
Appendix
Resolution by the
County Commissioners
to Form the
Watershed Plan Advisory Committee
COUNTRY COMMISSIONERS

January 13, 2005

05-C. 4

On motion of Mr. Ellis, seconded by Ms Damsker, it was unanimously adopted, that

WHEREAS, Pennsylvania’s Municipal Waste Planning, Recycling and Waste Reduction Act (Act 101) requires that county Municipal Waste Plans be updated every 10 years; and

WHEREAS, The Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection has approved the County’s grant proposal to fund the preparation of an update for the 1994 county Municipal Waste Management Plan; and

WHEREAS, Act 101 requires the formation of a Municipal Waste Advisory Committee (MWAC) that represents municipalities, the solid waste and recycling industry, other interest groups, and the public, and

WHEREAS, The MWAC will advise the county during the preparation of the plan update, a period not to exceed two years, and

WHEREAS, The Commissioners have considered a proposed list of MWAC members, prepared by the planning commission that satisfies the membership requirements of Act 101, and have found it to be acceptable.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the persons named on the attached list, entitled, “Suggested Municipal Waste Management Plan Advisory Committee Participants” are hereby appointed to the Municipal Waste Advisory Committee.

cc: File
    Controller
    Purchasing
    Finance
    Department
Request for Capacity
Request for Proposals for Municipal Solid Waste Capacity
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SPECIAL NOTICES

Request for Proposals for Municipal Solid Waste Capacity

The following notice(s) is placed through the Department of Environmental Protection as required by section 502(d) of Act 101 of 1988: the Municipal Waste Planning, Recycling and Waste Reduction Act.

Montgomery County is revising its Municipal Waste Management Plan in accordance with Act 101 for the purpose of including additional waste processing and disposal capacity for the county. The waste facilities to be considered in the plan revision must be permitted and fully available for use prior to January 1, 2006. Currently about 750,000 tons per year of municipal waste is generated in the county. For detailed information, interested facility owners should write to Drew Shaw, Environmental Planning Section Chief, Montgomery County Planning Commission, Courthouse, Norristown, PA 19404-0311. Inquiries should be in writing and made no later than 30-calendar days from the date this notice is published.
Montgomery County is revising its Municipal Waste Management plan in accordance with Act 101 for the purpose of including additional waste processing and disposal capacity for the county. The waste facilities to be considered in the plan revision must be permitted and fully available for use prior to January 1, 2006. Currently about 750,000 tons per year of municipal waste is generated by the county.

For detailed information, interested facility owners should write to:
Drew Shaw, Environmental Planning Section Chief,
Montgomery County planning Commission, Courthouse
Norristown PA 19404-0311

All inquiries should be in writing and made no later than 30 calendar days from the date this notice is published.
Mailing List for Capacity Survey
Facilities that responded to the advertised request for capacity and received the survey

Matt Kingsley, BFI Conestoga Landfill, Morgantown PA
Joel Breese, BFI-Imperial Landfill, Imperial PA
Nick Marino, Chrin Brothers Sanitary Landfill, Easton PA
David Leung, Commonwealth Environmental Systems, Hegins PA
Shawna Simmons, Delaware County Resource Recovery Facility, Chester PA
David Smith, Greenridge Reclamation Landfill, Scottsdale PA
Robert Lulucci, GROWS Landfill, Morrisville PA
John Lukens, Harrisburg WTE, Harrisburg PA
Samuel Donato, Jr., IESI Bethlehem Landfill, Bethlehem PA
Paul Yelinc, IESI Blue Ridge Landfill, Scotland PA
Joseph Dexter, Keystone Sanitary Landfill, Dunmore PA
James Gormey, Lanchester Landfill, Narvon PA
Carol Olson, LCSWMA Frey Farm Landfill, Conestoga PA
Bonnie Fink, Lycoming County Landfill, Montgomery PA
Tim O'Donnell, Modern Landfill, York, PA
Dean Mori, Onyx Chestnut Valley, McLellandtown PA
Thomas O'Connor, Pioneer Crossing, Birdsboro PA
William Stullken, SECCRA Landfill, Kennet Square PA
Stephen Corsner, Jr., Wheelabrator Falls, Inc., Morrisville PA
Jerry Grim, York County Resource Recovery Center, York PA
Capacity Certification
Waste Disposal Agreement
Capacity Certification Waste Disposal Agreement

The owner certifies and represents that the Owner and/or Operator (hereinafter referred to as "Owner") of the Municipal Waste Processing or Disposal Facility listed above ("Facility") will provide disposal capacity at the Facility, and any reasonable expansions thereof, for available municipal waste generated and collected within Montgomery County (County) for the term of ten years commencing on July 1, 2006 in the amount of no less than _________ tons per year, subject to necessary permit renewals during the term thereof.

The Owner acknowledges that the County or Waste System Authority is not obligated to guarantee the delivery of any minimum quantities of municipal waste to the Facility and the Facility will be designated to receive municipal waste from the County under the terms of this agreement and in accordance with the Montgomery County Municipal Waste Management Plan and revisions thereof.

The Owner also agrees to operate the Facility in compliance with the following:

1. Must be fully permitted and available for receiving wastes on or prior to January 1, 2006, and is at all times in full compliance with Pennsylvania Solid Waste Regulations if located in Pennsylvania, or the USEPA Regulations promulgated under Subtitle D of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA).
2. Shall be open for use by all licensed Montgomery County haulers operating in the County.
3. Complete records of the tonnage of Montgomery County municipal waste brought to the Facility by each licensed hauler must be kept on a daily basis. Quarterly summary reports must be submitted to the Authority no later than 30 days following the end of the previous quarter. The Authority shall at any time be permitted by the Facility to inspect waste disposal records for Montgomery County municipal waste.
4. The Facility must be available between the hours of 7:00 AM and 4 PM (weekdays) and 7 AM to 12 Noon (Saturdays).

The Facility Owner expressly understands and agrees that any false certification or representation in connection with this Agreement or any failure to comply with the provisions of this Agreement shall constitute just cause for removal of the Owner’s Facility(ies) from the Montgomery County Municipal Waste Management Plan.
Comments
From the Municipalities
Comments received during the voluntary 30-day review period:

Donald E. Berger, Jr., Manager, Springfield Township:
Figure 11, “2005 Municipal Recycling Rate”, should only include materials generated by the household/residential property that might otherwise be landfilled or processed in the Resource Recovery Facility in Plymouth. To include asphalt, for instance, is inconsistent with the remaining thrust of the plan document. Should we report vehicles sold for scrap?

*Response:* In some instances, the data on materials and tonnage is reported as a commingled total, making it difficult to distinguish between regularly recycled materials and the more unique materials. The plan calls for action to address the difficulties with gathering data on materials and amounts recycled.

Robert A. Ford, Manager, Towamencin Township:
The Plan Update is concise and well structured. It indicates that Towamencin Township has a 17.9% recycling rate for 2005. The Township will continue to increase that number.

*Response:* The Plan Update recommends working with the municipalities and haulers to improve reporting of recycled materials, and to identify ways of boosting recycling percentages.

Cecile Daniel, Manager, Perkiomen Township
The plan should address difficult to recycle materials, such as propane tanks, including options that involve the manufacturers of these items.

