

**DRAFT**  
**CHITTENDEN SOLID WASTE DISTRICT**  
**ZOOM MEETING Only**  
**May 25– Regular Meeting**

**PRESENT**

**BOARD MEMBERS:**

Bolton	-----
Burlington	Lee Perry
Charlotte	Ken Spencer
Colchester	Renae Marshall
Essex	Alan Nye
Essex Junction	Mike Sullivan
Hinesburg	Rick McCraw
Huntington	-----
Jericho	Leslie Nulty
	Tom Joslin, alt.
Milton	Henry Bonges
Richmond	-----
Shelburne	Margaret Wiener
So. Burlington	Paul Stabler
St. George	-----
Underhill	Paul Ruess
Westford	-----
Williston	Caylin McCamp
Winooski	Bryn Oakleaf

**STAFF:**

Jen Holliday, Nola Ricci, Amy Jewell, Josh Estey

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Thomas Melloni, Esq.

---

**AGENDA:**

1. Agenda
2. Public Comment Period
3. Consent Agenda
4. June Organizational Meeting preparation
5. Legislative Update
6. Executive Session
7. Other Business

- 
1. **CALL TO ORDER and AGENDA** Chair Paul Ruess called the meeting to order at 6:06 pm.
  2. **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD** - No discussion.
  3. **Consent Agenda –**

There was a request to remove the 3.3 VT Materials Management Plan Comments and to ask general questions in program updates. This will be discussed under other business. All other items accepted without edits.

**4. June Annual Organizational Meeting Preparation** - P. Ruess reviewed the enclosed memo regarding the Annual Organizational Election Process for officers and interest in the Executive Board or Committees. The deadline to nominate is June 16<sup>th</sup> and those nominations should be submitted to Sarah. It was noted that Alternate Board members cannot be appointed to offices or to the Executive Board. A. Jewell thanked Williston for the use of their meeting rooms, since 2006, and said that it is our intention to hold the June meeting at the new office space at 19 Gregory Drive in South Burlington. A. Nye requested that a letter be sent to the Town from Sarah thanking Williston for the use of their space.

**5. Legislative Update/ VT Materials Management Plan** – J. Holliday reviewed the VT Materials Management plan process and comments. She noted the state required Materials Management plan, with the purpose of reducing toxicity and volume of waste streams. Solid waste districts must meet certain requirements from this plan, which include service goals, outreach goals, and more.

A month ago, the VT Department of Natural Resources sought input from solid waste districts in preparation for their update of the plan. CSWD responded with request for review of hard issues including landfill capacity, biosolid jurisdiction, and PFAs.

***The following discussion was held on the Vermont Materials Management Plan:***

- Are solid waste organizations having conversations or taking action about these larger issues? J. Holliday said conversations are happening at the Department of Natural Resources.
- Has CSWD made any contingency planning for financial burden if MSW materials are sent out of state, rather than Coventry. J. Holliday clarifies that no contingencies are in place now and the timeframe is about ten years, but CSWD is concerned and is beginning the public conversation.
- CSWD staff has kept up with technological advancements. Is there a path for CSWD to lead on technical alternatives to landfills? J. Holliday responded that CSWD has often been a leader in the field, but at current capacity for staff this is outside of our available scope. However, staff agrees that this needs to be done. It was requested that staff provide further specifics details as to planning and policies.
- Request for clarification on staff statement, “evaluate existing variable prices guidance and consider changes to state....” J. Holliday responds that, in development of Act 148 variable rate pricing structures was included as a requirement. N. Plunkett had noted at that time that variable rate pricing is the greatest tool in getting communities to limit their household waste. Variable based pricing is pricing individuals based on the amount of waste they generate. There are many ways to achieve variable rate pricing. Some are more effective than others. Because there are many ways to implement variable rate pricing, Act 148 required that the state make guidelines for variable rate pricing. The current pricing variable structure is very easy to meet, and not effective and the bar should be higher.
- Requested an explanation of the MM Plan process. J. Holliday shared that this plan goes through a public review and comment period. Additionally, the plan also goes through a rule-making process.

