Advisory Committee Meeting Notes

Day: Tuesday
Date: March 12, 2013
Time: 2:30 pm to 4:30 pm
Location: Lincoln/Lancaster County Health Department
Room: Lower Level Training Room

Advisory Committee:

Present:
Mike Ayars; Gary Bergman; Eileen Bergt; Jack Coogan; Tim Farmer; Paul Johnson; Dan Kurtzer; Coby Mach; Sarah Murtagh; Adam Prochaska; Sue Quambusch; Jane Raybould; DiAnna Schimek; Cecil Steward;

Absent:
Ann Bleed; Steve Hatten; Casey Larkins; Jeannelle Lust; Meghan Sullivan; Chris Zegar

City of Lincoln/Lancaster County:
Miki Esposito; Milo Mumgaard; Nancy Clark; Sara Hartzell; Dan King; Karla Welding

HDR:
John Dempsey; Adriana Servinsky

Public:
Dave Dingman; Charlie Humble; Chante Earthwell; Matt Kasik; Neil Sullivan; Brady Svendgard; Bryan Pedersen; Greg West; Jim Klein; Sarah Hanzel; Seth Harms; Jacob Harms; Carrie Hakenkamp; Brian Kurtzer; Greg Kurtzer; Jay Kurtzer; Dale Gubbels

1) The facilitator conducted the Safety Briefing and acknowledged the posted public meeting law.
2) The Committee Chair called the meeting to order.
3) The Committee Chair conducted a roll call of attendance.
4) Meeting notes from February 12, 2013 were approved.
5) Information was provided via poster boards and handouts summarizing previously distributed information on the Vision, Guiding Principles, Waste Management Hierarchy, Regulatory Background, Evaluation Criteria and the Baseline Assessment/Survey for the convenience of the Committee members. The information has been previously distributed and posted on the project website.
6) A graphic depicting a continuum of solid waste management - from landfilling to resource recovery - was handed out to the Committee and included in the presentation. The continuum was discussed in the context of the forward looking aspects of the planning process and as an aide to visualizing where the City may wish to go in terms of timing and possible degrees of diversion. A facilitated discussion was then conducted on this broad concept. Among the items discussed were:
   - Should the starting point for planning be a diversion rate equal to USEPA’s national average of 34%
   - The values used to estimate the City’s current 18% diversion rate may be low because not all firms share their data. If all data was provided, the diversion rate may actually be higher.
A concept of conservation increment financing.
That being a green leader may or may not bring in jobs.
The importance of education and behavior change in reducing waste generation.
That not all haulers provide recycling services.
There should be incentives to not make waste.
UNL currently recycles 51% of their waste; provides a high level of education and convenience
The importance of incentives, education and convenience in encouraging waste reduction and recycling
Convenience (space in a building) was important to provide and promote recycling
Rates for recycling services should not be hidden in the cost of solid waste services costs.
Upcoming generations were pushing for more opportunities to recycle.
That recycling had a greater environmental benefit than energy conservation on reducing the carbon footprint of a building
That environmental savings lead to energy savings lead to cost benefits.
It may be in the best interest of the haulers to encourage recycling.
If everyone recycled the price for recycling services would decrease.
Levels of recycling may be gradually growing in the City.

7) A list of implementation considerations common to most options was listed and provided. These common implementation considerations would not be unnecessarily repeated on the option papers.

8) The facilitator provided information on public participation, project website, and various opportunities available to provide comments.

9) The process for the Committee to provide input for the preferred path will now include a selection to abstain from the first and second polling events for each option considered. Additionally, the process will now include an opportunity for the Committee to discuss the topic and options before the first polling event and again after the first polling event and prior to the second polling event. The Committee may also reword listed options for each topic, or may insert or delete other options to be considered for each topic. These were changes to the process reviewed and used at the previous meeting. A handout of the Issue, Options and Implementation Considerations for the topics of Source Reduction, Toxics Reduction, Yard Waste, Residential Recycling and Diversion, Commercial Recycling and Diversion, Construction and Demolition Materials Recycling, and Organic Waste Diversion (Composting) were provided to the committee at the beginning of the meeting. These same materials had been posted on the Solid Waste Plan 2040 website approximately a week earlier. The handout for each topic and the presentation for each topic included information from the technical papers previously presented to and reviewed by the Committee.

10) A short presentation was made summarizing materials previously presented on the Source Reduction topic/technical papers (including Product Stewardship and Zero Waste).

11) A short presentation was made summarizing materials previously presented on the Toxics Reduction topic/technical papers (including Household and Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generator Hazardous Waste and Universal, Special and Unique Wastes).
Following a discussion, Option 2 was reworded to be “Expand the Toxics Reduction Program and Create a Place to Provide Year Round Access”. The final polling of the committee related to the Toxics Reduction topic resulting in a preferred path that would expand the toxics reduction program and create a place to provide year round access.

12) The next Advisory Committee Meeting date and location were noted:
   - April 9, 2013; 2:30 pm to 4:30 pm; Lincoln/Lancaster County Health Department Lower Level Training Room.

13) The meeting was opened for public comments.
   - One commenter stated that there was more than one way to measure recycling rate and that different communities calculate the recycling rate differently. The commenter felt there should be a common method of measurement established. The commenter stated the Committee was building a record at 30,000 feet and that the record has to be more than general principles; there needs to be meaningful criteria.
   - One commenter stated that the business community has reached the peak of what voluntary recycling efforts can achieve and also that there were inefficiencies in the collection system. The commenter noted that it is expensive to run education programs. The commenter also stated that planning effort needs to look at how far voluntary recycling efforts can go.
   - One commenter stated kids are providing incentives to increase recycling and the commenter expects levels of recycling to rise without government meddling.
   - One commenter stated he has conducted surveys as part of his business and over the past 4 years he has seen interest in recycling rise. The commenter stated support for recycling.
   - One commenter stated that business owners are trying to do the right thing and that there are more businesses recycling but it takes time for programs to grow.
   - Several of the commenter’s thanked or complimented the committee for volunteering and for their efforts.

14) The Committee Chair adjourned the meeting.

Handouts provided at the meeting included:
- Vision, Guiding Principles and Goals
- Regulatory Background
- Evaluation/Screening Criteria for Solid Waste Management Options/Strategies
- Source Reduction and Recycling Options
  - Source Reduction
  - Toxics- Reduction
  - Yard Waste
  - Residential Recycling and Diversion
  - Commercial Recycling and Diversion
  - Construction and Demolition Materials Recycling
  - Organic Waste Diversion (Composting)
  - Construction and Demolition Waste Disposal
  - Municipal Solid Waste Disposal
- Baseline Assessment/Survey
- Continuum of Solid Waste Management