



Testimony on H.602

Provided by Jennifer Holliday, Chittenden Solid Waste District

Submitted to the Vermont House Committee on Natural Resources and Energy

February 25, 2016

Chairman Klein and Committee Members,

Thank you for providing this opportunity to discuss H.602

CSWD supports H.602 but would like to see the bill allow for grants to include capital investments made since January 1, 2015. Several major provisions of the law including mandatory recycling, kicked in on July 1, 2015. Regional solid waste planning entities, transfer stations and haulers had to make investments to comply. Six months prior to the requirement of this first major milestone is a reasonable starting date to fund capital projects. Entities that invested early or on-time to comply should benefit from grant money and not be penalized by the delay in available funding. Let me be transparent about this request. CSWD intends to invest in glass processing equipment at our MRF this June. The equipment will hopefully make this problematic material less contaminated and more marketable. CSWD estimates we process approximately 60% of the blue bin glass collected in the State. Grant funding will help keep our tipping fees down at the MRF which will help keep curbside collection costs down.

The second request that we have is the following changes to the language on page 4 line 17: to construct, **upgrade or purchase equipment for** solid waste management facilities to accept, process or recycle mandated recyclables, leaf and yard residuals, food residuals or **architectural waste**,

This change will support equipment necessary for processing and not just new construction. SWIAC specifically recommended administering grants or loans to existing processing facilities to increase their capacity before investments are made in new facilities. The current language only allows for funding of construction and not equipment or upgrades to existing solid waste facilities that might be necessary to implement Act 148.

The third request we have is to include architectural waste processing facilities and equipment eligible for grant funding. Architectural waste makes up a considerable portion of the waste stream and facilities and equipment that increases its diversion should be supported with funding. There is currently not enough infrastructure in the state. Also, solid waste districts may apply for funding for equipment such as a grinder for clean wood that could be portable and moved around the State and shared. The current language would not allow this. Architectural waste, which by definition, includes clean wood as well as other materials that are banned from disposal if there are facilities that accept the material nearby.

The fourth request is to authorize the Agency to establish a set of specific criteria for grant funding with input from the Solid Waste Infrastructure Advisory Committee that includes criteria developed by the SWIAC committee on page 27 of the SWIAC report 2/2015.

The rest of the testimony on Solid Waste Management Fees and roles of solid waste district vs. private sector.