

APPROVED
CHITTENDEN SOLID WASTE DISTRICT
19 Gregory Drive South Burlington
MEETING ROOM
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
March 26, 2025

***Hybrid Meeting via Zoom.**

PRESENT

BOARD MEMBERS:	Bolton	-----
	Burlington	Lee Perry
	Charlotte	Ken Spencer
	Colchester	Lauren Eagan
	Essex	Alan Nye
		Wendy Duncan, Alt.
	Essex Junction	-----
	Hinesburg	Rick McCraw
	Huntington	Barb Winters
	Jericho	Tom Joslin, Alt.
	Milton	Henry Bonges
	Richmond	Andrew French
	Shelburne	Margaret Wiener
	So. Burlington	Paul Stabler
		Allison Lazarz, Alt.
	St. George	Jaymi Cleland
	Underhill	Paul Ruess
	Westford	Katie Frederick
	Williston	-----
	Winooski	Rachel Kennedy, alt.

STAFF: Sarah Reeves, Amy Jewell, Jen Holliday, Josh Estey, Alice Certa, John Balparda, Dan Goossen

OTHERS PRESENT: Thomas Melloni, Legal; Michael Casella, Brian Somers

AGENDA:

1. Call to Order & Agenda
2. Public Comment Period
3. Consent Agenda
4. Marketing Agency Contract
5. Solid Waste Management Fee Discussion
6. Other Business
7. Adjournment

1. CALL TO ORDER & AGENDA – Accepted as presented.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD – No members of the public commented.

3. Consent Agenda – Executive Director update not part of consent agenda. Accepted as presented, sans Executive Director update

4. Marketing Agency – S. Reeves introduced the request for approval of a marketing agency contract and explained that CSWD previously had a Marketing Creative Specialist position and when the person resigned, as always, we reviewed the position and opportunities. In looking at all work needed it is determined that working with an agency for a broader scope of work would benefit CSWD. A. Certa stated that adding an agency will add bench strength to CSWD and will improve efficiencies. She outlined the RFP and said that of the 17 responses, five were selected for interview and scored on experience of staff, quality of response and blended rates. She noted that CSWD is recommending Place Creative Company, who is a full-service agency with a proven track record. Discussion was held on the contract start date, work that the agency will do, and not exceeding contract costs.

MOTION by P.Stabler, Second by R. McCraw to authorize the Executive Director to enter a one-year contract not to exceed \$95,000 with two one-year options to renew with Place Creative Company of Burlington, VT for marketing services as described in RFP No. 20250106. Voting: All Ayes. Motion Carried.

5. Solid Waste Management Fee Discussion – S. Reeves presented the CSWD's Solid Waste Management fee (SWMF) information to the Board, including how it is authorized and used, fee determination, and other solid waste entity fees. She explained the per-ton fee, currently at \$30/ton on all Chittenden County generated material sent to the landfill. CSWD Ordinance outlines the fee being used to fund district activities, which include support programs and partial funding of operations. She reviewed our current increase history, which reacts to capital project needs. She reviewed other District models, which can also include a per capita fee, on the residents of the communities, which would be included in the property tax bill. CSWD does not propose following this model and instead is recommending that the increase be tied to the Garbage and Trash Consumer Price Index with annual smaller increases, rather than infrequent and inconsistent larger increases. She reviewed the SWMF vs CPI-Adjusted SWMF using the Garbage and Trash Index, which if followed would result in a \$39.21/ton fee. CSWD is proposing a \$40/ton SWMF fee for FY 26 and an Ordinance change that includes the wording of the SWMF to be tied to the CPI Index, which will require finance committee and board review during each budget process.

Discussion was held on the proposed change to the SWMF. The Board asked questions about the increased costs, the effect on members in the community, and the effects on the hauler. A. Nye gave context that CSWD previously did per capita cost to the member communities of the District. CSWD no longer does this, which has removed the burden on communities and made it easier to pass budgets. A. Nye also noted that during previous discussions the haulers were not in favor of annual increases and preferred a rate stabilization model that carried the cost over time. S. Reeves stated that CSWD would look, and follow the language, that other solid waste management districts use with a similar structure. It was noted that the impact to an average home with a \$10/per ton increase would be about \$15/year, but that CSWD does not control the other factors that haulers charge or when they determine increasing rates for their customers. B. Winters asked if CSWD has considered having each drop off center be its own cost center. S. Reeves notes that it has been considered in the past, but is complicated because drop off centers still share maintenance, hauling, education services.

Mike Casella said he understands the challenges of increased costs and asked about the logistics of a per capita fee. He said that Casella is not in favor of annual increases to the SWMF and does not feel that comparing increased costs for CSWD to a hauler are similar. He said their costs increase due to

fuel and the cost of drivers and not administration and education. He also noted that the amount may seem small to a homeowner but businesses are impacted and some will see significant increases based on this fee, including UVM. He asked if now is the time to change to an index for the SWMF. He also feels that some of the SWMF is used to compete with haulers.

Further discussion was held on the advantages and disadvantages of the model. S. Reeves stated that CSWD intended to use most of the capital dollars to pay for the MRF project. Raising the SWMF to \$40/ton will generate an estimated \$1.5 million in year one. S. Reeves also recommends that CSWD not do any capital projects for the next three fiscal years, except for the new MRF. Plan to re-structure the Milton Drop-off center will be pushed out a minimum of 5 years. S. Reeves said that CSWD will be bringing the proposed ordinance change and the Proposed FY 26 Budget to the Board in April for approval.

8. Other Business – None.

9. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by P. Stabler, SECOND by A. Nye, to adjourn the meeting. VOTING: All Ayes. Motion Carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:05PM.

I agree that this is an original copy of minutes, and they have been approved by motion of the Board of Commissioners at the ___ meeting held in _____.

Amy Jewell, Secretary/Treasurer