*Response:* Language has been added to the recycling section of the Plan Update to this affect, including promoting corporate responsibility regarding hard to recycle items.
Resolution
Adopting the Plan
On motion of Mr. Matthews, seconded by Ms. Damsker, it was unanimously adopted, that

WHEREAS, Pennsylvania’s Municipal Waste Planning, Recycling and Waste Reduction Act (Act 101), administered by the Department of Environmental Protection (Department), requires that county Municipal Waste Plans be updated every 10 years, and

WHEREAS, An Update to Montgomery County’s 1994 Municipal Waste Management Plan has been prepared by the Planning Commission, and

WHEREAS, As required by the Department, the Plan Update documents that sufficient disposal capacity exists for municipal waste generated in the county over the next ten years, and

WHEREAS, The Plan Update further describes the actions being taken by the county to promote recycling, also as required by the Department, and

WHEREAS, The Plan Update is considered by the Department to be a non-substantial update not requiring municipal ratification, but that the county has voluntarily provided the plan to the municipalities for a 30 day review and comment period, and has not received any objections to the plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the County Commissioners adopt the 2006 Update to the Montgomery County Municipal Waste Management Plan, and direct that it be submitted to the Department for approval.
Municipal Waste Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
Municipal Waste Advisory Committee
April 6, 2005

Agenda

1. Greeting and Introductions
2. Role of the Committee and Scope of the Plan
3. Current System
4. Past Planning
5. Next Steps
   1. chairperson
   2. future meeting topics
Minutes
Municipal Waste Advisory Committee Meeting
Montgomery County Human Services Center
April 6, 2005

In Attendance:
Bob Beaty, Richard S. Burns and Co.
Don Berger, Springfield Township
Tim Boyd, Plymouth Township
Ken Caputo, Merck and Co., Inc.
Phil Dahlin, McNeil Consumer and Specialty Pharmaceuticals
Al DeGenaro, J. P. Mascaro & Sons
Ted Dorand, Towamencin Township
Art Feltes, Montgomery County Recycling Coordinator
Ned Foley, Two Particular Acres
Tim Hartman, Waste System Authority of Eastern Montgomery County
Rod Hawthorne, Lower Pottsgrove Township
Randy Hendricks, Specialty Waste Solutions/PWG
Jack Layne, Pottstown Borough
Calvin Ligons, PADEP
Edward Manhertz, BFI/Allied Waste
Tom Maslany, Perkiomen Watershed Conservancy
Jay McLaughlin, Waste Management
John Miller, John Miller Inc.
Tom Murphy, Montenay Power Corp.
Mary Alice Reisie, PADEP
Drew Shaw, Montgomery County Planning Commission
Julie Servigie, Montgomery County Planning Commission
Michael Stokes, Montgomery County Planning Commission

Role of the Committee and Scope of the Plan

The Municipal Waste advisory Committee (MWAC) has been formed to help the county in the preparation of the 2005 Municipal Waste Management Plan update. The county intends the plan to be a nonsubstantial update (see handout: Guidelines for the Development of County Municipal Waste Management plan Revisions).

Current System

Timothy Hartman, Executive Director of the Waste System Authority of Eastern Montgomery County, gave a presentation on the structure and activities of the Waste System Authority which services 22 municipalities in the eastern portion of the county. The authority utilizes the 1,200 ton per day (TPD) Resource Recovery facility in Plymouth Township operated by Montenay Power Corp., the Abington Transfer Station
in Upper Dublin Township, and the Lower Merion transfer Station in Lower Merion Township.

Art Feltex, Recycling Coordinator for Montgomery County, continued the discussion of the current system by describing recycling efforts in the county:
• The state goal for waste diversion from recycling is 35%, and in 2004 the county’s rate was 27%
• The Household Hazardous Waste Program is expanding to include electronic waste at this year’s collections
• Last year over $50,000 in fines collected statewide in reference to mixing recyclables and solid waste
• County is working toward uniform countywide standards for recycling
• Priority on education programs for schools and businesses

Past Planning

Michael Stokes, Assistant Director, Montgomery County Planning Commission, presented information on municipal waste management planning in Montgomery County, beginning with the 1962 Refuse Collection and Disposal Plan, through the 1994 Municipal Waste Management Plan. The 1994 plan, completed under Act 101, is the subject of this current update.

Drew Shaw, Environmental Planning Section Chief with Montgomery County Planning Commission, presented information on the municipal waste planning requirements of the Municipal Waste Planning, Recycling and Waste Reduction Act (Act 101).

Next Steps

A chairperson is needed to run the meetings. Anyone interested in the position should contact Drew Shaw at (610) 278-3733.

If anyone has specific topics relating to municipal waste planning that they’d like to see discussed at future meetings, they should contact Drew Shaw at (610) 278-3733.

Next Meeting

The MWAC meetings will be held monthly for the first few months, meeting on the first Wednesday of the month at 2:00. The location of the meetings has been moved to the Fire Training Academy on Conshohocken Road to facilitate parking. The next meeting will be held on May 4, 2005 starting at 2:00 p.m., at the Fire Training Academy.
Municipal Waste Advisory Committee
May 4, 2005

Agenda

1. Introductions and Minutes of Previous Meeting

2. Core Mission of the Update:
   – Adequate Disposal Capacity
   – Recycling Goals
   – Website

   – Disposal Sites: Evaluative Criteria
   – Pottstown Landfill Closure Committee

4. Recycling:
   – 2004 Numbers
   – Enforcement
   – Promotion, Grants

5. Next Steps
   1. chairperson
   2. future meeting topics
      a. Special Waste Collection (computers, Sludge, C&D)
      b. Pottstown Closure
      c. Contract Agreement with Montenay
Minutes of the May 4, 2005
Meeting of the
Municipal Waste Advisory Committee

In Attendance:

Tim Boyd, Plymouth Township
Ken Caputo, Merck and Co., Inc.
P. Michael Coll, Souderton Borough
Al DeGennaro, J. P. Mascaro & Sons
Art Feltes, Montgomery County Recycling Coordinator
Ned Foley, Two Particular Acres
Tim Hartman, Waste System Authority of Eastern Montgomery County
Rod Hawthorne, Lower Pottsgrove Township
Linda Landis, Specialty Waste Solutions, LLC
Jack Layne, Pottstown Borough
Sally Lohman, PADEP
Edward Manhertz, BFI/Allied Waste
John Miller, John Miller Inc.
Tom Murphy, Montenay Power Corp.
Chuck Oyler, Upper Dublin Township
Mary Alice Reisse, PADEP
Rick Sellitzer, A. J. Catagnus
Drew Shaw, Montgomery County Planning Commission
Michael Stokes, Montgomery County Planning Commission

Web page: The county is adding a page to its website that will contain all the meeting materials and plan chapters as they are developed, so that WPAC members and others can view the progress of the plan. It is anticipated that this will be running by the June meeting; the WPAC will be notified when the page is added.

1994 PLAN

Waste Disposal: Waste generated in the county has gone to many landfills and resource recovery facilities. A handout (Montgomery County Waste Disposal 1988-2003) was distributed which shows the tonnage sent to each location (out of state tonnage is not shown, and only the tonnage of sludge that is landfilled is included. Incinerated sludge is accounted for under “ash”). Trends and reactions to various market changes can be seen in the data. The amount of disposal capacity available at the facilities listed is likely to be adequate for Montgomery County.

