



Representative Greg Davids
Co-Chair, House Taxes Committee
2nd Floor Centennial Office Building
St. Paul, MN 55155

Representative Aisha Gomez
Co-Chair, House Taxes Committee
5th Floor Centennial Office Building
St. Paul, MN 55155

Dear Co-Chair Davids, Co-Chair Gomez, and members of the House Taxes Committee:

Ramsey/Washington Recycling & Energy is governed by the joint powers Ramsey/Washington Recycling & Energy Board (R&E Board). The Recycling & Energy Center (R&E Center) in Newport processes all trash generated by individuals and businesses in the two counties. At the R&E Center, approximately 450,000 tons of trash each year is processed to recover recyclable metals and food scraps and make fuel for producing electricity. Through this system, R&E is maximizing the recovery of resources and diverting as much as possible from landfills.

R&E supports HF 3172 and its proposal to create a rebate from a portion of the growth of Solid Waste Management Tax revenues to incentivize recovery of recyclable, compostable, and reusable material. Ideally, Minnesotans source separate their recyclable material at home and send it to our partners in the recycling industry for processing into new products. But, when recyclables do end up in the waste stream, it is important that there are mechanisms in place to capture that material and keep it out of landfills. In 2025 the R&E Center recovered 11,091 tons (over 22 million pounds) of metal from the trash for recycling.

Minnesota needs to invest in the solid waste system to ensure that we continue to move waste up the waste management hierarchy and keep materials out of our landfills. HF 3172 provides a sustainable mechanism for investment that does not rely on extensive general fund resources. We hope that you will join the R&E Board in supporting this important legislation.

Sincerely,

Commissioner MaryJo McGuire
Chair, Ramsey/Washington Recycling & Energy Board



April 27, 2027

Representative Greg Davids, Co-Chair
House Taxes Committee
2nd Floor Centennial Office Building
St. Paul, MN 55155

Representative Gomez, Co-Chair
House Taxes Committee
5th Floor Centennial Office Building
St. Paul, MN 55155

RE: Support for solid waste management tax rebate for materials removed from the waste stream for recycling, composting, or reuse ([HF3172](#))

Dear Chair Davids, Chair Gomez, and Members of the Committee:

I am writing to express strong support for the proposed Solid Waste Management Tax (SWMT) rebate initiative. This common-sense approach will ensure the SWMT, an existing tax collected explicitly for solid waste management, is used as originally intended for waste reduction initiatives.

The rebate structure is smart, straightforward, and results driven. It allocates funding only when measurable waste diversion outcomes are achieved. This model rewards actual impact ton by ton and ensures taxpayer money is used effectively.

The SWMT fund continues to grow annually, making this proposal financially self-sustaining without requiring new appropriations or adding burden to state or local taxpayers. In addition, rebate funds can support both ongoing operations and maintenance (O&M) and the debt service on capital investments in waste diversion infrastructure.

This proposal has the potential to “move the needle.” It rewards sound solid waste management planning and execution while delivering tangible environmental and economic benefits for Olmsted County and communities across Minnesota. Thank you for your consideration of HF3172 (Anderson, P.H.) and the opportunity to lend our support.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "David H. Senjem".

David H. Senjem, Chair
Olmsted County Board of Commissioners
david.senjem@olmstedcounty.gov



MINNESOTA
RESOURCE
RECOVERY
ASSOCIATION

ZERO WASTED
MAKING EVERY RESOURCE COUNT

April 28, 2026

Dear Chairs Davids and Gomez, and Members of the House Tax Committee:

On behalf of the Minnesota Resource Recovery Association (MRRA), we respectfully request your committee advance HF 3172 during the 2026 legislative session.

Minnesota's waste hierarchy prioritizes reducing, reusing, recycling, and recovering materials prior to landfilling. As the Legislature continues to evaluate policies that move waste up the hierarchy and reduce environmental risks, it is important that Minnesota's tax policy reinforces systems that deliver measurable diversion and recovery outcomes.

Minnesota's solid waste management tax was established to support responsible waste practices and reduce landfilling. HF 3172 reinforces this policy intent by creating a targeted tax incentive for materials that are removed from the waste stream and recycled, composted, or beneficially recovered. This proposed financial incentive promotes efficiency, performance, and investment in high-impact public and private waste processing systems. The rebate also will help address debt service costs for essential solid waste management infrastructure upgrades.

