

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

Date of Meeting: 6:30 PM, Wednesday, October 6, 2010  
Meeting Location: Union County Government Center  
155 North 15<sup>th</sup> Street, Lewisburg, PA  
Meeting #: **Solid Waste Haulers Stakeholder Meeting #3**  
Attendees: See Attached Sign In Sheet

Mike Goldman started the meeting and handed out the goals of the regional solid waste management plan (see attached). Terry explained that because this is a 5-county plan, it would have additional items on it. Mike asked if anyone had any changes to the last set of notes. There were no comments – last meeting final.

Jack Pyers, haulers representative to the Steering Committee, spoke. He stated some information that was particularly important to the haulers (application for planning grant document) and he discussed the bullet points. Jack stated that at the Steering Committee meeting, there were representatives from DEP there. Jack said that somewhere along the line DEP got the impression that this was a flow control program. Jack believes the grant application includes language that is consistent with laying the groundwork to have flow control in this plan. Jack feels that additional explanations need to be given on this subject. Jack showed a map of Centre County and how it identifies where the waste goes and, he explained, it's completely controlled. Further additional points, (2 pages in) #5, selection and justification of municipal waste management programs, the continued references to transfer stations, for most of this reason, Jack believes the only way a transfer station could survive is if the waste is directed to go there. Next section, multi-county regional component, promotes stability, certainty of waste flow, priority service partners (Jack doesn't understand what that is), waste costs, etc. If the plan is creating certainty of waste flow, Jack believes they have to be controlling it in some way. Jack said that the subject of evaluating expansion of waste programs that was mentioned briefly at the steering committee meeting, and what that mechanism would be; the haulers would be very interested in having input into this.

Steve Tucker and Terry Keene responded that while flow control was once being more seriously considered as an option, it has been repeatedly stated in public meetings that this option is not currently on the task. Kevin Witmer stated that he doesn't care where they (the Consultant Team/DEP) started, as long as flow control is not proposed. Jesse Pyers said the only thing that's on paper is that language, so that's the only thing they see and they (haulers) wanted to have clarification. Kerry Tyson explained that in the process of preparing a plan, all aspects of the DEP guidance document, which include the potential of flow control, need to be evaluated. However, just because something is being evaluated does not mean it will be part of the final plan recommendations.

Steve Tucker said that the plan started with the idea of waste sheds and some people are assuming that means flow control. Steve feels that DEP is trying to direct this plan.

## **MEETING NOTES**

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

#### **\*Solid Waste Haulers Stakeholders Meeting #3**

Date of Meeting: 6:30 PM, Wednesday, October 6, 2010

Meeting Location: Union County Government Center  
155 North 15th Street, Lewisburg, PA

Page 2 of 7

Jack's concern is that when the haulers don't have all the information, they are taking the information that they have now and going with what the language states.

Kevin Witmer asked how much weight this grant application document carries. Kevin McJunkin, Lycoming County, said that the main objectives of this plan haven't changed. We're having a scoping meeting to see if we can expand certain services. We want to get the haulers involved. We also may be going in a different direction, but there was never any commitment or settlement on flow control and no consideration about creating garbage police. Kevin Witmer asked if he was incorrect that the only documentation (grant application) he has suggests that there will be flow control. Kevin McJunkin said we still have to show that there is capacity. Jesse Pyers said Michelle at DEP looked confused at the last meeting and basically asked why we are still doing waste shed analyses if we're not doing flow control? Terry said we're not just looking at waste; we're looking at recycling throughout the region, which requires the related waste shed analyses. Jack commented that if DEP is the issue, we don't want to have this plan hijacked later on down the road. Basically the haulers don't want DEP to come back saying that we are not following the application for grant funding of the plan. We want to align ourselves with Lycoming County to make sure this happens.

Dale Henry asked why DEP is questioning things – it worries him? Terry commented that he doesn't agree that just because Centre County's plan uses waste sheds in its flow control, it means that every plan analyzing waste sheds has to have flow control. What Kevin McJunkin brought up is that flow control is an option to consider and evaluate, but it doesn't mean we're going in that direction. Terry said that we're sensitive to the haulers comments.

Kevin Witmer asked if haulers could have confirmation that flow control is not going to be included in the plan. Kerry asked Jack if he is aware of the regulations that are required to enact flow control in a plan. In order to enact flow control, there are numerous evaluations that must be done to prove that flow control is the best way to go. Jesse said even at the other stakeholder groups, he thought there was no flow control and what these grant application documents say is that there is an option for flow control.

