

State of Vermont
Department of Environmental Conservation
Waste Management & Prevention Division
1 National Life Drive – Davis 1
Montpelier, VT 05620-3704

AGENCY OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) Stakeholders Group Minutes – September 7, 2017

Group Members Present:

Cathleen Gent	Central VT Solid Waste Mgmt. District
Carl Witke	Central VT Solid Waste Mgmt. District
Bruce Westcott	Central VT Solid Waste Mgmt. District
Johanna de Graffenreid	VT Public Interest Research Group
Corey Raymond	Northeast Kingdom Waste Mgmt. District
William Driscoll	Associated Industries of VT
Esther Fishman	The Londonderry Group
Tess Kennedy	William Shouldice and Associates
Toby Howe	MMR
Kim Crosby	Casella Waste Systems
Don Maglienti	Addison County Solid Waste Mgmt. District
Jennifer Holliday	Chittenden Solid Waste District
Joyce Majors	Lamoille Regional Solid Waste Mgmt. District
Michael Batchner	Bennington County Solid Waste Alliance
John Leddy	Northwest Solid Waste District
John Malter	Mad River Resource Mgmt. Alliance

By phone

Greg Noyes	Town of Canaan
Pam Clapp	Solid Waste Alliance for Communities

ANR Staff Present:

Rebecca Ellis	DEC Deputy Commissioner
Cathy Jamieson	Solid Waste Program Manager
John Fay	Solid Waste Program
Mia Roethlein	Solid Waste Program
Mary Clark	Drinking Water and Groundwater Protection Division- Facilitator

Minutes

1:05pm – Mary started with welcome and introductions and invited Jen Holliday to speak briefly to an incident that took place at a Chittenden Solid Waste District (CSWD) HHW event in Jericho the prior weekend.

- CSWD HHW Rover Event was held at the town garage in Jericho. A resident brought two cans of diethyl ether to the event. The cans showed evidence of crystalizing meaning the material could be unstable and shock sensitive. The CSWD event staff called 911 and the fire department evacuated the event and would not allow anyone on site. VT Bomb squad was contacted and deemed the material as a non-emergency over the phone since the material had already been moved once by the resident and had not exploded. This left CSWD staff with no option but to move the cans to a shipping container on site in order to secure and research how to handle the unstable material. The Town of Jericho was not pleased with the situation as their staff were not able to access the garage and the surrounding trails were closed to resident access. CSWD followed up with VT Bomb Squad members who did come to the town garage to detonate the material on Tuesday.
- Cathy stated the goal of this group and provided summaries of the first two meetings.
 - Reminder that the goal of this HHW Stakeholder Group is: to make a recommendation to ANR on how HHW should be effectively and conveniently collected in a manner cost-effective for municipalities

- What does Success Look Like to ANR:
 - Vermonters are aware of risks with HHW, and either reduce use or divert from disposal.
 - There are convenient HHW collection options for all Vermonters.
 - The cost burden to municipalities and state are reduced
 - Over time, there are an increased number of non-hazardous products available to consumers, resulting in a decrease in HHW needing to be managed
- The first meeting went over current situation with HHW collection in VT. The estimated annual current cost of HHW programming is \$1.6 million to collect and manage approximately 1084 tons of waste. The solid waste program awards about \$400,000 in grants. The remainder of the cost is covered by the solid waste management entities.
- The second meeting looked at options for managing HHW and what the needs are.
 - Summary of AAFM Pesticide Program was given by Annie MacMillan
 - Need Convenient cost-effective options for residents and CEGs
 - Discussed a list of collection options.
 - Extended Producer Responsibility(EPR) was added to the options list by participants.
 - Participants took a non-binding vote on their top choices for a break out group discussion.

There were 4 break out groups that discussed the following options:

- Regional facilities with Consolidation for Rural Rover Events managed by SWMEs
- Extended Producer Responsibility(EPR)
- Regional facilities managed by state contract (with private contractor)
- Regional Facilities-
 - managed by SWMEs
 - managed by private contractor
 - state run

1:15pm Mary opened discussion of **What should services look like?**

Mary asked which of the listed options should the group be focusing on and which could they all form a consensus on.

- Greg Noyes asked if a Rover be at each town 4 days a year in order to meet the MMP Year 5 four- event requirement.
- Cathy Jamieson requested that the current requirements be put aside for purpose of discussion. The Agency may revisit the MMP requirements after this stakeholder process and could consider changes provided that convenience is met.
- Jen Holliday commented that optimal convenience is a regional facility within 15-20 miles of every town. Events only aren't convenient enough. Other programs in the country offer curbside pick-up of HHW.
- John Malter, MRRMA said that facilities need to be open to all residents, not limited by solid waste district, alliance or town boundaries.
- Carl Witke, CVSWMD asked aren't essentially Rover and Events the same for this discussion.
- John Leddy, NWSWMD commented that the difference is cost, events are more costly as a contractor is hired whereas a Rover refers to a District using its own staff to operate an HHW event and bringing waste back to their facility.
- Bruce Westcott, CVSWMD inquired whether or not state boundaries are relevant to this discussion
- Mia explained that the Town of Hartford is looking into working with some NH towns on establishing a facility to be used by all in surrounding region. There are some differences in how CEG Hazardous waste is regulated from state to state. Windham County Solid Waste District might also have looked into working with Keene, NH.
- Corey Raymond, NEKWMD commented that if regional facilities are established then who would operate them. If paid for by SWMEs, who's paying the proper surcharge or other fees to ensure fairness.
- Agreement by all that a model of regional facilities spread throughout the state with possible rural events is the option to look at.

1:30pm Discussion on a map of current facilities and the regions they serve

- Michael Batcher, Bennington County Solid Waste Alliance said that some communities go to Massachusetts; 15 mile distance in his region can be 35 minutes by road.
- Don Maglienti, Addison County Solid Waste Mgmt. District has a permanent HHW facility open 308 days a year. They are considering adding events but it would be a substantial cost and might not serve many.
- Esther Fishman, The Londonderry Group: A mobile staffing unit might be able to be in different locations around the state on different days.

- Joyce Majors commented that the paint stewardship program which has convenient take back is terrific, and hardware stores are where you buy your HHW. Could this be an option? Need to also consider that siting HHW facilities may be difficult.
- Discussion about population density and shopping areas that would be good hubs for siting facilities. Areas were circled on the paper map.
- John Leddy, Northwest Vermont Solid Waste Mgmt. District commented that residents get used to the convenience of a facility open 200 days a year over having it at their town garage as an event once a year.
- Don, ACSWMD said that the cost of one day events is too high when you might only get 12 cars. Maybe in the state requirements the days the facility is open should offset the mileage requirement.
- Esther, The Londonderry Group commented that there will be some resistance to change even if it provides better service.
- Johanna de Graffenreid, VT Public Interest Research Group inquired about the volume collected at permanent facilities.
- John, NWVSWMD explained that they saw a 100% increase in volume when opened a permanent facility. Now seeing more visitors with less material.
- Don, ACSWMD: Participation has almost doubled since 2005 when they stopped events. Volume collected still going up too. Currently, their district doesn't have statistics on use by outlying towns but is looking into that.
- Carl, CVSWMD commented that some folks say they never leave their hometown.
- Joyce, Lamoille Solid Waste Mgmt. District commented that people will call in fall after their events are over, but they are usually desperate because they are moving. Thus, are happy to go to the Environmental Depot in South Burlington.
- John, NWVSWMD: Folks are more upset at having to wait a year to get rid of their HHW than to having to drive several towns away.
- Jen Holliday, CSWD commented that a 14% participation rate is considered nationally to be optimal participation (all needing to get rid of HHW being served). The 2016 HHW survey shows that all permanent facilities have much higher rates than events only, in the 12%-15% range. Only three areas served by events (Londonderry, Salisbury, and a third) have participation over 10%.

1:45pm Break Out Group discussion

Thinking about the potential for regional facilities with shared access, groups consider Who Pays and Who Manages?

Four Groups were formed. Among the responses from each group were:

Group 1: a point of purchase fee to make it transparent to the consumer. Use of the collection system would be free.

Group 2: Strong consensus on the system not being tied to SWME borders. Should not be run by municipalities directly – RFP for running each facility, allows for private sector to run, or a district to run as an enterprise. Costs include 3 distinct parts: capitalization of site, staff and management, and disposal. Considered EPR, Pre-fee, and finding existing funds from \$6 state fees fund.

Group 3: Build on existing infrastructure, EPR best funding mechanism – both possible: costs shared according to sales, or costs shared according to what is received for disposal. Assess location needs for new facilities, and RFP for development.

Group 4: EPR could be considered thoughtful and fair system, but could be a heavy lift given broad array of producers. Can we focus on particular products by quantity, toxicity? Ideas for funding include: Unclaimed bottle bill escheats, fee on plastic bags, partial customer burden too. HHW should be managed at state-wide level. Local management limits convenience. Consider a labeling law that labeled toxic products requiring collection.

KEY POINTS posted on the boards:

Who Manages?	Who Pays?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State RFP – District and/or private sector could bid • Not each district – border issue • Build onto existing infrastructure • EPR Plan – Identify needs public/private 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consumer fee at point of purchase • EPR – nonspecific • Unclaimed bottle deposits (\$1.3-1.4M/yr) • Bag fee • Facility user fee • Label fee on Toxic products

2:40pm Discussion on Next Steps and Actions Needed

- Many agreed that this discussion and work from this stakeholder group must continue.
- Both Deputy Commissioner Ellis and Cathy explained that the goal of the Department for this stakeholder group is to gather all of this input, synthesize and make public. Before any action is taken on recommendations given by this group, upper management must support. These meetings are also important for informing various stakeholders in the event the legislature considers any action.
- Discussion regarding the differences of events versus facilities and staffing needs. And on the requirements for permanent facilities related to storage of materials.
- Johanna, VPIRG commented that the use of bottle bill escheats could help fund a regional collection system.
- Cathy responded that it has been brought up in legislative session for funding various initiatives in years prior and hasn't been supported.

3:15pm Wrap Up, Cathy Jamieson

Themes heard:

- Better understanding of the risks these materials pose in homes and collection
- recognize it's very costly to manage
- All agreed that a regional facilities model is most attractive
- Understand that the infrastructure ideally would be without municipal borders that limit access
- Some favored EPR funding model
- Good discussion of what regional facilities might look like, bulking, sharing staff, open year round
- Funding will be challenging, no consensus on how to pay for HHW management.

Cathy explained that a summary report of this stakeholder group would be provided to all and thanked everyone for their participation.

Johanna, VPIRG offered her thanks to the group for the work many are doing and for taking public health and safety into consideration.

DRAFT