

Town of Waldoboro, Maine
Transfer Station Committee Meeting Minutes
Municipal Building - 1600 Atlantic Highway
Thursday, December 11, 2014 – 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

1. Sign in and Call to Order
2. Determine presence of a Quorum (at least 5 of the 7 Committee members or their duly appointed Alternates must be present).

The following committee members were present and constituted a quorum:

Bob Butler – Waldoboro Resident
Elizabeth Dinsmore – Friendship Select Board
Terry Gifford - Hauler
Martha Marchut – Cushing Select Board
John Meyn – Friendship Resident
Randolph W. Robbins – Cushing Resident
Ted Wooster – Waldoboro Select Board

Also present were John W. Higgins, Waldoboro Alternate; Seth Hall, Waldoboro Alternate; Ronald Miller, Waldoboro Alternate and Selectman; John Daigle, Waldoboro Public Works Director; Monika Magee, Cushing Alternate; Alan Magee, Cushing Resident;

3. Discussion of the Minutes of the November 13, 2014 Meeting

Randy Robbins moved to accept the Minutes of the November 13, 2014 meeting as presented. Ted Wooster seconded the motion. All committee members present voted in favor of the motion.

4. Report of the Committee Chairman

- a. Letter that arrived from Rod Carr of Nelson & Doyle dated December 9, 2014 addressed to the Waldoboro Transfer Station Committee to answer questions the committee had presented in writing to Mr. Carr subsequent to the meeting the committee had with Mr. Knudsen and Mr. Carr during its November 13th meeting.

Bob Butler wrote the following e-mail on behalf of the committee to Mr. Carr on November 17, 2014:

“During the committee's October meeting, which you and Mr. Knudsen attended, Mr. Knudsen made a significant observation. He said that there are currently seven new waste-to-energy plants being built on the eastern seaboard. He said that there are still people who believe one can make money building waste-to-energy plants. He confirmed that waste-to-energy is the cleanest technology we have except nuclear and that it's no coincidence that new waste-to-energy capacity is coming on stream.

The committee would like to learn more about those seven plants. Would you please tell

us where they're located? Are the seven projects adding capacity to older plants? Are they using the same technology as PERC or are they using a different technology? If the latter, is it a technology that PERC could install at the Orrington plant? Would you please describe that technology?"

Mr. Carr responded to the e-mail in a letter dated December 9, 2014. The letter arrived at the Waldoboro Town Office on December 10th along with a raft of attachments intended to support Carr's response. Bob Butler read Mr. Carr's letter into the record. The letter is attached to these minutes.

Butler asked committee members how they would like to handle the review of the materials attached to the letter. Seth Hall, Waldoboro Alternate, volunteered to use his automatic scanner to convert the documents into pdf.files, which could be shared with committee members. Butler requested that the task be completed prior to the MRC Annual meeting on December 16th so that those committee members attending the annual MRC meeting would have the information available to them.

- b. The second item in Butler's report concerned the number of alternates on the committee. During its September meeting the committee had recommended to the Waldoboro Select Board that it review the number of alternates Waldoboro has appointed to the committee. Butler suggested that the matter be dropped as no action has been taken. Wooster commented that the committee should evaluate the issue as it goes forward, expressing the hope that matters can be kept under control.
5. Suggested Questions for Municipal Review Committee Director Greg Lounder. Prior to the meeting, Butler had circulated among committee members a list of questions the committee might consider submitting to Greg Lounder prior the annual MRC meeting, to be held on December 16th in Bangor. Butler believed answers to the questions would help to clarify the options the MRC was exploring for the years after 2018 and said he would suggest to Lounder that he address the questions during the annual meeting.

The committee agreed by consensus that the Committee Chairman should submit the questions to Lounder. The list of questions, with Lounder's written responses in **bold**, are attached to these minutes. Lounder submitted the responses to the questions the day before MRC's annual meeting.

