

WASTE & MATERIALS MANAGEMENT STUDY GROUP – Notes: February 6, 2025

Location: Virtual - Teams

Member Attendance: ☒ Curry, ☒ Doverspike, ☒ Kalvelage ☒ Karwoski, ☒ Ketchum, ☐ Knudtson, ☒ Mathewson, ☒ Michitsh ☒ Pellitteri, ☒ Sexton,
☒ Welch

Guests: Laura Stevens, City of Milwaukee; Amanda Haffele, Portage County; Adam Jordahl, WMC; Kari Rabideau, GFL; Leif Tolokken, Dairyland Power; Darienne McNamara, City of Superior; Jennifer Feyerherm, DNR

DNR WA Attendance: ☒ Krausensky, ☒ Semrau, ☒ Strom Hiorns, ☒ Murray

Time/ Presenter	Topic	
9:00	Welcome/Agenda Review/Minutes Finalize Group Charter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accept agenda as presented (unanimous). • Motion by Tim Curry, seconded by Rob Michitsh to approve notes. Approved with clerical correction. • Charter modifications- increase membership to 12, reserve one position for a compost operator, change “University of Wisconsin” to “Universities of Wisconsin,” meetings to be in-person or virtual at the discretion of the co-chairs/department. Kate Strom Hiorns noted that this would be the only specific position identified in the charter (do not specify transporter, MRF, etc.). Bart Sexton said other member’s representations are multi-faceted, but do not really represent composting. Unanimous consent of charter.
9:15	DNR Updates	<p>Staffing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Melanie Burns started Jan. 13 as Southeast Region Supervisor • New DNR secretary (Karen Hyun) and division administrator (Bart Sponseller) • Future recruitment: E-cycle Coordinator, Complaints Coordinator • HR wait times around 12 weeks <p>Upcoming meetings/Program Updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council on Recycling next meeting March 7, 2025, via Teams • Reporting season underway- infectious waste and hazardous waste (~1,000 reporters each), E-cycle reports all open now. Landfills 2024 4th quarter and year end. MRF report (~45) opens in mid-Feb. RU (~1,080) opens mid-Mar. <p>SWIFR Grant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HDR conducted statewide food waste surveys, summarizing feedback • Continued focus on outreach and partnerships • Assessing next steps for second contractor: one-on-one technical assistance to businesses

		<p>Governor Evers PFAS Press Release</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DNR Drinking and Groundwater has begun rulemaking for drinking water standards. • \$20 million additional funding proposed in Governor's budget • Community grant program, private well testing, research on effective disposal methods (proposed) • Press Release: Gov. Evers Announces New Plans to Combat PFAS, Protect Kids and Families from Harmful Contaminants, and Expand Access to Clean, Safe Drinking Water
9:30	Batteries	<p>Subgroup update (Julie Ketchum)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NWRA (National Waste and Recycling Association, WI chapter) met with PRBA (Portable Rechargeable Battery Association) and reviewed the IL battery EPR (extended producer responsibility) legislation. They have been working with Wisconsin's Legislative Reference Bureau to draft a WI version (on draft #4). • Meeting held with WMC (WI Manufacturers and Commerce), bill authors Rep. Kitchens and Sen. Tomczyk, NWRA members (GFL, WM, Pellitteri) and PRBA. PRBA gave a presentation on how this program works in other states. Another draft version is expected to incorporate WMC feedback. • Concern for small retailers if they cannot identify the manufacturer of the battery, to pay the expense (below). • All manufacturers have to pay into the Battery Stewardship Organization (BSO), then the BSO pays for the administration and collection/recycling of covered batteries. • PRBA wants to cover all specified batteries, doesn't want non-domestic batteries to escape the program. • David Pellitteri: Bill is being promoted as a battery safety bill. Still getting feedback. There are political issues and line-item veto concerns. Bill may not be introduced until late summer. May be part of the budget or separate (after). • Bart Sexton: Does DNR have comments? • Kate Strom Hiorns: Staff have been reviewing drafts. Sarah Murray will also be providing a DNR battery update. <p>DNR Battery Update (Sarah Murray)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feb. 18 is National Battery Day- DNR does focused outreach • Added rechargeable batteries to E-Cycle Wisconsin collection sites list • Partner on DOE grant received by Electronics Recyclers International • Considering adding battery-containing devices as eligible under new rule