Types of Waste: A second handout on the types of waste in tons per year was distributed. This handout shows the trends in generation rates and management options. These trends should be kept in mind as the plan revision progresses. It was noted that Construction and Demolition
waste (C&D waste) has only been tracked since 1991, and that out of state waste is not being tracked. The rise in tonnage that occurred in 1997 is likely due to economic changes, although factors such as wet weather and accounting practices may also influence changes.

A question was raised on if we knew how many of the landfills receiving Montgomery County waste are at or near their daily capacity. This is important to know, since landfills will turn away MSW if they are near or at their daily capacity. The answer is currently unknown, but the plan will look at this. We need a reasonable assurance of capacity at the facilities listed in the plan.

Pertaining to sludge, the MWAC was informed that the municipal sewage treatment plants in the county are being surveyed. Their responses will show how much sludge is being generated on average, and how it is being disposed of.

The MWAC was encouraged to contact Michael Stokes or Drew Shaw if there are data needs they feel are important to address. The county will try to investigate these issues as they arise, and report back to the committee.

**Disposal/Processing Sites:** A third handout, “Municipal Waste Disposal sites for Montgomery County” was distributed, which shows the amount of waste processed or disposed of at the Montenay Waste to Energy facility and the four landfills receiving county waste. The distribution of waste shows that the county system is diverse, and not dependent on any one facility (although the Montenay facility is a key facility in the county’s plan).

**Selection Criteria:** A handout describing the selection process from the 1994 Plan was distributed. The handout describes the process used to solicit requests by facilities to be included in the 1994 Plan, and shows the criteria used in the decision making process. The Absolute Criteria are 8 points that each facility must meet in order to be included in the plan. The Valuative Criteria listed points to evaluate new proposals by. These criteria will be reviewed during the Update to assess their applicability. Following that, the county will begin to solicit disposal and processing sites to be included in the Plan Update.

The MWAC requested to see the survey form used for the 1994 Plan; a copy will be distributed to the members. Committee members also asked what would be done if there is not enough capacity for Montgomery County’s waste. In this case, the county would be obligated to develop the needed capacity via contracts with other facilities or other means. The operating trash transfer stations in the county and their importance will be noted in the plan.

Art Feltes, Recycling Coordinator, indicated that he will make a capacity study completed by SWANA (Solid Waste Association of North America) available.

The closure of the Pottstown Landfill was brought up, specifically how this will affect disposal capacity available to the county. The landfill’s permit expires in October, and a pending appeal would only provide a few more years available capacity. Michael toks is a member of the closure committee, formed to represent interests in the Pottstown area as the closure plans are developed. The MWAC will be updated periodically on the closure committee’s progress.
RECYCLING

2004 Numbers: Information gathered for the annual report was provided to the MWAC. This information is also available on the web. The data is as up to date as possible, however, since the county requires the data to be provided in the early part of the year (to meet its reporting requirements with DEP), and DEP collects its own data towards the end of the calendar year, the numbers may differ from DEP’s data.

Highlights of the numbers for 2004 presented include:
- Approximately 650,000 tons MSW collected in the county, and 250,000 tons recycled
- Average recycling rate: 609 lbs/person/year
- Increase in recycling rate from previous year: 1.5%

Much of the discussion in this section of the agenda focused on improving the accuracy of the data collected. One suggestion made involved revising the municipal reimbursement so that some of the State money reached the haulers. This would provide an incentive for haulers to provide documented recycling tonnages in a timely manner. Funding was suggested as an important issue to be considered in the plan update. Much of the state funding is drying up. The household hazardous waste program is funded through recycling money. Grants to municipalities to develop recycling programs are becoming scarcer. If recycling is to continue, the funding question needs to be addressed.

Enforcement: Enforcement is critical to obtaining higher recycling rates. It also helps ensure a fair system for all haulers. The county has received a 902 grant for education and expansion of its recycling program. Sally Lohman noted that Montgomery County is unique in that so many of the non-mandated municipalities have recycling programs.

NEXT STEPS

Chairperson: A MWAC Chairperson is needed. After the meeting, two MWAC members indicated they would be willing to serve as co chairs. They are Chuck Oyler, Upper Dublin Township and Tim Boyd, Plymouth Township. The position of co chair will be acted on at the June meeting.

Future Meeting Topics: Several topics were suggested for future meetings. They are:
- Special Waste Collection (computers, Sludge, C&D)
- Pottstown Closure
- Contract Agreement with Montenay

Next Meeting: The next meeting of the Municipal Waste Advisory Committee is scheduled for June 1, at the Montgomery County Fire Training Academy. The meeting will begin at 2:00 pm.
MUNICIPAL WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
June 1, 2005

Agenda

1. Introductions and Minutes of Previous Meeting

2. Website

3. Disposal Sites:
   a. Resurvey/readvertize
   b. Assess capacity available

4. Preliminary Sludge Data

5. Chairperson(s)
Minutes of the June 1, 2005
Meeting of the
Municipal Waste Advisory Committee

The meeting was scheduled for 2:00

In Attendance:

Timothy Boyd, Plymouth Township
Al DeGennaro, J. P. Mascaro and Sons
Art Feltes, Waste System Authority of Eastern Montgomery County
Ned Foley, Two Particular Acres
Tim Hartman, Waste System Authority of Eastern Montgomery County
Jack Layne, Borough of Pottstown
Edward Manhertz, Allied Waste/BFI
John Miller, John Miller Incorporated
Chuck Oyler, Upper Dublin Township
John Poldore, Montenay Power Corporation
Mary Alice Reisse, Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
Stephen Ruprecht, Merck & Company, Incorporated
Richard Seltzer, A. J. Catagnus, Incorporated
Drew Shaw, Montgomery County Planning Commission

Introductions and Minutes of Previous Meeting
Municipal Waste Advisory Committee Co-chairs: Chuck Oyler- Tim Boyd

Unveiled Website and Purpose
Advisory committee members were informed that a website has been created pertaining to the Plan update. It is available for viewing in draft form at:
http://www.montcopa.org/plancom/municipalwaste/wastemanage.htm
It will continue to be developed over the next month. Any comments or suggestions for the website should be directed to Drew Shaw via E-mail at dshaw@mail.montcopa.org.

Discussion of Capacity

Facility Letter, Survey, and PA Bulletin Notice – A copy of the letter sent to municipal waste disposal facilities for the 1994 Plan update was distributed for comment. A similar letter will be sent to disposal facilities that may be interested in being included in this Plan update. MWAC members were asked to review the letter and the associated materials (PA Bulletin notice and facility survey) and provide comments to Drew Shaw by June 15. The letter is to be mailed by the end of June, with a deadline for response toward the end of July.

The following suggestions were made by WPAC members during the meeting:
- Request compliance history information on the survey, or check via DEP’s E-Facts website.
- Request the facility permit expiration date
- Require the contract/assurance and any fee from all parties, to be equitable
- Consider expanding the facilities contacted to include recycling and composting facilities. It was pointed out that the county is only required to show adequate disposal capacity exists. Composting and recycling do need to be addressed in the Plan update.
• The cover letter should indicate a “due date” for the survey.
• The letter should be clear that the request to be included in the plan does not guarantee that county solid waste will go to the site. Also, the county cannot obligate a hauler to use facilities listed in the plan.
• The letter should specify that if the recipient does not reply, the county will consider them not interested.
• The Plan update can specify the process to add additional disposal sites that are developed after the plan, or indicate a desire to be included in the plan after it is developed.
• The open market influences where a hauler takes MSW for disposal
• How will the Northern and Western Districts be addressed in the Plan update? The Northern and Western Districts were dissolved to county planning purposes in the previous Plan update. The portion of the county they represented is covered by the open menu system in the current plan.

