

**MEETING NOTES**  
**Regional Solid Waste Plan Advisory Committee**  
**Citizens Stakeholders Meeting #3**

Date of Meeting: 6:30 PM, Thursday, February 10, 2011  
Meeting Location: Union County Government Center, Union Cafe  
155 North 15<sup>th</sup> Street, Lewisburg, PA  
Meeting #: **Citizens Stakeholders Meeting #3**  
Attendees: See Attached Sign-in Sheet

Terry Keene from Barton & Loguidice started the meeting for Joyce since she could not be here. Terry advised that the only topic of this meeting is the draft plan that was sent to the Stakeholders via email. He said we will briefly discuss what is in this first draft plan, listen to comments and suggestions, through next Friday (2/18/11), and then the consultants will review those suggestions with the Steering Committee, come up with a revised plan and update everyone from there.

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.

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

## **MEETING NOTES**

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

#### **Citizens Stakeholders Meeting #3**

Date of Meeting: 6:30 PM, Thursday, February 10, 2011

Meeting Location: Union County Government Center, Union Cafe

Page 2 of 5

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 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.

## **MEETING NOTES**

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

#### **Citizens Stakeholders Meeting #3**

Date of Meeting: 6:30 PM, Thursday, February 10, 2011

Meeting Location: Union County Government Center, Union Cafe

Page 3 of 5

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.

Charlotte Resek asked why the administrative fee was illegal. Dave said that Act 101 did not give specific permission to the Counties to assess an administrative fee for material landfilled at out-of-state facilities. In addition, there was little accountability as to how the money was used by the Counties and the landfills objected to use for non-waste management applications. It made for an awkward situation for the haulers, since they were required to collect the fee from residents.

Kevin McJunkin mentioned the possibility of a Trust where the counties would have to submit requests for reimbursement. Terry stated that the courts felt that counties shouldn't be permitted to make an Admin Fee mandatory by Ordinance, but that they were comfortable with negotiating fees. We just have to be careful as to how we approach this situation and these services. Dave Minnear stated that it's tough because each county has a different approach. We need to make the process fair, while focusing on where we get the money to support the waste management programs we are proposing.

Sam Pearson discussed the Lewisburg program run by the boy scouts, which she feels is a very limited program. She wondered how the proposed "dual-stream" program would work with the haulers and mandated communities. Kevin McJunkin mentioned other options, for example, a municipal contract. Lycoming County would like to do dual stream and maybe some of the municipalities can have a contract with a private hauler.

## **MEETING NOTES**

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

#### **Citizens Stakeholders Meeting #3**

Date of Meeting: 6:30 PM, Thursday, February 10, 2011

Meeting Location: Union County Government Center, Union Cafe

Page 4 of 5

We're looking at all options and trying to come up with the best. There are definitely opportunities for improvement in the mandated communities.

Dave discussed his communications with DEP about the 10 mandated communities and whether a dual stream option through a subscription service would be acceptable for them. Kevin McJunkin stated that DEP has concerns about private haulers doing this in mandated communities, but they are open to reviewing it when it is submitted. DEP is hesitant due to the past history of haulers throwing the recycling away instead of properly disposing it, so they are cautious in approving it. We need to have a better understanding as to how the program would work, what it would cost, how we can get the haulers involved, etc.

Charlotte asked if it's tricky for a landfill to also be a recycling facility? Terry stated that we would send out an RFP and ask them all to participate in the bidding. Matthew Rogers asked what the compelling reason would be for the other 18 to participate. Terry said if they want to be in the plan, they could participate in it. If they don't take waste, they have no cost in being part of the plan. If they take waste, they must participate in the regional plan. Gwen asked if we have made a decision regarding the Mifflin County transfer station yet. Will the Region have a contract with whoever is taking waste from the Transfer Station? Terry said that we'd like to have an agreement stating that the transfer station will report what county that waste came from. Gwen said the transfer station reports that the waste comes from Snyder County but when the landfill gets it, it does not specify that the waste came from Snyder County. Terry said we have a place in this plan that identifies the transfer stations and landfills designating where the waste came from.

Charlotte asked about use of a multi-county website. Dave answered that eventually the current information will be transferred to a new website, whether it is maintained in one county, by an outside firm, or as a contracted service. Charlotte said she's less concerned about the website and more concerned about the content. It needs to be updated regularly in order to be effective. Dave commented that traditionally the county coordinators would distribute information quarterly through newsletters, in your bill, etc. but he feels it makes more sense to do it via a centralized website. Gwen feels it might be better if each county did their own. Matthew Rogers feels that it would work well if it went through each county coordinator. For counties, it's really a cost issue. Sam Pearson feels it may be a generational issue. Charlotte suggested having announcements at the drop off places that tell people where to take batteries or anything else that can't be left at the drop offs.

Sam Pearson said that some of the manufacturers or larger companies are encouraged to increase their recycling efforts. She asked if anyone could take it another step forward to see if those manufacturers would change their packaging of items. Dave said some of the

## **MEETING NOTES**

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

#### **Citizens Stakeholders Meeting #3**

Date of Meeting: 6:30 PM, Thursday, February 10, 2011

Meeting Location: Union County Government Center, Union Cafe

Page 5 of 5

bigger companies, such as Walmart and Weis Markets, are currently in the process of doing that now. Terry stated that Weis is currently involved in an organics program.

Terry asked for additional comments. No one had additional commented. Terry asked if anyone had any additional feedback about where we're headed with this plan. Gwen said she feels we're close to where we need to be, it is just getting DEP to approve it. Matthew said he likes how we've been respectful to the different business enterprises and he appreciates that.

Terry 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. Ashley took the current maps with the comments that were suggested.

Meeting adjourned at 8:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Cathy Johnson  
EfficientC