

<p>Carroll County ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MINUTES Robyn Gilden, Chair Kim Petry, Vice Chair Tuesday, August 11, 2009, @ 3:00 p.m. Room 003/004, Carroll County Office Building (COB)</p>		<p>Cynthia M. Parr, Chief Administrative Services 225 N Center Street, Room 300 Westminster, MD 21157-5194 Telephone: 410-386-2232 Fax: 410-386-2485 cparr@ccg.carr.org</p>
--	---	---

Members Present:

Robyn Gilden, Chair
Kim Petry, Vice Chair
Dan Andrews
Sandy Zebal
Brian Rhoten
David Pyatt
Chris Spaur

Members Absent:

Richard Haddad
Karen Merkle

County Government:

Cynthia Parr, County EAC Liaison
Maria Myers, Recycling Manager
Tom Devilbiss, Deputy Director of Planning

Judy Henn, Substitute Recording Secretary
J. Michael Evans

Other Attendees:

Ellen Cutsail, Union Bridge Council Member
Carrie Knauer, Carroll County Times

Jon Richardson, CCHD

CALL TO ORDER - Ms. Robyn Gilden, Chair, officially called the August 11, 2009, meeting to order at 3:02 p.m. asking for approval of the July 14, 2009 minutes.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – MOTION NO. 88 -09: Motion to approve the July 14, 2009 meeting minutes was made by David Pyatt, seconded by Kim Petry, to approve the minutes as presented. Motion carried.

COMMUNICATIONS – None

PRESENTATIONS – None

OPEN FORUM – None

OLD BUSINESS – Ms. Maria Myers and Mr. Mike Evans presented and updated the panel about Carroll County Recycling. Ms. Myers has been with the County for about a year and feels that they have come a long way, in that time. On the County website under “Living Here” list, there is a link to the user friendly recycling program, of which Ms. Myers has received positive feedback. There are documents to set up recycling in schools and the workplace as well as interactive pieces for students. It also has information for recycling at home, a freecycle link, composting information, landfill information, and recycle America videos to understand single stream recycling. There is also trash pickup information and directions for residents on selecting a hauler. There’s a smart choices link about composting, a guide to waste management to include plastics recycling, and a battery disposal guide. There is also a link to send Ms. Myers an email concerning comments and suggestions about recycling. The County has a new logo that was selected through a school competition. The winner was Alissa Herman, a senior at Westminster High

School. The County is looking at decals to put on vehicles, dumpsters and locations throughout the County. New additions in the past year to the recycling program include single stream, wide mouth containers, CD and DVD cases which all have a drop off at Northern Landfill, plastic bags, vinyl siding, kitchen grease and oil is starting to pick up now at the drop off center. Shredding has been added to the household recycling events. The County is kicking off a medication return/disposal program with the help from the Sheriff's office through Citizens Services. The tentative date for that is October 24, 2009. The Sheriff's office will have the containers for expired and unused medication disposal. Environmentally, it helps to keep it out of landfills and water. There are student volunteers to help with the special events. The composting and rain barrel program was very successful, more than anticipated. A composter was donated to Parris Ridge Elementary with a master gardener there to teach composting. Other programs include fluorescent bulbs and CFL's and are still doing research on how they will tie that into the hazardous household waste collection. The recycling program has increased public service announcements with WTTR, and all the local newspapers as well as working with WPOC to have a radio campaign that is unique to Carroll County. Ms. Myers continues to participate in events and meetings in the towns and municipalities. There is a student environmental team in conjunction with the Nike shoe donation/recycle event which will begin in October. She has had conversations with the public high school athletic directors about recycling at the athletic events. At the Stakeholders meeting she talked to the haulers about pickup and placement of containers, including their ability to pick up large totes. Overall recycling, the commercial side is up 4%, curbside is up 13%, municipalities as a whole are up 4% and the County pick up is up about 27 % in 2008 over 2007, all unofficially reported. They are continuing to improve with the reporting as far as recycling numbers throughout the County. There is an electronics recycling grant for \$32,892 that will attribute to us being able to collect more recycling. Ms. Myers will attend Council of Governments meeting in September. The County is planning an electronics drop for the municipalities so people have days of convenience so they don't need to go to the Northern Landfill for drop off. The first one is set in Finksburg, October 10th. The County has submitted a grant proposal to receive a stimulus grant from DOE for \$419,000 for a large bin program. It is proven that large bins do increase recycling.

