

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>MEETING NOTES</b> <b>Regional Solid Waste Plan Advisory Committee</b> <b>Steering Committee</b></p>
---

Date of Meeting:	1:30 PM, Wednesday, July 14, 2010		
Meeting Location:	Montour County Human Services Building 112 Woodbine Lane, Danville, PA		
Meeting #:	<b>Steering Committee Meeting #2</b>		
Attendees:	See Attached Sign-in Sheet		
	Counties Represented at Meeting:	Lycoming	
		Snyder	
		Union	
		Montour	
		Columbia	
	Stakeholders Represented at Meeting:	SW Haulers	
		Recycling	
		Citizens	
	<i>Not present:</i>	Municipal	
		B&I	
		DEP Rep.	

Terry Keene from Barton & Loguidice opened the meeting and everyone introduced themselves. Terry commented that Jason Yorks is in attendance representing the Recycling Stakeholders; Jack Pyers is representing the Hauler Stakeholders and Charlotte Resek is representing the Citizen Stakeholders. Not in attendance: John Cummins from the B&I Stakeholder group and Shane Pepe from the Municipal Stakeholder group.

Terry confirmed that everyone was aware of the Plan's website. He asked if anyone had the opportunity to review the notes from the first steering committee meeting. He recommended everyone to go online prior to future meetings to review the notes from the previous meetings in order to be prepared. Terry commented that the critical path item from the first meeting was to set up the Stakeholder groups, have the Stakeholder meetings, and have the Public Kickoff meetings. All of those have been complete. In the last meeting, the Consultant Team distributed a draft public notice letter as a guide for the municipalities to use notifying their communities of the solid waste plan process. The Consultant Team asked the counties to please provide copies of their specific letters to Kevin McJunkin. Kevin McJunkin requested the counties to provide copies of their letters directly to Dave Minnear of L.R. Kimball. Dave stated that he has already received a copy of the letter from Snyder County. Betsy Hack from Montour County said she would give a copy of her letter to Dave today. Columbia County and Union County have not sent their letters yet but will provide Dave with a copy when they send it. Terry also requested that if they ran an ad in a local newspaper announcing the solid waste plan process; please also give a copy of that to Dave.

## **MEETING NOTES**

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

#### **\*Steering Committee #2**

Date of Meeting: 1:30 PM, Wednesday, July 14, 2010

Meeting Location: Montour County Human Services Building, 112 Woodbine Lane, Danville, PA

Page 2 of 11

Terry confirmed that the Stakeholder Groups' lists have been identified and finalized. Dave asked each county to please check their list (on the website) to make sure all of the information is filled in. Dave may have a few blank spaces on the list (primarily information about whom the person is representing). Terry stated to the Stakeholder representatives that both the Representative and the alternate from each Stakeholder group need to be notified to make sure they are aware of the Steering Committee meetings since we need to have representation from each Stakeholder Group. Terry asked if anyone had any comments or changes to the notes from the previous Steering Committee meeting. There were no comments and we have considered them final.

Dave Minnear from L.R. Kimball stated that he would send a notification of the next Steering Committee meeting with meeting notes and ask everyone to review them prior to next meeting. Terry discussed the schedule and asked if anyone has any conflicts or comments about it. No one responded. Terry noted that the Steering Committee reviews the notes and comments from all of the Stakeholder meetings.

Kevin McJunkin mentioned that Union County has agreed to host the remainder of the Stakeholder meetings (the dates will be posted on the website). Times have been adjusted slightly so please check the website prior to the meeting to make sure you have the right date and time.

