

WASTE & MATERIALS MANAGEMENT STUDY GROUP – Notes: April 6, 2017

Location: Schmeeckle Reserve Visitor's center

Member Attendance: Albee, Curry, Doverspike/SWANA, Johnson, Karwoski, Meyer Smith, Morgan, Nickodem/AROW, Sexton,
 Welch/WCSWMA

DNR Attendance: Lamensky, Semrau, Sponseller, Van Rossum

Subs/Guest Speakers: Dr. Christine Thomas, Dean of the College of Natural Resources, UWSP and Steve Menzel, Director of Development for the College of Natural Resources, UWSP


Time/ Presenter	Topic	Follow-up/Notes
9:30 Meleesa & Chad	Agenda & Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes from 2/16/17 were approved (vote: 6:0). Finalized notes can be found here on the WMM website.
9:45 Dr. Christine Thomas and Steve Menzel	UW Stevens Point Waste Management Program Endowment Chair Presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UWSP is looking for someone interested in endowing a Professorship position for one of their professors in the Waste Management program. They are looking for any recommendations on who they may approach and for feedback on the endowment proposal. UWSP currently has three endowed positions in the College of Natural Resources (two Chairs, each with a two million dollar endowment, which were new positions that were filled after a national candidate search; and one Professorship with a one million dollar endowment for a professor who was already at UWSP). All three are in the wildlife program. The endowment positions are set up so they get to use the interest each year without touching the principle (\$40,000/yr interest for a 1 million endowment). Use of the endowment interest is approved by Dr. Thomas each year. The benefits of these endowed positions have been wide reaching. The Chairs have already brought in several grants of \$100,000 or more for research in Wisconsin since August. The positions are doing a wide range of student involvement activities with the money. The endowment money can also be used to provide matching funds to secure grants. The positions have created a “buzz” in the industry, inspiring a substantial increase in applicants for other professor positions within the wildlife program. Rob Michitsch is a Professor in the Waste Management Program at UWSP who has offered ideas on what he could do with an endowment position. He is known for his strong ability to engage students and his focus on experience outside of the classroom. Just this year he has won two student-nominated awards including one from the education sector and one from the Associated Recyclers of Wisconsin. Rob is an example of a current faculty member who has the potential to enhance the Waste Management program significantly through an endowed professorship. The endowment will require one or two people who are very interested in the long-term future of the waste industry and possibly people who want to leave a legacy. Naming rights are available as well as flexibility in influencing the vision for the endowed professorship. Lynn: The current endowment description sounds like the endowment will be maintaining status quo,

		<p>the description should focus on the new opportunities it brings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tom Q: Does the program have a Waste Management major? Dr. Thomas: Yes, only one in the country. • Tom Q: Will there be a course expansion? Dr. Thomas A: It is unlikely, the endowment would have to be much larger. • Tom Q: Are people leaving this major and going directly into the industry? Group A: Yes, many people currently in the industry have come directly out of the program.
<p>1:10 Joe</p>	<p>DNR and Study Group Updates</p>	<p>Study group updates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New member, Bart Sexton Sand Creek Consulting <p>WMMP (Waste and Materials Management Program) updates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landfill gas generation graphs and webpage updates will be posted soon. • The state budget is going through first round of public hearings. Things look very status quo for WMMP. • With the federal budget it is still unclear what impacts it will have on WMMP but it would most directly impact hazardous waste. John Q: What are the implications of the federal budget on the WMMP? B. Sponseller A: Current proposals have budget cut implications for EPA but not EPA funding of state programs in 2017 and cuts to both the EPA and EPA funding for state programs in 2018. The current 2017 proposal would include an EPA staffing cut of well over 10,000 positions which implies the states would have to pick up a lot of work which will be difficult in addition to budget cuts. It is still early in the process. • Meleesa Q: Wisconsin's program is more rigorous than federal subtitle D standards but most states are just implementing the federal standards, right? Joe A: That is correct but there isn't a federal funding component for those programs. • The spring SWIP meeting will be held on Wednesday, May 10, at 9:30 by webinar (fall will still be face to face). Please let Joe or Casey know if you have a topic you would like covered at the SWIP meeting. • Lynn Q: What is the status of the clean soil guidance? Joe A: It is slowly moving forward while we work through concerns with some stakeholders. <p>Hiring updates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First round interviews for the WMM Bureau Director (previously held by Ann Coakley) position were completed last week. There will be another round of interviews and we will hope to announce in May. • Once the Bureau Director position is filled we will move forward with filling the Field Operations Director (new position created from alignment for all DNR Programs) position. This position will be focused on facilitating consistency in decisions made across the state. • The lead engineer position (previously held by Bob Grefe) has completed the interview process and will be announced in the next two weeks. • A hazardous waste specialist in the southeast region and a hydrogeologist position in the west central region will both be under recruitment soon. • Ed Lynch the hazardous waste and nonmetallic mining section chief will be retiring in July and Colleen Storck the business services and IT section chief will be retiring in June. • The program will be relying on regional supervisors and frontline staff as we fill high level positions. • John Q: What is the turnover outlook for the WMMP for the next 5 years? B. Sponseller A: The turnover

