

Minutes
Old Town Planning Board
July 11, 2017
(City Council Chambers)

Members Present: Ted Shina- Chairman, Tim Folster, Phil Dunn, Sandra Russell, Russ Sossong, Glenna Washburn and Steve Baillargeon.

Staff Present: David Russell, Code Officer, Bill Mayo, City Manager.

Others Present: Jim Katsiaficas, Old Town's Landfill Attorney, Tom Doyle, Casella Attorney, Wayne Boyd, Casella, Jeremy Labbe, Casella, Toni King, Casella, Don Meagher, Casella, Chip Laite, Sargent Corp., Mike Barden, BGS, Mike Booth, SME, Ralph Leonard, O.T.L.C., Laura Sanborn Alton L.F.C., Charles Leithiser, O.T. Resident, Ed Spencer, O.T. Resident & Intervener.

Item 1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Shina at 6:00 P.M.

Item 2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of June 6, 2017. No minutes were presented

Item 3.

Case # 1529:

Ted Shina: introduced the agenda and explained that this meeting was to set the ground rules for the Board's review. Ted suggested that we go around the room and have everyone introduce themselves.

Mr. Katsiaficas: then began to explain the process. He explained that this process had been going on for approximately seven years figuring in the hearings for a determination of public benefit that Casella and NEWSME had to go through. He explained that Casella had submitted the application to the MDEP for the expansion of Juniper Ridge. Casella and the State along with BGS beginning in July of 2015 and had received that permit for an expansion and now the ball is in our court and it is up to the Planning Board to review the expansion of Juniper Ridge under Chapter 24 of which I understand each of you has a copy of. This is the Ordinance you will be working with over the next several months. He explained that it is a more limited review that the MDEP and MBEP. Ours is limited to Chapter 24. We cannot be more stringent than the state when we look at engineering, solid waste rules and such. We will be looking more at land use

issues, police power issues, traffic, fire safety, noise, odors, and all those things you will find under Section 24-12. A series of criteria this board will go through to see whether this application meets those standards. So the Board's role is to be the impartial reviewer of the application under the Ordinance. My role is to guide the Board as impartial outside counsel. I am not an advocate for the City. I am not an advocate for the landfill. I am not an advocate for those that oppose it. I am an advocate only for the process to make sure we all get through the process impartially, fairly looking at this and applying the Ordinance that the City Council has adopted to the application, Mr. Katsificus stated. So the end result is going to be a decision by this Board. It's either going to be an approval or a denial, or it could be a conditional approval but that approval would be one if there is one that it will go through all of the criteria in the Ordinance, all of the standard conditions of approval, any additional conditions of approval, and so we will go through that process of reviewing the criteria. It will be like many other projects that you see though. You will have a public hearing. Well first there will be a workshop and the workshop will be where the applicant presents the application so you all become familiar with it. That's what you do for subdivisions and site plans I assume and then you hold a public hearing where the public is invited to bring its comments to you as well and then you would deliberate as you would for any application and then you would close the public hearing, conduct your deliberations, go through the criteria, make a decision on each one, and ultimately a yes, or no, on the permit. It is similar to what you do with the exception of the subject matter as you don't typically see a landfill so this is the first time this Board has gone through this Ordinance, so it will be an interesting process, but one that we'll try to make sure is both efficient and fair so that everybody has the opportunity to provide comments so that you make the best decision you can based on the information before you Jim explained.

Mr. Katsificus: went on to add, that what we thought we'd do tonight, the City Manager and the Code Enforcement Officer, we talked about doing something with the Board that's similar to what happened when we began the process in front of the Board of Environmental Protection and that is to have a meeting on the process to try and reduce the number of disputes or issues we might have if we could agree on what the process is, so we all understand it and we all feel it's fair and we can all comment on it and make sure that it's appropriate. Then we can make this as efficient and fair. That is why the process tonight is to understand what we are being asked to do and to come up with the ground rules for how this Board will approach the application and then we can set up a schedule and start working our way through the application.

Ted Shina: asked Jim if he would comment on the responsibilities, under the City's Ordinance, for Planning Board members and where we should limit these discussions of this application regarding like ex parte communication. Again, you may have planned on mentioning it.

