



**HOUSATONIC RESOURCES RECOVERY AUTHORITY**  
**REGULAR MEETING**

**Monday, September 24, 2018, 10:30 a.m.**  
**Room 133, Brookfield Town Hall**  
**100 Pocono Rd, Brookfield, CT 06804**

**These are the NOTES from the meeting of September 24<sup>th</sup>. There was not a quorum at this meeting so therefore no official meeting minutes. They were reviewed at the December 7<sup>th</sup> 2018 meeting by the Full Authority. No changes were requested.**

**Members or Alternates Present**

Kent, Bruce Adams	1
New Fairfield, Kim Hanson	6
New Milford, Pete Bass	12
Newtown, Herbert Rosenthal	12
Redding, Jeff Hansen	4
Ridgefield, Rudolph Marconi	11
Sherman, Don Lowe	2
	<hr/>
	48

**Others Present:**

Bill Aduleit, Oak Ridge Waste and Recycling  
Mark Bobman, Bristol RRA  
John Decker, Oak Ridge Waste and Recycling  
Jay Lewin  
Patti Oberg, All American Waste  
Julia Perkins, Danbury News Times  
Taylor Prature, Bristol RRA  
Pam Roach  
Ed Spinella, All American Waste  
Ken Vallera, All American Waste

**Members Absent:**

Bethel  
Bridgewater  
Brookfield  
Danbury

**Call to Order:**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman R. Marconi at 10:36 a.m. without a quorum. Representatives attending comprised 87 votes present from 9 municipalities. R. Marconi led everyone in the pledge of allegiance.

**Public Comment:**

R. Hanna, Manager of New Milford Recycling Center posed questions relating to the region's participating in a 2-year pilot program to remove glass from mixed recycling: What is the benefit of the program? Who will it benefit? Why can't HRRRA consider a single pilot town so as to minimize any negative consequences should the effort fail? Why is the vendor identified as taking the glass free of charge from this program on the record in last month's Recycling Magazine as ceasing taking receipt of materials recovery facility glass? *(Executive Director, J. Heaton-Jones addressed these questions later in the meeting during Section 6.b. of the agenda)*

R. Hanna also commented the pilot program would increase expenses for the Town of New Milford by accommodating 17,000 additional households from Sherman and Brookfield bringing glass to their facility. R. Hanna stated the draft of a proposed communications piece to HRRR residents, the WIWO flyer, did not match what residents would find on the RecycleCT website and would likely cause confusion for residents.

**Chairman and Members' Comments:**

Chairman and no members made any comments.

**Director's Report:**

J. Heaton-Jones highlighted the following items from her written report:

- MSW tonnage year to date is running at **117%** compared to same time last year.
- Recycling tonnage is running at **135%** compared to the same time last year.
- E-waste tonnage is at **105%** compared to the same time last year.
- The July 28<sup>th</sup> HHW Event in Brookfield was well attended. HRRR processed 971 cars and the event cost a total of \$40,942. State Senator Miner and State Representative Harding attended the event and helped volunteers distribute free recycled paint donated by MXI Environmental Services.
- J. Heaton-Jones shared with the Authority that New Milford serviced 13 households from other HRRR towns at their HHW event on September 22<sup>nd</sup>. The standard practice for HRRR events is that HRRR absorbs the cost of the first 9 cars from non-participating towns and then charges the town for any vehicles over that number. The Director would like to have New Milford invoice HRRR for the 13 households and will include the cars in the September 29<sup>th</sup> invoice to those towns. The theory is that the municipalities would have had to pay for those households who attended the September 29<sup>th</sup> event regardless. R. Marconi acknowledged it was fair for HRRR to pay for the 13 cars attending New Milford's event and for HRRR to then invoice those municipalities with the invoice for the HRRR HHW Event scheduled for September 29<sup>th</sup>.
- J. Heaton-Jones informed the vendor contract with MXI is ending. Director will issue an RFP to engage a new contract.