Steve said in his opinion, DEP is creating flow control phobia. Kerry said they (DEP) want it because it makes their job very easy. Jack said he came into this hearing that flow control wasn't even an option. However, someone sent an email and got everyone stirred up. Jack said everyone was on the defensive, and out of the box they heard there was no flow control. Consultants have an open line of communication and his concern is that the haulers are being ignored.

Jack said that we need to evaluate what we are going to delineate in the plan. Kerry commented that you have to delineate first in order to evaluate. Mike Goldman asked

## **MEETING NOTES**

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

#### **\*Solid Waste Haulers Stakeholders Meeting #3**

Date of Meeting: 6:30 PM, Wednesday, October 6, 2010

Meeting Location: Union County Government Center  
155 North 15th Street, Lewisburg, PA

Page 3 of 7

what it is that we want to walk away with in this conversation. Jack wants to know where the county is with their conversations with DEP, where the funding is going, where the guidance is, and where the scope of the plan is going. He is assuming that there is a meeting planned. Kevin McJunkin said we're trying to schedule the meeting with DEP before the next Steering Committee meeting. Mike Goldman asked if anyone had anything else – there were no comments.

Mike Goldman proceeded with #3 on the Agenda – Hauler Questionnaire (attached). The questionnaire asks what counties you serve and the services you offer (cost information is NOT included). It requests contact information, person to talk to, etc. Some haulers received this questionnaire via email. Jesse commented that his vision of a questionnaire was just the top sheet and that the second sheet doesn't necessarily need to be there. Mike said the way we looked at it was free advertising and Jack countered saying he wants it to be good advertising. Mike offered to the haulers that if they feel like filling in one page, then only do one page; if you want to do both pages, great. If you don't want to do any, that's fine too.

Terry said the only point he wanted to make on this subject is that this survey is being sent to all the haulers that provide service in the 5 counties. Jack asked if, on the website, it's going to be broken up like this (Mike said we haven't thought that far ahead). Mike asked the haulers to please fill this out before they leave the meeting.

Mike said the real purpose of this meeting was to talk recycling. The last meeting there was a presumed decrease of DEP funding, and he introduced Kerry Tyson to discuss it further. Jack Pyers stated that he was at a meeting the other night where he heard that that Act 101 fees and funding have been extended for another 10 years. Kerry and Terry agreed.

Kerry stated that he felt the private haulers could fill the void in recycling left by the lack of municipal programs. Lots of businesses need to recycle, and the bottom line will depend on what the public wants and what they are willing to pay for. Kerry suggested that we'd have to treat it like a utility bill, similar to a water or sewage bill. It is an essential service being provided for a fee. At the stakeholder meetings that he's attended, the comments are consistent that more recycling programs are wanted in the five county areas, such as expanded existing programs, new curbside programs, specialty programs, etc. People and businesses want more programs, so how can haulers benefit from this?

One approach is that the local municipalities, institutions, or companies can identify what recycling programs they want, develop specifications, and then put it out for bids or price quotes. The haulers will then submit their costs to conduct the program. The bid prices will then drive whether or not the program is implemented. Also, the haulers can propose

## **MEETING NOTES**

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

#### **\*Solid Waste Haulers Stakeholders Meeting #3**

Date of Meeting: 6:30 PM, Wednesday, October 6, 2010

Meeting Location: Union County Government Center  
155 North 15th Street, Lewisburg, PA

Page 4 of 7

these services to certain businesses and individuals on their own as a business proposition.

Kerry reviewed the argument about haulers not being able to compete with municipalities and commented that grant funds are drying up. The DEP has lowered the amount you can ask for, and is requiring all programs to be self-sustaining. The grants cannot be used to fund the operations of the programs. Because of this, at some point the municipalities must implement fees in order to fund the program. It may be cheaper for a professional hauler to provide that service and for the municipality to pay that cost.

Kerry then discussed the possibility of municipalities sharing the funding with private haulers. Dale Henry said the haulers cannot have a private funding agreement – he's tried 2 times before and DEP will not allow it. Terry said a long time ago DEP did allow it but he does not have any knowledge on if they do it now or not. Kerry understands that it has been done in the past and thought it could still be accomplished.

