

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

-----X

IN RE: Washington Aqueduct Open House for :
the Draft Environmental Impact :
Statement for a Proposed Water :
Treatment Residuals Management Process :

-----X

Tuesday, September 7, 2004

Washington, D.C.

Oral statements and questions of interested parties were
taken at the Dalecarlia Water Treatment Facility, 5900
MacArthur Boulevard, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20007 from
6:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.

Notes:

Comments from different individuals are separated by the
following symbol " ***** "

Names of respondents have been removed from the transcript to
protect individuals privacy.

1 C O M M E N T S / Q U E S T I O N S

2 * * * * *

3 I'm President of Spring Valley West
4 Homeowners' Association. That is consistent of 157
5 family homes, single home dwelling. And we are opposed
6 to the landfill, dump. Thank you.

7

8 * * * * *

9 My comment is regarding your screening process. I
10 have looked at the material, which has been posted on
11 the internet and it's very useful and it's very
12 comprehensive; however, it presents a screening process
13 of something like 20 or 25 alternatives and simply says
14 that a certain number of them met the screening and
15 certain didn't. It doesn't say who decided that they
16 met the screen.

17

18 And I want to be sure I understood -- so,
19 therefore, the information that's on the web about what
20 the alternatives are and which ones met the screen, why
21 certain ones met the screen and certain didn't was not
22 clear to me. I know that there is a matrix that shows by
23 a whole series of criteria which ones met it, but it

1 really doesn't -- it's not clear about why certain checks
2 were in certain boxes and who made the decision about
3 which box to check.

4 So my comment is that I think you should
5 make that information available. Otherwise, the
6 information you're got on the internet is very easy to
7 access. It is very well done. It's very helpful. But
8 it's not clear how alternatives were chosen to meet
9 certain screening criterion or not. And that may be a
10 technically complex subject, but still think that's key,
11 because my reading of it was that many of the criterion
12 met the screening. That's all. That's my comment.

13 * * * * *

14 I think it's dishonest to
15 show pictures of the trees without saying what season the
16 pictures were taken because the buffering is going to be
17 a lot less in winter. The pictures, having lived in the
18 neighborhood, I'm quite sure the ones taken along
19 Dalecarlia Parkway were taken in summer when the
20 vegetation is very thick. So the EIS is terribly
21 misleading to people who might be within sight of the
22 monofill because maybe we'll see it in the winter while
23 they might not see it -- see it as much in the spring or

1 summer. It's really a serious flaw in the EIS.

2 * * * * *

3

4 My wife and I live in Spring Valley and studied Alternative
5 A and we both are vigorously opposed to it as
6 environmentally unsound and an unnecessary intrusion on
7 the residential quality of the neighborhoods abutting the
8 aqueduct. Thank you.

9 * * * * *

10 I would like to - very much would like to approve C.

11 I think C does far less damage to our houses than any other.

12

13 * * * * *

14 I think the option number three is by far and away the
15 best solution to the
16 problem. The areas under which the project this project
17 would take place are filled with a great lot of dense
18 population, including older people and lots of children.
19 And, given that situation, it seems to me that it would
20 be far better to truck this waste material some place
21 else and not build anything which would be 80 feet tall
22 in the neighborhood.

23 * * * * *

1 I am a native
2 Washingtonian. I am distressed by the poor management of
3 this. The acoustics are terrible. I cannot hear clearly
4 what he is saying. Moreover, the questions of the
5 audience are terrible. He mentions we can go on email
6 and can get some information. Why couldn't that have
7 been printed out here for information here. Instead, we
8 come here and then you have to call in later on and
9 hopefully we can get some in sent to us. It is very,
10 very poorly done. I hope there will be some better way
11 to establish this.

12 * * * * *

13 I'm from the Western
14 Avenue Citizens' Association. I think to add trucks to
15 the roads will affect the foundations of our homes and
16 our roads, which has been fixed by the District of
17 Columbia already. The Western Avenue Citizens'
18 Association will feel it will have to sue to protect our
19 property if sludge is transported by trucks. That the
20 trucks will present a safety concern which is not been
21 addressed. There are a lot of pedestrians on Western
22 Avenue and there have been a lot of accidents there.
23 These trucks will present a tremendous safety risk.

1 Thank you.

2 * * * * *

3

4 This meeting arranged at the treatment plant is a
5 disaster. I want to hear what my neighbors have to say
6 and I want them to hear what I have to say. And the
7 process leaves a lot to be desired. We're all standing
8 in a big hall. I can't hear the questions and so it
9 makes the whole proceeding useless. And I think it ought
10 to be done again and provide for adequate facilities, not
11 in an echoing hall where nobody can hear the questions.

