BEFORE THE INDIANA
RECYCLING MARKET DEVELOPMENT BOARD

- - -

PUBLIC MEETING

OCTOBER 24, 2024

- - -

PROCEEDINGS

in the above-captioned matter, before the Recycling Market Development Board, Bruce Burrow, Chairman, taken before me, Lindy L. Meyer, Jr., a Notary Public in and for the State of Indiana, County of Shelby, at the Indiana Department of Environmental Management, 2525 North Shadeland Avenue, Conference Room C, Indianapolis, Indiana, on Thursday, October 24, 2024 at 9:00 o'clock a.m.

- - -

ACCURATE REPORTING OF INDIANA, LLC
543 Ponds Pointe Drive
Carmel, Indiana 46032
TELEPHONE: (317)848-0088
EMAIL: accuratereportingofindiana@gmail.com

APPEARANCES:

BOARD MEMBERS:
Bruce Burrow, Chairman
Kelly Weger
Terry Guerin
Andrew Nunan
Debbie Hackman
Sandy Whitehead
Tara Wesseler-Henry
Craig Lutz
Matt Gratz
Rep. Lori Goss-Reaves
Rep. Sue Errington
Sen. Rick Niemeyer

ON BEHALF OF IDEM:
Deanna Garner
Carl Wodrich
Tom Leas
James French
Aidan Whitney

ALSO PRESENT:
Jason Donati
George Brown
Ezekiel Werden
Portia Bailey-Bernard
Matt Smith
Sasi Noothalapati
Morgan Mickelson
Todd Cavender
Pat Smoker
Leighanne Hahn
Patrick Brown

- - -

9:00 o'clock a.m.
October 24, 2024

- - -

CHAIRMAN BURROW: We'll get started, and I would like to welcome and thank everyone for joining us today on behalf of the State of Indiana and the Indiana Recycling Market Development Board, and thank you for coming and your interest. We will call the meeting of October 24th, 2024 to order.

The first order of business, Deanna's got some housekeeping issues.

MS. GARNER: Okay. Yes. Good morning. Thank you for joining us today.

This is for those that are attending virtually. I am Deanna Garner, Recycling Market Development Program Manager, IDEM's Office of Program Support.

All microphones are currently muted. For attendance tracking, please take a moment to write your name and affiliation in the chat box. This is very important for us to be able to trak who had attended our meeting.

We will be taking questions and comments

from the public at today's meeting. All participants will be able to unmute themselves and ask questions or make comments at the appropriate times. If you have questions or a technical issue during the presentation, please use the raised hand or chat features. For everyone present in Teams today, please identify yourself when speaking as well.

If any members of the media have joined us, please utilize the chat feature or e-mail rmdpgrants@idem.in.gov if you have any questions or would like to schedule an interview. This meeting is being recorded and will be posted on IDEM's Web site, recycle.in.gov.

With that, I will turn the meeting back over to you, Bruce.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: All right. The first order of business is consideration and approval of the July 25th, 2024 RMDB meeting summary, and has everyone had the opportunity to review that?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Do I have a motion

to approve?

MR. GUERIN: So moved.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Motion by Mr. Guerin.

Do I have a second?

MS. HACKMAN: Second.

MS. WEGER: Second.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Second by Ms. Weger. And all in favor?

(Board members responded, "Aye.")

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Motion carries. Thank you very much.

The next order of business is IDEM Update by Mr. Carl Wodrich, Deputy Assistant Commissioner, Office of Program Support.

MR. WODRICH: Good morning.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Morning, Carl.

MR. WODRICH: I'm going to keep my update pretty brief. I just have three things I'll mention for everyone's information. Goings on mainly in OPS, our Office of Program Support,

our Clean Community Program, as you guys might recall, was sort of retooled and relaunched a year ago, so we had six communities that were our pilot communities for several years while we've kind of retooled that with them, with their input.

So, it's now been relaunched, and we have had four new communities that have joined in the last year to that program and signed up to, you know, make a commitment to conducting sustainability projects within their communities, and those additional communities that have joined this year are Evansville, East Chicag -- the Town of East Chicago, the Town of Fortville, and the City of Bloomington was the most recent community that was accepted into the program.

And we also have our annual meeting for that program coming up next week, and that's an annual meeting that -- I think every other year we're going to probably have that as like an open invitation for interested communities. This year's meeting is going to be hosted by Beech Grove, the City of Beech Grove. They were one of

our pilot communities in the program. And so, this year's meeting is more so for the actual members of -- you know, more Clean Team members. So, we're looking forward to that and looking forward to having a lot more communities across the state that are interested in participating in that program.

The Partners for Sustainability, formerly Partners for Pollution Prevention, just had their annual conference last month. It went really well. Kelly was one of the speakers at that conference this year, and a great presentation, as always, very interesting.

MS. WEGER: Thank you.

MR. WODRICH: So, they do have -- their next quarterly meeting is coming up on December 11th. We don't have any information out yet on our Web site for the partners, but it is planned to be a virtual meeting again, like it was last December, so it's -- we're going to have for sure a regulatory panel from IDEM on -- our Branch Chief, Matthew Prater, from our Drinking Water Branch, is one of the panelists. Tim

Rourke, from our Office of Water Quality, Wastewater Compliance Section Chief, is one of our other confirmed speakers on regulatory panel.

(Rep. Errington arrived.)

MR. WODRICH: And we're working to get one or two others from IDEM to participate in that regulatory panel, and there's going to be several other guest speakers.

That's planned to be approximately from like 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m., with a break for lunch kind of in the middle there. So, more information -- so, if you're interested in that, let me know if you want to -- if you're not already on our subscription list for the Partners.

And then last but not least, IDEM -- the State of Indiana as a whole, really, but IDEM's kind of one of the last agencies that's transitioning over to Salesforce Marketing Cloud for all of our subscription lists. So, if you're subscribed to any of our lists, there's going to be some notification coming from our Media and Communications folks here soon.

We're transitioning away from GovDelivery, the state entry into a new contract, to provide those services through Salesforce. And so, some of our lists, most -- a lot of our lists may not capture everybody over, because our lists -- GovDelivery, because we've been using that for more than a decade -- are pretty substantial, and we're -- there's not a real easy way, unfortunately, for us to pull all of those subscribers out of the GovDelivery system because of how they -- you may have subscribed to some of the lists. It's really complicated. I'm not going to go into that rabbit hole.

(Laughter.)

MR. WODRICH: But anyway, there will be some notification that goes out through GovDelivery before we make the -- flip of switch over to Salesforce, so just a little heads-up on that.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Okay.

MR. WODRICH: That's all I've got.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Well, thank you, Carl.

And I believe the next on the agenda will be a Status Update of the Existing Grants, Ms. Deanna Garner, RMDP Manager.

MS. GARNER: Yes, thanks.

For Fiscal Year '24, our current round of grants, there is no -- nothing's arisen. Everything is moving forward. I've received most of the progress reports for the first six months, and so I'm excited. No unexpected things occurring with those.

Fiscal Year '23, we had one remaining open one, which was Petoskey Plastics, and they've just -- the grant expired, and I have received the paperwork to close out that grant. I will say that we are -- their operation is running and they're using the new equipment.

It's not running as smoothly as they had hoped. They're not getting the numbers, the results they wanted, so they are -- they have purchased another piece that's going to add to that line to make it run a lit bit smoother, and they've agreed, even though the grant has closed out, to do another six-month report so we can

hear the progress of how that's going with the tweaks.

And then we still have the one remaining grant from Fiscal Year '22, the Revive Indiana, the Plus -- that was Plus 5. That expires in January, and that's moving forward as they have reported to us so far.

And is there any questions regarding current existing grants?

(No response.)

MS. GARNER: I can go ahead and move on to the next agenda item, since that's me, too. The Central Indiana Waste Diversion Grant Program, if you guys recall, accepted grants through October -- or applications through October 1st, so we did receive seven applications totaling over 10 million dollars in requested funding.

We have, as a reminder, 3.7 million available to award in funding for that proj -- those projects. And since we have a bigger audience, those projects are for Central Indiana, Marion County, the surrounding donut counties,

and private-sector entities to divert additional waste from final disposal.

I have updated the Teams channel in your RMDB channel. I don't know all of the correct terminology for Teams, but -- so, you should be able to now see those applicants' information and the excel sheet with the project summaries on it as well.

The time line for that, we're reviewing them now. Our Compliance and Technical Assistance staff is going out and scheduling compliance visits to make sure everything is compliant, and we have -- similar to the way we did it last -- the very first round, we -- IDEM staff will have an evaluation form.

We're not scoring it, but we'll give a "Yes, does it meet the criteria?" and any comments and suggestions that we see from what -- how we review it, and we'll provide those to the Board by December 1st. And then the Board will be awarding those grants at the first meeting of 2025, which is on our agenda -- item to determine that date.

MR. GUERIN: Excuse me.

MS. GARNER: Yes.

MR. GUERIN: What's the deadline for the Board responding to you scoring them?

MS. GARNER: So, the Board does not score these either. We don't have scoring metrics that -- it's just kind of a --

CHAIRMAN BURROW: We make a recommendation.

MS. GARNER: Yeah.

MR. GUERIN: Well, that's what I mean.

MS. GARNER: So, IDEM will give you guys the recommendations December 1st, and then you will discuss them and award them on the next Board meeting.

MR. NUNAN: So, will there be proposals in front of us on that meeting, Deanna, or will that be open, or how will we work that, as far as will -- let's say Craig has a -- someone has a proposal. Will they come forward during that meeting, or is that closed off for that part of it? I don't remember.

MS. GARNER: Right, yeah. No, it's still -- it's still just whatever, quarterly public meetings --

MR. NUNAN: Okay.

MS. GARNER: -- and we'll invite all of the applicants, as we always have. And when we discuss the Board dates, we may also want to discuss the timing of -- yeah, that meeting two years ago went very long --

MR. NUNAN: Yes.

MS. GARNER: -- and then we had to have a second meeting. So, yeah, that's part of my agenda item, to discuss how --

MR. NUNAN: Sorry.

MS. GARNER: -- how the Board wants to manage that day.

So, other questions about the Central Indiana Waste Diversion Grants?

MS. WHITEHEAD: I guess I didn't remember that we didn't score those.

MS. GARNER: Yeah. No, we didn't. And I think -- so, that's what made the meeting go longer, because we didn't go by any kind of,

you know, ranking order based on scores. I think we just -- did we do alphabetical order, or -- I don't even know, but we made sure we listened to every applicant. And so, that's --

MR. LUTZ: I remember that.

MS. WHITEHEAD: I remember that part.

MS. GARNER: Yeah, yeah.

MR. LUTZ: Yeah, it was a little different than what we -- our normal thing, but I do remember that we -- we could add comments, edits.

MS. GARNER: Uh-huh.

MR. LUTZ: I remember that. We did not have like a one through ten, one through five on each, so -- but I think in our minds, as we kind of looked at it, we might have -- yeah. So --

MS. WHITEHEAD: Yeah.

MS. HACKMAN: Should we -- is that something --

MS. WHITEHEAD: That's kind of in my mind.

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: Some kind of

rubric.

MR. LUTZ: I don't know if it was a statute thing that we didn't do it that way, or something.

MS. GARNER: I think that -- yeah.

MR. LUTZ: I recall some -- I recall something in the statute that had --

MS. GARNER: I don't remember the --

MR. LUTZ: -- it said that we --

MS. GARNER: --- specific language, too, but it was based on how the -- it was written in the legislation. I mean I think that the Board has the authority to say, when you're reviewing it, awarding them, if you want some kind of rubric. The way that IDEM reviews them is I used the statute language, and it says that "This is established for the purpose of."

MR. LUTZ: Uh-huh.

MS. GARNER: And so, I outline each purpose and say, "Does it meet it? Does it not meet it?" And then we provide comments. And then there's a few other requirements that we want to know: You know, is it good waste

diversion? Does it meet, you know, a few other things that I've added into the evaluation.

So, if the Board so wants it, we can probably somehow put a number to those. We could even possibly adapt what we did this year, put as like RMDP, the zero to four, you know, does it meet -- I mean, you know, and then at least it gives a number --

MS. WEGER: A number to it?

MS. GARNER: -- that would be helpful.

MR. LUTZ: I mean the other thought is: This is such a big deal; right? It's a big deal on why it went in and the way it went in, and so, the second round is such a big deal. It's seven applicants. We haven't looked at them yet. Let's let the IDEM team kind of make sure that those qualify, you know. But if it's seven proposals and seven presentations we sit in, I think we owe it to all of us and the people that put the time in to listen and --

MS. WHITEHEAD: Well, I think --

MR. LUTZ: -- give them all --

MS. WHITEHEAD: -- we could still certainly do that, but isn't it like a ten-million-dollar ask, the total?

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: Yeah.

MS. WHITEHEAD: What did she say the total was?

MR. LUTZ: I forget.

MS. WHITEHEAD: So, we still have to --

MR. LUTZ: I think it was like 3.7, 3.6.

MS. WHITEHEAD: But the total of all of the projects --

MR. LUTZ: Oh, for sure, yeah.

MS. WHITEHEAD: -- was ten million dollars.

MR. LUTZ: Uh-huh.

MS. WHITEHEAD: So, we still need to have some kind of -- I'm all for listening to them, but it just kind of makes sense, because that meeting went so long the last time, that we have some kind of scoring rubric to facilitate the meeting.

MR. NUNAN: Can we adapt what we already have, or not?

MS. WHITEHEAD: Yeah.

MR. NUNAN: What do you guys think? And is there too much tweaking that you've got to do behind the scenes, Deanna?

MS. GARNER: I mean the -- it's -- the evaluation criteria we use for RMDP is just -- it's different. It's asking different --

MR. NUNAN: Uh-huh.

MS. GARNER: -- questions that are not a require -- not necessarily a requirement --

MR. NUNAN: Uh-huh.

MS. GARNER: -- of these Central Indiana ones.

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: I like your idea as just by what was in statute.

MS. GARNER: Yeah, the --

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: Let us set that up.

MS. GARNER: -- exact same ones, and I don't know how it'll go, but assign it a zero

to four so that it's -- because I don't -- I know I'm not going to be able to weight one worth more than the other. Like it'll just be like --

MS. HACKMAN: The initial one.

MS. GARNER: So, I don't -- yeah, I'm going to have to think about that, though, because then it won't -- everybody will get very close to the same --

CHAIRMAN BURROW: If you identify the goals in the statute and get that information to every Board member, and then put equal weight on each goal, and we can actually at least have some type of measurement.

MR. LUTZ: Perfect.

MS. GARNER: Yeah. I was going to try to pull up that sheet, just so the Board can see it. It might be helpful.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Regardless, I believe it's going to be a long meeting, so we need to look at the calendar and make sure that we -- I would like to --

MS. GARNER: I mean if it's something that --

CHAIRMAN BURROW: -- get it done in one day.

MS. GARNER: -- we want to see -- I mean we have to look into providing food, but if we want to go -- like have a lunch break and go like a full day, we can try to sort out how to do that, or if we just give enough time for everybody to be on their own.

MR. WODRICH: Yeah.

MS. GARNER: Where did I see that? Of course, when I'm looking for something, it disappears.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Would everyone agree, though, that if she identifies those issues raised by the statute, and then we can weight and go according to those?

MS. WHITEHEAD: Yes.

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Well, Deanna, if you could just get that out to the Board members after the meeting, and there's really no rush to worry about it at this time.

MS. GARNER: Okay. Yeah, well, it

has no -- it has no weight to it.

(Discussion off the record.)

MR. WODRICH: What Deanna put together last year is very similar to what she's done for us this year at IDEM, you know, and she's basically looking at categories like waste diverted. I think there's a couple of items under there with a yes-or-no check box, pros and cons. That's how we did that last year --

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Okay.

MR. WODRICH: -- very similarly, and she's pulling out, you know, the language from the bill, the conformance with the goals and priorities of the Central Indiana Waste Diversion Project, and there's a number of -- nine items under there with pros and cons for each, and the yes-or-no check box.

So, I think what -- correct me if I'm wrong, Deanna, but I think what she's suggesting is she could basically take this same thing that we're doing, but instead of the yes-or-no check box, she could add a zero-to-four weighted scale, then you guys can add some sort of scoring in

that way to this. I think that would --

CHAIRMAN BURROW: I think that --

MR. WODRICH: -- probably be the easiest thing to do.

MS. WEGER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: I agree. I believe that'll bring a little bit of structure on our side, because I know you guys have it.

MR. WODRICH: And she's already got this created, so it's really not a heavy lift to add the zero-to-four scale like you guys did for the RMDP.

MS. GARNER: Yeah. The one thing that -- I guess my biggest question is: We want each -- and this is kind of why I wanted to show it -- is that -- do we want each weighted equally? Because I think that we might end up with a lot of the same scores.

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: Is that what you noticed with the IDEM staff, that happens a lot with this?

MS. GARNER: Well, because with RMDP, it's -- we don't -- you know, like some are

weighted 25 points, some are weighted 20, and some are 5 and 15.

MR. WODRICH: Yeah.

MS. GARNER: So, that helps like equalize some of that.

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: We don't weight our Clean Water Indiana ones like from one to five. I mean we don't weight any of them, and that --

MS. GARNER: Really?

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: -- it's worked out.

MS. GARNER: And did that work out pretty well?

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: Uh-huh, yes.

MS. GARNER: Okay.

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: Yeah.

MS. GARNER: Yeah. So, the document isn't opening, and I don't know how you got it.

(Discussion off the record.)

MS. GARNER: So, you can't see the screen very well, but -- so, the first category we review is waste diverted, so does it increase

the amount of recycled material and provide detailed information on the amount and type of diverted waste flow, and how the waste diversion was calculated? And then, yeah, I have this whole section on conformance with the goals and priorities, which is straight out of the statute.

So, one thing I noted for this year in particular is some of these goals -- the first one addressed domestic supply chain disruptions, prevent unnecessary disposal of potentially valuable recyclable material, simulates economic development. Those would apply to all of them. Show the feasibility of expansion to other areas and future market development, identify Indiana-based end markets.

And then there's two that were added for the second round of funding that are not requirements, and I made a note of this. They don't have to meet these two requirements and still be eligible, because it says advances research and development to enhance existing waste diversion efforts. So, those are for research projects, which actually we did not have

any research projects to apply.

And then supports recycling technology or programs that involve return, collection, and sorting at professional sports and entertainment venues. So, an example of that technology that they were going for by adding that was the reverse vending machines, and we do have an application with those.

MS. WEGER: When you say that they were added for the second round, does that mean those are listed as eligible or preferable or what?

