

**CHITTENDEN SOLID WASTE DISTRICT
SOUTH BURLINGTON CITY HALL
MINUTES OF MEETING
October 24, 2007**

APPROVED COPY

PRESENT

BOARD MEMBERS:

Bolton	-----
Burlington	Steve Goodkind
Charlotte	-----
Colchester	Dirk Reith
Essex Junction	John Lajza
Essex	-----
Hinesburg	Thomas Nostrand
Huntington	-----
Jericho	Bert Lindholm
Milton	Ken Nolan
Richmond	Peter Parent
St. George	-----
Shelburne	-----
So. Burlington	Paul Stabler (Chairman)
Underhill	Dan Steinbauer
Westford	-----
Williston	Carlisle "Mike" Coates
Winooski	Erik Heikel

STAFF:

Tom Moreau
Tony Barbagallo
Jim Ticehurst
Amy Jewell
Clare Innes
Nancy Plunkett
Thomas Melloni, Esq.

OTHERS PRESENT:

Craig Abrahams
Kevin Fisher
Ted Siegler
Natalie Starr

AGENDA:

1. Call to Order
2. Agenda and Public Comment Period
3. Approval of Minutes (9/26/07)
4. Finance
5. Sales of Transfer Station to Northeast Waste Services
6. Expanding Mandatory Recycling List
7. Recycling Performance Research Project
8. Intervale Compost Products

9. Program Updates
 10. Other Business
 11. Executive Session
 12. Adjournment
-

1. CALL TO ORDER

Paul Stabler called the meeting to order at 7 p.m.

2. AGENDA and PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Under "Other Business": Add discussion of Goodwill Industries in Williston.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Craig Abrahams, Williston resident, offered congratulations to CSWD for the marketing campaign announcing the ability to accept plastics #1-#7 as a positive step to increasing recycling. Mr. Abrahams referred to a quote by Paul Stabler in the *Burlington Free Press* about the CSWD Board wanting to be as aggressive as possible in diverting as much as possible from the waste stream, contending the goal of 9% (as calculated in the *Burlington Free Press*) does not appear to fit with the CSWD Board's goal. With regard to statements about improvements to the MRF exceeding reserves, it appears there is \$5 million that could be used to better increase recycling and diversion, perhaps by developing a larger regional composting center or better use of truck trips (trucks not traveling empty) or creating small recycling centers along the route to handle C&D material. Mr. Abrahams also urged the Board to wait until after conclusion of the lawsuit involving the regional landfill with regard to the host town agreement. Fifteen copies of letters representing feelings throughout the county on the landfill were submitted to the Board. Mr. Abrahams stated VOCAL solicited volunteers on Church Street in Burlington who gathered 1,000 new signatures against the proposed landfill. Ninety percent of the signers are residents of Burlington, South Burlington, and Winooski, stated Mr. Abrahams.

Tom Moreau addressed the figure of 9% increase in recycling/diversion mentioned by Mr. Abrahams, noting at the November meeting staff will present a recycling plan, not a tonnage plan, for the landfill and the number is far more aggressive than nine percent. Mr. Abrahams interjected the percentage figure is a sum of amounts quoted in the newspaper.

3. MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 26, 2007

MOTION by Dirk Reith, SECOND by Bert Lindholm, to approve the minutes of September 26, 2007 as written. VOTING: all ayes except two abstentions (Mike Coates – Williston, Erik Heikel - Winooski); motion carried.

4. FINANCE

a) Finance Committee Report of Warrants.

Warrants approved by the Finance Committee. There were no questions from the Board.

b) Bank Balances as of 9/30/07

The Board reviewed the account balances. There were no questions from the Board.

**5. SALE OF TRANSFER STATION TO NORTHEAST WASTE SERVICES
MOTION by Dirk Reith, SECOND by Peter Parent, to authorize the General
Manager to execute the Lease Purchase Agreement per terms agreed to 10 years
ago.**

**DISCUSSION: Mike Coates commented if he had been on the CSWD Board
10 years ago he would not have voted in favor of the agreement then and will
not do so now. Thomas Melloni advised if the purchase option is not
approved, then the District will be in breach of fault under the Lease
Purchase Agreement.**

VOTING: all ayes except one nay (Mike Coates – Williston); motion carried.