The proposed incentive is tied directly to verifiable reporting, and rewards measurable outcomes through a targeted, performance-based incentive. Lastly, this legislation would provide needed revenues by diverting a portion of the growth in SWMT revenues but having a minimal impact on general fund revenues.

For public solid waste programs, this approach supports integrated waste systems without increasing local taxes or fees. It recognizes the environmental value of material separation and recovery while maintaining existing statutory revenue allocations and environmental funding structures.

MRRA stands ready to serve as a technical resource and to brief committee members and staff if needed.

Thank you for your leadership and consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sam Holl".

Sam Holl, Acting Chair
Minnesota Resource Recovery Association

April 27, 2026



Minnesota House
Taxes Committee

Re: Oppose HF3172

Dear Co-Chairs Gomez & Davids and Members of the Committee,

The Minnesota Zero Waste Coalition is a statewide alliance of organizations committed to advancing waste reduction, zero waste solutions, and environmental justice across Minnesota. We envision a system that protects communities and the environment by prioritizing prevention, reuse, and responsible resource recovery.

We are writing today in opposition to HF3172. Rather than supporting the development of equitable, upstream waste solutions, this bill threatens to undermine zero waste efforts across the state.

HF3172 provides rebates from the Solid Waste Management Tax to waste-to-energy incinerators, transfer stations, and other resource recovery facilities for removing recyclables, source-separated compost, and other materials from the waste stream. While we strongly agree that these materials should not be sent to landfills or incinerators, this legislation rewards extraction at the point of disposal rather than building systems that recover materials upstream—where recovery is cleaner, more effective, and better for communities.

We find this proposal deeply problematic for several reasons:

The Bill Rewards Incineration Instead of Preventing Waste

HF3172 includes a rebate for waste-to-energy facilities based on the volume of ash they generate and use in construction projects or “another approved use.” This creates a troubling incentive to burn waste instead of reducing it. Incinerator ash often contains hazardous substances like heavy metals, and using it in construction materials presents long-term environmental and public health risks due to the potential for toxic leaching into surrounding soil and water. Additionally, it’s unclear what “another approved use” would refer to and who would approve this. Public funds should be directed toward reducing harm—not subsidizing disposal methods that perpetuate pollution.

SCORE Dollars Should Be Invested in Solutions at the Top of the Waste Hierarchy

Cities and counties across Minnesota are facing growing financial pressure to maintain critical waste, recycling, and composting services. Directing limited public resources toward facilities that manage waste only after it’s been discarded diverts funding away from upstream strategies that truly reduce waste—like reuse systems, source-separated organics collection, and equitable

recycling access. We need to prioritize investment in prevention, not subsidize systems that operate at the bottom of the hierarchy.

Rebates Must Be Tied to Proven Zero Waste Outcomes

While the removal of metals and other recoverable materials at disposal facilities is important, these materials are often too contaminated to be effectively reused or recycled. By the time items reach a resource recovery or incineration facility, the opportunity for high-quality recovery is largely lost. Public funding should support strategies that prevent contamination in the first place—like upstream collection, reuse programs, and community-driven infrastructure that ensures materials are clean and recoverable before they become waste.

Concerns About Compostable Materials and Misuse of the Term “Source-Separated”

In practice, the only organic material that could qualify for a rebate under this bill is material collected in blue bags alongside trash, such as in Ramsey County. There are other mechanisms to ensure those materials are exempt from the Solid Waste Management Tax. Other organics found at resource recovery facilities are not truly source-separated and are typically too contaminated to be composted. Extending financial incentives to these materials risks greenwashing poor-quality recovery efforts and undermines genuine composting initiatives.

We urge the legislature to reject HF3172. Instead, we recommend requiring better data and reporting on recyclables and other materials removed at resource recovery and incineration facilities. Additional funding through the SCORE program should be directed where it’s most effective: toward strategies at the top of the hierarchy—waste reduction, reuse, community composting, and source-separated recycling and organics collection.

Thank you for your time and consideration of our shared responsibility to advance policies that protect public health, climate, and environmental justice.

