

## Waste Management Study Group 8/5/2021

### Attendees

Chad Doverspike	David Pellitteri	Karen Sieg	Lynn Morgan	Melissa Wenzel	Jennifer Feyerherm
Tom Karwoski	Paul Mathewson	John Welch	Andy Nickodem	Steven Schilling	John Oswald
Bryan Weldon	Caitlin McAleavey	Cassidy Tieman	G Shereda	McCurry Town of Lapointe	Kari Rabideau

Meeting slides will be saved with notes at <https://dnr.wisconsin.gov/topic/Waste/StudyGroup.html>

<u>Slide</u>	<u>Content</u>	<u>Conversation</u>
	Welcome, June meeting notes	June notes passed without changes and can be viewed here: <a href="https://dnr.wisconsin.gov/topic/Waste/StudyGroup.html">https://dnr.wisconsin.gov/topic/Waste/StudyGroup.html</a>
<b>3, Updates</b>	Hiring, E-cycle and coal residuals rulemaking, budget bill, QA data, household survey	
<b>5, IT Modernization</b>	Transporter licenses, submittals, digitization	Rollout date of electronic transporter solid license applications? <i>- early-mid Sept, expect communication on specific date and custom links</i>
<b>6, Looking Ahead</b>	WINS web-app, data-sharing	Rollout of electronic licensing, will there be a uniform date of send-out? <i>- feedback appreciated by David, expecting this would be possible</i>
<b>7 – 18, Alt. Liner Study</b>		
Scope	Reviewed regulations of liners and alt. liners, tech. review of alt. liners, review Seven Mile Creek Landfill alt. liner proposal	
WI MSW Landfill Liner	Diagram of WI base liner, alt. design requirements (Groundwater quality protection, exemption from SW rules, exemption needed for GCL)	
Alt. Liner approval	Approaches, min. standard to not exceed groundwater limits	

Types of Alt Liners	-GCL sub. for compacted clay liner for a set height or side slopes -Dual comp. is standard for many or for separation to groundwater cases	
Tech. Eval of GCL Liner	Groundwater impact, slope stability, design considerations, cost comparison	
Summary of design impacts	compacted clay: thickness of liner important -dual composite: construction and compatibility considerations	
Next	Study to be posted, discuss again in Oct?	Meleesa: perhaps send to subcommittee for follow-up? Andy, John W, Chad: agree, <i>have Golder be a part of discussion</i> No objections  John W: interested in what DNR will now be considering (or not) in terms of rule-making or proposal evals as a result of new info  Chad: will Kate arrange follow-up meeting? Brad: Yes
<b>20 - 28 Waste Characterization Study</b>	3rd study, sorting took place at 15 facilities (72% of WI MSW), hand sorting, study cost 335k, 85 categories,	
Interpreting Results	Picture of what is landfilled, not waste stream, data likely impacted by COVID, data by % comp. extrapolated to weight	
Changes	Top 5 MSW: Wasted food, flexible film, food scraps, textiles, compostable paper  Food waste doubled since 2009, recyclables increased, TVs decrease by 16k tons, shingles decreased from 30% to 10% in CDD	
Next	Study to be posted, use results to focus efforts in connection with other data collected	Casey: tonnage estimates by sector useful? Broad estimates by landfill?

		<p>Lynn: <i>this would be difficult and potentially unreliable unless there's a specific purpose/need</i>  David: <i>useful for recyclables and evaluating infrastructure.</i></p> <p>What makes up 3% of haz waste/problem materials? How does that impact risk assessment?</p> <p>Karen: what does rise in OCC reflect?  Casey: <i>possibly to do increase in online ordering in general and through COVID, will continue to rise</i>  Brad: <i>loss in recycling efficiency in households compared to commercial</i></p> <p>McCurry Town of Lapointe: has seen OCC is as profitable as aluminum, prices continue to climb. Curiosity as to whether or not OCC will remain high after COVID</p> <p>Brad: new focus on food waste reaffirmed by study</p>
<b>29 – 31, R&amp;D Subcommittee Update</b>	Recs for policy statement regarding recycling grant formula being finalized, discussion on lithium ion battery concerns, looking ahead to other emerging issues	
Grant Formula Rec Guiding Principles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-equitability, sustainability</li> <li>-streamlined process for reporting, eval, grant app</li> <li>-innovation, flexibility</li> <li>-object program eval</li> <li>-cost efficient</li> </ul>	
Recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Tip fees to be used for original intended purpose</li> <li>-changes, in order of preference: criteria/performance-based elements, per-capita basis, weight-basis</li> <li>-involve stakeholders</li> </ul>	<p>McCurry: Is it possible for the committee to explore and add additional funds to communities that host State Parks as well as end point tourist destinations? Per capita based may be skewed. We are a small community on Madeline Island with a year round population of 350, but we have a State Park that hosts over 5000 people a year and creates a lot of recycling and waste that is not formulated into our yearly disbursal.</p>

	<p>-add review process of grant formula to statutes, ex. done every decade</p>	<p>Karen: <i>agree that concern that per capita base does not cover tourism, college loads etc.</i></p> <p>David: is there anything going on politically in which immediate action is called for in terms of feedback?  Meleesa: <i>yes, could be time-sensitive based on legislative session</i></p> <p>Karin: having a bank of approved policy would be useful for when these opportunities present themselves at least for reference  Paul, Tom, Lynn, Chad: <i>supports</i>  John W: <i>supports all recs, can we get consensus as a group and how can we actually create this change?</i></p> <p>David: biggest concern is ensuring private MRFs are not competing with public MRFs given these grants, doesn't see this as an issue immediately but wants it to be considered Meleesa: <i>outside of grant, separate topic but a conversation to be had in the near future</i>  <i>Please add David to email list when this group meets</i></p> <p><b>Recs will be moved to policy bank</b></p>
<b>32 – 44, NR 544</b>	<p>Seeking input on current code, giving review so everyone is on same page</p> <p>Sets standards for RU effective programs, RU activities, and DNR approval, RU probation, variances to landfill bans, MRF standards to be used in effective RU programs</p>	
Not covered	<p>Definition of RU, landfill banned materials, required materials to manage, recycling grant distribution (in 287 Stat.)</p>	
Overview	<p>See slides</p>	

Discussion		<p>Chad: 544.14, clarification? Glass as net loss for most, does this fall underneath this exemption?</p> <p>Jennifer: <i>cost of <u>processed</u> materials, adjusted for inflation this number is about double (\$80/ton)</i></p> <p>Timeline?</p> <p>Brad: <i>12-18 months from audit release to develop scope statement</i></p>
<b>Final Comments</b>		<p>Karin: suggestion that R&amp;D subcommittee provides overview of lithium battery situation next meeting</p> <p><b>Submit ideas for next time after taking some time to review information from this meeting</b></p>