

roadway on the west side to improve traffic flow. This will be significant improvement to site. Mr. Smith said there is nothing in the Planning Dept. Staff Report that they cannot address with revised plans. Chairman Finaldi asked about the curb cuts and Mr. Smith said they already exist with aprons. Mr. Keller asked about the truck turning radius and how it would affect internal circulation. Mr. Smith said a tanker can enter either of the far driveways, maneuver around the pumps and still be out of the traffic pattern for whole site. Mr. Urice asked if the existing storage tanks would be moved. Mr. Smith said they would be moved slightly to north.

Henry Dittman, from Barkan & Mess Traffic Engineers, said this proposal will double the existing facilities. He added that of the two existing driveways, only the one opposite Hayestown Ave. is signalized. This one will become the main driveway and will remain signalized. There are eight dispenser islands proposed which will allow sixteen vehicles to simultaneously fuel. This site currently generates traffic and with these proposed renovations, it will generate even more traffic. The convenience store will expand roughly from 1,200 sq.ft. to 4,000 sq.ft. He said in a 24 hour period there are 13,200 vehicles on Tamarack Ave. and the traffic is always greater heading toward the hospital. He said this proposal will add new traffic to the site, but it will be what is referred to as "passing by" traffic. He referred to the traffic study, saying this will create only a modest increase in the amount of traffic because most of the traffic will already be passing by the site. So it will be new to this site, but already on the road.

Mr. Urice asked if he is saying that the increased number of pumps as well as the increase in the size of the convenience store will still only result in modest increase. Mr. Dittman said that is correct. He then said the LOS at the signalized driveway will be "C" or better. He added that the stop sign controlled driveways will have poor LOS because of the sheer volume of traffic on Tamarack and Hayestown. The good news is that the delays will be on the property not on the roadway. Mr. Keller asked if they would widen Tamarack at the south end driveway. Mr. Dittman said there is no land left to use in that area, so they cannot do any widening. He said they would want to if they could but it cannot be done. Ms. Hoffstaetter asked if there would be a stacking problem for cars turning left at the un-signalized driveways to get into the site. Mr. Dittman said they do not expect there to be because why would you pass the signalized driveway to use the others when it will be more difficult to cross the traffic. Mr. Manuel suggested a possible prohibition on a southbound left turn if Mr. Mohammed agrees. Mr. Keller said that is not a bad idea. Mrs. Emminger said that is suggested in her Staff Report, but we do not have Mr. Mohammed's comments yet. Mr. Urice asked Mr. Dittman if they are proposing to expand the control of the traffic signal. Mr. Dittman said the traffic signal will be completely modified because of changes to the roadway and the driveways. He said he is working with the City Traffic Engineer on this split phasing.

Attorney Jaber said they have not submitted any revised plans yet in response to comments because they have been waiting for the Engineering Dept. comments. Also the Traffic Engineer and the Traffic Authority comments. Mr. Keller asked if they will be selling either diesel or propane fuel. Attorney Jaber said they will sell diesel but not propane. Mrs. Emminger asked how the construction will be handled, by shut down or phasing. Attorney Jaber said they will submit a construction plan with the revised plans.

Chairman Finaldi asked if there was anyone else to speak in favor of this application. Lynn Waller, 83 Highland Ave., said the existing situation is mildly dangerous, so she is pleased about

