**WISCONSIN COUNCIL ON RECYCLING**

**Brown County Port and Solid Waste Department**  
**2561 South Broadway St, Ashwaubenon, WI 54304**  
**Conference Room, 2nd Floor**  

**May 11, 2012**  
**9:00 am - 12:00 pm**

**Council Board Members Present:** Rick Meyers, Jim Birmingham, Neil Peters Michaud, Joe Liebau, George Hayducsko, Charles Larscheid  
**Council Board Members Absent:** Bill Waltz, DNR: Cynthia Moore, Brad Wolbert  
**Special Guest:** Senator Robert Cowles  
**Public:** Jennifer Semrau (Winnebago County), Lynn Morgan (Waste Mgt), Mark Walter (Brown County), Dean Haen (Brown County), Chad Doverspike (Brown County)

| Call to order. | 9:05 call to order  
| Approve minutes | Approval of minutes (motion to pass with no amendments by Joe Liebau seconded by George Hayducsko) |
| Introductions | **Rick Meyers:**  
| Announcements | 1. Action to Accelerate Recycling, a group of 80+ diverse stakeholders, announced its goal to boost recycling by 20% in 3 years. Taken off the table were legislative concepts such as product stewardship or bottle deposit bills, although some in attendance were proponents of those.  
| | 2. Connecticut Senate passed a bill in support of EPR for mattress recycling. The House is expected to also support the bill. The state estimates 176,000 mattresses are discarded each year through municipal waste streams alone, with disposal costs of about $1.2 million borne by local governments.  
| | City of Watertown was given as an example of a WI local government operating a mattress recycling program.  
| | **Neil Peters Michaud:**  
| | At the March Council meeting, Neil offered to help coordinate an effort to engage AROW business members in a discussion on how recycling businesses can promote recycling. Jennifer Semrau (President of AROW) informed the Council she is putting together list of all current and past business members to come together to explore and discuss level of interest to move ahead on this. Neil will continue to provide updates to the Council. He is also working through WI Technology Council to learn about opportunities to harness Wisconsin Economic Development Corporation (WEDC) funds for recycling business.  
| | **Joe Liebau** was recognized as one of 12 “up and rising” recycling professionals by Waste & Recycling News.  
| Tri County Recycling Update (Mark Walter, Recycling) | The Tri-County Recycling program, covering Brown, Outagamie and Winnebago counties (referred to as BOW) takes in residential recyclables from the three counties and some other regions. It has started accepting commercial tonnage from Brown |
Coordinator for Brown County)  

County collected by Veolia. Last year BOW collected about 52,000 tons of material, with about half of it coming from Brown County. Payout process: net revenue received by BOW from sales is redistributed to community members as profit sharing. Last year, BOW paid back over $1.1 M to communities. Revenues are still up overall this year despite some decrease in prices.

*New programs* on tap include cartons and optical sorters for plastics #3-7. Cartons are not formally accepted at this time, and the decision will be made pending results from an on-going study. Optical sorter options depend on an on-going costs/benefit analysis.

Brown County Education Outreach “Waste Not” emailing initiative has generated calls and interest, even from out of state.

County has adopted LEAN for all departments. The Hazardous Waste Center is analyzing operations to identify efficiency options. For example, they are now shipping latex through Amazon for recycling rather than landfilling. While this is a cost to consumers, staffing costs have dropped because the Center is no longer bulking material, saving considerable labor time.

*Recycling Guide* was published this year as a tri-county guide with consistent messages and same list of recyclables across all three counties. It was distributed through local papers and at public events and locations. Education for recycling continues to be a big part of the county solid waste program.

BOW is negotiating a 5-year lease agreement with **Green Box**, a private company that sorts compacted waste collected from fast food restaurants (some from Canada). They sort out plastics and paper for further processing, and may get into food composting at a later date. ([http://www.greenboxna.com/](http://www.greenboxna.com/))

State Legislative Update (Senator Cowles) and Strategies for Communicating Recycling

Chuck Larscheid introduced **Senator Robert Cowles**. Senator Cowles is looking for input from the Council on major issues related to recycling and waste recovery, with funding of RU programs and uses of the recycling tip fee for non-recycling purposes as top priorities.