12 I don't blame the Director, but somebody
13 has lack of foresight here.

14 * * * * *

15 I would like to have
16 another meeting where we can all sit down in an
17 auditorium. It's impossible to hear the questions
18 because of the echo. We don't even understand the
19 speaker 30 percent of the time. We have to stand. And
20 this meeting is very unsatisfactory. Would you please
21 hold the same type of meeting in a proper auditorium and
22 then ask the people to line up with their questions so
23 they can be given in an orderly way? In other words,

1 like any decent meeting. It doesn't have to be
2 segmented, quote, unquote, just a well-run meeting,
3 period. Thank you.

4 * * * * *

5 I favor Alternative B
6 because it is the most equitable distribution of the
7 costs and the exposure over the entire weight-base, not
8 just one portion of the area.

9 * * * * *

10

11 I am from Bethesda. The criteria seem to be weak. For
12 example, we hear that the District, the Metropolitan
13 Area, has a shortage of trees and yet you're now saying
14 you're going to take a minimum of 30 acres of trees and
15 possibly more. This doesn't make sense. When I asked
16 your staff about drainage, they had no decent answers.
17 But you will have toxic drainage from there. The Blue
18 Plains alternative offers access by barge to transport
19 the material so it makes it a permanent solution, not
20 temporary. Also, be aware that many states consider this
21 substance hazardous material.

22 * * * * *

23 Well, we just wonder if they

1 considered that there was an impact on the neighborhoods,
2 because, of course, this is a meeting of 400 outraged
3 people and we feel that they tried to make it through.
4 Nobody had any word of this until late July and they've
5 been working on it, obviously, for many, many months.
6 And then -- ***** has a question.

7 We suggest that the next meeting, which
8 should be fairly soon, be in a local school that has a
9 decent auditorium so you don't have 400 people standing
10 up, a lot of whom are elderly and they're having trouble.
11 So we think there should be another meeting very soon in
12 which they can take the comments of the neighbors.

13 * * * * *

14 Have you considered the fact
15 that you're going to have a major hospital in your
16 backyard?

17 * * * * *

18 My statement is the
19 monofill will go in Dalecarlia over my dead body.

20 * * * * *

21 The landfill and the
22 trucking are short term solutions. Piping is the only
23 viable solution because it's long-term and it's safe and

1 it gets it out of our neighborhood. Period.

2 * * * * *

3 The option of cutting
4 down 30 acres of trees that have taken more than 30 years
5 to grow for a short-term solution seems a little odd when
6 by piping everything to Blue Plains, it could not only be
7 stored there, it could be moved from there to other uses,
8 as far in the future as we can see. Otherwise, you will
9 ruin the air quality around here and they're going to
10 just have to go pipe it to Blue Plains anyhow. So it
11 doesn't provide much.

12 * * * * *

13

14 I live off of MacArthur Boulevard. And I am
15 very concerned about the trucking option, as it would
16 endanger the children on our block, as well as pollute
17 the air, as well as shake the foundation of our house and
18 our neighbors' houses. And our retaining wall is already
19 showing damage and our house is cracking from trucks that
20 currently run up and down the streets. And we're very --
21 I'm very in support of -- very much in support of the
22 pipeline, as I feel like it's the most cost-effective
23 solution over a long period of time. And that is all.

1 * * * * *

2

3 I'm against the trucking option
4 for the damage and the pollution and the danger to the
5 neighborhood. I am for a long-term permanent option,
6 such as the pipeline and would be more than happy to
7 support it, whatever means I could do. Thanks. Thanks a
8 lot.

9 * * * * *

10 I just wanted to reiterate
11 the two points I made tonight. The first is that it is
12 not right to say to the people in the District who are
13 concerned about transportation and the people in Maryland
14 are concerned about the sludge shop. People in both
15 areas are extremely concerned and strongly opposed to
16 both of those alternatives. It will have a major impact
17 on our whole area, as well as the environment that is
18 somewhat preserved within that area.

19 My complaint -- my second point was to ask
20 why the Corps had not stated the maximum height for the
21 sludge dump or a maximum number of acres to be clear-cut.
22 I think the 80-foot height and the 30-foot clear-cut is
23 staggering, but at least we should know if it can be

1 worse than that. And I believe the answer was that it
2 was not possible to state the maximum. And I strongly
3 object to that. Thank you very much.

