

WJ
10
M 966
1975J

PUBLIC HEARING

before

ASSEMBLY WASTE MANAGEMENT, PLANNING AND RECYCLING COMMITTEE

(Alternatives to the incineration of sewage sludge)

March 14, 1990
Monmouth Beach Elementary School
Monmouth Beach, New Jersey

MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE PRESENT:

Assemblyman Daniel P. Jacobson, Vice Chairman
Assemblyman Thomas J. Duch

ALSO PRESENT:

Assemblyman John A. Villapiano
District 11

Mark T. Connelly
Office of Legislative Services
Section Chief
Environment, Agriculture, Energy
and Natural Resources Section

Algis P. Matioska
Office of Legislative Services
Aide, Assembly Waste Management
Planning and Recycling Committee

* * * * *

Hearing Recorded and Transcribed by
Office of Legislative Services
Public Information Services
Hearing Unit
State House Annex
CN 068
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

New Jersey State Library



HARRY A. MCENROE
CHAIRMAN
DANIEL P. JACOBSON
VICE-CHAIRMAN
THOMAS J. DUCH
ROBERT D. FRANKS
ROBERT C. SHINN, JR.

New Jersey State Legislature
ASSEMBLY WASTE MANAGEMENT,
PLANNING AND RECYCLING COMMITTEE
STATE HOUSE ANNEX, CN-068
TRENTON, NEW JERSEY 08625-0068
(609) 292-7676

NOTICE OF A PUBLIC HEARING

The Assembly Waste Management, Planning and Recycling Committee will hold a public hearing on:

Alternatives to the incineration of sewage sludge

The hearing will be held on *Wednesday, March 14, 1990 at 7:00 p.m. in the Monmouth Beach Elementary School Auditorium, Hastings Place, Monmouth Beach, New Jersey.*

The public may address comments and questions to Algis P. Matioska or Leonard J. Colner, Committee Aides, and persons wishing to testify should contact Elva Thomas, secretary at (609) 292-7676.

Issued 3/08/90

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Commissioner Sidney Johnson Monmouth Beach	4
Mayor Louis Sodano Monmouth Beach	7
Councilman Terrence Weldon Chairman, Ocean Township Sewerage Authority	9
Peter Genecki Executive Director, Ocean Township Sewage Authority	11
Pamela Stetz Stop the Stack Monmouth Beach Resident	13
Margaret Weil Special Committee Against Fouling the Environment (S.A.F.E.) and Monmouth County Environment Coalition (C.O.P.E.)	14
Robert Owen Monmouth County Friends of Clearwater	14
Elizabeth Croxton Alliance for a Living Ocean	17
Lawrence Zaayenga Monmouth County Solid Waste Coordinator Monmouth County Planning Board	18
William Hanson Monmouth Beach Resident	27
Edward Pompadur Monmouth Beach Resident	29
Russell Goyetil Monmouth Beach Resident	32

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
William C. Sullivan, Jr., Esq. Gordon, Gordon and Haley West Orange	36
Ed Brower Monmouth Beach Resident	39
John Lewis President Garden State Soil Enrichment Station	40

* * * * *

bgs: 1-54

ASSEMBLYMAN DANIEL P. JACOBSON (Vice Chairman): The politicians don't need the microphone. We put the microphone down on the floor so everyone could be heard. Just let me explain what this is. This is a meeting of the Assembly Waste Management, Planning and Recycling Committee. The purpose of this hearing is to listen to testimony concerning alternatives to sludge incineration.

Assemblyman Villapiano, my colleague in the 11th District, who is an ex officio member of the Committee tonight, and I, have come forward with possible alternatives to incineration, particularly the incinerator in Monmouth Beach. We believe that the sludge can be successfully treated such as for landfill cover, and this hearing is part of our attempts to follow up on that proposal and that alternative. We've already contacted the County Board of Freeholders, from whom we have to have cooperation in the matter, and they graciously have established a working committee with various sewage authorities also in the area, so they're currently looking at this thing also. There are also representatives of the county here tonight. The engineers as well as the recycling coordinators will be here to listen to the testimony. In addition, if this alternative is to be adopted, it has to have approval from the Department of Environmental Protection.

In the past -- previous administrations certainly -- the DEP has, in my estimation, been very biased towards incineration as a waste disposal method, whether it be solid waste or sludge. With a new administration with Governor Florio, we believe -- as well as with the new Commissioner of the DEP -- that the Department of Environmental Protection will be more open-minded about this alternative now and they have sent an official from the Commissioner's Office who's here tonight to listen to the testimony and report back.

In addition, there will be a transcript of this hearing and that will be available to other committees and

other members of the Legislature, as well as the Commissioner and the Governor. So what we are trying to do here is we're trying to get the ball rolling on this alternative to explore some of its potentials, perhaps some of its pitfalls, but to really find a way to avoid the incinerator in Monmouth Beach and to minimize the construction of incinerators in the State of New Jersey.

So we will be hearing testimony, and I'd like to recognize some local officials real quickly before we begin. Mayor Sodano is here, Commissioner Sidney Johnson is also here who will be saying some words, and up here on the Committee we have Assemblyman Thomas Duch, who is kind enough to come down from Bergen and Passaic -- he's very interested in this issue; they have some matters up there which are relevant on this topic -- as well my colleague Assemblyman Villapiano and Algis Matisoska, who is the Committee Aide for the Assembly Waste Management Committee, on which I serve as Vice Chairman. Do you have anything you want to say?

ASSEMBLYMAN VILLAPIANO: No. Ladies and gentlemen, I certainly appreciate the opportunity to sit with my colleague, Assemblyman Dan Jacobson, this evening and thank Assemblyman Duch very much for coming down. I appreciate the fact that so many of you came out tonight in this kind of weather to listen about alternatives to sewage sludge disposal. It's certainly not a heartwarming subject to leave your living room for.

Dan and I picked this spot this evening primarily because we felt that the people in Monmouth Beach deserved to hear that there are alternatives out there, and there are also alternatives to sites that have been proposed.

As we had in the late '70s and early '80s, this solid waste problem of garbage that arose in the Department of Environmental Protection in a knee-jerk reaction, said that the most favored technology would be to site 21 incinerators throughout the State of New Jersey. They have seemed to not

come off the most favored technology of incineration, but it seems now that as far as solid waste is concerned, that's garbage. They are looking a little bit more towards regionalization in the future, as opposed to building 21 incinerators throughout the State.

Our next most pressing problem as sewage sludge comes out of the ocean, especially from the three northern most sewage plants that are doing so much of the production, is the fact that there has to be a proper disposal method of sewage sludge that is being produced, whether it be incineration as the most favored technology, composting, or some combination of both, or some other alternative that science or people might thrust forward in the coming years. This is an item that has to be discussed. It has to be brought to the forefront, and I applaud Assemblyman Jacobson for doing it so timely, number one; in Monmouth Beach, number two; and the fact that he put together such an interesting panel of speakers that have differing points of view and will be offering forth other suggestions this evening that we can all listen to, understand, and begin to address this most pressing problem. Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: Thank you, Assemblyman Villapiano. Assemblyman Duch.

ASSEMBLYMAN DUCH: Ladies and gentlemen, I am proud to come here tonight and join and serve on this Special Subcommittee of the Solid Waste Management Committee. Assemblyman Jacobson and Assemblyman Villapiano asked that I be sure to be here this evening. I am very happy to be here and very happy to listen to what testimony you will offer.

I'm one of the few Assemblymen in the State who has the unique distinction of living in an area where within 15 miles there would be 10 incinerators built, including sludge incinerators, toxic waste incinerators, and regular waste incinerators. So, I am very pleased to be here to listen to your comments, your thoughts, and certainly to tell you that we

will carry your thoughts to the remaining members of this Committee and the other environmental committees in the Legislature. I sit on the Energy and Environment Committee as well as this Committee. I also am Chairman of Conservation and Natural Resources. I commend so many of you for coming out tonight. It was a little rough getting down here from North Jersey with the fog, and certainly we are anxious to hear what you have to say. I want to thank my colleagues for making certain that I was invited and that I am able to participate in this hearing, and we look forward to hearing from each and every one of you.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: Thank you, Assemblyman Duch. I'll be calling up the individuals who will be testifying. I ask that you try to keep your comments as concise as possible because we want to try to get to everybody, and we don't want to keep you up to 3:00 a.m. or so. We'll try to keep it down. But actually, seriously, we'll try to get out of here within a reasonable time. Again, please make your comments as concise as you possibly can, but feel free to make some comments.

I'd like to recognize, first, Commissioner Sidney Johnson from the municipality of Monmouth Beach.

COMMISSIONER SIDNEY JOHNSON: First, I'd like to thank the members of the Committee for coming to Monmouth Beach and spending their time listening to the problems we have here. They are very real to us, and we do appreciate, especially on the kind of night it is-- I'll be brief.

First, I'd like to say that Monmouth Beach has been living under the threat of an incinerator, smelter or stack, as it is commonly called here in Monmouth Beach, for three or four years. Monmouth Beach is very disturbed about that. We have the Northeast Sewer Authority plant here. That authority serves the six member towns, it serves six customer towns, and it also serves Fort Monmouth. I believe that represents about

25% of the population of Monmouth County. I think the borough has been very hospitable to what is not the most pleasant sort of an operation, namely the sewer authority plant. Now to be faced with the possibility of having an unknown, unknowledgeable technology put in here is almost unthinkable for us in Monmouth Beach.

Over the years, in other words, we have always been conscious of Northeast here. You all are aware, I think, that sewer plants -- waste treatment plants is a term I prefer, or is more preferred, I guess at least by the people who run them-- It has been a problem for us; most sewer plants are. It has not improved, and we still have that. And now to think that we may have some kind of technology fostered on us which is unknown, very expensive to operate, really frightens us in Monmouth Beach. I can assure you that there is no other issue before this community. We are a town that is at least 97% residential. We have a small business district in the center of town, some arenas, and that's about it. The rest of the town community is all residential. It's certainly not a location that you'd want to put a sewer plant in the first place, although years ago that was a different situation.

Environmentally, it is a plant that's surrounded by the Shrewsbury River, and I think that presents a problem for any large, innovative, new technology here. Furthermore, I am disturbed by the fact that the whole technology which is becoming such a pain -- at least the one they are discussing -- has not been tried in this country. My idea is that as long as we can postpone the final determination of putting the incinerator in here, we're going to the good.