Mr. Katsiaficas: That's a fair question. This is just like any other land use application that you might have before you in that you were sitting as a quasi judicial or administrative body. There's an Ordinance that's been adopted just like your Subdivision Ordinance, just like your Site Plan Ordinance, just like your Zoning Ordinance in general and these folks are coming before you, NEWSME, Casella, BGS with an application, and so you are going to be asked to make a decision on that application as to whether grant it, or deny it, or to grant it with conditions, and so just like with any other land use application you will hear testimony, you will be given documents. Everything you receive, whether written or oral, should only be in this meeting so that everybody can see it, hear it and respond to it. You should not be having any discussions about the merits of this application outside of this room. You can receive materials at home to review, certainly, like you do with any other application when you get the Board packet, you take a look at what's coming up, you look at the agenda and review the materials. That's fine, but no discussions with each other, or members of the public should occur outside of the public meeting because that is an ex parte communication and people don't know what's being discussed and there's always a concern that you might base your decision on something that no one else was aware of. We want to make sure that your decision is fair, impartial and based upon the material that's presented to you in this application. One word of caution, you are each being given a i-Pad tonight that has all the material and that should be a great help. I understand that there are seven-thousand pages with this application, so this will make life a lot easier. It will have internet connectivity so that if more materials are received or comments from the public that David has, that can be distributed to you electronically. Here's a warning, An ex parte communication can happen when you bump into someone at Hannaford, for instance, saying I hate that project, you want to know why? Or, I love that project, let me tell you why. It can also happen with an e-mail. Let's just be careful. You should not be communicating with the public about the substance of the matter before you or with each other because if you communicate with one another electronically, it is the same as picking up the telephone or bumping into one another at the store. Does that all make sense?

Ted Shina: Thank you, it's a reminder to what we already know.

Mr. Katsiaficas: I understand it but it's really, in part, why the City Council decided it was appropriate for the Planning Board to hear this sort of application because it's much like what you do already and so it's not a different role, not different responsibilities, it's just a different Ordinance and slightly different substance but, the process is very much the same. The legal considerations are very much the same.

Ted Shina: Thank you, it's good to have a reminder to what we already know.

Mr. Katsiaficas: Jim asked Mr. Doyle or Mr. Labbe, if know would be a good time for an i-Pad tutorial if that seems appropriate.

Jeremy Labbe: Introduced himself as the Environmental Manager for Juniper Ridge and Pine Tree landfills. My responsibilities include oversight of engineering and compliance with environmental policies. Maintaining our licenses and also the day to day procedures, as well as, maintaining relationships with the DEP and EPA and other regulatory agencies. He then gave a demonstration as to how to navigate around the various screens and tools. He worked with the Board as a whole and answered any individual questions.

Mike Booth: Explained the application stating that Sections A, B, C & D, were really the text of the application and what most of the review would be covering.

David Russell: Informed the Board and those in attendance that he had three copies in the Code Enforcement Office. Two copies at the library and two copies filed with the City Clerk if anyone wished to come in and review them.

Mr. Katsiaficas: Thanked Jeremy. He then went on: If I could continue, I think the Planning Board members each received a memo that I've sent to the City Council and to the Planning Board dated June 9, 2017. The cover sheet just talks about tonight's meeting, recommending that we have this kind of preliminary meeting a completeness determination. To be sure everyone understands the Code Enforcement Officer has reviewed the application and by letter dated June 21st, has determined that it is complete under the Ordinance so that's why the process has started. It's a 180 day review period unless the parties agree to an extension. I believe we are going to try to bring this in within the 180 days. That review period began on the date of completeness and that is June 21st. So what I've done is prepared sort of an agenda for tonight's meeting talking about the considerations and the proposed review schedule. Jim then discussed the considerations A-1 through 4. He explained Chapter 24 and the years of negotiations among the city, the State and Casella on how to approach the review of the expansion. It's limited and there are certain issues that were raised before the MBEP which may not have been relevant there and certainly aren't here and those are the need for an expansion. There's already been a Public Benefit Determination made by the State and it was determined that there is a need. The State's solid waste hierarchy is not something this board needs to review and other issues of climate change, out of state waste, etc. that the Board not need to hear as part of this review. He noted that from time to time things may be introduced that are not reviewable under Chapter 24. We want to make sure that what is offered up is relevant to this review. I suggest that that is something that the Chair can make a determination on. If asked I would be happy to give counsel as needed. Does the Planning Board have general by-laws or rules of procedure?

Ted Shina: Yes we do.