use ultraviolet light or another system designed for that purpose. Mr. Urice said the applicant has represented that there will be no odor beyond the doors, but asked how can they control that if one of the doors has to be opened during the process. He asked if this system can handle the doors being opened during its process. Mr. Wollenhaupt said this system functions on a negative air pressure up to about four minutes. Ms. Hoffstaetter asked if they would need a management system to control the opening of doors in order for this system to function properly. He said there would be some sort of operations protocol with the final design. Mr. Urice asked how they determined that the filters would need to be changed monthly. Mr. Wollenhaupt said it is an estimate based on the lifespan of the filters and the nature of this business. There is no mechanism to measure odors. Mrs. Emminger asked for additional copies of his documentation for the Commission. Ms. Hoffstaetter asked if the misting system they discussed at the previous meeting would affect this system. Mr. Wollenhaupt said this system will not be affected by the humidity level that is added to a building. The atomized mist system they discussed would be an if needed system, whereas the system they are proposing would be able to handle a large volume of dust. He said construction & demolition debris generates dust and municipal solid waste generates odor. He said there is a diverse mix of waste materials at any given moment; you would not get a bunch of municipal solid waste one day and then a bunch of construction and demolition debris on another day. Mrs. Emminger asked that the applicant address the issue of how they would handle the dust debris if it is outside of the building. Mr. Manuel said he is curious about the operations and maintenance. Mr. Wollenhaupt said the system is about 50% designed, so they have not yet gotten that far. Mr. Keller asked if any of the other facilities listed in his references are similar to this one. Mr. Wollenhaupt said there is a similar one in Holliston, MA, but is larger and accepts almost twice the tonnage that this facility is proposing. He said the larger facilities generally have more problems than the smaller ones because they handle more tonnage. He said the smaller ones (500 tons per day or less) are better off because they require the movement of materials quicker.

Attorney Cava then said one of the other issues were questions on noise and sound. He introduced Allan Smardin, HMB Acoustics, to try to answer some of these questions. Mr. Smardin said they use the dba scale because it closely approximates the human ear and also is used in the Danbury Noise Ordinance. He explained that the noise level inside the building is an average of 80 dba. The building itself will reduce the noise level to outside by 30 dba, so the difference is a 50 dba level at about 10 ft. from the wall of the building. The distance from the building to the nearest housing authority residence is 235 ft. and increasing the distance results in a reduction of noise level. He said there also has been concern expressed about the potential truck noise. Mr. Keller said he is confused by these distances. Attorney Cava then said they are going to be providing exact distances to the nearest residences, but the closest property line to Housing Authority project is 160 feet. Mr. Smardin then said there are three different regulations that apply to trucks in the State of CT. The first is the State of CT noise regulations, the second is the City ordinances and the last is the State of CT Noise Levels for Vehicles which is referenced in the Danbury noise code. He said the projected noise levels for this building and trucks project are below the levels for truck compliance for all three regulations. He said there also was a question on the effect of wind on noise generation. Wind is a secondary influence to sound propagation because the speed of sound is much, much faster. He said he had reached the conclusion that the noise from the building and the trucks would not be an issue based on all of these factors.

Mr. Manuel questioned the relevance of this noise information because the Commission has to determine how much noise this facility will make and if it will have a detrimental effect on the neighborhood. Ms. Hoffstaetter asked if Mr. Smardin if he could provide some information regarding the cumulative effects of the noise from the idling trucks. Attorney Cava pointed out that these trucks are only subject to the noise regulations if they are moving. Ms. Hoffstaetter then asked if they could prepare a set of assumptions based on the trucks moving and the doors opening and closing. She asked that he discuss how the trees would help to buffer the noise, questioning if they are full grown and if not, how long they would take to mature. Mr. Smardin said he was basing his comments on a 4-6 ft. height, but he has no idea on their growth potential. Mrs. Emminger asked that the Commission be provided with copies of Mr. Smardin's report.

