Appendix I STATE RECYCLING GOALS AND MANDATES

	Table AI-1 State Recycling Goals and Mandates ¹					
State	Mandate/Goal	Mandate?	Penalty?	Pre-/Post- Consumer Distinction? ²		
Alabama	1989 law, Act No. 89-824, established a 25% waste-reduction and recycling goal. No due date for goal; no formal requirements for localities to report recycling information to state. Statistics on recycling unavailable, but there has been a dramatic increase in curbside and drop-off-center recycling. 1990 law, Act No. 90-564 requires all state agencies, schools (K–12), and public colleges and universities to implement recycling programs.	No	No	No		
Alaska	No laws imposing statewide recycling mandates/goals exist, only declaration from the governor encouraging recycling. In 2000, the Assembly adopted for Anchorage municipalities the following goals: 30% of population to recycle (21% currently recycle but is not mandated); 1% of tipping fees go towards funding recycling.	No	No	No		
Arizona	Title 49 contains recycling statutes; state has no established recycling goals; state monitors municipalities and counties and is responsible for engaging them in recycling and waste reduction.	No	No	No		
Arkansas 📑	1991 law, Act 749, established recycling goals of 30% by 1995 and 40% by 2000. State met the 1995 goal and exceeded the 2000, 40% goal. The 1999 recycling rate was 44%.	No	No	No		
California	The Integrated Waste Management Act directs every jurisdiction to divert 50% of its waste stream for the year 2000. AB 2494, passed in 1992, requires a specific, standardized methodology to measure solid-waste disposal reduction. Each jurisdiction uses this methodology to summarize its waste-reduction progress in an Annual Report to the Board. AB 75, which added sections to the Public Resource Code, requires state agencies to meet waste-diversion goals of 25% by 2002 and 50% by 2004 and to document their efforts in meeting these goals. AB 939 (of the Integrated Waste Management Act) requires local governments to prepare and implement plans to achieve 50% waste reduction in 2000, to divert 25% of solid waste from landfills by January 1, 2002 and 50% by January 1, 2004. In regards to buying products, most must have both a 50% minimum procurement goal and 50% minimum recycled content.	Yes	Yes	No		
Colorado	No recycling laws, however, governor issued a challenge for citizens to divert 50% of the waste by 2000. 1991 law, HB1245, created an incentive for companies to recycle, giving them tax credits for equipment necessary for recycled materials. 1992 law, HB1318, created a recycling processing/manufacturing- loan and market-development program.	No	No	No		

Processing and Marketing Recyclables in New York City

118

	Table AI-1 State Recycling Goals and Mandates ¹ (continued)					
State	Mandate/Goal	Mandate?	Penalty?	Pre-/Post- Consumer Distinction? ²		
Connecticut	1987 law, PA87-544, set 25% recycling goal by 1991. 1993 law, PA93-423, raised goal to 40% source-reduction in 2000. 1998–1999 recycling rate was 25%.	No	No	No		
Delaware (Solid Waste Authority Goal (SWA) to recycle and reuse 35% of household solid-waste discards by 2001; SWA resource-recovery goal, including energy from combustible solid waste, is 50% by 2001 and 70% by 2010.	No	No	No		
Florida	1988 law sets county recycling goals of 30% of all solid waste and 50% of each of five material groups (glass, newspaper, aluminum, steel, and plastic) by 1994. Counties with populations less than 50,000 are excluded from these requirements provided that they offer the opportunity to recycle. Most counties met 30% goal, however, no county met 50% goal in ALL given material groups. The recycling rate has increased from 4% in 1988 to 38% for 1997. The March 2000 estimated recycling rate was 40%. There are penalties for large counties that do not meet the 30% goal, and there is a distinction between pre- and post-consumer materials. In 1997, a bill passed awarding a \$1.7 million innovative grant to one county (counties must compete for it).	Yes	Yes (cut off grant money and refuse permits)	Yes		
Georgia	1990 law, SB533, requires 25% recycling goal by July 1, 1996 per capita; 1993 law, HB257, updates the law requiring the state to reduce the amount of waste received by 25% by 1996. State did not meet 25% recycling goal, fell short at approximately 21%. State did not meet waste-reduction goal. Recycling rate in 1995 was 33%.	No	No	No		
Hawaii	Chapter 34G of the Hawaii Revised Statutes sets a 25% waste-reduction goal before 1995 (state did not reach that goal). A 50% goal by 2000 was set; state did not meet the 2000 goal and no penalty was, or could be, imposed. 1999 recycling rate was 24%.	No	No	No		
Idaho (No law, however, there is a nonbinding resolution that was passed encouraging state achievement of 25% waste-reduction goal. Legislation has given a 5% purchasing preference to those items meeting recycled-content standards	No	No	No		

