may be asked.

Howard Klein- Mr. Klein questioned whether this product is pasteurized and/or sterilized. He stated that he went to a DEP course on biosolids and never once did he hear that it was sterile or pasteurized. Mr. Klein questioned Plainfield Township Solicitor, David Backenstoe, on whether the nuisance lawsuit has a one year time limit. Mr. John Embick stated that he was aware of what Mr. Klein was asking. Mr. Embick added that a lawsuit of this type would be against the farmer/agricultural use. Mr. Klein stated that he is a farmer and is an organic grower. He added that Synagro has very deceptive advertising.

Emmanuel Damaris- Mr. Damaris quoted the 503 regulations. He stated that chemicals and pathogens can regrow and enter the food chain with this type of fertilizer. Many illnesses including death and deformities in all people and especially young children can arise from this production of fertilizer. Mr. Damaris added that this product is very hazardous. Mr. Damaris also brought up the quarry that is located right next to the facility. He stated that there is a sinkhole there which shale is falling in. He added that he would like a study done that proves that this facility's product will not affect the wells in the area. Overall, Mr. Damaris is very concerned of the overall proposal and does not want kids and grandkids to go through what he went through. He added that the waste treatment plant was never built in order to make fertilizer.

Don Moore- Mr. Moore questioned whether the applicant will have updates in regards to the truck turns by the end of June as requested at the previous meetings. Mr. Moore questioned whether both access points are bidirectional. Mr. Moore also mentioned six permitted uses within this zoning district. Mr. David Allen stated that this use is a refuse derived fuel facility. Mr. Moore questioned Mr. Jim Hecht on whether the plant can run profitably on 100% natural gas. Mr. Hecht stated that the proposed facility would not be using 100% on the natural gas. Mr. Moore commended Lisa Perin's statements and does not believe this is a "green" facility. Mr. Moore believes there is an infiltration basin on the property which is classified as a pond and will flow into the ground water. Mr. Moore also noted that plans which left out the existing boundary line of the sediment pond. He added that the existing boundary divides in half with the 12 parking spaces would be on

the one half. Mr. Allen agreed with Mr. Moore in this respect. Mr. Moore stated that his point is that there should be nothing placed within 50 feet of the pond. He added that there is much more needed with this application submission aside from a dimensional variance. Mr. Moore questioned the trail and road issue and why the applicant would not just create access right from Pen Argyl Road. Mr. Allen stated that the old landfill access used to be from Pen Argyl Road. Mr. Allen noted that in 1996, there was a lot of discussion on the trail easement and that the trail extends almost a mile directly up to SR 512. Mr. Moore notated the Board of Supervisors minutes from March 12th, 1997 word for word regarding the trail and that the trail is to return to Plainfield Township when the landfill ceases to exist. Mr. Moore knows that there are many individuals in the Township that can clearly recall what the intent was of this access drive from 1997. Mr. Moore stated that he finds the road access situation very objectionable. Mr. Moore discussed the letter that was sent to Solicitor Backenstoe from Attorney Witmer indicating the possibility of litigation on this matter. Mr. Moore added that the applicant stated they want to use the access drive for a haul road. Mr. Moore provided the Planning Commission with a picture showing the gates that are placed on the access drive. Mr. Moore added that he does not know of any public roads that have gates. He added that our community and surrounding communities do not desire this plant in this area.

Gail Weber- Ms. Weber questioned where the trail is going to be redone and how the residents will have access to the trail. Ms. Weber mentioned that she attended the open house and spoke to Mr. Jim Hecht about the difference between Class A and Class B biosolids. Mr. Hecht stated that the only difference is the level of pathogens. Ms. Weber mentioned about hospitals and their sanitation treatments because of pathogens and sicknesses. She stated that there is not much done unless there is a major contamination. Ms. Weber does not agree with the product or the placement of the plant in Plainfield Township. Ms. Weber added that there are two stages to the odor control including the caustic and acid stage and questioned what happens to chemicals. Ms. Racey stated that the chemicals are absorbed into the water and moved through the system to the storage tank. The wastewater will then be hauled away to another facility for treatment. Ms. Weber asked how many tons each truck can hold and how many will be used for transporting the waste each day. Ms. Racey stated that there is approximately 22-25 tons per truck. Mr. Hecht added that the trucks entering and exiting the facility per day will be a total of around 18 or 19 trucks. In addition, there will be approximately 5 trucks a day leaving. Ms. Weber mentioned that the pellets manufactured at this plant would be blended with coal at cement companies. She has concerns with SR 512 and the truck traffic in that area already from Waste Management. Ms. Weber brought up an issue with metals in the solution. Ms. Racey stated that there is a test called the TCLP which tests multiple parameters including that of metals. These tests are done less often because these items are not normally found in biosolids. Normally, this test is conducted once a year for smaller scale plants and biannually for larger plants. Such tests will be done at the proposed plant.

