

**DRAFT MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF  
HAMILTON COUNTY RECYCLING AND SOLID WASTE DISTRICT  
POLICY COMMITTEE  
November 19, 2015**

**DATE:** November 19, 2015

**TIME:** 1:30 p.m.

**PLACE:** Hamilton County Department of Environmental Services  
250 William Howard Taft Road - First Floor  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45219

**PRESENT:** **Policy Committee Members**  
Elizabeth Bruggeman, General Interest Member  
Tim Ingram, Hamilton County Public Health Representative  
Jeff Luehrmann, Generator Representative  
Sue Magness, Largest Municipality Representative  
Sophie Manaster, Student Representative  
Todd Portune, County Commissioner, Chair  
Larry Riddle, Ex-Officio Member  
Tom Turchiano, Public Member

**Staff**

Michelle Balz, Assistant Solid Waste Manager  
Holly Christmann, Director  
Ali Khodadad, Operations Manager  
Cher Mohring, Program Specialist  
Susan Schumacher, Assistant Solid Waste Specialist, Clerk  
Catherine Walsh, Business Outreach Coordinator

**Others in Attendance**

Robin Anderson, Cincinnati Health Department  
Chuck DeJonckheere, Hamilton County Public Health  
Katie Evans, Best Way Disposal  
Larry Falkin, Office of Environment and Sustainability – City of Cincinnati  
Dean Ferrier, Rumpke  
Matthew Hittle, Ohio EPA  
Greg Kesterman, Hamilton County Public Health  
Ernie Stall, Ohio EPA

**ABSENT:** **Policy Committee Members**  
Dennis Deters, Township Representative, Vice-Chair

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Portune called the meeting to order at 1:33 p.m. and welcomed everyone. Mr. Portune congratulated all of the award winners from Tuesday's 11<sup>th</sup> Annual Recycling Awards Ceremony.

Mr. Portune stated that staff did a great job.

Ms. Christmann thanked Mr. Portune, Ms. Bruggeman, Mr. Ingram, and Mr. Riddle for attending.

**2. CLERK'S REPORT**

**A. Approval of Minutes – September 17, 2015 Policy Committee Meeting**

Mr. Portune asked if there were any questions or comments on the minutes as drafted and circulated. Hearing no questions or comments, entertained a motion to approve the September 17, 2015 minutes as drafted. Mr. Luehrmann motioned to approve; Ms. Bruggeman seconded. All were in favor and the motion was approved.

**B. Additions to the Agenda**

There were no additions to the agenda.

**3. DISTRICT REVENUE UPDATES/ANALYSIS**

Ms. Christmann stated that Attachment B showed revenue through September 2015 compared to September 2014 and it has increased slightly by about \$60,000. The District is projecting \$2.2 million in revenue for 2015.

Mr. Portune asked if this increase would affect any recommendations for the 2016 budget. Ms. Christmann stated that staff would have to wait to see if it was truly \$2.2 million but it will not change the 2016 budget.

Mr. Portune entertained a motion to approve the revenue report. Ms. Magness moved; Mr. Turchiano seconded. All were in favor and the motion was approved.

Mr. Portune stated that he needed to leave for a few minutes.

**4. POLICY ITEMS**

**A. Solid Waste Management Plan Update – Special Needs Analysis**

Ms. Christmann reiterated the Plan Update process. The last several months, staff has been focusing on gathering all of the reference year data (2014) which is now complete. These include recycling tonnages, landfill tonnages, revenue, and expenses. Staff and the Policy Committee have also been working hard on writing, reading, and making comments on the strategic analyses and today is the last day for the analyses.

Ms. Christmann stated that the rest of this year and in January, 2016, staff will draft what programs will be included in the Plan Update along with the revenue structures and budgets which should be finalized in late January, if not by March, 2016. At the same time, the 15-year projections on how much waste will be generated, how much will be recycled, composted, and landfilled with the goal to have the draft Plan to Ohio EPA by late summer, 2016.

Ms. Christmann stated that Ohio EPA has 45-days to review the draft Plan and make comments back to the District. Once this information is received, staff will make any of their required changes with the goal to have the Policy Committee to adopt the Plan in the summer of 2017.

Ms. Christmann stated that once the Policy Committee adopts the Plan, it will then go out for vote to all the political jurisdictions with a goal to submit a final Plan to Ohio EPA no later than the end of 2017. Ms. Christmann stated that the goal during this whole time is to have the new Plan go into effect by 2018.

Ms. Christmann introduced Ernie Stall and Matt Hittle from Ohio EPA and stated that they have both been helping staff tremendously on the Plan Update process. The format for the Plan Update is new so they have been a great resource.

Ms. Christmann stated that in terms of the strategic analyses, many have been completed with Special Programs, Economic Incentives, and Outreach and Marketing being discussed today. The Policy Committee will receive, by email, the Diversion Analysis and Data Collection Analysis. These analyses are more inward

looking and there not much to discuss from a policy perspective and these will be emailed by the end of the year.

Ms. Christmann stated that the goals of the analyses are for an intensive, internal review of all District programs and for the Policy Committee to provide direction to staff on what programs the Committee would like to see in the new Plan so feedback is crucial to staff.

Ms. Christmann stated that the Special Needs Analysis is a really fluid one depending on the solid waste district. Solid waste districts have the authority to fund programs that are not necessarily related to the goals of Ohio's Solid Waste Plan and those two programs for the District are Health Department Funding and Litter Collection and these will be discussed today.

