

**Solid Waste Policy Advisory Committee Meeting Summary
April 21, 2006**

Participants		
Cara Clore	Michigan Recycling Coalition and Clinton County	clorec@clinton-county.org
Michael Csapo	Resource Recovery and Recycling Authority of Southwest Oakland County (RRRASOC)	RRRASOC@aol.com
Steve Essling	Michigan Waste Industry Association (MWIA)- Waste Management	sessling@wm.com
Jim Frey	Resource Recovery Systems (RRS)	frey@recycle.com
Dan Batts	MWIA	djbatohlf@aol.com
Tom Frazier	Michigan Townships Association	tom@michigantownships.org
Susan Johnson	Butzel Long	johnsons@butzel.com
Paul Zuger	Michigan United Conservation Clubs (MUCC)	pzugger@pscinc.com
Mike Johnston	Michigan Manufacturing Association (MMA)	johnston@mma-net.org
Barry Cargill	Small Business Association of Michigan (SBAM)	bsc@sbam.org
Clinton Boyd	Sustainable Research Group	cboyd@sustainableresearchgroup.com
Dennis Kmiecik	Kent County DPW	dennis.kmiecik@kentcounty.org
Doug Roberts	Michigan Chamber of Commerce	droberts@michamber.com

DEQ Staff		
Lucy Doroshko	DEQ-ESSD	doroshkl@michigan.gov
George Bruchmann	DEQ-WHMD	bruchmag@michigan.gov
Steve Sliver	DEQ-WHMD	slivers@michigan.gov
Rhonda Oyer Zimmerman	DEQ-WHMD	oyerr@michigan.gov
Noelle Hartner	DEQ-WHMD	hartnern@michigan.gov
Liane Shekter Smith	DEQ-WHMD	shekterl@michigan.gov
Jim Sygo	DEQ- Executive Division	sygoj@michigan.gov

Handouts

- Agenda
- April 7, 2006 Meeting Summary
- Policy Statement Flow Charts A-G

Introductions and notes from previous meeting

- Notes from April 7, 2006 meeting approved for posting on web site.

Explanation of Where Policy Will Go from Here

- The next step of this process is to share a draft version of the Policy (likely via a Power Point presentation) with the Environmental Advisory Council at the May or June meeting.
- Input from the EAC will be shared with this committee and the Policy will then be packaged into a readable format with a glossary.
- SWPAC may need to reconvene later this summer to repackage and finalize.
- No guarantee on what the Policy will look like after EAC reviews it.
- Will have implementation discussion when we get back together and organize a standing committee which will meet about every 3 months.
- The Policy could be issued in 1 of 2 ways; it could be issued by the Governor as an Executive Directive, or be established by resolution through the legislature as the state Solid Waste Policy.

Committee Review of Tier 4 Policy Statements E-G

Policy Statement Flow Chart E

Michigan's solid waste planning process should:

(1st box-planning)

- Do not reference work group in item (c)
- Include more than the 2 work group recommendations listed
- More general statements so it will apply in years down the line
- Convey planning stuff somehow- fundamental changes to improve planning process
- Include report and keep language more general in nature – pursuing work group recommendations
- Reference a state plan – Michigan should have higher goals/objectives to ensure consistency
- State Solid Waste Plan = Policy + all county and regional Plans
- Anything at state level would have to be extremely general – is addressed in minimum criteria.
- Define Policy goal/objective
- Mission statement explains it
- Should not include near-term items in the Policy
- Have Plans consistent with minimum criteria/standards/guidelines
- Diversion should be changed to utilization throughout
- Items (a) and (d) are redundant since you have to have reference point for appropriate – combine to “Ensuring appropriate disposal and utilization capacity and establish minimum criteria for that capacity”.

- Item (e) goes into detail in 2nd box over – planning comes from local level up to state. “Role of state to facilitate solutions to conflicting roles” should be added in 2nd box under state to resolve conflicts.
- Important to keep in mind that Tier 3 statements may be absorbed in Tier 4 in the Policy document since Tier 4 includes Tier 3 statements with more detail.
- Include a Planning discussion page in the final document that stands on its own for emphasis.
- Elevate items in left box throughout the document and specifically in Flow Chart A.
- Reference solid waste planning process in all boxes throughout the Policy.
- Item (a) fits under Local roles in 2nd box
- Items (b) and (d) fit under State roles in 2nd box

To ensure the roles of individual units of government are clearly defined, Michigan should
(2nd box-roles)

- Link between box 2 and box 3 (funding) to address responsibility
- Explain what we mean by tools and be consistent with this definition throughout.
- Add item (c) roles with respect to planning

To ensure that various units of government are equitably able to financially fulfill their responsibilities, Michigan should
(3rd box-funding)

- Keep item (b) as is, and then add another letter to develop and encourage effective local funding mechanisms.
- Address equitable in narrative section regarding sectors (industrial, commercial, residential)
- Add definition of equitable to glossary

Policy Statement Flow Chart F

- Change “preferred preferences” to “preferred solid waste management preferences”.

