

Waste Reduction Task Force

Governments' Role-Work Group #3

Conference Call – November 28, 2007

Summary

Work Group Members Participating: Shawn Lindsey-Athens, Lee Norris–Chattanooga, Andy Ashford-Memphis, Mimi Keisling-Rutherford County, Bryon Fortner-Sevierville.

Facilitator: Bob Knight, TDEC

The conference call began at 9:00 AM/CDT-10:00 AM EDT and continued for one hour.

TOPICS

- 1. Has the Regional Municipal Solid Waste Planning Board's role and responsibility changed/evolved since the Solid Waste Management Act was enacted?**

SUGGESTION 1: While the Regional Municipal Solid Waste Planning Board's role and responsibility has technically not changed, it seems these boards have gone from developing the initial 10 year plans and 5 year updates, to simply complying with annual reporting requirements. There seems to be little ongoing waste reduction discussion/planning involved. Also, these boards do not meet on a frequent basis. The Work Group feels there needs to be base requirements for these boards to follow for planning purposes, such as meeting requirements including: frequency, minimum agendas, and pro-active waste reduction activities of the board.

- 2. To make Regional Municipal Solid Waste Planning Boards more effective, should there be changes made in their composition?**

The Work Group generally felt there needs to be a revision in the make up of the regional municipal solid waste planning boards to include more solid waste professionals, rather than a mixture of generalized professionals.

SUGGESTION 1: Divide regional municipal solid waste boards into two committees – Technical and Executive. The technical committee would consist of waste industry members or those with

operational knowledge and influence. The executive committee would be city managers, public works directors, mayors, elected officials or other deemed appropriate.

ALTERNATIVE SUGGESTION: Have only one committee for technical purposes in regional solid waste planning which would report to the entire board.

SUGGESTION 3: Rather than two committees restructure the regional municipal solid waste board to be more technically oriented.

3. Can non-government waste generators be brought into waste reduction (efforts or requirements)? Further discussion is needed on how non-government managed municipal solid waste can be brought into the regional waste reduction equation and government's involvement in this process.

The Work Group has so far been unable to determine a definitive way to include non-governmental generators in municipal and regional solid waste reduction. Further study is needed; however, the following is food for thought:

SUGGESTION: Perhaps include representation of non-government generators on regional municipal solid waste planning boards. Representatives could include decision makers from large, medium and small businesses.

SUGGESTION: Additionally, have non-government members represented on the aforementioned technical committee as a means of achieving a "buy-in" toward the municipal and regional waste reduction efforts and goal.

4. Currently the waste reduction goal of 25% is a regional goal. Should the law be changed to require individual municipalities within the region(s) to achieve the 25% goal?

SUGGESTION 1: The idea of Best Management Practices (BMPs) was discussed and the Work Group agreed that municipalities should be equally accountable to the State and Region. Regions (and municipalities, if included) not meeting basic BMP requirements, should be penalized (loss of grants, fines etc); however, those who meet BMP requirements but don't meet the 25% reduction would not be penalized and would be required to report why they failed and what changes would be necessary to achieve the goal.

SUGGESTION 2: It was suggested that municipalities of 4,000 or more be required to prepare solid waste plans and be responsible for reducing their solid waste, while those with a population of less than 4,000 would not be required to prepare a plan, but would fall under the responsibility of their county planning. (According to MTAS, there are approximately 294 municipalities with populations under 4,000 and 105 with populations over 4,000 in Tennessee)

5. Parking Lot Comments and Suggestions (not Government Role Work Group related)

SUGGESTION: Require paint companies to provide paint recycling.

COMMENT: The base line study of what makes up the Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) is critical in shaping future policies in recycling and diversion. This data extrapolated to the 10 largest counties would go a long way in reducing much of the MSW entering landfills.

SUGGESTION: Allow time at the Task Force meetings for the Work Groups to meet. Perhaps at the end.

SUGGESTION: In order to better utilize Task Force meeting time, stay focused on the subject of reducing solid waste and not venture into water and ground water. Those topics should be addressed in another forum.

SUGGESTION: Large multi county regions seem to be too big and the current makeup of regional planning board seems to be too limited. Therefore, regions should be single county and if necessary, rural regions should no larger than three counties.