County Draft Comprehensive Plan, Community Facilities Chapter – A portion of the county’s draft Comprehensive Plan addressing solid waste was distributed. Although no new waste processing or disposal facilities are currently proposed in the county, the draft chapter contains guidelines for siting new facilities (buffering, drainage, proximity to general public).

The following comments were offered on the draft Comprehensive Plan chapter:
• The draft Comprehensive Plan and the Plan update should be consistent. Some facilities listed are no longer operating.
• How does this chapter relate to DEP’s requirements for siting? The county planning commission review process for any new facility would follow this policy.

Preliminary Biosolids Data
Information is being collected from the 40 municipal sewage treatment plants on how much sludge (biosolids) each plant generates, and how it is disposed of. Land application, a popular disposal method in the 80s and 90s, may be less of an option, as DEP says there are only 5 permitted land application sites in the county. We need a clearer understanding on biosolids, and will continue to collect data. If the advisory committee is interested, a tour of a biosolids facility can be arranged. Al DeGennaro indicated that J. P. Mascaro has such a facility out towards Lancaster.

Pottstown Closure Committee
Information on the activities of the Pottstown Landfill Closure Committee was distributed. The committee is the first of its kind in Pennsylvania, and DEP considers it to be a model for future closures of other facilities, should they occur.

Next Meeting
The next meeting has been tentatively scheduled for July 27th at 2:00 at the Fire Training Academy. Due to the July 4th holiday and vacations, the July and August meeting will be combined into the July 27th meeting. WPAC members are requested to contact Drew Shaw (dshaw@mail.montcopa.org, or (610) 278-3733) and indicate if they will be attending or not. An agenda will be distributed prior to the meeting; possible agenda topics include recycling, WTE, sludge, and composting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:20
Municipal Waste Advisory Committee
July 27, 2005

Agenda

1. Introductions and Minutes of Previous Meeting

2. Website

3. Advertising for Capacity:
   a. Advertisement placed
   b. Survey
   c. Assess capacity available

4. Funding for Special Handling Waste
Minutes of the July 27, 2005 Meeting of the Municipal Waste Advisory Committee

The meeting was scheduled for 2:00

In Attendance:

Timothy Boyd, Plymouth Township
P. Michael Coll, Souderton Borough
Ned Foley, Two Particular Acres
Linda Landis, SW Solutions, LLC
Tom Mason, Waste System Authority
Chuck Oyler, Upper Dublin Township
Stephen Ruprecht, Merck & Company, Incorporated
Richard Seltzer, A. J. Catagnus, Incorporated
Drew Shaw, Montgomery County Planning Commission
Michael Stokes, Montgomery County Planning Commission

Contact Information
A list of Municipal Waste Advisory Committee (MWAC) with contact information was distributed for review for accuracy. Once all the contact information has been confirmed, the list will be made available to the committee, as requested.

Articles
Three articles of interest were distributed to the committee:

* AP Newsbreak: Pa. Trash Imports Drop, But State Still No. 1*, from PennLive.com
* Recent Court Decisions Leave Legality of Administrative Fees in Limbo*, from The Pennsylvania Recycler, Legislative Perspective.

Website
Additional material pertaining to the MWAC meetings and municipal waste management planning in general will be added to the web page in August.

Advertising for Capacity

Advertisements Placed: An advertisement for additional waste processing and disposal capacity has been placed in the August issue of *Waste Age*. The copy of the ad distributed at the meeting was an early draft; the final copy is provided here:

Montgomery County is revising its Municipal Waste Management Plan in accordance with Act 101 for the purpose of including additional waste processing and disposal capacity for the county. The waste facilities to be considered in the plan revision must be permitted and fully available for use prior to January 1, 2006. Currently about 750,000 tons per year of municipal waste is generated in the county. For detailed information, interested facility owners should write to:
Drew Shaw, Environmental Planning Section Chief, Montgomery County Planning Commission, Courthouse, Norristown PA 19404-0311. All inquiries should be in writing and made no later that 30 calendar days from the date this notice is published.

The same text has been placed in the Pennsylvania Bulletin by PADEP. It was suggested in the meeting that we send the ad directly to any facility included in the current plan, as well as any existing facility within a 50-mile radius of the county. This will be done in August.

Survey: Those who respond to the advertising will be mailed a one-page survey. A copy of the survey was distributed during the meeting for review and comment. The survey asks for basic information about the facility, including its location, ownership, permit status, capacity, relationship to other county plans, and plans for future expansion. It does not request information on compliance history, only that the facility has a valid permit to operate.

It was suggested that the expiration date of the facility’s permit be requested on the survey. The survey will be amended to reflect this change.

Assess Capacity Available: Once the surveys are received, the county will review the responses to determine which facilities will be included in the plan. DEP requires that the county’s plan show that sufficient disposal/processing capacity is available to the county for the next 10 years. Being included in the county’s plan also helps facilities when they apply to DEP for a permit renewal or amendment. The county needs to determine what being included in the plan will mean for each of the facilities. Currently, a yearly $500 licensing fee is requested from the facilities included in the current plan.

Funding for Special Handling Waste
The County has conducted household hazardous waste (HHW) collections since 1989. The program was started to satisfy a requirement in Act 101 relating to the area served by the Waste-to-energy facility. The program was funded by a host county fee for the Pottstown Landfill, which was begun in 1989. For the past 7 years, these collections have been held as part of a cooperative effort between the 5 Southeastern Pennsylvania counties (Bucks, Chester, Delaware, Philadelphia, and Montgomery).

Tom Mason from the Waste System Authority explained that the county’s portion of the program has been funded through the county’s recycling fund. This fund has been supplied through the host county fee, which was substantially amended through a settlement agreement with Waste Management that provided $500,000 per year for a 10-year period. That settlement agreement expired this past May. A host county fee has also been collected on waste disposed of at the Pottstown landfill. This goes to the recycling fund. The landfill is closing in October of this year, and the host fee will cease in June. There is currently approximately $600,000 in the fund. The fund is also used for the recycling coordinator’s salary, and has provided subsidies to the Waste System Authority.

The cost of the HHW program for the county usually is just under $200,000 per year. Half of the cost (up to $200,000) is reimbursed through a DEP reimbursement program. Approximately
50% of the eligible salary costs for the Recycling Coordinator and other related expenses are also reimbursed through DEP’s 903 grant.

With some money in the fund currently, there is not an immediate problem with funding the HHW Collections. However, the plan should consider other means of funding the HHW Collections, since the current funding sources are being discontinued. The other Southeastern Pennsylvania counties in the HHW program fund their portion of the costs in various ways, including the operating budget, municipal contributions based on past resident’s participation, and an agreement with a waste-to-energy facility. The Committee offered the following funding suggestions:

- Assessing a fee on each disposal or processing facility listed in the plan
- Developing a funding source through the businesses that produce the HHW (pesticide/herbicide, electronics manufacturers, etc.)
- Adding a $0.30 per ton fee to the tipping fee (this would have to be fair to include those areas of the county not served by the Waste-to-Energy facility in Plymouth)

If MWAC members have other funding suggestions, please contact Drew Shaw at (610) 278-3733 or dshaw@mail.montcopa.org.

