

MEETING NOTES
Regional Solid Waste Plan Advisory Committee
Haulers Stakeholders Meeting #4

Date of Meeting: 6:30 PM, Wednesday, February 9, 2011
Meeting Location: Union County Government Center, Union Cafe
155 North 15th Street, Lewisburg, PA
Meeting #: **Haulers Stakeholders Meeting #4**
Attendees: See Attached Sign-in Sheet

Mike Goldman opened the meeting. 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 and that we would briefly discuss what is in the draft plan and 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.

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

MEETING NOTES

Regional Solid Waste Plan Advisory Committee

Haulers Stakeholders Meeting #4

Date of Meeting: 6:30 PM, Wednesday, February 9, 2011

Meeting Location: Union County Government Center, Union Cafe

Page 2 of 6

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 collection and destruction to the Counties. There is also a process to add facilities as part of this chapter.

MEETING NOTES

Regional Solid Waste Plan Advisory Committee

Haulers Stakeholders Meeting #4

Date of Meeting: 6:30 PM, Wednesday, February 9, 2011

Meeting Location: Union County Government Center, Union Cafe

Page 3 of 6

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.

Kevin Witmer shared his interpretation about Section 3.3 pertaining to flow control and getting rid of subscription hauling. Dave Minnear assured Kevin that this was not the intent of the section, and asked for specific language that gave that impression. Jack Pyers identified some items on page 44 commenting on "adequate" subscription service currently offered. Jack feels that we've had lengthy discussions in these meetings and felt there was a good give and take, but that the Section 3.8 wording appears to show preference to municipal contracted services over subscription plans. Mike Goldman suggested removing the word "although", but the remainder of the sentence may require some rewording to clarify the intent. Kevin Witmer read the paragraph and said that he was concerned about the intent of the section, as it seems that the Section is glamorizing flow control on a local basis through municipal contracts. His feeling is that we are making the case that municipal contracts are better because they can be used to fund recycling. Jack stated that it doesn't seem as though it gives a fair and balanced rendition of subscription versus municipal contracted services and that it's guided toward contractual. He's never been in a plan where the plan itself goes out of its way to recommend the municipalities go in a specific direction. Dave Minnear stated that it was not our intent to recommend municipal contracts as opposed to collection/hauling by subscription. Mike Goldman said if you read the whole document it pretty much says,

MEETING NOTES

Regional Solid Waste Plan Advisory Committee

Haulers Stakeholders Meeting #4

Date of Meeting: 6:30 PM, Wednesday, February 9, 2011

Meeting Location: Union County Government Center, Union Cafe

Page 4 of 6

“stay with what works”, which is by subscription. Dave Minnear commented that he understands Kevin and Jack’s comments and that the section will be revised. Terry said that the section was written this way because the majority of the Region uses subscription services; so most of the section was devoted to alternatives, although the intent was to provide additional information, not to recommend a change. Kevin McJunkin said the reasons that the Region primarily uses private subscription are important to discuss in this section. He feels that competition is also important, to keep the prices down and keep the current economic system of waste collection.

Mike Goldman asked for comments about the direction of the plan. He asked if everyone thought this plan was going in the right direction on what we’re trying to achieve – as to the waste collection in the region. Mike asked about weaknesses – are there places that were overemphasized/underemphasized, not specifically but generally. Jack commented that from a technical aspect, it clearly identified the needs from the tonnage aspect and how to go about fulfilling those needs to establish the 10-year tonnage values.

Kevin Witmer feels that if the explanation to his concerns is in Section 3.8, he apologizes for short-changing it before it was discussed. Dave asked everyone to read Section 3.8 and make comments from there. Jack said the #1 most important part is to properly identify the tonnage from the 5 counties and the need to move forward to guarantee capacity for that tonnage. Terry said in the interim Lycoming Landfill and Clinton County Landfill are expanding to provide additional disposal capacity. In addition, the LCRMS is implementing programs with the individual haulers to put in place a dual-stream recycling effort. This opens up a business opportunity for the haulers, as well as the ability to enhance recycling in the region. Jack asked who would prepare and review the RFPs for landfill capacity. Terry commented that the Steering Committee would review them. Jack commented that 99% of the waste goes to those 2 facilities and the rest is gravy.