Right now, as you well know, the Chemfix treatment of the sludge is being considered. DEP has already given the authority -- permission to the Middlesex Authority to use the Chemfix treatment as fill, or cover I should say for the Edgeboro dump in Middlesex. Monmouth County-- Rather the

Northeast, applied for that back about four years ago, along with Cumberland County, who then was evidently going to do something with a new landfill.

Cumberland pulled out. The application was revived, I believe, by Northeast and set down at DEP, and all of a sudden Middlesex comes out of the blue and gets the permission to try this on a temporary basis, and Northeast is denied. It didn't make much sense to me because the sludge from Middlesex County is obviously much richer in heavy metals -- that's the term you want to know, richer -- than ours, plus the fact that the reclamation center is a lined landfill. The other one, I believe, in Edgeboro is not.

So that, to me, never seemed very reasonable. It seemed to me -- and I agree with you -- that the prejudice down at the DEP was all for some sort of incineration, which is the last thing we want, in other words here. Also, I think there are possibilities over the year of some sort of a regionalization.

The "Big Six" up in the north part of the State, who produce infinitely more sludge than all the rest of the authorities will probably develop something along those lines up there which we could possibly use. In other words, there are alternatives that are out there; Chemfix number one. And I think they should be looked at and worked on, and the last thing in the world is the idea of a smelter, incinerator, or whatever you want to call it, in Monmouth Beach. Also I would say to the other members of the Northeast -- that is, the other member towns -- as well as the customers, that they'd better think twice about this, themselves. Obviously, we all are guilty of the idea, "Not In My Back Yard," so they're really not that interested. Monmouth Beach-- That's Monmouth Beach, Eatontown let's say, or Tinton Falls to be more exact-- However, the cost of this as estimated now, has risen to \$11 million and it will certainly be higher than that. We're maybe

talking \$14 million or \$15 million along with some other improvements that have to be made to the plant. You're looking at a tremendous increase in the cost. Right now it's \$200 a year in the member towns, and that's pretty reasonable. I can easily estimate that if this incinerator goes in, we're looking maybe at \$800 to \$1000 a year. That'll bring everybody to mind, whether they live in Monmouth Beach or not. So all I would say is I appreciate the fact you people are searching out for alternatives.

The incinerator is completely unacceptable to Monmouth Beach. We don't think that it's economic, we don't want to see it here; and we'd appreciate anything you could do, especially with DEP, to aid our cause. Thank you very much.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: Thank you very much, Commissioner Johnson. Our next speaker will be the Mayor of Monmouth Beach, Mayor Lou Sodano. And I must thank both the Mayor and the Commissioner for helping make the facilities available here tonight, and they have been meeting with Assemblyman Villapiano and me quite regularly on this problem, giving us a lot of guidance and information. Mayor Sodano.

M A Y O R L O U I S S O D A N O: Thank you, Dan. Gentlemen, I appreciate your coming. It is great the interest you gentlemen have shown, and certainly the town of Monmouth Beach thanks you for it. And you can see from this turnout tonight that this thing hasn't started rolling yet. We had another meeting here back about three years ago when they were outside the doors trying to get in here. So the people will come out if this thing gets more serious than it is right now.

Speaking of the Authority members, they just came back from a trip out to Ohio where they found they can take the sludge, and they can dry it 90% and their outlook was, "well isn't that great, what we're doing here now is we are only going to burn a little bit." I think that's a great idea and what they're saying it seems that they're on that line to

create some type of a melter which will just dry out the sludge, and they're saying that's going to eliminate trucks leaving town that causes the problems we have now.

Well, when we do this, the problem we're talking about if we go ahead with this furnace or melter or whatever we want to call it, you have to burn that around-the-clock to keep it efficient. The plant that they visited out there had to shut down their furnace because they didn't have enough material to burn. Well, that scares the hell out of me. That's telling me that instead of shutting down this incinerator, if it ever got here, that they would welcome other people into the town. Now there goes our luck of having not quite as many trucks going through town. No way could incineration go and take care of the Authority we have here. They're going to look for customers. That's going to cost us a lot more hardship.

As Sid mentioned, we're in a residential neighborhood. We have homes within 500 feet of where incinerators are supposed to be established, and we're certainly against that. The amount of problems that we have out there are considerable now. I do think the Authority tries their darndest to keep it under control. Last summer again -- and it seems to happen mostly in the summertime, where most people have their windows open and the west winds are blowing more consistently -- we had a lot of smells. We constantly have to put up with this. We certainly don't want to put up with an unknown factor of what is going to come out of this stack. I appreciate your help -- you know the concern of people -- and thank you for doing what you are doing. Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: Thank you very much, Mayor. Our next speaker will be Terrence Weldon, who is the Chairman of the Ocean Township Sewage Authority as well as, Councilman in Ocean Township. Mr. Weldon has been very active among a group of executive directors and sewage authority officials,

throughout the coastal section of the county who want to see an alternative to this technology, such as the use of chemically fixed sludge as landfill cover. He came tonight to talk about his efforts and apprise everyone of his findings on this issue. Mr. Weldon.

C O U N C I L M A N T E R R E N C E W E L D O N: Thank you Assemblyman Jacobson, Assemblyman Duch, Assemblyman Villapiano, and I'll thank everyone who attended here tonight, too, for coming out in this terrible weather. I think this certainly bespeaks of the importance of this issue, not only in Monmouth Beach, but in the entire coastal area of Monmouth County.

The reason that we were alerted to this problem was in Ocean Township, we had a sludge disposal cost in 1988 of \$150,000. In 1989, we went over \$300,000 and for 1990 we have budgeted \$400,000. That is totally unacceptable, and the prospects for improving that are very very bleak. When we have the authorities coming out of the ocean in March 1991 and when we have landfills being closed down to us that we now utilize, we are going to have fewer and fewer disposal alternatives. That is the reason that we took the initiative to bring together all of the authorities of Monmouth County and have representatives from each one come together, and sit down in a joint venture to come up with alternatives to disposal methods that are now used or projected to be used and one of those, of course, is this incinerator in Monmouth Beach.

We feel that an overwhelming majority of the members of this Committee and the technical expertise that is on this Committee -- certainly I pale in comparison to it-- These are very very technical people that know the industry. An overwhelming majority of those men absolutely believe that there are economically feasible, environmentally safe, land-based alternatives to how we are presently disposing of our sludge and how DEP particularly, proposes how we dispose of it in the future which, of course, is incineration. It was

important that this was a three-pronged attack. We had to bring in the State officials as well as the county officials.

I am happy to report that we have had two meetings with the Monmouth County Board of Freeholders, and then with the subcommittee appointed by that Board to work with us to come up with an alternative to our disposal methods that we presently use. We are working very nicely together, the cooperation on both sides is very good, and our only hope is that in the short-term, particularly for Monmouth Beach, that DEP will consider this application for a pilot program here in Monmouth County. The sewage authorities, as well as the county, are working to make the end result of our sludge, after a fixation process or a composting process or a combination of both, that has yet to be determined, but we are hopeful that DEP will grant Monmouth Beach this license to conduct this pilot program that they have applied for.

The greatest tragedy that could come out of this whole thing, in my opinion, is that they insist on making Monmouth Beach build this \$11 million incinerator with a 100 foot stack on the Shrewsbury River, and two years from now we find out that we had a very safe land-based alternative to that incinerator. That's why I think everyone is here tonight and that's why we are appealing quite passionately to our State representatives to please interject, on our behalf, with DEP to just give us some time to explore these other alternatives before they act. I thank you for your time and effort.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: Mr. Weldon, you make an excellent point, particularly about the fact that because of the large capital cost of these facilities, once they are on the ground and built, the decision to put them in is basically irreversible.

MR. WELDON: Absolutely.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: So it's critical that you explore all the alternatives. Incidentally, is your Executive Director here today from your sewage authority?

MR. WELDON: Yes, he is.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: Is he planning to speak? I had him on the list.

MR. WELDON: Yes, he is.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: The next speaker will be -- thank you very much, Mr. Weldon -- Peter Genecki who is Executive Director of the Ocean Township Sewage Authority, who has been very active from the technical end of exploring this alternative technology and will give us a few comments on his findings also. Mr. Genecki.

P E T E R G E N E C K I: Thank you, Assemblyman and representatives of the DEP. To go along with what my Chairman has said, I am not, in a technical sense, experienced in sewage and disposal, but I am an administrator, and money is my game -- economics and the budgeting aspect of which Mr. Weldon alluded to.

Just last week my sewage authority, Long Branch Sewage Authority, and the Aberdeen Utility Authority, all received letters from New Jersey DEP, and basically the letter says what we already knew: Governor Casey in Pennsylvania is cracking down on sludge and all waste coming into his state, but particularly, sludge is mentioned. No additional sludge will go, and as it stands right now, much of the sludge in Monmouth County does end up at the G.R.O.W.S. Landfill in Pennsylvania. Our sludge is picked up by an outfit that takes it up to North Jersey, dewateres it, then it goes out to the G.R.O.W.S. Landfill.

There is a gubernatorial election coming up in Pennsylvania, and unfortunately, I think the time is running out a lot faster than anyone expected. We're going to have to act, and we're going to have to act quickly. The deadline, which has already been mentioned tonight, is March of next year. You only have a year before the Big Six come out of the ocean and when they come out of the ocean, the market is going

to be even tougher. I easily foresee a fivefold increase in the cost of sludge disposal if something is not done now.

It's interesting-- You pointed out earlier Assemblyman, that this best technology was picked out. But I don't think the sewage authorities were consulted when it was picked out. I'm not technically versed in sludge disposal or even running a plant; I think I'm a good administrator, but we do have some people in Monmouth County, some of the executive directors and superintendents, who are very sharp and know their field very well. Monmouth County pales in comparison to any one of the Big Six. Middlesex County is talking about, the last I read, an \$80 million capital investment. For Middlesex County to do that, they can go out and ask for a \$10 to \$15 rate increase. They'll have it. We don't have that option in Monmouth County. We are all much smaller authorities. The capital cost can be astronomical. The county is working with us. We met yesterday and we believe -- I do and so do most of the other authorities involved -- we believe that there are economically and environmentally acceptable alternatives to incineration. If incineration is the way to go, it's got to be studied and looked at a lot more than it already has, I think, for sludge incineration.