Terry continued with Item 4 on the Agenda – Data needs and Surveys. Dave stated that he received every county's solid waste plan through 2001. He said that the Team will need historic data for recycling and solid waste disposal including septic disposal (2001-2010 if possible). Dave stated that he has received some of that data, but that Joyce Hatala would like to send a survey to each municipality, each of the designated sewage sludge haulers (with questions like: how much are they collecting and where are they taking it), and sewage treatment plants. Debbie Wolf from Snyder County asked if the Counties are required to report this information to the State. Dave commented that if they are land disposing sewage sludge or septage, they would have a separate permit with the DEP, although the tonnages would probably not be available. Steve Tucker from LCRMS stated that septage does not get taken to a landfill. Debbie Wolf stated that the County doesn't track sewage sludge or septage. Gwen Jones from Snyder County stated that she sent one report to the Waste Water Treatment Plant and one report to the municipality. Terry asked if there was specific information available regarding what percentage of the Counties had on-lot septic versus sewage collection/treatment. Shawn McLaughlin from Union county has a GIS system that can estimate what is sewage vs. what is on lot. Terry wondered if the Counties can provide estimates to the Consultant Team for each. Dave stated that the Consultant Team would like to be able to say in the Plan that sewage has been accounted for throughout the Region, even if we can't establish hard tonnage numbers. Jack Pyers from Hometown Haulers asked if most of the septage would end up being processed? Union county said they had a problem the

## **MEETING NOTES**

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

#### **\*Steering Committee #2**

Date of Meeting: 1:30 PM, Wednesday, July 14, 2010

Meeting Location: Montour County Human Services Building, 112 Woodbine Lane, Danville, PA

Page 3 of 11

last time they had to record data regarding septage. They were asked where it was going. Some of it went to WWTP's, but a portion was unaccounted for.

Dave asked everyone if the Committee members would prefer to have Joyce send the survey to the Counties or directly to each location (i.e., WWTP's, etc). Kevin asked if each County could do it differently. Dave stated that it would be more consistent coming from the County, if possible.

Dave said that Joyce wanted to get with the recyclers at the upcoming Prop Meeting (possibly Tuesday before dinner).

Terry mentioned that we would like information from the haulers on waste shed analysis. He asked if it would be easier and get more participation if we would create something like a workshop. We can send information out ahead of time to try to collect that data. Jack Pyers said that he doesn't understand the need for data collection, beyond what is currently supplied by the landfills to DEP. He feels that there are issues with some of the questions involved. Dave said the Consultant Team is not going to ask for specific customer information, we simply want to ask questions like: how many days of the week do you work, where is the waste coming from and where is it going, etc. The only data we can get from DEP is how much waste is being sent to the landfills per County. We don't have information on geographic distribution. The more information the better for us but Dave asked Jack to please tell the Consultant Team what information the haulers would be willing to provide. Terry suggested that the Consultant Team provide a map to the haulers and have the haulers circle their specific area of where they collect. Jack seemed to be in agreement with that. Gwen Jones stated that reports from DEP show transfer station and how many tons come from Mifflin (western part), how much goes to Clinton, etc.

Dave said that he will require population data for the Plan preparation. The Consultant Team is looking for projections from each County, and they have received some to-date. He said the information would be more accurate if we received that information from each County than for the Consultant Team to estimate it. Dave stated that the Consultant Team is looking for data from 2005, 2010 and then 2020 projections. As far as consistency from the 5 counties, Kevin suggested each county provide a best estimate although he does not want to dictate a certain source of acquiring this information. Union County noted that their projections were very close in their percentages previously. Gwen stated that she feels Snyder County's numbers are high. Terry asked Union County how they gathered their information. Shawn McLaughlin stated that it was a computer program that projected estimates based on information developed by the counties, such as closed institutions, etc. Terry reminded everyone to account for Marcellus Shale effects on their population growth. There are housing developments/dormitories being built and that has an impact on their projections. Dave

## **MEETING NOTES**

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

#### **\*Steering Committee #2**

Date of Meeting: 1:30 PM, Wednesday, July 14, 2010

Meeting Location: Montour County Human Services Building, 112 Woodbine Lane, Danville, PA

Page 4 of 11

noted that we have to estimate solid waste tonnages also, that's why we're asking for projections to 2020. Terry asked the Counties to please look further and include information up to 2025 projections, if possible.

