

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

Date of Meeting: 3:00 PM, Thursday, February 10, 2011
Meeting Location: Union County Government Center, Union Cafe
155 North 15th Street, Lewisburg, PA
Meeting #: **Recycling 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.

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

Recycling Stakeholders Meeting #3

Date of Meeting: 3:00 PM, Thursday, February 10, 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 commitments, identify the locations that can take the waste and put this in Chapter 5. It

MEETING NOTES

Regional Solid Waste Plan Advisory Committee

Recycling Stakeholders Meeting #3

Date of Meeting: 3:00 PM, Thursday, February 10, 2011

Meeting Location: Union County Government Center, Union Cafe

Page 3 of 4

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.

Wes Wertman asked about Terry's comments pertaining to contracts for recycling. He asked if we are talking about county contracting to a private hauler, to a landfill or to who? He can understand contracting for waste. In his County, he believes 99% of the waste goes to the LCRMS landfill and when it comes to recycling, 99% recycling goes to Jaws (which is his facility). Terry responded no, we're not telling people where the waste goes. Currently in most of those municipalities, it's private subscription. We offer different options in the plan, including collection by municipal contract. Wes asked about the fees designated. Are we suggesting the municipality set the fee, the landfill, or who? Terry said DEP is particular in what they will or will not allow pertaining to fees. Right now we're looking at the mechanism to include it in an RFP as part of the plan. Wes commented about being not only a county recycling coordinator but also a private hauler and a private recycler. He keeps his cost as low as possible that way.

MEETING NOTES

Regional Solid Waste Plan Advisory Committee

Recycling Stakeholders Meeting #3

Date of Meeting: 3:00 PM, Thursday, February 10, 2011

Meeting Location: Union County Government Center, Union Cafe

Page 4 of 4

Dave discussed his communication with DEP regarding the use of “dual-stream” recycling in Mandated communities. This information is discussed in detail in the Plan.

Jason Yorks stated that the primary concern for DEP regarding use of dual stream recycling in mandated communities is the historic problems that Berwick experienced. However, Jason feels that having it as an option is important if the program is to be a success. He'd like the option to offer dual stream if the haulers are on board with it. Terry stated that DEP's concerns are related to contracts and not subscription. Jason is concerned about his leeway to change his plan down the road if he feels another system would work better. Terry said it doesn't seem to be something he needs to worry about because DEP would not be concerned with those types of changes.

Jason asked how we're going to incorporate Act 108 for recycling of certain electronic devices that have to go to certified facilities. Jason said it only deals with residential recycling right now. Jason said there's much more to this than what is out there now. Printers, TV's, computers, etc, - the manufacturers are 100% responsible for recycling of electronic computers. There are many question marks so we need to acknowledge it is here and cover it for anything in the future.

Terry asked for more comments. No one commented. Terry asked if anyone sees weaknesses in the draft plan or are there any positive comments anyone sees. No one commented. Dave said that last night the haulers were concerned that we were recommending the municipal collection programs. It was not our intent but was their interpretation so we are going to be more sensitive about it and rewrite that section. As for the counties, in some counties there is a lot going on and in others there isn't much going on. We didn't intend to make it seem that there were better counties than others.

Dave said that Joyce previously pointed out that if you have curbside for a lot of commodities, you don't want to go backwards in recommendations. She is hesitant to throw out a big program for recycling. The residents are used to a certain program; if we change that program or make drastic changes, they get frustrated and then they end up doing less. We do not want that to happen so we want to come up with the best program.

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 4:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Cathy Johnson
EfficientC