Mr. Katsiaficas: We should have a copy of those available to all of us to review

David Russell: I'm sure the Clerk's office does and I will get a copy of them to all of you.

Mr. Katsiaficas: One consideration we want to make sure that the process looks at the issues that are germane to Chapter 24. I think it is also important to coordinate any other required reviews. One idea would be to coordinate the review with any other site plan review requirements. I know there will be the relocation of the scales and office building. I don't know if you want to wait until that time to apply for a site plan or whether you want now in advance?

Ted Shina: Would this trigger a review? It would have to be over 1,500 square feet I believe

David Russell: Our review for the Planning Board for site plan review does not kick in until approval has been granted for the expansion. This is based on the language in the Zoning Ordinance. Anything that they do out there now does not require Planning Board approval.

Mr. Katsiaficas: Okay, I hear what you're saying. However you folks (Casella) want to do it. We just want to make it expedient for you. That was the idea behind that. Now the Planning Board meets on the second Tuesday of each month. How soon before a meeting do need comments and materials submitted?

David Russell: Four weeks.

Discussion was had and David indicated that two weeks prior to the meeting would be fine. Discussion was also had as to the format in which the Board would receive the information. It was decided that David would pass the information along to the Board as he has in the past, to their personal e-mail accounts. He would also create a new field on the City's Web Site for public comment. These would also come to David electronically at his work e-mail address. A deadline was set for by the close of business two weeks prior to the next meeting.

Mr. Katsiaficas: Meetings begin at 6:00PM. The Board may wish to ask speakers to keep the comments relative to the standards in the Ordinance. In this case Chapter 24. Not to be repetitive and you can set reasonable time limits. If you look out in the room and see thirty people who want to speak and you have three hours you might ask that they keep their comments relative to what we have to consider. Please don't repeat what others have said if you can help it and five minutes max, or three minutes max in order to make sure that everyone has an opportunity to speak.

Ted Shina: In the past we have had some contentious meetings and the Chair has tried to manage that process so that we kept it in an orderly fashion or as

orderly as we get around here, so I would like to reserve the right to make that determination with advice from the Board at that time. I think that it's arbitrary to set them now. For instance with the number of folks we have here tonight there may be more time for them to prepare their comments and deliver them to the Board.

Mr. Katsiaficas: I've put down a review schedule, bearing in mind that we can go longer than the 180 days, but it would be nice to bring this in under the 180 day limit. The idea that I have set down is that we can start with a workshop meeting which would really be an opportunity for Casella, NEWSME, to present their application. There's a lot of material there and as they did with MDEP, if they could just present the application and guide you through it to explain their prospective on it. That would be a workshop meeting on August 8th, would be the next Tuesday meeting from 6:00 to 9:30 or however long you want to take or allow for, but those are just some guidelines. That way they could present the application and any waiver requests perhaps at that point. One question I have for the Board and the parties too and everyone out there, would you want a site visit so that you can see where these things are that you will be reviewing? Would that be more helpful before you hold the workshop and hear the application?

Ted Shina: Yes that would be helpful. We would want to see the boundaries and anything pertinent to the expansion that would help us envision what the built out expansion would look like. We'd like to keep it pretty focused to that so that it wouldn't be necessarily a very long field trip. It would be very helpful to the Board and anyone else from the public that wants to attend so that we are all talking about the same thing.

Mr. Katsiaficas: This is a site visit and not time for advocacy, but it is so that you would know where things are going and how they all work together.

Discussion was had and a decision to hold it on Thursday, July 20th, at 5:00 p.m. was scheduled. A meeting place was settled upon. A public notice is to be sent out and advertised in the BDN in lieu of the Penobscot Times as there was not sufficient time to get it into them. The Board discussed what they would want to see anything pertinent to the expansion and that there was to be no discussion or advocacy amongst themselves while on the visit. The visit is to be purely informational and that it is better to go as a group and not individually.