6. EXPANDING MANDATORY RECYCLING LIST

Tom Moreau reported after a month of collecting plastic recyclable materials there are four bales ready for shipment. Much sorting is done to collect a ton of the new expanded # 3 through # 7 plastics. A full shipping load is between 40-50 bales of materials. By the time this is collected, there could be mold and other contaminants on the material which is a problem. Additionally, space is limited at the MRF for storage. There was discussion of making smaller bales. Tony Barbagallo pointed out market specifications determine the bales and 20 tons must be collected before a shipment is made. Staff briefly described baling and binding to accommodate expansion in the bales.

Nancy Plunkett stated the definition of mandatory recyclables in CSWD's Solid Waste Management Ordinance should be revised to include the new plastics and paperback books. Having both an All-In-One recycling list and a mandatory recyclables list will be confusing to our members. More important, studies have shown that mandatory recycling increases the quantity of materials recycled. In addition, the Ordinance requires haulers to collect mandatory recyclables, so conceivably some haulers could choose not to offer collection of the new recyclables.

**MOTION by Dirk Reith, SECOND by Mike Coates, to adopt the resolution revising
the definition of mandatory recyclables to include the new materials as presented
and providing a two month notice. VOTING: unanimous; motion carried.**

7. RECYCLING PERFORMANCE RESEARCH PROJECT

Tom Moreau gave a brief history of the evolution of recycling performance by the District, including the inception of single-stream recycling, discussions of replacing the blue bins with carts, education (pay-as-you-throw and other options). The District has not witnessed a significant increase in recycling so an independent firm, DSM Environmental Services, was hired to do an analysis of the residential and commercial recycling performance by the District. To save money District staff collected the raw data for the study. DSM has been in business for 20 years doing work worldwide. Their expertise is in solid waste and recycling analyses.

Ted Seigler and Natalie Starr of DSM presented the results of their analysis of CSWD and commented positively on the progress made by the District with recycling. Ms. Starr noted the analysis looked at municipal solid waste (MSW), paper products, and containers, but not organics, scrap metal, and construction and demolition material (C&D). CSWD has a MRF, but there is also recycling by large generators and brokers, especially with paper and corrugated cardboard materials to occur but are unreported, so the District may not see an increase in recycling yet recycling is still occurring. Also, Vermont has a bottle bill which must be considered in the equation.

Findings from the analysis reveal on the residential side, monthly participation rates ranged from a low of 75% to a high of 98% for an average of 89% of the five and a half percent of the households in the District that were participants in the set-out rate study. Recycling quantities averaged 370 pounds per household in Burlington, 420 pounds per household in Westford, and 420 pounds per household collected at the Drop-Off Centers. Disposal of MSW per household per year was 1,930 pounds. In Westford, MSW disposal was 2,070 pounds per household per year.

Residential waste compositions (determined through sortings) revealed a decline of recyclables in the waste stream. Rates for August through November in 2001 ranged from 20.7% to 23.2% compared to rates in August, 2005 and 2006 of 15.3% and 18.8%. Currently, the residential recovery rate of recyclables (blue bins) is about 60%. The recycling rate is 20%. Diversion of materials is not included.

The distinction between the 'recovery rate' and the 'recycling rate' is significant, stated Ms. Starr, explaining the recycling rate indicates the blue bins are recycling 20% of the residential waste stream. The District could get 40% more if a recovery rate of 100% were achieved, but 100% recovery rate is impossible. Recovery rates for other places include Boston at 65%, Roxbury (MA) at 60%, Cambridge (MA) with mandatory recycling at 74%.

Recycling results for CSWD were compared to other communities in the country having single stream recycling, carts, and/or economic incentives (places included Iowa City, Cedar Rapids, Boston, Columbia (Ohio), Worcester (Mass). Participation rate between 75%-80% is considered high. CSWD's participation rate is 89%. A recovery rate of 65% is considered high. CSWD's recovery rate is 60%. The results show CSWD has participation, but is not recovering all the materials. Research has shown higher income routes generate more recyclables. Adopting for the income factor, a recycling quantity of 500 pounds per household is good. CSWD is collecting 490 pounds per household.

The bottle bill in Vermont represents another 150 pounds per household, stated Ms. Starr. Tom Moreau added if Vermont did not have the bottle bill in effect and the District collected 50% of the 150 pounds per household taken by the bottle bill, then the collection would be over 500 pounds per household in the District. Natalie Starr reported disposal rate per household less than one ton is good. Residents within CSWD dispose 1,930 pounds per household. The recycling rate for CSWD is 20% versus 23% in Massachusetts in 2003 and 2006. Residential recycling rates for the entire state

(Vermont) are not available. Recommendations from the residential recycling analysis include initiating a cart-based program to allow more recycling volume, having parallel service for all (recycling collection same as trash), and providing an economic incentive (pay-as-you-throw unit pricing or RecycleBank concept), stated Ms. Starr.