6. Discussion of Brochure Draft – Feedback for Alan Magee

Alan Magee submitted two draft transfer station brochures for the committee's consideration, one with cartoons and the other with photos. Monika Magee had drawn the cartoons. Alan explained that the brochure was a compilation of information obtained from the existing one-page flier, the outline the Brochure Subcommittee had presented during the November meeting, and the Town of Waldoboro website. Alan's purpose was to produce something with a fresh look that was also easy to read. The biggest challenge had been compressing the mass of information from the three sources into the brochure.

Alan's requested the committee to look at the work closely, ensuring it was accurate, factual, and as complete as possible, given the limitations of space. He thought more space could be created if he eliminated the photos and/or cartoons.

(The committee's consensus was that the objectives of the brochure might best be served by including both photos and cartoons.)

Alan said that Modern Postcard had priced the four-color tri-fold brochure (3" wide) on 100# glossy stock as follows:

<u>Qty</u>	<u>Cost</u>
1,000	\$460.00 (\$0.46, each)
1,500	\$504.00 (\$0.34, each)
2,000	\$547.00 (\$0.27, each)
3,000	\$611.00 (\$0.20, each)

With a wider tri-fold (5" instead of 3") the cost would be considerably more:

2,000	\$1,003.00 (\$0.51, each)
3,000	\$1,375.00 (\$0.45, each)

Alan believes he can get all of the desire information onto the regular 8.5" X 11" format.

Alan reminded the committee that the brochure couldn't be finalized until the Transfer Station fee schedule has been finalized. He has space on the back fold of the brochure for the fee schedule.

Wooster asked if Construction Demolition Debris (CDD) could be changed from cubic yards to weight.

Randy wondered if reference could be made to the 30% recycling guideline. He thought there might a rude awakening if some people were suddenly confronted with that number. Daigle suggested that the 30% guideline would possibly be increased and emphasized the standard had been in place for a year. "People are used to it," Daigle said.

Seth Hall thought the brochure could illustrate that recycling saves people money. Butler pointed to the cartoon on the front page of the brochure which says "Recycling saves you \$, Saves me \$, Saves the Town \$ and Makes you a hero to your kids". There was general agreement that some realistic dollar amounts could be included to give substance to the general argument.

Alan requested, again, that the committee should give him guidance as to content. Butler suggested that too many cooks spoil the pot and thought 3 or 4 committee members might work with Alan to iron out the details.

Gifford said there was nothing about sorting recyclables at home. Butler repeated Gifford's suggested phrase of "Recycling Starts at Home" offered at the November meeting and suggested the phrase be expanded to "Recycling Starts At Home, In the Workplace and At School."

Gifford thought there should be examples of "old wives' tales" to encourage reuse. Daigle advised against putting information like that into the brochure given the limitations of space. He suggested such content be reserved for other formats, like the town's website. Daigle said he'd come to the committee asking for a recycling guide. People would throw the previous one into the trash. The new, tri-fold design can be kept on the dashboard of a vehicle or the refrigerator door. Alan thought that the brochure could include mention of Re-use. Butler said the brochure could mention the hierarchy: "Reduce, Re-use, Recycle"

John Meyn thought the message needs to be kept simple and uncomplicated so that people can pick up on it. He said the committee is in the marketing business and needs to tie in the cost of trash disposal. "It costs you or your town \$XXX per ton. Bring it down to the level of the individual so one can get a handle on it." For example, for every 100 pounds you recycle, you save \$XXX because it has not been thrown into the hopper for transport to PERC. Alan said there's no reason we can't squeeze in something about what it costs every time a truck goes to PERC. He suggested maybe we need a newsletter to keep people up to date. Seth suggested including a link in the brochure, which would direct people to the Town Website for more information. Ron Miller suggested drawing the picture of a truck branded with "\$2,000 per load" and the question "how much of this could have been recycled?" Butler suggested that the existing cartoon of the line of trucks could be modified to include this information.

In response to Butler's question, "Where do we go with this next?" the committee agreed by consensus that Alan and Monika should get together with John Daigle and whomever on the committee wants to participate to iron out the details.