Attorney Cava said he was going to change the order of his presentation and have Mr. Zessin discuss the distances to put an end to the confusion. Mark Zessin, PE from Anchor Engineering, then said he would give them the distances using the site plan and aerial photo for reference. Mr. Zessin said *"Look at the site plan showing where the existing building is as well as the property line and the curve line along the apartments, to the west, afterwards I'll refer to the overall aerial photo. There were quite a few distances to the property lines, in to the wood lines, the wetland line, to the building itself and one of the things that is adding to the confusion, the building is straight, the property line is not straight, the curve in the road and you'll see in the other photo that the adjoining building is also skewed to that. You'll see here the distance, the thirty scale map, each inch on the map is thirty feet, it's about five inches, to the very closest point on the property line. Some of the wetlands are on the other side of the property line; some of them are on the easterly side of the property line. But at the nearest point, just the property line is about 150 ft. You'll notice also at that point, that's not the tip floor end of the building. The tip floor is over here, there are no doors here, for trucks to back and tip, there's actually no vehicular access. The curve line is here. So the closest point, people ask a specific question, of myself or Mr. Griddle, being our nature, we answer very specifically, the closest point is here, but that is not where the tip floor is. Just like the closest point here, the wetlands are on the other side of the brook, the closest point here, it's irrelevant now, but that's the closest point. There's some discussion about the trailers which aren't here, they're over there. But speaking to the point of the matter here, the closest point, the property line here is there, actually sectioning through the building, we had given that section to Mr. Smardin to the adjoining building, so the distance we gave him was 235 ft. and that's what the distance is. Looking at this map showing our building and this building, once again, the skew of that there, the closest point is 235; you can see the apartment building is skewed. You can also see if I bring it closer, if you can tell what these things are, this is the driveway this is parking cars, then the grass strip, then the adjoining building. So the distance once again to the property line, or to the facility shown on this map, when Syd Rapp prepared the map, he just picked up the curb line thinking that was the only thing relevant. But you can see here on this map, the curve and the bituminous curbing over there, skews the way you can see pretty much, that's where the curb is. Now to other adjacent facilities, the 800 ft., 820 ft. is to these, Arlington Woods apartments. There was also some questions while I'm here talking about distances. Woodland Hills Clubhouse, which is actually just about opposite the driveway to Arlington Woods, it's about 1600 plus ft. to the nearest units in Woodland Hills, which are units off of the first cul-de-sac past their clubhouse on the left. As you pull into their driveway, it's a semi-circle driveway, it would be down in this area, it's about 1,800 ft. So the distance Mr. Smardin was referring to earlier and that's past the junkyard and through the heavy woods, but nonetheless,*

it's here. And while I'm here, I also wanted to just for reference and points, we had some other distances. From the apartment building here to the sewage treatment plant buildings here, about 165 ft., to the nearest tanks over here are 185 ft. and to these open tanks to this building, it's about 350 ft. There's several tanks as you can see closer to these buildings than the fact that the transfer station building would be to the other apartments. Lastly there's about a 15 ft. elevation difference between the grade proposed on the finished floor here to the lowest point on the driveway over here. In between there would be the retaining walls with the trees on top and then beyond that, there's some question about the maturity of the trees. All this area is wooded, this area is also wooded which will receive supplemental trees and these plantings are 6 ft. minimum height on each of the, at planting, each of the White Pines, Norway Spruce and Colorado Spruce, 6 ft. minimum at plantings as indicated on the planting table. The height at maturity which was also asked for by the City, 50-80 ft., 40-60 ft., 30-60 ft., respectively on the White Pines, Norway Spruce and Colorado Spruce. Mr. Grindle, the landscape architect who prepared the landscaping plan is here if you want to ask him any questions about pine trees or any of the other plantings." Mr. Urice asked the distance from the northwest corner where the trailer parking is and also to the Housing Authority site. Mr. Zessin said it is just over 70 ft. perpendicular to the property line and 130 ft. from the curb line of the road. Mr. Urice asked if he said 130 ft. is the nearest distance between stored garbage and human habitat. Mr. Zessin said that is to the curb line for the road, adding that it is actually about 200 ft. from building to building. He said the difference between the numbers is due to the curbing, the road, the parking and the grass strip before you actually get to the building. Mr. Urice asked for the distance if you were in a car and Mr. Zessin said then it would be about 135 ft. Mr. Keller commented that in the northwest corner that is closest to the Housing Authority property, he did not see any additional trees proposed, only the existing woods. Mr. Zessin referred to the planting schedule saying they did not see any sense to knocking down a tree to plant another tree. He added that the landscaping had to be designed in accordance with the EIC approval.

Attorney Cava said they have responded to the Planning Dept. Staff Report regarding the apparent conflict between the Zoning Regulations and the City Code of Ordinances. The Staff Report says that the Code of Ordinances specifically designates the AWD White St. facility and the City Landfill as the only authorized sites for waste disposal. Attorney Joe Biraglia prepared a response letter addressed to Mrs. Emminger. He submitted the original which was designated **Exhibit K**. Attorney Biraglia's response was twofold, the first part saying that this section of the Ordinances is unconstitutional as drafted. It referred to a Stipulated Agreement between the City and P & G Sanitation, in which the City agreed not to enforce this Ordinance. It went on to say that the existence of the Stipulated Agreement proves that the City knows this is unconstitutional and additionally the City has never tried to enforce this Ordinance. The second part of Attorney Biraglia's response points out that this Ordinance is not necessarily consistent with this application, because there are other materials that the applicant could accept that do not fall within the definition of "acceptable waste". Based upon these two points, the applicant's position is that there is no conflict between the Regulations and the Ordinances.