**Highlights of the discussion** between Senator Cowles and Council members:

1. Implications of reduced state cost sharing/recycling grants to local governments
   a. Local governments still support the recycling laws and mandates in the state but maintaining recycling programs is a challenge with the reduction in state cost share (recycling grants now cover on average 17% of net program costs, from about 27% in the previous budget cycle).
   b. Most RUs don’t think funding will reach 2/3 of their costs, as initially promised, but would be satisfied with 1) commitment to direct all revenue from the $7/ton tip fee to the recycling program and 2) restoration of the funding level to cover 30% of program costs.

2. Council position on RU consolidation
   a. Council passed a resolution (3-2 vote) in May 2011 supporting DNR/s budget proposal to link grant eligibility to RU population, although
with an amendment that the population threshold be 10,000 rather than 25,000.

b. Most RUs do not, and did not, support this proposal
   i. Many smaller programs are efficient despite not being consolidated or large.
   ii. An RU could possibly receive a smaller grant if consolidated due to grant award conditions in state statutes.

3. Impact of grant reductions on RU programs
   a. Need to document impacts of reduction in basic grant funding on RU programs.
   b. Need to document impact of elimination of the Recycling Efficiency Incentive Grants (REI grant funded at $1.9 M) on local government cooperative agreements for special initiatives (recycling at multifamily dwellings, convenience stores, and special events; outreach and joint collection initiatives).
   c. There are many examples of consolidation for service provision already in place.

4. Options for Council to secure legislative support for recycling
   a. Develop a set of recommendations (update the Joint white paper) and request DNR to forward these to the legislature and Governor. As an independent entity, these recommendations would not need to be vetted through DNR.
   b. Continue to invite legislators to Council meetings.
   c. Meet individually with legislators.
   d. Develop a communications plan and explore with DNR whether it would be possible to secure a part time intern to assist the Council on its communications.
   e. Example of what can be achieved by reaching out to legislature: the joint initiative undertaken by the four organizations (Council, AROW, SWANA and WCSWMA) in response to the budget initiative to cut recycling culminating in a white paper sent to legislators followed up by in-person meetings.

5. Funding for a study on alternatives for reliable and sustainable funding
   a. Joint white paper included this as a recommendation, because of uncertainty of secure funding under the current system which 1) relies on revenue from tip fees subject to vagaries of market prices and 2) is susceptible to being put to other uses
   b. Legislative council study would be a longer term solution. The immediate need is for short term strategies to restore funding, and to demonstrate the impact of reductions in funding on program operations.

Summary of Recommendations:
- Redraft/reissue the white paper and send to DNR to forward to governor and legislature
- Meet with legislators; create awareness on the issue through newspaper articles and op ed pieces. Clearly demonstrate the implications of reduced funding
| Oneida Energy Garbage Pyrolysis-project update | Invited Speakers:  
- Kevin Cornelius, CEO Oneida Seven Generations Corp  
- Todd Parczick, President - Alliance Construction |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The project is located on the north side of Green Bay. It is the first of its kind in Wisconsin, although Waste Management manages another system in the US.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current status of project: They are waiting for a revision to the air permit from DNR, otherwise all other approvals have been received.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The system is best described as pyrolytic gasification with thermal distillation of material under anaerobic conditions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Basic System operation:  
When garbage hits the garbage truck, it’s still “garbage”. Recyclables have already been separated out by the homeowner. Collected garbage will go through a series of processes:  
- Manual sort to extract remaining recyclables for recycling (estimated at about 5% of the load) – plastic, metal and glass; and  
- Shredding of remaining garbage  
- Shredded garbage is passed through the pyrolysis unit where it is converted into a fuel gas. This fuel gas will be used to power gensets to make electricity.  
Project is designed for 150 tons/day operating three modules running at 60% of capacity. If one module experiences down time, the other two have enough remaining capacity to cover for it. |
| The project will take waste from the northeast WI area. It can accept mattresses, carpet, wood chips, manure, human waste, or just about any carbon product as they can remove non-carbon or otherwise useable products from system. All gas created will be converted to electricity. They have agreements to sell the electricity to WPS. |
| Because pyrolysis is not incineration (i.e., no oxygen introduced, no flame created), it is regulated as a solid waste processing facility and not as an incinerator. |
| For more information:  