Wooster asked if Daigle could erect a sign at the Transfer Station saying "last year recycling saved \$XXX." Daigle said the town receives monthly information from Lincoln County and that could be put up on a board at the Transfer Station. Butler said it's important to set goals and suggested the committee was straying away from discussing the brochure.

Alan asked whether people wanted the brochure to feature photos or cartoons. Meyn said the photo of the cans conveys the idea that they should be cleaned before being recycled. Meyn thought that sometimes the photos are best and sometimes the cartoons are best depending upon the context and the desired message. John Higgins thought the cartoons would attract younger people and that the photos would resonate with older people. Butler thought we should consider the target audience. Older people use the Transfer Station. Gifford pointed out that young people recycle at school. Alan thought the pictures need to fit the message and suggested we can use both. Ron Miller said the cartoons are something new and refreshing; the photos are old and already familiar. Alan wondered if we should do a brochure for the school and a brochure for the Transfer Station.

Meyn said this is this going to be a step-by-step process. The brochure with cartoons will attract more attention than the brochure with "old" with photos. Daigle said we'd learn by experience. "If the new brochure is working, great. If not, we'll come up with something different."

Monika asked that committee members look through each of the categories and provide feedback.

Ron Miller asked how the brochure is to be distributed. John Daigle said Transfer Station personnel would hand it out at the Transfer Station. Miller wondered if it could be included in a revival of the town's quarterly newsletter. Daigle thought that should be reserved for recycling and reuse tips.

Seth Hall suggested mailing it out with tax bills.

Butler reminded everyone that all three towns are paying for the brochure and that Cushing and Friendship citizens did not and will not receive a Waldoboro newsletter.

In winding up the discussion, Butler suggested the brochure contain a revision date, for example, "Rev: January 2015" to be able to distinguish each revision from its predecessor.

7. Up-date from Waldoboro Director of Public Works and Discussion of Budget

Daigle said the contractor is ordering the scale software and repeated his expectation that the scale will be operating during the first week of January.

Butler asked how the Transfer Station would prepare people to use the scales. He suggested a scale procedures manual.

Daigle said most people have noted the scales are under construction. Transfer Station staff have already explained the scales to a lot of people. He does not think it will be an issue. There will be a pilot period to gain experience and to put some prices together.

As for the software, Daigle had shopped it during the MRRA conference at the Samoset last spring. The software allows the recordation of up to 8 different types of MSW. It emphasized that the software is registered to the town, not to a specific individual. He described it as pretty much the "Cadillac" of scales software. A camera could be added in the future, the scales could be networked to the Waldoboro Town office, the price is very reasonable, and there's no annual fee. Software maintenance during the first year is included in the price. Randy said it sounds like the town will be

paying an annual fee after that. Daigle said “Not necessarily”. “If we do have issues, we have our own IT guy”.

Seth Hall asked about the cost of the software. Daigle said it was included in the cost of the scales.

Higgins said the scales had been discussed back in April. The information was not given to the committee. He said once the scale had been ordered the committee would be given a list of the PC software that could be used with it. He said the committee was not given any of that. Higgins said he was very dissatisfied that the committee did not look at the software at all. The Town Manager had said the software had already been looked at and the committee had been by-passed. The committee did not get a look at it.

Wooster said that because the town had paid for the software, the Select Board had gotten a pretty fair explanation of what was going on. “The software had gone through a couple of stages of refinement and decision and so on and the Select Board authorized the final conclusions with the financial responsibility associated with that”, Wooster said.

Daigle said “no”. He said he wasn’t sure but he thought he’d given the committee a package about PC software sometime back in July, when he’d provided the blueprints for the scale. He was pretty sure he did. Wooster said he was pretty sure the Select Board had passed judgment on the issue.

Gifford thought the software would be wired directly into the office instead of there being a scale house. She said the “office is the scale house”.

Daigle said he was not going backwards. He said all had been brought up, he’d shown the committee members, and the contract had gone out, the select board had seen it.