Mr. Spaur questioned the issue of mercury. He stated that button cell batteries contain substantially more mercury than CFL fluorescents and wondered if we should focus more on recycling these. Ms. Myers will take that into consideration and advises that these do go into the hazardous collection.

Mr. Pyatt asked if the County looks at the total trash consumption, and what would the average recycling be. Ms. Myers said that 4-5% overall as an estimate and to keep in mind that the program didn't really expand until late fall. This year we will have a full year of numbers reported.

Mr. Pyatt asked when the recycling manager was hired, was there any expectation or projection of what the recycling rate would be and consideration as to what would or would not work and whether those projections are anywhere near expectations from a year ago? Ms. Myers was not with the County last year and stated that it was difficult that the market fell last year and that didn't help with the program with contracts that fell through. Single stream is keeping it easy for everyone to recycle.

Mr. Pyatt asked how much of the 4-5 % is due to the single stream recycling. Mike Evans said that the first year was approximately 2% and still building on that. One of the lessons we've learned is that you don't want to be in their face nor do you want to back off. People need to be very conscious and also make it convenient. The County has done some things in the down market especially with the aluminum cans with the buy back program at the recycle center. They lose money every time that we buy back but it's necessary to do this. Mr. Pyatt asked if the market would return would this help? Mike Evans said

sure this would help and we have weathered it because we have not backed off on the program at all. Business is building back up.

Kim Petry asked if Ms. Myers has talked to the haulers about the large bin program and if so how do they feel about this? Ms. Myers said that she spoke to the stakeholders meeting and they see it as something that is coming and pretty much understand that this is the way of the future. Is the grant from DOE contingent upon a hauler picking up the large bins? Ms. Myers said no, if we work with a hauler who does not want to pick them up then we will move them to another area. Mr. Evans said that there will be more customers than bins.

Mr. Rhoten said that Ms. Myers should be congratulated and had a question about the bins. Do we currently have the bins with the County logo? Mr. Evans said no we do not have them currently but are working on getting them at a cost of about \$8,000. We expect to have a variety of sizes of bins available when the budget allows.

Dan Andrews asked if Maria Myers replaced Ms. Legge and Mr. Evans said that she replaced half of Vinnie, as Vinnie was Bureau Chief and Recycling Manager where Maria is the Recycling Manager. It seems that there are a lot of programs and she is making progress with a population of approximately 170,000 people and wanted to know if she had other help as in interns etc. Ms. Myers has volunteers, interns and internal staff to support her. Mr. Dan Andrews felt that more progress could be made if we had more personnel and wanted it on record. He felt that she needed more help even if it's consultant help.

Dan Andrews questioned the sub-division pilot project and how it worked. Mr. Evans said that there were about 150 homes and the community pretty diverse. The Leatherwoods have the contract to serve the entire community. The Leatherwoods were into recycling and pay as you throw. The volume of trash went down and recycling went up the average waste per household didn't change dramatically. Containers were provided. To that extent it was successful. The Leatherwoods are the only pay as you throw hauler in Carroll. What about restaurant, food scraping and composting? The County is working with Shoppers Food Market and partnering up with "Green Cycle" (composting business) and waiting for information. The recycle facilities are available for tours.

