

SAB Minutes 9-12-12

Present: Dallas Masters, Chelsea Gittle, Geneva Mixon, Greg Willson, Jesse Seavers

Meeting began at 6:42

SAB reviewed the minutes so they could be passed and used by the BOT. SAB began with the scorecard. Dallas reiterated that the Scorecard does give anyone who reviews it the major take home points. Greg feels the comments are more valuable than the actual number, but the trustees are more interested in the number. The SAB wants to make sure the important points and highlights of the Scorecard get relayed in the comments. Greg would like to be sure that it is clear that we are in the 2nd draft of the Scorecard. Dallas feels we should ask for the BOT to formally adopt the scorecard so that we are not continually be second guessed on the Scorecard.

Scorecard adopted unanimously.

Minutes from 8-8-12 all in favor of passing: unanimous

Minutes from 8-15-12 all in favor of passing: unanimous

Bylaws:

We began the discussion by pointing out the parts of the Bylaws we don't like:

Dallas suggests we change the unexcused absence from two from three. Jesse asked for an explanation of what is excuse absence. Unexcused – not notifying the chair prior to the meeting. If you let people know ahead of time then it is not as big of an issue

-Officers: SAB should choose the chair, but default to the Trustee Representative. The members of the SAB will elect the member to serve as chair, vice chair, and secretary. We should specify how long the chair could be elected. It was suggested one year or in the event that a request is made by a majority of members

-Article 7: add a time limit for how long to wait for quorum (10 minutes) "The meetings will wait for 10 minutes for a quorum"

-Article 3: When we have a new member joins we get their info, but the new member does not learn anything about the existing members. Jesse agrees this would help our ability to perform as a team. Every member should have a statement about their qualifications on the website. Chelsea and Dallas have submitted their statement of qualifications. The other members should do so as well.

Bylaws passed unanimously

Jesse has two ordinances he would like to usher through the SAB

1- Zero Waste Event Ordinance: Jesse has begun to make a case using existing ordinance language. One of the major decisions will be reusable –vs- compostable flatware. Jesse envisions collecting a deposit. Some of the "fee" would be used for signage and trash cans, some of it would be used to pay a trash hauler. Event Coordinators would pay a fee to get the permit and the Town would implement zero waste goals—Jesse in order to get the permit you would need to follow the instruction laid out.

Chelsea is concerned about theft of silverware—J feels like the fee could be such that it would replenish the stock.

Dallas suggests we step back and brainstorm the things that are important at zero waste event. Jesse recommends we break it down further and use the following categories:

Recyclables

Landfillables

Compostables

SAB begins brainstorming:

- Metal flatware at the CC
- Size of event could be captured as an “impact fee”
- We may not want to be so prescriptive all events are different
- Consider calling it a deposit instead of a fee and it could be refunded if zero waste steps are followed.
- How can we enforce- We could require them to fill out a form that outlines what they are required to do
- Could we require Chain of Custody forms for their waste?

Jesse: We need to think of the best ways to effect behavior change (carrot vs. stick)

Dallas: Town has a doc they are required to fill out, and Town provides info for the applicant of private companies that will do the work for the event coordinator. If the event coordinator decides do the zero waste management themselves then at the end at a TRC (Technical Review Committee) the coordinator must provide proof: pictures, documentation that they diverted the waste

Event Recovery Fee—Jesse still thinks this is a good tool and the fee could be reduced when the organizers hit pre-set targets. One scenario could have town setting target diversion rates as a percentage of the total. The fee would need to have teeth to it to get them fully implement their waste diversion plan.

Do we think certain groups will have trouble hitting these targets? Chelsea: We might have a problem where people choose to pay the fee and throw stuff in the trash because it would be easier to deal with just throwing it away. Request to the BOT that they add to their existing permit fee a portion that will go to a zero waste fund. *Could that trigger a law suit?*

Dallas thinks as long as Town can prove there is a real cost associated with the collection of the fee then town would not be liable for a law suit. We would want to integrate the fee so that it is inline with the existing fee structure so zero waste does not get a bad reputation. One suggestion is that we have a graduated scale by the size and duration of the event. Other variable that would be important are the number of people in attendance and the duration of the event.

We could set up numbers or goals of the percentage of the 3 waste streams.

Landfillables-just throwing out 10%

The other two can vary.

Let the private companies tell us what the numbers should be...what is attainable.

Jesse and Greg both remarked that they were at a recent Wild Bear event that had no landfill cans. No trash cans of any kind. So the onus is on the vendors in that situation.

We could have a stock compostable flatware etc. on hand, but adding to Town Staff's workload is not desirable. Can tell event organizers, "here is what you need to do, and here is a list of contractors that can help you achieve the goal or you can work to do it yourself."

What kind of fee do you think is big enough for people to care about getting it back?

We'll consider that if they don't get the fee back then at least we have a budget to start moving forward. That money could go into a sustainability fund.

Chelsea challenge but that puts money above our zero waste goal?

Have to collect the money up front because we have to teeth to recoup money after the event

Jesse: Goal should be zero—vs

Dallas: The goal should be a more reasonable attainable goal.

J: We can design this policy so that when someone wants to throw away something in a landfill then they get less money back the goal still being zero

Any diversion is an improvement and the more diversion the more deposit they get back

To Dos:

- Jesse & Greg come up with a target diversion numbers for landfillables for the ordinance
- Greg a plan is needed as part of the event application process (do it using the form or do this with the waste haulers) zero waste documentation
- Punitive damages (Greg & Jesse)
- Is there a lawsuit risk with the fund? (Dallas)
- Are there any groups that would be completely unable to do this?
- Graduated fee (people hours) higher fee based on the impact on people time (Greg)

Bag ordinance:

How to move forward?

We would want to invite the stakeholders who use plastic bags to our next meeting via Chamber (Geneva will do)

Greg was telling us that some are retail outlets (eg Alfalfas) have switched to new receipt machines to avoid using VPA paper which contain known toxins. The might be an issue the SAB wants to consider in the future

8:10 adjourn

60 30 10