Terry proceeded with Item V on the Agenda – Discussion of Public Meetings held on June 22-24, 2010. He commented that there were five (5) Public Kickoff meetings that week. Item VI on the Agenda pertains to Stakeholder meetings. Terry felt that all the discussions from these meetings were very good. In the Stakeholder meetings, there were a lot of common interests (such as recycling); and some interests were specific to their groups. Terry asked the Steering Committee if they had any reactions from those meetings. Charlotte Resek from the Citizens group mentioned that during the Citizens Stakeholder there was an issue on burning; not agricultural burning, but municipal, and how to get a handle on it. She asked if it involves legal issues, ordinances, etc. She does not know if the County needs to pass an ordinance but feels that the Public acknowledges that it's a problem and more education is required.

Terry stated that as a Regional planning group, we could provide some model ordinances that can be implemented by the municipalities. Charlotte commented that she assumes it would then effect what recyclables would be collected. Gwen said she feels educating the public through the municipalities would not be effective. Her opinion is that a policy to ban burn barrels needs to be done through the State. She doesn't know how you can do it individually because there is so much controversy. Jack Pyers stated that most boroughs don't allow burning. Bob Aungst from Columbia County said you have to have an ordinance in his County. Bob asked Steve Tucker if LCRMS still has the Chem Sweep program. Steve stated that he is not sure but Debbie Wolf commented that she believes it no longer exists. Steve said if a no-burn ordinance goes statewide, the agricultural community would be up in arms. They are staunch supporters of the right to burn agricultural wastes. Dave said one of the issues is if you are mandated (which means you are required to recycle), DEP will not issue grants unless you have (on record) a no-burn ordinance of recyclables. Dave said this same issue came up at most of the County Public meetings and that most of the Commissioners don't want to pass a County-wide ordinance and then have to enforce it. Kevin stated that he likes the approach of expanding education of the general public, and encouraging the municipalities to facilitate action, but not to dictate what to do. Gwen said part of the plan should be to increase people's ability to recycle as well as educate people. She doesn't feel a burn ban would work. Charlotte asked how you enforce a burning ban? Charlotte commented that there was a gentleman at the Citizens meeting that was very concerned about burning. Jack said the impact is significantly less to burn just paper than those that are burning their plastics and everything else. Kevin said as far as enforcement, Lycoming County included a Solid Waste ordinance that regulates proper disposal of municipal waste. Any citizen could take an action – it wasn't necessarily at County level only. Shawn from Union County said he knows of people who have called

## **MEETING NOTES**

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

#### **\*Steering Committee #2**

Date of Meeting: 1:30 PM, Wednesday, July 14, 2010

Meeting Location: Montour County Human Services Building, 112 Woodbine Lane, Danville, PA

Page 5 of 11

DEP, and DEP has come out to look at the situation. Sometimes penalties and fees are involved.

Jason Yorks from the Recycling Stakeholders said PROP marketing might be able to help offer more options for recycling. He gets calls daily asking if certain items can be recycled. If they can't be recycled, maybe that's why people are burning. Organics, electronics and pharmaceutical recycling is a big subject to talk about.

Terry said he heard some comments at the Business & Industry Meeting regarding a "waste product" from one company being used as a raw material by another – assuming that the two companies are aware of the issue. Terry said a possible suggestion could be a creation of a "clearinghouse" to try to coordinate reuse of available waste products. The next step is to try and get industry more involved.