Ken Nolan asked if typically municipalities with carts have municipally based hauler programs or independent haulers. Ms. Staff stated most places where data were collected had municipal programs. Ted Seigler noted the cart program is more difficult with subscription service. The issue is who owns the carts. The cost of the carts is a significant capital investment. Blue bins do not have enough capacity to handle the volume of recycling. Tom Moreau asked if most carts are owned by the municipality, not the hauler, even when there is a contract in place. Mr. Seigler confirmed this, noting with RecycleBank some users lease the carts. Ken Nolan recalled past discussion by the Board about franchising.

Bert Lindholm observed glass containers have transitioned to plastic containers which impacts the 'pounds per household' figure. Natalie Staff concurred, adding that is why recycling rates do not provide an accurate picture because of the weight of packaging. Recovery is a better measure. Mr. Seigler stated the entire country has a flat recycling rate. Packagers are decreasing the weight of their packaging. Recovery rates rather than recycling rates provide a more valid measure of recycling performance.

Steve Goodkind asked if the trash analyses were done at the transfer station. Nancy Plunkett confirmed this, adding the waste sorts were done at All Cycle. Ms. Starr clarified the percentages are from the sorts. The quantity is annual tonnages. Mr. Goodkind asked if the recycling rates are from single family households. Ms. Plunkett stated the set-out rate in the participation study was from single family households. Tom Moreau further explained routes with single family and some multi-family households were looked at as well as different economic sectors. A total of at least 18 samples were sorted per event.

Ted Seigler reported on the results of the commercial recycling analysis. Commercial recycling is hard to compare to residential recycling because there is a generator and a private hauler and data typically is not recorded. Data was collected by observing tip floor materials and through a survey of over 400 businesses. Waste composition included C&D, food waste, and cardboard. Ninety-two percent of the businesses had recycling programs in place. By comparison, in Cambridge, MA, with mandatory recycling in effect only 68% of the businesses had recycling programs in place. The research found a fair amount of corrugated cardboard and white/colored paper was found in the recycling and in the trash so there is potential to increase recovery of corrugated materials, mixed paper, and boxboard. Mr. Seigler reported the estimated commercial recycling rate for Chittenden County (CY2006) is 44% including the bottle bill and 40% excluding the bottle bill. Disposal per employee is 1,107 pounds. Delaware has a disposal rate per employee of 2,000 pounds, Maryland's rate per employee is 2,400 pounds, Seattle (WA) is 1,250 pounds, and California is 1,700 pounds for retail employee and 6,300 pounds for big box store employee.

Tom Moreau pointed out CSWD's commercial disposal rate per employee is low compared to other states which indicates a good recovery rate so perhaps effort should be focused on residential recycling. Mr. Seigler stressed there is room for improvement on both sides, but the data support there is a substantial amount of commercial recycling occurring in Chittenden County. There are "leakages" on the commercial side that the District cannot control (materials going out of the county, import of recycling and waste materials, difficulty in getting accurate disposal data because two private parties are involved).

Recommendations on the commercial side include continuing education and outreach activities, enforcing the hauler ordinance, working with haulers on economic incentives to the customer to increase recycling, looking at small and large retail to see where boosts to recycling can occur. The recycling rate (not diversion) for Vermont is 20% while the recycling rate for Delaware is 10%, Massachusetts is 22%, and CSWD is 33%. Chittenden County's recycling rate is higher than the state average for Vermont, Massachusetts, and Delaware. It should be noted that the recycling rate for other states can include other materials not included in Vermont's collection. Recycling markets are hungry for materials so there is room for improvement, but CSWD is doing better than average on both residential and commercial recycling, reported Mr. Seigler.

Dan Steinbauer asked if there is any effort by supermarkets to remove organics from the waste stream. Mr. Seigler confirmed there is significant effort to recycle organics.

Bert Lindholm asked if there will be an impact on the volume of material recycled if the deposit per bottle is increased to \$.10. Natalie Starr stated the recovery rate of the bottle bill in Vermont is 85%. An increase in the deposit amount would increase the recovery rate to over 100% because bottles would likely be brought from New Hampshire to be cashed in Vermont. Ted Zeigler stated based on personal observation there is not much room for improvement in behavior in Vermont if the data is accurate at the container collection sites so an increase in deposit amount will not have an impact. Ms. Starr commented it is coffee cups and non-deposit containers that make up much of the roadside litter.

