

# Recycling Public Advisory Council

## DRAFT Meeting Minutes for Wednesday April 22, 2015

Location: DELDOT Dover Administration Building, Farmington/Felton Conference Room  
800 Bay Road, Dover, DE 19901

Members present: BJ Vinton, Chairman (CSWSC)  
Paul Bickhart (Recycling Industry)  
Dick Cecil (DE Association of Counties)  
Marianne Cinaglia (DeIEASI)  
Kelly Davis (Educator, DelTech-Owens Campus)  
Stan Mills (League of Local Governments)  
Brian Nixon (DE Chamber of Commerce)  
Mike Parkowski (DSWA)  
Coralie Pryde (League of Women Voters)  
Adam Webster (Restaurant Industry)  
Julie Miro Wenger (Del. Food Industry Council)  
Bob Ziegler (Waste Hauler Industry)

Members absent: Marjorie Crofts (DNREC) George Danneman (Soda Bev Ind.)  
Michael Fusca (Alcohol Bev Ind.) Brenna Goggin (Delaware Nature Soc.)

Non-members present: Marshall Budin (DNREC) Terry McBride (Burns & McBride)  
Rob Clemens (Goodwill) Kimberly Jarrell (DNREC)  
Nancy Marker (DNREC) Bill Miller (DNREC)  
Jim Short (DNREC) Paul Sparks (Cascade Engineering)

### **Call to Order, Introductions**

BJ Vinton called the meeting to order at approximately 1:30PM

**Public Comments** - None

### **Approval of March 25, 2015 Meeting Minutes**

The March 2015 meeting minutes were unanimously approved as written.

### **Universal Recycling Grants-Cycle 6: Funding Recommendations to DNREC**

Marshall Budin summarized the grant application review and scoring process. In brief, 16 applications requesting \$1,156,619.00 in funding were received by the close of the grant application period on March 3, 2015. Application packages were prepared and emailed on March 27, 2015 to Members of the RPAC Recycling Grants Scoring Sub-Committee (SSC) comprised of six (6) RPAC Members (i.e. Paul Bickhart, Kelly Davis, Michael Fusca, Stan Mills, Coralie Pryde, and BJ Vinton) and three (3) members representing the DNREC (i.e. Marshall Budin, Bill Miller, and Jim Short). Seven (7) members of the SSC met to discuss applicant rank, average scores, requested funding, along with project details. The SSC agreed upon a preliminary list of suggested funding amounts and ranking for discussion among the full RPAC.

Following discussion of the recommendations of the SSC at today's meeting (summarized in the attachment, '*Universal Recycling Grant & Loan Program, Cycle 6 -Requested & Recommended Funding Summary*') a motion was presented by Stan Mills to award eleven (11) grants in the amounts noted subject to the conditions noted, seconded by Dick Cecil resulting in the approval of the motion by ten (10) members with two (2) members (Julie Miro Wenger and Mike Parkowski) abstaining.

Moving forward with the notification process, M. Budin will draft notification emails (full, partial, and no funding) and draft the project work scopes incorporating the noted and approved conditions. A status report will be offered at the May RPAC meeting. Related to the notification process, Brian Nixon expressed concern that the 'no funding' notification email lacks specific reasons for the decision or suggestions on how to improve future application submittals. M. Budin stated that applicants that didn't receive funding are encouraged to contact him by phone to discuss the reasons supporting the Department's decision and are further encouraged to seek technical assistance in advance of preparing another recycling grant application for submittal.

Stan Mills suggested DNREC do some more analysis of oyster shell recovery by the Partnership for the Delaware Estuary approved for funding in Cycle 6 and the Center for Inland Bays (which received funding in Cycle 4) before the next grant offering in the event that another entity applies to fund a similar project. BJ Vinton agreed, adding that sometimes new projects with an inherently higher level of risk have sometimes been funded more aggressively to seed projects that may result in similar applications from other entities; however, the outcomes of the funded projects, whether positive or negative, will be factored in to the evaluation of future applications which will receive a higher degree of scrutiny.

Julie Miro Wenger - responding to an earlier anecdotal observation that an average score of 60 has historically been the dividing line separating funded and un-funded applications - expressed concern that the current grant review and approval process, as described in the Grant Guidance document, centers on a numeric score which may result in members of the general public and unsuccessful grant applicants to erroneously conclude that the average score is the primary decision making factor. She elaborated that this could potentially result in greater scrutiny of the scoring process and trigger a FOIA request from an applicant whose application was not approved for funding. Moving forward, she suggested that the current system be reviewed and whatever process is decided on (unanimous post scoring vote system, or post discussion rescoring) should be explained so members of the general public and applicants that didn't receive funding understand that the numeric score is not the sole factor taken into account when evaluating an application for funding.