Appendix I: State Recycling Goals and Mandates

	Table AI-1 State Recycling Goals and Mandates ¹ (continued)					
State	Mandate/Goal	Mandate?	Penalty?	Pre-/Post- Consumer Distinction? ²		
Illinois	State procurement code mandates that, whenever it is economically and practically feasible, 40% of the dollar amount of paper purchased by the state be recycled. The aggregate rate increased to 50% by July 1, 2000. For high-grade printing and writing paper to qualify as recycled, it must contain at least 50% recovered material, 30% of which must be post-consumer waste. Beginning July 1, 1998, the post-consumer–content requirement increased to 40% and again to 50% by July 1, 2000.	No	No (except for newsprint)	Yes (for newsprint and procurement)		
Indiana	Goal to reduce waste 35% by January 1, 1996; 50% by 2001; counties must make 20-year plans; state did not meet the 1996 goal; 1998 recycling rate was 21%.	No	No	No		
lowa	1988 law established 25% waste-reduction goal by July 1, 1994 and 50% by July 1, 2000; 38 of 50 planning areas have met the 25% reduction goal and 2 of the 50 have reached the 50% reduction goal. 2000 goal was not met — recycling rate was 37%. After planning areas failed to meet the 1994 goal, the state offered a financial incentive. All waste-management–assistance programs and environmental protection programs involving waste are financed through a tonnage fee (\$4.25 per ton collected at the landfill). 95 cents of this fee is normally retained at the local level for programs. The first incentive for the 25% goal offered an additional 50 cents to those planning areas that meet the goal. The second financial incentive required those who did not attain the 25% goal to send the state an additional 50 cents per ton, in turn making the difference in the amount retained by those who reach the 25% goal and those who do not, \$1.00.	No	No (bottle bill)	Yes		
Kansas	1990 law requires counties to submit solid-waste-management plans to the Department of Health and Environment Bureau of Waste Management; no specific statewide recycling or waste-reduction goals. All counties have turned in required solid-waste-management plans and must do so annually. Some counties have no formal goals, others have goals as high as 50%. The Bureau released a new Solid Waste Management Report in December of 2000. Grant program established for recycling and other programs, which provides one million dollars a year to the recipient. The recycling rate for municipal solid waste in 1995 was approximately 11%. Actual quantification of the most recent recycling rate (1997) is difficult, but it is a few points higher than the 1995 rate.	No	No	No		
Kentucky	1991 bill, SB2, set a policy to reduce waste and set a goal of 25% by 1997. The state did not meet the 1997 goal and no new legislation has been passed.	No	No	No		

