

Waste Reduction Task Force

Fifth Meeting – February 21, 2008

Meeting Summary

The fourth meeting of the Waste Reduction Task Force took place on the 17th Floor conference room of the L&C Tower in Nashville, TN on February 21st, 2008.

After a call to order, review of meeting rules, objectives, and some housekeeping issues; the meeting began. Don McCain reviewed the day's agenda pointing out that the focus of this meeting was to be a working meeting to begin coming to consensus on the working policy points and recommendation of each of the Work Groups.

Prior to the work groups meeting Don McCain, Task Force facilitator reminded the Task Force that the work groups should be working to present their recommendations in the following format.

1. Align recommendation to objectives
2. Advantages and Disadvantages (Pros & Cons reviewed)
3. Resources required to put in place
4. Cost/Benefits
5. Obstacles and barriers along with Tactics to overcome
6. Implementation Actions

The workgroups alternately met and presented the following policy points for consideration to the whole Task Force. Additional information is available in each work group's meeting summary located on the website.

Work Group 1 - Goal and Methodology Work Group

Presenter: Lisa Williams

*Policy Point: The measurement method by which positive gains toward waste reduction should be measured in Tennessee should be based upon a decrease in the current 1.12 tons per capita disposed of on a **statewide level** into Class I landfills.*

Discussion points: Questions arose in response to this recommendation how waste coming in from out of state or an increase in population would affect this goal. Neither would, as waste generated out of state but disposed of in Tennessee is not considered, and an increase/decrease in population will not affect the goal as it is per capita. For point of reference, an example was displayed:

Year	Goal (Tons Per Person)
-------------	-------------------------------

2006	1.12
2012	Lower than 2006 (TBD)
2018	Lower than 2012 (TBD)
2024	Lower than 2018 (TBD)

No discussion took place to actual set what the individual goals would be for each year, however, it was discussed that if Class III/IV disposal was treated the same way as Class I, the 2006 figure would move from 1.12 tons per person per year to 1.45 tons per person per year.

Work Group 2 -

Presenter: Sharon Smith

Policy Point: Public sector (residential) recycling and waste reduction tonnage gathered from city and county programs will be reported to TDEC in the APR. (Municipality participation will fall under Working Group #2's recommendation on municipalities reporting requirements.)

Private sector (industrial, institutional, commercial) recycling and waste reduction tonnage data will be required by law to be reported to TDEC through Re-Trac, on a phased-in schedule.

Discussion points:

With this change in the way public and private recycling data is collected, the state could obtain more comprehensive reporting by the private sector. It would also provide the information necessary for future mandates that require that the private sector engage in recycling, waste reduction and re-use activities. Currently the counties are charged with personally collecting recycling data from private commercial, industrial and business locations. By having the private sector report directly to the state through Re-Trace software, it would take the burden and labor intensive process out of the hands of local government. Businesses could use the reporting method to serve as positive PR for their environmental practices.

A mandatory reporting requirement by industry would require changes within the law. This could be difficult and face intense lobbying pressures. Implementation would take time and require a “ramping-up” period and phase-in participation. Funding would need to be allocated to accomplish this higher level of reporting.

Businesses within the private sector would need to be targeted and monitored, and a program such as this one would require more staff at TDEC. Additional funding would be needed to collect this information. Several legislative changes would be needed to give the state the authority to collect this information and challenges to these legislative changes would probably occur.

Work Group 3

Presenter: Andy Ashford

Policy Point: The waste reduction goal is currently a regional goal. Our recommendation is that each individual municipality with a population of 4,000 or higher (about 100 statewide) and/or those with a solid waste system already in place be required to achieve the goal and report annually along with the region in the Annual Progress Report.

Discussion points:

Under the current annual reporting system, the burden of waste reduction rests primarily at the county level. Furthermore, counties are often shielded from waste reduction measures by being evaluated as part of a multi-county region. In order to have a stronger waste reduction initiative, all counties and larger municipalities with a significant amount of solid waste must be part of the waste reduction process. Annual reporting is a significant part of being part of this system.

Many cities might have resistance to being required to report annually and it would create more paperwork at the state level, although additional staff would most likely not be necessary. The 4,000 population point may need adjusting

Work Group 4 – Infrastructure and Financial Development Work Group

Presenter: Randy Etheridge

Policy Point: Charge \$0.90/ton surcharge on all Class III/IV Landfill disposal material and tie this surcharge to the Solid Waste Management Fund portion of the Class I surcharge. All funds generated would be placed in the Solid Waste Management Fund and designated for infrastructure improvement.

Discussion points: The thoughts behind this are that the Task Force has been making the statement that “landfilling is landfilling” and all disposal should be treated as such. This priority would incorporate that philosophy and ultimately try and drive recycling by making it more expensive to dispose of construction and demolition or Class III/IV material. Also, as discussed, if Class III/IV disposal is counted towards disposal instead of diversion, it should be treated the same as disposal. This would also encourage the continued segregation of wastes unto reuse.

One point came up that this might make Class I disposal cheaper in some cases. Moving material to Class III/IV landfills is the first step in this segregation process and should be continued. Also a concern that this might promote illegal dumping, however many said that those who dump have this behavior no matter what the cost of disposal.

Discussion also centered on having to require Class III/IV landfills to provide scales. The contingency would be first to use volume conversion. The thought by the workgroup was that over a year’s time that the engineering conversions are so close that it would not matter. It was also discussed that scales at a local Co-Op could be used or some other certified scales until scales could be installed at the Class III/IV. Another variation would include a ramp up or even just requiring scales at the larger disposal facilities. Funding for scale assistance could be the first target for the extra generation of funds designated for infrastructure improvement.