Ms. Christmann stated that Hamilton County is fortunate that both the City and County Health Departments are approved Health Departments which means they are responsible for issuing facility licenses, inspecting the solid waste facilities, and initiating enforcement of those facilities, if needed.

Ms. Christmann stated that this provides a local presence in Hamilton County to ensure that its solid waste facilities are operating according to Ohio's solid waste regulations.

The presentation can be viewed here:

[http://www.hamiltoncountyrecycles.org/uploads/pdfs/WhoWeAre/PolicyComm/2015/11-19-15/Special\\_Needs\\_Presentation](http://www.hamiltoncountyrecycles.org/uploads/pdfs/WhoWeAre/PolicyComm/2015/11-19-15/Special_Needs_Presentation)

After the presentation, Ms. Christmann asked the Committee the questions at the end and asked for feedback. Ms. Magness stated that she liked the idea of having an Environmental Crimes Taskforce rather than just enabling. The Committee concurred on eliminating the litter program.

**B. Solid Waste Management Plan Update –Economic Incentive Analysis**

Ms. Balz presented the Economic Incentive Analysis to the Committee which can be found here:

[http://www.hamiltoncountyrecycles.org/uploads/pdfs/WhoWeAre/PolicyComm/2015/11-19-15/Economic\\_Incentive\\_Presentation.pdf](http://www.hamiltoncountyrecycles.org/uploads/pdfs/WhoWeAre/PolicyComm/2015/11-19-15/Economic_Incentive_Presentation.pdf)

Mr. Portune stated that he and Ms. Christmann have spoken about alternatives at Metropolitan Sewer District in dealing with their waste sludge that are available today or that may be available in the future and asked Ms. Christmann if the District has considered how to try to marry, where appropriate, what is being done in the District dealing with difficult to manage waste streams with where MSD is going with respect to alternatives for dealing with their difficult to manage waste products that right now are being trucked to the landfill.

The Committee briefly discussed.

Ms. Christmann stated that when the idea was proposed of including yard trimmings into the RRI, the City of Cincinnati had some comments and staff invited Mr. Falkin to address the Committee.

Mr. Falkin thanked the Committee for their time and stated that the City of Cincinnati likes the RRI program and appreciates the resources that come with it but like all programs, it is not perfect and so he would like to voice some of his concerns.

Mr. Falkin stated that a concern with the RRI is an equity problem that a disproportionate share of the RRI goes to affluent communities and a much smaller share, whether it is on a per ton basis, per person basis, etc. goes to more disadvantaged communities. Mr. Falkin stated that the City has thought about this and has some thoughts.

Mr. Falkin stated that in response to an invitation from the District, Cincinnati City Manager has sent a letter to the District responding to some of the proposals that have been floated for the new Solid Waste Plan.

Mr. Falkin stated that Cincinnati is opposed to modifying the RRI program to take into account yardwaste and there are a couple of reasons for this.

Mr. Falkin stated that a lot of yard trimmings are currently managed at the point of generation, e.g. mulching mowers, backyard composting, etc., and the City thinks this is the best method of managing. The idea of incentivizing people to gather them and cart them off site is not necessarily a positive step. The City thinks it is very important to keep the yardwaste out of the landfills as the City runs a curbside collection program to keep that material out of the landfills but the idea that we are going to reward people for putting it at the curb when they are currently just hitting it with a mulching mower might not be progress.

Mr. Falkin stated that related to this is the concern that this change would intensify the equity problem because, in general, the communities that have a lot of yardwaste are the communities that have large yards and the more affluent communities are more likely to have somebody collecting and bagging it up as opposed to leaving them on-site.

Mr. Falkin stated that there is both the environmental and equity side of the City's concern with the yardwaste program.

Mr. Falkin stated that the final thing that is addressed in the City Manager's letter is identifying food waste as a very high priority for the City of Cincinnati. The discussion that Commissioner Portune and Ms. Christmann were just having about finding an outlet for food waste, supporting the creation of an anaerobic digester facility or some other technology that is able to create a destination for food waste where currently, there is not one available would be a high priority for the City and would be a great thing to be able to accomplish.

Mr. Falkin stated that one of the things he would float as a suggestion and this is not a City recommendation and is not in the City Manager's letter but is just a thought is that what is observed in the City is that equal efforts of a municipality to promote recycling or to provide recycling services are not always met with an equal response by the residents.

Mr. Falkin stated that he had copies of a neighborhood by neighborhood recycling participation chart and all fifty City neighborhoods have the same program, marketing, and access to recycling yet there are some neighborhoods that have 80% + participation rates and neighborhoods that have 40% and less participation rates. By enlarge, the higher participating communities are more affluent and the lower participating neighborhoods are less affluent even with the same recycling and marketing program in place. There is just certain demographics within the community that are more predisposed to do it and other demographics that are less predisposed to do it.

Mr. Falkin stated that with equal effort and technology, communities will not achieve equal results. If instead of rewarding based on recycling or diversion rate, they are rewarded based on the program the community has in place. For example, the community that has a pay-as-you-throw program would be at the highest tier, the next tier down would be a curbside recycling program that everyone is eligible for without paying extra for it and then the lowest tier would be communities that only have a drop-off program and subscription curbside.

