

TO: JENNIFER SCHENK, HC3
FROM: JURI FREEMAN, MEGHAN WEIBE, AVERY MUNSON, RRS
DATE: JUNE 28, 2017
RE: MINUTES FROM JUNE 28 ZERO WASTE TASK FORCE MEETING

MINUTES: Summit County Zero Waste Task Force
DATE: June 28, 2017
TIME: 3pm – 5pm
LOCATION: Frisco Community Center

Attendee	Organization
Aaron Byrne	Summit County
Abbey Browne	Woodwinds Property Management
Avery Munson	RRS
Gary Wilkinson	Town of Frisco
Dave Askeland	Colorado Mountain College
David Reese	Guest of Thomas Davidson
Graham Goodman	Vails Resorts (Keystone)
Jen Barchers	Town of Dillon
Jen Cawley	Storm Enterprises/Breckenridge Restaurant Association
Jen Schenk	HC3
Jessie Burley	HC3
Joanne Nadalin	Town of Silverthorne
Juri Freeman	RRS
Kat Slaughter	Breckenridge Grand Vacations
Larry Romine	Timberline Disposal
Lina Lesmes	Town of Silverthorne
Meghan Wiebe	RRS
Mike Johnston	Town of Breckenridge
Mike Nathan	A-Basin
Nicole Fazande	Colorado Mountain College
Randy Ready	Town of Frisco
Ray Weller	Vail Resorts
Scott Hutchings (Hutch)	Waste Management
Thad Noll	Summit County
Thomas Davidson	Summit County
Tom Gosiorowski	Summit County

Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 3:07 pm

3:07-3:25- Introductions

An introduction of Juri Freeman (Consultant – RRS), and all stakeholders.

3:25-3:30- Goals and Roles

Schenk outlined the goal of the project as follows: To provide long-term recycling funding solution to Board of County Commissioners by end of 2017. Schenk discussed that the project is being managed by High Country Conservation staff with financial support from the County.

3:30-3:35- Meeting Rules

Freeman provided an overview of the stakeholder meeting process, the role of RRS as a chair and the stakeholders as members. (see attached slide presentation for more details). All correspondence for the task force should go through Jen Schenk (HC3) (jenschenk@highcountryconservation.org).

3:35-4:00- Summit Background

Schenk reviewed the Summit County recycling system background. Jen Cawley raised a question regarding the Summit mill levy: "Does anyone know how much the mill levy was passed for?" Thomas Davidson responded with the following: "Total funds passed in 2004, and were around \$1.8 million for 3 different projects. We're allowed to have an ongoing mill rate for office buildings, reservoirs quarry and recycling". Davidson then went on to discuss the Safety-First Fund 1 (A), in which he indicated that "Safety-first fund was primarily created to provide free and safe disposal of e-waste, prescription drugs and HHW that was previously being dangerously disposed of. About \$300,000 in funding was raised through property taxes [Jessie Burley believed the voter approved tax passed with a 66 - 67% approval] with an absolute sunset for an 8-year period. It also worked well because of endorsements and no opposition."

Thad Noll added that 90,000 lbs of HHW was collected at the first safety-first fund event. Aaron Byrne indicated the influx in e-waste was due to the state law passed in July 2012 that banned disposal of e-waste in Colorado landfills. Schenk added "Prior to this initiative, there was an e-waste initiative at the SCRAP but volume levels were low. Giant increase in e-waste and HHW disposal because the Safety-First Fund allows disposal to be free.", at which Joanne Nadalin responded "The disposal is not free, rather it is included in property tax."

4:00-4:10 Project Scope

Freeman reviewed the scope of the project. Nadalin inquired whether RRS will view what is generated from the county's businesses, i.e. tourism, versus what the residents generate. Freeman indicated that RRS is working on a flexible model to incorporate both tourism and permanent residents waste generation. Browne asked to what level of detail the project would assess the operational efficiency of the SCRAP. Freeman reported that the project will review the current budgets and economics of the SCRAP but the project is not an operational efficiency study. Noll reported that part of the County's budget process is to constantly assess and improve cost efficiency at the SCRAP. During the economic evaluation, if RRS identifies obvious areas for cost savings or increased efficiencies they will be identified.

4:10-4:35- Baseline Economics of SCRAP

Freeman discussed the tonnage and diversion history of Summit County (see attached slide presentation for more details). Noll clarified questions regarding tonnage spikes in 2008 and 2014 with the following response: "2008 is not an outlier, rather we were decreasing [in waste tonnage] leading up to 2008, then construction stopped in 2009 due to the recession, leading to a large drop from 2008 to 2009. The 2014 spike probably stemmed from a specific job that carried a large weight in C&D or cover." Hutchings (Hutch) of Waste Management and

Davidson inquired about the county's composting success and sustainability, which Byrne replied "Yes, it [the composting] is sustainable. We have so much organics going in our landfills that we can pull the organic out of the landfill, put it in a developed compost model, market it and allow it to sustain itself economically."

Tom Gosiorowski emphasized that recycling and the SCRAP is "not a profit-making area for the county."

4:35-4:50- Introduction to Funding

Freeman presented and discussed common funding sources for publicly managed solid waste systems (see attached slide presentation for more details).

4:50-4:55- Discussion and Next Steps

Freeman outlined the next steps in the project. The remainder of the meeting was left open for discussion, suggestions and questions. Noll requested that "We add the idea and investigation of a disposal district to the 'next steps'". Burley requested more information on the potential of EPR at a local level for the next meeting. Freeman and Schenk requested the stakeholders answer the following questions in writing before exiting the meeting:

Question 1: What does success look like for you?	Question 2: What is the one wish that you would make to help us solve the funding challenges in the County?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Happiness, community, and collaboration. • A funding model developed that encourages recycling while providing sustainable revenue for the solid waste dream and works even if trash disappears. • A solution that everyone feels good about. • A viable solution with broad support • A recommendation to commissioners that is gained through consensus and that has a strong message and buy in moving forward. • Cooperation to create a self-sustaining system, which in the end will be a pioneering system for future policy on the matter • Common vision; an agreed upon road map. • The county and businesses are working together to achieve goals that work for the success of both... • Continued (and increased) level of waste diversion. • A fair way to share cost to the users. • Consensus and economic sustainability. • Get out of the recycling business and let the private enterprise do it. • Recycling needs to fund itself. • Making progress towards a goal. • Increased diversion rates. • Zero waste; funded recycling. • Creating a reasonable and generally agreeable plan to the county (both towns and citizens) • Sustainability and zero waste. • Community buy-in for funding. • Achieving zero waste through a best practices approach that sustains the SCRAP and is based on efficiency and equitable user fees. • Economic viability and equity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One wish is that consumers pay their share. • That we can get everyone excited about the solution! • That everyone would be open-minded. • An educated public. • Tax products. • That tax payers would give more to help the community. • Funding stream created that is used to incentivize increased recycling and decreased trash. • More success in recycling diversion • People would recycle even if trash was cheaper! • To find a way to ensure our visitors share in the cost. • Community effort to fund SCRAP. • Less government intervention. • Recycling needs to fund itself. • People would just pay for the cost of recycling because it is the right thing to do, rather than only doing it because it is free. • Start with an outside audit of operational efficiency to see where changes could be made immediately. • Haulers collaborating with community. • To be a leading, cutting-edge community for a positive waste solution. • Consensus. • To find a long term acceptable funding. • Bundled pricing- pay as you throw and include recycling fee in every trash bill. • The funding solution pushes us to the greater issue of less waste and more re-use of raw materials.



<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Increased diversion rates in the county, residences, businesses, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provide the resources and solutions for success.
---	--

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm