

**MEETING NOTES**  
**Regional Solid Waste Plan Advisory Committee**  
**Business & Industry Stakeholders Meeting #3**

Date of Meeting: 3:00 PM, Wednesday, February 9, 2011  
Meeting Location: Union County Government Center, Union Cafe  
155 North 15<sup>th</sup> Street, Lewisburg, PA  
Meeting #: **Business & Industry Stakeholders Meeting #3**  
Attendees: See Attached Sign-in Sheet

Mike Goldman opened the meeting. Mike asked if anyone had any comments on the previous meeting notes. Vince DiLoretti commented that on Page 2 of Meeting #2 notes, the volume should state 156K lbs. Currently it states 5 lbs. He asked to please make the change in the notes. Mike asked if anyone's contact information has changed. No comments. Mike stated that this meeting is the review of the draft plan that was sent to the Stakeholders via email. Mike said we will briefly discuss what is in the draft plan, listen to comments and suggestions.

Terry Keene started with summarizing the content of the document and asked everyone to email comments back to Dave Minnear at L.R. Kimball. There are 9 Chapters as well as Appendices. Terry pointed out maps that were posted on the wall for everyone to see. Map #1 showed mandated and other curbside communities. There are 10 mandated communities out of 132 in the region. Map #2 showed landfills, transfer stations, recycling drop-off sites, MRF's, combined activities, and rural transfer stations. Map #3 showed composting and mulching sites.

Chapter 1: Estimated Waste – focuses on population projections, historic waste production, previously developed County plans and collected waste, and estimates of the tonnage that will need to be landfilled over the next 10 years. It was determined that there is a little less than 0.7 tons of MSW per person per year generated in the region. There are 20-year projections included in the plan. The Chapter also discusses bio solids and infectious chemotherapy waste. There is a lot of information that we plan to include as reference material that's not in the main text.

Chapter 2: Recyclable Materials – Terry noted that we looked at the amount of recycling generated in each county, estimated at 69,000 tons of recycled material per year. We received valuable information from the DEP website also. We listed environmental benefits from recycling and, discussed energy savings associated with recycling. We show the amount of recyclables between 2005-2009 categorized as Act 101 materials and non-Act 101 materials. Joyce Hatala will be adding to the sections on the county programs, municipal subscription programs, recommendations, etc., when she gets more information. These recommendations come from the stakeholders groups, the Steering Committee meetings, and comments from citizens groups. We are working on the costs associated with the recommended recycling program.

## **MEETING NOTES**

### **Regional Solid Waste Plan Advisory Committee**

#### **Business & Industry Stakeholders Meeting #3**

Date of Meeting: 3:00 PM, Wednesday, February 9, 2011

Meeting Location: Union County Government Center, Union Cafe

Page 2 of 4

Funding and Fees – all stakeholder groups requested more recycling, but were concerned about how to fund the expansions. We will need to estimate what the costs should be for the services proposed and are working out the details since this is the most significant part of the planning process. We're not only looking for disposal, we're also looking for integrated services.

One of the alternatives is to convert some areas of the Region to a dual-stream recycling method. Dual-stream recycling is using two (2) separate bags to consolidate 2 types of material for later separation at the recycling facility. It does not mean two (2) separate trips for the haulers – they can pick up the two (2) bags in one load. Steve Tucker commented that it reduces the hauler's tipping fee by reducing the amount of material hauled to the landfill. He also noted that some recyclable items (i.e., glass) will not be picked up in the bags but will be collected at drop-off boxes. We need to minimize the handling of glass. He gives the glass company the glass without cost but they have to separate it themselves. Terry said there is a big drop in the waste stream for glass and he believes it will be phased out over time.

Chapter 3 – Selection and Justification – Terry explained Chapter 3 includes a background section, and a discussion about flow control (economics, contractual, government regulated, etc). Although the Chapter discusses “flow control”, the intent of the plan is not to require flow control to one landfill as part of a County or Regional Ordinance, but instead to recommend use of a “menu plan”, wherein several landfills are included in the Plan, and the hauler can select from any on the Menu (this is also a form of Flow Control, but one that is quite common throughout the State). The Chapter also discusses what is happening now with waste disposal, it talks about rates and economics that drives changes, and includes facility assessments and recommendations. We looked at processing and disposal alternatives, as required by the DEP regulations. Other technologies are discussed, but may be too expensive or won't work for this region. Waste and recycling recommendations goes through collection, transportation, recycling, education, etc. and includes identifying drop-off sites.