Brian Rhoten questioned whether any thought towards having people order bins rather than waiting for the County to have the money. The County should hear whether or not they received the award any day now. If awarded all requirements would need to be reviewed as to how the bins would be distributed and the dollar side of the issue. It will also be valuable to have the County logo on the bins. Advertisements in the local papers seem to be quite wordy and should be made easier to read. The County is working on a flyer now to be mailed to everyone. Pay as you throw does work.

Robyn Gilden asked if anyone else in the County was considering picking up pay as you throw. Mr. Evans said that he wasn't aware of anyone else, Sykesville voted and it was defeated.

Sandy Zebal had concern on how much Styrofoam is going in the landfills and have they come up with a way to recycle this. She also commented that the foam gives off some noxious fumes. Package peanuts can be taken back to a packing company but Carroll does not offer Styrofoam recycling at this point. Research is continuing. A Pennsylvania town does do that recycling however the equipment to do so is quite expensive and not currently in our plan.

WTE Update – Mr. Mike Evans presented a chronology of current events and a full breakdown of events (copies provided). 6/23/09 – Frederick County approves proceeding with preliminary design and permitting at the McKinney Industrial Park Site; 7/2/09 – Commissioners agree to go forward with engineering and permits via resolution 7512-09; 7/21/09 – Memorandum of Understanding signed by Frederick County; 7/23/09 – Memorandum of Understanding signed by Carroll County; 7/24/09 Memorandum of Understanding signed by Northeast Authority; 7/28/098 – Energy Recovery Agreement signed by Frederick County; 8/3/09 – Energy Recovery Agreement signed by Carroll County. The next steps are Frederick County executes land lease, Northeast Authority contracts with Wheelabrator, Northeast Authority issues Notice to Proceed, Wheelabrator begins preliminary engineering, and Wheelabrator makes application for permits. The permitting process is expected to take approximately 2 years which means 2 years from now for ground breaking. Robyn Gilden had some questions that were left by Karen Merkle. Has there been consideration of a penalty clause for Wheelabrator if recyclables are burned and what is the County doing to get a better control of the waste stream? Regarding the penalties for burning recyclables; there is not a specific penalty but there is a routine inspection required by contract where operators inspect every load on the tipping floor and if there is a large amount of recyclables visible, then the hauler will have to reload it and take it away. Unfortunately, there is no way of knowing what is in the black bags. Regarding flow control, we prefer to know that we have a certain amount of flow that will be going into the process. The Board of County Commissioners will be meeting with DPW on 8/20 to discuss the first round on flow control. There are several options that the Board of County Commissioners could be looking at, two main categories are *mandatory flow control* – as a matter of license that all goes to the County, the other option is *economic flow control* where the rules are similar but you lower your prices at the gate so much to keep the business, of course the downside of that is tax increase or benefit charges.

David Pyatt questioned that 1500 tons per day is probably more than Carroll and Frederick together can provide. What was the basis for that figure? Mr. Mike Evans stated that it's the sum of two numbers it was determined that CC current and future needs was 600 tons per day and Frederick was 900 per day. It was built for where we want it in the future as opposed to building it just over what we have now but to build that way and incrementally it was more of a financial cost. Surplus capacity could be sold to other jurisdictions. The MOU has a surplus capacity and we must first offer to Frederick County and if they do not need this then we can offer to an acceptable other source. The reverse is for Frederick County. We ship using transfer trailers and I70 would get the bulk of that transfer traffic.

Kim Petry questioned in the April 6th letter the renewable energy comment about municipal solid waste is considered a renewable energy by the federal government. This information came from the DOE web page and Mike Evans will provide a link to this information. Also, it was mentioned WTE produces greenhouse gas emissions according to EPA. According to what? From a report where methane that is produced by landfills is more harmful than CO₂ and Mr. Evans will get this specific information.