Attorney Cava asked David Brown to explain how they determined the number of trucks (105) at the maximum 500 tons delivery rate. Mr. Brown said these are conservative estimates, but one would be 30 trucks of municipal solid waste totaling 225 tons, the next would be 50 roll off trucks delivering construction & demolition debris totaling 250 tons, and finally 25 small volume customers dropping off 25 tons. This is assuming the facility was receiving the maximum

volume that is proposed. He submitted a sheet with these proposed traffic volume calculations on it, which was designated **Exhibit L**. He reminded them that this facility is intended for commercial usage, it is not a mom & pop drop-off facility. He said they would expect their clientele to be contractors (who would be self-delivering to this facility) and customers who would be looking to avoid engaging a commercial hauler. Mr. Manuel asked about the trucks hauling the stuff out. Mr. Brown said they assume that exiting trucks would have 22-24 tons per payload since the optimum is to maximize your payload. He added that the construction & demolition debris would go to Ohio. Mr. Manuel asked during what hour of the day this would happen. Mr. Brown said it would happen throughout the day during the regular hours of operation 6AM to 4 PM. Ms. Hoffstaetter asked why they would use a lower number when estimating what is being hauled in. Mr. Brown said it is better to use less than the maximum because you would not hit the maximum everyday. Ms. Hoffstaetter asked how long it would take for a truck to do the process. Mr. Brown said a truck could enter the site and off the scale in two minutes, then deposit the material on the tipping floor and leave the site within six minutes. He said this is a repetitive business, there will be a computerized system to log in, move through scales and continue around the facility. Ms. Hoffstaetter asked about peak time, with the trucks queued and waiting to get onto the tipping floor, saying that she calculated about thirteen trucks per hour. Mr. Brown said within fifteen to twenty minutes, five or six vehicles could do the entire process. Mr. Urice asked if the MSW designation means commercial waste versus residential. Mr. Brown said that is correct, most of the MSW would be coming in as commercial. Mrs. Calitro asked to confirm the numbers that Mr. Brown had presented to them regarding the trip generation. She said 105 trucks dropping off waste going in and out equals 210 trips and 25 trucks to move the containers in and out equals 50 trips. Mr. Brown said the traffic engineer used these numbers to do his analysis and he says there would be 284 trips per day, of which 260 are in heavy vehicles.

Mr. Keller asked where and how the trucks would be queuing. He also asked what would happen when more trucks try to enter than can be handled. Mr. Brown said there is ample space in the driveway for the queuing. Ms. Hoffstaetter asked if that includes the big trucks that will haul the stuff away. Mr. Brown said there is enough room for the big trucks to bypass the trucks that are unloading. Mr. Manuel asked about other trucks parking along the back of the site. Mr. Brown said this is a contingency to store either an empty trailer truck or for very short term storage of trailer awaiting removal from the site. Mr. Keller asked how many storage containers would be on site and also asked about tires. Mr. Brown said there are 5 potential slots for a trailer. Mrs. Emminger asked if the containers would be stacked on top of each other. Mr. Brown said no these are trailers that would be placed side-by-side. Mr. Keller asked how much they would hold. Mr. Brown said they assumed in their traffic study that they would handle 20 tons, but he believes they will actually handle more. He then said they did show a covered area for tires on the site plan because sometimes a tire may come in with construction & demolition materials. They cannot send tires to that kind of landfill, so they need to store them temporarily until they can send them to a facility that processes tires. He said most tires are used beneficially and there is a facility in CT that processes them. Mrs. Calitro asked if it is feasible for the containers of waste that are waiting to be picked up to be pulled around the back of the building and stored in the corner attached to something until the cab comes to take them away. Mr. Brown said they could be stored there but not on top of each other. Mr. Keller asked how long these containers will sit around waiting for pick-up. Mr. Brown said they don't have space to store trailers there so they would have to be leaving the site all day long. Ms Hoffstaetter asked if they would be storing any solid waste overnight in these containers. Mr.