**Administrative Approvals:**

a) **Minutes, June 25, 2018**

No comments were made, without a quorum, no vote was taken.

b) **Financial Statements:**

The Director reviewed the financials, without a quorum, no vote was taken.

**Old Business:**

a) **Recycling Markets Update:**

Per the Authority's request from the June 25th, 2018 meeting, J. Heaton-Jones shared information regarding the current recycling markets included in the agenda packet.

J. Decker, CEO of Oak Ridge Waste and Recycling, was asked by the Chairman to address the Authority on the current state of markets for materials from the mixed stream. J. Decker stated glass has little value as a saleable material if arriving as part of the mixed stream. Additionally, glass is a significant contaminant of other materials in the mixed stream negatively affecting the quality and marketability of those materials.

Additionally, J. Decker stated the high contaminated load of mixed recyclables cannot continue within the current pricing structure. Oak Ridge's intent is to collaborate with all stakeholders to clean up mixed stream. Contemplated changes in pricing include holding the \$55/ton for recyclables and instituting a penalty of \$20/ton for contaminated loads.

**b) Glass Pilot Program:**

**The following is the Director's presentation and overview of the glass pilot program.**

Nearly a year ago, as the market was showing no signs of letting up and Winters Bros. now Oak Ridge had requested in a short period of time to raise the tip fee from \$10 to \$25 to \$45 (*which we settled at \$37.50*) in October 2017, I asked what we can do to stop the bleeding. Since that time the tip fee has increased to \$55 a ton.

I was told by John Decker of Oak Ridge that pulling glass out of the mixed stream was a solution and a start to cleaning up the mixed recycling stream. He had already removed glass in West Virginia and it had proved to be successful.

At the same time the topic/issue of glass was also being discussed among my counterparts and peers in the industry.

It was first brought to the attention CT DEEP to find out if we could remove glass from the mixed stream under the current regulations of Statue 22a-220. There seemed to be mixed opinions. It was then brought to the attention of Sen. Miner and as a safety precaution to allow municipalities to move towards this direction Sen. Miner put together what we have today as PA18-181, the ability for municipalities to run a two-year pilot to remove glass from the mixed stream. (PA 18-181 is included in the agenda packet)

At the June 25<sup>th</sup>, 2018 HRRR meeting we discussed the glass issue and the Authority voted to move forward with a pilot program as a region and for the HRRR Staff to bring the details before the Authority before implementing.

My job is to present to you my discoveries since June regarding glass which will allow you to decide to move forward with a regional glass pilot program or not.

I represent the members of HRRR and your interest. I will leave it to you to give me the final direction you want the region to go in.

In order for the Authority to make an educated decision I will start with the history of cost. This may also answer R. Hanna's question on who benefits from this program.

The Hauler Tip Fee has ranged from \$10 to \$55 a ton in the past 5 years.

While the HRRR Members Tip Fee has stayed steady at \$10 a ton since 2012. This rate follows in the new 2019-2029 Regional Contract.

HRRR Recycling Revenue (Rebate) has fluctuated during this time from \$10 in 2012 to \$5, and to now \$7.50 a ton. This revenue stream is essential to our public education campaigns and outreach.

I should also note that All American Waste from 2012-17 donated \$5 a ton for material they took outside the region. Based on tonnage reports much of that material is now going through the HRRRA system.

The City of Waterbury's RFP for single stream recycling recently had bids as high as \$85 a ton.

Why is this important to know and care about the cost? Because someone must pay for it. It falls to your residents. No matter the cost of processing and tip fees, it ultimately falls on them to cover the cost of the system.

### **So why did we move to Single Stream in the first place?**

Convenience. Increase volume.

