

**Summary Minutes  
Solid Waste Management Advisory Council (SWAC)  
February 17, 2005  
High Banks Metro Park  
9466 Columbus Pike  
Lewis Center, OH 43035**

**The Following Members Announced Their Attendance at Roll Call:**

Erv Ball, Health Departments  
Brad Biggs, ODO's Director's Designee  
James Gilliland, Counties  
Karl Graham, Municipalities  
Dan Harris, EPA's Director's Designee  
Dell Heitcamp, Public  
Steve Hill, Industrial Generators  
Ron Kolbash, ODNR Director's Designee  
Mike Long, Single County SWMDs  
Richard Mavis, Municipalities  
Joe Sykes, Townships  
Kathy Trent, Private Solid Waste Management  
Richard Williams, Townships

**The Following Members Were Also in Attendance:**

Sean Logan, Counties [approximate arrival: 12:05 p.m.]

**November 18, 2004 Meeting Minutes Approved**

The first order of business was to review and approve meeting minutes from November 18, 2004. Mike Long MOVED to approve the November 18, 2004 minutes, Erv Ball SECONDED the motion. The minutes were approved on voice vote.

**Update on Legislative/DSIWM Issues**

Mr. Harris announced Joseph Koncelik's new Directorship at Ohio EPA. Former Director Christopher Jones resigned and is now employed by a private law firm. Director Koncelik has served as Assistant Director at Ohio EPA for a number of years after having also served at the Ohio Attorney General's Office in the area of environmental enforcement.

Other Ohio EPA leadership changes include a new appointment for Assistant Director. Ohio EPA's new Assistant Director is Laura Powell. Assistant Director Powell has been involved with Ohio EPA policy and legislative activities for the past several years. She has been significantly involved with Ohio EPA's budget preparation efforts.

Mr. Harris requested that any SWAC member who has been directed by the Governor's Office to attend a required ethics course, but who has not yet taken the course, please contact Kevin Shoemaker.

Mr. Harris informed SWAC members that Ohio EPA would soon begin the process

necessary to seek appointments/reappointments to SWAC for the positions that have expiring terms in late June, 2005. SWAC members whose terms expire this June are requested to contact Kevin Shoemaker so that we may know who is interested in seeking reappointment to SWAC.

The Ohio Department of Taxation has informed Ohio EPA that it is reducing the amount of withholding for fees collected on scrap tires from four percent to two percent. After the change, the additional money (approximately \$120,000.00) will be deposited into the scrap tire management fund and will be used for scrap tire cleanups.

Andrew Booker, Environmental Supervisor, DSIWM, distributed copies of recently proposed House Bill 59. The proposed Bill, addressing construction and demolition debris, was introduced Tuesday by Representatives Law and Harwood. The Bill has been referred to committee. It appears that the focus of this Bill deals with siting criteria.

**Training and Certification Program For Operators of Solid Waste Facilities/Infectious Waste Treatment Facilities and Health District Staff (Andrew Booker, Environmental Supervisor, DSIWM)**

Mr. Booker began covering this agenda topic by indicating that this presentation is only intended to be an abbreviated version of a future agenda item that will be planned for the May meeting of SWAC. SWAC should anticipate learning more detailed information about this topic in May from DSIWM representatives who are working to develop and ensure implementation of the training/certification program.

Mr. Booker identified the statutory basis for DSIWM's development of the training/certification program. Specifically, Ohio Revised Code 3734.02(L) charges Ohio EPA with developing the training and certification program.

Ohio EPA first attempted to develop and implement the training/certification program in the early 1990s. This attempt included filing rules for the training/certification program as well as the creation of a draft training manual by Ohio EPA's consultant. However, it was anticipated that the cost for the training/certification would be prohibitive to health districts. With this anticipation, the rule writing process ceased and the program was put on hold.

