

District Managers' Meeting  
October 30, 2008  
GUVSWD Offices  
Hartland, Vermont

Draft Meeting Minutes

Present: Jim O'Gorman, George Murray, John Malter, Fred Moody, Nancy Plunkett, Cathy Jamieson, Julie Hackbarth, Paul Tomasi, Jeff Fehrs, Dennis Fekert, Tom Kennedy, Pam Clapp, Terri Kuzinski, Mike Morrow.

Facilitators: Ted Siegler, Natalie Starr

Observer: John Deming (DSM)

Meeting Minutes from 10/2/08 meeting approved

Tom K- What is ANR's commitment to this process and the outcome? What are we going to do with our recommendations? What are we going to do with the legislature? I hope we can commit to making changes.

Ted – We're trying to inform the Solid Waste Working Group ("SWWG") on what legislative action needs to happen. We are hoping that recommendations to the legislature come out of this process.

Cathy J- We should work on the economic structure.

Jeff F- The MOU spells out that this group should be making recommendations for the next state solid waste plan.

Tom K – Bottom line we need legislative action.

Natalie- Today's discussion will begin with what we discussed last month (October 2). What does a uniform level of service look like? Note that the funding sources and the District budgets and related information that we have asked for is to inform our discussion on funding at our last meeting, and how the state might achieve a uniform level of service. (Went over the handout)

Paul T- Why pilot programs for special waste ("SPW")? The pilots are not the problem – end markets are the problem. There is a need for consistent end markets.

Natalie- Need to add market Development and statewide clearing house for special wastes (SPW) and end markets.

John- Encourage AOT to handle tires.

Mike – What is SPW? (Answer - Bulky waste, HHW, things not easily disposed of or handled, or not typically accepted mixed in with MSW)

Mike- Everything not MSW and C&D is SPW.

Nancy- End markets are the issue, not collection.

Discussion of Needs for Comprehensive Level of Solid Waste Management Service:

**Product Stewardship options:** Product Stewardship Council, framework legislature for CFL's, local product stewardship- need selection criteria for products/materials and for prioritizing those. While District Manager's said initial list should include latex paint, oil based paints, CFL's and pharmaceuticals, DSM stepped out of the facilitators role and argued that most pharmaceuticals end up in our wastewater as result of passing through the human body, so do we really know what the value is in collecting the last 20% that is unused.

**Special Waste and hard to handle waste:** Mike- is a rover more cost effective then a permanent facility? Tom- would statewide be cheaper then regional or local?

**Curbside and drop-off collection programs and facilities:** Nancy- Pay as you throw, Terri- Curbside is in the private domain, the public sector must get more involved i.e. organics.

**Recycling Management:** George- illegal dumping is on the rise at recycling centers, Paul-agrees, Mike- tires need to be looked at.

**Organics:** Terri- The state needs to prioritize the highest uses for organics.

**Education Programs:** For tourists, for the districts (professional development)

**Major facilities needed:** Tire processing, John- junkyards should be discussed

**Regulations:** Franchising, Mandatory recycling, Junkyards, Illegal dumping, Fred- Franchising and flow control need to be analyzed.

The following items were discussed as needing to be added to the initial list of items that together form a comprehensive level of solid waste service: **Product Stewardship**

- Framework legislation for product stewardship in general and criteria for determining new products to target
- Items that might be targeted include:
  - Mercury collection programs- need access to more?
  - Tires?            - Carpeting?

## **Special Waste/HHW**

- **Need to also address:** Books
- High Hazard waste
  1. Ammunition
  2. Explosives
  3. Cyanide
- Furniture & Mattress

## **Market Development/Sustainable Markets**

- Ag Film
- Books
- State-wide market development
- State market

## **Collection**

- Public sector curbside collection (organics)

## **Recycling Mgt.**

- Issue of tourist & residents dropping off garbage
- Illegal dumping
- Burial on-site

## **Organics**

- State priority/hierarchy for organics

## **Education**

- Residents
- Snowmobiles, lake associations
- State outreach to towns
- Professional development for district and municipal managers to better collect and analyze data among other things

## **Major Facilities**

- Tire processing
- Continuation of public & private Landfill capacity

## **Regulations**

- Junkyards
- Landfill bans
- Closure of unlined landfills
- Flow control
- Franchise
- Mandatory recycling
- PAYT
- Prosecution of illegal disposal.