Next Meeting
The July and August meetings were combined for this meeting (July 27). Beginning in September we’ll be back on the schedule, with meetings held the first Wednesday of the month. September’s meeting is scheduled for September 7, at 2:00, at the Fire Academy.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30
MUNICIPAL WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
September 7, 2005

Agenda

1. Minutes of Previous Meeting

2. Advertising for Capacity:
   a. Response to advertisements
   b. Additional effort

3. Compost

4. Sludge
MUNICIPAL WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

September 7, 2005
Meeting Minutes

In attendance:

Don Berger, Springfield Township
Tim Boyd, Plymouth Township (Co-chair)
Al DeGennaro, J.P. Mascaro & Sons
Ned Foley, Two Particular Acres
Rodney Hawthorne, Lower Pottsgrove Township
Edward Manhertz, Allied Waste
Tom Maslany, Perkiomen Watershed Conservancy
Tom Mason, Waste System Authority
Chuck Oyler, Upper Dublin Township (Co-chair)
Mary Alice Reisse, PADEP
Stephen Ruprecht, Merck & Co.
Steven Scannapieco, Montenay Energy
Drew Shaw, MCPC
Julie Sergovic, MCPC

Landfill Closing
The Pottstown Landfill is closing October 2. A public hearing has been scheduled by DEP to present the recommendations of the closure committee for September 13.

Funding for the County HHW Program
Continuing a discussion from last meeting, information on funding Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) Collection Programs in other states was presented. The other programs are funded as part of the municipality’s budget, by private donations, or by user fees assessed to the public or the municipality from which the participant belongs. The Plan will discuss funding for HHW programs, consumer education, and business responsibility towards product handling and disposal.

Advertising for Capacity
The text of the advertisement for capacity that ran in the Pennsylvania Bulletin (Saturday, August 13, 2005) and in the August edition of Waste Age was distributed. No responses to the ads had been received by the meeting. Letters and copies of the advertisement had been sent out the week of the meeting to each of the facilities listed in the county plan. Several members of the advisory committee representing disposal facilities requested that the advertisement and survey be sent to them.

Compost
Ned Foley made a presentation on the composting operation on his farm, and on how similar operations could be established on other farms. “Two Particular Acres” is a small farm outside of Royersford. He began composting on the farm 3 years ago, and under a DEP Permit he can process up to 500 tons per year of food waste from grocery stores and similar sources.
In order to promote similar activity on other farms, the farmers must be linked with grocery stores, institutions, and haulers. Transportation costs can be high, but if many stores and many farmers are involved, that cost could be reduced. It’s difficult to say where the breakpoint is, but about two stores could supply up to 500 tons to one farm (the general permit limits the amount taken at a farm to 500 tons per year).

Such a program would reduce the amount of waste needed to be disposed of at landfills or waste to energy plants. Because the farmer produces a product that could improve the farm’s soil, or be sold to landscapers, golf courses, etc., the program could also help make farms more viable. It is likely that the farms on the suburban fringe, near suburban centers, would be most feasible. Wegmans, Fresh Fields, and other supermarkets that cater to the suburban market are likely participants. The farmer may even be able to market the finished compost at the grocery stores that supply the food waste.

Institutions such as Graterford Prison and Parkhouse (formerly the Montgomery County Geriatric and Rehabilitation Center) may be interested in participating. These facilities have a farmer on site. The cost to the farmer/institution would be the time and effort involved in turning the compost and similar on-site activities.

The committee suggested that the Plan encourage this type of operation, and that the idea be developed further for the Plan.

**Biosolids**

Follow-up information was presented on biosolids generation, processing and disposal in Montgomery County. Some additional information is needed, and the data needs to be reviewed to remove double counting of volumes. This information will be included in the Plan, along with recommendations for processing and disposal.

Al DeGennaro mentioned that biosolids can be processed via composting. J. P. Mascaro And Sons, Inc. operates a composting facility in Manheim, PA that incorporates soil biofilters and other technology. The facility had an open house on September 17 (note: the J.P. Mascaro website has a virtual tour of the facility. Go to [www.jpmascaro.com](http://www.jpmascaro.com/), click on ‘composting biosolids’, and follow the links for the tour).

It was noted that often it is cheaper to dispose of biosolids in a landfill than other means. However, the Plan should encourage the use of biosolids as composted material or other more beneficial uses, and discourage landfilling.

**Next Meeting**

The next few meetings of the advisory committee will focus on actual chapters of the plan. The draft chapters should be mailed out before the meetings, so that comments can be received at the meeting.

The next meeting of the MWAC will be held on **October 5** starting at 2:00 pm at the Fire Training Academy.
Municipal Waste Advisory Committee
October 10, 2005

Agenda

1. Minutes of Previous Meeting
2. Update - Responses to Advertising for Capacity
3. Draft Outline
4. Draft Chapters
5. Timeline for Plan Completion
MUNICIPAL WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
October 10, 2005
Meeting Minutes

In attendance:

Don Berger, Springfield Township
Tim Boyd, Plymouth Township (Co-chair)
P. Michael Coll, Souderton Borough
Art Feltes, Waste Authority
Al DeGennaro, J.P. Mascaro & Sons
Ned Foley, Two Particular Acres
Rodney Hawthorne, Lower Pottsgrove Township
Linda Landis, Specialty Waste Solutions
Jack Layne, Borough of Pottstown
Edward Manhertz, Allied Waste
Tom Maslany, Perkiomen Watershed Conservancy
John Miller, John Miller, Inc.
Chuck Oyler, Upper Dublin Township (Co-chair)
Mary Alice Reisse, PADEP
Stephen Ruprecht, Merck & Co.
Drew Shaw, MCPC
Michael Stokes, MCPC

Minutes of Previous Meeting
There were no changes to the minutes of the previous meeting.
Michael Stokes briefed the MWAC on the closing of the Pottstown Landfill. The landfill closed on October 2, after approximately 50 years of receiving solid waste from the tri-county area and out of state sources. Waste Management owns around 700 acres in connection with the landfill. 276 acres are permitted landfill, including facilities for gas management, laboratory, scale house and other associated facilities. DEP formed a community based committee to review closure options. The Pottstown Landfill Closure Committee hired two consultants to recommend procedures for closing the landfill. Cole and Lee, two Doctors involved in environmental advocacy, and GAI, an architectural and engineering firm, performed studies and audits of the landfill. Radioactivity is an issue, as elevated tritium levels have been detected at the facility. DEP has performed a radiation study at the landfill.

The landfill is one of the first of the modern landfills to close in Pennsylvania, and the process followed at the Pottstown landfill is being considered a model for future facilities. It is a test of the closure regulations adopted in 1988 by DEP. The closure committee presented recommendations at a public hearing held on September 20, 2005. The draft recommendations were sent to Secretary McGinty, and a meeting to discuss them and the closure of the landfill is scheduled for October 27. More information on the closure committee can be found at the PADEP southeast regional office website: http://www.dep.state.pa.us/dep/deputate/fieldops/se/se.htm. Click on “Community Involvement” on the left hand list, and then select “Pottstown Landfill Closure Committee”.

The Plan update will address the closure of the landfill and its impact on disposal capacity for the county. The landfill has a closure plan, but it consists of the individual closure plans for the various permitted facilities at the landfill. The closure committee recommends consolidation of the various closure plans into one document.

