

**CTDEP Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee
Subcommittee Meeting Minutes - June 26, 2007
Solid Waste and Recycling Database Management Subcommittee**

CTDEP Subcommittee Lead:

Judy Beval, Environmental Analyst 3
Judy.beval@po.state.ct.us
860-424-3237

Stakeholders Present: See attachment.

Discussion focused on efforts to eliminate duplicative MSW and recyclables reporting requirements for municipalities in their Annual Municipal Recycling Report and for solid waste facilities required to report specific information back to municipalities.

- Last week, a description of the potential proposed changes was mailed to solid waste facility owners/operators and was e-mailed to municipal and regional recycling contacts (by DEP) for comment (see attached). Only a small number of comments were received:

Comments Received	Committee Discussion
3-4 municipalities and one recycling region expressed concern about facilities no being required to report to the municipalities and wanted those reporting requirements for facilities to remain in place. Those municipalities felt the information was useful for checking weight slips and keeping track of the municipality's waste on a monthly or yearly basis and they were concerned that DEP couldn't get that info to them in a timely manner..	<p>The proposed changes would not affect reporting to municipality by a facility if that reporting is part of the municipal contract with the facility. Such reporting would continue.</p> <p>It was felt that if the information from the quarterly solid waste facility reports were posted on the DEP website in a timely manner – that info would still be available to the municipalities. The facilities in attendance did not have any issue with a posting.</p>
HRRA comments suggested gauging recycling success based on changes to MSW tonnage disposed.	<p>This was discussed in the updated SWMP and per capita disposal rates will be used to help track waste reduction progress. However, decreases can also be caused by economic factors, such as a recession without any recycling increases occurring. Since recycling has a myriad of environmental benefits in addition to reducing waste disposal capacity needs, we will still track the amount of waste recycled, but we will not try and track every ton.</p> <p>It is difficult to compare municipal recycling programs just based on their recycling rates since demographics greatly affect potential recycling rates for example – municipalities with higher precapita incomes and higher education levels tend to generate more newspapers and magazines – which are heavy and if recycled result in higher recycling rates</p> <p>Actually the best way to determine how well a municipality is recycling is to look at the municipality's waste disposed stream to determine the amount of designated recyclables still finding their way to disposal.</p>

- The effectiveness of a town or city's recycling program can be assessed by looking at a variety of factors – including recycling rate (% MSW recycled; per-capita MSW recycled); MSW disposal rate (per capita MSW disposed); description of municipal recycling educational and enforcement efforts;

assessment of recycling programs in municipal offices, school, away from home setting, etc.; characterizing the waste disposed to see if designated recyclables are still entering the waste disposal stream; etc. The proposed amended Annual Municipal Recycling Report will not require municipalities to report tonnages of MSW or recyclables which are delivered to reporting CT solid waste facilities but will ask for more qualitative information regarding municipal efforts to enforce and promote recycling as well as provide info on the status of recycling programs in schools, municipal offices, away-from-home locations and assessment of residential and business recycling participation rates. If it appears that a municipality is not enforcing local recycling requirements or is not promoting recycling, DEP will intervene - actions to be identified.

The report will also need to provide tonnages for municipal programs that are not included in solid waste facility reports to DEP. For example DEP does not receive facility data from municipal leaf composting sites, waste oil transporters, etc. Municipalities would continue to report those tonnages.

The Municipal Annual Recycling Report would also need to include information regarding the **destination** of recyclables generated within the borders of the town – **not the tonnages unless** the recyclables were being delivered directly to a non-reporting entity (either in Connecticut or out-of-state). In which case the tonnages would need to be reported to DEP or the municipality (which in turn would report it to DEP) by the haulers.

There was a request that Judy Belaval send out a copy of the proposed amended Annual Municipal Recycling Reporting form to subcommittee members for their review and comment.

- There was discussion regarding the difficulty now for towns to get information from haulers – even if the town has an ordinance requiring haulers to report information to the municipality. There needs to be an amendment to the statutes – i.e. haulers will continue to be required to register in the towns and cities in which they operate and haul solid waste and/or recyclables, but those haulers should also be required to provide municipalities with information regarding the destination to which they haul the solid waste or recyclables, and if they are hauling directly to a non-reporting facility – the haulers would need to report those tonnages as well.. The statute should be further amended to stipulate that if a hauler does not comply with registration and reporting requirements, that the town have the authority to ban the hauler from operating in the town.
- The accuracy of information provided by the hauler to solid waste facilities and the extent to which the facility is responsible for accuracy when reporting to DEP was discussed.
 - As long as the facility requires the hauler to accurately report such information and provides a convenient mechanism for the hauler to provide the information – the facility can only be responsible for aggregating the info and accurately providing it to DEP. The facility would not be liable for the accuracy of the information provided by the hauler; absent any outright fraud (such as occurred about ten years ago in a facility that colluded with haulers to misidentify the town/city of origin delivered to the facility).
 - The need for the adoption of legislation which would require haulers to accurately provide the required information about loads of solid waste and recyclables they deliver to CT solid waste facilities, was brought up numerous times during the meeting.
 - Manchester LF - . Haulers do not always reporting origin/contents of loads especially when loads consist of waste from more than one town. In such cases the hauler should “guestimate” the percent from each town.
 - Currently DEP asks solid waste facilities to report:
 - the MSW recyclables, MSW, bulky waste and special waste received by (1) town/city of origin (if generated within the borders of a CT town or city); or (2) the regional solid waste facility from which the waste or recyclable was received; or (3) the state of origin if the waste or recyclable was generated out-of-state.
 - the C&D waste received by state of origin.