Mr. Falkin stated that this way, every community that is running a curbside recycling program will get the same payment per ton. There will still be some disparities because the poorer communities will not get the same number of tons but at least they will get the same number of dollars per ton despite their lower participation rate.

Mr. Falkin stated that this is one way that the equity problem could be addressed and still tier it to reward communities that make more effort. Mr. Portune asked for clarification if under this approach the pay-as-you-throw programs would receive highest priority. Mr. Falkin stated yes. Mr. Portune asked if this works to reward or continue to perpetuate the inequity imbalance. In some respects, this leads to rewarding based on ability to pay as well and asked if this was correct.

Mr. Falkin stated that it does, yet it is acknowledged that pay-as-you-throw is the state of the art system for driving diversion, recycling participation, and reducing the amount of waste going to the landfill. Mr. Portune asked if this was based on a statistical study or what was it based on. Mr. Falkin stated yes. Mr. Portune asked if those studies accounted for income imbalance. Mr. Falkin stated that his answer to this question would be yes and there are several thousand communities across the country that are doing various forms of pay-as-you-throw programs and there are a number of examples of individual communities going from something else to pay-as-you-throw and even from pay-as-you-throw back to something else and as one looks at what the impacts are on trash to landfill, requiring people to pay based on the quantity of trash they generate really does shape behavior.

Mr. Portune stated that he was not arguing what the studies show, what he questions is in the studies, if it is broken down by census track, for example, based on socio-economic criteria do those numbers hold up. Mr. Falkin stated that what he thought would probably make sense would be for his recycling staff and the District to work together and scrutinize that and put together a report for Mr. Portune rather than his off the top of his head response. Mr. Falkin stated that his assumption is that this is the best program but if that is not what the data says then the data should be followed.

Ms. Christmann stated that this exact model was looked at during the last Plan Update and the City of Cincinnati was opposed to this because there is no way the City can do a pay-as-you-throw program with the referendum which states that the City cannot charge for garbage service. Ms. Christmann stated that in general, the communities did not like this because a lot of times and while the District agrees with Mr. Falkin that pay-as-you-throw is the best way to reduce waste on a residential level, getting the elected officials in that community to change the garbage system to a pay-as-you-throw would not be successful.

Mr. Ingram asked if the referendum was part of the City's charter. Ms. Magness stated yes.

Mr. Falkin stated that he thought Ms. Christmann was right in that the willingness of communities to embrace pay-as-you-throw depends a lot on demographics and will have the same equity issues he discussed earlier.

Mr. Portune stated that he would be interested in seeing the litter statistics in those communities. His intuition suggests that people will get rid of their garbage but not necessarily by paying someone to pick it up.

Mr. Ingram thanked Mr. Falkin and stated that he appreciated him bringing these ideas to the Committee. Mr. Ingram stated that when the studies were being looked at from across the country asked if the disposal rates mattered and stated that Hamilton County has traditionally had the lowest landfill disposal rates and he would think this would come into play into the variable as well as the success of the programs when looking at pay-as-you-throw. Mr. Falkin stated that for the resident, the landfill disposal charge is not particularly relative because the resident does not pay that; it depends upon how that landfill charge gets passed through to them or if it gets passed through to them. In the City of Cincinnati, trash is free to the resident and is paid for out of the City's general fund so if Rumpke's fee doubled, the resident would not see it at all. If the residents are paying a monthly charge for trash and if that monthly charge is tied to it, it would depend on if the resident actually gets a financial benefit.

Ms. Christmann stated that she thinks the City has made some very good comments and staff has met with both Mr. Falkin and Ms. Magness about that. Ms. Christmann stated that Mr. Falkin was right in that the more affluent the community in general, the more recycling participation, which is nationwide. This is one reason

why Ms. Balz presented the idea of taking some of the RRI budget and focusing it really hard on the lower performing communities.

Ms. Christmann stated that the District does this now with a very small budget and it has been successful so to spend much more time in a community tailoring the program to their community needs is going to depend on the community of what that assistance looks like. Ms. Christmann stated that this is one way to help address the issue of what is being proposed in the analysis.

Ms. Bruggeman stated that the District would be taking money out of what goes back to communities and asked how much money was being suggested and asked if this amount would be a percentage. Ms. Christmann stated that over the next couple of months, all of the feedback that has been received from the Committee and starting to put money to that so at this point, staff is not prepared to share what the amount would be.

Ms. Magness asked what the range would be to make this effective. Ms. Christmann stated that depending on the community that the District works with, what their needs are, etc. and gave an example using assisting with the bid specs for Colerain and Springfield Townships and stated that this was about \$10,000 but another community may not need that much or they may need \$50,000. Ms. Christmann stated that at minimum, the District would not want to go under \$50,000 for that type of program.

Ms. Bruggeman asked how the communities would be chosen or would it be based on the community's willingness. Ms. Christmann stated that it would be a partnership with the community and this is how it is dealt with now with the smaller program of the target communities.

Mr. Turchiano stated that as staff works with the communities and is finished asked if there was any buy-in for that community to keep it sustainable. Ms. Christmann stated that the potential new program would be longer than how staff currently works with the target communities now and it could be a one to three year timeframe of working with these communities.

Mr. Turchiano asked there was any way to get any hardcore commitment out of them. Mr. Turchiano stated that he just wants to make sure that these communities are really engaged and really want to make improvement rather than staff spending time, money and a lot of effort to make something happen.