As noted in the article I provide in the packet, *"one of the most notable benefits of single stream recycling is the increased recycling rates and there is less space required to store the material and the costs for the hauling is reduced...The most notable criticism of single stream is the decrease in the quality of materials recovered.*

*Someone ultimately has to sort it, making the cost of recycling higher.*

*So, ultimately, the public convenience comes at a cost.*

*The battle is between quality and convenience. To this point in time, convenience has trumped quality..."*

I have also provided an overview of the China Sword. It's 7 pages long. Obviously, I don't expect everyone to read it or review it now. But the visual of the number of pages it takes to list the dates and details of the issue should speak volumes. It's important to understand the China Sword or at least have an overview because it allows you to appreciate the magnitude of the problem with the mixed recycling stream.

### **Why should we care?**

Our focus can't be to solve the global problem, but we can do our part to protect our local stream (our communities) and the impact that it does have on us immediately. The quality we contribute into the system has a ripple effect from the cost to processor, to the fees to the hauler, to the costs for residents as well as a financial impact to HRRRA and its member municipalities.

It's important for me to note that glass is not the only problem we have in the mixed recycling stream. I have included photographs in your packet to show what is coming out of our region. We have issues with **tangles** (hoses, wires, ropes, etc.) **small items** such as bottles caps, straws, plastic bags, and prescription bottles just to name a few, **hazardous material** like propane tanks and even cement blocks, **down to regular household garbage**.

We need to use this opportunity to clean up the system and bring more awareness to the "dirty" problem of single stream.

*"The primary factors causing contamination are:*

- **Simple noncompliance.** *Some folks are blatantly bad; they have no intention of recycling and just use their recycle cart as a second trash cart.*

- **The believers.** *Some citizens think virtually everything is recyclable.*
- **The hopefuls.** *For others, the thinking is “this should be recyclable” – and they put those materials in the cart.*
- **Route-specific issues.** *Contamination is seen in some pockets due to transient populations and language barriers hindering recycling education.”*

<https://resource-recycling.com/recycling/2018/09/02/contamination-in-focus-engaging-in-the-daily-battle/>

### **The review of actions since June**

Legislation (PA 18-181) was passed in June to allow Municipalities to remove glass from the single stream in a two-year pilot. The legislation is effective October 1<sup>st</sup>. It has been my goal that if there was a final approval by the Authority at this meeting we would be ready to launch the pilot October 1.

If and when the program does start, it means “beginning” the shift of separating the material by first having containers at all the transfer stations staged and launching a public education campaign. It doesn’t mean that it would happen overnight but that it would be the start date to the transition. The move to separate glass is going to take time, effort and energy from all of us. We need time to educate and implement the program which could mean we do it in phases.

However, it all hinges on the collaboration with CT DEEP. I started working with CT DEEP in August and requested that they work with me to meet the October 1 effective date. I assisted them on their draft application and requirements and submitted to them a rough draft of the logistics of the program in our region.

I had a phone meeting with CT DEEP to review the MTSGP requirements. It was also determined that it is not a problem for a municipality to have satellite locations if they wish under they’re MTSGP.

Although I have been working with CT DEEP since August they have been slow to meet the October 1 effective date.

As of Friday, I was told by CT DEEP that if HRRR wanted to begin collecting glass separately at our transfer stations that we could do that immediately as a soft launch but that we could not promote removing the glass from the mixed stream until they were ready with approving the application process.

In the meantime, HRRR Staff has been busy collecting feedback and working out the details.

HRRR Staff visited every transfer station/recycling center in the region to get a better sense on what each municipality could handle relative to container size and we had great conversations with each of your operators.

I met with the Regional Recycling Task Force and went over the concept of the pilot and addressed questions.

HRRR Staff hosted a meeting with your Transfer Station Operators and Public Works Directors to review the program and address their questions and concerns which were included in your agenda packet.

I met with the Haulers and Public Works Directors together to address their questions and concerns. Notes from that meeting are also included in your agenda packet.

All and all I would say the meetings and discussions were productive with both negative and positive criticism which helped contribute to the process. I hope you all had a chance to review the notes from those meetings.

**We are not the only ones talking about this issue.**

I have joined the North East Recycling Coalitions glass committee (an 11 state coalition) as well as their Material Marketing group looking at the China Sword and the impact to local governments.