The Chair agreed that the process should be documented to make clear that average scores are calculated prior to discussion and thus represent preliminary scores. Further, that preliminary average scores serve as a starting point for discussion which in some instances has resulted in Member's changing their assessment of a particular grant application based on new information learned through the vetting process. He asked DNREC staff to revise the Guidance Document to these points for Council consideration before the next grant cycle. He also reminded the Council that the funding awards are ultimately DNREC's own decision, and that the Council's scoring or recommendations are simply advisory.

### **Recycling Market Update**

P. Bickhart said that high grade paper went down about \$10.00/ ton while other commodities stayed about the same as last month. Mike Parkowski said the single stream is still negative with Sussex County haulers paying about \$35.00/ton and \$8.00/ton being charged in NCC. M. Parkowski shared information from the NERC meeting indicating a strong correlation of oil prices to all secondary material prices not just plastic concluding that if the low crude oil price trend continues, single stream will be down for a long time, reducing margins with the implication that some MRF's in the region may suspend operations.

### **Old/New Business**

Responding to a question from Marianne Cinaglia about progress towards meeting the waste diversion goals in the Universal Recycling Law, J. Short noted that the combined recycling rate for the residential and commercial sectors for CY2013 is 41.9%. The report for CY2014 will show whether the 50% diversion goal is achieved. He said that 2014 is the first year that the commercial sector was mandated to

implement recycling programs. To what degree the statutory requirement contributes towards making up the 8% difference to meet the goal remains to be seen. J. Short noted that the 2015 Waste Characterization study will inform us of materials that aren't being recycled at as high of a rate as they could which will give us some focus on areas and materials to better address. M. Parkowski said that the study will start this summer. BJ Vinton added that although the waste characterization study can help us to learn or re-learn that there are still high value materials being disposed to inform on where to focus our efforts, if no clear areas of focus develop, maybe we should consider focusing on educating the public on how to properly recycle to reduce MRF residue and increase commodity product quality.

The Chair touched briefly on an Education and Outreach idea to work with haulers to develop an awards recognition program for businesses and communities to highlight outstanding waste diversion initiatives noting that this would be a way to get groups involved, stimulate discussion, and get some attention. He deferred further discussion for the next Council meeting.

Regarding the renewed and reappointed Council seats, the Chair said that the Governor's Office prefers all appointments be processed at one time and the lack of a new member is holding up the process. There is one candidate for the position but the Chair would like to provide the Governor's Office with multiple candidates. He restated his request to Council Members to offer nominee suggestions in the general public category.

The Chair briefed Council Members on his understanding of a draft, unnumbered bill to impose a 10¢ fee on plastic bags split 50/50 with the retailer and the DNREC recycling fund. Representative Deborah Hudson and Representative Gerald Brady in the House and Senator Harris McDowell and Senator David McBride in the Senate have been mentioned as sponsors. J. Miro Wenger noted that the draft is substantial, written in language, proposed effective 2017, with the 10¢ fee applicable to both plastic and paper bags. The At Store Recycling program will continue going forward. She added that originally the 10¢ fee was proposed to stay with the retailer but this wasn't acceptable to the retail sector which suggested the split between the retailer and DNREC recycling fund. BJ Vinton stated that 10¢ is very ambitious and 2¢ may be sufficient to reduce consumer demand for disposable bags. J. Miro Wenger responded that there is a lot of expense on the retail side and it's not worth doing for 2¢. Other municipalities that have implemented bag fees have found that there is a fee level that needs to be achieved to make it worthwhile for the retailers. She emphasized that the goal is to achieve a significant reduction in bag consumption, not to keep the same amount of bags in play. To do that you have to charge at least 5¢ and at 10¢ you see a higher reduction. S. Mills asked if someone will monitor when the bill is numbered and forward the link. The Chair agreed and deferred further discussion to the May meeting.

S. Mills inquired if any thought should be given to Cycle 7 of the recycling grants. The Chair said that there is feedback for a longer grant application period, suggesting announcing the grant offering after the next Annual Report to give us an area of focus.

**Additional Public Comments - None**

**Next Meeting**

Wednesday, May 27, 2015, 1:30 – 3:30PM, DELDOT Dover Administration Bldg.

**Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned at approximately 3:20PM

Attachment 1

Universal Recycling Grant & Loan Program, Cycle 6 -Requested & Recommended Funding Summary							
Application Period Ending March 3, 2015							
Applicant ↓	Preliminary		Requested Funding	Recommended Funding	Project Summary	Prev Funding (Y/N)	RPAC Discussion
	Rank	Avg					
Red Clay Consolidated School District	1	85.4	\$56,215.65	\$56,215.65	District wide recycling program - Interior containers, material handling equipment.	N	Full funding
University of Delaware Sharp Campus	2	79.0	\$5,985.00	\$5,985.00	Implementation of "Zero Waste" program at Coast Day /Expansion of Sharp Campus recycling program - Containers, E&O services and materials.	N	Full funding
Cape Henlopen High School	3	78.0	\$8,316.50	\$8,316.50	School wide recycling program (Interior and exterior) w/ waste reduction component (reusable cafeteria trays) - Containers, liner bags, plastic trays.	N	Full funding subject to no reimbursement of waste bins.
Capital School District	4	77.6	\$15,276.00	\$15,276.00	District wide recycling program - Recycling dumpsters at all locations; interior containers being provided by WM - no charge - per state hauling contract	N	Full funding
Bright Fields, Inc.	5	75.3	\$1,978.74	\$1,111.74	On-site composting program - Composters, cart, interior organics collection bins, supplies.	N	Partial funding limited to reimbursement of one (1) of each composter
Apoquinimink SD	6	74.7	\$6,993.59	\$6,993.59	District wide recycling program - Material handling equipment only; interior containers being provided by Waste Management(WM) - no charge - per state hauling contract.	N	Full funding - Concern expressed about WM providing recycling containers and service to schools receiving waste removal service from another vendor.
Laurel School District	7	73.8	\$6,635.89	\$6,635.89	District wide recycling program - Interior containers, material handling equipment.	N	Full funding subject to submittal of budget price quotes.
Town of Fenwick Island	8	73.8	\$2,689.00	\$2,689.00	Beach recycling program expansion - Larger capacity recycling carts, E&O services and promotional materials, redeployment of replaced containers to residential recycling collection.	N	Full funding
Partnership for the Delaware Estuary, Inc.	9	63.4	\$24,179.49	\$12,029.49	Oyster shell recovery from restaurants & wholesalers in NCC to be consolidated and cured at a TBD location for oyster bed restoration at TBD bay locations - Lease pick up truck, buckets, bins, E&O staff, design, supplies, promotional materials.	N	Partial funding- Truck lease ineligible. Reported outcomes of the Inland Bays Cycle 4 grant funded oyster shell recovery project (20 tons annualized) presented as a benchmark. Consensus that this is an innovative project, funded more aggressively initially but similar projects will be looked at with greater scrutiny as performance and diversion outcomes are weighed against realizing project goals.
Delaware Plastic Pollution Action Coalition	10	60.9	\$20,126.28	\$0.00	Reduction of land sourced marine debris pollution through increased recycling engaging 4 school communities to increase recycling through focused E&O effort - E&O services, labor, promotional materials (reusable bags, poster contest, calendars, etc.)	N	No funding - Focus on mitigating the deleterious impact of fugitive bags on land and in marine environments is peripheral to the core purpose of the grant program - funding recycling infrastructure, affecting increase in diversion of recyclables.
St. Andrews School	11	60.0	\$8,186.00	\$0.00	Restroom hand dryer installation to reduce consumption and disposal of paper towels - Hand dryer purchase and installation, E&O materials.	N	No funding - Although environmental advantages are evident, the efficiency of grant funding is low relative to diversion of paper towels from the waste stream over the hand dryers service life.
Geller Associates Georgetown Manor Apartments	12	59.6	\$16,850.00	\$5,285.97	Multi family residential recycling program serving over 1,000 residents in 419 unit apartment complex - Interior recycling bins, exterior recycling collection dumpsters, E&O supplies and delivery labor.	N	Partial funding limited to apartment recycling bins and educational materials. Funding of future requests for capital equipment for multi-family single stream recycling may be ineligible in future grant cycles.
Clean Green Horizons, LLC	13	58.7	\$148,550.00	\$0.00	Composting of pre-consumer food waste generated at Cape Henlopen High School / Production of vegetables and herbs in compost growing media / E&O component centered on schools and disadvantaged communities in SC - Composters, growing units, containers, E&O services, staff labor, supplies, materials.	N	No funding - Project cost very high relative to the estimated weight of diverted food scraps.
East Pointe Associates, LLC	14	58.0	\$5,322.22	\$4,868.22	Multi family residential recycling program serving 634 residents in 216 unit apartment complex - Interior recycling bins, E&O services, supplies and delivery labor.	N	Partial funding limited to apartment recycling bins and educational materials. Funding of future requests for capital equipment for multi-family single stream recycling may be ineligible in future grant cycles.
Sussex County Habitat for Humanity	15	54.8	\$47,000.00	\$0.00	Expansion of salvageable material recovery from buildings slated for demolition or refurbishment - Purchase of a used straight truck.	Y	No funding - A delivery truck was previously funded. Grant funds are directed at seeding projects that grow to sustain themselves, not as a dedicated funding source.
Layaou Landscaping	16	39.9	\$395,000.00	\$0.00	Land clearing and yard waste processing into mulch, compost, and firewood - Purchase of processing, material handling, and transport equipment.	N	No funding - Yard waste management addressed through landfill ban; no measurable increase in diversion will occur and therefore no benefit will be realized by funding this project.
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>\$769,304</b>	<b>\$125,407</b>			