

# **BURNT**

IMPROVING THE ENVIRONMENT THROUGH  
CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT WITH GOVERNMENT  
BUSINESS, AND ACADEMIA

19 October 2007

Nick Lytle  
Environmental Specialist  
State of Tennessee  
Division of Solid Waste Management

RE: Initial Meeting of State Solid Waste Reduction Task Force

Dear Mr. Lytle

I appreciate your role in facilitating our group working on waste reduction methodology. I am concerned that I have requested specific presentations to be scheduled for the group on the following topics and they have not been scheduled

--solid waste impact on water in landfills

--transport of solid waste--over 12 million miles annually from Transfer Station to landfills

--composting food and yard waste

--legislative analysis--[it was odd to present only one (1) page of the main administration bill SB 2267 HB 2289 which contains many provisions of interest to those in this group.

--hazardous and toxic waste--types and sources

Thank you for conducting the group phone conversation Monday 15 October. **I would like to add some material from the phone conference that was not included**

A. a central concern is that all Class IV Construction and Demolition Landfills have scales

B. We very explicitly discussed and I thought agreed the methodology for this effort is to start with entire solid waste stream in Tennessee [12 million tons], determine what waste will be landfilled, and then develop programs and checkpoints to keep all the unwanted waste out of the landfill. Our goal is to markedly reduce Class I landfilling

1. For example, consider checkpoints at Transfer Stations and Landfills to prevent unwanted landfilling of waste

P.O. BOX 128555  
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37212  
615. 327. 8515

WWW.BURNT-TN.ORG  
burnt.tn@ gmail.com

***A Member Of  
Community Shares***

2. Methods to keep separate commercial and residential food and yard waste to compost in county where generated [includes backyard composting]

3. Diversion of construction and demolition waste

4. Very high priority on keeping hazardous waste from landfills

C. A state legislator has suggested several times that random audits should be done of solid waste reports

D. Statements about the 1991 State Solid Waste 'reform' must not be forgotten

1. There has never been a waste stream analysis

2. The 1991 Act is structured around reports and paperwork not results

3. The reports have been mostly formal exercise to reflect achievement of the 25% goal rather than real gains

E. Organic waste (yard waste & food waste) and construction and demolition waste bans were discussed but I think we need to develop programs that work. Bans sound good until they run into opposition. We need to determine **how** to compost food and yard waste and process construction and demolition waste.

F. We may know the weight and quantity of material landfilled at Class I landfills but that is less important than knowing what is actually being landfilled and the source

G. Cities should not be a problem if the regulations are written right. Solid waste is a public health problem—look at landfill pollution of water. Neither cities or landfill owners are exempt from keeping problem wastes from landfills.

H. Our fundamental point should be that solid waste has a higher value as raw material for business and compost. Money should be the incentive not bans. If the state provides technical assistance and programs, businesses will provide an alternative.

I. An absolute, fundamental priority is keeping the hazardous, toxic waste out of the waste stream.

Thank you

Bruce Wood  
BURNT Board  
Legislative Sponsors

