

**DISTRICT MANAGERS ASSOCIATION  
PROPOSED AGENDA**

**DECEMBER 8, 2008**

**Room 100 Stanley Hall  
Waterbury, VT  
9:00 – 12:00**

**I. INTRODUCTION** *(5 minutes)*

Approve Meeting 3 Notes, October 30, 2008  
Updates

**II. REVIEW MEETING 3 (October 30) DECISIONS** *(20 minutes)*

During the last meeting the group categorized activities that the District Managers believe would be necessary to provide a comprehensive level of service to all Vermonters. These activities were then organized into broad categories to help the group better define the institutional structure necessary to provide this level of service and how to fund it. The activities, organized by the categories they were placed in at the last meeting are presented in an addendum.

*Please review in preparation for the meeting and bring any comments.*

Activities that require Legislative Action (2, addendum) were presented by Fred Moody to the Solid Waste Working Group at their November 3 meeting, and formed the basis for discussion by the Solid Waste Working Group. We are hoping to also report from the District Managers' Association (DMA) to the Solid Waste Working Group at Meeting 4 (which is why the DMA is meeting in the morning). The report from the DMA for Meeting 4 will hopefully include additional decisions on the institutional structure – especially with respect to the need (or not) for some type of regional or state-wide authority -- as well as potential funding sources.

Note that three of the Legislative Action items the DMA discussed in Meeting 3, still need a final decision from the group as to whether they are a short term (S) or long term (L) priority:

- Creation of a statewide authority to manage SW
- Parallel collection mandated
- Reporting requirement for recyclables, business

**III. INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURE** *(30 - 45 minutes)*

Given the activities listed in Categories 1, 4, and 5 above, what institutional structure is necessary to accomplish these activities?

- Existing institutions are adequate
- Need regional district agreements
- Need super-district(s)
- Need state-wide authority

**BREAK** *(15 minutes)*

**IV. FUNDING** *(90 minutes)*

Given the list of activities discussed in the past meeting and today, how the state fund should these activities. Options include:

- Re-prioritize existing funds
- Change institutional structure to free up funds (economies of scale)
- Increase funding through new sources of revenue

The results of the State/DSM analysis of current District and State funding will be presented followed by a discussion of ways to fund the activities.

**Proposed new funding approaches from the Waste Prevention Report include:**

- Increasing the amount of the Vermont state solid waste franchise tax (currently \$6.00 per ton), directing the additional revenues to a capital fund that provides funding for new infrastructure and new market development.
- Evaluate current yearly disbursements from the Solid Waste Assistance Fund by ANR, as provided in 10 V.S.A. Section 6618, and determine whether additional funds can be made available to implement the plan.
- Increasing solid waste district surcharges to help fund additional waste reduction program costs.
- Dedicate a portion of revenues from Pay as You Throw (PAYT) programs for waste prevention.
- Apply product stewardship funding models (such as a packaging tax, escheat money [unredeemed bottle deposits], Advanced Recycling Fees [ARF], or percentage of market share paid by manufacturers for computers).
- Appropriate state funds to solid waste priorities, including General Funds and Capital Funds (state and federal).
- Set up a Cap and Trade waste program to systematically reduce the amount of waste landfilled in the state each year (similar to the Chicago Climate Exchange<sup>16</sup>. Revenue from the Cap and Trade system would be allocated for strategies outlined in the plan.

**4. WRAP UP (10 minutes)**

Fred Moody will need to report on decisions to the Solid Waste Working Group Meeting starting at 1:30. This will be the last Solid Waste Working Group Meeting before they make their Report to the Legislature on January 15.

**Addendum**

**Activities Necessary to Provide a Comprehensive Level of Service to all Vermonters Grouped into Broad Action Categories to Accomplish Them:**  
(From October 30 DM meeting)

**1) Interstate Issue**

Product Stewardship

Material Bans from Landfilling/Disposal

(How would they be impacted by other states disposal capacity?)

C&D processing (Are there markets?)

**2) Legislative Action**

The group voted on whether each item should be addressed in the short term – next year or two (S) or long term- within five years (L).

- S- Product stewardship – Framework legislation, materials (long and short term)
- S- Enabling Leg. For ANR regulatory Bans

- S- Infrastructure needs analysis & benchmarking, funding
- S-all municipalities must be part of a district or alliance
- S- illegal burning/dumping ordinance
- S-mandatory recycling
- S-ban on organics to landfills (YW, paper, electronics, cardboard, C&D materials?)
- ?- Creation of a statewide authority to manage SW
- ?- Parallel collection mandated
- Reporting requirement for recyclables, business

### 3) Managed by Existing Institutions

- Drop-offs
- Special wastes
- Organics collection

### 4) State-wide/Regional Management Necessary

- 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

- a) Disposal/management of waste pharmaceuticals
- b) HHW Management, including:
  - Need Priorities for materials to manage
  - The costs and benefits of significantly expanding HHW collection programs versus disposal of certain HHW's, and how best to expand programs;
- c) 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, including:
  - Number of facilities needed state-wide
  - Value of single stream vs. source separated
  - Transport cost sharing
  - Commercial materials
- d) The potential costs and benefits of constructing regional organics processing facilities in Vermont (including new technologies to process organics)
  - How do we achieve economies of scale
  - How many facilities and what type are really needed?
- e) 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.
- f) Parallel collection including:
  - How much parallel recycling collection is occurring in the state?
  - How are the haulers offering it?
  - What is needed to increase parallel collection?
- g) Whether or not C&D processing infrastructure is necessary?

- h) Issue of flow control and collection:
  - organized collection
  - control of funds
  - enough competition
- i) What is the value of mandatory recycling vs. bans
- j) What new technologies does the state really need and what are the environmental benefits and costs?
  - Dirty MRF's, Gasification, Bio-reactor landfills
- k) Market development for special wastes materials
- l) Performance of districts vs. towns needs to be evaluated.