Butler said he wanted to correct the record. He pointed out that the committee did not meet in April. The committee had met twice in March. He read from the minutes of the March 6th meeting, which paraphrased John Daigle: “There are lots of software packages available for scales. Scale options are numerous and growing. John Daigle recommends pending the discussion about software until after the scales have been approved and are undergoing installation.”

Butler said there’s no point discussing a package until you know you’re actually using it or buying it. That’s kind of where we are right now,” Butler said.

Gifford asked, “Are we discussing the package or is it off the table, now?”

Higgins said it’s a moot question. Miller pointed out that the Board has already approved it and that there’s no point discussing it any further. Randy Robbins said that the entire package had already been given to the committee; he had the package in front of him.

The committee moved on.

Seth Hall referred to a *Lincoln County News* article about recycling in the Jefferson and Nobleboro schools. Daigle said you’d be surprised about how much the schools recycle. Butler pointed out that Cushing school has an outreach program and that Monika has developed some wonderful materials for it. Gifford said the schools have recycling programs. “They are smarter than we are; they’re in technology” she said.

Butler moved forward on the agenda, opening up a discussion about the Transfer Station Budget. He pointed out that under the terms of the Municipal Services Agreement, Cushing and Friendship are entitled to a budget prior to the end of January. Their budgeting cycles run in accordance with the calendar year. Waldoboro’s annual budget cycle begins on July 1st of each year.

Daigle said that in all the years he’s been doing this, Waldoboro has given Cushing and Friendship an

expected percentage of increase. He said he wouldn't know what PERC's tipping fees would be for the coming year until mid-January. Butler pointed out that would give him at least 10 ten days to get some numbers to Waldoboro's partners.

Butler asked if there would be a line item in the budget for outreach. Daigle said there could be. He mentioned he has a few issues on which he's working that will impact the budget. For example, he'll need a separate line item for shingles on account of transportation costs. On the composting program, he's hoping he'll have a license by July. There's money in the capital reserve to cover the cost of composting pads. However, he will need a separate line item for the pails and little composting buckets.

Robbins asked if individuals or haulers would be delivering compostable materials. Daigle confirmed it would be individuals. Butler said some towns started composting programs with a nucleus of 30 people and suggested the Transfer Station could take the same approach.

Randy asked if the food-based compost actually has to be sent to the State to be tested. Daigle confirmed. He said that compost from grass clippings and brush does not require testing. Unlike Lincoln County Recycling, he does not expect to add manure to the mix. Daigle is expecting to compost grass clippings, brush and food waste, only.

Gifford asked Daigle if he could put into the budget a line item for printing Transfer Station Committee materials intended for Waldoboro committee members and alternates. She thought the amount of materials the committee chairman was sending out electronically was becoming overwhelming. Butler asked if she was making a motion, which she confirmed. There was no second to Gifford's motion. It was pointed out that Waldoboro Town Office staff is already very busy

Ron Miller asked about electricity rates. Will an increase in those rates be included in the budget? Daigle said it would be.

8. Amend Attachment B of the Ordinance?

Butler expressed his concern that a lack of ordinance clarity concerning the move from volume to weight and to the use of the scale and rates charged, could come back to haunt the committee down the road.

Daigle responded that he could anticipate that parts of the ordinance will require change and suggested the committee wait until those issues become clarified, issues such as the disposal of shingles, a possible swap table and composting.

Butler expressed his concern that Transfer Station practices not get out ahead of the ordinance. Martha Marchut replied that Attachment B does anticipate the use of scales and charging by weight, the absence of details notwithstanding.

9. Other Topics Not on the Agenda

Ron Miller asked why the committee was not spending more effort on discussions concerning single stream and dual stream. He said the topics have been brought up, but nobody has moved forward on getting anyone to come in to talk to the committee about those issues and facts and opinions about single stream. Is there to be a study done on both? He complained that the topics kept getting put on the back burner. He said there are a lot of people out there who had expressed a desire to discuss single stream.