4 * * * * *

5 I have a suggestion. Why wouldn't you truck at night?

6

7 Another suggestion. Truck at night to the
8 river and barge it down to the Blue Plains plant. Okay?

9 * * * * *

10 I was wondering what the
11 reason is for not just going ahead and doing the Blue
12 Plains stream-in facility. It seems to me that unless
13 there are some tremendous reason for not doing that, that
14 is just a no brainer given the topography of Dalecarlia
15 Parkway; that they should use the long-term solution
16 though it might cost more in today's dollars and just get
17 the sludge out of here.

18 * * * * *

19

20 I'm adamantly opposed to the monofill and I want it
21 stopped now.

22 * * * * *

23 I've looked at the three

1 alternatives and two of them pose long-term environmental
2 problems and one poses all of the environmental problems
3 only during it's construction, which is moving the
4 material away to Blue Plains via pipeline. So, from a
5 resident's point of view, this is a no brainer, because
6 we're concerned about the long-term environment. If the
7 only risks are whether in the short-term it can be built
8 in time, that's a risk we think the Washington Aqueduct
9 should be willing to take because that is the one scheme
10 that doesn't pose long-term questions and issues for our
11 environment and our children. Thanks.

12 * * * * *

13 I am absolutely opposed to
14 the monofill. I think the only real solution is the
15 pipeline. If you look at the monofill, it's a very
16 short-term solution relatively speaking. Even at a
17 substantial cost differential, the pipeline is a better
18 investment for achieving the goals of moving the material
19 back into the Potomac.

20 * * * * *

21 I think it is unconscionable
22 to take 30 acres worth of trees, including the deer and
23 the foxes, and then to create -- then for the chemicals

1 to stay there and for children to be -- or anyone for
2 that matter to be exposed to those chemicals. That's
3 all.

4 * * * * *

5 I have two things. The
6 first is that if you go on record, there was no official
7 announcement of a sign-up sheet to register how many
8 people were here. So this is not reflective, the sign-up
9 sheet does reflect the total number of people that were
10 here.

11 My comment is on the monofill plan, it
12 shows an outline for the monofill; however, discussions
13 with the moderator there, he recognized that you would
14 have to have berms and holding ponds and everything like
15 that. I'm assuming that's going to be around a bigger
16 parameter, so you're not showing the whole thing. And so
17 it's a larger area than what is shown.

18 The second thing is, also on the monofill
19 plan, it shows that this would give us 20 years to have
20 technology catch up. So it gives you that false sense
21 that technology is going to provide a better plan at the
22 end of 20 years when you've completely decimated a
23 forrest with the monofill, as well as all of the berms

1 and the holding ponds and everything. And, yet, when I
2 go over to the trucking guy, I find out that the
3 technology that they are anticipating having at the end
4 of 20 years is the trucking option, which you need to --
5 they need to be more specific and answer questions,
6 anticipate questions and not give half-baked information.

7 * * * * *

8
9 I am a 31-year resident of the
10 District of Columbia and a 10- year
11 resident of Spring Valley. I just spoke with one of
12 the professional representatives here this evening who
13 informed me that if the monofill option is used that
14 there will be residuals of aluminum hydroxide. This will
15 be in an area that is highly congested with residents,
16 particularly elderly residents and next door to a
17 hospital and it's in an area where we, the residents,
18 well know we have underground munitions left over from
19 the Army, plus there is a network of underground springs.
20 That's why they call this Spring Valley. So it would be
21 important to know, number one, when these materials leach
22 out of the monofill, as they inevitably will, into the
23 ground, what health effects will that have on the

1 residents and the patients in the hospital. And the same
2 concern would be for the dust in the air in a city which
3 is very polluted which has a higher cancer rate than
4 almost anywhere in the country. I myself am a victim of
5 cancer. I would have to move out of the neighborhood if
6 this proposal were to come to pass. I would much prefer
7 to see a more sensible alternative that can result in the
8 sludge being removed to an area where it does not put any
9 residents at risk.

10 I wanted to note that despite the fact
11 that I am active in the
12 neighborhood and a member of the Spring Valley West
13 Citizens' Association, I was totally unaware of this
14 proposal until approximately a week ago, which indicates
15 to me that the Corps of Engineers had not done an
16 adequate job of providing the public with notice of their
17 proposals and an opportunity to comment.