MS. GARNER: They're -- they were just added as goals and priorities. I think the statement says in the statute that the purpose of the Recycling Mark -- or the Central Indiana Waste Diversion Projects is to, and then it like bullet points all of them, and it's just another one of the bullet points.

MS. WEGER: I do think -- thanks for sharing this, but I do think that, yeah, just for us, having -- swapping out the yes-no for a one-to-four scale, I think that would be helpful.

MS. GARNER: Okay.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Isn't there also a factor, or maybe it was removed from CIWDPP, that the proposal -- the proposed project be a pilot study?

MS. GARNER: So, that was removed as well.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Good.

MS. GARNER: Yes, all of the -- all of that language revolving around pilot --

MS. WHITEHEAD: It was? I just -- great, that's fantastic.

MS. GARNER: Yeah, I think that that was made clear that that was very confusing --

MS. WHITEHEAD: Okay.

MS. GARNER: -- for us.

MS. WHITEHEAD: I'm sorry. I apologize --

MS. GARNER: I defined what --

MS. WHITEHEAD: -- for not remembering that.

MS. GARNER: -- the true pilot project was. I mean I think that was a big part

of why that meeting went so long was the --

MS. WHITEHEAD: Yes.

MS. GARNER: -- discussion around if it was a true pilot or not.

MS. HACKMAN: Yeah.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Okay. Thank you for the clarification, yes.

MS. GARNER: No more pilots. It is just whether or not it's a good project or not, yeah.

Terry?

MR. GUERIN: By removing that phrase, "pilot project," basically I think we were able to address the last round, just like we are addressing the current round that we're dealing with today, I mean that there were no restrictions.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Yeah, the value of the project. So, good.

MS. GARNER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Well, I believe when we get down to our schedule, we need to think long and hard about the length of the

meeting --

MR. LUTZ: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: -- and make sure that we have maybe a little bit of extra time on the day we schedule.

The next order of business is the Recycling Program Reports. Mr. Tom Leas --

MR. LEAS: Sure, yeah.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: -- RMDP Environmental Engineer.

(Discussion off the record.)

MR. LEAS: Good morning.

(Board members responded, "Good morning.")

MR. LEAS: So, glad to be able to give this presentation, and it's really a report of data that we collect through our Re-TRAC reporting system. And we're thankful to all of the respondents who do submit the data that -- so we can come up with some of the numbers about what our waste stream is about.

So, the data is for 2023, and although this is -- excuse me -- is a 2024 report, really we call it 2023, it's like an index report, but

it's for the data of 2023. That's why we call it that, but maybe she should change the title name to '24, because that's when it's -- maybe next year.

(Laughter.)

MR. LEAS: But yeah, this is it. This '23 data, we wrapped that up at the end of the year for '24, for data points. So, the metrics, yeah, they -- you know, we do have a standardized metric that we look at, and it's recycling rate as well as the per-capita MSW generation.

And as you see there on the 2023, you went down, so it is good to see a little bit of movement in that line of recycling rate and how we measure it, and the bottom line is the per-capita generation of the MSW. And while it did go down some, the five-year averages are pretty consistent, 19 percent for recycling rate measurement, and the per-capita is also about 7.3 pounds per.

Yeah, next slide.

Okay. As -- here, I mean it's a pretty

simple pie diagram of where-does-it-go-and-where-does-it-come-from type of thought, and it's tons. I mean this is based on tons, and you see recycling end-use markets, and that's really -- when you look at recycling rate measurement, you'll see it's approximately 15 percent went to recycling end-use markets. It's a percentage of the total MSW generation.

That's the definition of our recycling rate. Most of it goes to landfills and some to energy from waste, and that's not unusual for Indiana. So -- and about half of our waste, municipal solid waste, comes from the industrial, commercial and institutional sectors, and the other half, approximately, from households. You know, that's the general criteria. And yeah, these are tonnages based on Indiana origins, and so, it's -- when the reporting is done, it's for Indiana origins of municipal solid waste.

Yeah, next slide.

And this is -- you get an idea of where it comes from, and this is the baseline metric that we use to come up with the recycling rate

measurements, and, of course, most of it goes to landfills. We've got 27 in-state landfills that receive material, and some of it goes out of state, you know, approximately 500,000 tons of material goes to out-of-state landfills. Energy from waste is -- would be a rural facility, Indianapolis.

And there you see recyclables, organics, and other recyclables. So, the commodities are glass, metal, paper and plastics. Those are what you would typically expect from a household. Well, glass, metal, paper and plastics, we'll talk more about that in other slides.

Organics, wood waste and composting, we separated that out as a metric to follow, and other recyclables could be -- well, would be -- like e-waste would be in there, HHW would be in there, textiles may be in there, but it could be emerging waste streams may -- could be in that category.

So, next slide.

And as you look here, now, what really stands out about this chart, as I get back to my

notes, I mean you really just can't miss what goes to landfills. I mean that impacts what goes to the recycling rate of measurement, because that's what's -- that's the number that goes into the baseline. And so, you know, as long as that number is going to be there, it really impacts our recycling rate measurements like that.

And you see some of the other boxes, recyclables, wood waste and other recycling. That's where most of our programs will make a difference in. So, you know, we're just making a difference in this -- these small boxes, but they all have unique infrastructure requirements, so what goes to a landfill has its type of trucks and delivery, as well as -- oh, yeah.

MS. GARNER: I'm sorry; I went ahead.

MR. LEAS: As other infrastructure, and organics would be different than the commodity recyclables.

Okay. Next.

Yeah, the boxes tell the story, and here, when you look at commodity-type recyclables, glass, metal, paper and plastics, they're --

that's what most people think about of recycling. And so, the shipments were, yeah, 736,883 tons for '23, and, you know, it's not the seven million tons that to go to the landfill. This is the glass, metal, paper and plastics, approximately up to a million tons per year.

But most of it is paper. You know, 73 percent of those shipments was paper, you know, followed by plastics and metals, 17 percent. And some of the single stream gets shipped out of state to MRF'S for sorting. That's the number you see there. But typically, you know, paper, cardboard is mostly what we would collect and send out for end-use markets.

Yeah, next.

So, we'd like to dive in a little bit closer to single-stream recycling, and so, we can track those numbers by looking at the single-stream sorting facilities in the state as well as single-stream materials that get shipped out of state. We -- that number gets tracked in our Re-TRAC recording system.

And single stream is typical of what would

come from households, and so, now you see tons of that, and infrastructure specifically, and it went up. And so, while the overall recycling rate went down for 2023, you do see a 12-percent increase from in-state sorting facilities, shipments output. So, that's pretty significant.

I believe this chart really embodies a lot of what we do, and you can see, infrastructure we're looking at, on recycling averages, approximately 200,000 tons of in-state sorting and, oh, 72,000 tons being shipped to out-of-state sorting.

And so, we have roughly 300,000 tons, and the infrastructure that we have for single-stream sorting as a state, you know, you compare that to one of those landfills, and that is to be applauded. I mean seven million tons, it's a tremendous effort to move that much material.

But as you're looking at single stream, 300,000 tons, and as we grow that part, you know, that's what we're moving from, and so, there's potential to go from 300,000, perhaps, you know, towards a million tons down the road, but, you

know, it takes infrastructure to make that happen.

And this is where we're at now.

MS. GARNER: Oh.

MR. LEAS: Oh, sorry.

MS. GARNER: I saw you start to go towards me.

MR. LEAS: Yeah, this 40 percent -- yeah, the 40 percent single-stream recycling makes up the commodity recyclables. You know, this is another kind of important thing, so that single-stream recycling makes up 40 percent of our commodity shipments. You know, the other 60 percent is come -- comes from source-separated types materials, mainly from the industrial, manufacturing and institutional sectors.

And we've got specialized MRF's, I mean not the single-stream sorting MRF's, but there are MRF's that take the source separated and bale it and ship it out to end-use markets, like what you'd see Quincy Recycle or WestRock, or even Pratt's got facilities that handle the commercial sectors. And there's a lot of -- a lot of fiber

coming from the manufacturing, commercial and institutional sectors, and 60 percent of our commodities are coming from that source.

But anyway, though, who's reporting? It really covers the MRF shed, and we have good reported through the MRF shed, and then we got good reporting -- there's a part of the reporting that doesn't get -- like direct shipments to end-use markets, that's not mandatory to be reported.

You can see that from distribution centers. It doesn't go through the MRF shed, and that's probably a sector that we're not strong on, on getting data about. Our MRF shed data is pretty good, and we do have a -- well, there's a lot of other reports that -- we could really spend a lot of time on this, but we'll go on.

Sure.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: A question: On that mill direct shipment from generators --

MR. LEAS: Right.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: -- is there any way of capturing the data, what goes into Pratt,

Valpo or Wapakoneta, or if it goes down to Hood, and are we able to capture information at all?

MR. LEAS: Well, we -- yeah, once the -- if it goes into a specialized type of MRF, their shipments, they indicate state destinations of where it goes.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: They don't have quantity?

MR. LEAS: Yeah, they --

MS. GARNER: Those do per report; right, Tom?

MR. LEAS: Yeah, they do, they get quantity.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Okay.

MR. LEAS: They get quantity by state designation from like those specialized MRF's, like Quincy Recycling would have or WestRock would have.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: I see.

MR. LEAS: So, they do report --

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Okay.

MR. LEAS: -- if it goes through those facilities, but sometimes direct shipments

may go through a broker, or they may not go through the MRF shed --

MR. LUTZ: Yeah.

MR. LEAS: -- and we may not get that information.

MR. LUTZ: Like a big box company.

MR. LEAS: Oh, yeah, big box.

MR. LUTZ: And Amazon, for example --

MR. LEAS: Right.

MR. LUTZ: -- would have a mill direct shipment of your --

MR. LEAS: Yeah. So, Walmart does submit reports on a corporate basis, so they add up all of their Indiana stores and they just give us a report voluntarily.

MR. LUTZ: Uh-huh.

MR. LEAS: Walmart. And other big boxes --

MR. LUTZ: Vol --

MR. LEAS: -- could do the same, but they don't.

MR. LUTZ: Vol -- it's voluntary?

MS. GARNER: Yeah.

MR. LEAS: Yeah, and -- but instead, they have infrastructure. I mean it's not the MRF shed infrastructure that we're talking about, but the direct shipments, you know, it's on them. They move it, they move them, trail, and then -- whereas when we're building new single-stream sorting facilities, you know, that -- that may be a little closer to home.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Thank you.

MR. NUNAN: Thanks, Tom.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Any other questions for Tom?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Hi.

REP. ERRINGTON: Hello.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: How are you?

REP. ERRINGTON: Finally here in person.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: It's great to see you.

REP. ERRINGTON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Yes, go ahead.

REP. ERRINGTON: My question is about

the 81 percent of material going into the landfills.

MR. LEAS: Right.

REP. ERRINGTON: Where does that rank Indiana among the states? Are we --

MR. LEAS: Oh, what goes to landfills? You know, I -- you know, that number can vary. We're probably stronger on the landfill side than most states.

REP. ERRINGTON: Okay. So, who's the best? What state is the best?

MR. LEAS: I'd have to look at those rankings.

REP. ERRINGTON: Oh, okay. I'm just wondering.

MR. LEAS: And so, they're out there, but I would have to look.

REP. ERRINGTON: See what they're doing that we're not.

MR. LEAS: Yeah, they --

MS. GARNER: So, we do sit -- Tom and I sit on EPA calls for Region V, so the Midwest, and I think we did have somewhat of a

conversation about that in the last year.

MR. LEAS: Yeah.

MS. GARNER: And, of course, I'm not great at remembering numbers if they're not written down, but I think as far as if you want to know the Midwest, we are comparable to what our neighbors are doing.

MR. LEAS: Yeah, Michigan in particular. We're almost -- really close with what Michigan does.

MS. GARNER: However -- however, those states are really taking strong initiatives, have new legislation, have new money being invigorated into the infrastructure and the initiatives around their recycling, and like Michigan just reported their recycling number really went up a few percentage points in just a year. So, their efforts are really starting to show results.

Ohio's starting to also launch what's called Next Cycle, which is one of the things that Michigan was doing. They're going to launch that in the coming year, so I expect Ohio's

numbers to also start going up. Ohio has a lot stricter requirements around solid waste management districts and what they do and what they report.

So, that's kind of why they're starting to see better strides, but we're still comparable. But you're going to see, you know, East Coast, where there's landfill issues, where they don't have open landfills, where they have to ship materials out of state or further away --

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: Yeah.

MS. GARNER: -- they, you know, might have requirements that every municipality has recycling offered, and so, you're going to see way different landfill numbers for coastal cities and other cities that have high landfill disposal cost rates versus our very low landfill disposal cost rates.

MR. LUTZ: Yeah.

MS. WEGER: In follow to that, I'm curious: Does the EPA Region V group only talk about it in terms of percentage, or do they --

MS. GARNER: No --

MS. WEGER: -- because --
MS. GARNER: -- there was tonnage numbers --
MS. WEGER: Okay.
MS. GARNER: -- and --
MS. WEGER: Well, because I'm curious if like per capita would be more valuable, because --
MS. GARNER: Yeah.
MS. WEGER: -- to your point, if the landfill number goes down, even if the recycling volumes are identical, it changes the percentage, and so --
MR. LUTZ: Uh-huh.
MS. GARNER: You calculated that, didn't you, Tom?
MR. LEAS: Yeah, the --
MS. GARNER: Yeah.
MR. LEAS: -- per capita?
MS. GARNER: Yeah.
MR. LEAS: Yeah, we do have per capita.
MS. GARNER: Yeah, we do, but I don't

know, yeah, if every state does that or not, and --

MS. WEGER: Yeah, I'd be curious if there were some states that are taking two approaches: One, to increase the recycling rate; and two, to reduce the creation of waste in the first place.

MS. GARNER: Right. Yeah, that's a harder number to --

MR. LEAS: So, yeah, and some of the recycling rate measurements, they vary on methodology, but The Recycling Partnership has come up with like a household generation and what gets captured from households. And so, it's decoupled from what goes to landfills, and they specifically look at what a household would generate.

And the recycling rate is based on what is captured from a household generation number for packaging materials. And so, to their studies, each household would generate about 838 pounds of recyclables per year, and of that number, they determine what gets collected for recycling, and

that's the recycling rate measurement, and it's decoupled from what goes to the landfill.

MS. GARNER: And they --

MR. LEAS: It's a simplified recycling rate.

MS. GARNER: And so, it's a little bit different than ours, because we count organics.

MR. LEAS: Oh, yeah, it, of course -- yeah, that's the traditional way.

MS. GARNER: And theirs is paper, plastic, metals, per packaging.

MR. LEAS: And still we have a lot of numbers, I guess, overall, because we do track organics, and that's something that -- if you don't have numbers, it's hard to know what you're doing, but as long as it's still in the calculation, we still follow that.

MS. GARNER: They release those numbers for the entire country, as well for every state, so according to them, we're at 17 percent?

MR. LEAS: Right. TRP, the Recycling Partnership --

MS. GARNER: They're tracking --

MR. LEAS: -- indicates like --

MS. GARNER: -- traditional --

MR. LEAS: -- households specifically are recycling 17 percent for Indiana.

MS. GARNER: Uh-huh.

MR. LEAS: And that's where a lot of our education and outreach -- I mean that's the sector that we focus on, that -- that part of the waste stream.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Sen. Niemeyer, did you have a question?

SEN. NIEMEYER: Yeah, just a quick -- is there any data on out-of-state tonnage coming into the landfills --

MR. LEAS: Yes, yes --

SEN. NIEMEYER: -- in here?

MR. LEAS: So, we -- that number's also tracked. We can get that number. It's roughly 30 percent, what comes into our in-state landfills from out of state for disposal.

SEN. NIEMEYER: Okay.

MR. LEAS: Yeah, that's a number that

is tracked.

SEN. NIEMEYER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: And finally, Mr. Guerin.

MR. GUERIN: When the statute was originally passed requiring this reporting, there were several aspects of the waste stream that were able to opt out.

MR. LUTZ: Uh-huh.

MR. LEAS: Right.

MR. GUERIN: Is it time now to go back to the legislature and reassess that and try to capture those aspects of the waste stream that aren't being reported?

MR. LEAS: It's -- yeah, and, of course, the salvage yards, those salvage yards are part of the exempted group from mandatory reporting. Yeah, our numbers are specifically for municipal solid waste.

MR. GUERIN: Uh-huh.

MR. LEAS: And sometimes the salvage yards, they handle a lot more than just MSW materials. Yeah, so there's a little -- a

little -- you know, metals in general, of the waste characterization, they're like five percent of the MSW waste characterization, so --

MS. GARNER: So, I think that what -- I mean that's a tricky question, obviously --

MR. LUTZ: Uh-huh.

MS. GARNER: -- and it depends on what we're wanting to get out of that number. When that legislation for reporting was put in place, the reason we said we wanted reporting was because it -- tied to that legislation was a 50-percent recycling rate goal. So, you never know if you're going to reach 50 percent unless you start having reporting. So, that was the first step, and how long ago did we -- was that legislation now? How -- like how many years of reporting do we have?

MR. LEAS: Well, yeah, 2014 is when it --

MS. GARNER: 2014?

MR. LEAS: -- first got implemented, the reporting.

MS. GARNER: So, almost ten years.

MR. LEAS: Yeah.

MS. GARNER: So, I think, based on that, like we have ten years of reporting now in progress. You know, an evaluation of "Is this --" you know, just having the reporting, you know, what -- if we still have that 50-percent recycling goal, what do we need now to continue, get better data, but also move that goal forward? We, as Tom mentioned --

MR. LEAS: And the goal --

MS. GARNER: -- that -- the way we calculate it now -- and maybe that's something that's addressed, too, you know, even including the calculation of the rates, but it went down this year and -- just based on the way we've always calculated it. So --

MR. LEAS: Right, and it --

MS. GARNER: -- I think that it needs to be more -- not just looking at who's reporting, but it needs to be an overall -- just an examination of the whole process and why we are doing it and what do we want to get out of it.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: I think we would want to do something that's consistent with our adjoining states --

MS. GARNER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: -- so that we can get a regional number and --

MS. GARNER: And so, here's a --

CHAIRMAN BURROW: -- some comfort.

MS. GARNER: And here's a side note. So, we'll talk more about this at -- well, a meeting when we don't have so much on our agenda --

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Uh-huh.

MS. GARNER: -- but we do have a big balance in the Recycling Market Development Funds that we don't get allotted for grants.

MR. LUTZ: Uh-huh.