Mr. Katsiaficas: Reiterated to the members of the public in attendance that they are welcome to join the Board for the tour. With the Board having toured the landfill and hearing the presentation on August 8th, it would then be appropriate to begin the public hearing. You would then want to hear from the general public. The applicant could give a summary at the beginning of the meeting, but you really want to hear from the public. September 12th would be the first meeting

date in September. I don't know how many public hearings it will take to get through this. If it were tonight's group one meeting might be enough. I suggest you block out one additional Tuesday in case you have a bigger crowd. You could always cut back one, but it's easier to cut one than it is to add one, if you don't have one already. This is just a suggestion. If on August tenth if you don't have that many people, or you don't have enough of a public hearing crowd, you could hear everybody on the twelfth of September, you can start your deliberations in October. Once the public hearing ends, the deliberations begin. What would the Board find helpful in trying to make a decision? Let me put it this way. The Maine Board of Environmental Protection wound up drafting a 120 page decision because it had many criteria to go through and it received briefs, post hearing memos basically, from each of the parties and in was voluminous. There were lots of pages and exhibits. Not new evidence, but copies of the evidence that had been submitted that were being put in for argument, but someone in the commissioner's office had help, sit down and draft the hundred - twenty page decision trying to figure out what the criteria were and what went with each.

Ted Shina: Well it's easier for us because we just have Chapter 24.

Mr. Katsiaticas: Well it is. I have put together a decision form. It's still in draft form so I'm not ready to send it out to everybody, but I will be shortly. What it does is talk about the applicant, when the meetings were, when the notice was given, who testified, and then go through each of the criteria. It has a space for findings and a motion, because you'll be dealing with each of these criteria separately and voting on each one. This would be your Findings of Facts, conclusions of law, your decision form. What we could do is ask people to submit decision forms with their findings in it and then you can compare. You will get something different from opponents than you will from proponents, but at least it is in a format that addresses each standard and you can decide what to go with. So a possibility is that we get draft findings of fact and conclusions of law from the various parties based on the form. Or we could just ask them for written submissions and of course they will have made their comments orally. We will have those comments as part of the record. What do you think is helpful to you to come up with a decision, which I'll help you to write?

David Russell: I believe a standardized format would be best.

Ted Shina: And we will be going through each of these one by one all of the criteria and discuss these individually. We will get a lot of information and comments during the public hearing from the applicant and interested parties and then when we begin to deliberate, we will then go through each of those standards, as I understand it. Are you going to manage that process?

Mr. Katsiaficas: I would be glad to help go through that process. Let me write the decisions.

Ted Shina: The deliberations we go through will be at a public meeting, but at that point we will not be accepting public testimony after the hearing?

Mr. Katsiaficas: Right. Once you closed the public hearing, then you are in the deliberative phase. You can still ask questions from the parties, but the public doesn't have the right to participate, they can only respond if you call upon them. And you may decide you want to call upon them and look through each one of these criteria one by one. Whatever is easiest. DEP wanted briefs from everybody. Do you want that, or do you think just the application and the oral testimony and the supplemental documents that come in and my form will capture whatever we discuss here. Whatever will help the Board and what you are expecting? I'm looking at the parties to see. We're not trying to dictate the process, but come up with something that all of us can work with.

Ed Spencer: I've got some concerns and I'm a little confused. So you would be allowed to...

Ted Shina: Go up to the podium so that we can make sure we can get your...

Ed Spencer: Ed Spencer. I live out on the Kirkland Road. I guess I'm confused about written comments if this is a public hearing. Shouldn't written comments be part of that?

Ted Shina: I think what he was referring to, if I'm not mistaken, is that when we get to the point where we're deliberating after the public hearing, we will then consider all of the criteria in Chapter 24, the City of Old Town, we'll go through them, make comments, we will deliberate, we will consider all of the comments from the public, from the applicant. We will have a motion and a vote on each of those findings of fact and he was asking if we need briefs. Do we need detailed written decisions? I'm hoping that our discussion and the public record will be enough at that point. That is what I'm talking about.

Ed Spencer: Okay. So for the public hearing...

Ted Shina: For the public hearing, it will be wide open and we will accept, at any point we will accept your testimony or information from concerned parties like yourself, and channel it through Dave and it will get to all of us and eventually onto these machines so that we can consider it when we deliberate though we're going to be doing that criteria by criteria, making votes on findings of fact and we're not going to write a formal decision. It's going to be votes on findings of fact according to Chapter 24.

Mr. Katsiaficas: We will be working from this decision form which we will make available to everyone so we'll all understand what we're looking at.

Ed Spencer: Are these meetings recorded?

Ted Shina: Yes.

Ed Spencer: Okay. I'll sit down for now. I have some more comments for later.

The Board agreed that this approach made sense.