Responses to Advertising for Capacity
Drew Shaw reported on the responses to the municipal waste facility capacity requests sent to all the facilities currently in the Plan, and advertised in the PA bulletin and Waste Age. Seven waste disposal facility operating companies have responded and have been mailed the questionnaire. Because some companies operate more than one facility, 8 surveys have been returned. The information from the surveys is being summarized on a chart (a draft was distributed at the meeting). The capacity information will be compared to the 10-year projected capacity need to determine if sufficient disposal capacity exists.

Mary Alice Reisse clarified that the 10-year scope of the plan begins with the adoption of the plan. Since the Plan update is anticipated to be adopted in 2006, the scope of the Plan update will run through 2016. This is important, not only to show that capacity exists through that year, but also to look at the existing agreement with Montenay, which will expire before that year.

During the discussion of the process to add new facilities to the Plan, Mary Alice Reisse also explained that Chester County, which is updating its plan, has a methodology to add facilities without going through the update process. She will contact Chester County and get the information for us to review.

Draft Outline
A draft outline of the 2004 Update was distributed, and the following comments were received.

Given the uncertain nature of state funding, the availability of funding for the various programs DEP funds will not be clarified in the Plan update.

The agreement with Montenay and the impact of the Pottstown Landfill closure will be addressed. Regarding the municipalities currently using the Waste to Energy facility, the plan may state that the municipalities have the option to stay with Montenay under a new agreement, or enter into an agreement with other facilities listed in the plan, once the current agreement expires. The municipalities should make this decision before the agreement ends. The decision process and alternatives will be included in the plan; the decision will be left up to the municipalities.

The recycling section will include information to promote recycling, and indicate the municipalities now required to have recycling programs due to changes in population, as reflected by the 2000 Census. Composting will be included in this section, and yard and leaf composting requirements will be clarified. It does not appear that the composting requirements are currently well understood. Businesses in mandated communities are required to compost yard waste and leaves. Mary Alice offered to assist in completing this section of the Plan update.

Special Handling Waste, such as household hazardous waste (HHW) and electronics will be discussed in a separate section. Options for the structure of collection services, and funding will be discussed.
Separate chapters on biosolids, construction and demolition waste, white goods, and issues projected for the next Plan update will also be discussed in separate sections.

The draft timeline for Plan update completion was distributed. The schedule combines the November and December meetings for one meeting on November 30. It was suggested that the schedule may be too ambitious, and that more time will be needed. Also, it was suggested that the recycling chapter and the disposal/processing capacity chapters be distributed for the November 30 meeting. It is not clear at this point if a public hearing will be required. The commissioners may choose to hold one to receive comments on the Plan update, even if a hearing is not required.

**Next Meeting**
The next meeting of the MWAC is scheduled for 2:00 on November 30, at the Fire Training Academy.
MUNICIPAL WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
November 30, 2005

Agenda

1. Minutes of Previous Meeting
2. Update - Responses to Advertising for Capacity
3. Draft Chapter - Recycling
4. Additional Draft Chapter(s)
MUNICIPAL WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

November 30, 2005
Meeting Minutes

In attendance:

Don Berger, Springfield Township
Tim Boyd, Plymouth Township (Co-chair)
Art Feltes, Waste Authority
Ned Foley, Two Particular Acres
Rodney Hawthorne, Lower Pottsgrove Township
Jack Layne, Borough of Pottstown
Edward Manhertz, Allied Waste
Chuck Oyler, Upper Dublin Township (Co-chair)
Mary Alice Reisse, PADEP
Drew Shaw, MCPC
Michael Stokes, MCPC

1. Minutes of Previous Meeting: No comments were offered on the previous minutes

2. Update - Responses to Advertising for Capacity: Responses continue to be received. No response has been received from Montenay to include the Waste to Energy Facility in Plymouth in the plan. Drew Shaw indicated he will follow up on that with John Polidore at the Waste-to-Energy facility.

3. Draft Chapter – Recycling: Comments on the draft chapter were given at the meeting, including the following:
   1. Be sure the State’s goal of 35% recycling is included in the chapter.
   2. The plan should recommend a list be compiled (or the Recycling Centers list be expanded) to include the locations where hard to dispose of items such as white goods can be disposed. For example, the Myer Pollock scrap yard in Pottstown will accept these items for a fee. If the public and the municipalities knew where these items could be taken, it would decrease the amount of “dumping” that takes place at recycling centers.
   3. Page 1. – move waste reduction to the first line in the hierarchy.
   4. Page 2., Map – Clarify the “population over 5,000 and 300 p/sq. mi” category. Are Collegeville and Trappe in that category? Note that haulers may already be billing for recycling in some of the municipalities “likely to be required to recycle after the next census”.
   5. Page 3. – Nonmandated municipalities should be encouraged to contact the county recycling coordinator periodically for a list of drop-off centers.
   6. Page 3. - Explain why the 15% threshold was picked, and give the number of municipalities within this threshold.
   7. Page 3. – Note that the construction of a drop-off center and the containers can be funded through a DEP 902 grant. Also, Newman Paper Recycling will place and pull a container for recycling almost any grade of paper. Abitibi Paper has a paper recycling program too.
   8. Page 3. – Emphasize that education and promotion is essential as programs and materials change.
9. Page 4. – One of the factors in low recycling levels could be data collection. The residential numbers are easier to collect than non-residential or yard waste. The connection between better reporting by municipalities and larger DEP grants should be emphasized. Consider holding a data management workshop.

10. Page 4. – The plan should clearly state that commercial recycling is required by DEP in mandated municipalities.

11. Page 5. – At the top of the page, clarify that “nonresidential” includes multifamily housing with 4 or more units in a building, and institutional facilities.

12. Page 5. – The Recycling Council proposed in the plan could include a “list serve”, E-mail network

13. Page 5. – The council could also institute an awards program to recognize successful recycling programs. Awards could be funded through a DEP grant. The council should coordinate with the Chambers of commerce in the county.

14. Page 5. – Check the wording of Act 101: are “leaf waste” and “yard waste” the same?

15. Page 5. – SWANA offers $7,000 of technical assistance to municipalities to help them start a composting program. DEP’s web page also has information to assist the municipality.

16. Page 5. – Large county facilities, such as Parkhouse, or the County Prison, should consider developing an internal composting program. The SWANA assistance program, or the Recycling Council may help with this.

17. Page 7. – Move the section on Regional Drop-Off Centers up to the section on drop-offs.


19. Page 7. – Promote the idea that smaller establishments in mainstreet and downtown areas can coordinate their recycling efforts and spread out the cost.


21. Page 8. – Explore the option of a contribution from Montenay towards the HHW program funding. As part of the permit renewal, Montenay will need to show DEP what it is doing to reduce HHW.

22. Page 9. – Enforcement of recycling ordinances can be assisted by the recycling coordinator in municipalities where staff is limited and help is needed.

4. **Additional Draft Chapters:** The next chapters to be distributed will be the Capacity Assurance chapter, and the Construction and Demolition Waste section.

