

**Paul Tomasi**

**President, Vermont Solid Waste District Manager's Association**

**Executive Director, Northeast Kingdom Waste Management District**

### **Vermont Solid Waste District Manager's Association**

- While E-Wastes are not necessarily part of Act 148, the Vermont Solid Waste District Manager's Association (VSWMDA) is united in requesting a legislative fix, which would include compensation to collection sites for managing e-wastes. This compensation should include all of the costs associated with collection including, but limited to: labor, materials (gaylords, pallets, shrink wrap, labels), administration, equipment usage (forklifts, pallet jacks, etc.), and transportation (where applicable).
- The VSWMDA is unanimous in its continued support of Act 148 and the Materials Management Plan. However, we feel it is necessary that funding be made available to ensure continued success.
  - The VSWDMA would like 100% of a \$4 / ton increase to the State Solid Waste Fee in addition to the 17% of the existing \$6/ton (\$1.6-\$2.0 million annually).
  - The money should be used for planning grants and a revolving loan fund.
  - The justification for the funding is included in the Solid Waste Infrastructure Advisory Committee (SWIAC) report to the legislature and the Request for Information (RFI) put out by the Agency in the fall of 2015.
- Without an infusion of funding, many of the remaining deadlines for implementing Act 148 will be unmet—specifically providing residential collection of organics statewide. Even with a substantial infusion of funding it is unclear that residential collection of organics will be possible in all corners of the State. I would urge this committee to take testimony from waste haulers regarding this requirement.

### **Northeast Kingdom Waste Management District**

- Act 148 is focused on three basic concepts—mandatory unit based pricing, landfill bans of certain recyclables, and parallel collection of materials.
- The NEKWMD has always supported mandatory unit-based pricing and banning certain materials from landfill disposal. Due to our rural nature and significant costs, we have never advocated for parallel collection. Parallel collection in rural Vermont requires significant increases in costs for services that are not justified through the relatively small benefit.
- There is a myth circulating in certain circles that many of the deadlines for Act 148 have come and gone without the need for additional funding. The NEKWMD has sought and obtained an exemption from the parallel collection of recycling and sought and obtained a variance for the collection of leaf and yard wastes from several facilities. The reasons for us opting out of these provisions of the law are not that we don't support them, it's because we can't justify the expense.

- **Our system relies heavily on a network of 28 facilities scattered throughout 49 communities. These facilities not only allow us to collect mandatory recyclables, but a wide range of non-mandatory materials that might not otherwise be available if facilities did not exist. Our long-range plan is to expand the capabilities of all facilities so they accept all wastes—recycling and trash (the law requires all waste facilities to accept recycling, but we have several recycling only facilities in the NEKWMD). We are also examining ways to improve our own collection efficiency. While it would be nice to provide collection services for a whole host of materials, the reality in rural Vermont is residents have to travel significant distances for most services—including food, fuel, and medical services. Why should wastes services be made more convenient than these other services?**
- **Preliminary figures for calendar year 2015 indicate recycling is up in almost every NEKWMD town. These same figures indicate recycling increased most in towns that switched from tax-funded services to unit-based pricing. One might conclude that mandatory unit-based pricing has had more of an impact on increasing recycling while decreasing waste generation than the other 2 provisions of Act 148. Unit-based pricing is also the most inexpensive provision of Act 148. In fact, unit-based pricing has provided many municipalities with a net savings.**
- **The NEKWMD will continue to support mandatory unit-based pricing and landfill bans. We would, however, urge the legislature to re-examine the parallel collection requirements for recycling and organics in rural areas of the state.**
- **We would also urge the legislature to establish a temporary funding source for the implementation of Act 148.**

**Questions/comments: Paul Tomasi at [director@nekwmd.org](mailto:director@nekwmd.org) or 802-626-3532**