Ms. Christmann stated that in the past, Ms. Balz worked extensively with the City of Sharonville to do contracted curbside recycling and that was Ms. Balz time and that is sustainable from here on out. They have a contract for service, it is financially stable for them and this was a classic way staff likes to help communities. It is engrained in the community and they take ownership of it and the results can be seen by the recycling tonnages increasing.

Mr. Ingram stated that this type of assistance is really important as some communities do not have the infrastructure and staff are experts at this type of thing. Mr. Ingram asked who the target list would be and asked if this could be discussed. What five communities would be chosen? Ms. Christmann stated that in general, staff is thinking of communities with less than 10% recycling rate and asked Ms. Balz if she had a rough idea of some of these communities. Ms. Balz stated that the lowest performers are the Village of Addyston, Elmwood Place, the Village of Cleves, Delhi Township, Lincoln Heights, North College Hill, Silverton, and Whitewater Township.

Mr. Riddle stated that the District's goals all the time is to spend the dollars where there is participation to increase the recycling rate but traditionally the District has funded programs to get the best "bang for the buck" and he is wondering, as this moves forward to dilute the dollar that is being spent to get the higher gains how that process would work to bring the lower achievers up to where staff would like to see them without diluting the District's higher achievers.

Mr. Portune stated that one cannot have that discussion without including the issue of sustainability in there. The higher achievers, the District hopes, after so much time, after a certain point, can take care of themselves and those communities are vested in it, they believe in it, it is part of the social fabric of living in that community is all about, it is engrained in their psyche, their elected leadership and citizens are in support and so for example, there is a community that has a 70% participation rate so would we be better served in continuing to invest in that or are we better served by investing in a community that lacks that infrastructure and has no sustainability at all in which their participation would be at an 8% or below rate and with some early money, one could double that participation or greater and then with working with them over time, have them build up to a larger percentage rate and did not think this would be a bad investment.

Mr. Portune stated that some of the communities are lower producing and they lack the resources and this is the equity issue that Mr. Falkin brought forward that needs to be considered. Mr. Portune stated that the District's support cannot just go to those communities that have their act together and believes this does a disservice to the overall mission of the District as a matter of policy.

Mr. Riddle stated that the community must want to do it and everybody has equal opportunity, ever since the program was started, to apply but if they choose not to apply, it is kind of hard to force this. If they could be encouraged, with a little bit of support and help to bring them along, would be great.

Ms. Bruggeman stated that she felt as if the question of "should the District continue spending almost half of its budget on residential programs?" had not been discussed.

Ms. Bruggeman stated that there is a huge opportunity in the commercial business sector and the District virtually has no budget to promote those programs. She stated that if there was any way to take money away from the RRI and put towards commercial business programs would yield huge recycling increases.

Ms. Christmann stated that the RRI program has been in place since 1993 and the dollars have fluctuated between \$700,000 - \$1,050,000. The interesting thing about the residential programs is that the communities are the ones that vote on the Plan; not the businesses which needs to be kept in mind.

Ms. Magness stated that those political leaders do care about their businesses. Ms. Christmann agreed. In terms of who landfills the most it is commercial, residential, and industrial.

Mr. Turchiano stated that if you look at some of the larger producers on the industrial side, they do have mechanisms to recycle large amounts and they get a payback for, for example, cardboard. For residents, there is not a mechanism like that. Mr. Luehrmann stated that those mechanisms only affect certain markets.

Mr. Portune stated that Ms. Bruggeman made a good point and feels that the Committee agrees that the commercial office side of things is the great untapped area of potential. In the wake of that, other than cutting into the residential side of things, asked if there was any other answer on how this is tapped into and promote greater recycling. Ms. Christmann stated that there is a potential for a fee increase. Mr. Portune asked if this was the only answer. Ms. Christmann stated that there were other programs that the District may be able to eliminate such as the litter program, yardwaste drop-off sites, household hazardous waste, etc. that this is what will be brought to the Committee in January.

Ms. Magness stated that the businesses programs were just the bar and restaurant and recycling at work. Ms. Christmann agreed and what has been presented in previous meetings with the business programs is what is really needed is more marketing to let businesses know and that translates into additional staff.

Mr. Riddle asked if all of the commercial recycling was being captured and is the form that is being sent adequate to allow the commercial or industrial to document what they are currently doing. Ms. Christmann

asked if Mr. Riddle was referring to the commercial and industrial surveys. Mr. Riddle stated yes. Ms. Christmann stated no because it was a voluntary survey so not every business or industry is responding.

Mr. Portune stated that the numbers there are low and staff has acknowledged that they are low. Ms. Christmann stated that they are low compared to what is probably actually happening. Mr. Portune asked if staff knew what the range was in which the underestimating of the correct amount is occurring. Ms. Christmann stated on the industrial side, a good year for recycling surveys is a 30% response rate so one can see how much is being missed.

The Committee discussed why county recycling tonnages cannot be estimates.

Mr. Portune asked Ms. Christmann if solid waste districts in the state have raised this issue and have ever attempted to engage the director or the agency on addressing this issue. Ms. Christmann stated that on estimating recyclables, not that she is aware of but the District has sought help and Ohio EPA is giving it on trying to get better data for the surveying efforts. Mr. Portune asked if she meant better participation on the surveys. Ms. Christmann stated yes and that Ohio EPA has a new partnership with the Ohio Chamber and the Ohio Manufacturers Association to engage the members to let them know what the importance of the surveys means and think that long term, better results will be seen. Mr. Portune stated that there was still a less than 50% response rate.