Approximately six months ago, Ohio EPA renewed its commitment to develop the training/certification program and ensure its implementation. Progress is now being made and program options are being compiled for review by Ohio EPA management. Ohio EPA is expecting to begin the curriculum development and rule-writing process later this year so that implementation for the training/certification program may begin as early as mid to late 2006.

SWAC members were advised to contact Gina Gerbasi, Environmental Specialist, DSIWM, if additional information is desired prior to the May meeting of SWAC.

**Ohio EPA Budget—Environmental Protection Fee (Laura Powell, Assistant Director, Ohio EPA)**

Ms. Powell began by sharing a summary of some of the initial conversations that transpired when Ohio EPA and the Office of Budget and Management (OBM) first met to tackle the upcoming budget cycle. In these initial conversations, OBM encouraged Ohio EPA to be creative thinkers for how the Agency's budgetary needs could be met. However, even with this type of introduction for this year's budgetary process, Ohio EPA never envisioned that this opportunity would lead to identifying a new funding source that would stand in place of the approximately \$20 million Ohio EPA would normally receive from Ohio's general revenue accounts. Nevertheless, a replacement funding source for Ohio EPA's expenditures normally covered by general revenue funds is the directive Ohio EPA has been given by the Taft Administration.

The Governor's office has proposed a new Environmental Protection Fee (EPF) that will enable Ohio EPA to meet the directive to wean itself from State general revenue funds that have historically been used by Ohio EPA to cover a portion of the Agency's budgetary needs. The new EPF would be \$2.75 per ton for all solid waste disposed in Ohio's landfills. The addition of the new fee would increase Ohio's disposal fee to \$4.75 per ton. The new fee would be adopted with Ohio's 2006-2007 budget. Under this scenario, October, 2005 would be the effective date for the new EPF.

The new EPF would not only be used to meet a portion of Ohio EPA's budgetary needs, but part of the fee would be used to sustain the entire budget for the Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Division of Recycling and Litter Prevention (ODNR-DRLP). ODNR-DRLP is facing the loss of the corporate franchise tax used to supply all its budgetary needs in this upcoming budget cycle. Part of the new EPF would be forwarded to ODNR-DRLP after being collected by Ohio EPA. The portion of the EPF being earmarked for ODNR-DRLP is \$1.00 of the total \$2.75 per ton fee amount.

It is estimated that the new EPF would generate approximately \$39.7 million dollars annually. Using this estimate Ohio EPA would receive \$25.2 million annually and ODNR-DRLP would receive \$14.5 million each year. The anticipated \$39.7 million dollars anticipated for Ohio EPA would replace all general revenue funding used to fund seven environmental programs, allow Ohio EPA to initiate new programs to comply with the federal Clean Air Act requirements, and be used for matching funds to secure about \$23.4 million in federal grants. The anticipated \$14.5 million dollars anticipated for ODNR-DRLP would replace the revenue that ODNR-DRLP currently receives from a corporate franchise tax, be passed on to Ohio communities to support local recycling and litter prevention efforts, be used to build recycling markets, and be used to create jobs in the recycling industry.

Ms. Powell identified several factors that lead to EPF being applied to solid waste disposal. The general theme for this reasoning is that everyone will share in the responsibility to protect Ohio's environment, even out-of-state residents when their wastes are sent for disposal in Ohio. It is estimated that every Ohioan will contribute approximately \$2.00 each year toward the new EPF. It is estimated that residents in other states would contribute nearly \$6 million, in total, each year to Ohio's environmental programs.

Although this proposed fee for waste disposal is a significant increase in the State disposal fees collected at Ohio's disposal facilities, the total State fee proposed for collection is well below what other neighboring state governments charge in fees for disposal. West Virginia's state disposal fee is \$8.75 per ton and Pennsylvania's state disposal fee is \$6.25 per ton.

It was also noted that Ohio is not forging into new territory by using fees collected on disposal of solid waste to fund environmental programs unrelated to solid waste management. Both West Virginia and Pennsylvania uses a portion of their respective state disposal fees to fund multiple environmental programs.