Kerry explained the various ways the recycling programs would work, such as curbside programs, drop-off sites, institutional or business direct collections, and special collection events. The programs will depend strictly on what types of recycling program is requested and how the specifications are written. He also stressed the need to keep good records. He noted the potential problems with these programs, which included overzealous programs, incompatible equipment, and the lack of a payback, etc. The cost alone may shoot some of these programs down. Recycling programs in rural areas are more expensive and will probably need to be served by drop-off centers. Haulers and/or the sponsor of the programs will have to be able to deal with fluctuating markets for the collected material. There will be confusion with what day is recycling and what day is garbage. If you know a municipality is evaluating a recycling program, it is vital that the haulers should go in and work with them. It would be best if the hauler works with the municipality/institutions/businesses to develop the program specifications.

Next, Kerry discussed single stream versus multiple stream recycling. Typically, the value of the single stream material is lower due to contamination issues in the way the material is collected. In addition, there is a lack of processing centers for single stream, with the closest being York, PA. This would add increased hauling costs. Also, all the local processing centers are set up for multiple stream recycling.

He summarized by saying that there is potential for haulers to get into the recycling business and that they need to work with municipalities, institutions (school districts), and businesses to help them develop sound programs. In addition, haulers need to design their own programs and solicit them to the local municipalities/institutions/businesses. Overall, opportunities will exist if the public/business/institutions are willing to pay the

## **MEETING NOTES**

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

#### **\*Solid Waste Haulers Stakeholders Meeting #3**

Date of Meeting: 6:30 PM, Wednesday, October 6, 2010

Meeting Location: Union County Government Center  
155 North 15th Street, Lewisburg, PA

Page 5 of 7

costs of the programs. Recycling costs money and it needs to be viewed like any other provided service.

Mike commented that the problem with single stream is there is no place to take it, but with multiple stream there are still issues with contamination and equipment. It seems that single stream is easier to collect and multiple stream has higher collection costs. Mike asked what the solution is – to take to private recycler (does private recycler take everything or only certain things), or to take to transfer stations, etc. There are various destinations that need more thought. The big question has to do with money – how will the haulers get paid. Recycling will not pay for itself; it has to be subsidized – typically by the municipality.

Jack asked if in this conversation he's allowed to talk about specific issues. He feels a discussion should include a "per ton" price. Jack said that everyone in this room would be very interested in more thoughts on this regard. Kerry said he hadn't considered that information in his presentation. Jack said that the Steering Committee looked at it that way. Kevin Witmer asked, are we really here tonight to make this planning decision? Let's either put in the plan that everyone is going to put money toward a recycling fee or it doesn't go in the plan (he commented that he was confused about it). He wonders if it is relevant to the plan and, if there is a multi-county area and plan, can they say, you're on your own if you want to do recycling? Other than that it's a moot point. Steve Tucker from Lycoming said there is legislation that requires mandatory recycling be done by communities with certain populations and population densities. Jack asked if they have access to that data yet because there are areas that they have to provide this level of service to. Kevin Witmer asked what that has to do with the county plan. Isn't that completely separate from the plan? Jesse said it sweeps back and forth but the public perception is that recycling is a free service. If we up the fee to fund recycling, it will allow the public to continue its perception that it's free. Kerry said if you want a fee added to the tip fee, then you need to recommend it for evaluation in the plan. There are many ways to handle it.

Mike Heaps stated that people know that it costs to recycle and they don't seem to have a problem, it's being done now. Steve said we're trying to short-circuit something we can't short circuit. Everyone wants more service so what does it cost, how do you pay for it once you define it, etc. Jack said all of that involves the representation. We put that price per ton on and it continues to hide the value. That's the problem for haulers – the value of recycling is hidden. Kevin Witmer asked when people said they wanted more recycling, how was it worded, what were they saying, are they willing to pay for it? Terry said there are different funding mechanisms and we have to identify that maybe there is something we can do at a regional level that can't be done at a municipal level. It may help support a system if we add another MRF or include another drop off.