J. Holliday reviewed the Legislative Update memo noting solid waste bills introduced this first year of a two-year biennium. Two bills, heard by committees, were H.67 and H.158. H 67 is Extended Producer Responsibility for Household Hazardous Waste. This bill requires the producer or manufacturer of HHW to pay for and provide for collection systems for their products. The producers will form a producer responsibility organization to develop a plan for a collection and education program and submit to the state. This is the first EPR for HHW bill passed in the country. This bill covers 25-30% of products collected by CSWD, and the bill is waiting for the governor's signature.

H. 158 is the bottle bill which expands the bottles that are included in the redemption system; changes the management of the system to an Extended Producer Responsibility system; and requires an independent analysis of the bottle system. This bill passed the House, was amended by the Senate, and requires House review and vote to agree on the amendments. The House ran out of time and the bill was not voted on. It is possible that the legislature will pick it up again during the June veto session; the Governor does not currently support the bill.

***The following discussion was held on the Legislative Update:***

- Given the strain on redemption centers what has their role in the discussion been? J. Holliday said the redemption centers are supportive of this bill because of the efficiencies potentially gained through the producer responsibility section of H 158.
- How would the bottle bill changes affect the cash flow at the MRF? J. Holliday explained, as she did in testimony, that this is a hard issue to measure. Redemption rates and market variables cannot be easily quantified. Current redemption is about 73%; bill requires the beverage producers to achieve a 90% redemption rate. J. Holliday estimates a \$10-16/ton loss in revenue which would have to be made up for by tip fees.
- Comment that Casella is against the bill, while CSWD remained neutral. It was noted that VPIRG is sharing that CSWD is against the bottle bill; where is this information coming from? J. Holliday said this is a misconception. CSWD has expressed concerns about the rising costs of recycling to Vermonters, which the bill will do, but J. Holliday has never testified against the bill. The focus of CSWD on the bottle bill is its impact on recycling; no position is being taken, just providing the facts.
- Comment that the collection of wine bottles may be helpful to CSWD and questioned if during the calculation of revenue of cash flow if there was a factor for reducing glass handling? J. Holliday notes that staff did include this in their calculations. In her testimony, J. Holliday did say CSWD would support an expansion of the bottle bill to include more glass.

P. Ruess recommends checking in with S. Reeves on a meeting held three years ago when the bottle bill was introduced for additional background information.

When asked if there was another legislative action on the other bills or solid waste topics, J. Holliday noted additional discussions and studies related to solid waste are being discussed, but no action is being taken.

**Agenda #6. Executive Session.**

**MOTION by Alan Nye, Second by Paul Stabler that the Board of Commissioners of the Chittenden Solid Waste District go into Executive Session to discuss the contract negotiations with the City of Burlington, where premature general public knowledge would clearly place the District, its member municipalities, and other public bodies or persons involved at a substantial disadvantage and to permit authorized staff, other invited interested parties, and the Solid Waste District attorney to be present for this session. VOTING: All Ayes, Recusal from Lee Perry, Burlington. Motion Carried.**

**The Board entered executive session at 7:14 p.m.**

**Motion by Leslie Nulty, Second by Paul Stabler, to exit executive session and reconvene the meeting. VOTING: All Ayes, Motion Carried.**

**The board meeting was reconvened at 7:36 p.m.**

**Agenda #7 Other Business:**

- R. McCraw asked about the Williston article on reducing hours at the DOC's. It was noted that overall hours are increasing but Williston is moving from six days per week to five days per week on July 1, 2023.
- R. McCraw asked about the Community Clean Up Fund, draft e-mail and asked that it be sent to commissioners so that they could send out to Front Porch Forum. A. Jewell said she would check on this and ask Sarah to respond to the Board.
- R. McCraw asked about the waterline extension and requested an update on the process. A. Jewell said that she would ask Sarah to send an update.

**Motion to adjourn. Moved by P. Stabler Jericho; seconded by A.Nye Essex Junction. VOTING: All ayes. Motion passes. Meeting adjourned at 7:42 p.m.**

---

Amy Jewell, Recording Secretary

***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 Williston.***

---

***Amy Jewell, Secretary***