Ms. Powell identified some anticipated effects of the proposed fee increase as well as anticipated impacts for Ohio EPA and ODNR-DRLP resulting from non-passage of the proposed fee increase. The fee increase would result in an average per ton disposal cost of \$33.35 for waste disposed at Ohio landfills. This, in turn, could effect waste disposal in Ohio by making it a less attractive destination for long-haul waste.

The major impact for Ohio EPA with non-passage of the EPF would mostly likely result in a significant reduction of staff positions. The proposed fee is needed to support 181 positions in Ohio EPA's workforce. ODNR-DRLP would experience the impact of complete dissolution of the Division. This would result in elimination of 33 staff positions and the elimination of grants to communities.

Other impacts for non-passage of the fee include the potential adverse effects directed toward Ohio's citizens and Ohio's environment. Ohio could no longer be provided the environmental protections that are currently afforded. The specific areas of environmental service that would suffer are programs for: drinking water, stream quality, air quality, site cleanup and emergency response, hazardous waste, compliance assistance and pollution prevention, lab services, and recycling/litter prevention.

Following Ms. Powell's presentation were several questions and responses.

Ms. Trent indicated that although the solid waste private industry has taken no formal position, it is the general consensus of private industry that Ohio EPA be adequately funded. Private industry is mostly concerned that the amount of the EPF is appropriate for the required services.

Ms. Trent articulated that private industry views the EPF as a form of a generation fee that is being imposed on everyone, not a fee that is being levied upon the private solid waste industry. According to Ms. Trent, the private sector will essentially be fulfilling the role of tax collector for the new EPF by including a charge that will be added to existing tipping fee payment. The private solid waste industry does not intend to remit the EPF amounts using out-of-pocket monies.

Ms. Trent also reminded SWAC that while Ohio receives amounts of out-of-state waste, it also ships waste out-of-state for disposal. The addition of the EPF with several existing fees collect by solid waste management districts and other fees at the local level may result in higher amounts of wastes generated in Ohio that will be sent for disposal at out-of-state facilities. According to Ms. Trent, the increase of waste disposal fees in Ohio will make it attractive for companies to dispose Ohio generated waste in

the surrounding states of Michigan, Kentucky, and Indiana where it may make more economic sense to use facilities in these states. According to Ms. Trent, private industry anticipates that Ohio's waste export amounts could double in the future as a result of increased fees for disposal. Ms. Trent recommends that Ohio EPA, ODNR-DRLP, and Ohio's solid waste management districts give this serious consideration when planning their budgets. Consideration for Ohio's solid waste facilities that may be effected should also be given.

In response to a question presented by Mr. Biggs, it was noted by Mr. Booker that Indiana's disposal fee is much lower than what Ohio's disposal fee would be with the EPF. However, Mr. Booker also suggested that it is difficult to make direct comparisons for disposal fees because other states may have different types of fees associated with the disposal of waste that do not fit into similar categories.

Ms. Trent stated her familiarity of several other tax and budget adjustments taking place now in Ohio. She reminded SWAC that a significant portion of the licensing fees for solid waste facilities is currently deposited into Ohio's general revenue fund. Since the general revenue will no longer be used to support Ohio EPA, there should be consideration for how Health Districts may receive increased funding through the licensing fees.

Ms. Trent reminded SWAC that every business, industry, local government, etc. is learning to make adjustments in order to provide added services in times of limited financial resources. Ms. Trent questioned if there are certain programs that Ohio EPA or ODNR-DRLP could consider delaying implementation of or reducing in some fashion. She also suggested that it may be economically beneficial to restructure the two state agencies. As an example, Ms. Trent suggested that Ohio EPA could be restructured to cover the grant related responsibilities of ODNR-DRLP's existing programs. Perhaps the extra \$1.00 for ODNR-DRLP's portion of the EPF could be reduced by restructuring the two programs.

