

Draft Minutes – Meeting of the Solid Waste Data Management Subcommittee – September 25, 2007

Attendees: Judy Belaval-DEP; Debbie Denfield-Fuss & O'Neill; Dave Dunleavy-Transfer Systems Inc; Susan Hemenway – BRRFOC/TROC; David Westcott-DEP

A proposed amended reporting form for the Municipal Annual Recycling Report was presented and discussed by committee members. Various changes were recommended and a draft of the form incorporating those changes will be available for review within the next few weeks (please contact Judy Belaval–judy.belaval@po.state.ct.us .

Basically the Annual Municipal Recycling Report will no longer require the reporting of tonnages of recyclables sent to facilities which already report that information to DEP – and instead asks only the destinations (not the amounts) of recyclables collected within the borders of the city or town. However, if the recyclables are delivered directly to a non-reporting entity (i.e. municipal composting site, out of state facility, end user, etc), then tonnages must be reported. The rest of the report focuses on more qualitative information regarding municipal efforts with regard to recycling promotion, enforcement etc. See the minutes of the June 26, 2007 subcommittee meeting for more details.

Another issue discussed revolved around inaccurate reporting by some solid waste facilities regarding the origin of MSW and MSW recyclables received at their facilities. In mid-August 2007 DEP sent a survey to the larger CT solid waste and recycling facilities asking how they collected that information (i.e. origin of waste received) and how they reported it to DEP. Most (not all) of the facilities returning the survey indicated they were reporting MSW and recyclables received accurately by town of origin or by the solid waste facility of origin (if the MSW or recyclables were sent to their facility from another regional solid waste facility), which is how they should be reporting. DEP is planning to send out a survey to CT haulers as well to confirm that. However, a preliminary discussion with one hauler revealed otherwise, i.e. many facilities are not giving haulers the opportunity to identify, for each load delivered, the town of origin or to identify multi-towns when delivering split loads. This is disconcerting – and unless this is corrected – changes to reporting requirements cannot go forward. Under the proposed amended reporting system individual town recycling rates will be based mainly on the facility reports instead of the Annual Municipal Recycling Reports. Therefore, the town of origin must be accurately reported by the facilities.

There was also a brief discussion regarding the increasing amounts of contaminants and residue in recyclables delivered to recycling processing facilities. One subcommittee member reported that the amount of contaminants in recyclables received at their facilities had doubled within the past year. Whether generated at the recycling processing facility or at the manufacturer using the recycled material to make a new product, residue cannot be counted in the recycling rate and needs to be subtracted from tonnages collected for recycling in order to accurately portray true recycling rates. The question also came up about who should be responsible for paying for that increased residue which requires disposal i.e. generators? haulers? municipalities? processing facilities? The subcommittee on Increasing Recycling & Source Reduction should consider devoting some discussion to improving the quality (not only the quantity) of material being collected for recycling.

Subcommittee members will be polled via e-mail regarding the October 23, 2007 subcommittee meeting - i.e whether the subcommittee should meet and if so, topics for discussion.