Brown said it is possible but most unlikely. Mr. Manuel asked if these are trucks or storage containers and are they completely enclosed and sealed. Mr. Brown said they are tractor trailers and if you saw them on the highway, you would not know what was in them. He said it is an open top vehicle but any containers that are stored on the site will be covered. Mr. Manuel asked what kind of cover exactly. Mr. Brown said very likely it would be a canvas top. Mr. Manuel asked if that kind of top contains odors or prevents them from getting out. Mr. Brown said to a large extent it does. Mr. Manuel asked if they are cleaned in between uses. Mr. Brown said not usually. Mr. Urice asked if these roll tops would prevent all of the odor from escaping from the trailers once they are in place. Mr. Brown said it is an impervious surface being placed on top of a steel container. Mrs. Emminger asked him to clarify the construction debris area and discuss how they will control the dust and the delivery calculations. She asked how often it will be removed or if there would be debris left on the premises overnight. Mr. Brown said the delivery and pick up times that they discussed previously included all of the waste types to be handled at this facility. Mr. Brown asked if she meant inside the building because there would be no handling of any waste outside the building. Mrs. Emminger said she meant the clean brush area as shown on the site plan. Mr. Brown said that would be stored as "clean wood waste" and the removal would be determined by the volume of it. If it was a very small quantity, it might sit around as long as a week or a couple of weeks. He said there would be no MSW or C & D materials stored outside the building. He said they do not expect this to be a dominant activity on this site. Mrs. Emminger said this really needs to be defined because it is too vague. Mr. Brown said since "clean wood waste" is a State defined term; they can provide them with a list of what would be stored there. Ms. Hoffstaetter asked if this wood will be stored on the ground. Mr. Brown said that is correct. Ms. Hoffstaetter asked if they would use a piece of equipment to pick this up and Mr. Brown said yes, probably a small loader. Ms. Hoffstaetter then asked if they accept drop offs until 4 PM, wouldn't there be waste left on site overnight. Mr. Brown said that might happen, the waste would be put in the trailer and if there was enough, it would be removed. He added that the tipping floor is cleared continuously throughout the day. Mr. Manuel asked if there is any other handling outside of the building. Mr. Brown said only the clean wood is handled outside the building, all other materials are handled inside the building. Mr. Urice asked how much of the clean wood activity will actually happen outside the confines of the building. Mr. Brown said if there is a clean wood product in C & D materials that are on the tipping floor, a bobcat will bring it out to the designated clean wood area.

Mrs. Emminger asked if these additional movements have been calculated toward the noise level. Attorney Cava pointed to the five spaces to put the full loads, saying they would want to keep them empty so they could move the materials out of the site. He said Mr. Zessin would speak about the on-site truck traffic. Mr. Zessin submitted a reduced copy so he could speak about maneuverability on site. This was designated **Exhibit M**. Then using paper models as a visual aids, he showed how the two different truck sizes would move around the site. He demonstrated that most tractor trailers would enter and exit from Plumtrees Rd., proceed over the scale and around the building.

Mr. Urice asked if there are doors in the front of the bays that the truck back into. Ms. Hoffstaetter asked how the solid waste and construction & demolition waste are kept separate within the building. Mr. Zessin said they are separated by jersey blocks. He then said that they had tried to address everything in their memo but there were still a few more points to go over with the Planning Dept. staff. He added that Mr. Putnam has agreed to put a canopy roof over the wood pile. He said they are proposing to move the gate back so it is off of the road. They

also are showing the site totally enclosed with fencing. He said there is a note on the rendering that Mr. Putnam has agreed to remove and replace the existing fence, in order to provide more aesthetics and be a better neighbor. He said he would address the remaining comments with the Planning Dept. staff.