Ms. Trent is certain that private industry will be fielding questions from the public regarding Ohio's fiscal accountability. Private industry wants to be prepared to answer these types of questions. Ohio EPA and ODNR-DRLP should ensure that all the monies being sought are for high priority programs geared for environmental protection. Private industry will be looking to Ohio EPA and ODNR-DRLP to respond to these types of questions and concerns in order to identify the true need for the EPF.

Ms. Powell indicated that Ohio EPA has been involved with this type of critical analysis in the past for previous budget cycles. Ohio EPA has been fortunate in the past by securing various fee revenues that served to offset the loss of general revenue funding. At one point Ohio EPA had frozen the hiring process and engaged in a process of evaluating all positions being filled in a critical manner. As in the past, Ohio EPA is now applying critical considerations that will result in greater fiscal efficiency. One cost saving change that will be implemented is the physical moving of Ohio EPA's Central District Office to the location of Ohio EPA's Central Office at the downtown Columbus Lazarus Government Center. This move is estimated to benefit Ohio EPA with a cost savings of more than \$500,000 on an annual basis. Generally speaking, it is Ohio EPA's practice to critically analyze the programs and functions of the Agency from the perspective of being able to accomplish our mission while also "trimming off the fat."

Ms. Trent expressed concern that Ohio EPA-DSIWM's funding not be jeopardized as a result of the EPF. She stated that mechanisms should be in place to protect DSIWM's core funding from any potential future consideration that may be felt to have higher priority. Ms. Powell responded that the mechanics of the funding structure places the EPF and DSIWM's existing disposal fee revenue in separate accounts. Therefore, there should be no negative impacts to DSIWM's historic funding mechanism.

Ms. Trent proposed that consideration be given to including EPF fees for waste disposed at C&DD facilities and at captive landfills. In doing so, the EPF could be adjusted to a lesser amount than what is currently being proposed. Collecting fees from all disposal facilities would lessen the burden placed solely upon municipal solid waste disposal facilities.

Ms. Powell indicated that the suggestion is well received. Representatives from several different entities have worked hard to develop and improve the C&DD program. We do not want to hinder the progress being made in this area through unintended consequence that would cause more solid waste being sent for disposal at C&DD sites.

Mr. Long mentioned attending a meeting yesterday with the Organization of Solid Waste Districts of Ohio (OSWDO). Speaking on behalf of OSWDO, Mr. Long stated that there is a consensus from this group of opposition to the EPF. Mr. Long distributed copies of a document he prepared titled "Statement before the SWAC" for today's distribution to SWAC members. This document is stated to contain a summary of the consensus issues derived by OSWDO regarding the EPF.

Solid waste management coordinators and directors are opposed to this for a variety of reasons. First, members of OSWDO are somewhat stunned at the idea of imposing what they view as a "trash tax." Moreover, members of OSWDO are disappointed regarding the absence of communication by Ohio EPA during the development of the idea for the EPF. Also, on first glance, OSWDO suspects that the amount of fee being considered for the EPF results in higher amounts of revenue than what is currently being secured by the Agencies. Mr. Long recognized that some of the OSWDO concerns may result from lack of understanding in the absence of communication. He stated that Ms. Powell's presentation today has assisted in this area in some ways.

Other concerns being raised by OSWDO include questions for why the solid waste industry should be burdened to cover the costs for environmental threats caused by other industry types. In addition, OSWDO has similar concerns and opinions that match those expressed by Ms. Trent regarding the potential need for Ohio EPA and ODNR-DRLP to make adjustments so that adequate services may continue to be provided in times of limited financial resources,

With these stated objections, Mr. Long also indicated that OSWDO hopes to work with Ohio EPA and ODNR-DRLP to assist in meeting everyone's goals, where possible.