18 * * * * *

19 This area has one of the
20 most valuable real estate values in practically the whole
21 country. If they need the money to build the pipeline,
22 they will be better off selling the existing land and
23 putting in residential areas and using that money for the

1 pipeline. It would be very good for the tax revenue of
2 D.C. and it would not destroy the whole community. This
3 landfill would destroy a whole area and it would only
4 solve the 20-year problem.

5 * * * * *

6 I think the format for
7 this meeting was absolutely awful. Nobody could hear
8 anything and there was no reasonable forum for any kind
9 of discussion that anybody could participate in. And I
10 think that very few people up until the last few weeks
11 were even aware that this process of any kind was going
12 on. There has been virtually no notification of the
13 whole process and when one looks at the schedule of
14 accomplishments that is proposed, we are very near the
15 end of the draft EIS period and then it goes into a 60-
16 day public comment period and there is virtually -- I'll
17 bet you that 90 percent of the people that were here
18 won't even know what a draft EIS and what it can do and
19 what it can't do and how it is to be used in decision
20 processes.

21 I think that there are a lot more people
22 here than they anticipated and they are not prepared in
23 any sense to deal with this. And I think that unless

1 they -- unless the Corps of Engineers, or whoever is
2 dealing with this, turns around and starts over again
3 with their outreach to the public that they are going to
4 run into a fire storm from the people in the immediate
5 neighborhood and the people that are going to be affected
6 by any of the alternatives.

7 One of my big concerns is that they had --
8 they apparently started with 23 or 26 alternatives and
9 virtually nobody knew about them and nothing has been
10 published about any of these, to my knowledge or to the
11 knowledge of anybody that I've talked to here. And that
12 screening process of going down from 26 down to the 3
13 alternatives that they're now talking about is -- is not
14 -- it's not understood by anybody and nobody is going to
15 have any confidence in it.

16 And I think a process -- a whole program
17 like this really depends on getting good public
18 participation and good public -- good public acceptance.
19 They may not agree with everything, but at least they
20 know something has to be done and they want a voice in
21 looking at the alternatives. And that has not been
22 provided yet. And I believe that that's going to cause
23 the Corps of Engineers a lot of trouble until they get

1 that sorted out.

2 And one of the ways of starting to get
3 that sorted out is to have a public meeting that is
4 meaningful in a facility that is conducive to answering
5 questions and starting at time zero and telling people
6 what they're doing and why they're doing it and what the
7 process is and how they came to the -- why they came to
8 the schedule and the decision that they reached. They
9 haven't done any of that and I would hope they would
10 consider that as they go ahead.

11 * * * * *

12 I don't know exactly what
13 I'm allowed to say, but I am very much against the dump
14 being developed on the ground adjacent to Dalecarlia
15 Parkway. I think it was a tremendous environmental
16 effect and it's not the highest and best use for the
17 ground. The people, such as myself, who bought homes in
18 the area didn't expect industrial uses to be developed
19 around our homes and I think it's a short-term fix and
20 something that should be corrected now, not later. And I
21 think we're not comparing apples and apples as far as the
22 cost. If what is driving this is cost, we're looking at
23 the cost to develop a dump that is only going to

1 alleviate the problem for 20 years. And comparing that
2 to the pipeline and the other alternatives, we're not
3 comparing apples and apples because you're not capturing
4 the additional cost after 20 years to come up with a new
5 solution after the dump is full. That's all I have to
6 say.

7 I believe Alternative B is the best
8 solution because after 20 years and after filling up the
9 dump adjacent to our homes on Dalecarlia Parkway and
10 after destroying all of that acreage of green space we're
11 going to have to revert to Alternative B anyway. We're
12 going to have to convert the whole program to Alternative
13 B where we're trucking the waste out of the area instead
14 of concentrating it. I think that they ought to just
15 bite the bullet now and go to the Alternative B as a
16 solution to this problem.

17 * * * * *

18 My first comment --
19 question as to whether EPA conducted a NEPA process
20 considering these impacts when they made their decision
21 as to what conditions they would put on the permit that
22 they had issued and whether or not, if EPA did not do
23 that, whether they need to go through that type of

1 process now or if they should be a cooperating agency
2 with the Corps of Engineers and have their permit be one
3 of the options or conditions on that permit be subject to
4 consideration of options for that permit as part of this
5 NEPA process.

6 As far as the three alternatives that the
7 Corps of Engineers is considering, I'm concerned that any
8 alternative that has a 20-year maximum life is not really
9 a useful or not a viable or patentable alternative
10 because by the time we're finished with construction and
11 implementation of that project we would still be where we
12 are now 20 years from now, still looking for another
13 permanent solution.