Mr. Katsiaficas: It's going to be an iterative process. We'll be trying to work this through and make changes and adjustments as we need to, but basically we're talking about a workshop meeting, preceded by a site visit. We'll have one public hearing, maybe a second if needed. If not, then in October we'll be talking about beginning the deliberation phase. Comment, written material is all fine up until we get to deliberation. Once the public hearing closes, I don't think the Board wants to be receiving new material unless you ask for it. So then once you get through the criteria, and there are a number of criteria here, I tried to put together an outline of what the application looks like. We will be talking about financial and technical capacity, traffic, utilities, dust, nuisance odors, litter control, vector control, bird control, waste characteristics, noise, air quality, liability insurance. Existing uses, scenic characteristics, water quality, compliance records, environmental monitoring program, hours of operations and other Ordinances that might apply that are relevant to this use and then conditions of approval, if any. There's a lot there, so I can see this deliberation, going through the findings, probably taking a couple of meetings. We don't want to rush it. We want to do a good job as always. So if it takes two meetings, it takes two meetings. Ultimately there would be a decision, up or down, after having made the findings of fact and conclusion of law and votes on each of the criteria. So that is basically, as I see it, the process, but the devil is always in the details. There are questions the Board has, questions the applicant may have, the public may have. If I may Mr. Chairman, this might be a good time to get those questions, concerns and comments on the table.

Ted Shina: Ed, you said you had other comments. Do you want to want to start?

Ed Spencer: I've been making a little list here during the i-pad demonstration. Mr. Katsiaficas said earlier in the meeting that they had received their permits for expansion. Are you talking about the State?

Mr. Katsiaficas: I'm talking about the State permit.

Ed Spencer: How about the US Army Corp?

Mr. Katsiaficas: I understand that is still out there for wetlands, but the expansion was issued a permit on June first by the Board (BEP).

Ed Spencer: For clarification I think, I was an intervener during the BEP and my deadline to appeal the decision expired last week. It might still technically be open because it 's good for 30 days. It might still be technically open for non-parties because they get 40 days, but that's neither here nor there. I was also thinking, this is no, not necessarily in any order here, but if this is going to be a fair process, this is hard to pose questions or situations not having read, like Mr. Katsiaficus just found out that there are by-laws for the Board

Ted Shina: Well they have been published for decades. The by-laws are basically for how we conduct our Planning Board meetings.

Ed Spencer: I'm curious if there's a recusal, you know, conflict of interest?

Ted Shina: Yes there is and we've followed that different members have recuse themselves from different applications in the past.

Ed Spencer: Okay. David I will be down to find these. Both Chapter 24 and the by-laws. As part of this BEP process I submitted many numerous documents. Is it acceptable for the Board members to access the BEP web site and look at those?

Ted Shina: I'm assuming any public information we could.

Ed Spencer: But it's not acceptable for me to come hand you a copy.

Ted Shina: I would prefer that we send everything through Dave.

Ed Spencer: I could do that to.

Ted Shina: And remember, as Mr. Katsiaficas has advised, it has to apply to what we are able to consider, which is basically in Chapter 24, the City's Ordinance, for a generators own landfill.

Mr. Katsiaficas: One thing to consider, this is a separate proceeding from the BEP, so whatever might have been entered by Casella, NEWSME, BGS, you, others in the BEP proceedings is not automatically part of the record here. If you were going to submit something that had been submitted previously to the BEP, it would be better for you to make a copy and submit it to Dave to give to the Board. Because this is a separate proceeding and if any appeal were to be filed from this the court would want to look at the record of what is before this body to try and calculate.

Ted Shina: So if you feel it's important to us. We are trying to keep it as pertinent to what Old Town is allowed to consider. It's not more stringent than what the BEP can set. It might be the same but not more stringent.

Ed Spencer: So I think we've got the deadline straightened out. Oh, is there like an interested persons list to share submissions, or a web site created so the public can, in other words, you get something, you know, a submission, David Russell does and then he reviews it and passes it along to you. Is there a way for the public to know when these submittals are happening?

Ted Shina: Well if we put them on the City's web site.

Mr. Katsiaticas: You won't be getting a personal e-mail sent to you. You will have to check the web site regularly.

Ted Shina: Well I'm just wondering, is it possible to sign up for and put them on an e-mail address?

David Russell: Well then you need to consider pushing the submission deadline back to four weeks.

Glenna Washburn: I think it's available 24/7 on the web site. If you just check it regularly that would be better.

Ted Shina: I know you're looking for a specific notice?