| Compost Rule Rollout (Brad Wolbert) | The new rule is expected to be published with state register by May 30, and in effect June 1.  
Among the most significant “new” provisions of the revised rules is allowing mixed |
post-consumer food products for new category under 5000 cubic yards.

DNR is currently preparing for the new rule by:

1) Contacting current licensed holders about rule changes and impacts to their operations.
2) Contacting pilot projects operating under a low hazard solid waste exemption to inform them they must transition into licensed facilities under new rule.
3) Preparing guidance documents working with staff and UW Extension SHWEC.
4) Encouraging municipal facilities to do more actual composting (track temperature, turn, etc).
5) Training staff.

Implications for waste management facilities (landfills?):

1) Run off from large sites no longer has to be managed as a leachate, reducing costs and opening door to more sites.
2) Allows diversion of unique compost waste which couldn’t previously be composted.

| AB643 Fiscal Impacts to facilities and DNR (Brad Wolbert) | AB 643 eliminates or reduces tip fees for certain wastes. Revenue from these fees is deposited into the Environmental Fund and used to fund certain DNR environmental programs. Specifically, AB 463 would eliminate or reduce fees for waste for:
|             | ▪ Bad debt (loss in revenue and administrative cost)
|             | ▪ MRF residual (exempted on anything below 10%)
|             | ▪ C&D waste exemption (exemption of anything below 30%)

The DNR fiscal note shows the bill would impact DNR Waste programs funded by the Environment Fund, by reducing revenue from tip fees by about $1.5M. The bill has also raised questions whether reducing fees could serve as a reverse incentive for waste processors to be less vigilant about reducing residuals. It may encourage collecting more material that is waste but exempted from the tip fee because it is no longer in the waste stream. Exemption caps were placed to discourage this in the bill.

WasteCap Resource Solutions has observed that C&D wastes, recovered through on-site separation, can achieve 95% capture versus a much lower recovery rate when collected and processed as single waste stream.

The rationale behind AB 463 was to increase the cost-competitiveness of recycling activity versus landfilling. In addition, allowing MRFs to exempt a portion of their residual from the tip fee could provide an incentive to accept more materials, thus recovering more resources from the waste stream despite potentially higher contamination rates.

| Public Comment | Lynn Morgan (Waste Management) extended an invitation to hold the next Council meeting at their Germantown single stream MRF. The MRF now processes mixed plastics, pots and pans, and cartons. The Council accepted the offer. |
| Other Business | Chuck Larscheid reminded council members to keep channels of communication open with legislators and to consider this in deciding when/where to have meetings. Legislators considered for the August meeting at Germantown include: Senator Darling and Dan Knodl. A suggestion was made to also invite officials from the City of Milwaukee. |
| Action item: DNR Staff to package ideas on how to communicate with legislators for Council decision making. |
| Bill Waltz (Strategic Materials) is unable to attend meetings due to frequent work conflicts. He offered to resign or, preferably, name a proxy. A plant manager from their East Troy facility is interested in serving as his proxy. Council members agreed it would be preferable to have him delegate a proxy. |

| Next meeting | August in Germantown (date to be determined). |
| Actions before next meeting | 1. Redraft letter from Joint group on funding (Rick) |
| | 2. Position description for intern to build on communication plan (Joe) |
| | 3. Contact legislators for Aug meeting: |
| | a. Alberta Darling (Chuck) |
| | b. Alternates: Larsen (Joe), Knodl (Rick) |
| Action for next meeting | 4. Send out notice to RUs and public works/solid waste in Germantown area |
| | 5. Invite press or media |

| Motion to adjourn by Chuck Larscheid, seconded by Joe Liebau. |

Notes compiled by Cynthia Moore