

## Feedback comments on CCSMM

RC

Ron Capozzi <ronsraspberrries@hotmail.com>

Wed 10/7/2020 10:53

To: DEEP RecyclingProgram

Cc: Nelson, Chris; Tonya Buddie <tbuddie@townofdurhamct.org>

CCSMM Engagement Comments .docx

15 KB

CCSMM Public Engagement Questions.pdf

145 KB

2 attachments (160 KB)Download allSave all to OneDrive - State of Connecticut

Chris,

Attached are the comments you asked for. I included the questions as well for those I cc-ed. They have a stake in the process.

Ron Capozzi

CCSMM Engagement Comments 10/15/20  
DMIAAB

UBP – Before getting into the mechanics of UBP, ask will it work for DMIAAB where only 20% of the citizens have curbside pickup. We are accustomed to dual recycling and have had multi-stream recycling in the past to the degree of separating different color glass in different bins 30-40 years ago. UBP will invite creative ways to circumvent the program. For example, when I first came to Durham there was a neighbor who use to burn plastics in his fireplace at night and it stank. Selling this program is a solution that doesn't fit the problem for us.

Identifying heavy users and people who don't recycle or recycle improperly is a challenge we hope to resolve through the use of cameras which will give us the data and leverage we need to get everyone on board to take responsibility for their consuming lifestyle. There is a License Plate Recognition program (LPR), before DEEP from DMIAAB, which will not only reduce manning the entrance on a yes/no basis but also automatically record who enters and when they enter. Other cameras can do surveillance on the volume of MSW disposed and the frequency of an individual's visits, to determine who the heavy users are for special treatment. As a secondary benefit, we can review who is and isn't recycling to target our education efforts by examining the video footage. This also will free up staff to monitor quality control of recyclables.

#### Organics

For our community, organic reduction can most effectively be done at their homes via composting bins which we are currently subsidizing. We already municipal compost leaves for the community use. Our brush grinding and mulch production is very popular with our residents.

#### EPR

Asphalt shingles are being disposed of as demo, that our residents pay to dispose of. We could instead, create a bin to capture them for recycling if the right incentives were in place for all parties.

Foam peanuts, and bubble wrap will be reused if brought to a UPS office. There may be an opportunity here to divert something that has no weight, but a lot of volume from the waste stream.

Plastic nursery pots can be reused. Garden Centers, like Natureworks takes backs and gives out pots as needed. At one time people use to do the same behind the Durham Library for those participating in the Plant Sale for the library. Nursery pots can be plastics from 2-6. Reusing them until they are unserviceable is a better option than just tossing or recycling them.

#### Increased Recycling

Solutions for recycling is not a one size fits all. Urban areas have different challenges from rural areas. I speak for the rural areas that have drop off sites where the residents, I believe are willing to take ownership of their MSW which is mostly packaging of the products we buy. Scaling may not be possible when a rural solution is not transferrable to an urban setting.

For DMIAAB, getting a higher level of recycling is less important than getting more value out of the recyclables we do collect as long as the towns benefit from higher quality of recyclables. That is the hook the DMIAAB board needs, in order to sell the residents on the added effort of cleaning, as being worth getting a premium for their recyclables. Altruism will only get you so far. The contract with MIRA that DMIAAB is tied to, give no incentives for better quality recyclables. We could bypass Material Recovery Facilities (MRF) with the quality and granularity of what we can provide. I asked for over a year for a side deal with MIRA to provide the incentive for a better end-product recyclable in exchange for a cut of the margins (to offset our costs) that the premium product would bring, to no avail. Our problems are political rather than engineering or economic.

## Public Engagement Questions



### Request for Comment and Solutions

The Connecticut Coalition for Sustainable Materials Management (CCSMM, or Coalition) is an initiative of the Department of Energy & Environmental Protection (DEEP) and 74 municipalities in the State of Connecticut, intended to identify scalable solutions for reducing waste disposal. The Coalition is focusing its efforts on four areas—Unit-Based Pricing, Organics, Increasing Recycling, and Extended Producer Responsibility—which will each be explored in more detail during October and November 2020 in a dedicated working group.