5. **Next Meeting:** Due to the holidays, the next meeting will be held on **January 11, at 2:00 at the Fire Training Academy.**
MUNICIPAL WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
February 1, 2006

Agenda

1. Minutes of Previous Meeting

2. Draft Chapters – C&D Waste and Capacity Assurance

3. Additional Discussion:
   a. HB 1902 Update
   b. Licensing of Facilities
Municipal Waste Advisory Committee
February 1, 2006
Meeting Minutes

In attendance:

Bob Beaty, Richard S. Burns & Co.
Al DeGennaro, J.P. Mascaro & Sons
Art Feltes, Waste Authority
Rodney Hawthorne, Lower Pottsgrove Township
Linda Landis, Specialty Waste Solutions
Brent Lieby, Montenay Energy
Edward Manhertz, Allied Waste
Tom Mason, Waste System Authority
Jim McGlaughlin, Waste Management
Chuck Oyler, Upper Dublin Township (Co-chair)
Mary Alice Reisse, PADEP
Rick Seltzer, A.J. Catagnus Inc.
Drew Shaw, MCPC
Michael Stokes, MCPC

Minutes of Previous Meeting
No comments were offered on the previous minutes. Drew Shaw indicated that the capacity survey had been received from Montenay, requesting that the Waste-to-Energy facility be included in the Plan update.

Draft Chapters:
The following comments were made pertaining to the Construction and Demolition Waste (C&D) chapter.

General comments were made that many construction projects are requiring C&D recycling. Certain LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) certification requirements are satisfied through C&D recycling. Recycling can also reduce project costs. Some haulers allow C&D Waste to be deposited in one container to be sorted later. Other construction sites put out several containers for various materials.

DEP considers what many call C&D waste recycling to be C&D waste processing. Such activity falls under the heading of resource recover, and C&D waste processing facilities are regulated by the state.

A question was raised over the classification of some C&D waste as clean fill, and if it would be possible to dispose of clean C&D waste in a quarry. One issue would be lead based paint on wood or dry wall.
The chapter should begin with an explanation of why the Plan has a C&D chapter. Act 101 does not require that the county address it in its Plan, and DEP’s recycling definitions do not include C&D in recycling materials. However, the MWAC suggested that the plan address C&D to some degree.

In terms of recommended actions, the chapter should present suggested activities rather than commit to a specific plan. It is unclear now who would be responsible for the actions outline in the draft chapter, beyond the recycling coordinator. Perhaps the C&D Plan should start with determining how much C&D waste is generated yearly, its components, disposal options, municipal activity, and related aspects. The portions of the draft chapter under the heading of the Construction Waste Management Plan should be included in the appendix as a sample of what the county’s program could be.

Specific comments:

- Pertaining to research into the viability of a legal requirement for C&D waste recycling, perhaps grant money would be available from DEP.

- Drywall is undesirable in landfills, as it generates hydrogen sulfide as it breaks down. Some hauling companies will sell the drywall to farmers for use as a lime supplement in soils.

The following comments were made pertaining to the Capacity Assurance chapter:

- Specific numbers on how much waste is being generated in the county is hard to project. The yearly total for last five years seems to be accurate and could be used along with population projections to estimate waste volumes in 2014.

- The current plan includes implementation documents such as the capacity assurance agreement to be signed by the facility. According to Act 101, we have one year after the plan is approved to acquire signed capacity agreements. It was suggested that facility owners may be reluctant to agree to accept ten-year’s worth of waste, and that most agreements specify a weekly or monthly amount to be accepted at the facility from the county.

- The 1994 capacity certification waste disposal agreement and other existing documents will be circulated for comment. We should also look at what Wyoming County and Chester County have developed for these documents.

- The system outlined in the current plan is a menu system that buffers the county if one facility is becomes unavailable (permit fails to be renewed, facility is closed). The process should have a designated threshold (minimum number of facilities, or an amount of capacity lost), at which point the plan update process is initiated.

- The waste disposal agreement with Montenay will expire during the ten-year scope of this Plan update. The plan should state that while the agreement is in effect the
municipalities are contractually bound to bring waste to the facility. After the contract expires, Montenay will become one of the companies vying for waste in the open market. This should be discussed in this chapter.

HB1902
There is a newer edition of this bill that is coming out. The yard waste recycling component caused many municipalities to voice concern to their legislators. This section is being changed in the new edition. Many of the requirements addressed in the bill are found in Act 101 already.

License Fees
Some counties are charging $6 to $7 dollars per ton as administrative fees. These have been challenged in court. Statewide, this raises approximately 6 million dollars. Montgomery County does not have an administrative fee, but was considering one as one of several options for funding the specialty waste collection program. The county solicitor recommended dropping the licensing fee, so the authority is no longer collecting the fee (last year the fee brought in $32,000).

Next Meeting
The next meeting is scheduled for March 1, 2006 at the Fire Training Academy, beginning at 2:00. The tentative agenda includes review of the implementation documents discussed at the February meeting, and the Biosolids chapter.
Municipal Waste Advisory Committee
March 1, 2006

Agenda

1. Minutes of Previous Meeting
2. Draft Chapters – Revised Capacity Assurance
3. Capacity Certification Documents
   a. Revised County Certification
   b. “Model” Certification Agreement
4. Next Meeting
MUNICIPAL WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
March 1, 2006
Meeting Minutes

In Attendance:
Timothy Boyd, Plymouth Township
Tim Hartman, WSAEMC
Linda Landis, Specialty Waste Solutions
Tom Murphy, Montenay
Mary Alice Reisse, PADEP
Stephen Rupprecht, Merck & Co.
Rick Seltzer, A. J. Catagnus
Drew Shaw, MCPC
Michael Stokes, MCPC

Minutes of Previous Meeting
The previous meeting minutes were not distributed to the MWAC. They will be sent out with this month’s minutes

Draft Chapters
Revised Capacity Assurance
The following comments were made on this draft chapter:

- The total volume figure is just for year 10. The cumulative volume of waste needs to be calculated over the ten year period.
- Part of the tonnage generated will go to the waste to energy facilities listed. This needs to be figured into the disposal picture. The waste to energy facility capacity is in tons per day, and the landfill capacity is in available tons; the waste to energy capacity needs to be converted. Also remember that the waste to energy facilities try to operate at or near their permitted disposal rate, so they do not typically have excess capacity. Nevertheless, a portion of the waste goes there now, and will continue to go there over the 10 year period.
- The agreement with Montenay ends before the end of the 10 year planning period. Since the next plan update should begin 3 years before the end of the 10 year planning period, the next plan update will most likely have more detail on this issue. We should discuss the implications of the agreement ending in this plan update.
- The capacity assurance chapter with these changes should be sufficient to meet the DEP requirements. Actual agreements with specific facilities for specific amounts of disposal capacity will need to be in place one year after the plan is approved by DEP.

Capacity Certification Documents
A revised Capacity Certification Waste Disposal Agreement was distributed for comment prior to the meeting. This agreement is a modified version of the agreement from the 1994 Plan. The agreement from the 1994 Plan contained provisions based on conditions that are no longer relevant. The agreement
has been revised to remove sections that are no longer pertinent. It was suggested that the agreement be reviewed by the County Solicitor's office.

A certification agreement from another county’s plan was distributed for comparison. This agreement was several pages long, as it has language in it to address specific aspects of that county’s system that are unique to the county.

Additional Discussion
Specialty Waste Collection Program Funding: A draft section on funding options for the Specialty Waste Collection Program was distributed. The section describes three alternatives for funding:
1. County-funded program
2. County/municipal-funded program
3. Municipal/corporate-funded program with county supplement

The following comments were offered on the section:
- The cost spreadsheet should list pounds received instead of tons received.
- Collecting a fee from participants at the events would be very difficult.
- Some municipalities have ordinances that prohibit HHW from being disposed of in the trash. Residents need a place to take it, and these municipalities may see the benefit of providing funding for the program.
- The millage increase that would result from the county-funded alternative should be calculated. It may be, however, that taxes aren’t raised to support this program, but rather the needed funds are found within existing programs.
- Some municipalities already offer electronics collection, and may be unwilling to pay for this program also.