Attorney Cava said the would bring Mr. Brown back up to discuss the tonnage levels for the AWD facility on White St. versus what they are proposing for this site. Mr. Brown said he did research after the last meeting by visiting the DEP offices and reviewing their files. He said all solid waste facilities are required to report their tonnage numbers once each quarter. After researching AWD's files, he prepared a one page memo with an attachment prepared by DEP from their database at his request. He distributed copies of this report to the Commission members and it was designated **Exhibit N**. He compiled a table of estimated peak daily tonnage for the fiscal year July '06 through June '07 from information in the attachment. Mr. Keller then asked how much longer the applicant's presentation was going to last due to the lateness of the hour. Attorney Cava said about ten more minutes. Mr. Brown then said he followed up on this because questions were raised at the previous meeting about whether AWD has to report everything to HRRRA.

Attorney Cava then submitted a series of photos (numbered 16-24) which were taken at the Housing Authority project on Eden Dr. He said the purpose of these photos is to familiarize the Commission with the Housing Authority site. He described each photo individually and pointed out discarded tires and debris lying around the site. He said this definitely demonstrates the need for a transfer station. The photos were designated **Exhibit O**. He said they are still waiting for comments from several of the City departments. He again pointed out that there is minimal storage area on the site, so they will not have stuff lying around. They will want to keep these areas free for use. He said in response to Mr. Manuel's question about a vehicle entering the site that might smell there is a masking agent that can be sprayed on it while it is at the scale that will address the smell. They are going to try to address some of the Commission's concerns about odors before next public hearing. They will present additional information about dealing with odors. He said they are amenable to possible conditions on the approval. One possibility is a prohibition on right turns out of the site. He said Mr. Zessin spoke about the fencing and landscaping. He said some of the speakers mentioned vermin in this area and they have a plan to deal with this also. He said the public can be sure they will do whatever is necessary to prevent vermin. He reminded the Commission that since Mr. Putnam's auto body business is located in front of this site, there should be no doubt that it will be kept clean and vermin free. Mr. Keller asked if they could provide information on the impact if they do prohibit right turns. Attorney Cava reminded everyone that this is not an application for anything related to landfill or composting. This is a landfill station where waste can be deposited until it is disposed of. Mr. Keller asked if any of the Commission members had questions. Mr. Urice said he had asked earlier in the meeting if the roll top or tarp on top of the container would prevent the odor from escaping, so he now wanted to ask Mr. Wollenhaupt in his professional opinion, whether you would be able to smell a semi-trailer truckload of MSW in the summertime, with a tarp over it, at 130 ft. away. Mr. Wollenhaupt said "*professional opinion, odor is subjective; you could smell something at a much greater level than I could ever, or vice-versa. A loaded truck in a humid environment in the summertime is definitely going to be a lot more odiferous than in the dead of winter. The thing to remember when you have a truck that's loaded and you're not handling the material, MSW becomes odorous as it is handled, as it's moved around and air is moved through it. If it's loaded in a truck, and sitting in a truck, the potential for that odor to be*

moved from that truck is greatly reduced by the lack of the handling activity. So yes, if that truck just was loaded and you didn't put any controls in place, to cover that load with something that would prohibit the odors from leaving it. At 130 ft. away, I'm fairly certain you would smell something". "

Vice-Chairman Keller asked if there was anyone to speak in opposition to this application and several people came forward.

Sam Burd, 23 Faith La., said he had planned to have the audience stand to show their solidarity in opposition, but most of them have left since it is so late now. He asked that the Commission deny this application. He submitted some additional documentation from Doctor Yuvienco, who could not be here this evening. This documentation also included his certification from the American Board of Internal Medicine. The information consisted of reports about the ill effects that transfer stations have on the people who are exposed to them on daily basis. This information was designated **Exhibit P**. Mr. Burd said he has done research on the trucks used to haul this municipal solid waste and has learned more about them than he ever expected to. He said additionally he now looks at these vehicles on the road as he passes them by. He noted that the majority of the covers are usually cloth which does not protect anyone from microorganisms. He said this is a serious health issue. He added that the traffic concern is real also, especially to those that live in this area. In closing he said the character of this area has changed, the water treatment plan has upgraded, the former dump is capped off so this use really is not in harmony with the neighborhood as it exists today.