Tom Moreau noted in California in 1989 a law was passed (Assembly Bill 939) that mandated recycling or diversion of 50% of material so every municipality in California must post their recycling rate and volume disposed (materials include yard waste). On a pounds per year per person basis, Vermont exceeds every county in California that we checked. Regardless of all the money California has spent on the issue, California's disposal rate is no better than CSWD's disposal rate. Even when the consumer is mandated to recycle, it appears there will still be an amount not recycled so other approaches must be explored (incentives, further mandates). "There is no silver bullet. There is silver buckshot." quoted Mr. Moreau.

8. INTERVALE COMPOST PRODUCTS (ICP)

Tom Moreau reported staff has been assisting ICP with the following tasks:

1. recordkeeping to provide better accountability on how much material is received and what is food waste or liquid waste,
2. a system to evaluate the impact of leachate in the interval, and
3. (in an advisory capacity only) drafting standard operating procedures to cover how material is received, weighed, processed, exported, and recorded.

A meeting with CSWD, ICP, and the state to look at where ICP is currently and in the long term is scheduled. ICP handles about 20,000 tons of (biodegradable) material which would otherwise go to the landfill. Two-thirds of the material is cow and horse manure. ICP's focus is sustainable agriculture. CSWD's focus is solid waste practices. Statistics show biodegradable organic material is 25%-30% of MSW. The recovery rate nationwide is less than five percent. To affect the waste stream, organic materials must be addressed. In Vermont an in-vessel facility (under cover containment) is needed which is a multi-million dollar investment. This is one of the long term considerations. The first step is to determine what ICP is capable of sustaining both short and long term. If ICP finds they are having an adverse impact they will cease operation. Recovery rate is an issue (getting the material from the households to the facility) as well as cost. Paul Stabler noted the Executive Board met with two members and the ICP Executive Director to discuss the composting facility. ICP confirmed their commitment to continue their operation and resolve the issues facing them.

9. PROGRAM UPDATES

The Board received written briefs on programs/projects in the District.

Licensees of Transfer Station

Tom Moreau reported licensees of the transfer station are responsible for forwarding data to CSWD, but there are some technical issues related to the software database installed by one of the licensees which are currently being addressed. The data will be forthcoming.

MRF Downgrade

Tom Moreau reported the new contract for the MRF indicates Casella must absorb the cost of the downgrade of materials due to contamination. The MRF is doing well. Markets are strong. The District budgeted \$81.50/ton, but has received \$103.66/ton for the first three months of the year resulting in a \$124,000 surplus. The MRF requires continuous reinvestment in order to handle the volume of materials. Optical sorting is likely in the future.

Kudos to CSWD Staff

Recognition was extended to Clare Innes and staff for the successful community events and tire and appliance roundups that have been held.

10. OTHER BUSINESS

Goodwill Store in Williston

A memo from Lee Tuure, dated 10/24/07, explaining the plan to set up a collection box for the Goodwill Store at the DOCs was provided to the Board. The consensus is to support the recommendation to direct textiles to Goodwill in Williston.

11. EXECUTIVE SESSION

MOTION by Bert Lindholm, SECOND by Dirk Reith, that the Board of Commissioners of the Chittenden Solid Waste District go into Executive Session to discuss ongoing and pending litigation, property purchases, personnel issues, contract negotiations, and interdepartmental matters that concern matters other than primarily factual matters which are preliminary and prior to formulation of public policy, where premature general public knowledge would clearly place the District, its member municipalities, and other public bodies or persons involved at a substantial disadvantage, and further, to seek and discuss the advice of attorneys on various legal issues where premature public knowledge could adversely affect the outcome of such civil action against the District, and to permit staff and the Solid Waste District attorney(s) to be present for this session. VOTING: unanimous; motion carried.

The Board entered Executive Session at 9 p.m.

MOTION by Dirk Reith, SECOND by Steve Goodkind, to adjourn Executive Session and reconvene the regular meeting. VOTING: unanimous; motion carried.

Executive Session was adjourned and the regular meeting reconvened at 9:10 p.m.

12. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Mike Coates, SECOND by Steve Goodkind, to adjourn the meeting. VOTING: unanimous; motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:12 p.m.

M.E.Riordan, Recording Secretary

I agree that this is an original copy of minutes and they have been approved by motion of the Board of Commissioners at the _____ meeting held in _____.

Carlisle "Mike" Coates, Secretary/Treasurer