Basically, that's all I have to say. The clock is running a lot quicker than anybody expected. I would think that within a year, if we don't have some sort of plan in place, we are going to be in deep trouble. Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Genecki. I just want to briefly pull out two points which Mr. Genecki and Mr. Johnson touched upon, so it's very clear for everyone here. There are various alternatives for sludge disposal, such as fixing the sludge for landfill cover which we are talking about tonight. There are also options such as converting it for fertilizer or composting. The option about the landfill cover was mentioned by those two gentlemen. There

is an experimental program that the DEP has approved for the Edgeboro Landfill in Middlesex County, so this is not totally a novel approach. In addition, there was a second similar program approved down in Cumberland County at a landfill down there, however, that fell apart; there were some problems with bonding and insurance. Monmouth County did ask for this approval from the DEP and for some reason, in the bureaucracy it seemed to have been lost, and the second landfill down in South Jersey got the approval. But as I said, that one fell apart. So that's just a little background on I think two important points that were made already. With that, our next speaker will be Pam Stetz who is a Monmouth Beach resident and is active in the Stop the Stack group.

P A M E L A S T E T Z: I thank you very much for coming here tonight, and we appreciate your interest in this matter. I do represent the concerned citizens to Stop the Stack, and as you know we are totally against the installation of any incinerator in Monmouth Beach because the method the Authority is currently investigating, which would be the Kaboda system, has never been built or operated anywhere in the United States. We do not want this unproven system tested in Monmouth Beach.

It is on the record at the Authority that some industrial users are still putting toxins through the system. If this occurs with an incinerator in operation, what effect will this have on the quality of air from the stack emissions? Our environment will suffer greatly. What effect will this have on the quality of life in our community? The present record of the Authority on odor problems says it all. Anyone who lives in Monmouth Beach knows what this is all about. If the Authority and the engineers who represent them have not been able to solve this problem over the years, how are they going to be able to operate this new system effectively?

Finally, second only to not wanting any incinerator installed at all, the fear of Monmouth Beach ending up the

regional site for incineration is disastrous. The citizens of Monmouth Beach are unwilling and unwanting to accept this. Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: Thank you very much, Pam. Is Margaret Weil here?

MARGARET WEIL: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: Margaret Weil from the S.A.F.E. group?

MS. WEIL: Yes. I represent S.A.F.E. and I am also speaking for C.O.P.E., the Monmouth County Environmental Coalition.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: Ms. Weil will you explain for people in the audience -- try to use the mike there on the side -- what the S.A.F.E group is about?

MS. WEIL: We're the Special Committee Against Fouling the Environment, an anti-incineration group, and have expanded the entire clean air movement. We have coalesced with two other county groups because we feel the problem of incineration is an imperative that must be addressed with as much support as is possible. We are supporting the people of Monmouth Beach against sludge incineration because we feel that -- there is no point in reiterating what has been said already -- it's an unproved technology, in the long-run.

Across the country over \$3 billion worth of existing incineration contracts have been canceled. This is after bond issues have been floated. There is no incinerator that operates at a profit, and there is no incinerator that has proved itself to be environmentally sound. Thank you very much.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: Thank you very much. Our next speaker will be Robert Owen, who I know is active in the Clearwater environmental group, Mr. Owen.

ROBERT OWEN: Thank you. As Dan said, I represent the Monmouth County Friends of Clearwater tonight, and we are

also members of other groups such as the Clean Ocean Action -- I don't know whether they are represented here or not? -- and the New Jersey Environmental Federation, and a number of others. Though I am not speaking for them, what I say coincides with their very strong position against incineration of sludge.

I would like to start off and say that I know we have many friends in Monmouth Beach, we have members in Monmouth Beach, but I do not consider this a Monmouth Beach special preserve or problem. It is a county problem; it's a State problem; it's everybody's problem. I don't want incineration of sludge here. We don't want it anywhere in Monmouth County. That's true whether you call it smelting or melting, cooking, whatever. Incineration is not environmentally sound. It's not a sound disposal method. It is going to further degrade our New Jersey air which is in bad shape now, and that's true whether we have advanced technology, whether or not we use optimal methods. There's always going to be mistakes, and there's always going to be bad air pollution with it. The better it gets as far as the air is concerned is that more toxics are going to remain in the ash and in the stack dust. That requires very special handling, much more difficult than ordinary reclamation centers. That ash, as I said, is very bad.

Having incineration of sludge, encourages industry to keep on pouring toxics down in the drain where they go into the sewage, where they cannot be treated properly by the sewage business. It goes into the sludge, the sludge then becomes more difficult to use in other alternatives, and there are ways to get around that. I won't go on to the expense of it -- I'll let other people talk about that -- but incineration is absolutely the most expensive alternative, both in everyday management and in the original capital costs. To me, it's important that we're not just dealing with something we want to get rid of. We're dealing with an important resource.

Sludge can be used beneficially and should be considered as a resource, not just something to think of as something dirty and unpleasant. The uses can be used as compost, as fertilizer, landfill covers, and soil conditioners. It can be used right here in New Jersey where we can improve our soils which have been getting gradually weaker and poorer over the years. As I said before, the cost is less, perhaps when you use the other beneficial methods, it costs one-third to one-half less than it would if you incinerate.

I might mention my first experience with sewage and sewage sludge that goes back over 50 years at Marlboro State Hospital where I wandered the grounds, and I saw them open their first sewage treatment plant. I suppose it was only a primary plant and they were using the sewage directly on the crops there and having no problems whatsoever. My own home was less than half a mile away from both the plant and even closer to the fields where they were using this and it was not an unpleasant experience. We keep inventing the wheel, and many of these things have been going on beneficially for many years. Now, suddenly, we want to solve them with expensive, dangerous, technological fixes, and that is wrong.

I could go on a lot longer, but there are already in existence many proven methods of composting and of using sludge beneficially, including as covers on landfills. One organization that perhaps is best known among many in the United States for composting is the Cornucopia Network. They have become somewhat of an authority on this subject, and I can refer you to them if you would like more information.

You often hear that you cannot use compost that has been made from sewage sludge on agricultural crops because you get these heavy metals and other poisons. That can be true in some areas where you have these bad things going into the sludge from plants. This can in some ways be corrected by this chemical fixing you've heard about tonight. It's even better

if those heavy metals and poisons do not get into the sewage in the first place, and sewage industrial pretreatment is one opportunity. Another is to change your industrial processes so that you are not getting the same kind of pollution and dangerous products produced, or even product substitution. This is nothing new. I've been hearing about it for 20 years now. It's time we did something about it.

I didn't mean to be so vehement, but this is something that if you work on a problem long enough and you keep getting frustrated, eventually you get angry and say, "Enough is enough. Let's do it and not waste any more time with studies or even special test programs or trials," such as those you've heard suggested tonight. Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Owen. I should note that Mr. Owen brings up a very important point that we also have to redouble our efforts to make cleaner the flow into sewage plants, so it comes out cleaner. There are bills in the Legislature -- particularly by Assemblyman Duch which I am a cosponsor and Assemblyman Villapiano is also a supporter of the Clean Water Enforcement Act -- that would give sewage authorities the power to do that. Is there any representative here from Clean Ocean Action? I don't see Cindy Zipf. Is anyone representing Cindy, because I know she might have had a problem getting here? (no response) Okay. Is there anyone representing the Alliance for a Living Ocean. (no response) Okay, the next speaker as I mentioned before -- oh; yes.

E L I Z A B E T H C R O X T O N: I'm here from the Alliance for a Living Ocean. I am strictly here to monitor.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: Oh, okay. Thank you very much. The next speaker as I mentioned before, to have an alternative technology such as this accepted needs two types of approval: One is from the county to use the landfill covers, as well as from the DEP. Our next speaker is from the county.

He is the Monmouth County Solid Waste Coordinator. He has a very difficult job. Obviously the issues of solid waste disposal, in particular, as well as sludge disposal, are very tough to do countywide, and he balances a lot of concerns. He's also there, always, with the tough, fair questions. He is the person that the Freeholders have basically appointed as the lead representative to try to see if something here could be worked out. He, I believe, will be speaking here tonight. Will you be speaking, Larry? (affirmative response) Larry Zaayenga, the Monmouth County Solid Waste Coordinator.

L A W R E N C E Z A A Y E N G A: Thank you very much. Good evening, gentlemen. I appreciate the opportunity to speak here tonight, and I commend the Committee for taking the initiative to investigate the many issues concerned with proper management of sludge. My name is Lawrence Zaayenga. I've been with the planning staff of the Monmouth County Planning Board for more than 12 years and have specialized in waste management issues. I have worked with people from Rutgers and various health and agricultural agencies to investigate various sludge management technologies.

I brought some copies of a 1981 report produced by one of these working groups in which we looked at the use of sludge in agricultural lands. I have also been involved in experimental application of digested sludges on an old municipal landfill during the early 1980s, and have listened to and worked with groups in Millstone Township, where intense public opposition to land application of digested sludges on turf farms and other crops actually resulted in the withdrawal of a major program once used for a fair proportion of the sludges produced in Monmouth County. I don't envy the work this Committee will have to do or the position many of our sewage authorities find themselves in.

The comments I have to offer tonight are pretty much of a general nature. I don't have any easy suggestions or

specific solutions. My remarks are mostly based on personal observations. I am not here to present an official county position at this time or I am not offering any pros or cons for any type of particular approach. I hope you find my observations useful.

Monmouth County produces about 8% of the sludge that's now generated in New Jersey. The amount of sludge produced is equal to about 10,000 tons on a dry weight basis, if we could dry this sludge out completely before it is brought away from any sewage treatment plant. However, because of the way many of our plants are set up, we're actually dealing with 75,000, 80,000, 100,000 tons of wet sludges which present their own problems in transportation and handling. It might be useful to also note that sludge is primarily an organic material. Yes, it does pick up the heavy metals and other things that are going through our sewer lines, but it's mostly the dead organic material, the result of the biological treatment process.

