

SOLID WASTE MARKETING & PLANNING ISSUES
NOTES FROM STAKEHOLDER MEETING #1 -March 19, 2012

TOPICS: WASTE FLOW & REGIONALIZED COLLECTION

PROS-Waste Flow

- Economic tool for counties to fund comprehensive solid waste programs (e.g. recycling, household hazardous waste day, etc)
- Provides financial underpinning for environmentally sound county solid waste disposal facilities
- Can provide incentive for new facilities & technologies dependent on adequate waste volume to operate
- Counties report a significant increase in tonnage when waste flow is instituted

CONS-Waste Flow

- Makes it difficult for private solid waste companies to compete against “oversized” county facilities
- Impedes the building of new solid waste facilities & new technologies
- Provides a dis-incentive for separating recyclables from solid waste stream to increase tonnage brought to disposal facilities
- Drives up disposal rates by removing competition
- -Can impair the siting of a new facility (e.g. recent New York innovative technology proposal) if facility has to abide with existing waste flow plans
- Creates waste sheds along county boundaries

RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS

- Standardize flow control throughout the State
- Through the State planning process and consistent policies, DEP needs to address counties with lingering debt
- State shouldn't allow continuous county solid waste debt
- Add rates to the discussion for this workgroup
- Use waste flow only as a tool to pay debt going forward
- DEP needs to identify how new technologies can be paid for
- DEP should review new technologies to identify all environmental concerns upfront, and advise industry on how to address
- DEP needs to promote good behavior (e.g. debt, recycling, etc) through planning and financial incentives
- NJ disposal rates pay for many things (e.g. host fee, recycling tax, debt, etc), leaving little to no money available for new technologies.
- Recycling commingled with solid waste adds to disposal charges paid by customers; need to make it easier for the generator to recycle.
- The rate differential in a county can warp the solid waste market within that county
- Counties may opt out of disposal business if allowed to have regional planning and capacity
- Need ability for long-term agreements (e.g. McEnroe (resource recovery) facilities have up to 40 years); what exists legally to allow for long-term agreements? The current 5-year contract limit for collection contracts isn't practical.
- If waste flow is eliminated, it must be done slowly since private companies may have invested in improvements because of waste flow requirements
- If waste flow is needed, it tells you that a solid waste facility isn't necessary since there's too much capacity; facilities should be filled based on need.

- Provide better guidance on how a material resource facility (MRF) should operate to address recycling concerns
- Open markets work best
- DEP needs to be consistent and drive goals, but allow flexibility
- Continued waste flow plans and politics compromise regional planning and capacity issues
- Government waste market needs to stop fighting with open market
- DEP needs to be consistent in its message for its recycling goals, so that all programs (e.g. air, etc) support these goals.

NEXT MEETING-Date is Monday April 2 @ 9:30am; location to be determined

At next meeting:

Review Meeting #1 notes; edit as needed

Discuss regionalized collection, which was not discussed at meeting #1;

Questions:

What can be done by towns and/or by collectors to coordinate waste collection services?

Can this be addressed through the district solid waste management plans? Ordinances? Etc?

Begin discussion about solid waste debt; handout to be provided at Meeting #2