Ted Wooster said we had invited people to come in to talk about single stream. He said the committee wanted to obtain a solid understanding of MSW when the scales are operating. "The scales are needed to define the situation carefully before moving on", Wooster said.

Randy Robbins pointed out that Jim Guerra, the Camden/Rockport/Union Transfer Station Manager had addressed the committee in October and that someone from Rockland will speak to the committee in January. He added that EcoMaine had discussed single stream with the committee on a number of occasions. He said Monika Magee's real interest was in Pay-as-You-Throw.

Butler added that Lincoln County Recycling does not do Single Stream, and that until we leave Lincoln County or it adopts single stream as a *modus operandi*, it makes no sense to waste the committee's time.

Gifford said the people of the Town of Waldoboro deserve more than what this committee is doing. If you took a survey in Waldoboro...I think the committee should start doing something for the people instead of to the people. She has not heard a whole lot about what the people want. She suggested that it would be much easier with just one bin for recyclables. She said the committee talks only about money, adding that money is not an issue because the Transfer Station budget passes every year with no problem. "No one is complaining about that budget," she said. She said the chairman has put those items on the agenda many times, but the committee never digs into them. The agenda keeps repeating itself time and time again and nothing seems to get done.

Seth Hall asked John Daigle about his experience at the transfer station. Were people complaining about the absence of single stream? Was the staff hearing a constant stream of complaints? Seth asked. Seth confirmed he was not hearing complaints.

Daigle agreed that single stream would make life easier. Daigle warned that a shift to single stream would cost the towns \$60,000 a year or more to haul the zero-sort recyclables away. Right now Lincoln County Recycling hauls away the towns' *sorted* recyclables at no charge to the towns. "We've had people in here talking about single stream, you can't say that we haven't", Daigle said, referring to Miller's comment. "This committee has looked into it." Daigle suggested that the towns adopt Pay-as-You-Throw. The drop in tonnage to PERC, as a result of PAYT, would realize cost savings that could be applied to supporting the higher costs of single stream.

Gifford asked for a repeat of the study that had been done a number of years ago to determine how much recycling costs with Lincoln County Recycling. She said she'd made a motion months ago to complete a comparative study, just for information. She wanted to know how much recycling costs. She said she could not get the committee to agree to update the study.

Daigle indicated that Gifford did not understand the purpose of the study. The study was undertaken to evaluate the hours and job of the Transfer Station operator. He said that you're going to have people operating the transfer station no matter what recycling methods are used. The operator is going to be on the job doing recycling or doing something else. Right now if you look at the Transfer Station budget, there is NO SINGLE LINE ITEM for the cost of recycling. The current expense to Waldoboro for recycling is, "zero, zero, and zero", said Daigle. Friendship and Cushing do have to pay a small amount of money because they are not in Lincoln County. Daigle added that the Transfer Station's operating budget is about \$500,000. Other facilities that are dealing with the same population of about 8,000 are running budgets of more than \$1 million. "We've gone through this, visiting other transfer stations," Daigle said. The study was about Al (Mackay's) hours.

Ted Wooster commented that the three communities are incredibly fortunate that people are sorting their trash at home, and that we're not paying other people to do the work for us. Were they not to do it, the costs of sorting trash would go up dramatically if we had the municipal employees doing it.

Gifford said that when the day pads were built, she thought there would be two bins to take materials away from the day pads. Then she asked Robbins, "What did you think the day pads were going to do?" Robbins responded he was under the impression that the day pads would be used so people did not have to go out back and so that materials dumped on the day pads could be better checked for contamination. Gifford said she was in agreement with Randy.

Gifford then, continuing the conversation with Robbins, asked him what he thought they were going to do with the washing machines. Did he think they were going to be put on the day pads and then transported out back using the front-end loader? She wondered what Randy thought about people not being able to take their washing machines out back any more. "What is happening with the front-end loader is that it's being used to take the debris out back instead of the people taking it out," Gifford said.

The committee chairman indicated it was time to move on and requested items for the January agenda. He said he hoped David St. Laurent, the Rockland Transfer Station Director, would attend the meeting to speak about his experiences with PAYT.