MS. GARNER: And so, we did the economic impact study a few years back, but it may be time for the Board to look at how to use some of those funds, request an appropriation, and maybe do some of that initial research, you know, assessment of what the other states are

doing.

And some of that will also be done with our SWIFR funds, the EPA, the Solid Waste Infrastructure For Recycling, gave us approximately $500,000, and we're doing a state materials management plan. So, when we do that state materials management plan, we're also going to get a lot more information on our infrastructure.

And there's going to be some goals set forth in there as well, and that -- I think those baselines and other things can be established by learning what the other states around us are doing as well. So -- and that'll be a big like public input, stakeholder involvement, throughout that whole process of creating that plan.

MS. HACKMAN: I was at WASTECON this last week, and we spent all day -- all morning Tuesday morning trying to decide how -- who was number one. And Maine claims they're number one, but there's three ways -- there's three methods to feed it: EPA has a method; SWANA, the Solid Waste Association of America, has a method, okay;

and then The Recycling Partnership has a method, and they're none the same.

So, we need to either come up with a national policy on how we're going to -- how we're going to calculate diversion, or we're not going to -- or we're not going to worry about anybody else but ourselves, and look at our numbers and just try to improve our numbers, and not worry about what Illinois or Michigan or Maine's doing, just look at our numbers and try to improve our numbers on our scale.

MR. LUTZ: Tom, I've got a kind of comment/question. In the industry of the landfill side, I know we've got Rumpke here, South Side and Mr. Guerin, and I know we've got a rep that's at WM that's sitting in, so welcome.

A simple thing that we can do is -- and I -- I think we've said this before -- on that landfill side, on that -- just that landfill total tonnage number, we have a separate line for waste to energy, and that's just the material that goes to road RAP. But what is not stated in the landfill side is the landfills that have a

waste-to-energy facility --

MR. LEAS: Yes.

MR. LUTZ: -- renewable natural gas, or --

MR. LEAS: Oh, yeah.

MR. LUTZ: -- taking that methane that's being generated, cleaning it up and putting it right back into the grid. Could we segregate some of that total tons and say, "Hey, did you know --"

MR. LEAS: Yes.

MR. LUTZ: -- and this is kind of back to your point, is that "-- this is what's happening in the State of Indiana."

MR. LEAS: Right.

MR. LUTZ: We could say is make a line of, "Of that seven million tons, this is what's going -- that's coming back to renewable energy," or you make a subline of that and say -- you know, I think all of those landfills that have -- we know those that are accredited or they're lined item, and say, "Here's a -- of that seven million, this is what's going back into our

grid. This is what's going back into renewable natural gas. This is what's going back into --"

MR. LEAS: Yeah.

MR. LUTZ: "-- our energy lines." It would -- I think it would be better helping that story of, "Hey, State of Indiana, we're not as --"

MR. LEAS: Oh, really, yeah, yeah, the landfills are, you know, a specialized infrastructure for that segment and the materials management. And, of course, the purist recyclers, I mean they see a big difference there in what goes to landfill versus for final disposal versus what going into recycling and end-use markets. But materials management doesn't have that distinction, and so, landfills, as a whole, are very well run, and methane capture is very important going into energy use.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Just real quickly, unless I'm misunderstanding how the numbers are reported, you know, we see a huge landfill number, but there's only 24 commercial businesses that report their recycling. You know,

there's 76 solid waste districts that report it.

MR. LEAS: Right.

MS. WHITEHEAD: So, that totally, to me, skews the recycling number. I think that we would see a much bigger diversion rate if commercial businesses were required to report.

MR. LEAS: If -- you know, the MRF's -- it's the MRF shed is what drives the recycling, and so, everything funnels in through a MRF shed and that gets reported, and there's a lot of businesses that support the MRF shed. Solid waste management districts that do a hundred thousand tons per year of material, that supports the MRF shed, and the MRF's report that output.

MS. WHITEHEAD: So, you're saying that the businesses -- that what they're recycling is being captured?

MR. LEAS: Oh, yeah. If it goes through the MRF shed, it is being captured.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Okay.

MR. LEAS: What doesn't --

MS. WHITEHEAD: Unless they --

MR. LEAS: -- get captured is the direct --

MS. WHITEHEAD: Unless they direct ship it.

MR. LEAS: Correct, right.

MS. GARNER: Unless they direct ship, but a lot of them will, yeah.

MR. LEAS: Then it doesn't go through the MRF shed.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Right.

MS. HACKMAN: But that's a lot of tonnage.

MS. WHITEHEAD: I mean those are -- you're talking tractor-trailer loads; right?

MS. HACKMAN: Yeah, right.

MS. WHITEHEAD: You're talking 20,000 pounds.

MR. LEAS: Yeah, from the commercial sector --

MS. WHITEHEAD: Correct.

MR. LEAS: -- and from businesses --

MS. WHITEHEAD: I'd --

MR. LEAS: -- and manufacturing.

MS. WHITEHEAD: I'd be interested to see that. You know, if we could collect that data, it would be interesting to see how it could change the diversion rate.

MR. LEAS: Yeah, there are some tons there, and, you know, how far do you go? And are businesses willing to submit and to force everyone that needs to submit that data? Because everyone's going to collect it and send it, and it gets overwhelming.

MR. LUTZ: Yep.

MR. LEAS: And it's outside the MRF shed, and, you know, if it's handled through brokers, then that infrastructure is on them.

MS. GARNER: I think that also, though, addresses like, again, my question of like who are you wanting to see recycle? What is the goals of these numbers that we're getting? Because are you wanting to see residential recycling increase, or are you just looking for waste diversion from landfills? So --

MS. WHITEHEAD: Well, I mean that --

MS. GARNER: -- it's two different

angles, two different amounts of data that you collect.

MS. WHITEHEAD: The total of the landfill data, that's everybody. That's not separated out.

MS. GARNER: Yeah --

MR. LEAS: And MSW -- it gets reported --

MS. GARNER: -- that's everybody.

MR. LEAS: -- as MSW, and landfills also report it as coal ash, foundry sand, or other types of waste, but --

MS. WHITEHEAD: Right.

MR. LEAS: -- MSW has a big category that's all its own, and it's reported as such.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Right.

MS. HACKMAN: If we talk about Lowe's, for example, Lowe's sends their cardboard out by semi load, truck --

MR. LEAS: Right.

MS. HACKMAN: But their -- they have roll-offs in back of their building that end up in the landfill, and is that considered MSW?

MR. LUTZ: Uh-huh.

MR. LEAS: It would, yeah. If it goes to --

MS. HACKMAN: Yeah. So --

MR. LEAS: -- it probably goes to a transfer station.

MS. HACKMAN: Yeah, but it's still MSW --

MR. LEAS: Yes.

MS. HACKMAN: -- just like out of my bathroom.

MR. LEAS: Oh, yeah, that -- the landfill would probably see that as MSW coming in.

MS. GARNER: Yeah. So, if we still tied our reporting to landfills and calculate the way we do, you're right. Like it makes sense to collect the same from the same people --

MS. HACKMAN: Yeah.

MS. GARNER: -- same pool, yeah.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Good information, Tom.

MR. LUTZ: It's a good discussion.

MR. LEAS: We've been involved in that discussion for years.

MR. LUTZ: It's a passion.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Tom, I want to thank you. Thank you. A great discussion, but I do believe we trust your numbers explicitly based on the way we've done it previously.

MR. LEAS: The reporting, yeah, it's a good thing.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Thank you very much.

MR. GUERIN: Thanks, Tom.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: All right. Next, we have the E-waste Recycling Report by Jacob Schmicker, E-waste Program Manager.

MR. SCHMICKER: Hey, good morning, everyone.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Good morning, Jacob.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Good morning, Jacob.

MR. SCHMICKER: Yeah.

For those of you that don't know me, my

name is Jacob, and I oversee the Indiana E-Cycle Program, and today I just want to give a little background on the E-Cycle Program itself, and then talk about some of the stakeholders that make up the program and some data that we captured from those stakeholders for 2023, and then just kind of discuss some of the outreach efforts we're doing and some of the different initiatives that we've taken on in recent years.

So, with that, I'll just kind of jump right into it. So, the Indiana E-Cycle Program, it was established back in 2009, and the overall purpose of the E-Cycle Program is to reduce the amount of e-waste, electronic devices, that are being sent to Indiana landfills, while also ensuring that these devices are being handled in an environmentally responsible manner. And then also, another facet of the program is to promote the capture of valuable materials found in these electronic devices.

And then some of the stakeholders that make up the Indiana E-Cycle Program are going to be the manufacturers, so that's going to be like

your Dells, your Sonys, your Apples of the world, they report into the program and have different obligations and requirements. And then we also have collectors, and simply put, a collector is a facility or organization that's collecting electronic devices, so maybe like a solid waste district in the State of Indiana. And then we have the recyclers, which are going to be facilities that are dismantling and recycling these electronic devices.

And I'll get a little bit more into details about those in the upcoming slides, but before I jump into the upcoming slides, I do want to point out that the program does focus on strict listing of electronic devices, so we call those covered electronic devices.

So, in the upcoming slides, when I'm talking about what was collected and what was recycled, this is the material that we're looking at, so we're looking at like televisions, computer monitors, tablets, and we're not looking at like refrigerators or ovens, light goods, that sort of stuff. So, this is the kind of listing

that we go off of.

So, just kind of jumping to the next slide, which is going to be some data on the manufacturers, and all of this data is from 2023, but for 2023, we had 65 manufacturers registered with the program, and again, that's going to be like your Apples, your Sonys, the Dells of the world.

And manufacturers, they have a recycling obligation that they need to fulfill with the State of Indiana each year, and the way they go about fulfilling that is they work with a registered collector, and that collector works with a registered recycler to have material recycled on the manufacturer's behalf.

So, for the previous year, the manufacturers had a 21.1-million-pound recycling obligation that they fulfilled, and then for the upcoming year, their new recycling obligation was going to be 19.1, and these are collected numbers, and that's a trend that we're seeing with the manufacturers, that the recycling obligation's just kind of going down a little bit

each year, and that's just kind of with light weighting, more or less. You know, a laptop doesn't weigh 12 tons or more. You know, it might weigh four or five pounds. So, that's a little bit of information on the manufacturers.

And jumping to the next slide, we'll talk about the collectors. So, we had 84 collectors registered with the Indiana E-Cycle Program for 2023, and these collectors reported recyc -- or collecting of 25.6 million pounds of e-waste material.

And then I always like to point out that of this 25.6 million pounds, 23.2 million pounds came from metropolitan counties, or your larger counties, and then 2.4 million pounds came from your smaller counties, or we call them nonmetropolitan counties. So, a lot of collection going on.

And then we jump to the next slide, it's going to talk about the recycler results for 2023. So, we had 21 recyclers registered with the Indiana E-Cycle Program, and these recyclers reported recycling of 29.2 million

pounds of e-waste for 2023.

And then I always like to highlight that since the inception of the program, so since 2009, recyclers have reported recycling over 400 million pounds of e-waste through the program, and we know that's not a direct result of the program itself, but we definitely like to think that it's had a helping hand in reaching that number.

So, if I'd jump to the next slide, I just want to talk about some of the outreach efforts we do each year. So, we try to get out and visit different collectors and recyclers throughout the state and just provide education and resources to them, and also see if we can be a resource to them. We attend e-waste collection events and just different outreach events that might kind of focus more on recycling.

And then we also host several different collection events each year through the program. We always do an annual e-waste collection event at the Government Center, and we've even got into some different communities, which I'll touch on a

little bit later.

And then we do retailer outreach, just trying to talk to the different retailers, so like the Targets, Walmarts, Best Buys, about their re -- about the e-waste law's requirements and how it involves them.

And then we do do compliance initiatives. We try to get out into the different counties in Indiana. If we hear about a facility that might be collecting electronics or recycling them, just to get them into compliance with the law in the state.

So, jumping to the next slide, so I do want to highlight something we've done recently. The program and the state itself, we realized that there was a growing amount of e-waste out there and, you know, everything's kind of going to an electronic format. And then we also recognize that there is an increasing cost to get rid of this material, so we recognized there was a need.

So, what we did a few years back is we launched what we called an e-waste collection

project, and we looked at different criteria because we were looking to host e-waste collection events at different counties throughout the state.

And we kind of looked at different criteria, just kind of collection access and how easy residents could recycle their e-waste, and we also looked at some kind of socioeconomic information, so maybe like MHI, median household income, to identify a county that we wanted to host these events in.

And with that, we ended up hosting our first collection event, if I go to the next slide here, down in Seymour, Indiana, Jackson County, we hosted an e-waste collection event. This was the first one we took on, and we had various partners. We partnered with Technology Recyclers, which is right over here on the east side of the state. They're a large collector/recycler of electronics.

And we also partnered with Cummins. We actually hosted it at their engine plant there, at a large parking lot there, and we also

partnered with the Jackson County Solid Waste Management District for this event.

And during this event, we collected right at 63,000 pounds of e-waste material. We had tons of cars coming through, 380, to be exact, and then collected nearly 900 TV/s slash monitors at this event. And so, this was a very well received and very successful event. As you can see, you know, we collected and -- with collecting about 63,000 pounds. And mind you, this was only a three-hour event, so we collected over 20,000 pounds per hour.

So, a very well received and a very successful event in our eyes, but we definitely learn things from an event like this. We learned things with traffic flow, how to make it flow better and so forth, and also the importance of having staff on hand, adequate staff, to be able to handle so much material.

And then with that, and with the success of this event, we decided to do another event, if I go to the next slide, over on the west side of the state, in Sullivan County, which is right

below Terre Haute, Indiana. We did a very similar event. We partnered with ERI for this event, which they're located over in Plainfield. They're, again, a large collector/recycler of electronics.

We also partnered with the Sullivan County School Corporation. You can kind of see in that picture that we hosted it at the school, which was a great place to host such an event. They had a huge parking lot, so we were able to contain traffic and so forth very well.

And we also partnered with the Sullivan County Solid Waste Management District, and again, this was a very well received, very appreciated event from the community, and we collected over 42,000 pounds of e-waste that day, and 264 cars came in, and we collected about 872 TV's and monitors that day. So, just another really great event and successful event that we did with all of the partners in the program.

And with that, we are going to keep doing these events, and if I go to the next slide, we just hosted a couple of weeks ago another e-waste

collection event about two and a half hours north of here, up in Stark County, Indiana, which is Knox, Indiana.

And again, we partnered with ERI, the school corporation up there, and the solid waste district there, also Secure Shred as well, and we were able to collect about 35,000 pounds at that event and, you know, had tons of cars come through, and collected 489 TV's and monitors.

So, that's just kind of a program that we've started in recent years, and I just wanted to highlight that, that we've kind of been getting out into the communities and providing this event to residents, and it's been very appreciated and very successful in our eyes.

So, with that, that's kind of everything I have, so yeah, I'd be happy to take any questions.

SEN. NIEMEYER: Yeah, I have a question. When you do these sites, it's not bound to that area? If somebody come in from another county in that area, like Sullivan County, if they're an adjoining county --

MR. SCHMICKER: Right, yes.
SEN. NIEMEYER: -- they can come in?
MR. SCHMICKER: We're not checking like I.D.'s or looking at license plates, so --
SEN. NIEMEYER: Maybe not charging, but did you offer for people to bring their stuff in and drop it off and -- wow.
MR. SCHMICKER: Yeah, yeah.
MS. GARNER: And maybe you want to explain to them how we're able to fund these events.
SEN. NIEMEYER: Yes.
MR. SCHMICKER: Oh, it's funded through the E-Cycle Program, so manufacturers like your Apples, your Dells, your Sony's, they pay fees.
SEN. NIEMEYER: Yeah. Lake County's done a couple, you know, through their recycling or through their solid waste board district.
MS. GARNER: Right. So --
SEN. NIEMEYER: Yeah.
MS. GARNER: -- it's a little different funding source than like the counties.

Almost every county tries to do some, if they have a solid waste management district that's active.

SEN. NIEMEYER: If some counties --

MS. GARNER: But they have --

SEN. NIEMEYER: -- didn't have --

MS. GARNER: -- to use their own funds, which, of course, every county's solid waste district is funded differently.

SEN. NIEMEYER: So, some counties have a drop-off point for some of this stuff if they're bigger --

MS. GARNER: Right.

SEN. NIEMEYER: -- counties where they can drop this stuff off.

MS. GARNER: So, we've been able to identify that there's counties that are having -- struggling, you know, to provide the services or the funds for it, and that's one of the criteria Jacob looks at when he determines where IDEM is going to partner and do one of these collection sites --

SEN. NIEMEYER: Good program.

MS. GARNER: -- to help people, yeah.
REP. ERRINGTON: It is a good one.
SEN. NIEMEYER: Good program.
MS. GARNER: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN BURROW: Any other questions?
MR. LUTZ: Jacob, how are we handling batteries; i.e., particularly lithium batteries? Do you promote those to bring those in these e-waste programs, or --
MR. SCHMICKER: Yeah. So, ERI, I mean they've gotten grants through the state for different battery collection mechanisms and so forth. So, yeah, we accept batteries at these events, and it's something that we get a lot of, and we have a separate drum for those, and so, we collect batteries at these events.
MR. LUTZ: Do you see more and more, or is it hard to kind of --
MR. SCHMICKER: Oh, I mean they're definitely --
MR. LUTZ: -- quantify over time?
MR. SCHMICKER: -- I mean

everything's -- a weed eater, a lawn mower, everything's on a battery these days, so --

MR. LUTZ: Oh, yeah.

MR. SCHMICKER: -- yeah, we see more of them.

MR. NUNAN: Craig, yes, we are seeing an influx, same here.

(Laughter.)

MR. LUTZ: Very good, sir. Thank you very much. We'll move on.

MR. SCHMICKER: Yeah, we've got a question back there.

MR. DONATI: Okay. Are we ever going to see e-cigs become a part of e-waste?

MS. GARNER: And can you -- if -- you guys that are in the audience, if you can just say your name.

MR. DONATI: Jason Donati, Superintendent of Sanitation and Recycling for Muncie Sanitary District. We're seeing a huge influx of vapes and e-cigs that have rechargeable batteries in them, and a hazardous waste, because they have the nicotine pouches in them.

So, I mean even community cleanups, we're finding them in ditches and in these large containers, so we're concerned about fires. Everyone's throwing them in the trash. The companies that sell the vapes are calling us, seeing if we'll take them, you know, everything that they're selling, and, you know, every gas station sells them.