The Connecticut Recyclers Coalition, whom I am a board member of, has formed a government working group to study the glass problem in Connecticut and I have joined their efforts.

MIRA's Director of Recycling & Enforcement Tom Gaffey is 100% behind our efforts.

I spoke with Willimantic Waste and although they are not removing glass they respect our effort. But they are skeptical and don't believe we will be successful.

USA Hauling/All American Waste, who operates a MRF, said they don't have a problem with glass and do not support our efforts. They have concerns on the impact to their hauling business in the region.

I spoke with the Director of Public Works in Wallingford and they are separating glass at their transfer station. South Windsor is considering removing glass at the curb.

I have a long list of towns and cities across the US who have begun pulling glass out of the mixed stream.

It's important to know what is being done today with glass collected in the mixed stream.

MRF glass is dirty and contaminated with small pieces of plastic, metal and garbage. There are systems that clean dirty MRF glass. But, almost all MRF glass is made into an aggregate (essentially it is ground up) and then used as alternate daily cover for landfills. It is not recycled into new products.

Some MRF's are railing the material and just disposing it into landfills as part of the waste stream.

A very small percentage of MRF glass (I was told 5%) is mixed into bottle bill glass and sold.

Source separated glass (what we are looking to do) is recycled into bottles, fiberglass, insulation and other glass material.

Another important fact to consider. If glass is contaminated with non-recyclable glass such as mirrors, dishes, ceramic, drinking glasses, light bulbs, the entire load of source separated glass is considered contaminated and it will not be as valuable or usable.

**The proposed logistics plan/ideas to implement program**

- Educate the public to separate their glass bottles, jars and containers from the mixed stream. In order to recycle it they will need to take it to a local drop-off or ask their hauler to provide the service for them.

- There is rough draft of educational material in your agenda packet. Note: One flyer is a version to the WIWO guide. Although there are no noted restrictions on the Recycle CT website for municipalities, the change has not been approved or endorsed by the Recycle CT Foundation. It is simply being used as an example of what could be used to educate the public. To address R. Hanna's concern regarding the confusing the public if they were to visit the Recycle CT website and compare the two pieces - the point is well taken. Perhaps HRRRA will not reference the WIWO campaign and Recycle CT in publications.
- Haulers who attended last week's meeting were very willing to insert our material in their invoices.
- Some Haulers at the Hauler's meeting were willing to offer the separation of glass as a service.
- Additional education will come in the form of flyers, card inserts, newsletters, newspaper articles, social media, etc.
- The containers to collect glass would be placed in all the municipalities (including Brookfield and Sherman) and they are being provided by Oak Ridge at no cost. To address R. Hanna's concern that he would have an additional 17,000 residents using his facility from Brookfield or Sherman, providing satellite collection containers in these two towns would additionally provide easy access and convenience to Brookfield and Sherman residents so they do not have to drive to New Milford. This would reduce the need to travel to use the NM recycling center preventing the increase in use. The HRRRA has experienced that unless the event or location of disposal is local, residence don't tend to travel for disposal. The number of participants at the Brookfield HHW event compared to the New Milford HHW event is a perfect example.
- We will need to submit a map of each recycling facility and the location of the container to CT DEEP. I was told this can be drawn in and does not require engineering plans.
- Facility attendants will need to work with the public (especially in the beginning) to educate them and direct them to put only acceptable glass items in the container. I have included an example of a sticker or poster that can be used at each location.
- The separation of glass and the effort it will take your attendants may or may not be difficult for each site depending on the layout of the facility and/or the manpower you have in a given day. Some, not all, of your attendants do have concerns about managing the glass.
- The transportation of the glass to the processor (during the pilot program) will be covered by Oak Ridge.
- Clean uncontaminated glass will be sent to a glass recycler of Oak Ridge's choice. Strategic Material in South Windsor has offered to take the clean glass at no cost during the pilot program. To address R. Hanna's comment *"Why is the vendor identified as taking the glass free of charge from this program on the record in last month's Recycling Magazine as ceasing to take MRF glass?"* We are not providing them MRF glass, we are providing them clean source separated glass that has value. There is a significant difference in quality and value between MRF glass and separated glass which is why we are trying to run this pilot.

