

## Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) Stakeholders Group Minutes – August 2nd, 2017

### Group Members Present:

Cathleen Gent	Central VT Solid Waste Mgmt. District
Carl Witke	Central VT Solid Waste Mgmt. District
Christy Pion	Town of Lowell
Jeff Frederick	ENPRO Services of VT-NRC
Shaina Kasper	Toxics Action Center
Corey Raymond	Northeast Kingdom Waste Mgmt. District
William Driscoll	Associated Industries of VT
Esther Fishman	The Londonderry Group
Allison DeMag	Morris and DeMag
Tess Kennedy	William Shouldice and Associates
Heather Shouldice	William Shouldice and Associates
Erin Sigrist	VT Retail and Grocer's Association
Toby Howe	MMR
Annie Macmillan	Agency of Agriculture
Kim Crosby	Casella Waste Systems
Don Maglienti	Addison County Solid Waste Mgmt. District
Jennifer Holliday	Chittenden Solid Waste District

### By phone

Representative David L. Deen	House Natural Resources Fish and Wildlife Committee
Greg Noyes	Town of Canaan
Joyce Majors	Lamoille Regional Solid Waste Mgmt. District
Jim O'Gorman	Rutland Solid Waste District
Bob Vahey	Town of Hartford

### ANR Staff Present:

Rebecca Ellis	DEC Deputy Commissioner
Chuck Schwer	Waste Mgmt. and Prevention Division Director
Cathy Jamieson	Solid Waste Program Manager
John Fay	Solid Waste Program
Rebecca Webber	Solid Waste Program
Marissa Porcellini	Solid Waste Program Intern
Mary Clark	Drinking Water and Groundwater Protection Division- Facilitator

### Minutes

**1:05pm** – Cathy stated the goal of this group and provided a Meeting One summary.

- 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

Meeting 1 discussed how much it costs to manage this waste appropriately and how much it costs when it is mismanaged. Mismanagement can lead to much higher costs and negative environmental and human health impacts.

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.

Meeting 2 is to discuss options for collection and management.

Joyce from LRSWMD commented that one-day events are very costly and there is a high safety risk associated. Her recommendation is that there are year-round permanent regional facilities where waste can be collected and aggregated to eliminate the need for events. This would provide more convenience and offer safer collection.

Bruce from CVSWMD asked that we consider as part of the discussion how to capitalize the cost of permanent facilities.

Cathy requested that for Meeting 2, participants try to not think about funding or current state plan requirements, but rather think about what would be the most efficient and effective system for collection and management.

**1:15pm-** Annie Macmillan from Agency of Agriculture provided an overview of the Pesticide Disposal Program

- This program began in 1993 and requires manufacturers of pesticides to register their products sold in VT and pay an annual \$175.00 fee. Currently over 11,000 products registered. \$5.00 of the 175.00 registration is applied to disposal.
- The Agency contracts with solid waste districts, alliances and towns to reimburse them for pesticide disposal costs at their HHW facilities and events.
- 100% of pesticide disposal costs covered.
- Over 1,000,000 pounds have been collected since 1996.

**1:30pm-** Options for managing HHW Discussion

Mary listed the initial options provide to group via email and asked for other suggestions and a discussion.

- Unified contract with hazardous waste contractors for collection events
- Permanent regional facilities managed by solid waste management entities
- Permanent regional facilities managed by state contract
- Program modeled after Agency of Agriculture pesticide grant disposal program
- Privatization
- Different funding models
- Other?

- Jen Holliday, CSWD recommended adding Extended Producer Responsibility(EPR) for HHW to the option list.
- There was some discussion of the Agency of Ag. pesticide program model and how that could apply to HHW.
- Esther from the Londonderry Group stated that if permanent facilities were able to conduct events rather than a private contractor it could reduce costs.
- Corey, NEKWMD commented that services could possibly be expanded to towns beyond their district borders but it would need to be funded and maybe EPR could do that.
- Greg Noyes, Town of Canaan supported the regional facility idea as long as there were not district, town boundaries that prohibited access.
- Chuck Schwer, Waste Mgmt. and Prevention Division commented would a statewide contract for HHW services save money, with ANR managing a state contract.
- Bill Driscoll, AIV suggested a consumer fee at point of purchase on all HHW products.
- No current registration of HHW products like there is for pesticides.
- Carl Witke, CVSWMD commented regional facilities would offer more efficiency and reduce the challenges and dangers of remote one-day collection events.
- Jen, CSWD commented that her district looked at cost for rover events versus permanent facility and the facility is much less expensive. She doesn't think one-day collection events provide adequate convenience.
- Some commented on a need for both regional permanent facilities and rural events to accommodate large rural areas.

**1:45pm** Mary offered a list of Evaluation Options to be considered when looking at the pros and cons of various HHW collection options

- Cost (who pays, include externalities-carbon footprint)
  - Convenience
-

- Participation Rates
- Incentivizing/Motivating
- Safety
- Efficiency

Group Discussion

**2:00pm** Mary requested all participants to vote by sticker for their preferred option listed.

3 major options were chosen:

- Regional facilities with consolidation for rural events managed by SWME
- EPR
- Regional facilities with consolidation for rural event managed by state contract

**2:20pm** Participants were asked to move into break out groups and that each group have a variety of representation. Groups were tasked with discussing the pros and cons of the above options.

**2:35pm** Report Outs from break out groups

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

1. Regional permanent facilities with Consolidation for Rural Rover Events managed by SWMEs

Pros

- Lower Cost
- Increased Convenience
- Safer to Travel with HW shorter distance to a rural event
- More efficient for contractors to schedule pick-ups of HW at regional facility than one-day event
- Year-round convenience

Cons

- Districts resistant to sharing a facility due to funding issues (surcharge, per capita, etc.)
- Hard to get coverage in rural areas
- Facility needs to be heated in order to operate all year round.

2. Extended Producer Responsibility(EPR)

Pros

- Funding mechanism for infrastructure
- Strong education and outreach
- Increased efficiency statewide
- No regional boundaries
- Pollution prevention and waste reduction
- Convenience and increased participation

Cons

- Legacy waste/products that are obsolete-who would be responsible for
- Capitalizing infrastructure would be challenging
- How to control out of state waste

3. Regional permanent facilities managed by state contract (with private contractor)

Pros

- Could led to high collection rate like e-waste
- Could invite competition
- Cost saver

Cons

- Logistics would be complicated
- Geography issues

With Rover Rural Events

Pros

- Cost savings for consolidated staff, certification- no set up fee, equipment fees, etc.
- Having convenient consolidation location for waste

Cons

---

- Legal and safety costs are high
- Costs in general high for one-day events

4. Regional Facilities-

- managed by SWMEs
  - can replicate current infrastructure of the existing 5 facilities (NWSWMD, RCSWD, NEKWMD, ACSWMD, CSWD)
- managed by private contractor
  - issue of waiting for private sector to initiate
  - private could be more nimble
- State Run
  - Pro
    - Consistency and convenience for all counties
  - Cons
    - State lacks experience in managing
    - How would it be funded

**2:50pm** Wrap Up and Next Steps:

Email any further thoughts you would like considered.

**Meeting #3:** September 7th, 1:00pm – 3:00pm

Purpose: to prioritize options, discuss funding and make recommendation(s) to ANR

---