So, I just wanted to throw that out there and see if there's any help we can get to address that issue, so --

MR. SCHMICKER: No, yeah, I get questions all of the time about that, and obviously, if you go to a Walmart parking lot, you can find a discarded vape. So, at this time, no, they're not included in the E-Cycle Program, but definitely recognize that that's a growing concern across communities. You know, a couple of weeks ago, I just was talking to somebody, and a lot of the facilities, especially the e-waste facilities, I don't know of any of them in the state that actually accept vapes, so I'm just -- really because of like the nicotine or the other

substances that --

MR. NUNAN: Because you've got the HAZMAT piece of it tied to it.

MS. HACKMAN: Our household has a used waste facility that collects them.

MR. DONATI: Yeah, we collect them, too, in Delaware County, we accept -- Heritage and other people that take them sometimes deny them because of just -- it's hard to classify what it is, if it's something else. So, now we're asking residents to separate the battery from the nicotine pouch, and then we're collecting them separately, but it's becoming harder and harder.

MR. SCHMICKER: Right. And yeah, we definitely are seeing that and understand that and are looking into that, but yeah, right now it's not included in the program.

MR. DONATI: Okay. Thank you.

MS. WEGER: So, following up on that, what is -- what is the process, as new technology comes along, to then revisit the list of PED's and expand that if there is something?

MR. SCHMICKER: Oh, I mean the process would be to open up the law and to work with the legislature to incorporate those new devices, basically, within the law.

MS. WEGER: Because what -- obviously once -- if they were added to the list, then those manufacturers would have to be part of the program, and then there would be more funding to address it.

MR. SCHMICKER: Right. It would be opening the law and working with the legislature to make legislative updates to the law would be the process.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Any other questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Well, Jacob, thank you very much.

MR. SCHMICKER: Well, thank you.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Very informative.

MR. SCHMICKER: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: I think we may have touched on a few issues here.

(Applause.)

MR. SCHMICKER: Yeah, we definitely recognize it, so -- all right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Now, we will need to take a vote to approve the submittal; correct, of those reports to IDEM -- or to the legislature?

MS. GARNER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: So --

MR. LUTZ: I'll make a motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: We have a motion by Mr. Lutz.

MR. GRATZ: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: A second by Mr. Gratz. Any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: All in favor?

(Board members responded, "Aye.")

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Hearing none, motion carries unanimously.

Thank you very much, Tom and Jacob.

All right. Do you want to talk about the schedule now, Deanna?

MS. GARNER: Yeah. So -- and to start off with, I gave you guys like a proposed schedule for next year, and I forgot to change the year on the dates.

(Laughter.)

MS. GARNER: Thank you, Bruce, for pointing that out to me, so they all say our next schedule is for 2024, so disregard that part, but the dates should be correct. Typically we hold these meeting quarterly starting in January, the fourth Thursday of the month, so I listed those out.

And I did try to kind of get a survey to see how everybody felt about that and their availability for the next year. Most people are still available on those dates, and most people did say that they wanted to keep them. Is there any discussion around moving either, you know, to a different week of the month or a different --

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: I missed --

MS. GARNER: -- anything?

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: I apologize. I missed the survey, with everything --

MS. GARNER: That's all right.

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: -- else going on --

MS. GARNER: Yeah.

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: -- but the 24th, I will be on my way to Italy, so I will not be here.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Shame on you.

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: I know.

(Laughter.)

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: I'm going with 40 high schoolers, so wish me well.

MR. LUTZ: God bless you.

(Laughter.)

MR. NUNAN: It's more like "Good luck."

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: I don't want to go. No, they're good kids. They're all FFA kids, so --

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Make sure you don't

lose any.

MR. LUTZ: Just due to the first one being with the grant and knowing that it's going to be a very full day, any consideration on January, first month of the year, always kind of end of year, first of year, shifting to Feb, to February, for the first meeting? Would that be a --

MR. NUNAN: Like the first week of Feb, Craig, maybe something like that?

MR. LUTZ: First week of Feb, second week of Feb, third week, I don't care, but just February.

MS. GARNER: And I put it in, and we've actually done that sometimes in the past.

MR. LUTZ: Yeah.

MS. GARNER: One other consideration, and we do have legislative members here who can weigh in as well, like we would love to have them be able to attend this first meeting, especially --

REP. ERRINGTON: Uh-huh.

MS. GARNER: -- this year, since

we're doing the Central Indiana grants that are a new legislative effort, but that's like the worst possible time of the year for legislative members to attend, as we're aware, since the legislative session will have just started, and their schedules are pretty unpredictable.

SEN. NIEMEYER: Plus this is a long session. We'll be through April --

MS. GARNER: Yeah.

SEN. NIEMEYER: -- this year, so --

MS. GARNER: Yeah.

SEN. NIEMEYER: -- there's two meetings that -- the first two will --

REP. ERRINGTON: Yeah.

SEN. NIEMEYER: If that's the best we've got to schedule that day, we can come out.

MS. GARNER: Right.

MR. LUTZ: So --

MS. GARNER: So, you know, we have like, I mean -- and I wanted to hear your feedback, too, if there's a day of the week that would be better for us, if we're all available, that you might be able to make it, but I know

that a lot of times like sessions and meetings come up like the day before or the night before, and --

REP. ERRINGTON: Yeah. For the House, we meet on -- in the morning on Thursdays.

MS. GARNER: Yeah.

REP. ERRINGTON: So --

MS. GARNER: There's a --

REP. ERRINGTON: -- that's the only day of the week we meet in the morning.

MS. GARNER: So, I did propose some alternative dates for that first meeting in January, and I did go into the first week of February. Our Board members that did respond to the survey, five said they're available that Thursday. Other availability was all less, but I don't know if you guys have your calendars handy and want to look later into February. I mean that is an option as well, but obviously we want to -- we want to have a quorum, we want to have as many Board members contribute to this grant decision process.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: I should be able to

make every Thursday in February work.

MS. GARNER: And I don't know if Wednesdays would be better, if we want to try to make it a day that might be more likely for like the House to attend, or legislative members.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Do you want to say -- the first two; right?

MS. GARNER: First two?

CHAIRMAN BURROW: (Nodded head yes.) I mean I'll clear my calendar for whatever it is. Whatever -- whatever suits the Board I'll make work.

MS. WEGER: I have a couple of tentative things that aren't confirmed.

MS. GARNER: And that's always hard, too, I know, that it's months out. So, I'm looking at the months. I'm looking at the month of February. I think one of the dates I proposed was February 5th, and only one confirmed availability that date, so that wouldn't be ideal. If we go one more week out, like 12th or 13th of February, how is that looking for Board members?

CHAIRMAN BURROW: The 12th works fine for me.

MS. HACKMAN: And that's Wednesday, Thursday.

MS. GARNER: That's Wednesday, Thursday.

MR. GUERIN: That's okay.

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: Yeah.

MS. GARNER: Either one?

MS. WEGER: I'm not sure. I have a -- I have a conference that I might be speaking at that week, but I don't know yet.

MS. GARNER: Okay. Well, and does it influence your decision if like -- are we going to plan out that whole day for this meeting?

MR. LUTZ: I imagine we'll need to; right?

MS. HACKMAN: Yeah.

MS. GARNER: And hope that it doesn't go all day; right?

MS. WEGER: How far out is too far, because I'm also thinking, you know, for those that are driving in winter, later, February might

be better, if the third week of February works.

MS. GARNER: We can -- I mean we can probably do the third week of February. I don't -- there's no -- there's no legislation, there's no anything. The Board determines when you meet.

MS. WEGER: Well, Thursday, February 20th I have nothing tentatively on my calendar, so I could be here.

MS. GARNER: Do we want to do that Thursday or that -- you -- Thursday works better for you?

MS. WEGER: It actually doesn't matter what day of the week for that week.

MS. GARNER: Wednesday the 19th, even, maybe?

CHAIRMAN BURROW: I think we have a winner.

MS. GARNER: Okay.

MR. LUTZ: Wednesday the 19th?

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Wednesday the 19th.

MR. LUTZ: Do we need to make a motion?

MS. WEGER: 2025.

MR. LUTZ: 2025.

MS. WEGER: Okay.

MS. GARNER: All right. Well, you can either -- let's make a motion for the whole schedule so that we're not doing one for each meeting. Does -- do you want to keep the rest of them that Thursday, so the -- then we would move back to April 24th, July 24th, and October 23rd? So, that first --

MR. LUTZ: Yeah.

MS. GARNER: -- the first -- you know, the April is obviously a little bit closer to the last previous meeting, but it shouldn't be -- yeah, that's fine; right?

MS. HACKMAN: Yeah.

MS. GARNER: So, if you approve the rest of that schedule as is, then yeah, must just make a vote.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: So, do I have a motion to approve the next quarterly meetings of February 19th, April 24th, July 24th and October 23rd of 2025?

MS. WEGER: I'll make that motion.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: I have a motion by Ms. Weger. Do I have a second?

MR. GUERIN: Second.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: A second by Mr. Guerin. Any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Hearing none, all in favor?

(Board members responded, "Aye.")

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Aye. Opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Hearing none, motion carries unanimously.

Thank you, Deanna.

MS. GARNER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: We're getting to the meat and potatoes of the meeting now.

MS. GARNER: Oh, just real briefly -- I'm sorry -- I did want to ask you guys if, while we're talking about meetings, do you feel like this location, current location -- we did move into a library this summer that worked out real

nicely, too, or we could always move it back downtown. I don't think anybody wants to do that.

(Laughter.)

MS. GARNER: But if that's the Board's pleasure as well, like where they would like to meet, or if they want to keep this current location.

MR. GUERIN: This is convenient.

MS. WEGER: This is fine.

MS. GARNER: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: All right. The next item on the agenda is the Consideration of the Recycling Market Development Grant Applications.

I would like to say that, number one, thank you to all of the applicants on behalf of the Board. We had some nice applications this year, and we had a total of award moneys of two million dollars, and we had 3.9 million, I believe in that range, of applications that qualified. So, it goes without saying not everyone's getting a trophy today, but it is a

competitive grant process, and I think we've evaluated them based on their merits.

With that said, I guess we need to start through the program. You may be called to give a brief presentation of your program or answer questions. If so, please state your name, affiliation, obviously, and we can move on from there.

MS. GARNER: Do we want to just make sure we know who's -- the recusals, go through that?

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Thank you.

The -- I hope everyone has all of their recusals in to legal. Mr. Guerin, you're recused from Ball State, Clearline, ERI, Muncie Sanitary District, and Purdue. Mr. Lutz, ERI, Frankfort Plastics, Purdue University, and WM.

MR. LUTZ: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Mr. Nunan, ERI and WM.

MR. NUNAN: Yep.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Myself, Richmond Sanitary District and Smith Creek. And

Ms. Hackman, Richmond Sanitary District.

MS. HACKMAN: (Nodded head yes.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Are there any others?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: All right. Hearing none --

MR. GUERIN: Did you -- did you mention Clearline with me --

CHAIRMAN BURROW: I did.

MR. GUERIN: -- and Electronics Recycling?

CHAIRMAN BURROW: ERI and Clearline, yes.

MR. GUERIN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Any questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: All right. Thank you.

With that said, we can -- how would the Board like to proceed? It's up to the Board's pleasure how we proceed. Normally we look at our scoring matrix and the results, and we kind of

start with the top score and work our way down, and then when the money's gone, the money's gone.

MR. LUTZ: That's fine.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Is that how the Board would like to address it again this year?

MR. GUERIN: Yes.

MS. WEGER: Yes.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Yes.

MR. NUNAN: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: With that, I believe our top scorer was WM, who has requested, I believe, $500,000.

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: And obviously we're doing a zig-zag glass sorting process.

Is there anyone from WM in the audience?

MR. BROWN: Yes, we're here.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Would you like to come forward?

MS. WEGER: Yeah.

(Discussion off the record.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Thank you.

Well, good morning, everybody. I'm George Brown. I'm with WM. I also want to introduce my colleagues, Ezekiel Werden and Portia Bailey-Bernard. We're part of the leadership team for the Great Lakes Area for WM, which encompasses Indiana, Michigan and Ohio.

And we're really excited and thankful for this opportunity and consideration for this market development grant and the opportunities that really fold into the discussion you heard earlier of driving and increasing those recycle numbers in the state, and the opportunities to recover more materials and be part of Indiana's circular manufacturing economy, and that's reflective of our application to the Board.

We are seeking grant funding to install equipment to improve the recovery of glass and help produce quality material for end markets and manufacturers in Indiana, while improving efficiency and expanding upon the existing capacity and capabilities of the current recycling operations in the state.

We have submitted a request of $500,000 to

cover a portion of the project equipment costs for the installation of glass recovery equipment at our new state-of-the-art Indy MRF. You'll see that the poster board that Zeke has here, this is an example from our Cleveland recycling facility that we brought on-line, a 20-million-dollar investment last year, of the conveyors and the glass cyclone.

So, that's reflective of the type of equipment that we've made the request for here today. That equipment does include transfer conveyors, an air dyke glass cleaning system, vacuuming and screening system to reduce contamination in that cyclone to finish the mixed cullet for off-site shipment. The cost includes shipping, assembly, and installation of the equipment, and we are providing a dollar-for-dollar match of $500,000 to directly support this.

We feel this project fits the goals of the Board to help Indiana reach its goals and its recycling rates, and again, you saw some of those numbers earlier, and our complete investment of

this new project will help continue to drive and meet those goals and drive the upgrades to our Indy MRF.

All of these investments are based on market demands and research that we've done. As I mentioned, we've recently opened facilities in Cleveland. We're looking at other markets, but we know there's a need in Indianapolis, Central Indiana, and across the state, and that's why we've been making our upgrades and looking to rebuild our current legacy MRF on Southfield Road.

That was a site that we acquired as part of our Ray's acquisition. It's dated, it has dated technologies, and this summer we've actually begun our full rebuild of that facility, and with the support of this Board, we'll be able to include that glass recovery system as part of that rebuild that we're doing with our new state-of-the-art Indy MRF.

So, this glass recovery system is a key part to meeting the demands of consumers and businesses across Indiana and to recycle more

glass in Central Indiana and across the state. We do see a larger demand and need for cleaner glass material for end users. That's demonstrated by the letters of support that we also included in our application from the Indiana Manufacturers Association, the Indiana Chamber of Commerce, and some end manufacturing users as well.

So, we're thankful for that, and I'll let Zeke Werden quickly talk about the specifics of the equipment.

MR. WERDEN: Yeah.

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

MR. WERDEN: I'm just going to touch quickly on like the -- kind of the technical details of the equipment that we're looking to install. As George mentioned, we're currently working on a very outdated, antiquated system. So, currently we have the ability to process about 15 tons a day of glass. This new system that we're proposing to install would give us the ability to process 80 tons per day, so a 533-percent increase on the actual glass material

that we can process every day.

I want to kind of walk you though the picture here. So, the glass containers, the bottles, will go through two glass breakers to actually break the bottle or container down into a smaller size. Part of that glass breaking, it's looking to separate anything that's two inches or smaller.

Once it gets to that point, it goes through a vibratory screen which is, again, separating by size, but then also dimension, so that vibratory screen is looking to separate out anything that is larger than two dimensions in a three-dimensional shape, so bottle caps, pens, pencils, things like that that a lot of times will contaminate your glass for an end user that then wants to produce that into new glass; right?

And then lastly, the cyclone, which -- the cyclone and the zig-zag density separator. So, the density separator is exactly what it sounds like, it's separating by density. Your glass material is one of your densest materials that you have. So, glass falls through the zig-zag

separator.

That separator is then separating out small pieces of paper, which a lot of times will be -- you know, through all of the different screening processes, glass and small bits of paper kind of fall hand in hand, so that density separator separates out the paper.

And then finally, once it goes through the cyclone, it's exactly what it sounds like, the big funnel, the closed air loop, and that is discharging out the smaller bits of paper, and then you're left with just clean glass fraction that is then ready to ship to an end user to be used to make new recycled glass products.

I mean we attached a letter of support from Knauf right here in Central Indiana, that we feel we're going to make a good product for them, and then we can help drive that circular economy and ship it right up the road, instead of having to ship this material out of state to an end user and more carbon emissions. And so -- so, that's kind of the nerdy technical details of it.

MR. BROWN: Thanks.

We're happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Any questions?

Sandy.

MS. WHITEHEAD: So, you mentioned Knauf as an end user.

MR. BROWN: Uh-huh.

MS. WHITEHEAD: So, it -- so, they make insulation; right?

MR. BROWN: Uh-huh.

MS. WHITEHEAD: So, did you look into any technology -- I'm just curious -- you know, like an optical sorter of sorts that separates by color, so that those -- the end result is something that can be used to make new glass?

MR. WERDEN: Yes. So, there is elliptical sorters that are part of this process. I am not a hundred percent on the details of separating by color, but that's just because this is still kind of proposed technology that we -- we haven't actually placed the order yet, but yeah, I --

MR. BROWN: And we do see that in other markets, where -- at the end, where we're

able to do some separation --

MS. WHITEHEAD: Right.

MR. BROWN: -- and work with other manufacturers to make insulation if it's not being used to make glass bottles.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Is -- don't get me wrong. I certainly see the value, and there is a need for glass recycling in Central Indiana, because it's --

MR. BROWN: It's a need.

MS. WHITEHEAD: -- it's not available.

MR. BROWN: Right.

MS. WHITEHEAD: So, the fact that you're able to take that glass and make it into something, that's good, but insulation, that's an end -- you know, that's an end of life. So, that's why I wanted to ask the question. I still think this is a very good project.

MR. BROWN: Yeah, we like to meet our markets as close as they can be to where our facilities are. That --

MS. WHITEHEAD: Sure.

MR. BROWN: -- just helps everybody out.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Sure.

MR. BROWN: So, that's why we're excited that, you know, we have Indiana manufacturers coming to us asking for more of that clean glass cullet, and this would allow us to provide that for them.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Mr. Guerin?

MR. GUERIN: A few years ago we funded a glass processing facility for Republic. Is this equipment similar to what they have, or different, or better?

MR. WERDEN: Well, I can't speak to what Republic has, just because I'm not familiar; right? But I do know that this is, you know, in the industry referred to as like state-of-the-art technology. This is the latest and greatest on the market right now from a glass-separation standpoint.

MR. GUERIN: Because sometimes it still doesn't meet exactly what the glass companies want.

MR. BROWN: Right, yeah.

MR. GUERIN: Greg -- or Craig, do you know about --

MR. LUTZ: Yeah. I mean it -- I think the interesting piece on this piece is that zig-zag density, that it's -- it's the shredded paper --

MR. WERDEN: Right.