Section 3.8 summarizes the general recommendations, although we may relocate it to its own chapter, so it is not buried in the document.

Chapter 4 – Public Function – Terry commented that this section talks about the programs that support the plan. These include new state initiatives, landfills and operations, etc.

Chapter 5 – Description of Facilities – Terry commented that the plan acknowledges that landfills took in approximately 200,000 tons per year of municipal waste over the past 9 years. The Steering Committee plans to release an RFP for future landfill disposal

## **MEETING NOTES**

### **Regional Solid Waste Plan Advisory Committee Business & Industry Stakeholders Meeting #3**

Date of Meeting: 3:00 PM, Wednesday, February 9, 2011

Meeting Location: Union County Government Center, Union Cafe

Page 3 of 4

commitments, identify the locations that can take the waste and put this in Chapter 5. It was also suggested that agreements be developed with each transfer station for data collection and destruction to the Counties. There is also a process to add facilities as part of this chapter.

Chapter 6 – Implementing Entity – Terry commented that this section assigns responsibilities for various activities required by the Plan.

Chapter 7 - Implementation Documents – Terry stated that these documents will include County ordinances, sample contracts, etc.

Chapter 8 – Public Participation – Terry mentioned that this Chapter identifies and discusses the Steering Committee, Advisory Boards, website, etc. and documentation of all the meetings we've had.

Chapter 9 – Implementation Schedule.

Dave Minnear added that Chapters 1, 2 and most of 3 talk about what we did in the region and what happens throughout the rest of the state. Section 3.8 is really the meat of the document where it talks about the recommendations and forms the basis of future planning. There are 3 main sections to 3.8; one - how do we collect the waste and what are the methods we use, two - how do we transport it, and 3 - what do we do with it once we get it there. In addition, we have to account for Marcellus Shale drilling operations because it is a big issue in this region, and will impact landfill space. Illegal dumping and burning of recyclables are also included in this plan. We need to focus on expansion of recyclables and how we are going to pay for it. All of the groups have said they want more recycling and we need to clarify how we're going to do that and who's going to pay for it. We want to identify methods where the Counties can expand recycling without changing the current system.

Mike Goldman asked for comments. Charlie Benner, representing Agriculture, said he briefly reviewed the plan and asked if higher fuel prices would help recycling. Terry stated that the energy savings will vary by materials in recycling. Transportation impact depends on where the materials need to be hauled. We may have to look at the other sustainability impact of the program.

Dave commented that one way to expand recycling is through better education. There are also rural places that don't have easy access to being able to recycle. The question becomes if we can do it economically. Vince from Bloomsburg commented that from their point of view, they pay someone to come in and pick up the waste and, included in that bid is collecting recycling; taking it to a recycling facility and then providing Bloomsburg with weigh slips. You can certainly encourage haulers to do it that way.

## **MEETING NOTES**

### **Regional Solid Waste Plan Advisory Committee Business & Industry Stakeholders Meeting #3**

Date of Meeting: 3:00 PM, Wednesday, February 9, 2011

Meeting Location: Union County Government Center, Union Cafe

Page 4 of 4

Dave stated that we have encouraged haulers to do that. From the haulers standpoint though, they may not have a vehicle that allows them to pick up sorted material. The logistical part is what they need to figure out. The costs to the haulers would go down if they did this because of the lower tipping fees although there would be an increased cost associated with additional trips, and the haulers will need to determine if these costs offset.

The Lycoming recycling facility is implementing a program with the individual haulers to put in place a dual stream recycling effort. Terry commented that it is moving ahead. Lycoming is in the process of upgrading their facility to be able to handle dual stream. It opens up an opportunity to the haulers to enhance recycling in the region.

Mike Mitchell asked if additional hours at drop-offs could be recommended. Mike also commented that he didn't see a lot about industry in his review. What he did see is that there is plenty of capacity for the next 10 years and no one is telling him where to take his waste, although his municipal waste is specifically addressed in the plan. The way the committee is structured, there's business and there's industry. The whole committee commented that the main issue that's important to this group is recycling (to both groups).

Mike thanked everyone for their comments and feedback. He reminded everyone to please send any comments, recommendations, or changes to the plan directly to Dave Minnear at L.R. Kimball, who is collecting all the comments for this plan.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Cathy Johnson  
EfficientC