

10 percent. If you look on the next page, you'll see the projected costs for landfilling in the future. In 1991 householding is now approximately \$100, average, across the state per year. By 1996 that cost could rise to \$161 per year. For businesses it could go from 420 in '91, to 676 in 1996. So the spending by the entire state on solid waste disposal, if we make absolutely no changes by 1996, could rise to \$135.3 million. The next page describes simply what solid waste management means under 163 and the hierarchy we created, volume reduction, recycling, reuse, and vegetative waste composting, incineration, and energy resource recovery, incineration for volume reduction, and land disposal. This is what we put into the state solid waste management hierarchy. The bottom of that page we show what happens and how laws affect what we will and will not do. Just taking as an example volume reduction at the source, there will be state, local, and federal legislation affecting that. There will be regulations on the local, state, and federal level. But the programs will be simply from the local and state level. We don't expect any funding from the federal level. If we want to affect institutional commitment, that will have to come from the local level, and personal commitment, of course, comes from the local, or even the household level. We projected...ran some figures that if we reduce our volume by 15 percent, by 1996, that we could save \$115 million, excuse me, that the total costs would be reduced to \$115 million. That means a \$20 million reduction as compared to if we did nothing. Now this is not money that is in anyone's bookkeeping system, it's money that we can transfer to volume reduction to properly dispose of our waste and extend the life of our landfills. In other words, if you're paying X amount of dollars per ton to dispose of your waste right now, and that total is the 115 or 135 million dollars, and you take volume reduction steps, you're disposing of that much less volume, so you will incur that much less of a cost. So you can shift the \$20.3 million towards a volume reduction effort and break even, but yet do the more environmentally sound practice of waste reduction, and thus the other costs, such as extending the life of your landfill, reducing toxicity; reducing the amount of miles traveled and the people involved in the system can save you that money that you can use towards volume reduction. If we...taking on the next step to recycle and reuse 25 percent of solid waste by 1996, we can have a further reduction of \$33.8 million state wide to spend on recycling and reuse. So, if we take these positive steps in solid waste management, we can transfer costs of approximately 53,