**Taking from the initial list of comprehensive level of service and the items added to the list today, the group was asked to place each into one or more of five categories ;**

### **1) Interstate Issue**

Product stewardship  
Bans  
C&D processing

### **2) Legislative Action**

**The group voted on whether each item should be addressed in the short term (“S:) or in the long term (L), and defined short term as the next year and long term as the next 5 years. The “?” indicates that a consensus or majority was not reached on an item.**

- S- Product stewardship – Framework legislation, materials (long and short term)
- ?- Creation of a statewide authority to manage SW
- S- Enabling Leg. For ANR regulatory Bans
- S- Infrastructure needs analysis & benchmarking, funding
- ?- Parallel collection mandated
- S-all municipalities must be part of a district or alliance
- Reporting requirement for recyclables, business
- S- illegal burning/dumping ordinance
- S-mandatory recycling
- S-ban on organics to landfills (YW, paper, electronics, cardboard, C&D materials?)

### **3) Managed by existing institutions**

- Drop-offs
- Special wastes
- Organics collection

### **4) State-wide/Regional**

- High Hazardous waste- statewide program
- HHW – statewide contract
- State-wide brokering of materials (possible market development after needs analysis)
- State-wide recycling processing and transport infrastructure
- New technologies evaluation
  1. Bioreactor landfills

2. Dirty MRFs
  3. Gasification
  4. Etc.
- C&D processing

#### **5) Needs Analysis**

- Pharmaceuticals
- HHW
  1. Need Priorities for materials to manage
- Convenient collection
- Parallel collection

1. What % of haulers offer recycling?
- Issue of flow control
  1. organized collection
  2. control of funds
  3. enough competition
- Organics processing
  1. How do we achieve economies of scale
  2. How many facilities and what type are really needed?
- What is the value of mandatory recycling vs. bans
- Analysis of single stream
  1. # of facilities needed state-wide
  2. value of ss vs. source separated
  3. transport cost sharing
  4. commercial materials
- What Technologies does the state really need?
  1. Dirty MRF's
  2. New Technology
  3. Bio-reactor landfills
4. Other
  - Does the state need a C&D processing facility?
  - Market development for special wastes materials
  - Need to evaluate the performance of districts vs. towns.

## Report to the Solid Waste Working Group

The District Managers met with ANR staff on October 30 and as result of their discussions recommended the following:

1. The Legislature consider adopting Framework Legislation for Product Stewardship that would authorize the ANR or another body (uncertain who) to participate with other states on Product Stewardship issues, and would propose product stewardship requirements for specific products which the ANR or other designated body believe pose a burden on the Vermont solid waste management system or the environment.
2. The Legislature consider amending Act 78 to require that all municipalities be a member of a regional solid waste management district or alliance that encompasses neighboring municipalities.
3. The Legislature fund and direct the ANR to conduct an infrastructure needs assessment to determine, among other issues, the following:
  - The costs and benefits of significantly expanding HHW collection programs versus disposal of certain HHW's, and how best to expand programs;
  - The potential costs and benefits of constructing a second single stream Materials Recovery Facility in Vermont - including a fair and equitable means of sharing in economies of scale and transport costs;
  - The potential costs and benefits of constructing regional organics processing facilities in Vermont (including new technologies to process organics); and,
  - The behavior of Vermont residents using existing drop-off facilities, with the intent of developing a convenient and cost effective drop-off infrastructure (explicitly accounting

- for the costs and environmental impacts of residents driving to the drop-offs) for hard to handle wastes, MSW and recyclables.
- Whether or not C&D processing infrastructure is necessary.

4. The Legislature consider adopting enabling legislation authorizing the ANR to mandate recycling or diversion of certain materials **and ban them** from landfilling within the state based on the availability of sufficient infrastructure to manage the material in an alternative and environmentally preferable manner.

5. The Legislature consider adopting legislation requiring that all solid waste districts and municipalities adopt meaningful PAYT pricing for both municipal and private collection and drop-offs within the state, and authorizing the ANR to promulgate rules specifying what meaningful PAYT pricing entails.

-----