

Testimony before the Senate Agriculture and Natural Resources Committee Re: Substitute SB 119-2.

Chairman Schaffer, Vice Chair Landis, Ranking Member Hicks-Hudson and Members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify on Substitute SB 119-2.

My name is Steve White. I am Chair of the Ohio Chapter of the National Waste and Recycling Association (NWRA). The NWRA is the voice for the private sector waste and recycling industry. Association members operate in Ohio, as well as all 50 states and the District of Columbia. Our nearly 700 members are a mix of publicly traded and privately owned local, regional and Fortune 500 national and international companies. It is estimated that the private sector waste and recycling industry accounts for more than one million jobs and generates nearly a quarter of a trillion dollars in U.S. GDP.

The Ohio Chapter of the NWRA and its members are opposed to the adoption of SB 119.

While the NW&RA is opposed to SB 119, we do want to acknowledge the efforts by Senator Reineke to listen to our concerns and work with us on revisions to the Bill. The Senator has been very gracious with his time and very thoughtful in his consideration of our concerns and suggestions. We look forward to continuing these discussions.

SB 119 is an attempt to solve a local issue and restrict the flow of out-of-state waste into Ohio that would disproportionately affect Ohio's municipalities, Ohio businesses and Ohio's citizens.

SB 119 would increase the costs of waste disposal in Ohio by between \$122M and \$175M annually with no demonstrated need or improvements to Ohio's waste management planning or regulatory programs.

SB 119 would increase the solid waste disposal fees that our customers; Ohio municipalities, Ohio businesses and Ohio citizens pay for management of the solid wastes they generate by between 29% and 93%.

SB 119 would increase the construction and demolition debris disposal fee by over 619%.

The Ohio Revised Code requires that the owner or operator of a solid waste landfill or transfer station collect these fees from the generator of the solid wastes. Thus, these fees will be passed along to Ohio's municipalities, Ohio businesses and Ohio citizens. In some instances, when you include generation fees and District designation fees, which SB 119 does not impact, the fees will exceed the cost of managing the waste.

What are the real-world impacts of these changes? In 2021, the City Cleveland generated over 250,000 tons of municipal solid wastes. The proposed solid waste fee increase will increase the City of Cleveland's disposal costs by over \$1M per year. The Cities of Columbus and Cincinnati will see similar if not greater increases in their waste disposal fee costs. These are not out-of-states wastes.

At a time when Ohioans are recovering from the financial effects of COVID, are fighting inflation and communities are attempting to revitalize brownfield areas in their communities by

demolishing dilapidated structures. Ohioans do not need unneeded waste management fee increases.

While our main concern with SB 119 is with the proposed fee increases there are several other changes to ORC 3734, the solid waste statute, and ORC 3714, the C&DD statute. For example, SB 119 changes the definition of solid waste in ORC 3734 regarding the exclusion of C&DD. As noted earlier, SB 119 does not consider the potential impacts to generation fees or District designations fees. We just received the Sub Bill on Friday and are still trying to understand the impacts of the proposed changes.

The changes to the C&DD and solid waste fees are significant, the other changes potentially significant. We respectfully suggest, due to the real and potential impacts of SB 119 that SB 119 proceed as a stand-alone Bill where it can be given careful consideration.

Again, SB 119 is an attempt to solve a local issue by disproportionately and needlessly impacting all Ohioans.

Thank you.