Mr. Stall stated that when you talk about a response rate though and an industrial survey is looked at, one needs to look at more than just what we are sending the surveys and what you get back. One also needs to look at, for the industrial sector, a lot of time people only get 30% - 40% of the surveys back which is 80% of the employment so districts are receiving the largest ones to begin with and it is very difficult to get any of the smaller ones.

Mr. Portune stated that the focus here is not so much the industrial as it is on the office/commercial end of things. Ms. Christmann stated that the District still knows the top two materials going to landfill are food waste and fiber so there is still a lot of recyclable paper going to landfill from both the residential and commercial sectors. Ms. Christmann stated that Hamilton County could have a 60% recycling rate but still know that the number two material entering landfills is paper.

Mr. Falkin stated that Ms. Balz talked about how effective the RRI program was in enabling the District to collect data so if the District were to create a commercial recycling incentive program, even a small one, it would be a great tool in getting all of those commercial recyclers to report their numbers because there would be a check associated with it.

Mr. Falkin stated that Ms. Christmann's first answer to how this will be paid for without undermining the residential program was to talk about the fee increase. He knows that fee increases are touchy subjects but if he is reading Attachment B correctly, then 65% of the fee increase would be paid by entities out-of-district and out-of-state so if it is a way to bring in money largely from others in order to pay for services to Hamilton County, it may not be as unpalatable as some other kinds of fee increases.

Mr. Riddle discussed fee discrepancies between Ohio and Kentucky, with Kentucky fees being lower and how it affects waste disposal and the District's revenue. Ms. Christmann stated that the fee recommendation will be brought to the January meeting.

Mr. Portune asked if there was anything else a member feels that must be on the record today for the discussion to be complete as it can be today. Mr. Portune stated that it has been a really healthy discussion and a lot of variables have been brought forward. Mr. Portune stated that Ms. Christmann will come forward with options and there will plenty more time to talk about this and debate it.

Mr. Portune stated that he can see a few things that are worth pursuing and believes that there is a way to look at what the District is receiving in terms of survey data and extrapolate from that to a reasonable degree of certainty and with an abundance of caution and conservatism some way to develop a model that will be a more accurate reflection of what is occurring and if this is an administrative decision as opposed to acquiring a new general assembly to act then it might be worth trying to work this up the flag pole and to reach out to other solid waste districts to see if they have an interest in joining in and pursuing that issue with the director of Ohio EPA.

**C. Solid Waste Management Plan Update – Outreach and Marketing Analysis**

Ms. Christmann stated that another appendix of the Plan Update which districts are required to do and is new is all about outreach and marketing. There are a total of four phases but only phase I will be discussed today. Below is the Outreach and Marketing Presentation:

[http://www.hamiltoncountyrecycles.org/uploads/pdfs/WhoWeAre/PolicyComm/2015/11-19-15/Outreach\\_Marketing\\_Presentation.pdf](http://www.hamiltoncountyrecycles.org/uploads/pdfs/WhoWeAre/PolicyComm/2015/11-19-15/Outreach_Marketing_Presentation.pdf)

Mr. Portune asked what the total student population was for Hamilton County. Ms. Christmann stated it was approximately 161,000. Mr. Portune asked how many students the District reached. Ms. Balz stated it was in about 7,000 and in the grade school level, which the District is really focusing on, about 14% was reached.

Ms. Manaster asked how many schools did not recycle. This answer is not known. Ms. Balz stated that with the percentage that is reached, there are a lot of other organizations promoting recycling, composting and waste reduction and these can be found in the report. Ms. Balz stated that it was a requirement to talk about natural resources in the curriculum and believes every third grade teacher incorporates this due to the state standards.

Mr. Riddle stated that relating to the classroom programs, asked if that included cooperation that the District provides or is provided to teachers that carries the District's curriculum. Ms. Balz stated yes. Mr. Riddle stated that this means that the District is really reaching a lot more than just face to face.

Ms. Bruggeman stated that there is so much networking going on once the District comes to a school beyond what the District is doing and a lot more is happening that might not be initiated by the District.

Ms. Magness stated that when the schools have effective, well-ran recycling programs is probably the best investment that can be made because talking about recycling in a school that does not recycle is ridiculous. When kids learn recycling in school, they are more likely to do it at home which creates a ripple effect with that investment. Ms. Magness stated in having the Education position with the District for a number of years, it is really hard because every year there is about 20% totally new people in any school building so having a program run from year to year has to have administrative support and it has to be somebody's job. If these two criteria are not met, she feels that money is being wasted.

Ms. Magness stated that there are about 300 schools in the county and there is probably only 50 that the District can say have a really well-ran program and stated that this would be an area she would not want to cut.

Ms. Bruggeman stated that she thinks staff is targeting the school administration first which is the harder audience but it is needed for the sustainability of the program.

**5. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

**A. 2016 District Priority Grant**

Ms. Christmann stated that the Committee does not need to vote on the grant applications due to the policy of if grant applications are below \$15,000, the Committee does not need to approve and all of the 2016 District Priority Grants applications that staff is recommending funding for are all under \$15,000.

Ms. Christmann stated that descriptions of each project can be found in Attachment F. The organizations the District will be funding are the City of Mt. Healthy, Indian Hill School District, Loveland City Schools, Village of Indian Hill and Walnut Hills High School. All of the projects are focused on school recycling, public recycling in parks, etc.