The following Minnesota Zero Waste Coalition Members & Partners sign-on to this letter:

- | | |
|---|---|
| Maggie Schuppert
Director of Strategic Initiatives
CURE | Maria Jensen
Co-Director
Recycling Electronics for Climate Action |
| Lucy Mullany
Vice President of Policy & Communications
Eureka Recycling | Lori Olinger
Co-Lead
Coalition for Plastic Reduction |
| Nazir Khan
Executive Director
MN Environmental Justice Table | Emily Barker
Executive Director
Reuse Minnesota |
| Kelley Skumautz
Executive Director
Health Professionals for a Healthy Climate | Evan Mulholland
Healthy Communities Program Director
MN Center for Environmental Advocacy |

Kathryn Ringham & Mike Griffin
Leaders
Elder Climate Action Twin Cities

Judy Lissick
Co-Lead
Vadnais Heights Green Team

Kate Winsor
Co-Lead
Northeast Metro Climate Action

Judy Gregg
Co-Chair of Earth Stewards
St Luke Presbyterian Church

Kris Moua
Owner
The Swap Closet

Jean Ross
Board Chair
Vote Climate

Debbie Nelson
Lead
Lakeville Friends of the Environment

Abdulrahman Wako
Executive Director
Elliot Park Neighborhood Inc.

Nichole Jacquez
Member
Students for Climate Justice

Andy Pearson
Three Waters Pipeline Resistance Team

The Following Minnesota Residents Sign-On:

Todd Bartholomay, Minneapolis, MN
Christine Popowski, Minneapolis, MN
Alice J. Belden, Cottage Grove, MN
Rebecca W. Gaertner Minneapolis, MN
Kristine Strasburg, Stillwater, MN
Meghan Peterson, Stillwater, MN
Jo Holub, Bloomington, MN
Joseph Crowe, White Bear Lake, MN
Jackie Smolen, Minnetonka, MN
John Rodman, St. Paul, MN
Amy Shellabarger, Minneapolis, MN
Theresa Chmiel, New Brighton, MN
Tina Clarke, St. Paul, MN
Michael Walker, Minneapolis, MN
Kaja Just, St. Paul, MN
Lea J Hosley, Plymouth, MN
Jaci Christenson White Bear Lake, MN
Karen Lunde, Minneapolis, MN
Beverly Montgomery, Minneapolis, MN
Lydia DeGross, Minneapolis, MN

Tess Dornfeld, Bdeóta Othúŋwe, MN
Rebecca Cramer, Minneapolis, MN
Elizabeth Bonin, Minneapolis, MN
Elianna Lippold-Johnson, Minneapolis, MN
Kristen Ingle, Minneapolis, MN
Joel Campbell, Minneapolis, MN
Jessica Garraway, Minneapolis, MN
Kelly Moore, Minneapolis, MN
Gwen Myers, Minnetonka, MN
Brinsley Davis, Minneapolis, MN
Fredrick Anderson, Minneapolis, MN
Luke Norquist, St. Paul, MN
Stephani Maari Booker, Minneapolis, MN

April 28, 2026



Minnesota House
Taxes Committee

Re: Oppose HF3172

Dear Chair Davids, Chair Gomez, and Members of the Committee,

Eureka Recycling is committed to improving recycling and reducing waste in Minnesota. Unfortunately HF3172 will not help us accomplish these goals but rather hurts waste reduction and zero waste efforts across the state.

The legislation provides waste-to-energy facilities, transfer stations and other resource recovery facilities a rebate from the solid waste management tax for removing recyclables, source separated compost, and other materials from the waste stream. While these materials should not be sent to incinerators or landfills, we need to create systems that incentivize collection of these materials before they end up in the trash.

We find this proposal problematic for several reasons:

- **SCORE Funding Should Prioritize Solutions Higher on the Waste Hierarchy:** Counties and cities across Minnesota are struggling to cover the rising costs of waste management. Instead of offering tax rebates to facilities that operate lower on the hierarchy, we should invest in **proven, upstream solutions**—those that reduce waste at the source, support scalable reuse systems, require organics diversion, and ensure equitable access to recycling and composting for all residents and businesses.
- **Incentivizing Incineration Over Prevention:** The legislation includes a rebate for waste-to-energy incinerators based on the volume of ash used in construction projects—effectively rewarding facilities for burning materials rather than preventing waste in the first place. This incentivizes disposal over reduction, reuse, or recycling. Additionally, using incinerator ash in construction poses environmental and public health risks, as it can contain heavy metals and other toxic substances that may leach into soil and water over time.
- **Incentives Should Support Zero Waste Solutions:** While it's appropriate for facilities to be required to remove metals from the waste stream, the majority of recyclables, compostables, or reusable items recovered at this stage are typically heavily contaminated. Resources should go toward interventions that prevent these materials from entering the waste stream in the first place, where they are far more likely to be successfully recovered for further use.

