

## Dec 7, 2023 | 📅 Policy Committee Meeting

Meeting notes are in yellow

Attendees: Policy Committee Members

Introductions:

Randy Moorman

Jenifer Freeman

Alicia Archibald

Ally Byzewski

Liz Chapman

**We hope you will join us tomorrow, 12/7 from 1:30pm-3:00pm to get caught up on all things RC policy.**

We have extended tomorrow's meeting to allow for discussion on the RREO/FRWD merger bill concept that would create the Colorado Circular Communities Enterprise fund. Please review the agenda and concepts that we would like to see included in the future bill and bring your questions and comments to the meeting so we can develop a position paper on this legislation.

### 1. Topic

**Choose your RC Sector:** With our new sector voting structure, we are asking that all members of Recycle Colorado who are involved in the policy committee and will be involved in voting, identify which sector they represent. You can let us know your sector by filling out **THIS FORM** before the policy committee meeting. This should only take you 30 seconds to quickly fill in your information and select a sector.

**Liz Chapman:**

Recaps the current sector rep process and program. We want to maintain the sector representation while creating less work/ more efficiencies.

Questions about this Process?

No questions

Fill out the Sector Form:

[https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSfaLq6LMQkHVBT7thobT\\_9AyOMuEoM-nMWlc9fHnAyNDubHLw/vjwform?usp=sf\\_link](https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSfaLq6LMQkHVBT7thobT_9AyOMuEoM-nMWlc9fHnAyNDubHLw/vjwform?usp=sf_link)

### Agenda for December 7th Meeting

Update from Rural Policy Committee Working Group

Randy: Are there any updates from the rural policy group

Rachel Setzke: RREP grant fund conversations and we will cover it during the FRWD & RREO discussion.

**RREO/FRWD Merger Bill Concept:** CDPHE has put forward a bill concept to merge the RREO grant program with the FRWD Enterprise Fund to create one new Enterprise (see attached resources for more information on these changes). Recycle CO is working with CC4CA to develop concepts we would like to see included in the future bill. We need to create a RC draft position paper to share with our partners. During the Policy Committee Meeting we will discuss the following topics and then create the draft position paper from the discussion. This draft position paper will then be shared with the full membership in the next week to get feedback, and to get a vote through our new process to provide a recommendation to the Board of Directors.

Randy: Are there any questions

No questions

#### Position 1: Agreement to support

- Merging RREO and FREWD funds; Combining boards. Rachel Setzke - The rural working group supported all three of these items
- Changing RREO to an enterprise to remove time limits and other constraints. There is agreement for this.
- Increasing funding for CDPHE staff
  - Increase the solid waste user admin fee (proposed \$0.03)

#### Position 2: Declare prioritization for the use of Funds

- Prioritizing recycling (Single Stream, HTR, C&D)
- Composting/organics diversion
- Waste Reduction including reuse and refill
- Allow funds to focus on policy, innovation, diversion, education, programs, transportation rebates for rural communities

#### Questions

Shelly Fuller: HHW?

Kendra Appleman-Eastvedt - Hazardous waste would have to be called out to include them

Rachel Zerwin: Include Waste Preventions?

Randy: Yes

Celen Peck-Andreano: Would transportations rebates include rail?

Kendra - Rail is not called out specifically

#### Position 3: Add a focus for the clean-up and prevention of illegal dumping (e.g. tires, e-waste)

- Use of the funds for cost free collection events, ensure majority of materials collected are recycled

Randy Moorman: Could we call out funding to help with illegal dumping. Use funds through the grant program for collections events?

Liz Chapman: The collection events has been requested by the rural communities

Caroline Mitchell: What are the long term implications of free collections events being free then going to charge for it?

Rachel Setzke: Maybe participants pay some amount and funds are used as partial supplement instead of 100% free event

Position 4: Expand TASP, Ambassador Program statewide

Randy: Explained this

Position 5: Continue to fund the Circular Economy Development Center and Next Cycle

Randy: Currently this is supported by RREO & FRWD, if the two grant programs merge we want to make sure they are still funded.

Kendra: The CEDC contract is for 5 years and it starts 2024

Caroline Mitchell: What is the reasoning for 5 years?