## MEETING NOTES

### Regional Solid Waste Plan Advisory Committee

#### \*Solid Waste Haulers Stakeholders Meeting #3

Date of Meeting: 6:30 PM, Wednesday, October 6, 2010

Meeting Location: Union County Government Center  
155 North 15th Street, Lewisburg, PA

Page 6 of 7

Jesse said Terry had a good point specifically on dollar per ton – you would have to provide the same level of service for everyone. That’s a good point, he never thought of it that way. Steve Tucker said that’s the point to this subject. Jesse said none of us like to change the way we’re doing this, there’s room to change things to allow the haulers to put their minds to the task of doing things to increase recycling. Jesse said they are not saying this has to be done this way, but if the haulers have the ability to put their minds to it to help recycling, and then getting it back on the other end, if there were modifications on types of material you can take off the truck (to Steve at Lycoming), it would turn out better. Jack said if the haulers can identify where we are, identify the gap of where we need to be, maybe involving haulers and recyclers, we could best recommend the most efficient way to get to the 35% goal. Some of the recommendations from other groups are important but not the most cost effective. If we based the plan on the citizens hopes and wishes and then backed into it from there that would be hard to do. Costs would be a problem. It would be good to know the shortfall. No one has done anything about materials not reported properly, to have discussions on what’s missing, get a map and data, put together information like what communities have required programs, etc. Jesse said part of this is what Jack commented on - some of it isn’t being reported properly and there could be gains just in reporting, but if we’re able to put our efforts into helping recycling, and we can work toward being involved in it, you can get to that 35% goal. If you’re not pulling it off the haulers plates and taking it away, and haulers are still getting something at the end of it, you can get to that percentage.

Jack said the only funding he’s heard is that \$1 per ton. Mike Heaps said that dollar per ton is one less dollar they have to work with. At the end of the month it would be less money to work with to recycle. Mike Heaps said leave it to free enterprise – let the haulers get the customers. Kerry said the plan has to evaluate the current recycling programs and address ways on how you’re going to improve them. That’s what Joyce is evaluating in her data. Kevin said could it be that any municipality has to include a hauler add to the bid to help. No hauler will agree to give up that \$1 per ton to go into a fund in hopes that it will come back to them some day. No way.

Jack asked where Joyce is with her data. Terry said in October she would be producing information during that time. Terry said we’re not talking about a 5-county system that one company is going to run. This is going to include many counties and how it will work in a 5-county region. Does the hauling sector want to get involved and provide the service? Will the school district want the service, and can the haulers bid on it? Mike Heaps suggested that if we do that, keep it with single stream.

Steve Tucker said the idea for opting out of the state fee program would work great because we’re not charging people more money – we’d use the \$2 per ton that’s being collected to go into a fund for this region.

## **MEETING NOTES**

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

#### **\*Solid Waste Haulers Stakeholders Meeting #3**

Date of Meeting: 6:30 PM, Wednesday, October 6, 2010

Meeting Location: Union County Government Center  
155 North 15th Street, Lewisburg, PA

Page 7 of 7

Mike Goldman moved on to discuss Section 4D of the Agenda. Mike said if the haulers get involved in recycling, you could count on more regulation. The fact is that you will have to keep track of what you're recycling and you'll have to report it to someone. Kerry said make sure that you do recycle the material you collect. There are major fines associated with it going to the trash instead of being recycled. Weight tickets, special forms, and other record keeping methods are used to document the recycling. Payments – you have to keep records in order to get paid to show you did what you're supposed to do. Audits – expect them from either state, county or someone who wants to see your records that you really did what you said you were going to do.

Mike asked what kind of recommendation the haulers committee would make to the steering committee. Jack said he doesn't think a recommendation could be made from this meeting. Kevin Witmer said if we have to make one tonight, we'd like to see recycling stay on the municipal system instead of multiple county mandated to be subsidized or paid for. It's fair to say we can't make a decision but it's fair to say that the haulers would like to be involved in recycling if we can determine how we can work together.

Mike Goldman asked if it is safe to say that the haulers represented here are all supportive of getting involved in municipal recycling. Everyone said yes.

Jack asked if it would be a possibility to involve Joyce in this to figure out a way to get a crossover from recycling to the haulers group. Kevin McJunkin said it's a great idea so let us think about it and get back to everyone.

Mike asked if anyone has any other issues that need to be brought up before the committee. Terry said with Dale being here from Northumberland County, maybe the group should be brought up to date. Dale said the haulers had a meeting the other day. Dale declined to share the results of their meeting with the group tonight or to share that information after the meeting. Dale reported that Northumberland County is talking to Lycoming County about a potential waste agreement. However, it is still in the negotiating stage. The next Hauler's stakeholder meeting is Wednesday, December 15, 2010 at 6:30 PM.

Meeting adjourned at 8:35 PM

Respectfully submitted,  
Cathy Johnson, EfficientC