14 As far as Alternative B, which would be to
15 truck everything out, I think the neighborhood impacts of
16 10 to 20 trucks of that size a day going through
17 relatively neighborhood-type streets would be a
18 significant impact on the community and also on the local
19 roads as far as maintenance on the road and all of the
20 impacts of the truck traffic.

21 Alternative C seems to be the one that has
22 the least impact on the community as far as piping it to
23 Blue Plains. It certainly has the least impact on the

1 neighborhoods of Northwest Washington and nearby
2 Maryland. Understanding the cost is somewhat more, but
3 from what I heard today the cost did not sound
4 significantly more than the cost of the alternatives that
5 had much greater impacts. Thanks.

6 * * * * *

7
8 I just
9 wanted to register my significant concern over this
10 proposed monofill alternative for moving -- for the
11 deposit of the sediment from the river. I think it has
12 been described in somewhat benign terms, but I can't help
13 feeling that this is an industrial by-product that may
14 have significant long-term health consequences for the
15 neighborhood that lives near it.

16 I don't believe that I have seen in the
17 materials presented on the floor here or in any
18 discussions with folks from the Army Corps of Engineers
19 that addresses the issue of whether sediment that they
20 are depositing in the monofill is, in fact, likely to be
21 free of so many of the chemical by-products of
22 agricultural run-off of the various fertilizers and anti-
23 weed control products and various other chemicals used in

1 agriculture significantly up river.

2 They describe -- I suppose it's fair to
3 say that the monofill will be quite unsightly and they
4 used the tree screen as a way to mollify people's
5 thinking on the subject. However, it is my belief and,
6 in fact, we may be doing what we did with the World War I
7 munitions, which is to put a significant potential
8 environmentally hazardous by-product in close proximity
9 to a heavily developed dense city populated residential
10 location. And until I hear a strong response to that
11 concern, I am definitely not in favor of this
12 alternative.

13 * * * * *

14
15 And I have been at this meeting since 6:30 this
16 evening. At one point, because of the size of crowd, it
17 was decided that Mr. Jacobus would go into the hall, the
18 seated area, the little auditorium, and was to address
19 questions that we might have and as of 8:10 this evening,
20 he has not gone there. It is 8:35 and he has not ever
21 come into that room. And I just wanted to point out that
22 quite a few citizens were sitting in there waiting for
23 him to come in and address our concerns and they've got

1 nothing left and the room is now empty at 8:35.

2 So I want to say that this was a public
3 relations fiasco. I feel as a citizen of Montgomery
4 County that essentially the Washington Aqueduct has
5 thumbed its nose at the citizens, it's neighbors, by
6 saying essentially that they don't care about the
7 process, that they don't care about involving us at an
8 earlier stage in the game when there are more
9 alternatives on the table, some of which we might
10 actually like or may have some contribution to make.

11 In essence, I feel shut out of the
12 process. Except for the Blue Plains alternative, I don't
13 really want to comment on either of the trucking
14 alternative or the monofill alternative. I think that
15 they are both untenable, short-term solutions. To me
16 they seem to be 19th century solutions to a 21st century
17 problem. I think we need to be looking more into the
18 future in terms of recycling and addressing our waste
19 products in a long-term fashion. Thank you for this
20 opportunity to speak.

21 * * * * *

22

23 I had two questions, basically, for the

1 process. One is in the August 12, 2004, letter from the
2 Department of the Army, on the residuals processing
3 alternatives, Alternative A noted that on average six on-
4 site truck trips per day six days per week would be
5 required to transport residuals. And Alternative B, that
6 an estimated average number of trucks for handling the
7 residuals is approximately ten per day during the five-
8 day work week. I wanted to know why the discrepancy
9 between 36 truck trips and 50 truck trips on a weekly
10 basis.

11 My second question was in the truck route
12 alternative site proposal there was absolutely no
13 inclusion of the Clara Barton Parkway as an access point
14 to 495 and, clearly, the most direct route from the water
15 treatment plant would be down MacArthur to Arizona and
16 onto Clara Barton Parkway. If it's a matter of getting
17 an exemption or some change in designation for parkway
18 usage, it know that certainly needs to be considered.

19 * * * * *

20

21 I live in Spring Valley. And my concerns are
22 two-fold. One, that we're looking at a short-term
23 solution and, obviously, this is something that is a

1 long-term problem, a long-term issue that we need to be
2 finding an environmentally-friendly solution for, getting
3 rid of the residuals.

