

DRAFT MEETING NOTES

District Managers Meeting 9/12/08

Attending: Mike Morrow, Donna Barlow-Casey, Pam Clapp, Fred Moody, Tom Kennedy, George Murray, Carl Mitchell, Tom Moreau, Jim O’Gorman, John Malter, Teri Kuczynski, Dennis Fekert, Jeff Fehrs, Cathy Jamieson, Julie Hackbarth.

Facilitators: Natalie Starr, Ted Siegler

Cathy J.- Starts the meeting, hopes this group can help develop recommendations to be considered in developing the new state solid waste plan. DSM will be facilitating the solid waste working group (“WG”) as well the District Managers (“DM”)

Natalie- DSM will be facilitating 3 more meetings, ANR is in a support role, Go over agenda and Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), looking for agreement on the objectives.

The WG will be evaluating the SW report and will make recommendations to the legislature; ANR is a member of the WG.

Ted- DSM has not seen the final MOU, but understands that the ANR is looking for input on a couple issues. DSM is hoping for more of a tie in to the WG’s work. Maybe the potential for equitable services infrastructure will lead to recommendations to link to the WG’s work.

Fred M- recommends that we stay with the statewide economic structure for the basis of a new plan.

Ted asked if there are issues with the MOU? After obtaining general agreement with addressing the issues presented in the MOU, the group agreed to have Fred Moody sign the MOU on behalf of the District Managers Association, with the following three wording changes:

1. Need to refer to association not to the districts in the 3rd paragraph.
2. Alliances want a voice. Change Districts to members of the association & some alliances.
3. #5 change taking into account into consideration.
4. fill in the dates – September 12, 2008 to May 31, 2009.

Ground rules- please attend all meetings or send an alternate.

Agreements – Try to reach Consensus if not use a minority report

You are representing your district, mention your personal bias if that is the case.

If you have to go to your board with an issue, we will table the issue until the next meeting.

ANR/DSM will summarize agreements, discussions in a report.

| Questions – Are we setting policy? Who gets to vote?

Will ANR be voting? Answer – No, District Managers need to work towards consensus; ANR staff will be able to contribute to discussions. ANR can agree or dissent in a minority report.

October 2 is the next meeting date, 1:30 to 4:30, DM agreed.

Brain Storm – What would new SW rate structure look like? How to fund programs not on disposal fees?

Mike Morrow – Look at exemptions, C&D out of state, Sludge at Landfills for daily cover. Any waste going to the landfill should pay the franchise tax.

Tom Moreau – Called for a pre-emptive strike, when a facility turns garbage into energy, how do you tax? Suggests a sliding scale tax on highest uses, best use = less tax. A differential surcharge to deal with the commodity issue. The future will have more and more processing less and less landfilling.

Product stewardship – manufacturing responsibility, fees for end of life management.

Energy – re-use – burning – recycling? – no fees

Terri K- Solid Waste as more of a utility, try to tie into utility rate structures. Get monies for garbage which creates energy. Asks about the Governors Climate Change Report; why no mention or representation?

Cathy J, Julie – ANR & UVM signing a charter to study new technologies related to climate change.

George M - Statewide pay as you throw? Why not payment on the front end? Resource utilization tax to fund SW programs. Increase in the sales tax.

Tom M – Run bigger districts, maybe politically impossible, statewide fee instead of district fees.

Alternative sources of money or alternative uses of money?
Charge linked to purposes, graduated tax on good behavior.

Donna BC – Why talk about a system change as opposed to behavior change?

Tom M – Landfill bans on certain materials, there should be (or there will be) dirty MRFs at all disposal facilities. All banned materials will be pulled from the waste stream at these facilities. The legislature can drive the business community.

Members were divided into three working groups to brainstorm the first issue – Funding and then report back to the full group in 20 minutes.

The working groups reported back as follows:

Funding discussion

Group 1 – Fred, Mike, Julie, Ted, John, Carl

1. Close tax loops on disposal, C&D and Biosolids, demolition permit delivered for disposal. Do in the short term.
2. Differential tax related to difficulty to manage disposal within landfill. Reuse = less tax, composting, landfill bans if alternatives
3. PAYT.