In Monmouth County, we're mostly residential, commercial, light industrial. We do have some of the cleanest sludges produced in New Jersey. I've looked at the results of the testing of the various authorities, and the dirtiest sludge produced in Monmouth County is cleaner than the average sludge produced in New Jersey. Basically, the alternatives break down into three general categories: the one category being dumping -- dumping in the ocean, or dumping in a landfill. We can't dump in landfills in New Jersey; we haven't been able to for quite some time. As noted previously, there is some sludge going to landfills in Pennsylvania, and that's likely to be restricted much more in the next couple of years. Ocean dumping will be phased out soon, and yes, our sewage authorities will be faced with some intense competition from some very large sewage authorities for the available disposal options now out there.

Another general category is what I am going to call thermal reduction. Yes, there is traditional incineration, where you throw it in an incinerator, oxygen is used along with a flame and the sludge is burned. There is also paralysis, which I believe would be the category that the facility proposed in Monmouth Beach would fall under, and various other technologies we've heard about somewhat akin to paralysis, but more properly referred to as gasification, where they actually reduce the sludge in an oxygen deficient atmosphere and are able to draw off the gases and use that as a fuel.

And then there is the broad category of land application which is being looked at more closely today, which in fact, has been used for years. Probably 25% to 50% of the sludge in this country is handled by land application that could be composted. Once you have a sludge compost it could be used in many backyard gardens. The EPA is looking for some technical regulations for the distribution of sludge derived products such as compost. We can use digested sludge on a farm. Until the advent of chemical fertilization, most of the fertilization was cow manure or human manure. It does have some good nutrient value, and it provides many benefits to the crops. And then we have the soil substitutes. We've looked at a lot of soil substitutes over the year. Some of them have been big promises with not much delivery, some have been more promising, but we still have difficulties with the characteristics of the final product.

Yes, we have continued to investigate alternatives. In my work with the County Planning Board, I am approached by many kinds of vendors. Many of these vendors have to give up after we start asking them hard questions about cost, hard questions about what's going to happen with the final product if it doesn't meet particular specifications. We get some very technical presentations. We get some very glowing presentations that have no real fact or substance to them.

Generally, all we do get are estimated costs. When we're looking at any of these alternatives, we hear about a fertilization process, a fixation process; I'm not speaking of any particular one. We often rush to embrace that without asking some of the hard questions which must be asked.

A particular vendor offers to do something at a given price: Does that include transportation of the material to the facility? Is some sort of pretreatment necessary before they get ahold of it? Many times when we have somebody presenting a particular approach to us as an alternative to a facility which is not desired, we're very content to hear their approach and say we like it, and let's go this way. But we must ask the same kind of hard questions of these alternative technologies as we ask of the people promoting incineration or fixation or anything else.

Any disapproval we have of one particular technology has to be balanced by asking the same kind of questions of whoever is offering an alternative technology. I don't like to say this, but I often have to ask some people who get very emotional about a particular facility in a particular place and promoting an alternative technology, do you really want that alternative technology, or are you just looking for an alternative site? We've, in fact, had past attempts by the Northeast Monmouth Sewage Authority for a composting approach, that never got much of anywhere.

A lot of these off-site approaches also involve a lot of truck traffic. A vehicle is a combustion engine. It is a very inefficient combustion engine. Sometimes we are looking at an approach that requires, just take the liquid sludge away and do something with it. We have to recognize the fact that these trucks coming in and out produce a lot of air emissions themselves.

I'd also like to speak a little to the use of the Chemfix process, or another approach as a cover substitute at

our Monmouth County Reclamation Center. We have, in fact, with our consultants, looked at several different companies that offered a similar approach to the county. Some of them simply came in to say, "Just give us some space at the landfill. Give us a few acres, provide us with this equipment or that equipment, and we can solve the county's problems." Most of these particular approaches are still experimental themselves and we have to ask the hard questions of them. Having worked with digested sewage sludge at a landfill and looked at some of these fixation processes at other landfills, we have some problems with the drainage of this material. If this material does not drain properly, we can actually develop a leachate problem. Adding an immense amount of organic material to the landfill can also generate additional methane gas.

Some of the proponents of various technologies will say, "Well, a cover substitute will be cheaper than your current needs." That assessment seems to me to be based on a cost estimate offered by the vendor, and the sewage authority looking at it being trucked away at so many cents per gallon or dollars per ton, and yet we are not recognizing that there will, in fact, be operational problems we'll have to resolve. There are additional permits required of the landfill. There will be some leachate and gas problems potentially; there's additional monitoring required; there's liability concerns. Some of the people we've talked to said, "Well, you have to give us a storage area. You have to give us an area to process it at." These added costs cannot simply be assumed by the county.

The landfill is not funded by county tax dollars. It's funded by dumping fees paid by the people that use that landfill. Why should the people that are dumping solid waste pay for a solution to our sludge disposal problem? These costs would have to go back to the regional sewage authorities; that must be recognized. The county staff and consultants have been

working with Chemfix and have talked to other parties. We are not against this process. We do have particular concerns. We are identifying the type of specifications we would need to use it as a cover substitute, and we are continuing our investigations.

On an issue of fairness, I'd be very interested to see the type of testimony that might come, through holding this public hearing in Tinton Falls, or Millstone Township. I've gone out to Millstone Township when we were still land applying sludge. I talked to a room full of angry, confused people, better than 150 to 200, that didn't want these sludge farms. Agricultural use, particularly for Monmouth County sludges, could be very beneficial, but we have public opposition to just about any form of sludge management that we are considering.

On a brighter note, the county representatives have begun a series of meetings with representatives from the sewage authorities at the direction of the County Board of Freeholders. We have been developing some common goals and objectives which will address both the short- and long-term management approaches. For example, how can some of the sewage treatment plants modify their current operations to improve their range of management options? Can we dewater more of the sludge at the plant? Can we dewater it at a higher degree to reduce the transportation impacts? We intend to revisit some, and investigate some new pros and cons of all the existing and new technologies.

We are working on methods to develop a cooperative regional solution with some back-up options available to all the sewage treatment plants. We cannot put all our eggs in one basket. Everything we look at, we have to really be careful to assess the true environmental and economic impacts of the proposal alternatives, whether that be the impact of the facility itself or the impact on the surrounding neighborhood. We've talked about and we would really like to try to set up

some sort of public education seminars or forums, for people to come and talk to us, and really get the people who don't like land application to get together with the people who don't like incineration, with the people who don't even like the idea of it at all, and maybe we can, by brute force, come up with some regionally acceptable alternatives.

What we've done with the sewage authorities now is really just a first step, but it is a very important one. It's a good thing that we've gotten together. We will need the sewage authorities, we will need support of the local towns and the county, and ultimately, the DEP.

From my own perspective, what we really need is a range of alternate technologies and sites to handle our sludge; not just one site, not just one technology. Even should we be able to take the sludge -- fixed for a daily intermediate and final cover at the landfill, something not permitted by current regulations -- we could not handle all the sludge generated, at the County Reclamation Center at Tinton Falls.

We need more attention to processing technologies for sludge, ones that can reduce the toxicity, reduce quantity, get it in a drier form that opens up more management options. We again -- I've said this several times -- we need a true assessment of the cost and environmental impact of these alternatives. We cannot rush to one, embrace one alternative because it sounds better than the others, or it would be done somewhere else.

It's been said before, but no matter which way we go, we're going to be saddled with higher costs, and we have to be willing to accept the higher cost to get the alternative that the public desires. In the long-run, it's not the government that pays for it; it's not the landfill that pays for it. It's each of us that pay for it. I didn't come here tonight to suggest the best or preferred approach, but I consider this

time well spent, if I at least raised some good questions in people's minds and get us to approach this in a more realistic fashion.

ASSEMBLYMAN VILLAPIANO: Mr. Zaayenga, the-- Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Zaayenga truly is a professional in his job, and what he said today raised some concerns that we should all listen to. Technically speaking, the reduction of solid waste, garbage, by incineration is about 80%. Would you agree with that?

MR. ZAAAYENGA: It's about 90% by volume, 75% by weight.

ASSEMBLYMAN VILLAPIANO: What kind of reduction do they expect to get if they burn sewage sludge?

MR. ZAAAYENGA: I'm not up on the latest information on the sewage sludge. I've inspected various incinerator ashes and dried sludges. There's really a wide range of processing technologies out there, I've seen sludge dried so much it looks like cotton fluff.

ASSEMBLYMAN VILLAPIANO: A couple of important points that Mr. Zaayenga brought out -- I hope that people were listening, and I hope I didn't misread you. The county -- I don't want to throw this on the county's back -- but it appears from your statement that the county, to the executive directors of the sewage authorities, are beginning to look at this problem in a serious note. Would you say that that's a correct statement?

MR. ZAAAYENGA: Yes, we can't let the sewage authorities stand alone. We have to approach this on a cooperative basis.

ASSEMBLYMAN VILLAPIANO: One other question, and I don't-- Maybe you can answer it, maybe you cannot. It is somewhat technical, and I think while most of the people in this audience are here this evening and that would be-- I was a County Freeholder and had one of the tough jobs as to site an incinerator in Tinton Falls. If we were doing that type of

siting process, I would ask your opinion as a professional, and now we're talking about the scope of solid waste or something -- I'm sorry, sewage sludge disposal countywide. Does it seem off-the-cuff, to make sense, to site an incinerator right on the edge of a river?

MR. ZAAYENGA: I will pass on that question, Mr. Assemblyman.

ASSEMBLYMAN VILLAPIANO: You know, I think that's the point. It's a common sense approach, and we are not here to discuss siting, but you did make some questions and raise some points about NIMBY and I think the people -- that's "Not In My Back Yard" -- but I think everybody knows that here. That was somewhat of a leading question, and nobody here is going to agree that it should be sited on a river or whatever.

I'm not throwing darts, and I appreciate the fact that you're willing to work with the executive directors in this particular problem. Ladies and gentlemen, I will say that as far as solid waste disposal in the County of Monmouth, there are no better professionals than Larry, John Gray, the Director of our Monmouth County Reclamation Center, and Howard Birdsall, the engineer who is in charge of solid waste in Monmouth County, and they are here tonight to listen, and we really have handled the situation and taken into account solid waste and problems left and right. But I think while we are here, none of us are truly professionals, and we can't say this method is better than that method, this site is better than that site.