	Table AI-1 State Recycling Goals and Mandates ¹ (continued)					
State	Mandate/Goal	Mandate?	Penalty?	Pre-/Post- Consumer Distinction? ²		
Louisiana	State law set goal of reducing waste landfilled by 25%; state has not met this goal. Recycling rates averaged approximately 15-17% in 2000.	No	Yes (no more than 20 cents per ton)	Yes		
Maine	1989 law set 50% recycling goal by 1998. This goal has been extended with no target date. Statistics are calculated in two sectors: community and commercial. Community sector achieved 43% in 1998. There is no penalty for not meeting this goal. Commercial sector rate has not yet been calculated, but will probably fall short of the goal as well. Legislation enacted to create a reasonable progress goal of 35%.	No	No	No		
Maryland	1988 law set 20% waste-reduction goal by January 1, 1994; 15% for smaller counties; all counties in the state met 1994 goals. In 1999, 36% rate was reached and goal was increased to 40%.	Yes	No	No		
Massachusetts	Commonwealth adopted a 46% recycling goal by 2000. The 2000 recycling rate is estimated to be 36%, triple that of 1990. 85% of population has the ability to participate in a comprehensive program. 2000 Solid Waste Master Plan has objectives to increase recycling efforts in areas where it is lowest (urban areas), provide grants for municipalities, and increase technical assistance.	No	No	No		
Michigan	1988 policy encourages by 2005: waste reduction by 8–12%, reuse rate of 4–6%, composting rate of 8–12%, recycling rate of 20–30%, waste-to-energy goal for incineration of 35–45%, and landfill rate of 10–20%.	No	No	No		
Minnesota	1989 law set a 35% recycling goal by December 31, 1996 for the Greater Minneapolis area, and a 50% recycling goal for the metro area. Source-separation plans are required for each SWM district. Every county must have one recycling center; all counties must recycle at least four items. 40% of waste was recycled in 1998 (46% with waste-reduction and yard-waste credits). Individual counties have set their own goals in the planning process.	No	Yes	No		

Appendix I: State Recycling Goals and Mandates

	Table AI-1 State Recycling Goals and Mandates ¹ (cl	ontinued)		
State	Mandate/Goal	Mandate?	Penalty?	Pre-/Post- Consumer Distinction? ²
Mississippi	1991 law, SN2984, created authorities — nonhazardous-waste fee collection, 25% recycling goal by 1996. State has not met the original goal — the 2000 rate of recycling averages 11–12% statewide. There are no penalties for not meeting the goal; recycling is not mandatory.	No	No	No
Missouri	1990 law, SB530, established a 40% waste-diversion goal by 1998. State increased the percent of solid waste recovered from 10% in 1990 to 26% in 1995 to 33% in 1996. Goal still stands at 40% for the state. There is no mandate to meet this goal and no penalties for nonachievement.	No	No	No
Montana	1991 law established a 25% recycling goal by December 31, 1996. There are no reporting requirements, hence there are no estimations on recycling rates. A proposed rewrite of the Integrated Waste Management Act hopes to provide more accurate data on the states' recycling rate.	No	No	No
Nebraska	1992 law, LB1257, sets 25% waste-reduction goal by 1996, 40% by 1999, 50% by 2002. State met 1996 goal. Some counties have met 40% goal and some have not. Since there is no tracking or requirement of reporting, the goals are not mandated.	No	No	No
Nevada	1991 law, AB320, set a 25% recycling goal by 1995. The state did not meet the 1995 recycling goal but no penalties were imposed. Tire fee to fund recycling; counties must submit plans. 1995 law weakened the recycling requirement — municipalities and counties over 100,000, as opposed to 40,000 are required to provide curbside recycling. Statutes have been amended (for 2000 on) to include public buildings in recycling programs.	No	No	No
New Hampshire	40% waste reduction for 2000 extended, but classified now as a diversion goal.	No	No	No
New Jersey	1992 revisions to the recycling goals in the Recycling Act established a 50% municipal-solid-waste– recycling goal by December 31, 1995; and a 60% total recycling goal by December 31, 1996. State failed to meet the municipal-solid-waste–recycling goal of 50% in 1995. State did meet overall recycling goal, with a recycling rate of 61% in 1996. Law has not changed but policy decree raised the total recycling goal to 65% by 2000. NJAC7: 26A describes the state recycling rules.	No	No	No