Ms. Powell responded to Mr. Long's suggestion of poor communication by Ohio EPA during the developmental stages of the EPF. She explained that although we tried to do as much outreach as possible, the circumstances associated with the EPF did not allow for the standard type of outreach/feedback initiatives that Ohio EPA generally tries to promote. Ohio EPA was not in a situation where additional funds were being sought for

new or existing programs. This situation presented itself from a totally new angle in that we were being guided by the Governor's office on how to identify a brand new source of revenue that would allow us to meet the necessary expense requirements. This did not provide an opportunity for us to solicit support through our standard outreach/feedback initiatives. Nevertheless, Ohio EPA representatives did meet with private industry, including Ms. Trent, a week or two prior to the announcement of the EPF proposal. Ms. Powell apologized for the unusual circumstances that prevented the type of outreach Ohio EPA has implemented in the past. Mr. Harris added that DSIWM is presently available and willing to attend meetings, or coordinate meetings with other Ohio EPA representatives, with anyone who has a desire to learn more about the EPF proposal. Ohio EPA recognizes that the EPF has significant impacts for private industry and governmental organizations and we want to be as responsive as possible to every concern.

Mr. Biggs identified a perception or theory that may surface with implementation of the EPF related to the stated goals of Ohio EPA and the *State Plan* to promote recycling and waste reduction. This perception or theory might communicate that Ohio EPA has less incentive to promote recycling since greater economic benefits are directed toward Ohio EPA when wastes are disposed in Ohio landfills. Mr. Biggs suggested that it may be more appropriate to seek revenues for Ohio EPA through some other fee mechanism. Mr. Harris responded that Ohio EPA would, as always, be delighted to see recycling boost in Ohio. He is confident that Ohio EPA would adapt its budget in a stronger environment for recycling.

Mr. Long suggested that larger cities that provide subsidies for waste disposal may end up in the situation where disposal facility gate fees result in unintended elimination of recycling programs. Mr. Harris stated that this has seemingly always been a hurdle for communities that subsidize waste disposal. Often residents of these communities are faced with the situation of incurring no additional charges for waste disposal while recycling is only available if payments are made. The strongest economic way to encourage recycling, and make it economically competitive, is through implementation of pay-as-you-throw programs, not government subsidies.

Mr. Booker added that Ohio EPA is well aware that solid waste management districts and municipalities will be most effected by the EPF. Ohio EPA is open for discussions to determine the best way Ohio EPA can assist these entities.

Chairman Harris opened the floor for comments by members of the public.

Patrick Holland, Executive Director of the Cuyahoga County Solid Waste Management District, offered comments regarding the proposed EPF. Mr. Holland distributed information that he stated would lend support to the idea that solid waste management districts and municipalities will be highly impacted by the EPF. The information shared by Mr. Holland summarized additional cost estimates that would result from the EPF for communities in Cuyahoga County. The estimates shown by Mr. Holland indicate that the additional fee amounts collected for the EPF would cost Cuyahoga County communities a total of nearly 2 million dollars (using the 2003 disposal estimates). Mr. Holland also suggested that when the additional EPF fees are added to all other applicable disposal fees paid on Cuyahoga County wastes sent for disposal, it amounts to over 15.5 million dollars. With cost amounting to this level, Mr. Holland stated that he

would be forced to advocate out-of-state disposal for wastes generated in Cuyahoga County as a logical business decision. This, in turn, would create funding deficiencies for the Cuyahoga County Solid Waste Management District causing many of the existing recycling initiatives to be in jeopardy.

Ms. Powell summarized the topic by stating that Ohio EPA does not operate in a vacuum. We realize that other programs may suffer in communities that are shifting the financial burden from one area to the another. We want to make the most of the time now being spent for considerations to create the EPF. The Director provided budget testimony to the House Finance Committee this past Tuesday. He is scheduled to provide additional testimony for the budget March 9, 2005. Meanwhile, we want to meet with the interested stakeholders as an outreach effort so that we can develop a better understanding of all the consequences associated with implementation of the proposed EPF. SWAC members were directed to Ohio EPA's web site where current updates will be posted regarding the EPF.