Randy: We would have to defer to CDPHE

Rachel Roussel-Diamond: Two terms. Sunset and repeal. The sunset triggers a review process and repeal does not.

Randy: CEDC is a sunset and will be reviewed in five years.

Jenifer Freeman: EPR with an end market to send feedstock is an incomplete process. We need to continue it after five years to continue the momentum.

Randy: The CEDC is not taking money from the general fund. We would not get political resistance.

Position 6: Allow CDPHE to be flexible with funding beyond grants (e.g. use for studies like organics management, baseline studies)

Randy: This would be to make it clear that the new board has the flexibility to fund beyond grants like the RREO and FRWD currently do.

Position 7: Ensure funding for rural areas does not get reduced. Ensure there is equity.

- Question: Do we want to specify X% of funding allocated to rural communities (non-Front Range)?

Randy: The rural communities need more funding. What are the group's thoughts on this?

Rachel Zerowin: Is this a scoring mechanism system?

Caroline Mitchell: Are there a lot of rural projects which are not getting funding? Is there a dollar per capita / diversion per capita?

Rachel Setzke: Legislatively what is the best way to do this

Rachel Roussel-Diamond: C3 board has discretion to design a variety of solutions. The C3 board will have a broader representation. We want to leave more options on the table. The board should consider rural equity. The board needs flexibility.

The next rural meeting is December 18th

Position 8: Ensure the funds to the Green Biz program are for waste diversion and waste reduction

Randy: We do not want the funds to go beyond the scope

Rachel Roussel-Diamond: It is a rebranded program. No funds from the tipping fee to go to this. It is funded by tier 2 haz funding.

We get funding from an EPA grant for prevention. We cannot use those funds for diversion.

Update the language in the statute from pollution prevention to the broader sustainability framework.

Liz Chapman: There is push back from the western slope for using fees for things other than waste generation under the guise of sustainability.

Position 9: Encourage/Require the spending of the un-allocated balance.

- Question: Do we want a mechanism to use the funds which are not spent for the other good initiatives such as TASP, Ambassador, illegal dumping collection events, infrastructure identified in the EPR Needs Assessment?

Randy Moorman: There is great need on the horizon and the FRWD board is waiting on the needs assessment.

Questions?

Position 10: Funding Mechanism.

CDPHE's proposal eliminates the Front Range communities payment of \$0.14/cubic yard into the RREO (maintains \$0.64/cubic yard from FRWD as of 1/24) and eliminates the CPI escalator for FRWD landfill tipping fees. As proposed by CDPHE there is an estimated \$3.5M loss in revenue. With the proposed \$0.03/cubic yard increase for the Solid Waste User Fee, the Front Range users would see a total tipping fee decrease of \$0.11/cubic yard and the rural (non-Front Range) communities would see a tipping fee increase of \$0.03.

- Option 1 is to support CDPHE's proposal
- Option 2 is to request that there is no loss of funding; Front Range continues to pay \$0.78/cubic yard (RREO and FRWD fees) and rural continues to pay \$0.14/cubic yard AND an additional \$0.03 for the solid waste user fee increase. (NO CPI adjustments/escalator)
- Option 3 is Option 2 + a CPI increase adjustment/escalator for each year for both Front Range and rural communities
- Option 4 is the removal of RREO fee (\$.14/cubic yard) to Front Range Communities, but allow for the CPI increase adjustment/escalator to both Front Range and rural communities.

- Option 5 is options 1 or 2 above, but the CPI increase adjustment/escalator is included annually ONLY if the previous un-allocated balance has been spent.

Randy Moorman: Explained it all

Caroline Mitchell: It feels like we do not need to reduce the contributions into these funds. Option 3 or 5 if political necessity requires it.

Jenifer Freeman: Could CDPHE explain their thought process?

Rachel Roussel-Diamond: Enterprise funds are TABOR exempt. I cannot talk more about why the proposal is in place.

Liz Chapman: How can the programs thrive with this loss of revenue?

Kevin Sullivan: Higher tipping fees help push for more recycling?

Randy: Any additional questions

Meghan Ibach: Do we have any input on the labeling bill?

Randy: R.C. did not take a position, but Eco-Cycle did take a position.

Jenifer Freeman: Commerce city representative is interested in more composting and EJ. Rep Ridgnell

Randy: Waste Tires fee program needs to be renewed.