In addition, school districts may get on board when they learn that it could benefit them. In some school districts, the kids come in and demand recycling, the teachers encourage it but then at the next round of board meetings, the school board removes it from the next year's budget. At the school district level, there's a struggle to recycle and few are doing it. At the college level, the kids are demanding it so they have to find ways to do it. Terry said it would be nice to figure out where the disconnect is. The question remains as to why can't recycling be done in schools. Shawn stated that it is because the school board has a budget and the colleges have tuition. The institutional sectors are behind in what to do. Jason Yorks said in his county, the elementary schools are doing very well but middle and high schools are still behind. He's looking for next year to do mixed office paper programs and get more involvement – maybe with contests.

Jack asked Jason if he has any cost analyses associated with recycling versus landfilling of waste products, and whether he uses roll off boxes. Jason responded that he uses small totes. Jack said he imagines they are 64-gallon totes for what they are generating. Jason said that if the schools needed a larger size tote, they would get two totes. Gwen said recycling contests would be a good way to encourage more recycling in schools, and it could be used as a springboard into recycling other materials. Steve said this subject came up in three of our stakeholder groups. Debbie stated that we need to find out what is holding the schools back from recycling (Gwen commented that that's a different survey in itself). Jason said that if they care about recycling, they will do it. If they don't care, they won't recycle.

Jack said haulers are very interested in transitioning into hauling recyclables. The haulers are aware and know that it's all about recycling. Their challenges are trying to understand recycling hauling and they want to be involved. Dave said it looks like the DEP and municipalities are in a transition period. DEP encourages municipalities to recycle by providing funds for purchase of hauling equipment, but that these funds may

## **MEETING NOTES**

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

#### **\*Steering Committee #2**

Date of Meeting: 1:30 PM, Wednesday, July 14, 2010

Meeting Location: Montour County Human Services Building, 112 Woodbine Lane, Danville, PA

Page 6 of 11

be drying up. Jack said if the private sector haulers could feel secure in that area, they would not have a problem buying the equipment needed to take recycling to the proper facilities but that this is a big transition for haulers. It's difficult to compete when a municipality pays 10% of the total cost for their equipment and haulers would have to pay 100% for their equipment. If the haulers are required to collect source separated recyclables, it would mean more money for their trucks and equipment. If the municipalities go from source separated to single stream, it would require a huge investment. Jason Yorks estimated the cost for an upgrade at his facility of around \$7M, and said that's just not possible. Charlotte said Joyce commented in the Citizens Stakeholder meeting that you should never go backwards when it comes to recycling –so if the citizens are used to source separation, going to single stream would be a mistake. If you can create more opportunity to recycle, recycling will continue to increase. Dave said that curbside recycling in a rural area would be inefficient and unlikely to be successful. Jack would like to find a way to compromise. Jason said Lycoming County is obligated to put out cardboard and newsprint each week. If his recycling numbers dip from what is set, he's docked money. Wax cardboard is a problem in the market also. Quality is a huge issue and education is important.

Ellen Montis from LCRMS said there was an issue at the B&I Stakeholder meeting about the terminology regarding residual waste for municipal. She stated that she spoke with DEP and the clarification is strictly for transportation purposes. If they are mixing municipal with residual waste, it needs to go to an appropriate municipal waste facility listed in the plan. Dave asked if there was a significant price differential between “residual” and “municipal” wastes from industry. Ellen commented that Lycoming County does not have a great price difference. The price is based on the characteristics of the waste. The facilities that can take it and process it need it to be segregated. While we were at the Stakeholder meetings, Kerry Tyson from Nittany Engineering mentioned that Lewistown has a hauler that collects co-mingled waste and they ship it to York County to get processed by Penn Waste. Charlotte said, in Kelly Township, there is a waste management bin and it is not where Kelly Township's recycling is. She doesn't understand why that bin would be there. Jack said he believes that bin is for “Riverwoods” (a local community). Steve asked if they are taking that down to Recycle America and mentioned they are doing the same thing at Penn College. At the Citizens meeting, Charlotte commented that we should recycle because it's just the right thing to do. If we educate the public on the reason you should recycle, it would educate people to want to do it. She suggested that maybe we could put together some educational information about recycling for the public in this plan.