I think what we're asking, and what the people are saying, and what the Assemblymen are here for, and hopefully the message that gets back to the Department of Environmental Protection, which is here this evening, is that: 1) this probably wasn't the best site, and 2) the technology hasn't been thought-out. The county is now offering their assistance, so let's take the offer. Let's get together and let's truly

study the situation for a combined solution that makes sense and not just rush into an expenditure that's being proposed. Thank you, Larry.

MR. ZAAYENGA: Thank you for your comments, Mr. Assemblyman.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: Mr. Zaayenga, thank you. Thank you also very much for your comments. I think that your discussion with Assemblyman Villapiano -- this exchange -- or the comments that you've put forward, bring out also a very important point, and that if we don't have the capacity to take care of the disposal of our sludge produced in Monmouth County through land-based disposal alternatives to incineration and if we have to go to incineration, there's no other way to do it, again, it's clear to me now -- it's absolutely clear, we've kind of put that up in front, ahead of the game. We don't know where the best site is.

You went through a long, complex siting process for the solid waste incinerator. Whether that was a good decision or not is not to be discussed tonight, but it was obviously a long considered process, and in a sense, we are short-circuiting that if we ever do build an incinerator for sludge in Monmouth County, by just saying, "Boom, it's in Monmouth Beach."

I also appreciate your other comments about the particular problems with a land-based disposal alternative, as well as its benefits. I'd also like to commend you and the Board of Freeholders for being very open-minded about it and meeting with everybody and trying to find a common solution for the good of everyone. I appreciate it. Thank you.

MR. ZAAYENGA: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: Our next speaker will be Mr. William Hanson from Monmouth Beach.

W I L L I A M H A N S O N: You're wondering what the pail is? (witness brings bucket to witness stand) It's not that I

am going fishing, it's just that I never cleaned up my garage like I should have during the winter. But we think the air is so clear in Monmouth Beach because we have the ocean and not much manufacturing and things around, so a couple years ago I-- Last year I'd been having trouble with my throat and I've been claiming that the odors from the sewer plant, which is about less than one-fourth of a mile across the creek of the river and it's about northeast of the plant, which means any wind from the west, southwest, or south, finally winds up across the little creek into my yard, into my house. I've gotten to the point where I've been to meetings almost constantly, and they don't seem to have the interest that I think they should.

But anyway-- This weather-- I have trouble with my throat and the doctor said I should use a humidifier. With the water we have in Monmouth Beach, it has a lot of chemicals in it, and it has a lot of chlorine -- not chlorine I want to say, but a white powder. When you run the humidifier, your room gets full of this white powder from the lime that is in the water.

So I was experimenting, and we had a good snowstorm coming, so I said I have one-half dozen of these pails. I'll put them out and I'll get some clean snow, and when the snow melts, I'll have distilled water, and it won't have any chemicals in it because it hasn't touched the ground. And much to my surprise, I couldn't use the water because it was so dirty from the snow. The snow was white as could be, but after it melted and I tried to use it, I ran it through some filtering cloths and I still couldn't get good water. This pail is one of the pails that I used to get that snow, and I just wanted to bring it and let you see what white snow turns out to be in Monmouth Beach, if you let it dry. Now this is how clear and how clean the air is right here in Monmouth Beach.

On the second story, we have electric heat in our house. We don't have an oil burner, we don't burn gas. Most of the neighbors burn gas and this is unbelievably-- And when I heard this meeting was going on, I said this is the place to go. I want you fellas to see what a smelter will do. If this is the kind of air we have without a smelter, what would we have with a smelter? (witness shows pail to Committee -- applause)

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Hanson.

MR. HANSON: Thank you, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: The next speaker will be Mr. Edward Pompadur from Monmouth Beach.

EDWARD POMPADUR: Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak. Thank you very much for having the hearings here. I am really amazed, and I think probably the people who are attending here this evening who have been at prior meetings are absolutely as amazed, as I am, of the tenor of what's happening here this evening.

It just seems to me that the prior meetings that have gone over for the last year, year-and-one-half, whatever, there has been a very definite situation where we were the downtrodden and the folks up there on the podium were the folks that were trodding down on us. Somehow I feel that that has turned around. Different administration perhaps? Different people sitting up there perhaps? It is delightful to hear that for a change someone is listening with, what I would like to call, a business point of view as opposed to -- will you forgive me? -- a political point of view.

The unit that was supposedly going to be built here was built by Kaboda as was said earlier. We were told at the time that this unit -- that there were three or four of these units operating in Tokyo, and they were doing a marvelous job. Well, my information tells me there is one left.

Okay. From what I gather, there are more choices than just incinerating and burning. And as someone earlier had said, you can call it what you want, when you put a flame to it, it doesn't really make a bit of difference. You burn it; you burn it. You are left with a particular product that you have to get rid of in one way or the other. It depends on how dry it is and what you do with it at that particular point. You are going to have to truck it. If it is here in Monmouth Beach, you are going to have to truck it out of Monmouth Beach. There is no land for it to be put across.

I am really concerned with something I didn't know before, and that is that it appears that there are-- You fellows mentioned the six majors that we'll be pulling out of ocean dumping, and I am really really concerned about the fact that Monmouth Beach is going to become the supermarket of the area for disposal. Considering that 8% -- to quote whoever quoted it -- of the sludge in New Jersey comes out of Monmouth County, I would question what the percentage would be coming out of Monmouth Beach of that 8%? If we have the cleanest sludge in New Jersey from Monmouth County, why then can't we do something with it that makes some sort of business sense? I understand we have a deadline, and I understand that certain things have to be done, but at the same token it would seem to me that we also have an obligation to the people that live in this town, and I am one of them, not a longtime resident, only four years-- And I think I said at a prior meeting that I sold two acres in another town to come here to be on the shore and then find that I am in a town where all of a sudden now we're talking about a stack that is 80, 90 feet above the ground -- 100 feet above the ground.

I simply want to say that I thank you for the opportunity of standing here and speaking. I know that there's an awful lot of people who would like to speak. I know that there's an awful lot of people who feel very strongly against

the stack, if you will, in Monmouth Beach. I am pleased to hear that there is thought perhaps, of putting it somewhere else. We already have the disposal unit.

Just as an aside, I live right here in town and last night at about 7:00, 7:30 p.m., my wife and I took a walk. We live on Gull Point Road. We walked out of our house, we walked around the corner, double backed down towards the Sewer Authority to Highland Avenue I believe it's called, and could not believe the aroma that was coming from the area. I said it's got to be low tide or something. We'll continue on. And we continued on. We get down to the cul-de-sac, we turned around and came back up again and I said, "You know what? We're in trouble." This is 10:00 at night. We've got a serious problem if at 10:00 at night we take a walk and this odor is so bad we can barely walk through it. I would like you to keep that odor in mind when you think about whether or not we really are going to get a stack in this town. Thank you very much for the time. (applause)

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Pompadur. I'd just like to also briefly recognize three other individuals in the audience. Ray Papowsky is here representing the Department of Environmental Protection -- the Commissioner. He's the fellow who's dutifully writing all the notes on the side and is going to be reporting back. In addition, Mark Connelly who is the actual head of the Office of Legislative Services, Environmental Section which is the Legislature's nonpartisan research arm, which does the policy formulation is here. In addition, Joe Devaney who is on the staff of the Senate President, John Lynch, who also is interested in these hearings, is also here monitoring the testimony.

At this point, we have about five more speakers left. If anyone else wants to testify, make sure that you sign up over here. The next speaker will be Mr. Russell Goyetil from Monmouth Beach.

R U S S E L L G O Y E T I L: Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak and the opportunity to be heard. A lot of what I have to say, I think, has been stated occasionally in other ways by others, but what I'd like to do is to approach it a little bit differently, possibly.

I'd like to question the logic of the DEP in that by its means of procedures, policies, and timetable, it's virtually mandating that each of the sewage authorities dispose of its sludge individually, probably by incineration because of the time restraints. I'd like to attack their logic on two bases: economically and environmentally. Eventually, I guess it will come down to technology and siting. We see some attempts at regionalization, and it looks like maybe the first guys ahead might be the guys that would be the regional one, which is certainly one of the fears that we express here in Monmouth Beach.

If you think about the site here in Monmouth Beach, 25 years ago when the plant was first built, it would never have met the CAFRA requirements or guidelines in terms of location. Here we are in an extremely environmental sensitive area, very densely populated, about 4500 people per square mile -- in the summer probably double and triple that. The environmentally sensitive area where the plant currently is located, you should understand that right now it's highly used for recreation. It's used also for clamming, for fishing, for crabbing. The elements here directly enter into our foodchain much more closely than in a lot of the other land applications that we'd see, so the things that come out of the stack is something that really affects us directly.

In terms of the siting, Monmouth Beach wouldn't even qualify from the DEP as a site for a laundry, I mean a dry cleaners. It's folly to think that we'd be considered for a toxic incinerator to incinerate or smelt industrial wastes as well as others. I mean, the DEP's folly really has to be thought about here.

From the economic plane, think about the Northeast Monmouth County Authority has been asked to develop the engineering costs, the permit costs, the cost of the applications, the construction costs, and then the operating costs. I brought up the environmental considerations to the Authority at the last meeting, last month. Mr. Ryan, the Commissioner, said, "It's totally irrelevant. Economic considerations at this point are irrelevant to our considerations. We are in a crisis forced on us by the DEP. Our only option left, as we see it to meet their timetable unless we get authorization from this county option, would be to proceed with incineration." And as you know, the applications and the permits are proceeding.

Last year, I had the opportunity to visit Japan on two occasions, in March and again in June. I had appointments with the authorities in Japan, from the sewage authority both from the construction phase and Dr. Tonoca (phonetic spelling) who is in charge of all technical development in Japan. As you may know, the sludge smelting process is being developed and really only in use in Japan at all, this so-called Kaboda process. Well, Kaboda has built six plants to date. Three of them are operating, and two of the three don't handle just sludge. They also handle solid waste incineration.

There's only one plant that was built in the Toyama Prefecture, completed in August of '88, that operates with the kind of design they're talking about here. We only have the track record of the first eight months of operation of that plant. It was down four of the months because of technical problems in terms of operation. I brought this to light to the Authority. They talked to Dr. Tonoca back in October. As of the last meeting, he was still unable to get back to them with any update of their operating track record. Now I asked about the reasons that this Kaboda system doesn't work -- and remember now that there is only one plant of this type that is

operating anywhere in the world and has a downtime of 50%-- Now, in theory, the system might sound good in that the ash is more handleable through this slag type thing than other types of incineration ash, so theoretically, it's a good concept. But the technology is in the embryonic stage and still developing. It's highly evolutionary at this point.

