

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

Date of Meeting: 4:00 PM, Tuesday, February 8, 2011  
Meeting Location: Union County Government Center, Union Cafe  
155 North 15<sup>th</sup> Street, Lewisburg, PA  
Meeting #: **Municipal Stakeholders Meeting #3**  
Attendees: See Attached Sign-in Sheet

Terry Keene from Barton & Loguidice started the meeting by advising that the only topic of this meeting is the draft plan that was sent to the Stakeholders via email. Terry said he will briefly discuss what is in the draft plan, listen to comments and suggestions, through next Friday (2/18/11), then the consultants will review those suggestions with the Steering Committee, come up with a revised plan and update everyone from there. Terry commented that this draft plan is a very good start so the team is excited to get your feedback.

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**

#### **Municipal Stakeholders Meeting #3**

Date of Meeting: 4:00 PM, Tuesday, February 8, 2011

Meeting Location: Union County Government Center, Union Cafe

Page 2 of 5

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 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

## **MEETING NOTES**

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

#### **Municipal Stakeholders Meeting #3**

Date of Meeting: 4:00 PM, Tuesday, February 8, 2011

Meeting Location: Union County Government Center, Union Cafe

Page 3 of 5

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.

Tom Zorn commented that he's a little disappointed that there have only been two (2) meetings (this being the 3<sup>rd</sup>) and is wondering what impact that has on his input for this plan. He also stated that everyone received the draft plan report on Friday, we're having the meeting today, and that makes it hard to be able to review it. He wonders if it's almost "a done deal" with the report as it is. Terry stated that he feels those comments are fair. Terry said that a possible reason for canceling some of the meetings in 2010 might have been because of not having information of value to share with the group. Terry confirmed that we had originally planned to have meetings in December, which put us behind. It is a big document, there are several main authors of this document, and internal comments are required so it did take longer to get the document out. Joyce commented that it is not a done deal from the recycling standpoint. She commented that where the draft stands now, it is a first draft; it is something to get out there, get comments, and make changes. She'd rather do it this way than not to get it out to everyone for review. Terry reiterated that it's not a done deal. Terry stated that DEP has worked with us to push dates back. He believes DEP wants to see progress so he doesn't feel they will have an issue.

Terry asked if anyone had any questions or comments. Commissioner Derk commented about the maps that were included with the draft plan that was sent via email. He asked what the prices were. Terry said those were municipal gate rates for some of the facilities where waste goes. It just gives everyone an idea of the costs associated with the facilities and tipping fees. Some facilities did not provide any information on their tipping fees so those locations have blanks. Pertaining to Section 3.8, we may move it around so it's not so buried in the document. There is quite a bit of meat in this section and in the next draft we are probably going to move it to its own chapter.

Tom Zorn mentioned that at the Recycling Committee meeting recently, Lycoming landfill was looking into implementing a program with the individual haulers to put in

## MEETING NOTES

### Regional Solid Waste Plan Advisory Committee

#### Municipal Stakeholders Meeting #3

Date of Meeting: 4:00 PM, Tuesday, February 8, 2011

Meeting Location: Union County Government Center, Union Cafe

Page 4 of 5

place a dual stream recycling effort. He was wondering if any progress has been made to that. Terry commented that it is moving ahead. Lycoming is in the process of upgrading their facility to be able to handle dual stream recycling. What that means for the region is that haulers would now be able to provide recycling services along with their regular trash service. The haulers would deliver the collected recyclables to the same location they take their trash. It opens up an opportunity to the haulers to enhance recycling in the region. Steve Tucker from LCRMS commented that this new program at the landfill has been budgeted, it's a sorting mezzanine (where they used to grind plastic), now they will be doing junk mail, chip board, and try to accommodate the best they can. The dual stream idea is being looked at to use prisoners to do the sorting to keep the costs lower. He hopes the haulers will take advantage of this opportunity.

Kevin McJunkin stated that DEP has concerns about private haulers doing this in mandated communities. They have issues but they are open to reviewing it when it is submitted. They provided a list of items of what is required to be a part of it. DEP is hesitant due to the past history of haulers throwing it away instead of recycling it, so they are cautious in approving it. Kerry Tyson commented that the mandated municipality would need to do a contract with the hauler so he feels that contract should encompass the requirements that the DEP is concerned with. Kevin commented that haulers will need to provide the proper documentation in order to prove that they are doing recyclables since it is individual residential pickup. Steve Tucker feels that if you make the participation easier and simpler for the resident, you improve the participation. Joyce stated that it depends on what recyclables are collected, whether it is dual stream or curbside, and that paper should be curbside. Steve commented that glass will not be picked up in the dual-stream bags but it will still be collected at curbside. We need to minimize the handling of glass. He gives the glass company the glass for free but they have to separate it themselves. With the paper market increasing, it makes more sense to collect paper.

Chuck Henry said he feels the glass issue is enough of a big deal that we should go back to doing them as returnable. Terry said there is a big drop in the waste stream for the glass component and he believes it will be phased out over time. Terry doesn't think there is any legislation at this time for a bottle bill. Kerry commented that the decline in glass packaging considers the transportation costs associated with glass and weight. Even if you don't go to dual stream, it still makes more sense to add paper. Terry commented that this plan should focus on the transportation and processing of materials. How it's collected is not necessarily as important as transportation and processing. Kevin McJunkin commented that Lycoming is collecting curbside and he feels it will be interesting to see if there is a cost savings for the haulers to do it.

Based upon the maps, there are 132 municipals in the 5 counties and 10 are mandated communities. Joyce made recommendations regarding education that she feels are extremely important. Some counties have more money and staff than others to fund and

## **MEETING NOTES**

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

#### **Municipal Stakeholders Meeting #3**

Date of Meeting: 4:00 PM, Tuesday, February 8, 2011

Meeting Location: Union County Government Center, Union Cafe

Page 5 of 5

provide recycling education. She believes the comments made about waste minimization were also good. We need to have someone go out and educate the public.

Steve Tucker asked if it is mandated to have garbage service for everyone or if it isn't required. Kerry said it applies to requests for 902 money; you have to have local or county ordinances for everyone to have trash pickup. If a county or a municipality goes after 902 money, they would probably have to provide a requirement for everyone to have garbage service. In reference to illegal dumping in rural regions, where refuse collection is not available, some communities provide small transfer stations for their residents. There are comments in the draft plan regarding these transfer stations. Kerry said in the areas that the haulers don't go, the community has unique ways to handle their trash and recycling.

Funding and Fees – the interest in all stakeholder groups pertains to funding and how we're going to pay for recycling. Part of it is to estimate what our costs should be for the services required. Our suggestion is to put together an RFP and negotiate to a program sustainability fee. It's being done in other counties but it is the general concept. We are working out the details on how it will be put into the document. It may be a key on how to handle recycling in this plan.

Terry asked for more comments. Tom Zorn passed on a positive comment about Lewisburg Area School District. They recently entered into a single-stream-recycling contract with the students. It's a big step in the right direction and he's pleased the school district agreed that it is important and allowed it to be implemented. Steve Tucker questioned single stream and wondered if it's something we should put in this plan when history shows that single stream collected materials are not good, you don't make a lot of money and transportation costs can be large. Joyce commented that Steve is correct and we should focus on the three (3) Material Recovery Facilities that are available and working: source separated at Bloomsburg, co-mingled at Jaws, and dual-stream at Lycoming. Joyce's recommendations are to stay local and save gas.

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.

Meeting adjourned at 5:25 PM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Cathy Johnson, EfficientC