- **Compost Definition and Funding Concerns:** The only "source-separated organics" recovered at resource recovery facilities are those co-collected with trash in blue bags, such as in Ramsey County. There are other mechanisms to ensure those materials are exempt from the solid waste management tax. Other organic materials at these facilities are not truly source-separated and are often too contaminated to be composted.

Our recommendation is that the legislature pass a bill that requires better reporting on recyclables removed from resource recovery and waste-to-energy facilities and invest additional SCORE funding at the top of the hierarchy – reduction, reuse, community composting, and recycling and organics collection and end market development.

Sincerely,



Lucy Mullany
Vice President of Policy & Communications
Eureka Recycling
www.eurekarecycling.org
lucym@eurekarecycling.org

April 28, 2026

Representative Greg Davids
Representative Aisha Gomez
Co-Chairs of the Committee on Taxes

Re: HF 3172 – Anderson: Rebate from the solid waste management tax for materials removed from the waste stream for recycling, composting, or reuse required; and money appropriated.

Dear Chair Davids, Chair Gomez and Committee Members,

The City of Minneapolis supports the concept behind HF 3172 but feels additional work is needed before this bill should be considered for adoption.

Additional discussion by waste, recycling, composting and reuse industries are needed on the following aspects of the bill:

- **Diversion from landfills.** There are facilities in the State who are saving reusable and recyclable items at landfills. As written, the bill would not allow for these programs to be eligible for a rebate, and it's considerably easier, lower cost, and safer for materials removed at landfills for reuse or recycling than at resource recovery facilities or waste-to-energy facilities.
- **Diverted for composting.** If the intent of the bill is to offer a rebate for organics diverted through durable compostable bag programs, the draft language covers this activity. If the intent is to offer a rebate on additional removal of organics from mixed municipal solid waste (MMSW), the definition for compostable materials needs to be modified as it defines compostable materials as 'source-separated compostable materials.' Removal of organics from 'trash' is not source-separated. Compost facilities should also be engaged to verify they will accept organic materials separated from mixed municipal solid waste (MMSW) before they should be considered eligible for a rebate.
- **Solid Waste Management (SWM) Tax rebate for source-separated organics.** A broader discussion with the Department of Revenue is needed to accurately classify what portion of an co-collected (organics in a durable bag collected with MMSW) should not be subject to SWM taxes and fees.
- **Diverted for reuse.** Subd.2. (2) *the number of tons of recyclable material that are manually or mechanically separated from mixed municipal solid waste that are reused*, is not accurate. Recyclable materials (per the definition) are not items that would be considered reused by the industry. Reusable items could include a wide variety of other items from furniture, fixtures and storage bins to even building materials. Additional discussion is needed to identify what materials should qualify for reuse. If building materials are included, a separate rebate may need to be developed as Construction and Demolition landfills have a different SWM tax structure than MMSW.
- **Combustor ash and other 'beneficial uses'.** We do not feel that WTE ash or a vague description of other approved use should be eligible for a rebate.
- **Rebate calculation.** Additional research is needed to understand the full implications of the rebates for these activities.

Most importantly, the State should prioritize the reallocation of Solid Waste Management Tax funding currently siphoned from the Environmental Fund to the State's General Fund to its intended purpose. The increase of the State's recycling and composting goal in 2014 set higher expectations on counties and cities to develop or expand diversion programs and educational efforts to meet the goal. It did not, however, come with sustainable on-going funding for increased programs or educational efforts. Since the implementation of SCORE and SWM taxes, cities and counties have gone from just offering recycling programs to adding organics programs, electronics recycling, mattress recycling and a wide variety of reuse programs and activities – all without a permanent increase in SCORE funding to support these efforts.

The City appreciates the work done by authors and stakeholders in developing HF 3172 to be used as a starting point for industry discussions. The City is interested in working collaboratively with other solid waste management stakeholders to improve this bill for next session.

Sincerely,



Nicholas Gerold, Director
Division of Solid Waste & Recycling
City of Minneapolis