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since the last meeting, DNR was notified by DOE (Dept. of Energy) that we were awarded grant for “Charging Up WI Battery Recycling” program. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ \$3.1M total project cost over 4 years; 50% cost share requirement ○ Use E-Cycle Wisconsin outreach/collection grants as most of cost share ○ Project objectives: Increase participation in existing battery/e-waste collection opportunities; Identify gaps in Wisconsin’s battery collection infrastructure; Establish and promote new collection locations for batteries (with focus on Justice40 and underserved communities) • If funded, initial project steps include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Hire project manager (LTE) to oversee work of this project in collaboration with E-Cycle WI coordinator ○ Establish website of existing battery collection locations ○ Conduct GIS analysis to identify gaps ○ Expand statewide battery outreach ○ Use existing E-Cycle WI grant recipients to collect batteries ○ Cover 50% of battery collection/recycling costs • DNR is working to improve and expand outreach using PSAs, Google ads and additional research beyond surveys. 60% don’t know how to recycle batteries and a significant percentage put them in the recycling bin. Survey respondents tend to be older, less people of color. • Working with contractor to conduct further research with emphasis on reaching underrepresented groups. Hope to understand more of the nuances in awareness and barriers. Contractor is using AI voice interviews, should have results next month. • Use combined outreach results to adjust outreach methods and messaging • DOE funding would double outreach budget, put more focus on batteries • Sexton: If DOE funding isn’t available is the match (DNR) funding still there? • Murray: Yes, \$125,000 E-cycle grants, \$100,000 for education will still be available, and DNR will still work with E-cyclers on taking batteries. But there will not be additional resources for battery collection. • Ketchum: Appreciate efforts on education. This is a missing component in other states. Glad DNR sought DOE funding.
10:00	Rulemaking Updates	<p>Recycling rule (WA-13-21)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did get assigned to Senate and Assembly committees of jurisdiction. May ask for hearing/meeting- have 60 days. Committees could make changes. <p>Landfill rule (WA-11-22)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval from NRB Jan. 22

