

**DRAFT**  
**CHITTENDEN SOLID WASTE DISTRICT**  
**19 Gregory Drive South Burlington**  
**MEETING ROOM**  
**MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING**  
**October 22, 2025**

**\*Hybrid Meeting via Zoom.**

**PRESENT**

<b>BOARD MEMBERS:</b>	Bolton	-----
	Burlington	Lee Perry
	Charlotte	Ken Spencer
	Colchester	Renae Marshall, Alt.
	Essex	Alan Nye
		Wendy Duncan, Alt.
	Essex Junction	Mike Sullivan
	Hinesburg	Rick McCraw
	Huntington	Barb Winters
	Jericho	Leslie Nulty
		Tom Joslin, Alt.
	Milton	Betsy Paret
	Richmond	-----
	Shelburne	Margaret Wiener
	So. Burlington	Paul Stabler
		Alison Lazarz, Alt.
	St. George	-----
	Underhill	Paul Ruess
	Westford	-----
	Williston	David Howell
	Winooski	Bryn Oakleaf

**STAFF:** Sarah Reeves, Jen Holliday, John Balparda, Joey Catania

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Thomas Melloni, Esq.

**AGENDA:**

1. Call to Order & Agenda
2. Public Comment Period
3. Consent Agenda
4. Solid Waste Implementation Plan Draft
5. MRF Project Update
6. CSWD Identity and Image Alignment
7. Other Business

**1. CALL TO ORDER & AGENDA** – An additional item is added to the Agenda, under “Other Business” the Committee will discuss electing an Assistant Secretary to the Board. Agenda accepted as presented. P. Ruess called meeting to order at 6:02 PM.

**2. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD** – No comments were made by the public.

3. **CONSENT AGENDA** – Approved as presented.

4. **SOLID WASTE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN DRAFT** - J. Catania presented updates to the Solid Waste Implementation Plan (SWIP) Draft. He provided an overview of the state requirements that are fulfilled by the SWIP and noted that Board approval will be requested at the next meeting (November 19<sup>th</sup>). The SWIP was pre-approved by the Department of Environmental Conservation in August and has a website dedicated to public comment, of which there have been eight emails. No emails have triggered any changes to the SWIP as of the meeting, and the public comment period ends Friday, October 24<sup>th</sup>.

B. Paret noted that there are some interesting comments related to recycling film plastics and re-use options that might be used for future Board discussions. J. Catania shared that while the comments are helpful, they exist outside of the SWIP but are referred to staff for consideration within their programs. Specifically, B. Paret noted community interest in Re-Use zones. CSWD staff responded with historical Board discussion reference points. B. Winters also noted her experience as a CSWD staff person, now retired, and the existing opportunities for re-use opportunities (Habitat for Humanity, ReStore).

P. Ruess noted the positive comments on the conservation focus and dedication to community displayed in the SWIP and his interest in providing community education on questions, including recycling plastic film.

5. **MRF Project Update** – S. Reeves shared that the Williston DRB approved the updated MRF plan at their most recent meeting. She shared that the revisions will result in an overall reduced disturbed construction area. Currently, CSWD is working with the town on approvals to begin clearing a small area of the site.

P. Stabler shared that this collaboration may have resulted in an even better plan than initial; S. Reeves agreed in terms of environmental land conserved and a larger queueing space for trucks which will lessen traffic impact on Redmond Road. The design also now includes a robust plan for avoiding and mitigating threats from invasive plant species.

S. Reeves shares that the ground-breaking will be November 13<sup>th</sup> at 11am, pending receiving proper approvals, and invites Board members to attend. If a quorum of the Board m attends, the meeting will have to be warned, so RSVPs are encouraged.

L.Nulty asks for a notional timeline for next steps for the next Board meeting.

6. **CSWD Identity and Image Alignment** – S. Reeves presented on a plan to redesign CSWD's logo as part of the development of the new MRF. She reviewed CSWD's positive public perception and CSWD mission, vision and values and noted some challenges to the current logo and image. Namely, the color and design of our logo might cause confusion as it appears very similar to private company Casella Waste Management, a company that offers direct pickup services which CSWD does not offer.

S. Reeves also noted that CSWD's image should reflect what the organization wants to represent to the community: CSWD helps people; it strengthens Vermont's excellent commitment to the environment; it helps the community rethink waste; it provides good information which leads to better choices; and it celebrates our staff, who are the best in the business.

The building of the new MRF provides a great opportunity to review our public-facing image and how we communicate that image. S. Reeves reviewed the process of expanding conversations throughout the entire district, which will run from now through January 2027 with a presentation of concepts to the Board likely in May 2026. Costs are estimated to be roughly \$66,000 over FY26 and FY27.

With that in mind, the re-imagined vision board looks something like the image below: focusing on the heart of the mission of CSWD.



P. Stabler asked if there will be an updated mission statement as well, which would require a Board conversation. S.Reeves noted that the mission statement does seem resonant, but the vision statement might be too narrow. Additionally, P.Stabler noted that staff may want to collaborate with State of Vermont and seek input or guidance.

A.Nye noted concern over the estimated costs being too small, especially considering the larger ticket items currently facing CSWD. S.Reeves noted that the larger ticket items are things like signage, but these can be rolled out as needed, as will apparel.

B.Oakleaf spoke in support of the project, especially considering the confusion community members often express differentiating Casella and CSWD. K. Spencer also spoke in support of focusing on concerns over community education and understanding, especially supporting Vermonters' dedication to environmental concerns.

R.McGraw noted that the vision statement is difficult to find online and requires some work to identify on the website. Staff respond that they will work to highlight this information better.

M.Wiener also shared support for the project but noted the importance of connecting this work with the mission and communicating that connection to the wider community.

P.Ruess also shared his support and for connecting emotionally with the work done at CSWD. As an example, he noted the community's commitment to and connection with Green Mountain Compost, and how that has made the transition to "ORF" more challenging.

L.Perry noted that, during the meeting, he asked AI to search Casella and it returned a response that Casella works "alongside and in partnership" with CSWD. These searches may be contributing to the confusion.

**7. OTHER BUSINESS** – Discussion was held on the need to elect an Assistant Secretary for the duration of A. Jewell's leave of absence. S.Reeves shared that she nominations for the position of Assistant Secretary should be sent to her by November 7<sup>th</sup>. The position's term will run through the end of the fiscal year.

T.Melloni noted that when the election is held at the next Board meeting on November 19<sup>th</sup>, language will need to be added to the motion that such a position was determined necessary for functioning of the Board, which will fulfill the legal requirements for creating this role. The Board should include language such as, "the Board finds it appropriate to elect an assistant secretary for the District".

Discussion on the requirements of the position was held. The Assistant Secretary could extract AI-derived notes but will need to be reviewed and re-edited by staff for clarity, to identify participants, and to maintain legal requirements for note taking. From discussions, it is determined that the Assistant Secretary would need to record votes for both the Executive and Full Board meetings. Staff would continue the practice of warning meetings, posting draft minutes, and compiling the annual report.

S.Reeves confirmed that draft minutes (transcripts generated that are reviewed, edited by staff, and reviewed by the Secretary) would have to be generated and posted within five days of each meeting. The note taking program would generate the transcript, staff would take two days to review, and the Secretary would have two final days of review. All days are calendar days.

**8. Adjournment – Motion by A.Nye, Second by K.Spencer to adjourn the meeting. Voting: All Ayes. Motion Carried.**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

***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 \_\_\_\_\_.***

---

Board Secretary