Keith Lloyd, 44 Faith La, said he is also member of board of directors at Woodland Hills. He said this is about quality of life issues especially health and safety. He said he had done some research and wanted to share his findings with the Commission. He submitted copies of the following articles and asked for them to be considered an exhibit:

- I) Draft Summary Report titled "Solid Waste Transfer Facility Site Selection Advisory Panel" prepared in 2000.
- II) Article titled "Qualitative Human Health Assessment for airborne particulate matter at the Harrison Street Park, Berkeley, CA" prepared in 2003.
- III) Article from the Gotham Gazette titled "The Mayor's New Garbage Plan" published 10/28/04.
- IV) Article from the NY Times titled "Garbage Transfer Stations Face Civil Rights Inquiry" published 3/7/99.
- V) Two newspaper stories from 2007 dealing with Transfer Station Fires.
- VI) A Summary of Article titled "Waste Hauling and Environmental Impacts" prepared by a resident of Woodland Hills.
- VII) An excerpt from the EPA publication titled "Waste Transfer Stations: A Manual for Decision Making."

Mr. Lloyd reviewed each article in detail and then asked that the Commission deny this application, so the applicant cannot profit from playing "Russian Roulette" with their health and quality of life. This package of articles was designated **Exhibit Q**.

Mike Marschner, 707 Sienna Dr., said he downloaded a wealth of information from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) website. He then proceeded to read three pages of questions on this issue. He said this is a quality of life issue for the residents of fourth ward and

asked when they would get to review all of the City comments on this application. His three page questionnaire was labeled **Exhibit R**.

Roger Mitchell, 103 Sienna Dr., said he just wanted to make a couple of quick points. He submitted excerpts from the "Decision Makers Guide to Solid Waste Management, Volume two, a report that was prepared under an EPA grant and is considered an approved EPA publication. He reviewed the excerpts, Chapter 2 titled "Facility Siting & Permitting", Chapter 3 titled "Developing A Waste Management Program: Factors to Consider", and Chapter 4 titled "Collection And Transfer." He also submitted a document titled "Proposed Transfer Station Questions" that he downloaded from the EPA website under the heading of Environmental Justice in Waste Programs. He discussed each of these briefly and said this is not a democratic way to decide if this is a site for this use. He suggested that the City really needs to be proactive about this as there does not seem to be an overall long term plan. This documentation was designated as **Exhibit S**.

At 11:45 PM, Mr. Manuel was called away and had to leave the meeting.

Joseph Long, 304 Sienna Dr., president of the board for Arlington Woods. He proceeded to review the traffic report submitted by the applicant, pointing out issues that he would like to see explained or answered. In closing he suggested the Commission and the City should take a closer look at this traffic report and they would see the holes in it.

Carlos Zimudio, 507 Sienna Dr., said he wanted to comment on the potential for air pollutants. He said he came across an executive summary of a report titled "Trash and the City" prepared in 2004 by Environmental Defense. He submitted a copy of this and briefly summarized what it had to say. He said he also found a website called "Scorecard, the Pollution Information Site." He submitted a sheet titled "Definitions of Air Pollution Source Categories" describing Area Sources, Mobile Sources and Point Sources. He said this site also allows you to enter your zip code and it will rate your county for Hazardous Air Pollutants. He said we rank pretty low. The last thing he submitted was a listing of the Environmental Releases of Chemicals for Fairfield County. In closing, he said he had found one of Mr. Smardin's comments to be a little odd. He does not say they will comply with the noise ordinance, he says they will be just as guilty as the rest of the surrounding area. The documentation he submitted was designated **Exhibit T**.

At this point 12:00 AM, due to the lateness of the hour, Vice-Chairman Keller asked how many more people wanted to speak. Two people came forward.

Tom Saadi, 24 Tobins Ct., listed all of the developments in this neighborhood that have been built that were not included in the traffic study. He suggested that they might need to use a loud speaker system to communicate to the trucks. He spoke about the noise level bleeding onto Eden Dr. He said the idea of one door being open issue sparks thoughts of odor issues. He suggested that each of the applicant's engineers should submit their resumes. Mr. Keller said he believed that we had received this information at the first public hearing. Mr. Saadi suggested they look at the potential maximum capacity tonnage that this facility could handle because once this is approved, we won't be able to control that. He reminded the Commission that fourteen years ago, an out-of-state developer wanted to amend the Regulations to allow a fertilizer plant in this neighborhood. He said that was before all of the residential development

