

RECOMMENDATIONS

60% diversion goal

1. The State should revisit the 60% diversion goal.
 - a. In revisiting the goal, the State should consider:
 - i. what is realistic, practical, and economical;
 - ii. the impact of advancements in light-weighting; and
 - iii. the impact of design innovations.
 - b. The capacity of available Connecticut disposal facilities should not be considered when determining the diversion goal.
 - c. The goal should be based on accurate data as to the amount of individual packaging and other recyclables generated in Connecticut.
2. In the 2015 Waste Characterization Study, the State's consultants determined that approximately 40% of the disposed MSW consists of potentially recoverable materials. The State should determine if there are markets for recyclable materials in this waste stream and how, if at all, those markets can be efficiently and economically supplied by Connecticut's waste and recycling industry.
3. Connecticut must continue to focus on the possible diversion of food waste because it is a substantial part of the disposed MSW.

25% reduction in packaging

4. The Task Force does not believe a 25% reduction in packaging is achievable given the significant strides that the packaging industry has made to reduce packaging materials.
5. DEEP should determine the amount of waste avoided upstream and downstream, as a result of packaging source reduction efforts including light weighting and other techniques.

Existing laws, infrastructure and data

6. The State should determine what gaps, if any, exist in Connecticut's waste management statutes, collection infrastructure, and processing infrastructure that relate to the management of mandated recyclables in order to find ways to recover more of those materials.
7. DEEP has insufficient data as to the amount of consumer packaging generated and recycled in Connecticut. Before setting any recycling or diversion goals, DEEP must present data establishing how much and what kind of consumer packaging is generated within the state, the current recycling levels for those packages and the primary sources of unrecycled packaging. This would include how much consumer packaging was generated in 2010 and 2015; how much was recovered in 2010 and 2015; how much was disposed in 2010 and 2015; and what is a reasonable reduction rate by 2024.

8. Every 3 years, DEEP should perform or have performed waste characterization studies to track progress, evaluate priorities, and create new priorities based on markets, technological innovations, and the evolution of the waste streams.
9. DEEP should track the disposal of residential MSW to assist towns and cities in evaluating their efforts to reduce, reuse and recycle.
10. DEEP should track the disposal of commercial MSW to assist towns and cities in evaluating their efforts to reduce, reuse and recycle.

Increase recycling

11. Local authorities that are poor recycling performers must effectively, uniformly and aggressively enforce the relevant statutes and ordinances, specifically existing recycling mandates and disposal bans. Large municipalities must do more to enforce the applicable statutes and ordinances against owners of multifamily homes and apartment buildings.
12. To ensure uniformity across the state, DEEP should continue with the "What's In, What's Out" program. The State should continue with its efforts to increase the availability of drop off sites for film/plastic bags.
13. Local authorities that are poor recycling performers must effectively enforce the relevant statutes and ordinances against commercial and institutional generators of MSW.
14. Commercial and institutional generators of MSW must provide to local authorities recycling management plans showing that they have in place appropriate collection for MSW and mandated recyclables.
15. When local authorities issue building permits, they should require the owner to make available a convenient recycling infrastructure that is equal to the infrastructure available for the management of MSW. If appropriate infrastructure is not available, the building permit should not be issued.
16. Food service and/or liquor establishments that do not have in place a convenient recycling infrastructure and recycling business plans should have their food service/liquor permits revoked.
17. The State must increase its recycling rate for C&D waste materials. The State should pass legislation similar to C.G.S. §22a-226e, a law that requires certain generators of food waste to recover food waste if an appropriate food waste recycling facility is located within 20 miles of the generator. The "new" law would require generators of C&D materials to deliver or have delivered the C&D materials to appropriate material recovery facilities if a recovery facility with sorting equipment is located within 20 miles of the generator.

Funding

18. Local authorities should increase hauler registration/permit fees to support recycling efforts. Local authorities should use the registration fees solely to support their recycling efforts and programs.
19. The escheats from the "bottle bill" should be used solely to further recycling enforcement and education efforts.
20. The revenues created by the solid waste assessment (C.G.S. Sec. 22a-232) should be used solely to promote recycling education and programs in the under-performing cities.

21. Local and state authorities should provide tax incentives and tax exemptions for recycling equipment to encourage private investment. This will assist operators to upgrade equipment and systems, as necessary, to meet market demands.

Extended producer responsibility for consumer packaging

22. Extended producer responsibility for consumer packaging is not recommended because:
 - a. Extended producer responsibility for consumer packaging will not significantly improve Connecticut's collection or processing.
 - b. Extended producer responsibility for consumer packaging will not significantly improve the quality of the materials processed by materials recovery facilities and sold to end markets.
 - c. Extended producer responsibility for consumer packaging will harm Connecticut's economy, Connecticut's waste collection and recycling businesses, and Connecticut's materials recovery processing facilities.
 - d. Extended producer responsibility for consumer packaging will not improve the enforcement of the applicable recycling statutes and ordinances.
 - e. Extended producer responsibility for consumer packaging will substantially increase the cost of the collection, processing, and marketing of mandated recyclables.
 - f. Extended producer responsibility for consumer packaging does not incentivize recycling since producers pass costs on to consumers and often results in the consumer paying a higher cost to recycle due to the creation of additional program bureaucracy and added administrative expenses for producers that will be passed on to consumers.
 - g. Extended producer responsibility for consumer packaging will make it more costly and burdensome for Connecticut packaging companies, brand owners and retailers to do business in the state of Connecticut.
 - h. Extended producer responsibility for consumer packaging, will not cause design changes that improve the recyclability of a package in Connecticut or elsewhere.
23. Producers should consider financially supporting the CTRecycling Foundation and have, at a minimum, two appointees on the foundation.

Glass

24. Glass cannot be processed by Connecticut's existing MRF infrastructure. The bottle bill should be amended to include wine and liquor bottles and to no longer include plastic and metal containers. The State legislature should consider the use of tax incentives to help the establishment of a secondary glass processor to Connecticut