Shawn mentioned that in a private subscription area, you might see 5-10 different haulers up and down the same street on the same day. Dave asked the group to consider how efficient (or inefficient) that is especially if you add recycling on to that. Jack said the same thought pattern could apply to every service in our nation (bottled water, etc) and

## **MEETING NOTES**

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

#### **\*Steering Committee #2**

Date of Meeting: 1:30 PM, Wednesday, July 14, 2010

Meeting Location: Montour County Human Services Building, 112 Woodbine Lane, Danville, PA

Page 7 of 11

the choices everyone makes. He suggested that if small businesses in each community turned their money back into their local community, it would increase business for small businesses, but if you go to a bid process, you could eliminate smaller haulers participating because they can't compete in the process involved. Steve Tucker said that in his original hometown in WV, they went to a bid system and one company now collects all of their waste. That county's costs have risen, as a result. Gwen said she feels it's a matter of economics. Shawn from Union County suggested that the local municipality make that decision.

Dave summarized the Stakeholder meetings with highlights and observations as follows:

#### **Municipal Meeting:**

The Tuesday afternoon meeting was well attended and the members were well informed about a variety of issues. Waste issues that they mentioned included Marcellus Shale sludge disposal (how does that fit into the plan), and various Hard-to-Recycle or Special Waste issues (including pharmaceuticals, sharps, and the typical HHW issues). This group understands that a waste and recycling collection system is in place and their focus was on how to expand or include items that are falling thru the cracks, recognizing that many of these items tend to be expensive to work with. They also mentioned the need to improve recycling in public schools.

Comments from the Steering Committee are: Ellen said that Marcellus Shale sludge is a problem. Steve commented that if they drill 4,000 wells, as it has been stated, the northern tier landfills are going to be taking 100 tons of waste a day. Antrum is currently a C&D waste site and they want to switch to a residual waste site so they can take as much as 500 tons a day. Jack asked if that would be considered a much lower air space use, since the sludge is so dense. Steve said that was true, but that 500 tons would still take more space. Dave commented that DEP said that some C&D landfills are asking DEP to have their permit modified so they can accept it. Steve said some drillers are proposing to rail out the waste and that they will look at the bottom line before making any decisions. Dave said this Solid Waste plan is going to at least acknowledge how the Marcellus Shale will affect this plan. Other suggestions included getting more industry involved to accept things like pharmaceutical waste and to get more schools involved, possibly add to an RFP.

#### **Business & Industry Meeting:**

Well attended by a diverse group. We may need to look at this group as two separate subgroups (commercial/manufacturing versus universities) since their needs are different. I think that one of the group's ultimate suggestions might be that those two subgroups establish a clearinghouse for ideas and lists of materials that are available, since the individuals on the Stakeholder Committee have great ideas about items that are very specific to their particular industries. The universities in particular have much to gain by working together to discuss recycling issues and methods, including "reuse" of

## **MEETING NOTES**

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

#### **\*Steering Committee #2**

Date of Meeting: 1:30 PM, Wednesday, July 14, 2010

Meeting Location: Montour County Human Services Building, 112 Woodbine Lane, Danville, PA

Page 8 of 11

good quality items left behind at the end of the semesters (textbooks, carpeting, mattresses, clothing, etc), and the students have been demanding recycling as part of their lifestyle (even when it is not economical). The manufacturing group really needs a technical clearinghouse for use in listing the types of “waste” products generated by different industries, which may have value as raw materials in other industries. (Mike mentioned a manufacturer who was paying a high fee to dispose of an acid that was a waste product in his process – and later found that a local manufacturer was buying that same acid as a raw material for his synergy through communication). Perhaps that can be funneled through the local Chamber of Commerce or other such groups, or maybe the PA Recycling Markets Center can step up and provide something like that.

