Summit County Zero Waste Task Force

DATE: September 6, 2017
TIME: 3pm – 5pm
LOCATION: Frisco Community Center

Attendee	Organization
Aaron Byrne	Summit County
Abbey Browne	Woodwinds Property Management
Avery Munson	RRS
Derrick Fowler	Town of Silverthorne
Gary Wilkinson	Town of Frisco
Graham Goodman	Vails Resorts (Keystone)
Jen Barchers	Town of Dillon
Jen Cawley	Storm Enterprises/Breckenridge Restaurant Association
Jen Schenk	HC3
Jenny Hammock	HC3
Jessie Burley	HC3
Juri Freeman	RRS
Kat Slaughter	Breckenridge Grand Vacations
Lina Lesmes	Town of Silverthorne
Meghan Wiebe	RRS
Mark Johnston	Town of Breckenridge
Mike Dudick	Town of Breckenridge/Breckenridge Grand Vacations
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 3:05 pm

3:05-3:10- Introductions
An introduction of attendees.

3:10-3:15- Project Review
Schenk reviewed the previous stakeholder meeting (6/28) and provided an overview of the Zero Waste Task Force goal. Schenk discussed that the project is being managed by High Country Conservation staff with financial support from the County and input from County stakeholders.

3:15-3:30- SCRAP Economic Model
Freeman explained the logistics of the SCRAP Economic Model, including a review of the factors that affect the model outcomes including the SCRAP budget. Dudick raised a question regarding the budget: “How big is the

recycling deficit?" Freeman answered "the baseline model in the budget is about $300,000 annually and the actual deficit varies by year", Schenk clarified that this amount includes the current the Safety 1st and Legacy Fund mill levy funding. Schenk and Noll noted that the mill levies may not be always be present and that determining how to fund recycling once achieving zero waste is the challenge Summit County will be faced with (as the County reaches zero waste, tip fee revenue decreases). Dudick inquired into what the net costs for recycling (without the mill levies) will be in the County in the long-term. Freeman noted that the cost is unknown at present, but RRS will work to share estimates of the long term costs at the next stakeholder meeting.

Freeman briefly reviewed a range of financial scenarios Summit County may be faced with depending on the availability of property tax funding, various levels of waste diversion, and different post closure funding. Based on the range of scenarios, it's possible that the County may not face a deficit in the 15 year time horizon, however Freeman presented another scenario that showed an average of approximately $1M / year deficit over 15 years. All of the reviewed scenarios assumed the Designated Disposal Site ordinance is present. Freeman also explained the trends of the outputs for each scenario. At the next stakeholder meeting in October, RRS will provide a narrowed estimate of annual recycling funding based on County/HC3 input utilized the developed economic model.

3:30-3:45- Funding Elsewhere
Freeman reviewed alternative recycling funding types and examples used throughout the US.

3:45-4:00- Colorado Statutes
Freeman reviewed the RRS understanding of the county, municipal, and special district authorities to raise revenue in Summit County. Freeman distinguished between County, Municipality, and Special District enforcement limitations. Dudick asked Noll who the licensing authority was for the municipality, which Gosiorowski and Noll clarified that the County essentially preforms the clerical work for the municipality and municipalities hold the authority for issuing hauler licenses. Davidson noted that Summit County has the ability to create a Special District, but Freeman noted that all impacted cities and counties must approve the proposed service plan in order to form the district. Noll noted that the County commissioners can form the District, but cannot generate the funding for it without a vote by the people. Davidson noted that potentially putting an impact fee on waste disposal could be an interesting study. Noll added that the County does charge a small hauler licensing fee but that it is illegal to generate revenue beyond the funds needed to administer the licensing program. Davidson noted that tourism fee cannot be implemented due to legalities and County limitations. Noll stated that a to raise $1M annually through a mill levy, a $500,000 home would be charged approximately $20/year on their property taxes. Schenk requested that everyone in the room consider the relationship between fees and diversion rates, and asked the group to brainstorm ways to incentivize landfill diversion.

4:00-4:45-Breakout Groups
All attendees were asked to go to 3 different breakout groups to discuss funding options. The groups and the summary of what was discussed follows:

Property Tax Group- led by Jen Schenk
The group found property taxes to be relatively equitable among people who own property and a good potential source for funding. However, tourists and guests generate a substantial amount of recycling and waste but would not be paying into the system. One solution for this problem was to combine a property tax with another funding source such as a trash service fee. One concern of the groups was whether recycling costs would grow at the same rate as amount from a property tax.

Sales and Use Tax- led by Jessie Burley

The sales and use tax group discussed how a sales tax connected to consuming and disposing aspects of a product could raise funds, change consumer behaviors, and is linked to use and disposal. The group reported that they felt a sales tax would be equitable because visitors would also pay the tax but also noted sales tax would not incentivize diversion as much as other potential options. The group wanted to review the items that would be taxed and not have the tax on necessities (i.e. a sin tax). The group was concerned about how the system would be affected by a downturn in sales (i.e. a no snow winter) and also proposed a two-source funding system (i.e. sales tax and property tax). It was reported that Sales and Use taxes may have potential as a funding source in the future.

Tip Fees / **Surcharges Group**- led by Aaron Byrne
The tip fee group discussed the idea of having a surcharge or added fee on recycling as well as one on composting or disposed solid waste to raise funds. The group reported that charging for recycling creates a disincentive recycling. The group reported that there is the potential for a fee or surcharge to be collected at the landfill to support recycling. The group also talked about combining multiple funding sources to support recycling. One idea discussed was a property tax to pay for the recycling drop-offs and HHW / e-Waste programs and a surcharge to cover the rest of the recycling costs.

Innovation Group- led by Avery Munson and Meghan Wiebe
The group discussed potential solutions to distributing the costs of the recycling system between permanent residents and visitors. One solution was encouraging donations from tourists at resorts. The example considered Copper Mountain's encouragement of $1 per night donation for the US Forest Service for all guests. An alternative was to have a zero-waste fee built-in to room charges by resorts. The groups considered the development of an import tax on goods entering the county but found that the implementation required would be very complex. Another idea was to put a licensing fee on vacation rentals and second homes, which was also found to be difficult to implement and has limited equity.

Other Fees- led by Meghan Wiebe and Avery Munson
The group discussed impact fees, which are usually fees on new construction, and potential for a deconstruction fee since Summit County is mostly built out. The group found this funding mechanism to be limited, short term, hard to regulate, and potentially not equitable. Generator fees were discussed, as were their potential barriers, which include difficulty of regulation between cities and the limited use and implantation at the county level. Occupation and head tax were discussed, but the group found many challenges within them including limited use at the county level, potential inconsistencies between cities leading to inequity, and the high number of transients or seasonal workers.

4:45-5:05 Report Out and Conclude Meeting
The discussions from the breakout groups were summarized. The meeting adjourned at 5:05 pm.