He said, in talking about the operation that was being considered here, that it would make folly to put it here; this is Dr. Tonoca speaking. He wasn't talking about the environmental side because he's trying to sell the system worldwide.

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER OF AUDIENCE: (inaudible question; speaking too far away from the microphone)

MR. GOYETIL: Part of the media operation in Japan, the Ministry of Industrial Development. He said the problem was we don't have the mass required or about 15% to 20% of the size required to efficiently run this smelting furnace. Part of their problem in where it's not running, is it has to be constantly monitored through the process in terms of the substance, identifying what it is, and adjusting the extremely high temperature coming through. What happens is, if the temperature's wrong, it clogs up in the system, breaking down the furnace. They have to chip it out, clean it out, and start again.

He recommended that there be four engineers that have some form of smelting experience to operate around the clock. Four engineers with smelting experience preferable, but at least incineration experience. When I asked about what kind of supervision they would have here -- technology supervision -- they said they had two engineers in terms of experience in sewage treatment; none in incineration, certainly none in the smelting process. How is this going to operate effectively? Where are the technicians going to be trained? It's the only facility outside of the one in Japan. I guess we are going to get our operating instructions in Japanese. So, I think this

technology is something that certainly should not be explored with, on an experimental basis here in Monmouth Beach.

A little bit on the environment: The DEP, I'm sure you have your standards, your procedures, the air modeling that's going on now -- I inquired about the air modeling -- well, they have records from two locations that are north and south of Monmouth Beach to see what the air current and air patterns are or whatever. One is Newark Airport, one is Atlantic City. The air currents here are totally irrelevant to those two locations. If you live here, you live on the river. Especially ask any of the sailors what happens in the summer in terms of the thermal inversion, the air coming up on the land and across? We get a different kind of breeze here. When we have thermal inversion here, it's very very different because we have this moisture underneath. What happens when we have the inversion, the air that would come out here simply sits here. I think that's a little bit of what my neighbor experienced from his snowfall. But with a smelting furnace, I think it would be exaggerating the problems.

Technology, ability, engineering expertise: Monmouth Beach just doesn't have it with our Sewer Authority now to control this kind of experiment. I think our guys try really hard. Mike Lyons and his crew, I think, really genuinely try hard. I think they are the victims of plant design, overcapacity, and probably funding to some respect. The plant does not run as well as it should, as evidenced by the odor problems we have, the air quality we currently have just with the sewer treatment plant.

The NIMBY syndrome: I really don't think it's just not in my backyard. This kind of technology, any kind of incineration, especially experimental: Not in anybody's backyard. Do it on the right location where this should be tested, when it should be tested, with the right kind of engineering expertise and guidelines.

I ask you for a couple of things: Grant us a temporary permit. I think in the landfill applications, grant us temporarily, that will allow a couple of things to happen; the technology to evolve. It is evolving. We don't have to invent the wheel here. A temporary permit would allow us to, at the source now, to identify, separate, and pretreat industrial contaminants coming in. There are very very few significant contributors to industrial waste here. We're talking about residential communities, some commerce, very little industry, and Fort Monmouth. Let us identify it and separate it. Then our options explode. Also, we have to pursue offsite options to composting the landfill. I think the temporary permit that we're looking for in Tinton Falls certainly makes a lot of sense to give us some time. Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: Thank you, Mr. Goyetil for your well-considered comments. Our next speaker will be Mr. William C. Sullivan, Jr., an attorney with Gordon, Gordon and Haley in West Orange.

W I L L I A M C. S U L L I V A N, JR., ESQ.: Good evening. I am with the law firm of Gordon, Gordon and Haley in West Orange. We are a law firm that specializes in representing municipalities and environmental groups in various battles.

I'm here tonight to speak on behalf of the Clean Sludge Coalition, which is a group we're counsel for. It's a statewide coalition of groups which have taken this issue very seriously, a collection of groups which have said New Jersey is my backyard, and have said that this is a very significant issue that has to be dealt with on a statewide level and should not be up to individual municipalities to find themselves under attack by the DEP in their latest technological solution to a people oriented problem. The group is essentially made up of Greenpeace, New Jersey Environmental Federation, the Natural Resources Defense Council, the Environmental Defense Fund, New Jersey PIRG, Clean Ocean Action, and a number of other groups.

These groups have spent the last year, year-and-one-half, collecting a lot of information on this issue. And it came up because many of these groups were involved with the -- what I've heard here called tonight the Big Six; the utility authorities that are currently in the ocean. When they were told that they had to get out of the ocean which of course we also supported, they then went to DEP and DEP said, "Well, we're burning garbage. Why don't we burn sludge?" They have basically been totally uncooperative, in my opinion, with those utility authorities in looking at alternatives. So, the Clean Sludge Coalition went out and did its own research and as you've heard tonight, found out a lot of very interesting things. Those things have, I believe, blunted the argument for incineration of sludge. I'll be very brief because many of them have been discussed previously.

First of all, the first thing you hear is that there are no markets for sludge; we can't do anything with it. Well, there are markets. Many cities across the country, many very large cities are solving their sludge problem through land-based alternatives in an environmentally beneficial matter, particularly land application, composting, landfill cover. I've even spoken to someone in Philadelphia who tells me they use a lot of it in closing old mines. What we're talking about is creativity here, creative solutions to problems. There are a number of resources available.

I went to the forum that U.S. EPA Region II held at the Hackensack Meadowlands a few months ago in which EPA brought in representatives from utility authorities and cities across the country, to talk about the creative methods of solving this problem. DEP was there, and I got the sense that EPA and some of these other groups were trying to tell DEP to back off, that there are these alternatives available. I haven't seen a lot of evidence yet that DEP is listening, but there are a lot of these resources around. I was very

interested in the comments from Mr. Owen from Friends of Clearwater, who talked about the market saturation, but that we must aggressively develop these other options. Mr. Owen's comments, I think, are very important in that regard as the other markets being available.

Now, the second thing that you hear about -- and we hear about all the time up north -- is the contamination problem. I am very glad to hear that you don't have that much of a problem with it here, but it could be better. One of the things that DEP correctly points out is that we don't want to be putting in contaminated sludges in places where they are going to harm other people. On the other hand, we're actively involved in the Clean Water Enforcement Act which all of you are very familiar with, which had to be done because DEP has not been aggressively enforcing pretreatment violators. That Act and a lot of other initiatives that people are trying around the State, are intended to make the sludges as clean as possible so they can be used in an environmentally beneficial manner.

We also hear about the best technology, that it being the best technology, and this is the part that bothers me the most because DEP seems to always pick the high-tech solution to these people-oriented problems. They did it with garbage, and now they're doing it with sludge. It's time we looked at these creative low-tech solutions, instead of always going for the better mousetrap.

Now, one thing that I just heard from the very good comments from the gentleman who just spoke -- and it's great to hear that the local people have gotten involved and informed, so they can tackle these issues head-on-- One thing you don't want to have is somebody with experience who comes in with a private operator who isn't concerned about the environment. Now, I must confess that I am not familiar with everything that is part of this proposal. However, if your local utility

authority can't handle it, DEP is going to tell them, well, go out and find Waste Management or Browning Ferris Industries or Wheelabrator or one of these other companies that shouldn't even be allowed to do business in New Jersey because they've been convicted of price fixing or bid rigging in other states and then, come on in and build it here. (applause) You don't want that either, believe me.

Composting must be done properly, and I want to address that issue. I disagree, unfortunately, with the gentleman from Monmouth County because I'm familiar with that Millstone site. That Millstone site is a disaster area, and there is a very good reason why a lot of those people were out there screaming about what was going on in their neighborhood. You don't just want to create a problem and dump it on somebody else. You've got to make sure that these alternatives are done properly, and there's no reason why they can't be done properly.

So, I commend you for taking the time to be here tonight to listen to these comments. I think it's very important that you do that and take this back to the members of the Legislature. I also want to let the citizens here know that there is a statewide organization that's done a lot of work on this issue and is perfectly willing to help out anybody that comes to us for assistance. Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: Thank you, Mr. Sullivan. Our next speaker will be Mr. Bill Kennedy from Monmouth Beach. Mr. Kennedy. (unidentified speaker from audience indicates Mr. Kennedy just left) Okay, just missed him. Mr. Ed Brower from Monmouth Beach.

E D B R O W E R: Much of what I wanted to say has already been said, but I wanted to make the point that it's not that people in Monmouth Beach are against it because it's in Monmouth Beach. It's probably the worst possible place in the world to put an incinerator. We all live about one-half-a-mile from where they want to put it. If they ever build an

incinerator, there shouldn't be any houses or there shouldn't be any people within a half-a-mile of the incinerator, because we don't know what the ash contains. If it has a little bit of arsenic in it the size of my thumb, if you get it on your skin, you get skin cancer. We don't know what it's going to do.

We wouldn't be in favor of moving it over into Oceanport. There's room over in Blackberry Park. That wouldn't solve the problem. There are people that live over there. There are people that live in Fair Haven, people that live in Rumson. There's no place around here that an incinerator should be built. I suggested maybe the tip of Sandy Hook, or maybe out in the middle of rural -- someplace where there are no people, but no way should an incinerator, particularly one that has never been really built and examined and with background behind it, shouldn't be built anywhere where there are houses. It should be at least one-half mile from where people live. Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Lewis, I'm sorry, Mr. Brower. Our next speaker will be Mr. John Lewis from Lakehurst. Okay.

J O H N L E W I S: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for the opportunity to stand here tonight. I received a notice that you were going to have this hearing and I inadvertently threw it away.

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER OF COMMITTEE: Use the microphone.

MR. LEWIS: Thank you. My name is John Lewis, President of the Garden State Soil Enrichment Station and I, myself, my consultant, my engineer, attorney -- we have a record with the Northeast Monmouth Authority, a few years before the deadline for ocean dumping in 1981, we were in the avant-garde of sludge disposal, that is alternative methodology. It's very sad, very sad because the fact that we are here tonight, does not speak well of New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection.

I would like to just briefly say that in Germany, when they have an environmental problem, they make an environmental decision. They do not make a political decision for an environmental decision. That's why we are still struggling along after two decades of the DEP with the problem of what to do with sludge.