Comments from the Steering Committee are: Jack asked if universities have any ideas of what their waste quantities are? He asked if anyone considered whether they have marketable quantities that would make it worthwhile to recycle. Terry commented that Bucknell has a model program and there are things that we might want to consider there. Sean said recycling’s purpose is to help the environment so it needs to be recycled correctly instead of just thrown away.

#### **Solid Waste Meeting:**

In general, we found that the haulers are very focused on profitability and maintaining their share of the business. They are very interested in change that will lead to more work for them (hauling of recyclables), but against anything that might increase competition from other companies (like moving away from subscription plans) or give an advantage to their competition.

Comments from the Steering Committee are: Dave reviewed the summary (above) and asked Jack if he agreed with that summary. Jack said yes. He commented that they would like to consider single stream recycling since it reduces their costs to get in the game.

#### **Recycling Group Meeting:**

Again, a very knowledgeable group, with long histories in recycling. Change, if made, will prove challenging since the Region has some locations where municipal recycling programs are very robust (Bloomsburg) and other areas where recycling is handled almost exclusively by drop-off bins located by the LCRMS, with probably little input from the municipalities. Generally, each of the municipal groups is pretty much maxed out with respect to capacity and I suspect that they would not be interested in increasing coverage area or commodity processing, without continued grant funding from the DEP. They also would not be interested in switching to single-stream recycling (as suggested by the Haulers and several people on the Citizens Group).

Comments from the Steering Committee are: Critical group to get information from. Bob from Columbia County said his county had a great recycling program before the

## **MEETING NOTES**

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

#### **\*Steering Committee #2**

Date of Meeting: 1:30 PM, Wednesday, July 14, 2010

Meeting Location: Montour County Human Services Building, 112 Woodbine Lane, Danville, PA

Page 9 of 11

administrative fee was lost. He hopes the county can get back to having a great program. Dave said the administrative fee is still in legislature. Bob said that issue would literally get down to the nuts and bolts of recycling for his county. He'd rather see a structured program than to negotiate with an individual landfill. Steve said once the costs are established (based upon tons going to facilities), they would be able to negotiate and create an established fund). He would like to see Lycoming continue to put drop off sites in rural areas – areas that aren't mandated. That would be helpful to Columbia County. Dave said DEP is cutting back on grant funds and many municipal type programs are maxed out.

With respect to the landfill agreements, the plan can't identify a required fee, but it can allow for negotiation of a fee for a specific period of time. It has to be negotiated individually with each landfill. Terry said you can't put \$2 per ton in the plan, but you can have separate negotiations. Kevin said Jay Alexander of the Clinton County Landfill said he would be willing to pay a negotiated fee. Steve said if it's a contractually obligated fee than it's okay. Jack said haulers don't want to be involved in having to charge more and collect more money to participate in the recycling business. He doesn't understand why there's no educational information to tell the public that recycling is the right thing to do. If there are negotiated fees, there has to be a good educational (PR) program out there. Kevin said this might exert some budget discipline in the Counties. We don't want to lose waste because it costs more; we need to remain competitive in rates. Terry said everyone wants more recycling but there also seems to be a budget crisis.

#### **Citizens Group Meeting:**

This meeting was not quite as well attended as some of the others, probably due to a lack of early notice, and we may need to do some emailing to get more participation at the next one. Some of the members are county or municipal reps and were pretty knowledgeable. Others seemed to be interested citizens with a specific issue of interest. One discussed burning and hoped that the Plan would include a tough ordinance to ban burning of recyclable materials, because of both the loss of recyclables but also because of the environmental hazards associated with burning these items. There was general agreement but also discussion that the Twp Supervisors and County Commissioners typically are hesitant to get aggressive about burn bans. One member discussed her understanding of the advantages of single stream recycling, and the potential for profitability from recycled products, but Steve and Joyce were able to explain the reality of recycling economics. That may be something that we have to explain in some detail in the Plan. Another member discussed her frustration with the lack of recycling in public schools – an issue that came up in each of the Groups, so one that will need to be further explored and discussed.