In order to ensure solid waste policies and laws adequately guide proper choices, Michigan should minimize unintended consequences by

- Include examples (i-iv) in narrative portion of Policy and distribute throughout Policy (Flow Chart A and others).
- Add “and administration of” after “revisions to” in item (a).
- Add “utility and commercial” to item (i) – beneficial reuse of utility, commercial, and industrial by-products.
- Elevate this statement to recognize waste as a resource – move to 2nd box in Tier 4, Flow Chart A.

- Add “waste utilization” to item (ii) after “disposal capacity”.
- Add “construction and demolition wastes and organic” after HHW in item (iii).
- Revise item (ii) altogether – not clear
- Beneficial reuse is addressed by term ‘waste utilization’ and 2nd tier but not with specific terminology.
- Intent of F needs to be stronger to assess unintended consequences of our choices when making solid waste management choices – ensure Policy abides by mission statement/philosophy.
- Keep in mind that no one policy statement stands alone- each has a common thread. This is just a framework to follow.
- Only tool that addresses this is in Flow Chart D, item (a) but this is not strong enough – assess consequences not just facilitate access to them.
- Must be consistent with preferred management practices but we need a mechanism to address it.

Policy Statement Flow Chart G

- There is analysis and collection of data, etc. (3rd step)
- Examine costs/benefits, risk, performance
- All included in Tier 1 and 2
- Be more robust in talking about evaluation – thread is there
- More detail about how we’ve addressed fostering sustainability (triple bottom line)
- Enhance item (b) or add new one to bring back to triple bottom line
- Way to get data that group can use to analyze decisions
- Comprehensive recycling system not mentioned – assumed in minimum criteria statement
- May not be direct enough in minimum criteria/standards category
- In the narrative, address Bottle Deposit Law as impediment to recycling – needs to be mentioned in the narrative that the group said that.
- Add “Employ analysis and evaluation techniques to benchmark achievement of sustainability standards” as item (ii) under (a)(i) and renumber accordingly.
- Requiring stakeholder work group to assess based on sustainability belongs in both Policy Flow Chart F and G.
- Add second sentence under item (a) in G, “This system should utilize necessary and available data and information on ecological, economic, and quality of life consistent with this policy (i and ii under Flow Chart A).

Utilization vs. Diversion Discussion

- Utilization is a subset of diversion

- Utilize is higher in management scale – dropped divert and lost our thrust
- Talk about utilization throughout document
- Divert is change from natural path – utilization is a better term
- Cannot utilize 100% but same applies to diversion – some will still have to be disposed.
- Utilize resources (not divert resources)
- Resource utilization vs. resource diversion
- Utilizing resources
- Diversion is a consistent term nationwide – will we end up with different numbers not related to other data?
- How is utilization and diversion translated?
- Diversion is comfortable
- Utilization should go in glossary and state that is also known as diversion.
- Interchangeable term, but its emphasis is different – changes mindset of utilizing waste as a resource.
- Define utilization as reuse and recycling (AKA diversion) but emphasize why we're using it to emphasize waste as a resource (paradigm shift).

Other Comments

- Regarding Flow Chart D, deposit system may not give us consensus.
- Retailers are burdened with collection deposit on products
- Recyclers being forced to take material they are not ready to handle.
- Need to look at issue in light of entire policy (overarching policy).
- The policy states it will consider deposit system expansion
- If committee has different wording or language they would prefer to see, and are more comfortable with, please send to DEQ staff via e-mail.
- Would like to have a final product with most possible agreement.

Next Steps

- DEQ will work on word-smithing and language issues discussed today.
- Committee decided to have one more meeting before draft Policy goes up to EAC.
- Draft will be sent out to committee prior to May 5, 2006 meeting.
- Once DEQ sends out changes, the Committee will decide if there is still a need to meet on May 5, 2006, or whether comments can be incorporated via e-mail.