4 The short-term solution, especially the
5 monofill, I think is the worst possible solution of the
6 three that we have been faced with here, for one reason,
7 obviously, an environmental standpoint and, just from an
8 aesthetic standpoint, having an 80-foot high, eight-story
9 high monofill the size of 30 football fields is not
10 something that I want in my front or back yard.

11 Secondly, from a traffic standpoint it
12 seems to also be the worst possible solution, and not a
13 solution at all. You have six trucks a day that are
14 continually and constantly going down the same route.

15 Whereas, in the alternative that is
16 allowing the material and the residuals to be trucked
17 out, you would not only be able to properly disseminate
18 the residuals across large areas, you would also have
19 less traffic burden due to the fact that you would have
20 more routes.

21 I also don't under the fact that you can't
22 have a more direct route out, which is the route down
23 Arizona and down the Canal area toward Clara Barton.

1 Obviously, that is something that needs to be looked
2 into. But it definitely offers more traffic solutions.

3 Lastly and finally, it's just the fact
4 that we need to really be thinking more in long-term
5 environmentally friendly solutions. In the short-term we
6 know that there are problems and it's something that
7 we're going to have to deal with, but let's not destroy
8 our neighborhood in the process. Thanks.

9 * * * * *

10 I'm
11 on the Spring Valley Board of Directors. And one of my
12 concerns, there are many, but the short-term solution --
13 I mean, 20 years from now, what is going to happen?
14 We're going to need to address the situation all over
15 again. The other thing is living in Spring Valley we've
16 already dealt with the Corps of Engineers, the arsenic
17 and the munitions. And my understanding is the monofill
18 is going to be built on an area that has munitions in it
19 and they are yet to be discovered. So this is even more
20 problematic than has been publicized.

21 * * * * *

22

23 I would like to express my opposition to the landfill. A

1 couple of points, we say this is a short-term solution,
2 which is somewhat true. The problem is once you have
3 created this thing, it's going to be a long-term landmark
4 and an eyesore for the community and possibly a health
5 hazard.

6 The trucking option, I would be in favor
7 of.

8 * * * * *

9 One of the factors
10 driving the decision is cost. And from the cost
11 estimates that I've seen, the landfill seems to be the
12 cheapest one. I wonder if the cost of the landfill takes
13 into account that this is a temporary solution and in 15
14 year's time they going to have to do another project.
15 So, on a short-term basis, a landfill may be the cheapest
16 one, the least costly alternative, but on a long-term
17 basis, the fact that it has to be done twice once the
18 landfill gets filled up may drive the cost up so that it
19 becomes actually the most expensive alternative, as
20 opposed to the other three. Thank you.

21 * * * * *

22

23 I'm hoping that we could resolve this in a way that

1 we don't have to do the same thing twice. And so,
2 hopefully, we could go to Alternative C which seems to be
3 the most reasonable way to not create a new problem by
4 trying to solve another problem. And maybe we could just
5 do a financial study and see what it would take to get
6 this set up and get it done in a way that will be of
7 long-term positive results. So my button would read vote
8 for C and forget A and B. All right, thank you.

9 * * * * *

10 (The following are handwritten comments
11 provided to the Stenographer.)

12 9/7 Comments.

13 Alternative C is the best alternative as it is already a
14 processing facility and away from residential areas and
15 drinking water supply.

16 Please do not proceed with the monofill.
17 It is too close to a public water supply and may have air
18 quality issues, it could end up back in the water. Also,
19 the sheer enormous size is very disturbing and unsightly
20 to the Maryland residents with absolutely no cover from
21 the view of the monofill. It should not be built in this
22 area.

23

1.

2

* * * * *

3

(The meeting ended at 9:00 p.m.)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, Linda M. Kia, the Stenomask Reporter
who was duly sworn to well and truly report the foregoing
proceedings, do hereby certify that they are true and
correct to the best of my knowledge and ability; and that
I have no interest in said proceedings, financial or
otherwise, nor through relationship with any of the
parties in interest or their counsel.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
hand this _____ day of _____, 2004.

Linda M. Kia
Certified Verbatim Reporter

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, Linda M. Kia, the Stenomask Reporter who was duly sworn to well and truly report the foregoing proceedings, do hereby certify that they are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and ability; and that I have no interest in said proceedings, financial or otherwise, nor through relationship with any of the parties in interest or their counsel.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 15th day of September, 2004.

Linda M. Kia
Linda M. Kia
Certified Verbatim Reporter