Kevin Witmer commented about the language on page 71 – contract collection. He is concerned about the comments that pertain to small haulers and DEP on page 74. Terry said we posed a question to DEP asking about the use of dual-stream recycling collection in mandated communities. DEP said if they want to do that they have to meet a certain set of requirements. Dave said in the 10 mandated communities it may be hard to utilize subscription recycling service due to DEP’s list of requirements. Dave said that in his conversation with Michelle Ferguson of the DEP, she explained that her concerns about this issue are based on past experiences (Berwick) and meeting the DEP regulations.

Steve Tucker asked if DEP would be open to discussion on their 11 item requirements. Dave said it would not hurt to meet with them to get a better clarification. Dale Henry said he believes those 11 requirements are used throughout the state, not just in this region. He stated that the whole reason DEP does this is so that residents can’t put their recycling with their garbage. Jack said the most efficient way to do this is to do both

MEETING NOTES

Regional Solid Waste Plan Advisory Committee

Haulers Stakeholders Meeting #4

Date of Meeting: 6:30 PM, Wednesday, February 9, 2011

Meeting Location: Union County Government Center, Union Cafe

Page 5 of 6

(trash and recycling) at the same time but it doesn't look like DEP would allow that. Per Terry, once a month recycling collection is the minimum that DEP requires but weekly is the most common.

Kevin Witmer asked why the towns that are mandated couldn't go up for recycling bids. Dave Minnear said that is probably what DEP would prefer. Dave Minnear said there are three options in the plan for recycling collection – drop-offs, municipal contracts, and subscriptions. Dave said we're trying to convince DEP that a subscription service would work. Ideally we would like to provide the municipality with options. We have to figure out how DEP would accept it. Most municipalities would prefer a subscription-recycling program. Jack said one thing that should be looked at is a public/private partnership to make this work and asked if we needed to have some of these questions answered for the plan.

Kevin Witmer asked if they are going to push mandated communities to become compliant with the DEP requirements, or is there no such push? Dave said all mandated communities are in compliance. We're trying to come up with ways to make the recycling collection more efficient. Dave said that in the past, municipalities have gotten grant money to help with the program costs. However, DEP is now saying there will be less grant money available in the future, so mandated communities need to find ways to make the programs sustainable. Steve Tucker said it might have to come down to the municipality writing the contract saying we're going dual-stream for recycling and we are hiring a private hauler to do it. He asked Jack is that was what they are looking for. Jack said, "We're getting there".

Kevin Witmer said he hadn't realized that this plan was a trailblazer. Dave said that's the point of the plan. Kevin Witmer said he thought the purpose of the plan was to meet capacity for the next 10 years. Terry said we're looking to expand recycling in the Region, by a series of optional methods, including dual-stream where appropriate, and probably municipal contracts in mandated communities. Under that plan, municipal contracts would only impact 10 out of 132 communities.

Mike Goldman said we've heard comments on 2 issues. Jack said we mentioned briefly issues on funding. Are there any recommendations on funding recycling? Dave said that Section 3.8 discusses the possible use of a sustainability fee, probably paid by the landfills based on the tonnage of material received from the Region. Terry said part of the RFP process would be negotiating for disposal sites, and part of this negotiation can include discussions of innovative ways to expand recycling within the Region. Jack asked if the costs that the Region incurs for waste management will be broken out in categories – Dave said we're working on those categories.

MEETING NOTES

Regional Solid Waste Plan Advisory Committee

Haulers Stakeholders Meeting #4

Date of Meeting: 6:30 PM, Wednesday, February 9, 2011

Meeting Location: Union County Government Center, Union Cafe

Page 6 of 6

Mike commented that he is hearing weaknesses in the plan from this group. He asked if anyone had anything good to say about any part of the plan? Jack commented that most of it was all good. Mike asked for more recommendations. No one commented.

Mike thanked everyone for their comments and feedback. Terry 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. We will then come up with a revised document that will be reviewed with the Steering Committee in March. Along with that, if the stakeholders feel another meeting is needed, we could meet one more time to go over the changes to the plan. He asked if that sounds acceptable to everyone, but there were no more comments.

Meeting adjourned at 8:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Cathy Johnson

EfficientC