MR. LUTZ: -- that becomes --

MR. NUNAN: Very contaminant?

MR. LUTZ: -- a contaminant direct to a bottling company or the fiberglass company, but if that zig-zag density in the rotator is that final piece that really can get all of that shredded paper out, that's pretty slick.

MR. BROWN: Because those end users --

MR. LUTZ: It's a lot -- our system has got a lot of that blowing -- it's got the vibrating systems and everything, it's got the

air blowers into it. It's a lot better than just --

MR. GUERIN: Is the glass company satisfied with the cullet that Republic is --

MR. LUTZ: Some days are better than other days, you know.

(Laughter.)

MR. LUTZ: It's kind of like -- on kind of where their demand is and how much they're willing to kind of --

MS. GARNER: Republic --

MR. LUTZ: -- get with their components.

MS. GARNER: -- sends it to further cleaning, though, don't they?

MR. LUTZ: Yeah, we take it to --

MS. GARNER: Their home or --

MR. LUTZ: -- we take it to a couple of -- one other place before it goes through.

MR. BROWN: I think, to also just add, I don't know that there'd be much duplication, just because there's so much demand in the market; right? There's -- there's a lot

of demand and need for glass cullet, so we continue to see these investments that a state would make in building out that road map to help recover more of that material.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Ms. Hackman?

MS. HACKMAN: This may be oversimplified, but I -- this will open up your residential accounts, either curbside or roll-offs and drop-offs, that -- your residential accounts that come to the Indianapolis MRF will now be able to put glass products in your -- glass bottles and jars -- in your recycling --

MR. BROWN: Do you want to talk to that -- on any of that.

MS. HACKMAN: -- or will there be a limitation on who --

MS. BAILEY-BERNARD: So, I mean it would expand and open us up. Obviously there are some big contracts pending out there that we're marketing, talking about the City of Indianapolis and other areas like that, the nine-county region, so all of Central Indiana, and some of the availability to even go a little bit further

outside of those.

So, yeah, it'll definitely expand, and really, after looking at the stats and that great presentation, I think, Tom gave earlier, there's a ton of opportunities for Indiana as a whole to improve its recycling capabilities, and so, this is just one piece of that, with the investments we're making at our Indianapolis MRF as well to get us better educated, informed, and improve our numbers as a whole in the state. So, we're really appreciative of you hearing us out, and we can move forward.

MS. HACKMAN: I'm confused; I'm sorry. I didn't quite --

MS. BAILEY-BERNARD: Okay.

MS. HACKMAN: I didn't quite clearly get my answer, or I didn't understand it. Not every residential customer that you have, that you collect recycling from now that goes to the Indianapolis MRF, will have the availability of glass? So, if you have a drop-off that's coming to the MRF in Indianapolis, or --

MS. BAILEY-BERNARD: Oh, yeah.

MS. HACKMAN: -- if I'm a residential customer --

MR. WERDEN: Yeah, sure.

MS. HACKMAN: -- of WM, will I have --

MS. BAILEY-BERNARD: Oh, I see what you're saying.

MR. WERDEN: Yeah.

MS. HACKMAN: Will everyone have access to glass recycling --

MR. WERDEN: Yeah.

MS. HACKMAN: -- all of your customers?

MR. WERDEN: Yeah. So, I'll answer that more on probably the technical side of things. If -- yes, glass can be introduced into the residential curbside stream, the commercial stream. If it's a single stream that's coming into the Indianapolis MRF, this system would give us the ability to separate the glass, and we would then encourage --

MS. HACKMAN: Okay.

MR. WERDEN: -- glass to be recycled

in that same stream, yes.

MS. HACKMAN: Okay.

MS. GARNER: So, I want some clarification on that. As I read the proposal, one of the benefits that was listed, and that kind of stuck out to me, is it said something like, "We would now --" then kind of what you just said, "We would then be able, if we got this, to promote that we accept glass," but am I wrong in saying that you currently do accept glass in your recycling program?

MR. BROWN: On a limited basis.

MR. WERDEN: Yeah.

MS. GARNER: Okay.

MR. BROWN: Just based on the restrictions we've had with the legacy facility, we've been able to accept some, but this would allow us to expand that.

MS. GARNER: So --

MR. BROWN: It's been more commercial --

MS. GARNER: So, current -- so, why is it --

MR. BROWN: -- not necessarily on the residential side.

MS. GARNER: -- not the residential? Yeah, you do take glass residentially to any residential customer, or based on your municipality, or what is it?

MR. WERDEN: Yeah, it's -- typically it's -- correct me if I'm wrong here, but it is based on the agreement with that individual municipality --

MS. GARNER: Okay.

MR. WERDEN: -- on what we actually accept versus what we do not.

MR. BROWN: Yeah.

MR. WERDEN: And we face, it sounds like, some of the same issues that Craig faces with having to then send it to somebody to clean it up before it can get to the end user --

MS. GARNER: Uh-huh.

MR. WERDEN: -- which, again, just adds to the carbon footprint, and that's part of the reason, you know, we want this density separator, so that we just can go straight to the

end user with the cullet.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Can I ask you what the total investment is? Would that be to making it in Indy?

MR. WERDEN: Do you want to talk to that a little bit?

MS. BAILEY-BERNARD: Yeah.

So, right now we're, like rough numbers, looking at a 53-million-dollar investment is what we're looking to make here in the reconstruction of that.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: So, it's bigger than the Cleveland --

MS. BAILEY-BERNARD: Yes.

MR. BROWN: A large facility, yeah.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Okay.

Any other questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: All right. Well, thank you very much.

MR. BROWN: Thanks for your consideration.

MR. WERDEN: Thank you for your time.

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Good job on the picture.

MR. WERDEN: Oh, thank you. I'm not available for hire, though.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: What's the pleasure of the Board? We have a request for $500,000, and then we have two million dollars available.

Mr. Guerin?

MR. GUERIN: The glass industry has been crying for increased supply for as long as I can -- have been involved with this, and the fact is that because of the low value of glass, industry on its own is quite hesitant to make the investment in this type of equipment, primarily because of the low value of glass. So, I -- I think this is a necessary project, and if you're looking for a motion to approve for the $500,000, I would make that.

MS. WHITEHEAD: I would second it.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Well, it's quite a motion by Mr. Guerin, and a second by

Ms. Whitehead. And any further discussion?

MS. WEGER: Just not specific to this one, but just looking at the rankings and the requested amounts, I know that in the past we have asked applicants if they would be willing and able to move forward with the project if they were to receive a little bit less. Right now, if we were to award the top candidates with the dollar amounts requested, I think we would fall shy of six, so I don't know if we want to maybe listen to the top six or seven and then go back and talk about award amounts or not.

MS. WHITEHEAD: I think this project has a lot of value, I truly do.

MR. GUERIN: I do, too.

MS. WHITEHEAD: That's my feeling.

MS. WEGER: I agree.

MS. WHITEHEAD: I mean there are a lot of good projects, there really are, but I feel like what this will bring to the Indianapolis area is a big deal, so --

CHAIRMAN BURROW: And I would like to speak to the issue of awarding -- trying to

squeeze more money for more applicants. We ask these people to develop a presentation and a grant request based on a certain dollar amount that they need, and they work diligently to provide us with that.

And sometimes I wonder how fair it is to ask them to accept less, because then their project may suffer, and obviously some people can afford less more than others, but it's a competitive grant process and, you know, the score is the score, and we have winners and losers, and we used to get a trophy when we played soccer as a kid --

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: -- but not everyone gets one today.

MS. GARNER: And I think that if the Board wants to look to, you know, fund as much as possible, which I understand that sentiment, looking at the different line items and what the grantee is actually purchasing, and looking at projects where maybe the project would still go forward but maybe a piece of equipment or a

specific line item is not essential for the Board to fund, or looking at it a little bit differently than just like cutting the dollar amount might be a strategy to maybe explore at least.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Well, we have a motion on the floor and we have a second. Any additional discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Hearing none, then we will do a roll-call vote, and I will start with Ms. Weger.

MS. WEGER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Ms. Wesseler-Henry?

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Mr. Guerin?

MR. GUERIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Mr. Nunan?

MR. NUNAN: I cannot vote. I have to recuse.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: All right.

Ms. Whitehead?

MS. WHITEHEAD: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Mr. Gratz?
MR. GRATZ: Yes.
CHAIRMAN BURROW: Mr. Lutz?
MR. LUTZ: I stepped out.
CHAIRMAN BURROW: Recused?
MR. LUTZ: Yes.
CHAIRMAN BURROW: Ms. Hackman?
MS. HACKMAN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN BURROW: Well, with that, the motion carries unanimously.

Congratulations, WM.

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Thank you for your investment in the state, and we're excited about, you know, the end product remaining in the state as well.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. We're excited.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Great.

Moving forward, the next highest scoring applicant that we had on our reviews was a company that I have to recuse myself from, so I

will turn the meeting over to Ms. Weger.

MS. WEGER: Wonderful.

So, is there somebody from Smith Creek here in the room? If you would, state your name and give us a brief overview of your project.

MR. SMITH: Matt Smith, with Smith Creek. We're out of Southern Indiana. Thank you all for having me here today.

We are a recycling company. All we do is 100 percent wood and organic recycling. Currently we take in organic food waste, but only from manufacturers that have source separated. These would be clean wastes, meaning no packaging.

This project here would allow us to take in packaged food waste from a variety of different post- and preconsumer waste and depackage it to go into our compost. We have certified composters that are currently making USTA-approved -- or STA-approved compost, as well as OMRI-certified compost, which is the organic certification.

We're wanting to increase that compost

with organic food waste, and this would allow us to take that current food waste that is going to the landfill and take the packaging out of it and reuse it. We believe that we can increase our capacity some 15,000 tons a year, about 60 ton a day, churning out food waste.

The trash that comes off of the depackaged food waste is about four percent of the total weight. There are some options to recycle that, but that's currently not our focus. We're focusing on the first 96 percent of that.

To my knowledge, there's no one in our geographical region that is currently doing this, and we should be able to service all of Southern Indiana without a problem with this one machine. The machine and the project involved require a fair amount of infrastructure.

The infrastructure are specific food waste pits that are used to collect and maintain the food waste so you don't have water runoff issues, vector issues, and other things that want to get to food waste and eat it or tear it apart. So, we would build concrete pits that the trucks dump

off into.

And then we would take that material, load it into this machine, it would be depackaged, the trash would go into a compactor, and then the food waste would then be mixed with our organic or carbon waste that we currently already have, and put in our windrows or static piles to make our STA- and OMRI-approved compost.

The compost is then sold to either retail yards, big box stores in a bag, or there's a few other companies that we'll sell to that package it. Scotts Miracle-Gro would be one of those type customers that would do that, or your local retailer.

That is our project.

MS. WEGER: Thank you.

Do we have questions?

MR. SMITH: I'd be happy to answer.

Yes, sir.

MR. GUERIN: Yeah, this project intrigued me, because I never really thought about canning operations and what they do with the material that they can't sell. So, this --

these -- well, the Austin plant, I used to take classes there --

MR. SMITH: Morgan Foods.

MR. GUERIN: -- years and years ago, but is Red Gold still their primary --

MR. SMITH: They do a lot of beans. I don't know exactly what manufac -- what labels they're going underneath of. I think they do a lot of --

MR. GUERIN: They had multiple --

MR. SMITH: -- private labels, too.

MR. GUERIN: -- dealings with Red Gold at that point in time was the primary one, but the cans, the equipment you're looking for, will decan the material?

MR. SMITH: It'll decan, de-Saran wrap, take eggs out, meat, small amounts of meat, you know, like your chicken fingers, about any packaging that you would see in a grocery store you could put in this machine --

MR. GUERIN: And you have a --

MR. SMITH: -- and it extrudes it.

MR. GUERIN: And you have a market

for whatever you're taking out of the package itself? Like aluminum cans, of course, you'd have a market for.

MR. SMITH: Yes. The cellophane and the styrofoam, currently no. That is the four-percent waste -- roughly three and a half -- that would be set off, and it could go maybe to Covanta or something like that. Maybe ultimately the MRF's will get good enough to take that, but there's food waste mixed with it, so it's a little -- a little hairy to recycle that. Cans, yes, no problem, but then the food waste would be mixed in with the compost or organic matter.

MR. NUNAN: From the labor standpoint, what labor's going to be required for it?

MR. SMITH: One operator. One operator to run the machine, and then obviously after the material comes out, it would be dealt with with a different group of people, and it's actually mixed into the compost.

MR. NUNAN: Okay.

MR. SMITH: Cleanup is critical for

this, so, you know, you're going to run for half, three-fourths of a day, and then you're going to clean. You want to make sure that you keep it washed down, because you don't want fly larvae or maggots, the other things that come along with it.

One of the problems that some of the grocery stores are having right now is, there's a fair amount of meats that's going into the waste stream, and those meats are causing some problems, because the renderers are pushing back on some of that.

MR. LUTZ: Uh-huh.

MR. SMITH: And that's what's really pushing this project is they're wanting us to take the fruits and vegetables along with the small amounts of meat.

MR. NUNAN: Yeah, the reason why I asked about the labor is the cleaning piece of it at the end of the day. Does this have the -- does the equipment have the cleaning mechanism in it to where it's self-cleaning, to where just one operator can take care of it?

MR. SMITH: One operator can. I've been to Texas in the last two weeks to look at similar systems.

MR. NUNAN: Uh-huh.

MR. SMITH: Now, down there, their systems are outdoors.

MR. NUNAN: Uh-huh.

MR. SMITH: We can't have that in Indiana, because it can't freeze. But yes, there's watering systems in the machine, but you're not washing down just the machine, you're washing down the area around it, because you're -- you know, you're going to spill food waste when you take a wheel and wheel it over a roller. But yes, it's a -- it'll be an enclosed machine with wash-down.

MR. NUNAN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

MR. LUTZ: How do you control the contamination?

MR. SMITH: Well, in this case here, you'll accept the contamination. So, the grocery store can put it -- package it all right in their

egg carton, it doesn't matter. It's going to go right through the machine, and then it will extrude it out the screens. The packaging then will all stay enclosed and go straight to the trash compactor while the food is going out into a pit, and then the wheel loader is basically making a cake in the pit, solidifying that material to go into the compost pile.

MR. LUTZ: Is it -- is that concerning in the aspect of you're kind of making it simpler for the grocery store, controlling them to not be lazy --

MR. SMITH: I would --

MR. LUTZ: -- on the front end or something like that?

MR. SMITH: If I had to choose, I would prefer the grocery store to separate it themselves.

MR. LUTZ: Right, exactly. So, how do you -

MR. SMITH: We can't get that to happen.

MR. LUTZ: How can we -- yeah.

MR. SMITH: Unless you legislate that, I don't know. It's actually going the other way, because the grocery stores can't get the labor to get it done correctly, or they can't get it thoroughly. Now, that won't happen in the case of like Morgan Foods, because it's expired food.

So, you have a truckload that's gotten wrecked, damaged, held up, whatever, and now it's already in the packaging on a load. Now you're not in a grocery store to have labor take that away. We get calls all of the time, watermelons, cantaloupes, potatoes. Well, they're packaged. I can't deal with them, so they end up having to.

Yes, ma'am.

MS. HACKMAN: We've always thought of compost as being fruits and vegetables. You're talking about meats, bones. Is --

MR. SMITH: Small amounts of meats, the percentage would be small. We don't -- I don't want large -- I don't want large ham bones and that type of thing. That's not typically what you get in a grocery store. Most of that's

already happened at the butcher outside of that. But chicken fingers, a steak bone, composting in industrial sites hot enough, that's not going to be a problem.

MS. HACKMAN: So -- well, we're thinking of what might come from a grocery store or at Walmart, if they see -- you could take it. If there's nothing there, then you'll say, "No, don't bring us that"?

MR. SMITH: Huh-uh. We're even taking their plants, so some of the loads that we -- I saw in Texas, you know, your pots and plants, they don't take -- they don't take the tomato plant or the flower out of the pot, they throw the whole pot in there. Well, this machine will take it out, and the soil and the vegetable or the plant will be right with it. So, it's not just food waste, it would be on their garden center as well. That stuff can go in there.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Thank you, Debbie. I had that same question.

MR. SMITH: The one thing we do not do is we don't do any biowaste. So, you're not

taking anything from the restroom or anything like that. We do not deal with any biowaste. Our customers don't want to deal with that. That's a totally different animal.

Yes, sir.

MR. GUERIN: Is there a tipping fee?

MR. SMITH: Yes, there is a tipping fee. You would be out of business day one if you didn't have a tipping fee, yeah. It is more expensive for the grocery store, by far, to recycle the food waste than it would be to take it to the landfill.

MS. HACKMAN: Say that again.

MR. SMITH: It is much more expensive to pay to have the food depackaged than it would be just to put it in the landfill.

MS. HACKMAN: Okay.

MR. SMITH: But --

MS. HACKMAN: So, what's the incentive for people to bring it to you?

MS. GARNER: Yeah. So --

MR. SMITH: They want to recycle.

MS. GARNER: -- many fall into that.

MR. SMITH: They want to recycle. There's lots of things that happen that have the same economics, and Indiana, unfortunately, has -- unfortunately, fortunately -- the landfill rates are cheap.

MS. HACKMAN: Uh-huh.

MR. SMITH: So, a lot of times recycling is more expensive than throwing it in a landfill. You have to choose to do that, but a lot of the corporations now have a zero-landfill goal --

MS. GARNER: Sustainability goal.

MR. SMITH: -- that by 2035, they want to meet that. You know, Walmart, Sam's, those guys, they're doing it now, but we take Walmart waste in now, but it's source separated. Walmart is moving to not source separated because they can't get it separated, and their meat vendor does not take up the meat anymore. So, they have to put it with their fruits and vegetables.

MS. HACKMAN: So, these items could be compacted goods to you?

MR. SMITH: No, typ -- they can be, they can be, typically not. If you're going to go to a large grocery store -- let's use Walmart as an example -- you're going to have a four-yard steel container or a plastic container out behind the store, and it's going to say, "Organics" on it. They're dumping it in it, and then someone is going with a specialized truck that's sealed up, and they're dumping that into a truck, and they're going to, you know, 10 or 15 different Walmart stores or other grocery stores collecting that to bring it to us.

MS. HACKMAN: Okay. So, the container is sealed, so leachate --

MR. SMITH: Yes, yes. If you didn't, you would have lots of problems in behind your grocery store. We also work a company that collects from restaurants --

MS. HACKMAN: Uh-huh.