level continues to look high over the next 5 years. Many DNR staff were hired about 30 years ago and that wave will be retiring. To manage this process HR is back to full staff and will be working on streamlining the recruitment process. There are also many cases of people being trained by the state and then going on to private industry positions, especially hires in their 20s.


1:25
Joe

Wood Waste Processors Streamlining Project



Streamlining Projects_WMM_SG_Af

- In January the WMMP started looking for two streamlining projects they could undertake with stakeholder engagement. The program already has a lot of built in efficiencies. The first project selected is automating the relicensing process which will free up a lot of staff time. WMMP will be determining how to reallocate that time. The second is a streamlined process for certain waste wood processors. Once the process has been improved the same process could be used for several other facility types such as C&D and shingle processing.
- John Q: Is this for green wood waste only? Joe A: No it is for processing of wood that is painted, treated, contains adhesives or is otherwise not pure wood but that also has available markets – part of the project is defining this.
- B. Sexton Q: What will the OFR requirements look like for this type of approval? Joe A: They will be required to have OFR and determining the coverage will also be part of the project.
- John: Improving markets for this type of wood waste is on the agenda for the C&D subgroup.
- Meleesa Q: Will these submittals need a PE stamp? Joe A: We’re hoping it will not.
- John Q: Will there be different approval levels based on operation size? Joe A: The project will be evaluating this but I’m hoping it will be a one size fits all. If it doesn’t work as a one-size fits all this might not be the right facility for this type of general approval.
- Meleesa Q: Will storm water management requirements be part of the plan of op? Joe A: We will be evaluating that but it may be a general storm water permit from the Storm Water Program instead.
- Chad Q: If we make it easier for these facilities to get approval do you have concerns about flooding the market? Joe A: Does not anticipate this, the facilities will still have to demonstrate markets.
- John: This ties back into the need for market development for this material including use as boiler fuel, animal bedding etc. Joe: This project will not be focusing on market development; it is more focused on the actual approval process for facilities that do have markets.
- B. Sexton Q: Are these facilities regulated under ch. 502 processing requirements? Joe A: yes
- Meleesa Q: What metric will be used to determine success? Joe A: it will be a struggle to have a metric besides case studies or anecdotal evidence because it is difficult to measure the hours spent.
- Lynn Q: Would you have internal data on hours spent on review and approval? Joe A: some.
- John: Even data tracking number of days in house before an approval went out would be helpful.
- B. Sponseller: The focus of the streamlining work are the projects staff say they feel they spend a disproportionate amount of time on.
- Joe: In his experience, a big part of the time sink is the back and forth between the facility submitting information and staff who are trying to get all of the information needed for a review.
- Lynn: The clean soils workgroup talked about making an application template. One thing they discussed was that if the department has made it as easy as possible for submitters by providing an application template and they are still receiving incomplete information at what point does the department start

