

Waste Reduction Task Force

Sixth Meeting – March 20, 2008

Meeting Summary

The sixth meeting of the Waste Reduction Task Force took place on the 17th Floor conference room of the L&C Tower in Nashville, TN on March 20th, 2008.

After a call to order, review of meeting rules, objectives, and some housekeeping issues; the meeting began. Don McCain reiterated the importance of the Task Force and how the Task Force only has three meetings remaining to consolidate the working points. He brought up four parking lot issues that were still on the table that needed addressing and referred the issues to Joyce Dunlap and Larry Christley for response.

The first issue was relating to minority representation on the Task Force. Joyce Dunlap noted that due to the lateness in the process that the Department will continue to use Costin Shamble, the Department's Environmental Justice Coordinator, to continue to attend the Task Force Meetings. She has already spoken up several times on issues that might affect the minority community.

Larry Christley addressed the remaining issues. The scrap tire program disposition at this time will remain the same. Additional funds from revenues from new tire sales are down from the projected amounts. The Department feels this is just the first quarter reporting and that the low projections may be related to initial quarter of change. Also, adjustments to tire grant amounts are based on county tire sales and money paid into the Department of Revenue for the tire fees.

The Parking Lot issue on the revising of multi-county regions into single county regions was referred to the Government Roles work Group for further study. They will report on this at a future meeting.

The last remaining Parking Lot issue was should the state require compost/mulch tonnage to be reported and by whom. Currently the reporting of composting and mulching material is permissive to a large degree. Most local governments do report these operations as it helps their diversion rate under the current system. To count this material in the future would be up to the Task Force to incorporate these measures into any waste reduction goal.

After addressing the parking lot issues, Don McCain introduced the presentation topic which is the Tennessee Bottle Bill. The first presenter, Marge Davis with the Pride of Place, presented the position of her organization. Her presentation materials will be posted on the website for reference. Several members of the Task Force were interested in the how the money collected would be broken out and used for what programs.

After answering a few questions clarifying the process of collection and distribution of the proposed deposit and administrative fees, Don McCain introduced Kevin Dietly, Principal Northbridge Environmental. Mr. Dietly presented his position which will also be posted on the website for reference.

After fielding several questions about impacting the carbon foot print, Pay-as-You-Throw (PAYT) and Enterprise fund type accounting as it relates to the bottle bill the discussion continued.

In the discussion, Shawn Lindsey asked the question after discussing using money as an incentive; does the Beverage Industry have a better solution? Kevin responded that PAYT is the better action as it covers all types of wastes not just one small portion of the litter/waste stream. Sharon Smith asked the question: "Are we going to have a plastic bag bill? A McDonald Bag bill and create another whole layer of bureaucracy?"

Randy Etheridge had planned to be a speaker on this topic from a county perspective. He was unable to attend but sent a briefing that Mark Kinsey shared for him. Mr. Kinsey did not answer any questions but just presented what was sent. According to the briefing, the surveyed county solid waste directors are neutral on the matter making the comments that they desire to see progress in container recycling, would like to see an increase in litter grant dollars to help them locally, some procedures still needed to be reviewed and that if there were not enough redemption centers the local governments may be left to be responsible.

Jeff Norman's presentation was rescheduled to later in the meeting due to a small conflict with scheduling. In the mean time, the Task Force had a working lunch to firm up their priorities based on the model presented previously as noted below.

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

After lunch, Jeff Norman presented two presentations. The first presentation provided background information on the history of landfills and how they were constructed. This information was helpful to helping the Task Force understand the progression from open city dumps to the new RCRA Subtitle D landfills. The earliest waste diversion efforts were related to protecting the public health not for recycling. This presentation will be posted for future reference on the Task Force Website.

The next presentation reviewed the definitions of Special Wastes and Hazardous Wastes and the implications of sending household hazardous wastes to landfills. It was pointed out that currently, by definition, household hazardous wastes are exempt from the regulatory restrictions other hazardous wastes of the same type are. It was strongly encouraged to promote the use of mobile and permanent household hazardous waste collection facilities. This presentation will also be on the web site.

The workgroups alternately presented work they had worked on in prior meetings and at work completed during the working lunch.

Work Group 1 - Goal and Methodology Work Group

Presenter: Lisa Williams

Policy Point 1: In place of the 25% reduction goal, a statewide goal focusing on reducing the amount of waste per capita placed in Class I landfills would be enacted.

[Policy Point 2:](#) Performance of regions, counties, and municipalities should be measure based upon their programs and services that promote waste reduction. TDEC should provide a series of promoted programs that the regions can pick and choose from and receive the necessary resources to implement these programs.

[Policy Point 3:](#) Class III/IV landfills should be required to report origin of all material with accurate weights. Class III/IV material should not be counted towards waste diversion unless the material is truly recycled or used towards a beneficial end-use other than being simply buried in the ground.

Work Group 2 -

Presenter: Sharon Smith

[Policy Point 1:](#) Newly permitted facilities (Class I landfills, Class III/IV Construction and Demolition (C & D) landfills, transfer stations, and expansions of existing landfills) will be required to separate recyclable materials on the front-end of waste collection. This would be accomplished through curbside pickup, voluntary drop-off programs, and/or sorting and separating on-site.

This requirement of separating materials will be a part of the permit conditions. In order to receive a permit, there must be a plan for separation, sorting, and segregating materials written in the permit application.

[Policy Point 2:](#) Specific waste streams including cardboard, electronic waste, aluminum, and metal would be banned from landfills from the private sector (industrial, institutional, commercial). Residential sector would then be phased in to participate in the landfill bans as well.

Work Group 3

[Policy Point 3:](#) The discussed basically served to expand and refine three recommendations presented to the Task Force earlier:

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

Work Group 4 – Infrastructure and Financial Development Work Group

Presenter: Mayor Franklin Smith

Policy Point: Provide 3-2-1 pilot program grants to assist local governments in starting new programs.

Discussion points:

After the last work group presented their recommendations, the facilitator reviewed the recommendations and brought the meeting to a close. Don McCain shared reserved meeting dates and set the date for the meeting of the Task Force and the Task Force was adjourned until the next meeting to be held April 17, 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. The last two meeting may be long as we try to finish the work of the Task Force.