Ed Spencer: Yeah, I just thought, you know, when the Boards receiving new information, it might be nice to have the public to have access to that information as well.

Ted Shina: We're trying to set up a way that the information is there all the time. I think it might be difficult for us. We'd hate to set something up like that and forget someone and have that be a bone of contention. You know?

David Russell: My advice would be for any interested party to check the web site every day.

Ed Spencer: I guess my other comment would be, that if the standard procedure is to notify meetings in the Penobscot Times, I still think that it's a good idea to do that, even though it might be late plus the BDN, because that's where people go for their, to you know, to know when you're meeting, or when the City Council is meeting, So even if technically, they publish on Wednesdays or Thursdays, so it might be just a week before you take the site visit on July 20th. I encourage you to keep the same procedure and in the same place and legally if you're required to do a notice in the BDN as well, then do that.

David Russell: It wouldn't be in until the day of. You have to have it to the by the Friday of the next week's publication. So if I put it in this Friday, it would come out next Thursday. I will put in on the access channel, the web site and the City's Facebook page for this one specific meeting. I will put it in the BDN.

Mr. Katsiaficas: There is a notice requirement when the application rolled in that there be a public notice in the BDN and also the PT as well as public notice being mailed to the abutters and to each member of the joint committee and all those notices were published and mailed. So that was the notice of application. Then there will be notice of each public meeting as well.

Ted Shina: Isn't there a difference though, between the public notice requirements for an application, which have all been met, and then these subsequent meetings and site visits. Is that the same requirements?

Mr. Katsiaficas: No.

David Russell: Then we would go back to what we currently do. The only reason we are going to the BDN this time is that we can't give adequate notice in the Times.

Ted Shina: I think what we are going to try to do Ed, is make every effort to get the word out so that you can participate. Any other questions, comments or concerns about this process? We are learning as we go as well. This is complicated. Do the applicants have any other comments or advice for us other than run for the hills?

Mr. Katsiaficas: So what I'll do is put together a draft. It isn't really an order. This is going to be the procedure and I'll run it by you if that's alright. If the Chair approves, and I'll circulate it to all the Board, so that it is ready before the first workshop. I'll send it to Dave to go out to all of you. You can take a look at it and if it looks good then we'll send that out as the process. And you know there may be changes that we need to make as we go along, but we will at least have the basic rules of the road down so that we all understand it.

Ted Shina: What's the time frame on this? When do we need to make a decision on this so that you can publish it?

Mr. Katsiaficas: We won't publish the procedural rules. We would post it eventually. I'll have that turned around within a week so you'll have a draft to respond to.

Ted Shina: Acknowledged some one in the audience hat wished to speak and asked them to the podium.

Charles Leithiser: I was just sitting here thinking, as someone who works 8 to 5, Monday through Friday, it's sometimes hard for me to get things at the Clerk's office. Could the Planning Board by-laws be posted on the web page under the Planning Board?

David Russell: I will have those put on , as well as , Chapter 24.

Mr. Katsiaficas: That's all I have for this evenings meeting.

Ted Shina: Okay. The whole purpose for this meeting was to establish a framework and set the date for the field trip. Understand how we are going to proceed and then the next thing to do is get started.

Tim Folster: Noted that we haven't been real busy as a Board, but if other business comes before us, it looks like we will be pretty well dominated for 5 or 6 months here, so we might want to think how we're going to handle that. We might also want to think that we don't have to wait a whole month to hold the public hearings.

David Russell: Well you have advertising to take into consideration.

The Board discussed time lines for advertising and agreed to one meeting a month.

Ted Shina: Dave, you and I had discussed another pending application to come before the Board. What Tim is talking about is how do we shoehorn in other projects?

Glenna Washburn: I think that any new applications that come in should be put first on the agenda.

The Board concurred that they wanted to be timely with any other applications and we could set a second meeting if being on the same agenda as the expansion would not allow enough time.

Ted Shina: All right. Are there any other questions? The purpose of tonight was to just kind of get us started. I think that now, just for a point of clarification, Jeremy, these i-pads belong to Casella? Okay. You obviously want them back at the end of this process. Okay. We're to keep these until a decision has been rendered. That's my understanding. Is that correct?
Okay. So there is no formal decision that needs to be made tonight, but I will request a motion to adjourn.

Item 4. Old/New Business (None)

Item 5. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made by Steve Bailargeon and seconded by Russ Sossong. The motion carried (7-0).