The Federal government, universities, and private individuals in states, have spent multimillions of dollars doing studies. Studies are legendary studies. You don't have to study anymore, there's enough done. The gentleman that went to Japan -- what's his name, Mr. Goyetil?-- this gentleman spoke-- In fact, the people here are speaking from a position of knowledge and intelligence and it's very difficult to fool people who know, but you go somewhere else where they don't know-- I can tell you places in the State of New Jersey where the Department of Environmental Protection has pulled some deals on the people, and it comes from a position of ignorance, but you won't do it here.

Now where they did this, they continuously did this in Ocean County to push this big burn system. First, it was the big landfill system. The public rallied -- and I was part of that history in Ocean County -- rallied against it, under tremendous odds. We were beaten back repeatedly and finally, we overcame that, and the politicians switched in Ocean County from purchasing the landfill and it fell upon the Township of Manchester to go on its own. They fell back on it and we stopped them from buying the debacle because we already had the problem with Bricktown that purchased a landfill and the Allegra case in Jackson, which made history. Why buy a landfill? Because they inherited a disaster.

Today we found that just recently the Freeholders in Ocean County went for incineration, which is nothing but a thermal process, whether it's paralysis or whether it's incineration or gasification, still it's a heat process -- a

thermal process. It creates pollution in the air no matter which way you put it. We are modern people supposedly. People are not stupid anymore. We don't need these high technology thermal processes. The idea is this: Well, if you flush it away, it's gone.

So what happened originally when a sewage line was put in? It was basically hosting human waste. You could take the sewage generated and put it on a farm, because you are not going to eat toxic waste, and bury it. But then as New Jersey, leading among the states of America, began to make sophisticated chemicals -- in fact, it's a leading chemical State -- it had the problem of disposal. It created jobs, it created economy, but they just dumped everywhere, all the big titans of the chemical industry today. That's why they have the Spill Fund Compensation bill. Then they used a nearby sewer pipe because it was there and a certain agency that's supposed to have safeguarded us kind of turned their back and allowed them to just use the sewer pipe. They put margin wells in. Well, they had margin wells here and margin wells there. The purpose of a margin well is to insure that we will watch to see what's happening to the groundwater. If at a certain point we detect that there is something going to happen, we can take corrective and immediate actions. But what good is a margin well sprung all over the world like Ciba-Geigy for instance, then you have a debacle like you have now with a major lawsuit, and here's a man, Mr. McFerson (phonetic spelling) of Ocean County about to spend the rest of his life in jail.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: Mr. Lewis, we have to kind of keep the comments towards the Monmouth Beach--

MR. LEWIS: Okay, now back to this. My part that I'd like to play here tonight, ladies and gentlemen and Mr. Chairman, is the Garden State Soil Enrichment Station was approached-- We sent out a notice in '81. Dr. Marwan Sadat, foreman of the DEP was the doctor in charge of the Office of

Sludge Management and Industrial Pretreatment, called OSMIP. There was at that time-- The Freeholder in Ocean County was Senator Leonard Connors, former Freeholder Director, and that was on the county side. Mr. Joseph Portash was the Administrator and Mayor of the town which I now reside, and did reside for the past 30 years.

We have about 150 acres of property. We've been struggling for years to hold onto this property paying a tremendous amount of taxes. We were in the business of hauling sewage sludge. We hauled for the Boro of Point Pleasant, for Avon, for Belmar, Manasquan. We had contracted Bricktown, Dover Township, Seaside Park, Leisure Village. We were rising at the time, and the traditional way to get rid of sludge was landfills. Then when the landfills began to have problems, and we, in particular, experienced problems in Ocean County which we found were political, we went to composting. We traveled to Beltsville, Maryland. On the way, we made an appointment with Congressman Bill Hughes, of the Second District at that time. He was about to introduce a bill called the Marine Protection Sanctuaries Act, I call it the "Ocean Dumping Act Number Two," because I think it was Gordon Bishop of The Star-Ledger back in '72 who sued and forced the first ocean dumping ban. Then in '77, Bill Hughes took me for a tour of the D.C. underground, which is semi-surprised, but quite underground there, then you came up in the Capitol, he went into session with this bill he sponsored, and the bill, I later learned, as he called me jubilantly from D.C. that it was passed, the Ocean Dumping Act, that meant that Monmouth Beach-- At that time, the seven notorious ocean dumpers had to stop dumping in the ocean by December 31, 1981.

Meanwhile, we were heading down to Beltsville, Maryland to look at this new technology of composting which the Federal government, the United States Department of Agriculture, had just announced was now economically feasible

to deal with prolific amounts of sludge. The problem though with composting was how do you do it quickly because it produces so rapidly? We went to Beltsville, Maryland with two--

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: Mr. Lewis, will you sum it up a little bit because we're going to have to--

MR. LEWIS: Thank you. We went to Beltsville, Maryland with three potential persons who are still here to run this operation. We came back and later on as time went by, we hired the consultant who went into private practice, Dr. Epstein, and he was worldwide renowned on composting. We spent over \$200,000 and the DEP fought us all the way. Northeast Monmouth and I and my consultants met Charles Mangenera (phonetic spelling) of New York. They put us together, and the deadline was rising up and coming fast, and the DEP, on the record, fought them and kept them from coming and bringing their sludge to Lakehurst, New Jersey, to Manchester Township, to my farm to be composted. They fought them all the way.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: Mr. Lewis.

MR. LEWIS: Now just a minute, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: I just want to make sure the comments--

MR. LEWIS: Do you want to hear me, people?
(affirmative response from audience)

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: I just want to see if we could get it towards this particular disposal alternative.

MR. LEWIS: We do have that, but I wanted to give a little background because this gentleman you're looking at is a survivor of a blitzkrieg. I have a simple answer. The gentleman who spoke, yes, composting-- You said you were here for recycling. Composting is a recycling alternative. It fits the Federal Resource Conservation Recovery Act; it fits the Clean Water Act; it's public policy, both Federal and State. It's a simplistic answer. There are certain technologies, however, what must be done is--

Someone mentioned the word "significant industrial users." Yes, where you have a significant industrial user of a sewage treatment plant, the law requires that they must pretreat that waste to ensure that what goes down that line to that sewer plant does not prevent that sludge from being used for agricultural purposes. That's the Federal law, The Clean Water Act. So, it put the burden on the user; therefore you protect the sludge. So, if we simply get the DEP to enforce the law, then what you would have is fairly good sludge sewage coming down the line to be produced into sewage from the industrial user. It's very simple. You don't have to invent the wheel over again.

Congress was not stupid when in 1977 they amended the Clean Water Act to take into consideration and set up what they call industrial pretreatment. But in 1982, on April 13, the DEP took over from the Federal government, the Discharge Act. Now when they took it over, they later on delegated down to the local sewage authorities and told them you could give it to the actual users. Well, that's like saying to the fox, here, you can run the show. Now the EPA threatened to take away the rights of New Jersey to regulate and to handle the discharge permit because it had the highest number of violations of the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System than any state in the country, including Ciba-Geigy.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: Mr. Lewis, can I just interrupt for a second? Could you sum up because we did promise everyone we would try to have them out of here by 9:00 p.m., and I just want to make sure I have it straight. I assume the comments are in support of composting, in support of the idea of tougher pretreatment standards. You're critical of the DEP as far as its previous enforcement, as far as its open-mindedness about alternative disposal methods, and its past conduct in a sense, and that you believe that at this point the alternatives have to be explored and the DEP has to change its act. Is that an accurate--

MR. LEWIS: Well, I would say so, except, sir, we don't have to explore anything. The exploration has been done. Volumes, volumes. We simply have to make decisions. Now, composting is definitely on the top of the pile. If you are going to get out of the ocean, if you're coming out of landfills, then you have to go to land alternatives. That's what your Committee is sitting there for, and of course you know that. We're asking you to support the Garden State Soil Enrichment Station. I would like for you right now, Mr. Chairman, you're from Essex County I understand, are you not?

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: No, I'm from down here in Monmouth County.

MR. LEWIS: Are you Mr. Villapiano?

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: Jacobson. I'm Jacobson.

MR. LEWIS: Jacobson. Mr. Jacobson, I'm sorry.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: I'll tell you what, why don't we take this up more after the hearing, you and me together.

MR. LEWIS: Well, I found out that's it's better to do things for me in the public because when you go behind closed doors-- (applause)

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: Oh, no. I'll be happy to stay--

MR. LEWIS: See, my kind of people have to be in the open.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: Just one second. Mr. Lewis, one second. I'll be happy to stay here--

MR. LEWIS: I'm dark enough.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: Excuse me. I'll be happy to stay here for the next few hours, if you'd like. I just want to make sure that--

MR. LEWIS: I'll sum it up in about five minutes. Okay, thank you, because I see-- May I?

ASSEMBLYMAN DUCH: Just one other comment, sir, and you missed that because you were not here at the beginning of the hearing, and that is one of the issues that you have spoken

of, the fact that the DEP has been too lenient regarding pretreatment standards. That issue will be dealt with tomorrow. The Energy and Environment Committee meeting is taking place tomorrow morning, commencing at 9:30 a.m. in Trenton, and we expect to pass the Clean Water Enforcement Act in the State of New Jersey and bring it to the floor of the full Assembly for a vote. I expect it to pass that Committee tomorrow and that will handle the pretreatment problem, and hopefully that will help generate a more organic-based sludge, which is one of the things that you have spoken about. That is a priority of this administration, and that is something that will come to the floor of the Assembly and to the floor of the Senate.

MR. LEWIS: Well, that's good, and I certainly do applaud that. What I want to say is that again what we have here, and I encourage you, is the enactment of a new statute of enforcement to take a regulatory agent to do what really is already on the books. And I ask myself the question after looking through 20 years of hell that I've caught down here, trying to help to resolve the problem to be part of the solid waste plan.

By the way, to Mr. Larry Zaayenga: The Garden State Soil Enrichment Station did timely apply to be part of the Monmouth County Solid Waste Management Plan, so people here, we are officially a part of the Monmouth County Solid Waste Management Plan that went in in 1979. We are officially a part of it. But the State DEP denied us an invaluable law, by not sending us notices and making us part of it. So we were there in the very beginning of the solid waste plan of Ocean County. We are also part of Ocean County and Burlington County, and the Legislature said -- of which these gentlemen are a part of -- the Legislature said, in the law, that sludge disposal shall be regional in nature.