The Coalition is eager to engage the public, interested stakeholders, affected communities, and members of the waste sector—including service providers, developers, and innovators—to solicit input, concepts, and considerations for sustainable materials management solutions in four focus areas, described in greater detail below. To initiate that engagement, the Coalition invites interested members of the public to provide responses to any and all of the questions listed below. Comments will be posted on the CCSMM website at <https://portal.ct.gov/DEEP-CCSMM>. Respondents are encouraged to submit comments by October 15, 2020, though late comments can be submitted and will be considered as time allows.

### Focus Areas

#### 1. Unit-Based Pricing (UBP)

- a. Models for unit-based pricing (container size, sale of bags)
- b. Measures to address common concerns about UBP
  - i. Addressing affordability, impacts on low-income residents
  - ii. Enforcement
  - iii. Voluntary vs. Mandatory programs

#### 2. Organics

- a. Organics reduction/collection/diversion mechanisms
  - i. Donation & reduction
  - ii. Food scrap collection
  - iii. Leaf and yard waste collection/backyard composting
- b. Development and siting of infrastructure
  - i. Anaerobic Digestion
  - ii. Composting facilities
  - iii. Municipal onsite composting operations

#### 3. Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR)

- a. Enhancement of existing EPR programs in CT
- b. Introduce legislation for new EPR programs covering:
  - i. Hard-to-manage materials (HHW, Propane tanks, tires, sharps)
  - ii. Packaging

#### 4. Increased Recycling

- a. Measures to improve the quantity of material collected through mixed-stream or other means
- b. Specific source-separated programs including
  - i. Textile collection

- ii. Glass
- c. Measures to improve the quality of recycled materials
  - i. Review collection methods
  - ii. Should some items be banned?
  - iii. Disruption fees?
  - iv. Other
- d. Education and Outreach programs
- e. Measures to support new end-market development to attract manufacturers that use recycled-content in their product manufacturing, including recycled content standards for glass, plastic film, fiber, polypropylene (including minimum recycled content requirements)
- f. Encourage/Incentivize the development and siting of processing plants/end markets

### Questions for Response

1. Are there any model programs, best practices, or innovative concepts that the Coalition should consider, that could provide a scalable solution in any of the Focus Areas, listed above? The Coalition is interested in hearing about approaches that are conceptual, implemented on a pilot basis, or implemented at scale, whether here in Connecticut or in other jurisdictions in the United States or other countries.
2. For any solution identified in Question 1, what are the barriers that need to be addressed in order to advance any of these solutions at scale in Connecticut?
  - a. Are there different implementation considerations for full or partial “subscription” towns versus towns that provide for curbside collection of trash & recyclables?
  - b. Is it necessary or beneficial for the solution to be implemented on a statewide, multi-town, or other regional basis, or can it be implemented successfully town-by-town?
3. For any solution identified in Question 1, please describe the types of implications or benefits that the solution provides with respect to:
  - a. Sustainability- environmental benefits,
  - b. Reducing costs
4. Would you be interested or willing to present to the Coalition or a Coalition working group on solutions you've highlighted, or is there another speaker or organization that would be helpful for the Coalition to hear from on this topic?
5. DEEP can play an important role in advancing sustainable materials management solutions, including: issuing RFPs for long-term energy contracts to support anaerobic digestion facilities; providing grants for collection trucks powered by compressed natural gas (CNG) or electricity through the Volkswagen settlement; employing different approaches to permitting innovative technologies; and streamlining permitting processes. Are there things that DEEP should do differently in its approach to any of the above roles/functions, that would better support sustainable materials management in Connecticut?
6. Are there any solutions that you would like the Coalition to know about that do not fit within the Focus Areas above?
7. Are there any aspects of the Focus Areas, listed above, that the Coalition should *not* consider (and if so, why)?