


WASTE & MATERIALS MANAGEMENT STUDY GROUP – Notes: August 9, 2016





Location: DNR Fitchburg Service Center, Gathering Waters Room

Member Attendance: Albee, Curry, Doverspike/SWANA, Johnson, Karwoski, Meyer Smith, Morgan, Nickodem/AROW, Salisbury,
 Welch/WCSWMA

DNR Staff Attendance: Carey, Coakley, Lamensky, Semrau, Wolbert

Subs/Guest Speakers: Rebecca Mattano, Waukesha County Solid Waste Supervisor; Valerie Joosten, DNR NE Region Waste and Materials Management Program Manager;
 Joe Lourigan, DNR Hydrogeologist Plan Review expert

Time/ Presenter	Topic	Follow-up/Notes
12:30 Meleesa	Agenda Adjustments and Note Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agenda adjusted at the discretion of the chair so that guest speakers can go first Notes from 6/23/16 were approved (vote: 10:0). Finalized notes can be found here on the WMM website
12:45 Ann	DNR Updates	<p>DNR Staffing Updates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brad is retiring on August 26th, 2016. The position is in the process of being filled. The exam closed on Monday August 8th. An exam rating and interview panel have been set up. Dan Werner started as a new (non-landfill) waste management specialist in Fitchburg Matt Matrise started as the new WMM Program SE Region manager in Waukesha Dan Kroll started as a new (non-landfill) waste management specialist in Green Bay Position fills for an engineer and hydrogeologist in Green Bay are being worked on Ed will be looking to hire a new (hazardous) waste specialist in CO New solid waste and hazardous waste program attorneys – Jess Kramer and Jennifer Rashel <p>Alignment Updates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The alignment is on hold indefinitely but Ann does think the initiatives will continue WMM Program updates will likely continue starting with the redistribution staff to supervisors Ann will provide an update on the alignment as she finds out more
12:50 Rebecca Mattano	AROW Glass Task Force Recommendations  Glass Recycling in Wisconsin.pdf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Andy asked if non-cullet uses have industry support and if they can be as cost effective as sending to a cullet recycler. Rebecca believes support has been lacking due to unclear regulations for non-cullet uses and that clarifying those can bolster support. The cost equivalency for non-cullet uses comes from finding local uses that greatly reduce transport costs. Chad asked if there was a cost evaluation on non-cullet options compared to landfilling the material. Rebecca said she hasn't but wants to have a consulting firm do a full life cycle analysis. Meleesa commented that this is very location specific. John and Jason want to know if we should still be recycling glass. Rebecca explains that in general the Task Force wants to maintain glass recycling. The markets do exist so do we want to do a complete reeducation and reconfiguration our collection and sorting investments and technology?
1:20	FOWRD Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meleesa says FOWRD wants to decrease the tipping fees if the money isn't going to recycling. Jason

<p>Meleesa/John</p>	 <p>FOWRD-1.pdf</p>	<p>points out that this would have big impacts on developing recycling markets that are able to charge smaller tipping fees than the landfill in part because of the tax.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amber asked about next steps and Meleesa said the legislature wants recommendations from them by January • Lynn pointed out that Waste Management does not support mandatory consolidation • Lynn asked if people are hearing about communities feeling pinched by the tax levy limit and if anyone is interested in bringing that up to the legislature
<p>2:15 Valerie Joosten</p>	<p>WMM Program Consistency Initiatives</p>  <p>Consistency SW Study Group Aug 9 20</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John asked if having plan review experts means 1 or 2 people do plan review for the entire state. Valerie explained that they assist with more in-depth and precedent setting plan review but that in general field staff are leading plan review. • John asked if precedent setting decisions are discussed on team calls and if those decisions are documented somewhere. The WMM Program does try to bring up any precedent setting decisions on team calls and the decision should be documented in meeting notes and in electronic file system. • Meleesa said she wants to make sure that when an original precedent setting approval is issued any other plan submittals that are pending a decision on the same approval type are moved along quickly • Brad stated he would like to have approvals and possibly submittals available on the web so facilities could look at any approvals issued to similar facilities • Lynn asked about our ability to share recent approvals internally and Ann discussed that it is possible and admitted DNR IT systems are out of date and are currently being worked on. Valerie added that we are standardizing our submittal intake procedure to help with equal distribution of plan review and consistency. • Lynn asked how we are measuring progress on our consistency initiatives and Valerie commented that this was a something we need to set standards for
<p>2:30 Joe Lourigan</p>	<p>Landfill Siting Near Wetlands Guidance</p>  <p>Wetland Guidance (2).pdf</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The guidance has to go through several internal reviews including legal reviews with the new Program attorney before it goes out for public comment • Look for it to be out for public comment later this year
<p>2:45 All</p>	<p>Presentation of Scope Statements</p>  <p>WMM Study Group Organics position state</p>	<p>Organics Management Presenter: Andy Authors: Andy and Meleesa</p> <p><u>Background:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wisconsin already diverts a majority of yard waste • Several states have organics landfill bans that cover some food waste and a few Wisconsin cities have optional programs • Has the potential to save landfill space • Several states have found economic difficulties because the ban went in place before infrastructure. While food waste bans have worked better in European countries and Canada, those countries have higher landfill taxes and more robust food waste management plans respectively when compared to Wisconsin. • Current options of composting and anaerobic digestion can be very expensive and we need to make sure that things happen economically and in the correct order to ensure food waste diversion is cost

effective and the best option environmentally when you factor in transportation and processing.

- Meleesa added that there should also be a focus on food waste reduction

Goals:

- Setting standards for composting, dry anaerobic digestion and POTW wet anaerobic digestion, researching how food waste diversion changes landfill leachate and gas collection, look at the technical, legislative and regulatory requirements for implementing a food waste ban in Wisconsin and when it makes sense to expand past pilot programs

Potential members:

- Jonathan Rivin (SHWEC), Compost Crusaders founder, Karin Sieg and Bart Sexton

Group feedback:

- Brad suggested that a consultant who had worked with other states could do this very efficiently if the group could find a money source

Alternative Landfill Caps Presenter: Chad Authors: Chad and John

Background:

- Federal and state standards have a two year requirement for capping landfills
- Alternative caps could allow for easier use of airspace that becomes available as waste degrades
- Some alternatives have been approved at Wisconsin landfills
- Known cap alternatives include: vegetative cover with a root system to stabilize top soil, exposed geomembrane for ease of adding more waste after degradation, solar covers and long term intermediate caps
- John pointed out that Wisconsin has its own climate concerns
- John also points out that Advanced currently has a rain diversion temp cap right now and asked if that is something the DNR would be interested in with proper research. Ann said WMM is open to it if it complies with Subtitle D

Goals:

- Researching how alternative caps could work with the organics stability rule, researching potential for delayed capping schedules, outlining what an approval for an alternative cap would look like at a State and Federal level, standardizing the application process, and demonstrating the alternative caps can be as effective as traditional caps

Potential members:

- Someone who has submitted an alternative cap proposal and had it approved before (national consulting firm), national landfill firms to access information from other states

Group feedback:

- Tim pointed out other states have approved caps like these
- Brad suggested the group should identify where it is going and then provide information to DNR technical staff for feedback

Discontinuing Groundwater Monitoring at Closed Landfills Presenter: Tom Authors: Tom and Erik Lietz

Background:

- Already some guidance on decreasing monitoring but it allows for a minimum of annual monitoring



alternative landfill caps scope statement.



Discontinuing
Monitoring at Closed L

- Hundreds of closed landfills have been monitored with very low contamination for a long time
- Mike Solomon is working on providing information on the different levels of monitoring currently being carried out by Wisconsin's closed landfills
- Erik adds that many sites have used all of their long term care money and many have lost the person who knew there were long term care requirements for the landfill. Educating people about still required long term care through a reduction in monitoring requirements may be effective.

Goals:

- Answering what could be done to expand on the guidance to a full monitoring stop and to educate sites that would be eligible

Potential members:

- Erik, Joe, landfill owners, consultants, DNR hydros, Larry Buechel from Clean Wisconsin

Group feedback:

- Joe voiced concerns that no annual monitoring would mean the wells would go into disrepair and may even be lost. He suggested that wells may be inspected for groundwater levels to confirm that the wells are still in good shape or a site could test for VOCs rather than indicator parameters.
- Lynn asked that the group ask if PAL is really the correct technical standard in every situation

Recycling Funding Presenter: Amber Authors: Amber and Lynn

Background:

- Recycling funding may be at a crisis point
- 87% of Environmental Management Account (EMA) is from tipping fees and 37% is going to recycling
- The EMA is currently reported as in deficit, communities are facing levy caps
- Amber asked if DNR had any up to date info on current EMA standing –DNR does not but Colleen Storck gets landfill receipts and may have tonnage info
- Lynn added that in addition to funding decreasing, the grant money is also worth less
- AROW and Council on Recycling (COR) are each working on a letter encouraging the maintenance of current grant levels
- Sen. Cowles office believes EMA may be above the earlier projected values since tonnages are up
- Lynn believes they should call for a stronger position than current grant levels. She encouraged educating the legislature on the specific benefits of recycling that are relevant today.

Goals:


- a work product to share with the group at the October meeting

Feedback from group:

- John asked if we want the first recommendation to come out of this group to be a push for additional recycling funding. Brad added that that is the first message coming out of the new COR as well.
- Ann said legislature wants specifics, not just general letter stating grants are needed. She stated that people in the industry need to work on the specifics and the proposal needs to be reasonable. No legislator will consider using all of the EMA for recycling. The legislature is focusing on best uses of money to protect human health and the environment and are more focused on immediate crisis management than the longstanding recycling program.



WMMWG Recycling
Funding Scope Final.p

	 C&D.pdf	<p>C&D Presenter: Jason Authors: Jason, John and Lynn</p> <p><u>Background:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John stated that C&D landfills are not paying state fees and have less rigorous requirements and that playing field should be leveled • Lynn talked about the importance of education for C&D recycling. <p><u>Goals:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encouraging municipalities to adopt C&D recycling ordinances, standardizing and streamlining the approvals for C&D processors, finding wood markets, finding alternative uses for processing fines, holding C&D landfill to a higher standard, educating on C&D recycling <p><u>Potential members:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reps from DSPS and Dept. of Workforce Development for building code insight, C&D processors, state permitting staff, waste generators <p><u>Feedback from group:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If organizations created publications the DNR could potentially convert into a DNR document. AROW may be a tool for education. Materials could potentially be provided with the asbestos notification form.
3:45 All	Determination of Next Steps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Groups will form sub committees, have a meeting to discuss goals and objectives and a leader by October meeting ➤ Group members and meeting notes will be sent to Casey for distribution to the group ➤ Brad and Casey will find out if subgroup meetings need to be public noticed ➤ Casey will send out Doodle for February and April meeting dates