The Garden State Soil Enrichment Station was designed to be a regional facility, not a local. It's 150 acres of land. They build a composting site in Middletown on about less than 10 acres of land, in a residential area. We're way out in the boondocks. I'm the only facility in New Jersey that got the people to sign their name and say we approve it. So, I have no NIMBY syndrome problems at all; I did the State a favor. I got 34 people to sign their name and say, we approve it. That was 95%.

So, I'm saying that as to your efforts, yes, but I think that we the people, you here, must be vigilant. But I don't know. I have reservations, and I encourage you in this action tomorrow, as far as the NJPDES is concerned, but I'm discouraged from the history, and I'm thinking that maybe what we need is a California I & R, then we can get something done. At any regard, I would ask you to support-- Do you support a project for which you are sitting there for to chair -- to find?

Now, we can take and have a composting facility built within 45 days. Basically, it consists of a glorified asphalt pad. We have a design already in the DEP that they fought me all of the way. I had to sue them. I had to sue the Freeholders. They still fought me. We have spent at least \$150,000 in legal fees. It's outrageous. Folks please help me and learn about me.

Gordon Bishop will tell you about me. Thanks to Gordon Bishop, I was able to get the law that saved me when the State sued me, sued me to stop the project. Now, I was on the front page of The Newark Star-Ledger twice, thanks to Gordon Bishop, four times in the Press. I was on Channel 6 Action News.

Now, I want to say this to you, I will not die. My son has a bachelor's degree in environmental science. He's supposed to have a Ph.D. He couldn't conclude his education because we got pounded by the DEP every step of the way. They

spent more money on me, to stop me, than they did on Ciba-Geigy, and this is the record. The record on Ciba-Geigy is about this high. (witness demonstrates) The record on me is about this high; a brand-new file at 401 E. State Street, and it's taller than me. This is on me. Ciba-Geigy's file is like this. So you would look at the pile and say, which one is Ciba-Geigy, which one is John Lewis? Oh, Ciba-Geigy is this guy.

On my farm, by the way, they claimed I had pollution. We had tests taken, masked side by side, and you can drink the water. I stand right here before you and tell you God's truth. It's outrageous. I'm the answer to their problem, and they did political solutions because the Freeholders didn't want me to be a part of the Ocean County plant; arrogance.

You have paid the price. It was \$51 a dry ton for my consultants, \$51 a dry ton in 1981. That's what it would have cost you. Fifty-one dollars a dry ton which is equivalent to about four wet tons at 20% solids. Now today, I learn from your executive director, you're spending about \$400 a dry ton now, so I'm only saying to you that we can have this on-site in 45 days. You can transport that sludge to us. We will compost it. Dr. Mark Singley (phonetic spelling) of Rutgers University, Dr. Hank Higgins, Dr. Hannah, Dr. Melvin Feinstein, they all work with me, they all support me. These are academicians and these are scientists. The academicians are on my side. Rutgers is on my side. We are not a fly-by-night operation. We have the best consultant-- Dr. Elliot Epstein from Massachusetts is number one. When you read composting, you've got to read his name. He's the bible. So, I didn't have a fly-by-night plan here you see. It's not a rigged job. It's a real job, so we're asking you, the Assemblymen here tonight, to do the power-- You have the legislative power to go back to Trenton. Now, there's one gentleman--

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: Mr. Lewis, I've allotted you the extra time that you wanted, and I appreciate the problems that you've gone through, and it's been very instructive, your comments, but out of fairness to everybody here including the people who traveled a long way, I'm going to have to cease your testimony because I have given you at least 15 minutes.

MR. LEWIS: Okay.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: I'm very generous.

MR. LEWIS: Okay.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: And I'd like to just wrap it up now, and Mr. Lewis, I will be available at the end of the hearing to talk to you further about this because I know there's a lot to it.

MR. LEWIS: Okay. I'd like to just--

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: And again, let me just stress one more thing too. We're also on the side of composting, an alternative disposal. Don't worry about the gentlemen up here.

MR. LEWIS: Well then, I'm the composting man. I'm right here now.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: So, I'd like to just ask you to-- One more quick remark.

MR. LEWIS: I would like to ask the audience, would you allow me to speak, do you want me to speak two more minutes? (negative audience response) Okay, thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: Mr. Lewis, clearly no one is trying to be hostile, but please, we have to run the hearing, and again we take note of your comments and we thank you for coming.

MR. LEWIS: Okay, now I'll give you a copy of my written statement. Thank you very much.

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER OF AUDIENCE: What was that gentleman's name?

MR. LEWIS: John Lewis.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: Thank you, Mr. Lewis. Now we will have some quick summary comments. My colleague in the 11th District, Assemblyman John Villapiano.

ASSEMBLYMAN VILLAPIANO: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that everybody has stayed on so long. It's been a very very important hearing in the fact that from Mr. Lewis to so many others who have spoken today, it's very very obvious that there are alternatives to incineration. And in our haste to rid ourselves of the sewage sludge problem in the State of New Jersey, or in Monmouth County, I think that we have explored, or that we haven't, but a certain number of people have only explored one particular area. It's been brought out very plainly today, Mr. Chairman, that the siting issue, that this site, would never have lasted in today's situation at all. We couldn't have even put a dry cleaner on there, I think if it came out today.

The most important issue that I think came out -- and I know this from the study that I have done on particular types of incineration -- is that there has to be product in order to keep the incinerator running efficiently. I don't believe that Northeast Regional Sewage Authority can produce the kind of sewage sludge that's necessary in order to keep the temperature up in an incinerator and to therefore make it run efficiently. Therefore, you'd either have to pick up some more customers, or stockpile on this small site out here, other solids. I'm not so sure that that's the best thing for us to do.

I can't comment on the particular method because it is untested in the United States, and I also believe that a couple of key comments were made about a piecemeal fashion, as far as this particular sewage sludge disposal method in Monmouth County, in the State of New Jersey-- I'm so happy and so pleased that the county was here today to hear the testimony, and to hear what I consider to be somewhat of a commitment that along with the executive directors of sewage authorities, that

the county, who is our ultimate source in solid waste management situations, would also participate in the ultimate solution as far as sewage sludge is concerned.

I would strongly encourage the Board of Freeholders through the representatives here today, to make haste with their meetings, so that we can come up with an environmentally safe and a sound plan for the disposal of all Monmouth County's sewage sludge, and hopefully that can be addressed quickly. I will send the DEP back with one message, that they have to sign off, it would seem to me, before anything is built here in Monmouth County; that the DEP would have to sign off on a plan.

Given the objections of today, given the uncertainty of the technology, given the fact of the site that has been considered, I don't believe that the Department of Environmental Protection can possibly sign off on a site here, and I also believe that we have not done our homework as far as an entire process is concerned. I would hope that the message that's brought back, is that we in Monmouth County, who have handled our solid waste situation so well and so organized, and so well thought-out, is that that same kind of thinking will be instituted when it comes to sewage sludge, and that we shouldn't rush into a piecemeal fashion that has been signed off on by the DEP. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: Thank you, Assemblyman Villapiano. Assemblyman Duch?

ASSEMBLYMAN DUCH: I want to thank everyone who came out and participated tonight. This has been a very informative hearing for me. Most of the hearings in my district are on toxic waste incinerators and on solid waste incinerators. The sludge incinerator is something that is being considered for the City of Newark. The Passaic Valley Sewage Commission is one of the largest dumpers of sludge in the ocean, at the present time.

Incineration is something that must be dealt with by this administration, and it must be dealt with rather quickly. In my first term as an Assemblyman, as a member of the Environmental Quality Committee, I learned that there has been no study completed by our Department of Environmental Protection -- no study, admitted by former Commissioner of the DEP, Christopher Daggett-- No study done regarding the cumulative effect of the emissions that will be generated by all of these incinerators that may possibly be built in the State of New Jersey. None. Each one is dealt with on an individual basis, each one is studied on an individual basis, and a permit is issued for that particular plant.

A very interesting thing has happened in Warren County. A plant that was approved after much back and forth with the DEP-- The plant has been closed more than four times. They have been fined in excess of \$180,000 by the same DEP that gave them the permit to open. So we have some serious serious problems and some serious concerns. Those concerns typically, are dealt with in hearings that are held in Trenton.

There are not a lot of Assemblymen down there-- And I've only been there for three years. There are not a lot of Assemblymen down there who take the time to schedule a hearing such as this, come back to their district, and allow the people the opportunity to speak. So, as a member of the Assembly, I want to commend my colleagues, Assemblymen Villapiano and Jacobson, who are providing this opportunity to the people, and for making sure that someone else who was affected by this issue such as me, a member of all three environmental committees in the Assembly, can go back and report to each and every other Committee member of what we've heard here. It's very very important. This is the way the legislative process works best: when we come out to the people, when we hear what the people have to say, and when we bring that message back to

Trenton. And you can be assured that that message will be brought back to Trenton. Thank you very much for allowing me to participate.

ASSEMBLYMAN JACOBSON: I'd just, of course, also like to thank everyone for coming on a very foggy night, particularly Assemblyman Tom Duch. Tom, I'll be happy to go up to your district to have any hearings on similar issues. I'd just like to thank the other people who came out from Trenton, such as from the Commissioner's Office, as well as people from the county.

I think Mr. Pompadur said a very interesting comment, and that is that there are new people up here. I, in fact, was just sworn in as your Assemblyman in early January, and there is a new Governor and a new Commissioner of the Department of Environmental Protection, Judith Yaskin. She's been in office for two months; that's it. So, I think what we're trying to do here, particularly as your representatives, Assemblyman Villapiano and Dan Jacobson, is to try to catch an administration that's new and give them more information, and get them to rethink a policy, before the policy is engraved in stone, as it was during the previous eight years. So, that's why we're in a rush right now to do this. The testimony that was offered tonight from various people with various backgrounds was very valuable, and both Assemblyman Villapiano and I will be following up, will be pursuing this issue to the fullest extent we can, and we will continue the search to the best of our ability to find an alternative to this incinerator. And again, I'd just like to thank you all, for your time and your interest in coming out. Thank you very much.

(HEARING CONCLUDED)