

**Recycling Fund Advisory Committee  
Meeting Minutes of January 30, 2018**

**The following RFAC members were present:**

Michele Nestor, Chair  
Bob Watts, Vice-Chair  
John Vatavuk  
James Sandoe  
Gary Roberts  
John Frederick  
Shannon Reiter  
Ed Vogel  
Eli Brill  
Randall York  
Jerry Zona  
Richard Fox (Sen. John Yudichak)  
Leda Lipton (Rep. Matt Gabler)

**The following RFAC members were absent:**

Gregg Pearson  
Gordon Burgoyne  
Joyce Hatala  
Tanya McCoy-Caretti  
Joe Reinhart  
Jim Close  
Tim O'Donnell

**The following guests and Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) staff members were present:**

Jim Lambert	Monroe County Solid Waste Authority
Mike Crist	Clinton County Solid Waste Authority
Scot Sample	Northern Tier Solid Waste Authority
Mary Keenan	Pennsylvania Waste Industries Association (PWIA)
Lisa Schaefer	County Commissioners Association of Pennsylvania (CCAP)
Bob Bylone	PA Recycling Markets Center (PennRMC)
Veronica Harris	Montgomery County Recycling
Ryan Ingham	Hough Associates
Amy Mazzella diBosco	Greater Lebanon Refuse Authority
Tom Santanna	TSSC, LLC
Chris Noble	DEP Bureau of Waste Management (BWM)
Walt Harner	DEP BWM
Dana Aunkst	DEP BWM
Laura Henry	DEP BWM
Larry Holley	DEP BWM
Todd Pejack	DEP BWM
JoAnne Yurcaba	DEP BWM

**Guests and DEP staff present (cont.):**

Neil Bakshi	DEP Policy Office
Tyler McCarthy	DEP Policy Office

**Call to Order; Old Business**

The January 30, 2018, meeting of the Recycling Fund Advisory Committee (RFAC) was called to order at 10:09 a.m. by Michele Nestor, Chair. She asked for introductions of committee members and guests.

Ms. Nestor called for a motion to approve the December 6, 2017, meeting minutes. Shannon Reiter made a motion to approve the minutes, seconded by Gary Roberts. The motion carried unanimously.

**Action Item: Responsibilities of County Recycling Coordinators**

Michele Nestor, Chair, and Larry Holley, Chief, Waste Minimization and Planning, led a discussion on potential expansion of the responsibilities of County Recycling Coordinators under the Act 101 Section 903 Grants.

Larry Holley explained that the primary focus of the draft responsibilities list is to clarify what the Department expects from counties/municipalities regarding the grant program. He noted that reporting data is a large part of the program and one of the biggest challenges; the data collected is utilized to show the progress being made on the grant program. Mr. Holley explained that counties need to be more proactive in communicating with municipalities to ensure that the requested data is being submitted in a timely manner and that it is submitted correctly. Another reason for the clarification of responsibilities is for counties/municipalities to be more mindful of market opportunities. Utilizing local markets and businesses helps improve the local economy as well as decrease transportation costs if transporting material to a local Material Recovery Facility (MRF).

Mr. Holley noted that the premise of the county coordinator responsibilities is to establish a baseline that all entities must meet to receive a grant. He explained that some of the concerns already raised to the Department about proposed responsibilities were that some of the points were too subjective, and that some coordinators did not have enough time to comply with all of the items. He reassured the committee that clarification will be made when the responsibilities are finalized as part of the 903 grant package. Regarding the lack of time, Mr. Holley explained that DEP pays half of the coordinator's salary as part of the grant, and that data entry is a grant-related item. Ensuring that the correct information is getting into the Department's Re-TRAC data collection software system in a timely fashion should be a top priority.

JoAnne Yurcaba, Solid Waste Program Specialist, gave examples of expenses eligible for reimbursement for county coordinators under section 903 grants.

- Travel/mileage;
- Conferences/meetings;

- Subsistence (per diem limits apply);
- Publications/newsletter subscriptions; and
- Salary/benefits.

Ms. Yurcaba clarified that the items are reimbursable expenses only when they pertain to recycling.

The committee members reviewed the responsibilities list and provided overall positive feedback on the Department's effort to identify specific tasks that the county coordinators should be performing. The following suggestions were offered:

- Lessening the subjectivity of some of the responsibilities;
- Furthering educational opportunities for county coordinators across the state;
- Replacing language in some of the responsibilities to reduce confusion or perceived burden on the municipalities to ensure compliance.

There was concern from the audience about the Department encouraging enrollment in PROP in terms of a government entity encouraging membership in a private organization.

JoAnne Yurcaba gave a brief overview of Re-TRAC as well as a summary of information the Department is required to collect. From this information, DEP's recycling program staff can run a variety of reports such as on trend analysis and county and statewide data. Act 101 requires annual report data to be entered into the system by April 15<sup>th</sup> of each calendar year.

There was additional commentary regarding the importance of education and communication between the county coordinators, haulers, and municipalities.

The Committee asked the Department to revise the draft responsibilities for presentation at the next scheduled SWAC/RFAC meeting for official action. The Department will then finalize the responsibilities and include them in the upcoming grant packages.

### **Continued Discussion: Funding Mechanisms and Grants**

Michele Nestor led further discussions of the grant programs authorized by Act 101.

Discussion opened on the grant criteria of the Section 901 Household Hazardous Waste grants, to which the committee had no revisions.

Section 902 Implementation Grants cover equipment, structures and land improvement, but do not cover operating costs. Discussion focused on how these grants are utilized within the parameters set by Act 57 (The Commonwealth Procurement Code), which reduces direct competition against existing private sector entities. Larry Holley explained that the Department requires the grantee to demonstrate that they reached out to existing private entities both to ensure the grantee would not be encroaching on their operations and to attempt to enter into agreements for shared use of equipment, etc. Ms. Nestor instructed members to prepare and submit specific comments on these grants for further consideration by the Committee.

Section 904 Performance Grants are a financial award under Act 101 that includes specific criteria that must be met before the funds can be used in an unrestricted manner. Specific criteria were established by Act 140, which amended Act 101 in 2006. Ed Vogel recommended that only mandated recycling communities should be eligible for the award. Mr. Holley mentioned the possibility of a formula change regarding how the grant payouts are calculated. Other topics of concern included universal access to waste disposal and recycling and an outright ban on burning and burying waste materials. Mr. Holley asked committee members to offer a list of comments/concerns for the Section 902 and 904 grants so that they, too, can be reviewed and addressed by the Department and this Committee.

Mr. Holley also asked each committee member for additional Act 101 topics to address when grant discussions conclude. Universal access to waste disposal and recycling was the key topic offered for discussion at future meetings. Other topics include convenience centers, the possibility of public-private partnerships and incentivizing investments into infrastructure in rural communities.

### **Public Comment; New Business**

Gary Roberts moved to adjourn the RFAC meeting, seconded by Ed Vogel. The motion carried, and the meeting adjourned at 12:36 p.m.