Work Group 1 - Goal and Methodology Work Group

Presenter: Lisa Williams

Policy Point: TDEC, with help from other groups, should produce an easily adoptable “program based” methodology to achieve waste reduction to the landfills. In the methodology, TDEC will provide resources to municipalities and counties in adopting one of many “pre-packaged” programs.

Discussion points: No specific questions arose from this recommendation. However, one member of the Work Group felt strongly that the Task Force should play a role in developing these “pre-packaged” programs with TDEC. At that point, the full Task Force noted three specific waste streams, targeted generators of each, and indicated possible programs to address:

Waste	Target	Program
Organic	Institutions	Composting
C & D	Building and Demo Industry	Process such as Tennessee Waste
Fiber	Residential/Office	Recycling

Work Group 3 -

Presenter: Andy Ashford

Policy Point: For non-complying regions, a qualitative tier system, based on a list of best management practices should be implemented to guide those regions towards full compliance.

Discussion points: This would require some work by specialist within the waste reduction field and additional work by TDEC staff and contracted staff. This method would require a method to compel the noncompliant region to cooperate and strive toward gains in waste reduction.

Work Group 4 – Infrastructure and Financial Development Work Group

Presenter: Jeff Heyduck

Policy Point: Introduce a four tier infrastructure goal moving solid waste regions towards building an integrated solid waste management system. The goal would take regions where they are and target moving them up to the next level on the tier system.

Discussion points: See group document formally titled “Best Practices in Waste Reduction Strategies that Local Governments May Enact” for details. This will be uploaded to the web page under title “Four Tier Infrastructure Goal Recommendation WG-4”.

This action point is very similar to points discussed by the Government Roles Work Group. The thought is that everyone should do what is required and should not be left off the hook.

A discussion of the pros included: 1.) Continual improvement and Total Quality Management, 2.) Improved infrastructure, 3.) Sets a target for infrastructure, 4.) Clear and defined, 5.) Gives the regulatory agencies objective evidence of following the Best Management Practices, 6.) Dynamic, 7.) Measuring Stick, 8.) Multi category goal for infrastructure, 9.) Development Districts can use this with their Needs Assessments to set more definite spending needs.

Cons included: 1.) Cost is open ended, 2.) Some people won't like it, and 3.) Someone would have to take ownership.

The overall implementation would need to be ramped up and would tie tiers to the population of the region.

Work Group 1 - Goal and Methodology Work Group

Presenter: Lisa Williams

Policy Point: In the permitting process, Class III/IV landfills should be required to report the origin of all waste received, accurate tonnages of waste. Furthermore, Class III/IV landfill material should not be counted towards waste diversion, or waste reduction goals unless a certain amount of that material is shown to have been recycled towards a beneficial end-use and not simply placed in the ground.

Discussion points: The Task Force was in general agreement with this recommendation. Only one member voiced concern over implementing this strategy. No final decision was made as to whether or not this would be a part of the final recommendation.

Work Group 3 -

Presenter: Wayne Brashear

Policy Point: Many of the members on regional solid waste planning boards are not knowledgeable of solid waste/recycling issues. Recommend creation of a technical committee made up of private and public solid waste professionals to advise the local solid waste planning boards on solid waste/recycling issues. The board would not be bound by any recommendations of this committee – it would only provide insight and information.

Discussion points: For fully functional solid waste planning boards this would be a valuable asset. It might be difficult to enlist further board members to create the second technical committee. For solid waste planning boards that do not meet often, have low participation, or fail to enact any authority within their regions, then a secondary technical committee will be of no use.

Work Group 4 – Infrastructure and Financial Development Work Group

Presenter: Randy Etheridge

Policy Point: To implement a Full Cost Accounting (Disclosure)/Enterprise Fund Accounting for all Solid Waste and Recycling Programs in local governments.

Discussion points: The work group indicated that this is very much needed and would level the playing field for local governments. An example given was one county mayor was talking to another asking why they pay so much for garbage. The first said they only pay \$29/ton while the other pays upwards of \$125/ton. The reason for this is that the first mayor doesn't have a complete picture of all the costs. They are scattered through out the budget and are not attributed specifically to solid waste. The second mayor had an accurate cost but now believes his county is paying too much. In reality, solid waste is more than just what it costs per household for a collection contract. There are many costs that are often lost when trying to calculate.

By using the full cost accounting disclosure method, an exact cost of solid waste can be given. It will tend to treat solid waste like a utility that it is. The caveat is that many like the hidden costs of solid waste and may not want to see this happen and it may take a while to implement. The Comptroller's office is moving counties toward using the GASB-34 methods of accounting. This is definitely a step in the right direction.

There are many resources available to local governments to help in the implementation of this. In addition to the local government's accountants, CTAS, MTAS, and the Development Districts are all sources that can assist in the implementation of this recommendation.

After the last work group presented their recommendations, the facilitator reviewed the recommendations and brought the meeting to a close. Wayne Brasher shared reserved meeting dates and set a date for the next meeting the Task Force was adjourned until the next meeting to be held March 20, 2008 on the 17th Floor Conference Room in the L&C Tower. Don McCain reminded everyone of the importance of these meetings and asked that the Task Force members guard the remaining dates.

It was requested that each Work Group leader meet briefly after the Task Force meeting for a few minutes to discuss the formation of a conference work group. The conference work group will work to reconcile wording issues and continuity issues as the policy points are being narrowed down and developed by the full Task Force. These leaders are: Randy Etheridge, Lisa Williams, Sharon Smith, and Andy Ashford. Wayne Brashear set in for Andy as he had to leave prior to the Task Force meeting's end. These work group leaders will start meeting at the end of the next Task Force meeting and start working on the policy points recommended from this meeting.