- Haulers who wish to collect glass separate will take the material directly to Oak Ridge. The tip fee, if any, has not been determined. It is my hope that it will be a \$0 tip fee to incentivize haulers to participate. Understanding that there is a cost for Oak Ridge to handle the material this is to be negotiated.
- Oak Ridge will maintain for now a \$55 a ton tip fee. During the first 90 days they will monitor trucks and their loads giving haulers a chance to educate their customers on removing glass and other contaminants out of the mixed stream. They are calling this a buffer period. After that time Oak Ridge has requested to charge a contamination fee of \$20 a ton on top of the \$55. K. Hanson from New Fairfield is concerned that a \$20 fee is not high enough to incentivize participation.
- Photographs will be taken by Oak Ridge of the contaminated loads, and a form will be filled out that will require the signature of the driver which will accompany invoices to haulers.
- Oak Ridge has also asked that Haulers who bring in loads with large amounts of non-recyclables and garbage be sent back to the scale house to be weighed and disposed of as MSW.
- The goal over time (*time period to be negotiated*) is to clean up the stream and reduce the tip fee by \$10 or more depending on other market conditions. To further incentivize the haulers to bring in cleaner loads of mixed recycling.
- HRRRA will include on the list of registered haulers posted on the HRRRA website which company provide the collection of glass as a service as we do now for PAYT. This will help residents know who to call if they need the service provided.
- Oak Ridge is requested that they also charge municipalities the same contamination fee if loads of glass come in contaminated. They will have to cover their cost for alternative disposal if it does not go to Strategic Materials.

### **In Summary**

- We are asking our residents to change their behavior from what to recycle to how and where.
- We are asking haulers to support the program, educate their customers and change their operations.
- We are asking transfer station operators to adjust their system and how they operate their facilities to accommodate an additional container and attention to another stream.
- We risk residents not participating and ultimately throwing the glass into the garbage, thus shifting the recycling ton to the MSW ton.

### **What happens if we do nothing?**

We would continue to work with Oak Ridge as we have. Based on market conditions and the cost to process the contaminated mixed stream, the tip fee will be adjusted per the HRRRA contract.

In addition, Oak Ridge will need to charge haulers a contamination fee to move towards a cleaner stream.

Whether we move to take glass out or not, we do need to take some responsibility in cleaning up the mixed recycling stream by removing other contaminants such as tangles, hazardous waste, bulky items, garbage etc.



R. Marconi stated per CT Sec. 22a-220, municipalities may remove a material from the mixed stream while providing an alternate collection method. If the full authority votes to move forward, waiting on CT DEEP to approve an application should not inhibit the mission of this body.

**New Business:**

**a) CT DEEP Comprehensive Material Management Strategy Phase 2 Requirements:**

J. Heaton-Jones reminded the Authority their responsibility to comply with CGS Sec. 22a-220(f), CGS Sec. 22a-241b and RCSA 22a-241b each town shall develop a plan or program for residential outreach and enforcement of local ordinances and update ordinances. Language for updating local ordinances was previously written by HRRRA legal counsel and provided to each town to share with their own legal counsel. Towns should plan to have an updated ordinance approved by end of the calendar year. J. Heaton-Jones will resend a copy of the draft language.

A copy of the full CT DEEP presentation titled “Meeting State Recycling and Diversion Goals Thru Shared Responsibility” was provided.

**Adjournment:**

On a motion by H. Rosenthal, second D. Lowe, the meeting was adjourned at 11:53 a.m. **Vote:** All in favor of adjournment. (48 yes votes.)

Respectfully submitted,

Tiffany Carlson  
Administrative Assistant