Ms. Christmann stated that the City of Loveland, Princeton City Schools, and Sycamore Community Schools are not recommended for funding.

A brief discussion ensued regarding the grant program.

Mr. Portune asked if there were any questions. Hearing none, thanked staff for their work.

**B. 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Performance Measures**

Mr. Portune stated that this item was here for informational purposes and asked if there were any questions. Mr. Portune stated that it was always nice to have the results captured in that report and gives the Committee a great impression of all the good work that is being done District-wide.

**C. U.S. EPA Food Waste Initiative**

Ms. Christmann stated that this was briefly mentioned at the last meeting and that U.S. EPA and USDA came out with an announcement to set a food waste reduction goal of 50% by the year 2030. The District has not seen anything concrete come out after that goal was announced of what initiatives will be taken place but wanted the Committee to be aware that this is out there.

Ms. Christmann stated that one item that is in the information that was presented and staff presented to the Committee earlier this year is that the average family of four throws away nearly \$1,500 of uneaten food per year.

Ms. Christmann stated that staff has talked heavily earlier this year about food waste reduction which means not generating it in the first place which is a great start and whether or not a compost facility or anaerobic digester facility are available.

Ms. Christmann stated that staff will keep tabs on this to see if there is anything that the District can latch onto but at this point, have not seen anything concrete in terms of programs or policies.

Ms. Christmann stated that the District is currently working with a school on a food donation program that will be launched shortly and are excited to see the results of that. Mr. Portune asked when this would be launched. Ms. Mohring stated that she heard from the Recycling Coordinator at Amity Elementary and they are piloting the program and have already started doing it. Ms. Mohring stated that she will be looking for feedback from them to see how it is going. Ms. Mohring stated that the Health Department has been consulted about what can and cannot be donated and a space has been set up so once/week the unused food can be taken to a food pantry.

Ms. Christmann stated that the Committee will be kept updated on this as it progresses throughout the school year.

**6. TENTATIVE FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

There were no future agenda items at this time.

**7. POLICY COMMITTEE MEMBERS' COMMENTS**

There were no Policy Committee Member comments at this time.

**8. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Mr. Stall complimented District staff on the work that has been done on the Plan Update analyses.

**9. UPCOMING DISTRICT MEETINGS**

The next Hamilton County Recycling and Solid Waste Policy Committee meeting will be held on Thursday, January 21, 2016. The meeting will begin at 1:30 p.m. at Hamilton County Department of Environmental Services located at 250 William Howard Taft Road - First Floor, Cincinnati, Ohio 45219.

**10. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 3:24 p.m.

**2015 Tipping Fee Receipts**

*Rumpke '15	In District	Out of District	Out of State	Total Tonnage	Total Dollars	Quarterly Tons	Quarterly \$\$
Jan	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	\$0.00		
Feb	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	\$0.00		
Mar	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	\$0.00	0.00	\$0.00
Apr	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	\$0.00		
May	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.03	\$0.03		
Jun	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	\$0.00	0.03	\$0.03
Jul	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	\$0.00		
Aug	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	\$0.00		
Sep	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	\$0.00	0.00	\$0.00
Oct	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	\$0.00		
Nov	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	\$0.00		
Dec				0.00	\$0.00	0.00	\$0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.03</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.03</b>	<b>0.03</b>	<b>0.03</b>	<b>0.03</b>
<b>*Bond Road Landfill</b>							
<b>Rumpke '15</b>	<b>In District</b>	<b>Out of District</b>	<b>Out of State</b>	<b>Total Tonnage</b>	<b>Total Dollars</b>	<b>Quarterly Tons</b>	<b>Quarterly \$\$</b>
Jan	60,077.23	46,797.58	6,872.31	113,747.12	\$160,544.70		
Feb	49,828.65	40,589.58	7,817.21	98,235.44	\$138,825.02		
Mar	66,520.64	55,319.74	10,433.67	132,274.05	\$187,593.79	344,256.61	\$486,963.51
Apr	69,780.96	62,075.36	10,646.43	142,502.75	\$204,578.11		
May	66,440.75	55,603.74	9,851.26	131,895.75	\$187,499.49		
Jun	67,798.63	60,036.80	9,539.59	137,375.02	\$197,411.82	411,773.52	\$589,489.42
Jul	70,807.45	62,176.37	10,440.82	143,424.64	\$205,601.01		
Aug	64,384.33	55,419.58	8,500.32	128,304.23	\$183,723.81		
Sep	62,912.99	53,357.25	8,198.38	124,468.62	\$177,825.87	396,197.49	\$567,150.69
Oct	66,045.76	52,341.16	8,169.61	126,556.53	\$178,897.69		
Nov	60,977.72	52,775.73	8,493.56	122,247.01	\$175,022.74		
Dec				0.00	\$0.00	248,803.54	\$353,920.43
<b>Total</b>	<b>705,575.11</b>	<b>596,492.89</b>	<b>98,963.16</b>	<b>1,401,031.16</b>	<b>\$1,997,524.05</b>	<b>1,401,031.16</b>	<b>\$1,997,524.05</b>
<b>Grand Tot</b>	<b>705,575.14</b>	<b>596,492.89</b>	<b>98,963.16</b>	<b>1,401,031.19</b>	<b>\$1,997,524.08</b>	<b>1,401,031.19</b>	<b>\$1,997,524.08</b>
<b>% of Total tonnage dollars</b>	<b>Tier 1</b>	<b>Tier 2</b>	<b>Tier 3</b>				
	50.36%	42.58%	7.06%				
	35.32%	59.72%	4.95%				