	Table AI-1 State Recycling Goals and Mandates ¹ (continued)					
State	Mandate/Goal	Mandate?	Penalty?	Pre-/Post- Consumer Distinction? ²		
New Mexico	1990 law, SB2, sets 25% waste-diversion goal by 1995 and 50% goal by 2000; mandates solid-waste program by 1993; requires procurement of recycled products; state did not meet 1995 goal; in 1994, state at 12%; no penalties imposed.	No	No	No		
New York	1987 Solid Waste Management Plan established a 50% waste-reduction/recycling goal by 1997; not mandatory. 50% recycling goal is broken down into two categories: 8–10% waste-reduction goal and 40–42% recycling goal. The state has met these goals with a recycling rate of 42% in 1997 and 1998. Executive Order Bo. 142, issued January 21, 1998, required state agencies and public authorities to engage in certain recycling and waste-reduction practices, such as double-sided copying and the computerization of files.	No	Yes	Yes		
North Carolina	1989 Solid Waste Management Act established a 25% waste-reduction goal by June 30, 1993. State did not meet 1993 goal. 1991 law added a 40% waste-reduction goal by June 30, 2001. By June 1, 2001, each local government must have submitted a plan that includes a goal for the reduction of municipal solid waste and a further goal of continued reduction by 2006. 1998–99 recovery rates for different programs include 37% for curbside, 35% drop-off, 2% mixed waste, and 26% for other programs. The state reports an estimated overall recovery rate of 32% for 1998–1999 which includes two sectors: 1) the local government which provides an accurate diversion rate of 10%; and 2) the private sector which has data that is more difficult to calculate but has a high diversion rate of approximately 22%.	No	No	No		
North Dakota	1991 law established a 10% waste-diversion goal by June 30, 1995; 20% waste-reduction goal by June 30, 1997; 40% waste-reduction goal by June 30, 2000. State met 1995 and 1997 goals. 1999 had a 27% recycling/composting diversion rate.	No	No	No		
Ohio	Goal for waste reduction and recycling of municipal solid waste was 25% by 2000; 50% of industrial waste by 2000; and 50% for total waste (MSW plus industrial waste). In 1996, the most recent year of recycling rate calculations, the state recycled 42% of waste generated.	No	No	No		

123

	Table AI-1 State Recycling Goals and Mandates ¹ (continued)					
State	Mandate/Goal	Mandate?	Penalty?	Pre-/Post- Consumer Distinction? ²		
Oklahoma	Oklahoma State Recycling and Procurement Act; no mandate, it is voluntary. State government agencies, entities, and schools receiving funding must create a waste reduction program, if it is economically feasible.	No	No	No		
Oregon	1991 law, SB66, set 50% recovery goal by 2000; mandates different recycling rates for different waste sheds; established minimum-content requirements for rigid plastic and glass containers, newsprint, and telephone directories; requires statewide solid-waste plan by 1994; created Recycling Markets Development Council. 1997 legislation directed counties to set new recovery goals equaling the greater of either the numbers in 1995 statutes or actual 1996 recovery rate — it was an effort to encourage counties to work towards the 50% goal. Oregon DEQ showed a 1998 recycling rate of 37.3%.	No	No	Yes		
Pennsylvania	1988 law, Act 101, required state to recycle 25% of municipal waste by January 1, 1997. 1997 goal was met. No new legislation, but the governor announced a new goal of 35% of municipal waste by 2005. 1998 recycling rates averaged 25.6% for the state.	No	Yes (civil and criminal)	Yes, postconsumer		
Rhode Island D	1989 law established a 70% recycling rate with no deadline for achievement. Current recycling rate is approximately 15%. Regulations have changed. The state mandatory list of recyclables has been increased. New composting regulations require composting facilities to register with the state and create plans. Regulations have increased composting.	No	No	No		
South Carolina	1991 law, SB366 set a 30% waste-reduction goal and a 25% recycling goal by 1997. Recycling goal was met but waste reduction was not. In 1999, Bill 3927 increased the state recycling goal of municipal solid waste to 35% by June 30, 2005.	No	No	No		
South Dakota	HB1001 required the phasing in of certain landfill bans; communities may opt out through a referendum. Recycling goals were 25% by July 1, 1996 and 50% by July 1, 2001. The state met the 1996 goal. Recycling rate for 1997 was 42%. October of 1999 reported a source-reduction rate of 43%. Certain items such as yard waste, lead acid batteries, appliances, and waste motor oil are banned from landfills. Any other recycling is up to individual municipalities and is not mandated by the state.	No	No	No		