### **History of ODNR's Division of Recycling and Litter Prevention (ODNR-DRLP) and Discussion of Future DRLP Funding (Donna Stusek, Deputy Chief and Ron Kolbash, Chief, ODNR-DRLP)**

Mr. Kolbash served to introduce this topic, to be covered by Ms. Stusek, by sharing some general comments. He stated that although ODNR-DRLP has been working to promote recycling and litter prevention in Ohio for the past 25 years, many people are still unaware of the activities that the Division is involved with and the accomplishments that have been made. The presentation that Ms. Stusek will share today was developed about two years ago. However, this presentation has been revised to include more current information.

Mr. Kolbash explained that when you compare how ODNR-DRLP is funded to how equivalent state agencies are funded for some of the other 49 states you will quickly realize that the historical way ODNR-DRLP has been funded is very unique. Some other states fund their version of Ohio's DRLP through bottle and can bills, tipping fees, and general revenue, etc. Ohio is the only state that uses a franchise tax as the funding mechanism for its DRLP. Historically, the franchise tax has worked well in Ohio. The franchise tax generates approximately 13 million dollars each year. Historically, DRLP has received approximately 10 million dollars from this total that it has used for grant funding and to otherwise meet its budgetary requirements. However, the tax is now being considered for removal. Therefore, it is important that everyone realize the activities of DRLP and the accomplishments that have been made. These activities and accomplishments are highlighted in Ms. Stusek's presentation.

Ms. Stusek began her presentation by covering some historical aspects for ODNR's Division of Recycling and Litter Prevention. In 1979, the bottle bill appeared before the public as a statewide ballot issue and was soundly defeated by a margin of 73 percent to 27 percent. In 1980, Substitute HB 361 established the Office of Litter Control with temporary funding by a two-tier Ohio corporate franchise tax. In 1985, HB 201 extended the provisions established by Substitute HB 361 and the office's name was changed to Office of Litter Prevention and Recycling. The passage of several other bills followed that provided for a number of changes at ODNR-DRLP. Laws were established covering litter control, solid waste disposal, plastic labeling, and

procurement of recycled content products by state agency purchasing authorities. In 1994, HB 345 named ONDR's litter and recycling section the "Division of Recycling and Litter Prevention" and made the franchise tax a permanent funding source for the Division.

The next segment of Ms. Stusek's presentation highlighted major activities and accomplishments for ODNR-DRLP. The activities and accomplishments were listed in two categories: those prior to the passage of HB 592 in 1989 and those after 1989. The numerous examples presented depicting ODNR-DRLP's activities and accomplishments make it obvious that the Division's role in promoting recycling and litter control has greatly expanded over the years. The major components of ODNR-DRLP's program include: grant funding, education, research, public outreach, state agency assistance, recycling market development, technical assistance, data collection, and partnerships with various stakeholders for recycling and litter control. This role has clearly influenced Ohio's ability to recycle, procure recycled content materials, and improve litter conditions. ODNR-DRLP has been instrumental in helping Ohio achieve the goals of the State Solid Waste Management Plan, as adopted by SWAC. ODNR-DRLP has even been able to have broader influences beyond the borders of Ohio through its affiliations with national and regional boards. ODNR-DRLP has also been the recipient of multiple awards for the services it provides to Ohio citizens and the environment.

ODNR-DRLP has received funding at nearly standard levels for the past ten years. The Division has made adjustments to contend with the declining value of the dollar while continuing and improving the services provided. One way the Division has dealt with the economic challenges is by lowering the number of staff positions. In 1990, the Division employed 47 people. By the end of this year, the Division will have decreased the number of employees to 28.