## **MEETING NOTES**

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

#### **\*Steering Committee #2**

Date of Meeting: 1:30 PM, Wednesday, July 14, 2010

Meeting Location: Montour County Human Services Building, 112 Woodbine Lane, Danville, PA

Page 10 of 11

Joyce stated that she is currently working on the surveys and she needs addresses in order to send them out. The first survey Joyce would like to send out is the municipal survey about recycling (i.e., what's happening, what's not happening, what they would like to add, etc). Dave asked if that includes what type of waste collection in addition to recycling? Joyce feels it should include that. She would like feedback from the Steering Committee on what they want her to put in this survey. She then said the septage survey would be next (she finds that this one is the hardest one to get information back). Terry said we talked about other approaches - maybe one for WWTP/Sewage treatment plants and one for colleges, etc. Joyce stated that if she gets limited information back, she starts making calls. She also sends surveys to hospitals and larger clinics. Normally Joyce gets about 1/3 of the survey's back. Columbia asked if she wanted small packaged plants also? Joyce commented that she would like to send to a medium size plant but maybe not really to a small. She would like to know how everyone feels and asked if she should send to all. Terry said one way to estimate is to find out how many customers wastewater treatment plants have. Universities and schools have their own issues and Joyce asked if we should do a survey to the universities to get feedback. Dave said the issues with hospitals were different (chemotherapeutic, etc).

Gwen asked if Joyce wanted all the names of their local wastewater treatment plants. Joyce said she would appreciate the contact person and phone number for the plants, as well as for municipalities. She asked if it was better for the County to send the survey or for Joyce to send it. Kevin stated that he likes Shawn's idea about contacting the wastewater treatment plant directly to get that information. Joyce said that way is certainly easier but she needs to find out if DEP would accept that. Kevin would like to talk about it more. He said a lot of money gets spent on data collection and he would like more effort and emphasis on the end result. If there is a way to get that information without spending excessive time on it, he feels it would be a benefit. Bob from Columbia County thought that septage haulers were licensed by DEP. He asked if it would be easier to get information directly from DEP. He stated that there's got to be an easier way to get this information. Bob said Columbia would send Joyce any of the information she needs. Joyce asked if it would be a good idea to get separate surveys regarding public and private schools. Joyce and Dave will come up with a list and what types of information needed.

Kevin commented on Item VIII on the Agenda - Intergovernmental Agreement. The Lycoming Commissioners will take action next Thursday, July 22, 2010. Gwen from Snyder County said that they haven't signed their Intergovernmental Agreement yet but she advertised and they are looking at August 3<sup>rd</sup> to do that. Kevin said that Lycoming County is going to have their Commissioners sign the Agreement and then send it to Snyder County. Kevin has 15 copies to sign so that each County would get 3 originals. Betsy from Montour County stated they have already taken action so they would be available to sign the Agreement right away. Shawn from Union County stated their

## **MEETING NOTES**

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

#### **\*Steering Committee #2**

Date of Meeting: 1:30 PM, Wednesday, July 14, 2010

Meeting Location: Montour County Human Services Building, 112 Woodbine Lane, Danville, PA

Page 11 of 11

action is August 3<sup>rd</sup>. Bob from Columbia County said their action is also August 3<sup>rd</sup>. Kevin stated he will send the Agreement to be signed to Montour first and then Montour can send it to Snyder, etc.

Dave commented that at the Montour County Public meeting, there was a request for an announcement that could be posted in their County for public viewing, and he had prepared a handout (see attached map and description). Dave invited everyone to take a few back with them to their respective counties.

Date for the next Steering Committee Meeting is: Tuesday, September 28, 2010 at 1:30 PM at Union County Government Center in the Union County Café.

Meeting adjourned at 3:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Cathy Johnson  
EfficientC