MR. SMITH: -- that will go around, or Cummins -- Cummins Engine Plant's one of them. We'll have -- we'll have containers at Cummins Engine Plants, at their cafeterias. Things can

go into there, bring it to us, we'll run it through this machine and take out anything that someone did not mean to put in the trash can, the ketchup packet, the plastic fork, whatever it is, or a takeout container.

MS. WEGER: Any other questions from the Board?

(No response.)

MS. WEGER: All right. Thank you.

MR. SMITH: Thank you.

MS. WEGER: Would anybody like to make a motion?

Yes.

MR. GUERIN: I think this is opening up a whole different aspect of composting than what we've been dealing with in the past, primarily because of the approach of being able to handle canned goods, and I think it's something that we ought to seriously consider funding.

MS. WEGER: I would agree. I found it to be a very compelling project, and I think it starts to bring together recycling and

organics in an interesting way, but it -- yeah, it sounds like there's a good need for this.

MR. GRATZ: I'll make a motion we approve this project.

MR. GUERIN: I'll second that motion.

MS. WEGER: Okay. Wonderful. And we'll go ahead and do a vote.

Tara?

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: Yes.

MS. WEGER: Terry?

MR. GUERIN: Yes.

MS. WEGER: Andrew?

MR. NUNAN: Yes.

MS. WEGER: Sandy?

MS. WHITEHEAD: Yes.

MS. WEGER: Matt?

MR. GRATZ: Yes.

MS. WEGER: Craig?

MR. LUTZ: Yes.

MS. WEGER: Debbie?

MS. HACKMAN: Yes.

MS. WEGER: And you're recused, and I am also a yes, so it carries.

Congratulations.

(Applause.)

MS. WEGER: And I'll turn it back over to Bruce.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Thank you, Kelly. And so, we're down to a million dollars. That's easy math, Deanna.

(Laughter.)

MS. GARNER: We don't not need an Excel sheet this time.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: You didn't even look at it.

The next highest score, with a 98.6, was Frankfort Plastics, and they've requested $500,000.

Do I have anyone from Frankfort?

MR. NOOTHALAPATI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Welcome, and please state your name.

MR. NOOTHALAPATI: So, this is Sasi Noothalapati. I'm the owner of Frankfort Plastics.

Our project is to increase the capacity of

processing the flex material, so we are asking for a half a million dollars to install a densifying line, and also a vertical suppression system. We started this project with a pre-shredder, but we had to change in the last minute to more like a densifying line.

If you don't know what densifying line is, I just want to give you a brief description of what it does. It takes the film or flex material and shreds the material first. When it's shredding, it's generating convectional heat, so -- and the convectional heat is melting the plastic, too. It becomes like a big doughnut. Then we shock it with cold water, and it becomes like a popcorn.

So, that material gets shipped to like the compounding facilities that can make their own pallets, and also nowadays we send it to Advanced Recycling, where they take it and convert it back to pyrolysis oil, and that oil is converted back to take the minerals out of it, and they make a plastic out of it.

So, it's very close to -- like the same as

a virgin plastic, but it's made from recycled plastic. So, that's where our growth has been since more than a year. We've been one of the biggest suppliers for MW Recycling.

So, that's, in a nutshell, what we're trying to do; okay? But the project will add close to ten people, new people, and anything else that I need to address is --

CHAIRMAN BURROW: But the total diversion will be -- is that 2635 pounds?

MR. NOOTHALAPATI: Yes, uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Any other questions from any Board member?

MR. GUERIN: I guess I have a question for Deanna, if I may.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Please.

MR. GUERIN: We've funded other plastics companies over the past few years.

MS. GARNER: (Nodded head yes.)

MR. GUERIN: Okay. Is this complementing those other companies, or is it expanding, I guess, the scope of capturing additional plastics?

MS. GARNER: Yeah, yeah, I mean I think that -- and in this particular, we're looking at plastic film; right? And we have funded, I know, another plastic film or two, but --

MR. NOOTHALAPATI: Can I answer that? I think that you did fund like CT Polymers last time, okay, but this project is completely different from what they did. So, we're taking the film that is actually going to a landfill, so some of the companies, they take the film and take the valuables out, and whatever they cannot use they're sending to the landfill.

So, we are taking that and converting it to use. That can be recycled again. So, I don't think there's anybody that has been funded for this kind of project, and we are the very few people that does that.

MS. GARNER: Yeah, because they are getting the lower grade --

MR. NOOTHALAPATI: Uh-huh.

MS. GARNER: -- films, so that's what CT does for sure.

MR. NOOTHALAPATI: And we are also working on the MRF film that has no home yet for a lot of Republics and Waste Managements, you know, and we are doing that, too. We can process with what we have for now, but it needs extra investment, which we talked to IDEM on it, that would cost like a four-million dollar line, so we thought more on it.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Any other questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Hearing none, I thank you. I appreciate it.

MR. NOOTHALAPATI: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: And what is the Board's pleasure with this program?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Again, they're requesting a half a million dollars, and they will be diverting 2635 tons. Anyone?

MR. NUNAN: Can we table and come and come back to it? Can we do that, with all of us kind of scratching our heads here a little bit?

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: Let's move on.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Do we have enough understanding of the project, though, to table it at this time?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: I guess we have a motion to table, so I'll just take that as a motion to table, I guess. Okay.

MR. NUNAN: Thanks, Bruce.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: And you're --

MR. NUNAN: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: And do I have a second to table?

MS. WHITEHEAD: I second.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Second by Ms. Whitehead. So, all in favor of tabling this motion until later?

(Board members responded, "Aye.")

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: All right. With that, we will move on to our fourth highest scoring applicant, which is Indiana --

Indianapolis Airport Authority.

Welcome. Take your time, take your time.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: We don't want you to slip and fall.

MS. MICKELSON: Thank you. I'm Morgan Mickelson. I am the Manager of Sustainability and Resilience for the Airport Authority. You may have seen me up here two years ago, was it, representing the City of Indianapolis, so no longer in that role.

I'm joined on-line with -- by Todd Cavender, our Director of the Environmental and Sustainability Department, as well as Taylor. I believe Taylor was pretty involved in writing our application.

Todd had a -- his wife has a -- had a medical procedure yesterday, and so, he's at the hospital with his wife. He apologizes he cannot be here today, but he is listening in and will add any additional context. Since I'm only about a month into this role, there might be a little -- some gaps in my knowledge here.

(Laughter.)

MS. MICKELSON: But -- so, for the application, we are seeking funding. The total amount we're asking for is $312,415, for a total project cost of 639,083 something; the Airport Authority is putting up a 51-percent cash match. And this funding would go towards the purchasing of 180 dual-bin containers, receptacles for trash and recycling, completing the rest of the airport campus.

So, right now the airport has inconsistent receptacles throughout our terminals and across the campus, because they're just, you know, ten, fifteen years old and they've been added to as necessary. This results in sometimes the trash bin being ten, fifteen steps away from a recycling bin, and we all know that you have to make it convenient to provide excellent customer service to get our highest recycling rates. And so, it results in a challenge to ensure that they're together.

You may also have seen dual bins across the terminals. Those dual bins are the ones that

are fifteen-plus years old. There are actually three, this is like before the single-stream recycling, where they wanted you to separate newspaper from plastic and whatnot, and so, that adds an extra level of confusion. The sign tries to make it clear that it doesn't matter, put it in the green side, but when you're dealing with passengers from all around the world, really, you know, it can be -- you need to have it as simple as possible, we think.

And so, that's our goal here, to equip the entire campus with consistent dual bins, and through the community grant that we received last year, we have started that process by purchasing, is it 60 bins, for both A and B Concourses, and then this will help us round out the final necessary pieces.

And so, we're really excited about this opportunity, because it will not only help us to contribute to the statewide goal of reaching fifty-percent recycling, but also, we think that it's really important to position Central Indiana, and Indiana as a whole -- if you don't

have a comprehensive recycling service, it's really putting your best foot forward when the airport is the first thing they see.

You know, the airport is top rated for so many things. We're very well known for providing excellent customer service, and so, this is just one of those pieces, and we need to step up our game.

I'm happy to take any questions.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: How much of your grant money will be put towards education?

MS. MICKELSON: So --

MS. GARNER: And actually, I can --

MS. MICKELSON: Yep, if you could pull that up.

We have committed 15,000 of our own dollars towards a recycling education and outreach plan. I've developed that plan. It outlines how we're going to message both to passengers and employees, and across the terminal. So, we're estimating around $15,000 to both develop that and deploy that, in combination with the deployment of the new bins.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Thank you.

MS. MICKELSON: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Any other questions?

MS. WEGER: Did you -- maybe I missed this, but what is the -- sort of the current number of recycling bins versus what you'll have after? I understand that the ones that are there are older and --

MS. MICKELSON: Uh-huh.

MS. WEGER: -- will be -- some of them will just be swapped out, but are you increasing the number?

MS. MICKELSON: Todd, I'll let you chime in there. If you didn't hear --

MR. CAVENDER: Yeah. So, we are -- I would say we are increasing the number, because we do have some bins that do not have recycling, and this way we will be consistently, across the campus, about 240 bins. We're probably getting about 50 to 60 percent, because there's some of our bins that are external through the campus, parking, parking garage, shuttle service, curbs,

that do not have an accompanying recycling capability.

And just so you -- the question on training or the education, if it -- you know, because we're doing it with our own money, and if we determine that there needs to be additional, we will put additional. Whatever it takes to do the education that makes sense, so we can make sure we're promoting recycling through, you know, as Morgan stated, the gateway to the city, to the state, that over ten million passengers annually come through the terminal.

MS. MICKELSON: On the training piece, I'll also add that we'll be working with Republic, our new partner, to offer training to our terminal employees, making sure that recycling is going in the right compactors and all of that. There's many pieces of education along the way.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Thank you. I wondered that. I was going to ask that very question.

MS. MICKELSON: Okay. Perfect.

MS. WHITEHEAD: So, thank you.

MR. LUTZ: So, with that, to Morgan's point, I need to recuse myself on the Airport Authority, too, so --

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Thank you, Craig.

MS. WEGER: I have another question. So, the clarification that this will not just be inside the terminal, which is what I was visualizing, but the parking areas --

MS. MICKELSON: Correct.

MS. WEGER: -- I think that's also really helpful, because I was trying to -- I was like, "That's a lot of bins."

MS. MICKELSON: Right.

MS. WEGER: I spend way too much time in the airport, and so, I probably know them all by heart, but yeah, understanding that they're going to be additional out in the parking areas --

MS. MICKELSON: Uh-huh.

MS. WEGER: -- which I've also traversed. So, you guys will -- are you going to experience a need for additional labor to empty

all of the additional bins?

MS. MICKELSON: That is a good question.

MR. CAVENDER: No, we are not. I mean our current terminal services and maintenance, depending if you're in the building or, you know, out in the parking lot, they go to the areas where we're wanting to install them now, so it will just be a segregated -- when they collect, it will be segregated and we'll be able to staff that. So, we do not anticipate additional need for workforce.

MS. WEGER: Thank you.

MS. MICKELSON: I do want to call out, we have a separate line item for receptacles with a rain hat. Those will be in the areas that do not have a covered parking.

Yes.

MS. HACKMAN: I noticed on an airplane last week that they -- that they collected trash recycling separate. Do you get that from the planes for those airlines that collect their recycling separately?

MS. MICKELSON: Todd, maybe you can speak to this a little bit more clearly than I could.

MR. CAVENDER: Yeah.

So, could you repeat? I could barely hear that question.

MS. MICKELSON: Our airline partners, how do we collect the trash and recycling from them?

MR. CAVENDER: Yeah. So, how -- within the terminal, the Airport Authority manages both waste and recycling for the terminal airline partners, tenants. We have over a hundred business partners on property that will utilize the infrastructure that we currently have in place, and again, we're working to continue to improve the signage.

The back -- what we call the back of the house, which is not part of this grant request, and then obviously with the new containers, we'll have education on the front end, both from a passenger standpoint and from a tenant perspective, that might utilize those bins as

well. But --

MS. MICKELSON: So, as long as they're putting recycling on the planes from passengers, yes.

MS. HACKMAN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. CAVENDER: Yes. So, we recently -- just for back-of-the-house infrastructure, we recently just redid the -- with the changing of the service recently, redid the -- all of the compactors that handles both waste and recycling. In each of the rooms, there's a least one compactor that's handling the recycling, one compactor that's handing the waste out on the dock. We have four out there; there's two and two related to that. So, we are -- we've got the infrastructure on the back end, working to get the front end, and really promote and move the program forward to where it should be.

MS. GARNER: And I just want to point out something to the Board that Morgan mentioned offhandedly. They did get some grant funding from the Community Recycling Grant Program from IDEM to start this process.

Do you want to speak on like how many and where you guys are on that?

MS. MICKELSON: Sure.

Todd, forgive me; is it 60 bins?

MR. CAVENDER: Yeah. So, we did buy 60 containers. We are -- we were late in getting the -- the final execution just happened in the spring, so we have made -- went through the selection with -- you know, obviously we've been through that process.

So, if we are successful in your consideration with this, you know, we won't have any procurement delay other than making, you know, the purchase, once we can. And then the lead time is about -- we're looking at about eight to twelve weeks is what the lead time is on those, so we are due to receive the first 60 hopefully before the end of the year, or right in that -- probably in that time frame.

MS. MICKELSON: I think it'll be an effective two phased rollout, first our Concourses, and then the rest of the campus. That kind of makes sense.

MR. CAVENDER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Any other questions?

MR. GUERIN: I guess a comment, because I'm kind of bothered. First off, the airport is a class act. I mean it's the most user-friendly airport I think I've seen. But having said that, when China cut off buying a lot of our recyclables, we turned a little bit in our thoughts and started funding primarily projects that increased the manufacturing base in the state. And this is a worthwhile project, but I just don't see it increasing that kind of capacity, and therefore, I have a problem with it.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: I'm not sure that I understand your comment in its entirety. It doesn't have --

MR. GUERIN: Well, most of the moneys we have allocated have gone to companies that are manufacturing a product.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Correct.

MR. GUERIN: And I don't see that in

this particular case. It's good to collect more recyclables, but I'm not seeing it increasing our industrial base.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Two hundred seventy-three tons of additional recycling, estimated, is captured. And I understand your concern, Terry. I'm not arguing with you.

MR. GUERIN: Good.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: That wasn't the reason for my question with regards to their education component, because you can put all of the cans in the world out there that you want --

MS. MICKELSON: Oh, true.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: -- and if you don't educate people on recycling, they're not going to use them. And it's just -- it's the most frustrating thing in the world, and I think we all share in that concern.

MS. WEGER: If I can comment as well, I think -- I hear Terry's comment. I do think -- for me, I think there is something unique about this being the airport and the gateway to Indianapolis and to Indiana. I do think that

that elevated visibility changes a little bit about the opportunity for just education and awareness.

So, for me, that was one of the reasons why I saw this as a very valuable project. I have some of the same reservations, like do we just want to put more cans out there for recycling? But I do think that it plays a unique role because of it being our airport.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: I kind of had a little bit of the same thought myself, Kelly, because if the airport takes the lead in the Indianapolis area to recycle, at some point in time the city's going to have to get on board.

MS. WEGER: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: And if you can commit to me that you guys will take that lead and lay down that challenge, I would support it, even though it's only 275 tons.

MS. MICKELSON: Sure.

MR. CAVENDER: Yeah. So, I will -- I will make that commitment, and I can tell you that I have conversations all of the way up to

our Executive Director, and, you know, he's constantly asking about recycling. So, I think, you know, we are very committed. We are very committed to promoting and working in a way that allows the rest of the state and the city -- to try to move them in the right direction.

I have hopes of, you know, really increasing all organics as well. So, again, I think there's a lot of opportunity, especially in Indianapolis, that we haven't maybe been tapped, and I have a much bigger, bigger, you know, program envisioned, and this is just the first step to get right and continuing to move recycling and to driving Indiana and the state forward.

MS. MICKELSON: Right. Also leading the way on diverting construction waste, not just, you know, your standard recyclables.

MS. WEGER: Did you guys also have a discussion when you were making this selection -- you mentioned organics. Certainly there's a lot of people passing through the airport with food waste, so did you have discussion about having

compost receptacles as well paired with this?

MR. CAVENDER: As part of this, we did not make it -- I mean every time we talk about either the community grant, this grant, or even when we've changed, you know, services, we're having conversations about organics, and, you know, the struggle is: How do you collect it? But I need to have it go somewhere and be utilized; right?

So, yeah, I think that's our struggle on the back end, but we are committed to continuing to try to figure out and move that portion forward, but didn't want to get it -- didn't want to inadvertently try to show that, when we know there's a lot of work left to get there, and we will be looking at organics, but as part of this grant, no, we did not include it, but yes, we did talk about it. We talk about it every time.

MS. WEGER: And the things that I'm looking at the cut sheet for, it looks like it's specifically designed as a two-part piece, that there wouldn't be like a later option to add on a --

MS. MICKELSON: Uh-huh.

MS. WEGER: -- third module to it.

MS. MICKELSON: Sure. I think that with organics, one of -- our biggest potential is back of the house anyway --

MS. WEGER: Yes.

MS. MICKELSON: -- right? First we'd want to tackle that piece before taking it to the passengers, so I'm not sure how many years we're looking at down the road there.

MS. WEGER: Yeah. Okay.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Any -- Deanna?

MS. GARNER: I did want to -- just speaking to Terry's comment, too, I was just looking at our summary of how IDEM scored and how the Board scored, and, of course, we're looking at the overall average, but there is a significant point difference between how IDEM looked at it and the Board, and I think that the IDEM's lower score is reflective of exactly what Terry said, just between diversion numbers as well as promoting the end markets and end-market development in the state. So, I just, you know,

try to explain why those numbers are two different --

MR. GUERIN: Well, if --

MS. GARNER: -- make the Board aware that they're there.

MR. GUERIN: -- if -- the previous grant application, Frankfort Plastics, is taking something out of the waste stream and doing something with it, you know? This is collecting recyclables, which is admirable, but I don't think it -- we're going to get as much bang for the buck, if I can put it that way.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Any other questions or comments?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Hearing none, I thank you very much.

MS. MICKELSON: Thank you. We appreciate your time today.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: So, we have no other questions, and what would be the Board's pleasure on this? They're requesting $312,415.

MS. WEGER: Personally, I'd like to

hear the next applicant.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: I think that's probably a good idea. Any -- anybody opposed to tabling this one as well?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Well, we won't do the motion, we'll just table.

All right. Then the next one, Kelly, you're going to have to take over.

