

NOTES OF WORKING GROUP MEETING 8, SEPTEMBER 3, 2003
Revised (underlining)

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by Mike McGonagle, co-chair.

Members present: Terri Bisson; Geoff DiCenso; Tom Getz; Terrence Gray; Leo Hellested; Dante Ionata; Sarah Kite; Bob Lamoureux; Jamie Magnani; Mike McGonagle; John O'Brien; Chris Ratcliffe; Timothy Reagan; Jean Tracey-McAreavey; Shim Silverstein; John Trevor; Harold Ward.

Observers; James N. Allam; Nick Bayard; Richard Brussard; Claude Cote; Atiyah Curmally; Morgan McQuester; Mike Mesolella; Sherry Mulhearn.

There were no comments concerning the August 6th Working Group Meeting Notes or any of the previously submitted redrafted chapters.

Mr. Trevor made a presentation of RIRRC'S recycling education and outreach program using slides, a paper set of which is attached as part of these Notes.

Mr. Trevor presented in detail the report of the Market Development Subcommittee using slides, a set of which is attached as part of these Notes along with the notes accompanying a number of the slides which Mr. Trevor used in his presentation. A set of Chelsea Center slides, which was used as a source for some of the data in the market development presentation, is also attached as part of these Notes.

Mr. Silverstein said the American Forest and Paper Association is concerned that, by 2005, because of a fall off in the rate of extracting paper from the waste stream, there will not be enough recycled paper coming to market to supply all the mills currently processing recycled paper. As a result, AF&PA has developed a campaign to stimulate increased paper recycling.

Ms. Bisson, who presented part of the Market Development report, reported on the agreement of newspaper publishers in 10 northeastern states to utilize newsprint with a minimum annual recycled content of 27%. This agreement was necessary because an insufficient supply of recycled content newsprint made it impossible for newspapers to comply with the statutory mandates of the northeastern states to use newsprint with 40% recycled content. In order to make Rhode Island state law consistent with this agreement, DEM will introduce legislation in the next session of the General Assembly amending the statute.

Mr. Trevor reported that the Market Development Subcommittee reviewed the market development work that the consulting firm of R.W. Beck did for the State of Pennsylvania. The subcommittee concluded that the Pennsylvania project could serve as a model for Rhode Island should the State decide to utilize the services of a market development consultant.

Mr. Trevor reported in detail concerning market development initiatives undertaken by the State of Rhode Island recently.

Members of the Working Group suggested that crumb rubber made from waste tires be used in batching road-building asphalt. Mr. Ionata reported that RIRRC had in the past offered funding to RIDOT to help develop a rubber asphalt program in Rhode Island but that RIDOT flatly refused to consider the use of crumb rubber to make road-building asphalt. Ms. Mulhearn said RIRRC had recently renewed its proposal to RIDOT that waste tire crumb rubber be used to batch road-building asphalt but was again turned down by RIDOT. Mr. Gray reported that DEM is aware of a waste tire processing facility being proposed to be located in Rhode Island. Mr. O'Brien reported that the URI Transportation Center, in collaboration with RIDOT, is working on research concerning the utilization of waste tires for road building. Mr. Ionata said waste tire processing deserves consideration because closure of the economically marginal Sterling, Conn. tire incinerator, which burns 10 million tires annually, would result in a serious tire disposal crisis.

Ms. Bisson said the Market Development Subcommittee' recommendations do not differ from the types of recommendations made in the current Plan. She suggested that RIRRC and DEM attempt to interest the Economic Development Corporation in the kind of market development work that was initiated by the DEM more than 10 years ago.

Mr. O'Brien suggested that all of the solid waste management needs that have been identified by the Working Group and its subcommittees should be earmarked and the resources necessary to implement each recommendation should be identified.

Mr. Ward said adequate funding is essential to implement a proper comprehensive and integrated solid waste management program and that there would be sufficient funding for such a program if the RIRRC'S funds were not taken by the General Assembly every year. Ms. Mulhearn described the difficulties encountered by the RIRRC when it has sought to persuade key decision-makers to not transfer RIRRC funds to the State's General Fund.

Mr. Allam suggested that the need for higher municipal tip fees be addressed in the Plan. Mr. Allam also noted that successful PAYT programs would result in a reduction of the monies needed to implement state-of-the-art solid waste management programming. Ms. Mulhearn said the Corporation has supported PAYT which would have to be implemented at the municipality level and could not be imposed by the Corporation. She said the largest barrier to implementation of PAYT is the very low municipal tip fee, which has remained at \$32/ton for about ten years. Ms. Mulhearn said municipalities would be more amenable to implementing PAYT if the Municipal Tonnage Cap were lower and the municipal tip fee were higher. Ms. Mulhearn noted that according to the existing statutory formula the municipal tip fee would exceed the statutorily mandated \$32.00 tip fee in this fiscal year. According to this statutory formula, the municipal tipping fee would increase by 7.5% annually. However, the General Assembly annually adopts an article to the State Budget which overrides the statutory formula and continues the \$32/ton municipal tip fee for another year. . Mulhearn discussed the possibility that the Central Landfill could become a facility dedicated to the disposal of solid waste from municipalities only. Mr. Gray suggested that the municipal cap be lowered to strengthen the economic incentive to recycle. After a long discussion of the municipal cap, municipal tipping and related issues, there was general agreement that the municipal cap should be lowered to provide an economic disincentive to increase disposal vs recycling.