Group 2 – Cathy, Pam, Jeff, Jim, George

1. PAYT
2. Upfront producer responsibility
3. Front end charge used in conjunction to foster development of producer responsibility

Group 3 – Tom K, Tom M, Terri, Donna, Dennis

1. Population = more disposal = more money, less disposal less money this is inherently unfair.
\$6 a ton should be more pass thru money. C&D is not tracked like MSW is. The rate structure is fine but it's not working correctly. Surcharges are not adding up, so districts are feeling the pinch. Is the Franchise fee being collected efficiently?
2. Fix the current system before inventing a new one. People are greening up.
3. Product stewardship can help. A tax would need to statewide and not local.

General Infrastructure discussion; Related to creating more equitable services

The full group then discussed the second issue on the MOU concerning the need for more equitable service provision around the State.

Data collection is weak from the generators. HHW vendors are leaving the state.

Donna BC – Clear consistent data across the state. Example GIS food sources and potential compost sites. Complete data on waste products by material and location.

Regional Planning Commissions may be able to do this. Develop preferred mgt. systems and acceptable secondary systems.

Mike M – We have enough Landfill space, what are the next facilities? MRF's, Composting.....?

Pam Clap People not at the table today will probably not agree with the views held here.

A group brainstorm identified the following issues:

- Economies of scale, routing i.e. trucking costs are big. Efficient routing is a consideration in siting facilities.
- What exists now? What can be expanded?
- Think on a state level (certification of need)
- Infrastructure married to funding to franchising, one good dealer.
- Money
- Consolidate districts
- Incentive agreements between entities
- Laws that drive private sector investment, statewide policy
- Intermediate facilities, coordinate trucking
- Need to consider other parties such as manufacturers
- Need an education component

Breakout #2 Infrastructure (same groups as Breakout #1)

Group 1

1. Uniform level of service (collection)
 - Look at school systems – baseline level
2. Permits – standardized procedure for permitting new technologies.
 - Compost regulations study group is trying to address this
3. Landfill bans only after management system in place
4. Practically speaking need new entity to consolidate & to make systems equitable. Would have to give up something to pay for this. Statewide facilities for low volume, hard to manage high hazard materials.

Group 2

1. Act 60 type legislation for solid waste.
2. Statewide data/survey 6 programs and services
3. Transportation, collection is important. Mandatory statewide recycling.

Group 3

- Enforcement, does it need to be a component of re-structuring?
- Change the local community i.e. determining a public good should be more of a regional decision.
- Towns should be required to join districts or a regional authority
- A regional authority could do the jobs that towns won't do.
- How do you structure an authority.....appointed, elected?
- Sub regional facilities for brokering materials
- Authority can attract vendors and address funding problems
- District managers association can become the Authority.

Flip Chart Notes

Infrastructure

- Need complete data on waste products by material and location (e.g. food waste) GIS system
- Determine using complete data, What preferred mgt. system is (by material type)
- Consider economies of scale in facility development (statewide when feasible, certificate of need concept)
- Consider low tech technologies and how they fit in local systems
- John M
- Franchising available as a tool statewide
- Money needs consistent statewide
- Statewide authority?
- Cooperative infrastructure in financial mgt. (Donna)
- No barrier to entry for private sector
- Statewide policy to direct waste/commodity to higher use
- Coordinated transportation i.e. recyclables to CSWD and organics to CVSWD
- Need to consider other responsible parties (manufacturers) in discussion of infrastructure
- Education at citizen and municipal level

Funding Flip Charts

- Biosolids currently exempt from \$6 fee if beneficial use – shouldn't be the case. Including out of state facilities
- Franchise tax should apply to all materials
- Pre-emptive strike (trash or commodity)
 1. Tax commodities
 2. Variable tax
 3. Highest and best use
- Differential surcharge
 1. Most appropriate use of food scraps
- Economics through product stewardship e.g. paint, CFL
- Part that wasn't commodity might become a commodity

- Solid waste as a utility, tie in with franchise tax
- Climate change, involvement of Commission on Climate Change with District Managers Association
- Current report doesn't mention solid waste gasification or energy source
- Why not front end charge to fund solid waste mgt. system?
 1. packaging tax
 2. resource utilization
 3. add-on to sales tax, based on cost of disposal
- Replace franchise tax with front end tax
- PAYT or disposal fees
- Purpose of charges?
 1. infrastructure
 2. change behavior
- Goal: change system to stop wasting resources
- Much broader issue
 1. National
 2. back to the source
- Question of charge on Organics?
- Bans on disposal
 1. mandates on pre-processing prior to disposal.