John Meyn said there should be a report on our attendance at the annual meeting of the Municipal Review Committee.

Butler asked if there was anything else for the January agenda.

Gifford said she had questions on two very different categories from two of her customers. She asked what charitable organization the money goes to for collections of redeemable bottles and cans that are left at the transfer station. Daigle responded, "The Food Pantry". Gifford asked, "The money is given to the Food Pantry?" Daigle responded, "Not all of it." The Food Pantry receives funds generated from the redemption of bottles and cans placed in the blue barrel, which is signed, "Waldoboro Food Pantry". Redeemable items not placed in the blue container are sold to defray the operating budget of the Transfer Station. Gifford asked where these bottles and cans come from.

Butler interjected, saying that if there's a customer who has a specific question it's best to ask the question of the Transfer Station operator.

Gifford then asked about tires. She said people were surprised to see the transfer station continuing to accept tires for the hopper. To paraphrase Gifford, "If we're trying to get the recycling rate above 30% and as high as 50%, why are we putting tires in the hopper if there's someone who will come to the transfer station to take them for \$2.00, each, even with rims on them, to be shredded?" Daigle responded, asking, "Remember Jimmy Hays had that tire up there in Nobleboro?" Gifford said she did. He said, "The town of Waldoboro is held responsible for a lot of stuff that goes out (of the transfer station) after we give it." "We're responsible from cradle to grave," Daigle said. Daigle said it's cheaper sending tires down the hopper at a charge of \$2.00 each than it is for people to pay \$2.50 per tire to give them to someone else.

Terry asked how many tires we're putting into the hopper each month. Daigle said we could put in about 40 tires per trailer load. "How many trailers go out in a month?" asked Gifford. "11? 12? Each tire weighs about 20 pounds. A hundred tires weigh a ton."

Butler stopped the conversation, saying we've been through this before and the information is on the record.

Butler asked, again, if there was anything else to go on next month's agenda?

Seth Hall said he'd like to have a sense of the committee and of the town regarding pay-per-throw. Butler said the committee is trying to develop the information so people can figure how they feel about it. Butler said it is his intention to put on the agenda a discussion about priorities. What's the most important thing to look at to increase recycling? What's the easiest thing to do to obtain the biggest reduction in materials sent to PERC? And what recommendations do we make to the Select Board? More importantly, what goals do we set and recommend for the towns to go after? It's a process. It takes time, Butler said.

10. Adjournment.

John Meyn moved that the meeting adjourn. Martha Marchut seconded the motion. The committee's vote on the motion was unanimous.

Approved:

Bob Butler, Chairman (Waldoboro Resident)

Terry Gifford (Waste Hauler)

John Meyn (Friendship Resident)

Randolph Robbins (Cushing Resident)

Martha Marchut (Cushing Select Board)

Ted Wooster (Waldoboro Select Board)

Some Questions for Greg Louder,
Managing Director,
Municipal Review Committee

1. Has the MRC suggested that PERC and the MRC, as partners in PERC, invite proposals to convert the PERC facility to a Mass Burn facility? Or have USA Energy Group and MRC already reviewed those costs and determined it's not economical to make the conversion?

We explored this & George will describe tomorrow

2. What fallbacks is MRC intending to pursue if Fiberight does not meet requirements as an alternative to PERC?

We do have fallbacks in wings with alternative vendors & local private off-take partners. MRC member best interest not to disclose entities now.

3. Would a contract with Fiberight eliminate Lincoln County Recycling's (LCR) claim on the recyclables Cushing, Friendship and Waldoboro currently generate and send to LRC? Note: LCR transports the recyclables from Waldoboro's transfer station to LRC's facility in Wiscasset at no cost to participating towns. As long as revenues from sales of recyclables cover LCR's operating costs, capital investments and indirect overheads there is no impact on the three towns' budgets for transporting their recyclables.

No. Local programs need not change. Fiberight economics designed around "catching" what is missed first pass locally.