Dan Andrews said that the solid waste is going in the wrong direction as far as greenhouse emissions with the WTE facility. He questioned how much CO₂ the Dickerson facility (Montgomery County) emits from their stack and what the last EPA reading was of the Dickerson stack. Mr. Evans will get this information. The stacks are tested at various times not just annually and the WTE proposal is to test for certain emissions continually via samples. Permits are a license to operate under certain standards and will contain the known limitations of allowable emissions. The testing is done by the operators and contractors. With regard to the ash and Dickerson Facility- Mr. Evans deferred questions about the Dickerson facility to be addressed by Montgomery County. Mr. Dan Andrews has issues with what is in that ash and bringing it back to the County. The permitting process will tell us what the requirements are and what the make up of this ash is. Mr. Dan Andrews feels that the County should see if Dickerson

made this decision to ship their ash versus landfill locally, but Montgomery County does not have a landfill. Frederick anticipates using ash as daily cover for their facility. Mr. Evans again asked that Frederick be asked this question. Our plan is to use our share of the ash that is generated at the facility as daily cover and looking at other opportunities to put to use as aggregate to road cover, concrete block products and are investigating this. We need to be conscious of the term ash. It's not what comes from a fireplace. Samples will be provided; it's more granular and heavy and doesn't float around.

All the trash that is collected in Carroll does not go to the Northern Landfill and therefore does not go across the scales and the same is for recyclables. Any of the waste that goes across the scales is being reloaded and shipped to Pennsylvania on contract. Other that is not crossing scales is going to Pennsylvania and yes it is counted as Maryland waste. The ash is not covered by the Resource Recovery Act. It is not considered hazardous; in order to leave the facility it has to meet standards and is considered normal material. Mr. Rhoten again suggested that the County doubles their recycling staff and support. Mr. Dan Andrews asked we know how much methane is coming out of the existing landfills in Carroll? Mr. Evans said that all have a gas collection system with the exception of Hoods Mills which is in the process of being installed now. The Northern Landfill has an open flame burning through a pipe. Right now we burn methane and convert it to CO₂. We don't produce a lot of methane at the landfill. Mr. Dan Andrews made the statement that the amount of CO₂ coming out of this WTE facility will probably negate everything else the County is doing to reduce the greenhouse gasses by many fold. Someone should be looking at this from a broad perspective. Are the contracts with sister counties currently being worked on? Mr. Evans responded that they are beginning that process and have a great interest in developing contracts to address their problems. Mr. Andrew's concern is that other counties can walk away later if they find a better deal and we can't. Mr. Evans commented that there would be long term contracts with sister municipalities with a requirement of either give the volume of trash or the financial equivalent. Ms. Gilden said that Maryland Hospitals for Healthy Environments (MD H2E) is currently working with the hospitals to get them out of their long term contracts with the medical waste incinerator and that goes against the progress they have made with hospitals to say that we are going to trap other people in this endeavor with us with a long term contract. If the permitting does go forward is it possible for the EAC to be involved to review permit applications? Mr. Evans does not know the permitting process and assumes it is similar to other permitting processes he has been involved in. Other than the public comment and review stage the EAC would not have the opportunity to get in on the permit process. Mr. Evans is willing to share the reports with the EAC. Ms. Zebal asked if we are to go ahead with this do we have any idea if this facility is less than or equal to the cost of the original site. Mr. Evans said that this is one of the requirements and we expect that the operating costs will be less expensive and the building costs will be less expensive due to a smaller footprint. The plan is to burn Frederick bio solid sludge at the plant and that will also produce heat.

NEW BUSINESS: - Mr. Tom Devilbiss, Deputy Director of Planning - Sewage Sludge Permit Applications.

Ms. Gilden reported that several emails were received about permits for sewage sludge application. We have an opportunity to ask for a public hearing which is due August 24th.