Tracy Carluccio, Deputy Director of the Delaware River Keeper Network- Ms. Carluccio explained that from what she understands of this project and the impacts that were described, the Delaware River Keepers are very much opposed to this proposal. The proposed location is too small and too close to where residents live. She noted that the facility is in the wrong location. She noted that the application should be declined based on public health and environmental concerns. She questioned why the applicant is opposed to a 50 foot setback from the pond located on the property and contemplated on whether there was enough room for the placement of the plant with the 50 foot setback. Ms. Carluccio stated that there is no question that the body of water on their land is a pond which is referred to as sediment basin #2. Ms. Carluccio also wanted to correct the applicant in a statement that they made earlier in the meeting in regards to the DuPont plant. She stated that this plant has been closed since 2011 as a commercial hazardous waste facility. The plant can no longer accept any off-site waste. This plant was named as one of the back-up plants that Synagro would use. Ms. Carluccio noted that they were incorrect as they cannot use this facility. She expressed concern with how far this application has gotten in the process without any verification from where waste will be coming from.

Ron Angle- Mr. Angle asked whether this type of facility would be permitted in New Jersey or New York and why the applicant is opposed to looking into those areas for a possible plant location. Mr. Angle noted that once the applicant has their foot in the door, they will not be leaving the area any time soon. He added that this is not only a problem for Pen Argyl, but Bangor too. Mr. Angle stated that the pellets have very little nutritional value. He added that the applicant needs to build a plant where there is natural gas. Mr. Angle stated that he does not want this type of plant in this area.

Jane Mellert- Ms. Mellert noted that she will put her comments in writing and submit them to the Planning Commission. She questioned whether the construction of the facility will be publicly bid. Ms. Racey stated that this will be open to various contractors but they will choose the three contractors to receive quotes from. Ms. Mellert asked who is in charge of determining who the bid goes out to, why there is such an interest of placing this plant in the proposed location, and whether there will be local residents who will benefit from the placement of the plant and possible local construction contracts. Mr. Jim Hecht stated that the reasoning for their interest is because of the waste heat source. He added that biosolids should be managed only where they are produced. Ms. Mellert's response comment was that biosolids really should be managed where it is generated and not ship state to state. Ms. Mellert spoke to the residents on behalf of the Board of Supervisors and noted that the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors do not always have complete control over the application process. She added that there are many other regulations that need to be met including state laws, federal laws, zoning laws, etc. that need to be met. She added that the State of Pennsylvania does not allow the Township to regulate applications for biosolids. Ms. Mellert stated to the public in attendance that this is very unfortunate and that they should be contacting state representatives to voice their concerns. Ms. Mellert had minutes dated from March 1st,

1989 where a supervisor questioned whether the Township owns the railroad right-of-way. Based on the maps that were discussed at the Board meeting in 1989, the supervisor stated that it shows Grand Central Landfill owning the right-of-way. The Township Solicitor at the time explained that the Township does in fact own the right-of-way and will bring it up to DER in order to fix the map. The Township Engineer at the time these minutes were written questioned how an engineer can certify a plan that is completely incorrect. He added that the plan is showing the line to be ½ a mile away from the landfill rather than 500 feet. A motion was made by the Board of Supervisors to contact DER to make them aware that the railroad right-of-way is owned by Plainfield Township. Ms. Mellert stated that the Township has always owned the railroad right-of-way. Additionally, Ms. Mellert stated that it was never the intent of the Board of Supervisors to give the access drive to Grand Central Sanitary Landfill forever. Ms. Mellert will submit the rest of her extensive comments in writing.

ACTION: Motion was made by Robert Simpson and seconded by Terry Kleintop to table the meeting for the next available meeting date. *Prior to the vote, Chairman, Paul Levits, asked if there were any comments from the governing body or the public.* Motion approved. Vote 4-0-1 with Jeffrey Beavan abstaining.

ADJOURNMENT:

Having no further business to come before the Planning Commission, motion was made by Robert Simpson and seconded by Robin Dingle to adjourn the meeting. Motion approved. Vote 5-0.

The meeting adjourned at 10:48 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Paige Gerstenberg
Planning Commission, Secretary
Plainfield Township