		<p>charging the applicants? It seems reasonable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joe requested volunteers from the study group to review the work products of the project team.
<p>3:05 All</p>	<p>Subgroup Overview</p>  <p>reducing groundwater monitoring WMM Stud</p>	<p>Reducing Groundwater Monitoring (Tom):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group continues to look at the best options for three different types of reduction: # of parameters, # of wells, and frequency. They are also focusing on making the guidance easier to use which will in turn help the department receive a proper submittal. • Tom shared the table of contents of the guidance with the proposed changes. Tom and Erik Lietz wrote the new text with review by Joe Lourigan. • The group is considering which landfills should not be considered for monitoring reduction as well as when an expedited plan mod may be used for very special reduction circumstances. • The group has a draft which they will be sharing with the full subcommittee with a review time of 2-3 weeks. They will be meeting in early May to discuss the draft. If more changes are needed after the meeting they will do so and then will provide a draft to the full Study Group. They would like to would like to share the product at WIRMC or at a future SWIP meeting. • B. Sexton Q: What about EPA regulated landfills? Tom A: They will not be part of this guidance since that would go through the EPA. • B. Sponseller Q: Did your group consider how other states are addressing this type of monitoring reduction? Tom A: We looked at a few. MN's program results in the state taking over landfills long term, and Iowa has very little administrative code on monitoring requirements. Most other states are following standard EPA requirements so monitoring reduction policy is pretty unique to WI. B. Sponseller: I would recommend explaining why this is unique to WI in the guidance. Tom: There is a lot of data from other states on the science of reducing monitoring, but not on the regulatory process of reducing it. • The group is also working on solutions to the concern of infrequently tested wells getting "lost." Iowa has a condition that requires facilities to conduct a well assessment to look at the condition of the wells and to fix any issues. The group is considering a requirement that if testing frequency is reduced to less than annual the facility would still have to demonstrate the wells are testable. John: Small towns typically hire out for the testing and are looking at reducing frequencies to save money. If you make proving that a well is still testable too complex they will still have to hire consultants and little money will be saved. It would be helpful if the well assessment could be done in house. • John Q: Can there be a requirement to document the well location with GPS? Tom A: It's a good idea. Even for abandoned wells mapping the exact location would be helpful. • The group also plans to say that if monitoring is terminated certain activities should never be approved at the closed landfill. <p>Recycling Innovations (Meleesa):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group decided to create scope statements to reign in the goals of the group a bit. • Three of the 5 focus areas have drafted scope statements. Air space conservation and economic and job benefits scope statements still need to be written. • The group is considering the R&R needs for recycling as well as recycling definitions. • There is a senate bill currently proposed on a tax break for mattress recyclers that defines recycling by


what it means for a single product.

Alternative Landfill Caps (Chad):