The economic threat the Division is facing today, involving the loss of a secure funding source, will have far reaching effects that will hinder Ohio's ability to make additional progress toward meeting the goals of the State Solid Waste Management Plan and will establish greater threats to the environment. From a different perspective, ODNR-DRLP has published information that also suggests any setbacks to Ohio's recycling industry will cause significant negative impacts for Ohio's overall economy. Ms. Stusek concluded the presentation with supporting data that shows the significant role held by the recycling industry lending support to Ohio's overall economy.

### **H.B. 432, Construction and Demolition Debris (Andrew Booker, Environmental Supervisor, DSIWM)**

Mr. Booker described the main areas for change that are associated with HB 432. Two of these areas were identified as fee changes and changes related to ground water monitoring.

While C&DD facility license fees are eliminated with enactment of the Bill, a new disposal fee for waste disposed at C&DD facilities now applies. The disposal fee amount is \$0.30 per cubic yard or \$0.60 per ton. This fee will be submitted by C&DD facilities to the local approved health district or to Ohio EPA if the applicable health district does not appear on the Director's list of approved health districts. The approved health district will distribute a portion of the fee to Ohio EPA, the host city or township, if

applicable, the county commissioners, if applicable, and the remainder will be retained by the health district. If the C&DD facility is located in an unapproved health district, the facility will submit the fees to Ohio EPA. Ohio EPA will make disbursements to townships, cities, and the county, as appropriate. Fees received by Ohio EPA and health districts must be used for administering and enforcing ORC 3714. and rules adopted under it. Townships, municipal corporations, and county governments receiving a portion of the fees must direct the revenue toward the same purposes for which fees are levied under ORC 3734.57(B) in the case of county government and under ORC 3734.37 ( C ) for township or municipal corporations.

When C&DD wastes are sent for disposal at solid waste disposal facilities, the MSW facility owner is required to collect the C&DD disposal fee with one exception. If a MSW landfill owner collects solid waste fees on C&DD, the operator is not required to collect the C&DD disposal fee.

A separate fee provision included in the Bill will enable Ohio EPA to enact rules to levy additional fees of up to \$0.05 per cubic yard and \$0.10 per ton of C&DD disposed. Once established by rule, monies collected from this fee will be routed to Ohio EPA and the appropriate local health district. When the \$0.10 per ton fee is collected, the health district will receive \$0.02 and Ohio EPA will receive \$0.08. Fees levied under this provision of the Bill must be exclusively used to conduct groundwater monitoring.

Estimated annual revenue anticipated to result from the C&DD fee is \$4,073,670. Annual revenue estimates anticipated for the groundwater fee is \$678,945.

The groundwater monitoring component of the Bill authorizes Ohio EPA/health districts to install wells and conduct groundwater monitoring. Contracting for these services by Ohio EPA is also authorized by the Bill. The groundwater monitoring aspect of the Bill applies to C&DD facilities operating before the effective date of the law. Ohio EPA, in consultation with health districts, are required to determine the priority order of facilities that will be monitored.

Other aspects of the Bill provide guidance for the proper management of solid waste when these wastes are received at C&DD facilities and clarification of the C&DD definition to include particles and dust created during demolition activities as C&DD waste.

### **Potential Future Agenda Topics**

- Ohio EPA/ODNR-DRLP Budget Update
- Drop-off Study Final Analysis Update
- Product Stewardship
- Operator/Health District Personnel Solid Waste Facility/Infectious Waste Treatment Facility Training and Certification Program
- Presentation Covering the Programs/Activities of Another Ohio SWMD

The next meeting is scheduled for May 19, 2005 to be held at Highbanks Metro Park from 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

**Meeting Adjournment**

Richard Mavis MOVED to adjourn, James Gilliland SECONDED the motion. Meeting adjourned on voice vote.

Respectfully submitted: \_\_\_\_\_  
Erv Ball, Vice Chair

Minutes approved on: \_\_\_\_\_

Certified by: \_\_\_\_\_  
Kathy Trent, Secretary