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next steps- approval by Governor's office, then to legislature, assigned to committees (may request hearings, make changes) and Joint Committee on Review of Administrative Rules (JCRAR). • Rule could become effective in fall 2025. • Fee changes not until Jan. 2026 and Jan. 2027 • Link to rule package with EIA and response to comments • Ketchum: WM had rep on TAC (Technical Advisory Committee), very engaged. Comments were submitted. Overall satisfied with how rule ended up. • Curry: GFL also on TAC. Many areas improved, maybe somethings could have been improved more but overall ok with it. • John Welch: Dane County also on TAC. DNR was receptive to changes. With rulemaking timelines, must limit what is covered. • SWANA issued letter of support in comment period. <p>Municipal Landfill Owner Financial Responsibility rule (2023 WI Act 107, WA-07-24E, WA-08-24)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permanent rule, WA-08-24; emergency rule, WA-07-24E in place since Nov. • Establishes alternative method of OFR (owner financial responsibility), similar to the net worth test for private facilities. • Public hearing on emergency and permanent rule yesterday, Feb. 5, 2025. Only six attendees. Comment requesting to extend the number of days to submit CPA audited documents. • Two municipal facilities already approved, two others submitted, others interested. • Sexton: For those with set aside funds, every ten years is OFR amount checked? • Strom Hiorns: For this method, annual check. • Welch: Went through this for vertical expansion. Without this method looking at 8% interest compounded for 30 years. <p>Non-landfill Solid Waste rule (WA-14-24)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes composters, transfer stations, combustors, storage, low hazard exemptions (LHE), infectious waste, processors, PCBs • Department submitted a scope to LRB • JCRAR requested a public hearing on the scope • Department requested & received approval of public hearing at January NRB • Public hearing on scope held on Jan. 30 • 24 attendees, 1 comment • Department is requesting approval of (unchanged) scope at Feb. 26 NRB meeting • If approved, 8-10 months of language drafting and feedback
--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Next public feedback during WIRMC session on Feb. 27• Eventual public hearings on the economic impact analysis and the proposed rule language• Not doing TAC, instead targeted feedback will be sought (as too many different facility types in this code).• Feedback session results																														
		<div># of survey takers identifying as someone directly impacted by code section</div> <table><tr><th>code section</th><th>section</th></tr><tr><td>502.06 (transport)</td><td>28</td></tr><tr><td>502.07 (transfer)</td><td>15</td></tr><tr><td>502.08 (processor)</td><td>2</td></tr><tr><td>502.09 (incinerator)</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>502.10 (air curtain destructor)</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>502.13 (MSW combustor)</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>502.11(2) (open burning)</td><td>17</td></tr><tr><td>502.011 (3-5) (woodburning)</td><td>7</td></tr><tr><td>500.08 (disposal exemptions)</td><td>9</td></tr><tr><td>502.05 (storage)</td><td>10</td></tr><tr><td>518 (landspreading)</td><td>12</td></tr><tr><td>157 (PCB management)</td><td>6</td></tr><tr><td>526.15-526.22 (generators)</td><td>70</td></tr><tr><td>526.06-526.14 (handlers)</td><td>6</td></tr></table>	code section	section	502.06 (transport)	28	502.07 (transfer)	15	502.08 (processor)	2	502.09 (incinerator)	0	502.10 (air curtain destructor)	0	502.13 (MSW combustor)	0	502.11(2) (open burning)	17	502.011 (3-5) (woodburning)	7	500.08 (disposal exemptions)	9	502.05 (storage)	10	518 (landspreading)	12	157 (PCB management)	6	526.15-526.22 (generators)	70	526.06-526.14 (handlers)	6
code section	section																															
502.06 (transport)	28																															
502.07 (transfer)	15																															
502.08 (processor)	2																															
502.09 (incinerator)	0																															
502.10 (air curtain destructor)	0																															
502.13 (MSW combustor)	0																															
502.11(2) (open burning)	17																															
502.011 (3-5) (woodburning)	7																															
500.08 (disposal exemptions)	9																															
502.05 (storage)	10																															
518 (landspreading)	12																															
157 (PCB management)	6																															
526.15-526.22 (generators)	70																															
526.06-526.14 (handlers)	6																															
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• General feedback<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Exemption sizes and materials seem to be about right○ Received feedback on what undefined terms mean to various people so we can add clarity○ Desire for more specific definitions○ Split thoughts on more or less structure in plan of op requirements• Specific feedback (75% or more responses)<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ More structure for transporters finding end locations○ Specific transfer code for non-putrescible wastes○ Clean fill exemption users want locational criteria (over performance standards)○ Code standards in place of current LHE process																														

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Landspreading final destinations should not be site specific ○ PCB code should follow SW code format ○ Strong support for all clean wood and brush burning, half support for household rubbish ○ Gate at public access (road) is acceptable at woodburning facilities ○ License exempt burn should still require an attendant for the entire burn ○ Don't think grinding sharps decreases safety at IW treatment but don't think it increases safety in transport or disposal. Thoughts? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ketchum: Sharps at MRFs harder to see if ground. Dangerous to workers. ▪ Pellitteri: For needles properly disposed of going to a landfill after microwaving, if whole can still puncture. Therefore, grinding is preferable. Won't puncture through boot. ▪ Curry: Some concern for receipt at landfill (if whole). ▪ Welch: Agree with Curry and Pellitteri, grinding that can't puncture gloves, boots. • Sexton: Still support for burning household rubbish? From older adults? • Casey Krausensky: Not households, working with WI Towns Association <p>E-cycle rule (2023 WI Act 108, WA-15-24)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scope statement published in Jan. • Rule required by legislature • Manufacturers who fall short of targets may seek a waiver requesting exemption from shortfall fees. Procedure (now in guidance) to be codified. • Also make couple of technical changes/clarifications. • May add/remove items to program or add to landfill ban (battery-containing devices) • Feb NRB meeting- asking permission to hold a public hearing in early Mar. • April - seek NRB approval to start rule writing • Not intending to have TAC, will get stakeholder feedback
10:45	Discussion and Future Meeting Plans for DNR Procedure Efficiency Ideas	<p>DNR seeking suggestions for procedural efficiencies (requested by landfill rule TAC). DNR will set up meetings/calls with each Study Group member.</p> <p>Process Efficiency Evaluation</p> <p>What:</p> <p>The department will initiate a streamlining review process through the Waste and Materials Management (WMM) Study Group. The department will hold meetings to brainstorm ideas, discuss priorities, and determine methods of implementation and needed resources, such as rulemaking, guidance, or budget proposals.</p>