- The group had determined 3 main topics: guidance document creation, delayed final cover system options and possible state or federal code change.
- There was a new alternative cap approval in IA and 3 in MN that Foth Consulting worked on so Foth presented on them to the group.
- Based on new information the subgroup learned from the Foth presentation they reevaluated the 7 major topic ideas (reduced to 3) with very helpful comments from Foth and SCS who have both worked on alternative cap projects before.
- John Q: Trying to reach infiltration equivalency is cost prohibitive. Can that change from a federal regulation standpoint? Foth modeling for the Iowa project proved it can be done.
- It was suggested that guidance be drafted for the short term opportunities currently available to landfills such as ET, exposed geomembrane, solar and synthetic turf.
- Chad is hoping to have a draft product from the subgroup by the August study group meeting.
- Meleesa: Can the presentation the subgroup received from Foth be shared with the full Study Group?
- John: Another related but smaller picture item the group is looking at is a way to demonstrate having reached a certain level of organic stability and until you have reached that level a facility is not required to put on a final cap. B. Sexton: Because of plastics in the landfill you will never have equal saturation and therefore never have complete organic stability. Chad: The facility approved in Iowa had 3:1 slopes and a cap that was 3 ft thick (typically would have been 2 ft). At a 3:1 slope they found that 85% of water sheds off the slope while 15% infiltrates. B. Sexton: Until landfills with organic stability plans are observed and studied for many years we will not have comparable data.
- B. Sexton: If the Study Group is interested in a landfill with a poplar tree cap he can share a site experience. He doesn't support trees on caps but it could provide the information on the project. Peak flows to landfills are during the spring melt which in WI is before deciduous trees have budded.
- Alan: There is also a landfill in MI that has an exposed geomembrane cap that could be looked at.
- Joe Q: How are you envisioning the guidance document writing? As the group considers recommendations it's a good idea to keep in mind how time consuming guidance writing can be especially before the state has actually gone through the approval process for any of these.
- John Q: Once the subgroup gets to the recommendation stage, what should be done? Joe A: Go back to the charter to look at who the best for is for each recommendation. If the recommendation is a statutory change it needs to be addressed outside of the DNR.
- John Q: Is the expectation that the study group will work on the projects after the recommendation or does the work of the subgroup stop once the recommendation is completed? B. Sponseller A: If that is addressed in the charter use it, if not the charter should be updated to include this. Meleesa: Work after the recommendation could be included in the charter under the language that says the work of the Study Group will include "facilitating processes to tackle issues, promoting follow-through on issues discussed, and taking a role in implementing changes as appropriate."

C&D (John):

- The group did not have a quorum available for the proposed meetings dates before this meeting.

	 <p>complaints data vs landfill access WMM S</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group has lost two members since they started. The group is going to reevaluate the members who are actually willing to make a commitment to the project and refocus. • The group has two main focuses, C&D landfills and C&D recycling. • So far the C&D landfill group has focused a lot on small C&D landfills because they don't have a liner requirement. The group's recommendations may be to make these landfills closer in regulation and fees to MSW landfills. It is important to consider the C&D materials have changed since C&D landfills were initially approved. • In response to a question the C&D landfill group asked at the October 26, 2016, Study Group meeting, Casey shared some data comparing SW complaints to disposal accessibility. • C&D recycling is considering methods of education and for sharing sample ordinances as well as identifying market development opportunities and barriers. • B. Sexton Q: Is drywall recycling still happening? Brad Dormady, operations and Compliance Manager for Landfill Reduction and Recycling A: Some is still being recycled as a soil amendment. Landfill Reduction has a couple of farms they work with but there is still a stigma that the drywall is "trash." Meleesa: Renaming paper mill sludge as fiber cake has really helped market the material. <p>FORRM (Meleesa):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group met last week and determined that they have two main focuses. Source reduction of food waste and non-landfill options for food waste management. • Source reduction is looking at if they need to create new programs or just help or add to already existing programs such as Green & Healthy Schools. Some proposed actions may go to the DNR while others may go to AROW or SWANA. • Non-landfill disposal is trying to look at where the regulatory barriers are as well as the locations of alternative disposal. For example, it may seem like wastewater treatment plants with anaerobic digesters are a good fit for food waste however increasing your food waste feedstocks increases the phosphorous levels of the sludge and almost all wastewater treatment plants are already at the top of their phosphorous allowance. B. Sexton: Wastewater is looking at a multi-discharger variance where a wastewater treatment plant could pay a fee to exceed phosphorous levels.
--	---	--

<p>3:55 All</p>	<p>Next Meetings</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • June 6, 2017 from 1 to 4 p.m. at the DNR Fitchburg Service Center • Aug. 16, 2017 from 9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. at the DNR Fitchburg Service Center
---------------------	-----------------------------	---