

AGENDA & MINUTES
WASTE AND MATERIALS MANAGEMENT STUDY GROUP

Wednesday June 27, 2018

12:30 pm – 3:30 pm

Portage County Main Public Library, Pinery Room
1001 Main St., Stevens Point

Member Attendance: Albee, Curry, Johnson, Karwoski, Meyer Smith, Morgan, Sexton, Welch/WCSWMA

Not present: Doverspike/SWANA, Nickodem/AROW

DNR Attendance: Lamensky, Semrau, Van Rossum, Strom Hiorns

Guest – Chair of Recycling and SW Committee for Town of Grand Rapids, Choose to Reuse Program

- | | | |
|--------------------|--|---------|
| 12:30pm | Welcome | Meleesa |
| 12:40pm | Agenda review and adjustments & review of notes from last meeting Introductions around the room Notes not ready from 4/13/18 meeting, group will review at next meeting Re-ordered agenda to discuss priority topics first, DNR updates later | Meleesa |
| 12:45pm | 2:10 DNR updates <u>Staffing</u> – Owner Financial Responsibility Specialist and Recycling & Solid Waste (SW) Reporting Specialist starting 7/9; Interviews for Hazardous Waste (HW) Specialist in CO this week, maybe start 7/23; After that the Program will be within 1-2 positions of spending authority. Focus has been on mentoring and coaching of new staff, particularly with Hydrogeologists and HW that have had a lot of turnover. <u>Programs</u> – HW rule package in process, including SW definition of HW → EIA comment period soon, public hearing by end of year. E-manifest under HW rules goes live 7/1. (If transporting waste that requires a manifest, continue to do so on paper for short term, but transition to electronic eventually to track from generation to disposal.) Research, Development, and Demonstration (RDD) rule public EIA period was done 6/18, next step is public hearing in early September. Goal to get rule to Legislature in January. <i>Question was asked if the group should pursue an alternative cap and closure/RDD concept?</i> With 21-year RDD, gives us more time to learn about using new airspace or other outcomes. Let's discuss ideas, how to integrate. Beneficial Use rule for NR 538 – Technical Advisory Committee meeting one more time in August, hope to have final language ready for TAC to review mid-July. Then economic impact comments and public hearing. <u>Budget</u> – no update <u>Guidance documents</u> – Upcoming: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Final version of shingle processing facility guidance ready soon for 21-day comment period• Ground water monitoring guidance out for public comment soon as well• Alternative Glass use for MRFs and Managing Glass (getting info from other states and glass processors now; getting more data as far as acceptable contamination rates; MRF ability to clean to those specifications? May consider convening glass sub-group (with Meleesa, Lynn, Jill, Rebecca) → Plan on 60 days or less to get the shingles and groundwater monitoring guidance out. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Infectious waste processing facilities | Joe |

- Clean soil guidance, still collaborating with RR staff and drafting response to comments and reaching out to stakeholders, then get to finish line

1:00pm

2:45 Updates from subgroups

Construction and demolition waste

Alan/Bart

C&D Landfill group: Bart: Group met 3/20 and 4/9 and zeroed down to 6 areas to focus on. This is not written up yet, but will include:

- Looked at code related to “department may.” Looking into code or legislative options.
- Group agreed VOC monitoring and OFR standards for small demolition landfills should be required.
- Include a bad actor clause for small demo LF operators – give department another tool.
- Separation – NR 503 quarter mile offset, recommend for small demo sites a variance on case by case basis, at intermediate sites reduce to 300 ‘ min separation between.
- Two other items not unanimous agreement within the group. Hope to finalize at next meeting and write up.

Related to the above, it was recommended that the subgroup develop documents for legislators that support recommendations and give legislators a starting point for developing legislation.

Recommended that the subgroup check with DNR on best pathways to achieve goals – DNR or Legislature?

C&D Recycling group: The group met 6/26 and discussed three focus areas: Dirty wood, dirty drywall, and price point between landfilling and recycling.

- ID’d key members in the group to focus on each area.
- Talked a lot about gypsum. A company in Canada recycles gypsum. Valerie Joosten (DNR) has reached out to other states re: drywall bans – only MA has one so far that we know of. Also talked about a group member’s trip to Texas re: drywall diversion education. Questions about using gypsum as fill in berms, has been used that way in other states. Questions re: hydrogen sulfide and gypsum. If landfills accept drywall it is big generator of H₂S, big impacts (Tim).

Recycling innovation

Amber/Lynn/Meleesa

No update at this time, but the AROW press release discusses National Sword effects. Surveyed the MRFs and RUs in the State. Got results in late April. 100% MRF respondents having some loss in revenue, but this has not trickled down to RUs yet, they are mostly oblivious. RecycleRightWI domain purchased, quality issue.

Food and organics residuals reduction management

Meleesa/Bart

Dave chair: Group met earlier today:

- Focus has been on action items developed recently that the group can undertake, rather than make changes legislatively.
- Talked to UW-SP class to develop tool to help communities start organics diversion programs – barriers, etc. Second class this fall will likely take farther and develop.
- Kelly Addlington doing organics curbside collection and diversion compost effort in Stevens Point area.
- Discussed Madison’s recently defunct organics/compost pilot program.
- EPA also visited to share the Food Waste/Excess Food Opportunities Map.
- FORRM wants to be authority on this subject to help communities develop programs. Hurdle for the group now: no financial means to develop action items. Talking whether this group should go beyond this DNR group and “expand.”
- Compost Crusaders in Milwaukee interested in beginning/joining US Composting Council WI chapter.