Overview – Several different types of sewage sludge (SS) permits can be issued: one is a land application to apply to farmland in Carroll and the other is for reuse as a transport permit from one facility to another. An example of the transport permit is the application received to transport SS from a plant in Keymar to the Waste Water Treatment Plant in Freedom. We have been directed to forward to the EAC to review. The logistics problem is that the County usually doesn't get them until late in the process and it's tough to make the deadline for requesting permits. It's been directed to get the application to the EAC as soon as

possible in order for the EAC to make the decision whether or not to request a hearing. Normally at staff level they look at applications and if near a municipality they request a hearing. Vary rarely does anyone show up. For a true rural area with true agricultural preservation land around them a lot of times a hearing is not requested. If multiple applications are received by MDE, they can be combined into one hearing. The basic components of an application are information of location, where sludge applied, chemical make up of sludge and certification of nutrient management plan had been developed and implemented on the farms. Tom Devilbiss never known one that has not been granted but they may alter some portion, such as in increasing the setback. It is a preferred reuse of sludge in Maryland.

Discussion - Ellen Cutsail questioned the last hearing and how it was advertised for in Union Bridge. It is advertised in the legal notices under land management administration in the Carroll County times as an informational meeting. There are two applications before the EAC, one transport and one land application permit. Ms. Gilden asked what the EAC is being asked to do. Cindy Parr said that the EAC reviews of the sewage sludge permit applications and request public informational meetings to bring more attention to this. There is a 3 week window and this may not correspond with the EAC meeting times. Cindy Parr will get copies of the requests and can walk them through to the EAC in a timely manner. Typically the public meetings are conducted by MDE (Maryland Department of the Environment). The EAC needs to figure out multiple ways to advertise it if there is to be a public meeting. We need an informational meeting on sewage sludge and the process of permitting. This should be an agenda item for a future meeting with the Chief of Staff and his vision of how this will play out. There is a task force at the state level looking at sewage sludge legislation, including notice of surrounding residents. The County has no control over the issuance of the permit, which goes to MDE as well as MDE determines the hearing site based on resident convenience. It is requested that the EAC have someone from MDE speak to the EAC (agenda item). Although a hearing is not typically required for a transport application, only for a land application, ***a letter of request for hearing by the 24th for the land permit hearing and the 25th for the transport hearing to be submitted by Tom Devilbiss.*** Ms. Cutsail asked how many years the permit is good for. The permit term changes, they are good for so many years and then they have to let the ground rest.

COUNCIL MEMBERS – Issues for future consideration

- Ongoing Pathways debate to the degree that we could be helpful in the understanding. The public doesn't really understand the implications. Cindy Parr stated that the Planning and Zoning commission is conducting workshops with the next one being 8/20. The Plan is still in the review process. Ms. Cutsail requested that the Maryland Department of Planning talk to the EAC about smart growth and Ms. Gilden thought that this may be possible for October Mr. Devilbiss said the document is not open for public input now. The Planning and Zoning Commission is editing and revising the plan. The Commission is a diverse group of people. The Board of Commissioners has not been given the plan yet.
- Brian Rhoten mentioned that Manchester Valley High School is considered a green school and the EAC has been offered a tour of the school. The Construction Director from the Board of Education said that he would come to speak to the EAC about the school as well as inviting Neil Ridgely, Carroll County Sustainability Manager.
- Dan Andrews would like for the Council think about making a recommendation to get Maria Myers additional help for the recycling program. Ms. Cindy Parr stated that the County is on a hiring freeze and can not create a new position. Mr. Dan Andrews suggested reassigning individuals or hiring a consultant.

- Ms. Cutsail suggested that municipalities come in to meet with Maria Myers to work with her on recycling, maybe on a volunteer basis. An evening meeting may be more adopting to municipalities.

ANNOUNCEMENTS –

Ms. Robyn Gildea announced the next regularly scheduled meeting, an **afternoon** meeting, will be held **Tuesday, September 8, 2009, at 3:00 pm** in Room 003/004

ADJOURN: MOTION NO. 89-09: Motion made by David Pyatt, seconded by Dan Andrews to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 5:31 p.m. Motion carried.



Please inform the secretary if you are unable to attend

Environmental and Resource Protection\ECO Files\EAC\MINUTES\2009\August 11, 2009