Next Meeting
The next meeting of the advisory committee is scheduled for April 5, 2006 beginning at 2:00 at the Fire Academy. We'll be reviewing chapters that have been revised according to MWAC comments, and looking at the biosolids chapter.
Municipal Waste Advisory Committee
April 5, 2006

Agenda

1. Minutes of Previous Meeting
2. Draft Chapters: Capacity Assurance - 2\textsuperscript{nd} revision
   Biosolids
3. Next Meeting: May 3\textsuperscript{rd}, 2006
   (Draft Plan will be provided prior to the meeting)
Municipal Waste Advisory Committee
April 5, 2006
Minutes

In Attendance:
Don Berger, Springfield Township
Timothy Boyd, Plymouth Township
Al DeGennaro, J. P. Mascaro
Rodney Hawthorne, Lower Pottsgrove Township
Ned Foley, Two Particular Acres
Edward Manhertz
John Miller, John Miller Inc.
Tom Murphy, Montenay
Chuck Oyler, Upper Dublin Township
Mary Alice Reisse, PADEP
Stephen Rupprecht, Merck & Co.
Rick Seltzer, A. J. Catagnus
Drew Shaw, MCPC
Donald White, Whitemarsh Township

Minutes of Previous Meeting
There were no comments on the minutes of the March 1 meeting

Drew mentioned that the revisions to the chapters are underway and that the comments form the previous MWAC meetings are being incorporated. The MWAC Committee suggested that the May meeting be cancelled and that the June Meeting be held to review a draft of the entire plan. Once the Plan revision is reviewed by the MWAC, it will be distributed to the municipalities for review and comment. Mary Alice indicated that ratification of the plan revision is not required, since this is a minor revision. However, she also encouraged the county to distribute the plan revision in draft form to the municipalities for comment, and recommended we follow the ratification process. She noted that no response from the municipality is considered tacit approval, and that a hearing is not required. The MWAC recommended that the County Commissioners be briefed on the plan prior to its distribution to the municipalities, in case questions are directed to the Commissioners from the municipalities. After the municipal comments are received and any necessary revision made, the Commissioners can act on the plan.

Draft Chapters:
Capacity Assurance - the following comments were made on the chapter:
Change the title in Figure 1 to refer to Municipal Waste rather than Residential Waste.
Revise Figure 2 as follows: add a column to show the change in average daily need by year. The population is increasing along with the per capita generation rate, so that the average daily need increases each year. This should be compared to the amount of available capacity each year, as this changes a facilities' permits expire. Remember that the Montenay agreement will be up for renewal towards the end of the planning period. Change “days” to “tons” in the Harrisburg MERRF row of Figure 3. Remove the asterisk after Tulleytown in Figure 3. Compare Figure 4 and 5 in terms of the capacity. Figure 4 lists capacity and Figure 5 lists remaining capacity. How are these different?

Biosolids - the following comments were made on the chapter:
In the second paragraph where disposal options are listed, include composting as a processing/disposal method, and expand the description. The J. P. Mascaro website has information on composting operations. The costs associated with composting are greatened, but the environmental benefit is greater too.
Under Land Application, page 4, make a distinction between the various grades of biosolids and the disposal methods.

Next Meeting: The May 3rd meeting has been cancelled. The next meeting of the MWAC will be held on June 7, 2006 at 2:00 at the Fire Training Academy. A draft of the waste plan will be provided prior to that meeting.
MUNICIPAL WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
June 7, 2006

Agenda

1. Minutes of the previous meeting
2. Comments on the Draft Plan
3. Next Steps
MUNICIPAL WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
June 7, 2006

Minutes

IN ATTENDANCE:

Timothy Boyd, Plymouth Township
Rodney Hawthorne, Lower Pottsgrove Township
Edward Manhertz, Allied/BFI
Tom Murphy, Montenay
Chuck Oyler, Upper Dublin Township
Mary Alice Reisse, PADEP
Stephen Rupprecht, Merck & Co.
Drew Shaw, MCPC
Michael Stokes, MCPC

COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT PLAN
The comments listed here are limited to substantive comments. Editing and other similar comments were received from MWAC members who handed in their marked up copy of the plan.

Overall comment: The goals of the plan should be reiterated at the beginning of the plan: showing adequate capacity for disposal, increasing recycling, better tracking and reporting, addressing the Montenay contract, sustaining the special handling waste program (HHW), and any recommendations regarding construction and demolition waste handling and biosolids.
A table of contents is needed.

Context of Municipal Waste Planning
Add more history of waste planning in the county, and make this Chapter 2.

Chapter 1 Existing Plan
Chapter 1 should be the plan update and requirements, and Chapter 2 should be the Existing plan and history.

Plan Update Requirements and Process
Add Michael Stokes, Tim Hartman, and Mary Alice Reisse to the list of Advisory Committee members, along with tic lines, and an asterisk to signify Tim Boyd’s co chairmanship.

Chapter 3 Capacity Assurance
Figure 2 should be titles Municipal Waste Disposal…
Use percent change instead of percent increase
Add a daily need column to Figure 3
Ad a paragraph to discuss the concern that daily capacity on occasion is limited at northern and western Montgomery County facilities, due to weather or seasonal fluctuations. Indicate this in connection with Figure 4, Regional Disposal Capacity Figure 5 lists large distances to facilities. Include some indication of trash transfer stations as a means of providing reasonable and economical access to these facilities. Include a complete list of transfer facilities and their capacity. Figure 6 should include the committed capacity form Montenay. Procedure to Include a Facility in the Waste Plan – note that the contract is between many entities, including WSAEMC and Montenay.

CHAPTER 4 RECYCLING:
Add the 2005 numbers to the Recycling Percentage chart. Accuracy and consistency of reporting: The municipality should be responsible for collecting the nonresidential numbers. The problem is that the way in which the numbers are collected and the materials the percentage refers to is not uniform. This should be acknowledged and standardization should be recommended in the plan. The recommendation should be added to the list at the end of the chapter. Map of recycling municipalities: title should be Mandated and Nonmandated Recycling Municipalities Throughout the chapter, change references to plastic to #1 and 2 plastic. The hierarchy of waste reduction techniques should have disposal removed. Throughout the chapter, “Commercial” should read “Commercial and Institutional” The Household Hazardous Waste Collections have been held for more than five years; clarify that and the number of cars per day (program wide or just Montgomery County?) Add county funding as an option for funding the HHW Collections. Art Feltes will revise the Tire and Battery section. Tim Hartman will revise the Ash Recycling section.

Chapter 5 Food Waste Composting
Take out this chapter as its included earlier.

Chapter 6 Biosolids Handling
This should be titled Biosolids Management, and is now Chapter 5

Chapter 7 Construction and Demolition Recycling
This is now Chapter 6

Chapter 8 Plan Update Approval/Ratification
DEP has stated that municipal ratification of this plan is not necessary. The plan will be sent out for municipal comment. All comments received will be included in the appendix.

NEXT STEPS:

The plan will be revised according to the comments received. Once the plan is revised, it will be distributed to the municipalities for comment. The cover letter to the municipalities will explain why the plan is being updated. The MWAC will get a copy of the revised plan.