**2014 Tipping Fee Receipts**

*Rumpke '14	In District	Out of District	Out of State	Total Tonnage	Total Dollars	Quarterly Tons	Quarterly \$\$
Jan	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	\$0.00		
Feb	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	\$0.00		
Mar	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	\$0.00	0.00	\$0.00
Apr	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	\$0.00		
May	0.15	0.00	0.00	0.15	\$0.15		
Jun	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	\$0.00	0.15	\$0.15
Jul	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	\$0.00		
Aug	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	\$0.00		
Sep	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	\$0.00	0.00	\$0.00
Oct	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	\$0.00		
Nov	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	\$0.00		
Dec				0.00	\$0.00	0.00	\$0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.15</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.15</b>	<b>0.15</b>	<b>0.15</b>	<b>0.15</b>
<b>*Bond Road Landfill</b>							
<b>Rumpke '14</b>	<b>In District</b>	<b>Out of District</b>	<b>Out of State</b>	<b>Total Tonnage</b>	<b>Total Dollars</b>	<b>Quarterly Tons</b>	<b>Quarterly \$\$</b>
Jan	63,545.75	44,239.32	8,764.42	116,549.49	\$160,788.81		
Feb	61,963.50	40,748.92	8,052.24	110,764.66	\$151,513.58		
Mar	69,640.94	46,201.01	8,559.29	124,401.24	\$170,602.25	351,715.39	\$482,904.64
Apr	72,024.49	54,084.52	8,850.37	134,959.38	\$189,043.90		
May	69,279.70	55,173.02	8,687.58	133,140.30	\$188,313.32		
Jun	67,338.86	53,615.82	8,385.78	129,340.46	\$182,956.28	397,440.14	\$560,313.50
Jul	74,035.70	54,992.74	8,399.03	137,427.47	\$192,420.21		
Aug	64,034.44	49,804.28	7,718.57	121,557.29	\$171,361.57		
Sep	65,170.26	51,398.61	8,015.41	124,584.28	\$175,982.89	383,569.04	\$539,764.67
Oct	67,442.63	54,009.59	7,602.17	129,054.39	\$183,063.98		
Nov	64,682.17	45,211.26	6,838.91	116,732.34	\$161,943.60		
Dec				0.00	\$0.00	245,786.73	\$345,007.58
<b>Total</b>	<b>739,158.44</b>	<b>549,479.09</b>	<b>89,873.77</b>	<b>1,378,511.30</b>	<b>\$1,927,990.39</b>	<b>1,378,511.30</b>	<b>\$1,927,990.39</b>
<b>Grand Tot</b>	<b>739,158.59</b>	<b>549,479.09</b>	<b>89,873.77</b>	<b>1,378,511.45</b>	<b>\$1,927,990.54</b>	<b>1,378,511.45</b>	<b>\$1,927,990.54</b>
<b>% of Total tonnage dollars</b>	<b>Tier 1</b>	<b>Tier 2</b>	<b>Tier 3</b>				
	53.62%	39.86%	6.52%				
	38.34%	57.00%	4.66%				

## **Solid Waste Management Plan – Outreach Priority**

---

### **Background**

Solid waste management districts are required to select a priority for the Plan and develop a strategy to provide outreach and technical assistance to all appropriate audiences. The priority selected should be based on the analyses that have been presented to the Policy Committee.

### **Recommended Priority 1 – Organics**

Organics include food scraps and yard trimmings. Combined, these waste streams comprise the largest component of material entering U.S. landfills. The District's current program menu for this waste stream includes:

- Providing three yard trimmings drop-off sites
- Conducting multiple backyard composting seminars
- Working with private sector facilities interested in siting an organics facility in southwest Ohio by providing them information on the tons of organics generated in Hamilton County and connecting them to local and state resources such as zoning officials, Ohio EPA, etc.

It is apparent through the analyses that the District lacks a robust program for reducing food waste and has the opportunity to further commit itself to yard trimmings diversion programs.

### **Food Waste Reduction**

The District recommends focusing on food waste reduction and donation as a first step because reduction and donation are highest in U.S. EPA's hierarchy and our region currently lacks food waste composting infrastructure. There are great opportunities available to feed the hungry and save residents money given that the average family of four throws away 1,160 pounds of food a year (approximately \$1,400). To accomplish this, in the first year of the Plan (2018), the District will bring together stakeholders to better understand the needs and barriers to food waste reduction and donation. The culmination of this stakeholder input will result in a program to address those barriers and needs. The District intends to develop a significant budget to address food waste.

The District will also continue to work with the private sector on infrastructure development.

### **Yard Trimmings**

The District intends to continue its yard trimmings drop-off sites to help residents who live in communities that do not have a separate collection program. The sites also help residents who primarily manage their yard trimmings via backyard composting as some larger materials, such as tree limbs, can be difficult to compost in a backyard. In addition, the District will continue to provide backyard composting seminars as long as the need and participation warrant it. The District also intends to allow communities credit in the Residential Recycling Incentive Program for separate yard trimmings collection.