MS. WEGER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: All right.

MS. WEGER: So, our next highest ranking applicant is Richmond Sanitary District. Do we have someone here to represent that?

And why don't you state your name, and then just give us a brief description of your project?

MR. SMOKER: Yes. I'm Pat Smoker of the Richmond Sanitary District, and this is?

MS. HAHN: Leighanne Hahn, Richmond Sanitary District. Pat is our Sup -- is our Director, and I am the Environmental Coordinator.

MR. SMOKER: So, Richmond Sanitary

District currently has a recycling program. One week we collect recyclables, and the next week we hand sort our recyclables. We 1's and 2 plastics, steel and aluminum cans, glass bottles as commingle, and then at the curb, paper and cardboard are separated.

The conveyor belt that is used in our -- through our hand-sorting process and the baler/compactor are all beyond their useful life. As we move forward with purchasing new equipment, our goal is to move away from hand sorting to then send that commingle off to a facility to auto sort, and then I can use my staff and the trucks that are parked during that week that we're currently hand sorting to go out and collect more recyclables throughout the community.

Primarily we're going to focus first on the Sanitary District itself. We did a waste audit last year. We still found about 20-some percent recyclables still in trash, so we know there's a lot of growth there. And then there are several neighboring small towns within the

county that do not have any recycling programs at all. Our goal would be to then use our infrastructure to go out to them and offer curbside recycling for those communities as well.

And that is our project and overview. We would grow --

(Discussion off the record.)

MR. SMOKER: Yeah, we operate our own landfill, municipal landfill, and those surrounding communities, most of their trash does come to our landfill. We would, with this as well -- our conveyor system only has so many allotted cages for hand sorting. As I said, we do 1's and 2 plastics. This would allow us to go 3 through 7's as well.

And one of the big components for this would also be sort of rebranding the marketing as we reach out, as we're changing products that we're collecting. We'd be altering routes, we'd be going into communities where there isn't established recycling programs, so a lot of it is public education and outreach as well.

MS. WEGER: Thank you.

Do we have questions from the Board?

MR. GUERIN: How is the direct funded?

MR. SMOKER: The landfill itself is funded through user fees, but our trash and recycling is done through tax dollars.

MS. GARNER: And this is not a solid waste management district, this is not county, this is the City of Richmond.

MS. WEGER: Other questions?

MR. LUTZ: So, how -- going out to the residents, to the new residents --

MR. SMOKER: Uh-huh.

MR. LUTZ: -- what will -- how will they put their recyclables -- what -- are you offering carts? Are you offering the 18-gallon bins for them, or how are they collected to get into the trucks, the city trucks?

MR. SMOKER: We will -- we will supply the cans that we use with the Richmond Sanitary District, so it's the big 64- and 96-gallon containers. We have both sizes.

MR. LUTZ: So, you have those

already, and that's not in this --

MR. SMOKER: That's not part of the grant request, no.

MR. LUTZ: And you have enough of those to go about --

MR. SMOKER: I mean we purchase new ones every year; right? We've kind of perfected it in the overall budget to acquire those as those come on board.

MR. LUTZ: And the type of truck that goes out to the neighborhoods today is a -- is it an automated side load, is it -- or is it rear load with the drivers hand loading?

MR. SMOKER: So, it's not quite fully automated. The driver gets out and pulls the can to the arm, and then the arm grabs it --

MR. LUTZ: The arm grabs it?

MR. SMOKER: -- and dumps it.

MR. LUTZ: Okay.

MR. SMOKER: And it has a split body, so like paper is bundled and placed on top of the container, so the one side of the truck takes that paper waste, and the other sides gets the

dumped commingled waste into it.

MR. LUTZ: And then that truck is just a recycle truck only, it doesn't run any of your solid waste?

MR. SMOKER: Correct.

MR. LUTZ: Okay.

MS. WEGER: Other questions from the Board?

(No response.)

MS. WEGER: Okay. Thank you for your presentation.

And how would we like to proceed?

(No response.)

MS. WEGER: Are there other applicants that we would like to hear from, or would we like to go back and revisit the previous three that we have not had a motion on?

MR. GUERIN: Personally, I'd like to go back.

MR. LUTZ: And look at all three of them together and just discuss all three of them?

MR. GUERIN: Yes.

MS. WEGER: Well, I'll say, in

looking at the applicant summary tab and the spreadsheet, you know, looking at the volumes of diversion, I think Frankfort Plastics is doing a good volume. Obviously they are asking for more money, but 2,635 tons per year, and that project is interesting to me because it does sound like they're identifying a waste stream that is not currently being processed, so it really is expanding a little bit. Those are my thoughts on that one.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: It looks like, from those comments, I think Frankfort Plastics is a little bit innovative, and I like that.

MS. WEGER: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: And it's a lot of money, but I know there's a significant investment.

MR. NUNAN: Can I ask a question about Frankfort Plastics? From a downstream standpoint, does that stay in the state, or is that going out of the state?

MR. NOOTHALAPATI: So, right now it's going out of state --

MR. NUNAN: Okay.

MR. NOOTHALAPATI: -- but when Nova comes on line --

MR. NUNAN: Uh-huh.

MR. NOOTHALAPATI: -- so, they have a waste stream that we can get from them, too --

MR. NUNAN: Okay.

MR. NOOTHALAPATI: -- and we still can process. There's no Advanced Recycling that's started in Indiana yet.

MR. NUNAN: Uh-huh.

MR. NOOTHALAPATI: There's one, but they have to bring themselves; okay?

MR. NUNAN: Okay.

MR. NOOTHALAPATI: But there are other companies that are planning on coming to Indiana --

MR. NUNAN: Uh-huh.

MR. NOOTHALAPATI: -- then it will stay within Indiana.

MR. NUNAN: Okay.

MR. NOOTHALAPATI: So --

MR. NUNAN: Perfect. Thank you very

much.

MR. NOOTHALAPATI: Uh-huh. And we -- we also can provide some feedstock to Nova, because we're going to take the valuable stuff from some of the material --

MR. NUNAN: Uh-huh.

MR. NOOTHALAPATI: -- that we're going to get, and that's going to stay within Indiana.

MR. NUNAN: Okay. Perfect. Thank you very much.

MR. NOOTHALAPATI: I'm adding one more there. Republic, Blue Polymers, some of their waste stream also might end up with us that we can process, too, so --

CHAIRMAN BURROW: It's hard to make the math work, isn't it, Kelly?

(Laughter.)

MR. GUERIN: Are you looking for a motion, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN BURROW: I am.

MR. GUERIN: I would move that we fully fund Frankfort Plastics.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: I have a motion to fund Frankfort Plastics for $500,000. Do we have a second?

MR. NUNAN: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Second by Mr. Nunan. Any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Hearing none, we'll take a roll-call vote.

Ms. Weger?

MS. WEGER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Ms. Wesseler-Henry?

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Mr. Guerin?

MR. GUERIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Andrew --

MR. NUNAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: -- you can vote on this?

MR. NUNAN: Yep.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Mr. Nunan?

MR. NUNAN: Yep.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Ms. Whitehead?

MS. WHITEHEAD: Yes.
MR. GRATZ: Yes.
CHAIRMAN BURROW: Mr. Gratz?
MR. GRATZ: Yes.
CHAIRMAN BURROW: Mr. Lutz?
MR. LUTZ: I've recused.
CHAIRMAN BURROW: You're recused.
Ms. Hackman?
MS. HACKMAN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN BURROW: I will vote yes as well. With that said, motion carries unanimously.
MR. NUNAN: Congratulations.
MR. NOOTHALAPATI: Thank you.
(Applause.)
CHAIRMAN BURROW: Now we're down to $500,000, so we're getting down. We have the next highest scoring applicant, they're requesting 312,415, and the one that I'm recused from, requesting roughly 250, 249,382. What's the Board's pleasure with those two applicants?
MS. WHITEHEAD: I guess I have a thought. Could we now hear the next highest

applicant and then make a decision with those three?

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Certainly. Our next highest applicant is Purdue University. They want to purchase a tractor and a turner for their composting operation.

Is there anyone here from Purdue University?

MS. HACKMAN: I think --

MS. GARNER: Oh, yes, they had to be online.

MR. NUNAN: He's got a hand up.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: I see a hand raised. Go --

MS. GARNER: Go ahead and unmute yourself.

MR. BROWN: Okay. So, Patrick Brown, Purdue University Sustainability Manager.

So, Purdue University Administrative Operations is applying for funding to purchase a tractor and windrow turner that will be used for composting operations and will help with increasing diversion of organic material from the

landfill, reduce the cost of waste management operations, and support district work on -- in the sale and use of the compost material.

We are requesting $69,080, which is a little different than what's shown, I believe, on the form, with our match, for a total purchase price of $138,160.

So, our existing yard waste composting program is managed and operated by our Grounds Department and has been very successful, running for over a decade, and diverts around 2,000 tons of organic waste annually. However, the current program has reached its operational capacity, and that is -- the limiting factor is our equipment.

So, we are currently sending additional organic waste streams away, and those are going to the landfill right now, and one specifically is our College of Vet Medicine is generating around 240 tons of animal bedding per year, and that is going straight to the landfill as of July 1st this year.

So, the purchase of the appropriate tractor and turner, which was specified in this

funding request, will help increase the efficiency of our campus compost operations, allowing for a larger quantity and then a variety of organic waste streams, so including that animal bedding. That's the project.

One other thing, too, I think, to note on ours is that currently, you know, materials going to the landfill, and this operation is on campus, so there's a lot of the hauling cost and emissions being saved that weren't exactly captured in this application.

Also, it's a great learning opportunity for students. We do try to highlight this operation to them and then try to use this as a living and learning about our piece of campus.

So, I want to thank you for your consideration, and just really appreciate having access to this grant and CRGP, really a great opportunity for us in higher ed in the state.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Could you confirm the ask again? You said it was 69,000?

MS. GARNER: And --

MR. BROWN: Yeah, $69,080 exactly.

MS. GARNER: So, that was -- sorry, Board. If you'd noticed in the comments that I had provided, we needed to remove the three-percent inflation that they -- estimated inflation that they had built into their budget, and I was a little late in getting the Excel sheets updated with that, but removing that three-percent estimated inflation, it is 69,080.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Okay.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Six nine zero eight zero; correct?

MS. GARNER: Yes.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Correct.

MS. WEGER: Patrick, you mentioned that you have the 240 tons per year of animal bedding that would, once this project happens, immediately get diverted from the landfill and be processed in the compost. Are there other streams that would also be added, or is that the primary focus?

MR. BROWN: The primary. We also do a -- we have multiple yard waste streams right

now, so we have -- we pile -- both Purdue University and West Lafayette sends their materials here, so we're collecting all of our own, and then West Lafayette is utilizing our property and sending their material. That is not included in these totals, so they are sending all of their large yard waste, so tree limbs, things like that, they're shredded and ground.

And then we have our weed compost, which they're just spaced out in piles currently, and then we have just random smaller yard waste debris coming in. So, we have three different operations going right now. Those right now are pretty much separate.

We're doing a small amount of combining those three together with some topsoil from other construction projects and creating -- they have some mini windrows right now that they've been operating for a few years and testing this process out, but creating a really high quality, you know, topsoil organic matter for all of our plantings on campus.

So, what this will do is be able to

increase all of those streams coming together, so we will be bringing the mulch, bring the leaf, bring just the granule, smaller yard waste, and then add this animal bedding into that mix. There are some other streams in our different operational -- mostly on our ag school side that we aren't capturing and bringing to this location right now that could be added. We don't have any quantification on what those would be currently.

One thing that we cannot add at this time is food waste, though. Food waste, due to the proximity of the airport to this, we are really concerned with bringing animals and birds to these piles, so we're keeping those separate. Our food waste back of house right now from all of our dining parts is currently going to the West Lafayette Anaerobic Digester, and that's around a quarter million pounds per year animal waste.

MS. WEGER: Thank you. And what -- what do you do with the compost once it's generated?

MR. BROWN: So, most of this compost

right now is being used as topsoil for construction projects, and then for annual plantings. There are -- is additional sources that get sold, so construction projects that aren't being managed directly through the university, the bigger capital projects, some of those topsoils are being sold to the contractors for use on campus, and then I believe also the city is taking some of this as well. So, we are really trying to keep it local and going back into the local economy slash the ecosystem.

MS. WEGER: Got it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Any other questions from Board members?

MR. NUNAN: So, from an equipment standpoint, I know in the past we've taken a look at equipment as far as trucks, tractors, things of that nature, and we haven't really funded a lot of that. Am I misspeaking, or am I --

CHAIRMAN BURROW: No, I think we -- we've always wanted the equipment to be focussed on the recycling aspect.

MR. NUNAN: Okay.

MS. GARNER: We have -- the Board has funded tractor equipment at compost sites, because we know that its sole purpose will be used there at that -- well, we are hoping that that sole purpose will be using it at that compost site.

MR. BROWN: And that will be the plan for this. We currently are using a mix of skid steers and front loaders that have other purposes, so we're trying to have the tractor and windrow -- so, it's using the tractor to properly pull the windrow turner, and would be stand-alone on that work.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: I'm sorry; I don't have access to my computer. It's got -- it has a problem today, so if you could explain what type of tractor was in your request. What's the name of it?

MR. BROWN: I don't remember. I'd have to pull it up in a second. It's -- you know, it was specified from our Grounds Department more than from me. It was a -- it's a smaller tractor size. It does have that low gear

to be able to actually properly pull --

There, thank you. Yeah.

MS. GARNER: Yeah.

MR. BROWN: It might just be mostly --

MS. WEGER: Aeromaster PT-120, whatever that means.

MS. GARNER: Yeah.

(Laughter.)

MR. BROWN: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: I'm not familiar with that one.

MR. BROWN: Yeah, I believe it's a Case IH, you know, a smaller-sized tractor.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: I say that because I used to manage a compost facility. Obviously we used a normal scarab to turn windrows, and you just have to be careful with them once they get too warm, but you said you are composting already and you know that, and -- but as you expand, you have to have the equipment capable of responding quickly if needed. So, if you're going to put 25 windrows of material out there, you're going to

need the equipment to be able to turn it timely.

MR. BROWN: Correct. And the plan was to have -- I don't know if there's an --

(Discussion off the record.)

MR. BROWN: There's some kind of water system. I think we're getting partially in-house on that. Our staff on that site is -- some of them are already trained in compost operations, and the plan was to send more of them to compost training if this was to happen.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Good. Thank you. Deanna's been able to pull up some --

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: Well, that's requirements for the --

MS. WHITEHEAD: This is for the --

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: -- Aeromaster.

MS. WHITEHEAD: This is --

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: That's for the --

MS. WHITEHEAD: -- for a turner --

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: That's for the turner.

MS. WHITEHEAD: -- not for the

tractor; right?

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: Correct, but that has the tractor requirements, so hopefully they're getting one that has the --

MS. WHITEHEAD: Right.

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: -- requirements.

MS. GARNER: Yes. And then this would be the -- yeah, this must be the tractor.

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: Yeah, it has a loader on it.

MR. BROWN: This is the tractor; correct?

CHAIRMAN BURROW: It was my understanding it's a turner that needs a -- some motorized device to pull it, so --

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: -- you'll have the tractor.

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: It's a big turner.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: And you say we're looking initially at about 200 tons additional diversion?

MR. BROWN: I've got 240 on average right now that our new -- that college has added and expanded their complex in the last few years, so the number has been increasing. That 240 is a fairly good average over the last, I think, seven years, so that would be, yeah.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Any other questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: All right. Thank you very much for answering our questions. We'll see what the Board's pleasure is.

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

MS. WHITEHEAD: So, is it necessary for us to just address this application at this time, or can I offer a three-for-one?

(Laughter.)

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: Yes.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Okay. So, we had some back and forth about the Indianapolis Airport Authority. We feel that it's a good project because they're a gateway to the -- to Indiana, but there was some hesitation from some

of the Board members about the project. So -- and we really didn't discuss Richmond Sanitary District; right? We really didn't talk about it, but I feel it's a worthy project.

So, what if we subtracted the amount for Purdue University, the 69,080, from the Airport Authority, if they would take less, you know, from their 312,415, so instead, offer them 243,365, fully fund Richmond Sanitary District, and fully fund the Purdue project?

CHAIRMAN BURROW: The number was 243,345?

MS. WHITEHEAD: And maybe it could even -- yes, the 243,365, but maybe it could even be different, because honestly, I didn't add that up to a million dollars, but I was just thinking, you know, "How could we fund these three projects?"

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Well, maybe I'll ask the Airport Authority if they're able to proceed forward with their project with a little less funds.

MS. MICKELSON: If Todd's still on,

I'll let him chime in as well.

MR. CAVENDER: Yes.

MS. MICKELSON: We did discuss this, that we would likely need to just purchase fewer bins.

MR. CAVENDER: So, I would -- I would agree that we are definitely willing to take less. Obviously we'll have to strategically make it -- you know, again, I think we can -- we're willing to do a little bit more than the 50/50, but we'll have to -- as long as there's some agreement that there could be, you know, a few less cans, and then we'll, you know, turn around and budget that -- try to budget that and/or seek another community grant next year to capture the rest of them. I mean I'm comfortable with taking less, just as long as you guys don't say, "You have to hold to 180 containers."

CHAIRMAN BURROW: All right. Thank you very much.

MS. WEGER: Sandy, I just wanted to clarify, because I think you and I were thinking similar, but I took a slightly different

approach, so my numbers are a little bit different. And so, the way you proposed it, Purdue would be fully funded, but both Indianapolis and Richmond would be reduced, because we only have 500,000 left.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Oh, we only have 500,000 left?

MR. LUTZ: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Yes.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Oh, I'm sorry.

MS. WEGER: So, I did the math a slightly different way, and I said, "What if we look at our 500,000 remaining, fully fund Purdue, fully fund Richmond, and the remainder goes to the Indianapolis Airport, which would be 180,000, more or less.

MR. WODRICH: Yeah, it would be 181,538.

MS. WHITEHEAD: That sounds good. I don't know why I -- I forgot that we funded Frankfort Plastics, so I apologize. But yes, same train of thought.

MS. WEGER: And partly, again, it's

not that it's -- there are so many worthy projects, but that one versus like you can't get three-quarters of a tractor. You know, it's a little bit easier to, you know, prorate that, so to speak.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Any other comments from the Board on that scenario?

MS. WEGER: I can make a motion --

CHAIRMAN BURROW: If you would, please.

MS. WEGER: -- to -- can I roll it all up in one? I think -- is that --

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Was that fully -- do that again.