	Table AI-1 State Recycling Goals and Mandates ¹ (continued)					
State	Mandate/Goal	Mandate?	Penalty?	Pre-/Post- Consumer Distinction? ²		
Tennessee	1991 law, HB1252, required a 25% per capita reduction in solid waste by December 13, 1995. In 1996, reduction rate was 22%. The recycling rate increased from 35% in 1995 to 37% in 1996. In 1995, the 25% solid-waste-reduction goal was extended until 2003.	No	No	No		
Texas	1991 law, SB1340, set a 40% recycling goal of solid waste by 1994; 1993 legislation, SB1051, amended it to become a waste-reduction goal; state did not meet the 1994 goal and no penalty was imposed. 1997 reporting estimated an average of 20% current waste reduction.	No	No	No		
Utah	No recycling laws/goals.	No	No	No		
Vermont	40% waste reduction goal after 2000. State expected to meet the 40% goal. 1998 recycling rate was 36%. 1993 law, SB51, established solid-waste districts that must adopt mandatory source-separation ordinances. Solid Waste Management Plan set a diversion goal of 50% by 2005.	Yes	Yes \$1000 per violation	No		
	1989 law set a 10% recycling goal by 1991, 15% by 1993, and 25% by 1995. All goals were met; localities are recycling at an average of 35%. 1995 law requires localities to maintain a 25% recycling rate and have a solid-waste plan that specifies methods for maintaining the required 25% recycling rate. There are no longer reporting requirements for localities.	No mandate, but required solid-waste management planning	No	No		
Washington	Mandatory recycling goal of 50% by 1995. Loans and grants available to local governments for waste reduction, recycling programs, composting, and education. Waste tax funding goals. Parks, airports, and marinas separate two recycling materials in 1993. Recycling litter tax now applies to by-products produced by some manufacturers and food processors (1992). Business waste tax on trash sent to landfills. Local governments could not institute bans, but the ban on bans was lifted in 1993. State did not meet 1995 goal — all funding ended in 1995 but goal still exists. Recycling rate for 1999 was 32.5%.	Yes	No	Yes, postconsumer		

125

Table AI-1 State Recycling Goals and Mandates ¹ (continued)					
State	Mandate/Goal	Mandate?	Penalty?	Pre-/Post- Consumer Distinction? ²	
West Virginia	1991 law established recycling goals of 20% by 1994; 30% by 2000; 50% by 2010. State did not meet 1994 goal and no penalty was imposed. The average recycling rate was approximately 13% for 1998.	Mandatory for cities above a threshold population and for counties that adopt a mandate provision.	No	No	
Wisconsin	No recycling goals. However, in 1989, Department of Natural Resources regulation (Chapter NR 544) set a standard for a recyclable collection measured in pounds per person per year. Recyclables include newspaper, magazines, aluminum, steel, bimetals, tires, plastic (no. 1 and 2), and glass containers and foam polystyrene packaging. In rural counties, each person should recycle 83.7 pounds per year. In other counties, 108.2 pounds per year. Due to market fluctuation, an exemption exists for recycling polystyrene. There is also a ban on oils, batteries, major appliances, and yard waste from landfills.	No	No	No	
Wyoming	There is no recycling mandate or requirement for municipalities, only guidelines to help the municipalities set up recycling programs.	No	No	No	
 Information in this table is reproduced from the website of the American Forest and Paper Association (www.afandpa.org) and may not reflect states' most recent data. In addition, states' interpretation of definitions of "goals" and "mandates" may differ. Does the state distinguish between pre-consumer recycling (i.e., recycling of industrial scrap) and recycling of collected material after use? States without such distinction may have higher recycling rates since industrial scrap is routinely recycled as part of normal production processes. 					
Source: www.afa	andpa.org.				

Processing and Marketing Recyclables in New York City