- Destination of all waste and recyclables leaving the facility
 - Currently out of state landfills in PA and OH are reporting receiving more CT MSW than CT solid waste facilities are reporting sending to those facilities.
- Confusion and contradictions reign when referring to types of solid waste (such as bulky waste, special waste, C&D waste, oversized MSW, untreated wood waste, regulated wood fuel, landclearing debris, etc) in RCSA, CGA, and solid waste permits and related reporting requirements. These definitions need to be revised and clarified. This subcommittee should set-up a meeting with the Statute/Regulations subcommittee.
- At this point the discussion veered off topic:
 - DEP is planning to contract for a waste (MSW) disposal characterization study – best way to gauge success of current recycling efforts and identify those areas which need to be targeted with greater recycling efforts.
 - The Town of Groton requires all *non-residential* entities to use the town contracted hauler - collects commercial recycling and trash. However, trash and recycling residential collection is provided by private haulers. There is one exception, the City of Groton (political subdivision of the Town of Groton) does provide for residential trash and recycling collection through their tax base.
 - Enforcement
 - CRRA fines haulers for delivering MSW loads containing substantial amounts of recyclables to the RRF or TS for disposal and notifies towns or cities but we are unaware of any CRRA programs to follow-up with the waste generators to correct.
 - BRRFOC was using CBEC to follow-up with businesses identified as responsible for generating loads containing significant amount of recyclables delivered to the RRF.
 - Covanta SE has inspectors on the tipping floor and when they get loads with significant amounts of recyclables the violations are reported to SCRRA.
 - Recycling increases with enforcement.
 - State of MA has recycling ban.
- This was a brief discussion regarding electronic reporting and posting solid waste and recycling data on the DEP website – which will be the next issues tackled by the Subcommittee. Solid waste facility operators are eager to have DEP move on establishing electronic reporting and will petition DEP to make this a priority.
- Consensus of subcommittee was to skip the July subcommittee meeting (Judy Belaval on vacation). The next meeting will probably be scheduled for Tuesday August 28th from 10:30 am – 11:30 am (immediately following the SWAC meeting). Check the website for updates:

http://www.ct.gov/dep/cwp/view.asp?a=2718&q=332500&depNav_GID=1646

Solid Waste Data Management Subcommittee Meeting – June 26, 2007

Attendance List

Attended	Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Phone	e-mail
Yes	Belaval	Judy	DEP Office of Source Reduction and Recycling	(860) 424-3237	Judy.Belaval@po.state.ct.us
No	Changaris	Steve	NSWMA	(508) 839-4751	schangaris@nswma.org
No <small>Cab't attend funeral</small>	Delroso	Hugo	Northeast Lamp Recycling	(860) 292-1992	delrosso@NLRLamp.com
Yes	Dunleavy	Dave	Transfer Systems Inc.	(203) 743-0405	automatedwaste@aol.com
No	Eagan	Peter	CRRA	(860) 757-7725	pegan@crra.org
Yes- via phone	Freidenfelds	Erik	Covanta Energy of SE CT	(860) 889.4900 ext 135	EFreidenfelds@CovantaEnergy.com
Yes	Hemenway	Susan	BRRFOC/TROC	(860) 585-0419	shemenway@brrfoc.org
Yes	Hogan	Jim	We Recycle	(203) 793-1008	jhogan@werecycle.com
Yes	Leitch	Stacey	Town of Groton	(860) 536-5699	SLeitch@town.groton.ct.us
Yes	Lentini	Joe	Town of Manchester	(860) 647-3234	JLentini@ci.manchester.ct.us
Yes	Orsaia	Nick	City Carting & Recycling	(203) 324-4090 ?	NickO@citycart.net
Yes	Quattromani	Colleen	Town of Groton	(860) 448-4091	Cquattromani@town.groton.ct.us
Yes	SaimininKas	Kathy	Town of Manchester	(860) 647-3286	dumpladykat@netscape.net
Yes	Westcott	David	DEP – MMCA	(860) 424-3666	david.westcott@po.state.ct.us
No	Williams	Steve	Town of Chester – CT River Estuary Regional Planning Agency		swill@snet.net