2:15pm

1:50-2:05 Break

2:30pm

12:40: Results of priority topics poll – topics to evaluate

Meleesa led this discussion among Study Group members regarding the utility of the WMM Study Group's meetings and resources, direction, and communication plans:

Discussion – policy questions:

What is the future of the Study Group as it relates to the priorities?

Is the Study Group framework adequate for addressing the priorities?

What are the expectations of the members of the Study Group related to the outputs and outcomes in addressing priorities?

- Described concern after last meeting that DNR response (although factually accurate) was not what the Alternative Landfill Cap group wanted to hear after much time spent on this sub-group's efforts. Don't want to feel the meetings were a waste of time. DNR's response about the ideas made the sub-group think DNR would not take a good effort to take a look at the ideas. Members don't have time for a group that makes recommendations and then sit on a shelf. Next steps?
 - Efforts are not a wasted effort even if it takes long time to get results, can't expect change right away. Carry forward ideas from other groups like SWANA, etc.? Group may feel better about the work as long as some of its rec's are in the queue in policy/guidance change. Some ideas came from the department for which DNR needed help and helped them work through more quickly.
 - Could the DNR produce a list for the group to work through also? Work on common goals?
- Study Group has a list of priorities, need DNR to weigh in on things they could take care of on their own or what do they need from us? If no outcome through DNR, tell us, or we work through others.
 - Do we have the influence to push agendas to others? EPA? State legislators?
- Could this group be modeled more on the Brownfield Study Group? That group spent a couple years to develop policy priorities. Led into rule changes later on. When a lawmaker plans legislation, can we add on to it? Takes patience. This group was massively collaborative, not just group members doing the work, also DNR.
- Group's efforts are stymied by rules process sometimes for 3-5 years. That results in giving up. With Small Demo Sub-group, looking at legislative process to expedite process instead.
- It is good to have a consensus document that guides our goals so when legislation option comes up we can pull up our goals and use them.
- We don't understand DNR's full priorities right now, would like the feedback to know if our priorities align. Discuss priorities as long-, short-, mid-term? How do we ask DNR to indicate level of priority from DNR's perspective?

Joe/DNR response: Yes, we could go through that exercise to discuss priorities. This Study Group should focus on what it wants to work towards. What problem(s) are we trying to solve? Be specific around that, how to make the situation better. Rather than nebulous topics (glass, etc.). Good to id what the goal/end-state is, but what is the road map to that destination, what changes are needed to occur to make it happen – our staff's knowledge, versus state regs in code, versus statute, versus fed level? ID gaps as part of road map to achieve the goal. → Joe will work with Kate and the Recycling & SW team to come up with our list of challenges and issues right now. Current focus in the DNR program is transition of personnel and program ideals from individual experts to overall program knowledge/consistency. Joe's focus as program director is to re-staff with quality people, focus on training and process needs, and begin to turn corner from maintenance to future-looking. Keep moving forward, but serve needs of the regulated community.

- Questioned on how much retirement and time to re-hire affects moving forward. Is it beneficial to retain and overlap new staff with long-term staff? [Joe – Feasible, but in practice it is a challenge to get someone in the door to overlap. Trying to get regional staff to take on topics to become experts so less reliant on one individual person.] Industry perspective of no overlap of staff and institutional knowledge pass down is the loss of interpretation and precedence set for years. New interpretations get thrown into the mix immediately and industry not able to catch up or discuss or arbitrate that change. Don't want to arbitrarily change policy b/c a person isn't there anymore. Sometimes code doesn't make sense, so different interpretations may result in going backwards.
 - Form subcommittee to look at code that doesn't make sense to get more clarity? Any quick hitters we can do? Look at the precedence.
 - Study Group survey results: improve consistency in code was highest in poll
 - Several people noted that they like when experienced staff bring along new staff to sites and discuss how we look at things, when to be "lenient" with exact code language/how we interpret things. Mentoring new with old staff is great to transfer knowledge.
 - Put interpretations on paper, not just discussions
- Ask ourselves these questions: what is the problem, what's the road map to fix it, what is the solution. Ask DNR to tell us what we can contribute to. Maybe a couple people sit down with Joe and go over examples and understand perspectives.
- Goal for consistency of approvals and framework for success along with DNR; strategy and tactics
- Overall survey priority results: 1 consistency, 2 glass management, 3 cleaning up long term care and closure fee language; Others: site diversion target, organics mngt, c&d landfills issues, waste to energy, leadership in waste to resources, recycling economic concerns, single definition of recycling

ACTION ITEMS:

- Joe and staff will id DNR priorities; Meleesa and Chad will factor in those and discuss at next meeting;
- Determine how many committees to create. What could we tackle quickly to continue momentum?
- Group agreed to think about code and interpretation inconsistencies and send their ideas to Chad and Meleesa, then they will share with DNR – Meleesa will send out email to group with deadline date. (Request clarifications rather than inconsistencies – worded broadly to things that have changed but also any undocumented interpretation) Have prior DNR decisions been factored into the new interpretation? Look at this and think about what's coming up next year.

3:30

Wrap-up and adjourn at 3:15 pm

Next Meetings: August 10, 2018 9:30-12:30 Fitchburg

October 2, 2018 9:00-12:00 Stevens Point area tbd