### **Recommended Priority 2 – Paper**

Paper is the third largest component of U.S. landfills and the number one material that Hamilton County residents' landfill. As outlined in the Waste Composition Analysis, Hamilton County and the region has a strong paper recycling infrastructure in place. The District's primary program to address this waste stream is the Recycling at Work program. Through this program, the District provides technical assistance to businesses and schools on implementing recycling, with a primary focus on paper.

With the large amount of recyclable paper still going to landfills, the District recommends focusing on this waste stream through the following program expansions:

- Recycling at Work – The District recommends increasing the budget to allow for an additional staff person, marketing, and interior recycling containers.
- Paid advertising – The District recommends an appropriately-sized budget for advertising, as it has shown to improve recycling rates. Industry standards suggest spending \$1/household on recycling advertising. While the District does not have that amount of funding, significant improvements to the advertising budget will yield positive results.

### **Summary**

The two priorities recommended target a significant portion of the waste stream and, if appropriately funded and executed, will reduce the amount of waste going to landfills. Organics and paper are recommended to be the District's focus for the 5 years of the Plan. However, the District will annually review the priorities based on changing waste streams, technology, and stakeholder needs. Any recommended changes will be presented to the Policy Committee for their approval.

## **Financial Subcommittee Recommendation on District Revenue**

---

### **Background**

A requirement of the solid waste management plan is to include a budget outlining expenses and revenue. For revenue, that includes identifying the source of funding the solid waste district will use to implement its approved solid waste management plan.

The District initiated this process with the preparation of a financial analysis that was presented to the Policy Committee at its May 21, 2015 meeting. At the September meeting, the Policy Committee approved the development of a financial subcommittee whose goal is to examine the District's current financial position and assess the financial requirements and revenue sources needed during the solid waste management planning period. The committee members included: Elizabeth Bruggeman, Health Commissioner Ingram, Jeff Rumpke, and Tom Turchiano.

Financial Subcommittee Recommendation: Retain a \$1/\$2/\$1 tiered disposal fee and implement a \$.30/ton designation fee to generate approximately \$2.8 million annually.

### **Summary of District Revenue**

The District is currently funded through a tiered disposal fee. For every ton of waste disposed at a municipal solid waste landfill located in Hamilton County, the District receives \$1/ton for in-District waste, \$2/ton for out-of-District waste, and \$1/ton for out-of-State waste. The amount that a solid waste management district can charge in fees is set in state law. The District has, since its inception, imposed the lowest fees allowable under State law to fund its programs.

District revenues averaged approximately \$2.8 million from 2008 to 2011. With waste disposal shifting to other landfills, District revenue has declined to a new average of approximately \$2.1 million. *Based on additional waste disposed at Rumpke Sanitary Landfill beginning in 2016, the District has changed its annual revenue projections from \$2.1 million to \$2.5 million.*

### **Funding Mechanisms**

Solid waste districts have several options for funding, but there are three primary types of fees used: tiered disposal fees; generation fees; and generation fee with facility designation (designation fee).

#### *Tiered Disposal Fees*

Districts that have municipal solid waste landfills within their boundaries can be funded through a tiered disposal fee. This fee is levied on waste disposed at the local landfill(s). The in-district fee must fall within a \$1-\$2 per ton range. The out-of-district fee must fall within a \$2-\$4 per ton range. The out-of-state fee must be equal to the in-district fee.

#### *Generation Fees*

Ohio Revised Code 3734.573 authorizes solid waste management districts to levy a fee on the amount of solid waste generated within the district. In this funding scenario, fees are collected based on the tons of solid waste generated within the district and disposed in Ohio landfills or accepted at Ohio transfer stations. Waste that is hauled out of state without passing through an Ohio transfer station (known as direct haul) is not subject to the generation fee.

The challenge with a generation fee is that it cannot be levied on waste that is direct hauled out of state. This provides out-of-state landfills with a competitive advantage over Ohio landfills. Because of our proximity to the Ohio border, this circumstance will have a significant impact on the ability to generate revenue from a generation fee. Hamilton County waste direct hauled out of state ranges between 140,000 and 175,000 tons per year.

### *Designation Fees*

A designation fee allows for the collection of fees on District-generated waste that is disposed both in and outside Ohio. The legal process for instituting a designation fee is tied to the ability to designate public or privately-owned solid waste facilities where all solid waste generated within the District must be delivered for transfer or disposal. The Policy Committee must reserve the right to implement designation in the District's approved solid waste management plan (ORC 343.01(I)(2)). Designation fees are implemented outside of the plan approval process by the Board of County Commissioners via adoption of a resolution.

In general, any solid waste facility that is designated agrees, via contract, to remit the solid waste management district's fee. If a solid waste facility does not sign the contract, they cannot legally accept the solid waste management district's waste for disposal without a waiver from the solid waste management district. Because of this, legal resources may be needed to develop and enforce the designation fee.

### **Financial Subcommittee Summary**

The financial subcommittee examined the following options for the District's revenue:

- No fee increase
- Implementation of a designation fee
- Increase of the tiered disposal fee

The subcommittee diligently deliberated the various options and their impacts, strengths and weaknesses. Ultimately, the subcommittee unanimously voted in favor of a designation fee of \$.30/ton for the following reasons:

- Provides the District with \$2.8 million in revenue without further increasing the disparity between Ohio and Kentucky landfills
- Allows the District to enhance its recycling advertising budget
- Provides funding to enhance the District's assistance to the commercial sector
- Provides funding to support technology and innovation