4. USA Energy Group argues that it can accommodate lower levels of MSW intake -- resulting from increased rates of recycling -- by reducing operating costs. Knudsen, USA Energy Group Vice President of Operations, says that PERC can maintain optimum operating levels with reduced MSW by reducing the number of its employees through retirement and natural attrition. (PERC is not unionized.) By reducing employee costs, Knudsen argues, PERC can operate more efficiently with lower throughput and remain competitive, while minimizing tipping fee increases. Knudsen does not believe PERC would have a problem reducing the number of its employees. He argues that PERC has a good work environment. The company works very hard to service employee needs. Any reductions to accommodate lower operating levels would be gradual. How does MRC respond to this? Do the foregoing considerations argue against MRC's view that PERC's technology is not viable? Can MRC document and demonstrate its position?

I will not be too comfortable talking about employees tomorrow. PERC's other partner encouraged them to come & frankly, I believe what Knudsen told your group about employee levels differs from

what USAE told their employees. Sad. Bottom line is USAE has no plan for scaled down operations at any level. Employees are just part of the scale-down equation.

5. Does MRC anticipate increases in its indirect overhead, capital and operating budgets as its oversight role shifts from PERC to Fiberight?

No. We expect things to stay about the same (meaning drift back to pre-ramp up for 2018 levels. 2013, 2014 and 2015 have been exceptionally high work load years)

6. MRC's future sources of income could be the rent it would charge for the land it leases to Fiberight and, if MRC makes an investment in the Fiberight operation, a share of net income. Does MRC expect to share its net earnings with its charter member communities?

MRC is a pass thru entity created by the towns. Money is either returned to the towns or held in their names. This won't change.

7. Will the charter members of MRC/PERC also be charter members of the Fiberight enterprise?

All charter members would join the new system as charter members.

8. Is the Fiberight project scalable to the extent that other non-MRC communities may be allowed to join?

Fiberight is scalable and others could join so long as it made sense for the core group.

9. Does Title 38 Sanction a Fiberight-like facility? Or, is new legislation required?

The holistic approach offered by the Fiberight system fits very well with the existing state policy framework. I don't expect significant legislative change being necessary, but something could always come up.

10. For comparison purposes, would you please estimate the following:
 - a. Current tipping fees paid to PERC, after adjustments for GAT
 - b. Estimated PERC tipping fees after April 2018 (please provide a range)
 - c. Estimated tipping fees payable to Fiberight.

This will be in the presentation in detail

11. Who will purchase the products Fiberight produces? Are the markets local or out-of-state? Will Fiberight conclude medium- or long-term contracts for the sales of those products? How will Fiberight's projected sales prices of its

products compare to prices of similar products available on the open market today? What are the annual projected revenues, operating costs, indirect overheads and net income of the Fiberight project?

Fiberight has the lead on this part of transaction and it is early to disclose this without their participation. We independently looked at biofuels markets and talked with local market participants and we feel comfortable that we are on the good side of supply – demand curve

12. Fiberight's products will be hazardous and probably poisonous. How will the products be transported? Rail? Truck? Over what distances? Have probabilities of disasters and their associated costs been calculated? Have clean-up costs been reviewed? Can insurance coverage for spills be purchased at costs that are not prohibitive? How do the probabilities of a Fiberight disaster stack up against risks currently represented by the PERC operation?

Fiberight product transport should carry no materially different risk than a number of other viable, insured businesses storing, transporting, and receiving liquid fuels throughout Maine.

13. Will the Fiberight project reduce the MSW transportation costs which Cushing, Friendship and Waldoboro currently incur?

Transportation may be slightly less compared to status quo & we are exploring a transport allowance for more distant members

14. Is it possible to arrange a visit to an *operating* Fiberight plant?

MRC and UMaine peer reviewers have been to Fiberight, Lawrenceville, VA. More trips can be arranged in 2015

15. Will the workforce of a Fiberight plant be greater in numbers than the workforce at PERC?

Fiberight workforce comparable to PERC, likely less # of employees though