		<p>Who: All members of the WMM Study Group, WMM Program Director, WMM Recycling and Solid Waste Section Manager, other department staff as needed.</p> <p>When: Individual and group meetings with WMM Study Group members throughout 2025. The goal will be to have an implementation plan by the end of 2025.</p> <p>Why: The department continually strives to provide good customer service. This effort will help assess existing procedures that impact WMM Program customers and determine potential ways to streamline and improve efficiency. The department wants to learn from partner efficiency examples and incorporate ideas into its plan review, reporting, inspection and other regulatory procedures.</p> <p>Questions to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What have stakeholder and customer businesses or organizations done to improve their procedural efficiencies? Examples to share? What were any financial, personnel and time resources needed to implement procedural efficiencies? • When conducting work with the department, have response times been adequate? If not, can you provide a specific example? What resources could have improved response time? • Are there templates or trainings or other resources that would better help customers prepare submittals or information given to the department? • Are there department tasks or procedures that would benefit from automation/IT improvements? What could be streamlined? • Is there a specific process or approval type that would benefit from an efficiency assessment? (Lean Six Sigma) • What resources are needed to implement efficiency ideas? (legislation, rulemaking, guidance, IT development, training, consultants, etc.) <p>Additional department internal discussion questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To assess a specific process and optimize workflow (Lean): What steps are legally required? What are not? Is there opportunity to remove steps, minimize errors, or reduce rework? • Are there any unnecessary steps that can be eliminated? • How can we automate repetitive tasks? • Are there clear performance metrics in place to track efficiency? • Do employees have the necessary tools and training to work efficiently? • Are there established protocols for decision-making to minimize delays? • Can we measure the change/improvement? Do we have accurate metrics that reflect desired outcomes?
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How effectively are people, time, and equipment being used? • Is there a need for better collaboration or communication? <p>Sexton: Appreciate the effort to ask these questions. Already has notes to share. Tom Karwoski: Really appreciate DNR doing this. Going to check with others at SCS Engineers. Brian Kalvelage: Agree. Will meetings be set up in advance? A: Yes. Sexton: When conducting work with DNR, lots of new people (inexperienced, takes more time). Performance standards vs specifications. New staff interpretation- big challenge. Welch: Agree on new staff. Also need systems in place for consistency, training, on-boarding. And efforts to retain staff (pay). Ketchum: Issue in other states too. MPCA using new process with “agreement” on permitting between permittee and state. MN efforts to streamline continuously.</p>
11:15	Topics for next meeting, Adjourn	<p>Topics for next meeting/rest of the year (suggestions from DNR):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DNR efficiencies (with plan review, project management, etc.) • Batteries • Food waste • Landfill organic stability (a topic that DNR did not cover during the landfill rule) • Managing closed landfills – whether they have owners or not (a topic that will continue to grow in importance and impact for the DNR) • Climate resilient facilities – how best to plan • Other ideas? <p>Ketchum: What is meant on landfill organic stability? Reduced financial assurance? Strom Hiorns: If there are goals for stability. Reduced financial assurance could be part of the discussion. Sexton: How landfill stability is viewed in plan of operation has changed since rule was enacted. Strom Hiorns: Landfills with no owner- big, growing concern. Study Group can have subgroups for selected topics. Ketchum: Food waste- interested in local efforts. Sexton: With new composter operator on group, get presentation on their operation. Krausensky: To clarify, new member should be licensed compost operator or compost hauler? Sexton, Pellitteri: Operator Topics for next meeting: batteries, federal grants, new compost operator, food waste/HDR survey results. Motion by Ketchum, seconded by Curry to adjourn. Meeting adjourned 10:54 a.m.</p>