MS. WEGER: To fully fund Purdue University, to fully fund Richmond Sanitary District, and for the remainder to go to the Indianapolis Airport Authority.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: We have a motion to fully fund Richmond Sanitary District, Purdue University, and the balance remaining to the Indiana -- Indianapolis Airport Authority. Do we have a second?

MS. WHITEHEAD: I second that.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Now --

MS. WEGER: Does that confuse matters, because you have to recuse?

MR. NUNAN: Yes, that was my -- going to be my question.

(Laughter.)

MR. WODRICH: So, you have to do one at a time.

MR. LUTZ: I'm out -- on two out of the three, I'm out.

(Discussion off the record.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: I think the question still stands in place. Will the Airport Authority be fine with that less -- even the less amount of 181,530 -- or 598 -- 538?

MR. CAVENDER: Yeah, I would say we're -- we're happy with obviously anything that you are considering, because that just helps us move the program forward. It slows us down a little bit, but I think, you know, any step forward is a good step, and that'll really allow us to, you know, maybe focus on the whole

terminal getting going, and we can, you know, see what the remaining is. But, know you, we would accept 181 as long as we can work through how many containers those -- kind of work through, before you give us a contract.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Certainly. Thank you very much for your understanding --

MS. MICKELSON: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: -- and flexibility.

MR. CAVENDER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Since we have the dollars worked out, we're going to have to do these in individual motions.

MS. WEGER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: So, let's start off with -- well, why don't you start off with Richmond?

MS. WEGER: Sure. So, I would like to make a motion to fully fund Richmond Sanitary District. Am I allowed to be motioning on --

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Oh.

MR. GUERIN: Second.

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: Yeah, she had to

take over; right?

MS. WEGER: Yes.

MR. NUNAN: So, she can't.

MS. WEGER: Sorry; I can't --

CHAIRMAN BURROW: You now have to withdraw your motion.

MR. GRATZ: I'll make a motion to entirely fund Richmond Sanitary District.

MS. WEGER: Okay.

MR. GUERIN: Second.

MS. WEGER: We have a second; okay. All right. Tara?

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: Yes.

MS. WEGER: Terry?

MR. GUERIN: Yes.

MS. WEGER: Andrew?

MR. NUNAN: Yes.

MS. WEGER: Sandy?

MS. WHITEHEAD: Yes.

MS. WEGER: Matt?

MR. GRATZ: Yes.

MS. WEGER: Craig?

MR. LUTZ: Yes.

MS. WEGER: Debbie?

MS. HACKMAN: Recuse.

MS. WEGER: All right.

And you're also recused, and I am also a yes, so that motion carries.

Congratulations.

MR. SMOKER: Uh-huh.

(Applause.)

MS. WEGER: And I will pass it back to our faithful leader.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Well, let's take the next one then, Purdue University, and do I have a motion on that application?

MS. WHITEHEAD: I make a motion to fully fund Purdue University.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: In the amount of 69,080?

MS. WHITEHEAD: Correct.

MS. WEGER: I'll second that.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: I have a motion by Ms. Whitehead, a second by Ms. Weger. Any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Hearing none, Ms. Weger?

MS. WEGER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Ms. Wesseler-Henry?

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Mr. Guerin?

MR. GUERIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Mr. Nunan?

MR. NUNAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Ms. Whitehead?

MS. WHITEHEAD: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Mr. Gratz?

MR. GRATZ: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Mr. Lutz?

MR. LUTZ: I'm recused.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Ms. Hackman?

MS. HACKMAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: I vote yes. The motion carries unanimously.

MR. GUERIN: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Yes, sir.

MR. GUERIN: I think I just voted for

Purdue, and I have to recuse myself.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Terry, you have a whole list of recusals on here.

(Laughter.)

MS. WHITEHEAD: He just wanted to be part of the club.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: I can see why you messed up, though, because you have about one, two, three --

MR. GUERIN: Six.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: -- six or seven on there. So, Mr. Guerin's vote will not count on Purdue, and the motion still carries unanimously.

Thank you very much, Terry, and thank you, Board members.

Congratulations to Purdue.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Now we have the balance of moneys, in the total of 181,538; is that correct?

MS. GARNER: 181,538, yes.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: And we --

MS. WEGER: I would like to make a motion.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Ms. Weger?

MS. WEGER: I'd like to move that the remaining balance be awarded to the Indianapolis Airport Authority.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Ms. Weger's made a motion to award the balance to the Indianapolis Airport Authority. Do I have a second?

MS. WHITEHEAD: I second.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Ms. Whitehead seconds. Any further discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: With none, we'll have a roll-call vote.

Mr. Guerin, I looked at your list. You don't have a recusal on this one.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: So -- and let's start with Ms. Weger.

MS. WEGER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Ms. Whitehead -- or I'm sorry; Ms. Henry?

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: Yes.
CHAIRMAN BURROW: Mr. Guerin?
MR. GUERIN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN BURROW: Mr. Nunan?
MR. NUNAN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN BURROW: Ms. Whitehead?
MS. WHITEHEAD: Yes.
CHAIRMAN BURROW: Mr. Gratz?
MR. GRATZ: Yes.
CHAIRMAN BURROW: Craig, you're recused; correct?
MR. LUTZ: Yes, sir.
CHAIRMAN BURROW: Ms. Hackman?
MS. HACKMAN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN BURROW: And I vote yes. Again, another unanimous vote, and with that, we have depleted our available funds for grant awards this year --
(Applause.)
CHAIRMAN BURROW: -- but I would like to congratulate all of those successful in receiving moneys, as well as thank every one of you, those who did and did not receive funding.

Please continue to submit. We will have another round next year, and I believe we have the budget approved for that, do we not?

MS. GARNER: No. So, it is the biennial budget year --

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Oh.

MS. GARNER: -- so, we will not know for sure if we have funding approved until usually at the very end of the legislative session at the end of April.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: So, stay tuned until the end of April, then.

MS. GARNER: Huh?

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Stay tuned till the end of April as far as --

MS. GARNER: We hope to have another two million. That's what we anticipate, so --

CHAIRMAN BURROW: They've been very good at supporting our projects, and --

REP. ERRINGTON: Question.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: -- we thank the legislation.

Yes, Rep. Errington.

REP. ERRINGTON: How much is in the pot that we draw from? I mean we have a lot of --

MS. GARNER: I'm terrible at pulling numbers out of thin air, and I can actually -- we just did have the report, so let me pull it up before I throw a number -- did you -- was it removed?

MR. WODRICH: Yeah, I took it out.

When we checked the legal fund balance, there was -- the math wasn't adding up on what we were told the revenue last year was and what the legal fund balance was, so we're trying to get an answer. Unfortunately, we have several vacant staff positions in IDEM Finance right now, so we weren't able to get an answer to the question for everybody today, to include it in the report that Deanna puts together, which is a shorter report that's not legislatively required to present to you guys, but I believe she did send you guys a copy of that. So, we can get an answer to that question.

MR. GUERIN: Well, what's the

approximate --

MS. GARNER: A rough number is over 15 million.

MR. WODRICH: Yeah.

REP. ERRINGTON: So --

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Every -- so, it's approximately two to two and a half million a year.

MR. WODRICH: Correct.

MS. GARNER: Right, yeah.

MR. WODRICH: Yeah, I was just going to say that, so, yeah.

REP. ERRINGTON: So, there's a lot of reserve whenever you have --

MR. GUERIN: So, if we -- so, if we can get more money, that would be good.

MS. GARNER: And that was because first -- like we were still generating revenue when we didn't have the grant, when the grant program had been paused after 2008, 2010, so there was a few years that the Board wasn't awarding anything, and then when the Board was able to continue the grant funding, it originally

was only approved for the one million, and even like during the COVID year, we had a restriction of only half a million.

So, with two and a half coming in, average, every year, yeah, that has kind of built up, and I think that was one reason I talked to the Board and mentioned this thing about how we can maybe hopefully try to use some of those. It's hard for -- to get it passed through the budget beyond the two million or -- for grant funding, because that's what's coming in, so it wouldn't be like sustainable in the long --

MR. WODRICH: We are -- we are asking, though, and we have -- you know, we have what --

MS. GARNER: We try.

MR. WODRICH: -- we do as an agency to supply to the Governor's Office, supply to the State Budget Agency for the budgeting process that you guys will enter into here in January. We are requesting, you know, to be able to have the Board award three million in the next two years because of the higher balance.

MS. GARNER: Didn't it stay -- it didn't stay in the requested IDEM budget, did it?

MR. WODRICH: I haven't -- I'm not sure. So, it's a question that hopefully Hilary Alderete, our CFO, when she comes to the next meeting, which is now February, not January, that's usually when she gets the report on the legal fund, so I think that would be a really good time to ask that question of her.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Regardless of the amount, we would --

MR. WODRICH: We'll be sure --

CHAIRMAN BURROW: -- appreciate --

MR. WODRICH: -- to have the answer.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: -- your continued support.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Yeah, we certainly do.

MR. NUNAN: We'd appreciate it.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Even another half a million dollars would fund another project --

MS. WEGER: Yes.

MS. WHITEHEAD: -- you know?

REP. ERRINGTON: Yes.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Looking at the projects that we had that -- you know, the ones that didn't get funded, they were still good projects.

MR. NUNAN: Uh-huh.

MS. WHITEHEAD: They really were. So, you know -- and half a million dollars, with 15 million in the bank, that's 30 years if you added an extra half a million every year. Just saying. Just throwing that out there.

(Laughter.)

SEN. NIEMEYER: One of the things you've got to look at, if you've got a fund that just keeps growing and you keep appropriating so much but it keeps growing up here, that gets to be too much of a reserve.

MR. NUNAN: Uh-huh.

REP. ERRINGTON: Yeah.

MS. WHITEHEAD: I call it a reserve, but a lot of people call it surplus. A lot of that stuff is reserve, so if we get tough times, we have a reserve in there. But the reserve is

starting to get at a point now that maybe we need to look at that reserve and get more money, and if it happens that it goes the other way, then the Board knows that they -- it happened in the COVID time. You got less money --

REP. ERRINGTON: Right.

SEN. NIEMEYER: -- and that has to be looked at. But I think it's the time to look at that reserve growing in the way it's growing and see if we can get more money.

MR. WODRICH: Yeah.

MS. GARNER: And it's just -- because this is a separate fund, completely separate from the general fund --

SEN. NIEMEYER: Right.

MS. GARNER: -- dedicated fund dollars. And I did pull up Hilary's presentation from this January, so for cash balance at end of Fiscal Year '23, what she reported in the Recycling Promotion and Assistance Fund, which is where this grant funding comes from, it was a little over 18 million.

REP. ERRINGTON: Well --

MS. MICKELSON: Could you clarify if this comes from a different fund from the Central Indiana Waste Diversion --

MS. GARNER: Yes.

MS. MICKELSON: -- and the --

MS. GARNER: That is Morgan Mickelson from Indianapolis Airport Authority who asked where these -- the different grant fundings come from. So, both the Recycling Market Development Grants and the Central Indiana Waste Diversion Grants will come from the same -- this 18-million-dollar balance fund that we're discussing now.

And then we've mentioned during this meeting the Community Recycling Grants, that's the other recycling grant that IDEM does and not the Board, and that comes from the State Solid Waste Management Fund, which does have a lower balance, but -- and just to give additional background, that's -- all of that funds come from a fifteen-cent-per --

MR. WODRICH: Fifty.

MS. GARNER: -- fifty-cent-per-ton

tipping fee at the landfills, and 25 cents is supposed to go into the Recycling Promotion and Assistance Fund and the other 25 cents goes into the other fund that funds the Community Recycling Grants.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: And just to clarify, if we have 18,5, we're going to award next year 3.5, so we're back at the 15.

MR. LUTZ: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: We'll have 2.5 coming back in, so we'll be at 17,5 reserve or surplus, whatever you want to say. So, at 17,5 we should be able to look at possibly a little bit more for the next few years.

SEN. NIEMEYER: Uh-huh.

MR. GUERIN: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Yes, Mr. Guerin.

MR. GUERIN: I'm addressing this to our guests here today. When this Central Indiana grant cycle first started, it was restricted to pilot projects, and that was a problem for most of us in here, and there were some people eliminated from consideration because they didn't

meet the definition of a pilot project.

Now, some of those people have come back and have been successful. The legislature took "pilot project" out of the statute, but there's one thing hanging that, personally, I find a problem, and I think there are other members on the panel that feel the same way, and that is that fifty cents that Deanna mentioned is collected statewide, and the grant is restricted just to those counties around Marion County.

And that seems to me unfair, because the entire state is paying into that fund and is not eligible. So, I would hope the legislature revisits that and opens it up to the entire state and not just counties surrounding Marion County.

SEN. NIEMEYER: Good point.

MS. GARNER: And Terry, as of now, that way it's written in state legislation, this will be the last round of Central Indiana Waste Diversion Grants, because it's not an ongoing program. It was just approved through legislation for a second round.

SEN. NIEMEYER: Can I ask a question?

So, these -- these grants that were given today is tied to that Central --

MR. WODRICH: Huh-uh.

SEN. NIEMEYER: No? Is it statewide?

MR. LUTZ: These are from statewide.

SEN. NIEMEYER: These that are --

MS. GARNER: These today --

SEN. NIEMEYER: -- approved for --

MS. GARNER: -- are statewide.

SEN. NIEMEYER: -- today were statewide?

MS. GARNER: Yeah --

SEN. NIEMEYER: Okay.

MS. GARNER: -- uh-huh.

MR. GUERIN: But the next one we'll consider --

SEN. NIEMEYER: Is Central?

MR. GUERIN: -- is restricted to counties around Marion County.

SEN. NIEMEYER: Okay.

REP. ERRINGTON: Was that originally just Marion County?

MR. GUERIN: Yes.

MS. GARNER: It wasn't surrounding, it was just Marion County.

MR. GUERIN: So, it's getting better.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Anything else, Board members?

MS. GARNER: I did want to, I guess, speaking -- I wanted to address, too, the Board saying that they'd like to see more funding with these -- the way that the budget approval goes is that IDEM puts it in their budget for the legislative to approve, the legislators approve, and then, of course, the State Budget Agency still has to approve it since it's a dedicated fund going to IDEM.

The Board -- I recommend, if you want to see these funds added, to also reach out to our Commissioner and let them know that you want to see that in the IDEM budget for the upcoming biennial budget --

MR. NUNAN: And when's that due?

MS. GARNER: -- so that he -- he understands that.

MR. NUNAN: When's that due for you guys, Deanna, as far as when they should submit --

MS. GARNER: Well, they've already submitted --

MR. WODRICH: I think we've already submitted our --

MS. GARNER: -- something, but --

MR. WODRICH: -- information --

MS. GARNER: -- I don't know how --

MR. WODRICH: -- to the State --

MS. GARNER: -- that works.

MR. WODRICH: -- Budget Agency.

MR. NUNAN: For --

MR. WODRICH: Where it goes from there, I don't know.

MR. NUNAN: Okay.

MS. GARNER: I mean obviously my applications are made during the legislative process, and I don't -- yeah, I'm not that familiar with that whole end of it, so --

SEN. NIEMEYER: Well, I'm the Environmental Chair in the Senate, so I'll be

having those conversations with Mr. Rockensuess. Brian's --

MS. GARNER: Okay.

SEN. NIEMEYER: -- a good guy, good Commissioner. We'll have the conversations.

MS. GARNER: Thank you, Senator.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Deanna, if you would like for us as Board members to send something, can you send us contact information, like just a littler tickler, reminder? You know --

MS. GARNER: Yeah.

MS. WHITEHEAD: -- that will be the reminder to send them.

SEN. NIEMEYER: And if you all want to talk to your own legislators about this issue, that's great, too.

MS. HACKMAN: Uh-huh.

MS. WHITEHEAD: Uh-huh.

SEN. NIEMEYER: The more help, the merrier.

(Laughter.)

SEN. NIEMEYER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Thank you.

All right. Is there any public comment? Anybody in the audience that wants to address the Board?

MS. MICKELSON: Thank you.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: All right.

I'm sorry?

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: Is there anyone up there?

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Oh, we have one up --

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: No, I thought we had a comment come through. Was there a comment?

MR. WODRICH: There was one question.

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: Yeah, I thought there was a question that popped up.

MR. WHITNEY: It was that these people that scored lower don't get a chance to present.

MS. WESSELER-HENRY: Oh, okay.

MR. WODRICH: Yeah, it was posed as a question that only those that scored higher are given the opportunity to talk to the Board.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Well, in answer to your question, it's unfortunate that not everyone can present their application and their project, but through our scoring process and through past awards and meetings, we get into the early evening hours at times if we would listen to everybody's program, so that's why we focus on working off of our scoring matrix and working down the scoring matrix until the funds are depleted.

And I apologize to you who did not get to present. They were still worthy applications, but they just did not score high enough to be heard today.

MS. GARNER: I try to make it clear in the invites that it's -- we're asking you to be available for Q & A, we're not asking every -- every applicant to come and present their project to the Board, so --

CHAIRMAN BURROW: But thank you for asking that question, and I hope everyone understands.

All right. Any other business that we

have to tackle today, Deanna?

MS. GARNER: We have addressed it all. We are --

CHAIRMAN BURROW: All right.

MS. GARNER: -- a little bit --

CHAIRMAN BURROW: The Board meeting is --

MS. GARNER: -- ten minutes over already, too.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Our next Board meeting is when?

REP. ERRINGTON: February.

MS. GARNER: Wednesday, February 19th.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: What year is it?

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: What year is that, Deanna?

MS. GARNER: 2025.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Thank you.

MS. GARNER: We are not repeating 2024, I promise.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Do I have a motion to adjourn?

MR. LUTZ: I make a motion to adjourn.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: And do I have a second?

MR. GRATZ: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Thank you, Mr. Gratz.

All in favor?

(Board members responded, "Aye.")

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN BURROW: Hearing none, the motion carries. Thank you. Thank you all very much.

- - -

Thereupon, the proceedings of October 24, 2024 were concluded at 12:10 o'clock p.m.

- - -

CERTIFICATE

I, Lindy L. Meyer, Jr., the undersigned Court Reporter and Notary Public residing in the City of Shelbyville, Shelby County, Indiana, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the proceedings taken by me on Thursday, October 24, 2024 in this matter and transcribed by me.

Lindy L. Meyer Jr.

Lindy L. Meyer, Jr.,
Notary Public in and
for the State of Indiana.

My Commission expires August 26, 2032.
Commission No. NP0690003

B

D

E

F

G

M

N

T

U

V

W