OPINION

Tax proposals threaten recycling

By Doug Koplow

Though attracting far less press attention than proposals to drill for oil in the Arctic, new tax breaks for landfilling and virgin material production have been included in a host of energy bills introduced by Democrats and Republicans alike

Under the banner of increasing the use of existing domestic energy resources, these provisions pose a significant long-term threat to the economic viability of recycling and

composting programs.

Many of the bills expand Section 45 tax credits (currently worth roughly 1.7 cents per kilowatt-hour) to include steel cogen-eration and a wide range of biomass sources. Originally, these credits were limited to wind power and biomass grown exclusive-ly for energy production. Some of the bills may also provide incre-mental tax credits for investing in industrial cogeneration equipment at these very same plants.

Current proposals (e.g., S. 389 and S. 596) exclude only unsegregated municipal solid waste, paper "destined for recycling," and oldgrowth timber from their list of eligible biomass. Questions regard-ing how much sorting of MSW is needed to obtain the credits, or of how one defines which paper is "unrecyclable," are left unan-swered. If ferrous removal turns MSW "segregated," for example, most waste-to-energy plants in the country would get the subsidy.

The bills provide rather bizarre incentives. Old pallets are subsidized if burned rather than recycled; crop residues and animal wastes are subsidized if burned for energy rather than composted. Byproducts of virgin paper production, including mill residues, all receive tax breaks, S. 389 and possibly S. 596 extend eligibility to any facility recovering energy from biomass, even if the plant is already in operation. This means that virgin paper mills can likely claim tax credits for energy recov-ery systems that have been in use for decades. Subsidies to steel also skew the market: 90 percent of all steel cogeneration occurs at integrated mills that use relatively little steel scrap.

Determining the aggregate val-

ue of proposed subsidies to all the industries that compete with recycling is difficult. However, because provisions often extend eligibility for tax breaks to publicly owned facilities (allowing them to sell tax credits that would otherwise be of no value to a tax-exempt entity)

A LOOK BACK

1916: Thomas Jasperson obtains a patent for making paper from deinked wastepaper.

Five years ago this week: New Jersey officials say they will appeal a federal judge's decision to throw out the state's flow control-based waste management system.

A year ago this week: Voters in Kansas City, Mo., reject a proposed citywide curbside recycling program by a margin of 54 percent to 46 percent.

GUEST VIEW

and to energy recovery facilities already in operation, total subsi-

dies are likely to be quite high.
The Joint Committee on Taxation estimated the revenue loss from analogous proposals included in H.R. 2511 at an average of \$235 million per year, a value that seems far too low. A detailed examination of landfill gas credit proposals suggests that they alone are worth more than \$250 million per year. Since one ton of waste in place at a landfill continues to generate landfill gas (and tax credits) for many years, the present value of the new subsidies to landfills could reach \$2 billion to \$4 billion. The pulp and paper industry also stands to gain a great deal. As the largest industrial producer of biomass-based, self-generated elec-tricity, access to Section 45 tax credits could be worth upwards of \$750 million per year. The vast majority will go to virgin mills.

Recovery of waste energy from whatever source makes sense. Many plants already do so with-out taxpayer support, and more will move in this direction given the rise in energy prices. Over the long term, however, it is changes in how we make and use our basic

est environmental benefit. Subsidizing disposal and energy-inten-sive virgin production undermines the economic benefits of recycling and composting at a time when these programs are already strug-gling. The recycling community should fight these proposed subsi-dies as if its future depended on defeating them. It may,

Koplow is president of Earth Track Inc., Cambridge, Mass

Our customers

"Always exceeds production guarantees."

¹¹Every aspect . . . met or exceeded our expectations.¹³

ffl highly recommend

Bollegraaf and Van Dyk

Wonderful to work with...

gave us many innovative

"Always have the needs of the customer in mind."

Great Lakes International Recycling Roseville, Michigan

tell our story

Why Bollegraaf Equipment?

OWEST COST ER TON!



With over 350 systems installed throughout North America, Bollegraaf shredders, balers and sorting systems are the industry standard. Designed for high speed, fully automatic operation, lower maintenance, and lower energy consumption, they deliver a consistently lower cost per ton than any competitor. For more information and an informative video, contact us today.

VAN DYK BALER CORPORA

Southeast Region: Midwest Region: Western Region:

Main Office: Telephone: (203) 967-1100 Fax: (203) 967-1199 Telephone: (305) 374-0300 Telephone: (312) 595-1700 Telephone: (310) 378-9700

Telephone: (519) 940-3000

Fax: (305) 554-7422 Fax: (312) 595 -0002 Fax: (312) 378-4926 Fax: (519) 940-9853

website: www.vandykbaler.com

e-mail: info@vandykbaler.com

North American Distributor of Bollegraaf Equipment