

DRAFT MEETING NOTES

District Managers Meeting 10/02/08
Agency of Agriculture Building
Montpelier
1:30 – 4:45 pm

Attending: Mike Morrow, Pam Clapp, Fred Moody, Tom Kennedy, Carl Mitchell, Tom Moreau, Jim O’Gorman, John Malter, Teri Kuczynski, Dennis Fekert, Jeff Fehrs, Cathy Jamieson, Julie Hackbarth, Skip Flanders.

Absent: George Murray, Donna Barlow-Casey, Mike Ewell, Paul Tomasi

Facilitators: Natalie Starr, Ted Siegler, DSM Environmental Services, Inc.

Introduction

Ted S – called for the approval of the previous meeting minutes

John Malter – Mentioned that in the minutes his name is listed under infrastructure, his actual comment was about the need for statewide education efforts.

Minutes are approved.

Ted – DSM is proposing agenda for today and the next two meetings to be:

1. Define what uniform level of service is (today)
2. What is the infrastructure needed to furnish this uniform level of service (today)
3. What would the institutional structure look like (3rd meeting)
4. How would this be funded (4th meeting)

The agenda was agreed to.

Terri – Any funding discussion should include how collection and dissemination of the funds to the Districts would be accomplished.

Natalie – DSM hopes that the District managers group can stay ahead of the Solid Waste Working Group and feed information into their discussions and process.

Discussion of Comprehensive Level of Solid Waste Management Service:

What services would you like to be able offer your district, if funding and politics were not a consideration? What is missing from the services that you currently provide?

Terri- Product stewardship of latex paint, all paint, electronics, CFL’s, Pharmaceuticals

Fred- Publicly owned landfill capacity

Carl- HHW collections (more of them)

Tom M- Organics processing facility, SSO, Leaf, bio-solids

Cathy- Recycle consistent materials, mandatory

Pam- A dirty MRF or a single stream MRF

John- Establish re-use zones

Mike- Collection programs, eco centers – convenient, comprehensive drop-offs that handle a variety of materials. Would also like to offer buyback for materials, and to have a mandatory list of materials

Jim- opportunities for expanded list of materials for recycling

Terri- regional brokering of recyclable materials and organics collection w/processing

Fred- high hazard waste collection (those materials not accepted by contractors, med waste)

Carl- enlarged storage capacity for HHW & recyclables

Tom M- C&D processing facilities

Cathy- More opportunities for tourists to recycle (on the go, convenience stores, parks, rest areas)

Pam- Paint take backs

John- education curricula for waste mgt. issues in schools

Mike- Franchise curbside haulers, parallel collection for business and residents

Terri- marketing the value of Solid Waste Mgt.

Carl- Educate haulers

Tom K- Education programs for businesses and mandatory programs

Carl- Educate ski area mgrs. and municipalities

| Mandatory LFG recovery

Terri- Maintain a voice at the table, network with other groups in the green movement

Tom M- Energy recovery (Gasification) before disposal

Fred- Pilot programs for special wastes and hard to handle materials i.e. tires, Ag plastics

Fred- Flow control

Terri- Waste Prevention

| John- Local product stewardship

Pam- More hauler choices, more competition

John- Free compost bins

Repeal of the bottle bill

Expansion of the bottle bill

Local use first – bio solids

Better Freon mgt.

Breakout Groups

Group 1: Terri, Pam, Jim, Carl

Topic HHW

- Need more HHW collection points
- Allow Transfer Stations to manage and store this material w/in SQG status (**note from certification and compliance section, we do allow transfer stations to manage these materials. It needs to be addressed in the facility management plan**)
- Form a larger entity to bid HHW services statewide

- Rover option for rural areas
- Chittenden district has a dedicated facility and they average a 16% participation rate per year. This is very good.
- Promote PS for paints, rechargeables, CFL's
- State assistance with information such as, what CEG waste is being generated and who is collecting it.
- Need more HHW Depots south of Rutland (**state will provide a list of HHW collection points**)
- Would like State assistance with pharmaceuticals, WWTP & Landfills
- Options for handling sharps, compressed gasses, high hazard waste

Group 2: Tom M, Mike M, Dennis, Cathy

Topic Drop-offs

- Adaptable with the ability to collect wider variety of materials
- Convenience – less than a 10 mile trip to the drop-off, convenient hours of operation
- Two classes
 1. MSW, common recyclables, scrap metals, organics, e-waste, clothing, tires
 2. C&D, HHW, Used Oil, Bulkies. Less in number based on population
- Pricing fair and equitable – in some cases (materials) subsidized
- Less than ½ way there to getting suitable infrastructure
- Need time to invest (amortize over 20 years)
- Need more product take back programs

Group 3: Tom K, John M, Jeff F

Topic Collection

- Needs to be parallel collection
 1. focused on residential
 2. include commercial
- Need both curbside and self haul
- Collection – more than just recyclables – organics, bulkies
- Unit based pricing for MSW, other materials subsidized
- Needs to be economical locations to take materials (time and distance)
- Visit issue of why commercial haulers can't collect CEG waste

Second Breakout

Group 1: Commercial Recycling

- Pricing structure does not favor recycling

1. require pricing structure to be reported during licensing
- Need to improve pricing
 - More tip locations for commercial recycling collectors
 - L.F. bans will push recycling
 - More involvement in commercial building design
 - More data collection
 - Economic recycling data collection
 - Participate in the new Product Stewardship group

Group 2: Organics

- Target big generators
- In-vessel in urban areas
- Windrow in rural areas
- Aerobic vs. Anaerobic?
- Decision making model
- SS Recycling
 1. Multi-county
 2. managed by an authority
 3. Need 2nd facility
 4. transfer station infrastructure to haul

Group 3: Landfill Capacity

- Is there a need for new capacity?
- Environmental & Economic analysis
- If there is a need – public capacity is desirable
- Should it be a landfill?
- Where is the ideal location
- If there is a need for new capacity then should have front end capacity to separate materials
- Bottle Bill
 1. If we are going to keep BB then it should be all or nothing
 2. Is it effective as a litter control measure
 3. Is it cost effective
 4. Tax on non-refillable containers

Next Meeting Date will be the last week in October in order for the District Managers to meet again before the Solid waste Working group. Would like to meet possibly at GUVSWD offices.