

Summary Minutes
Solid Waste Management Advisory Council (SWAC)
March 12, 2001
ODOT, Room A
1980 West Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43223

Members in Attendance:

Erv Ball, Health Departments
Michael Canfield, ODNR Director's Designee
Jane Goodman, Public
Arthur Haddad, Counties
Dan Harris, Ohio EPA
Steve Hill, Industrial Generators
Mike Long, Single County Solid Waste Management Districts (SWMDs)
Reed Madden, Counties
Phil Palumbo, Joint County SWMDs
John Rininger, Municipalities
Joseph Sykes, Townships
Kathy Trent, Private Solid Waste Management Industry
Richard Williams, Townships

January 12, 2001 SWAC Minutes approved

The first order of business was to review and approve the January 12, 2001 meeting minutes. John Rininger MOVED to approve the minutes, Erv Ball SECONDED the motion. The minutes were approved on voice vote.

Update on DSIWM/Legislative Issues

Dan Harris presented the following legislative updates:

- C SB 37 (formerly SB 285) and the companion bill HB 83 (formerly HB 644) were introduced and accommodate agency comments provided during the last legislative session. These bills are specific to dispute resolution prior to a county withdrawing from a multi-county SWMD.
- C SB 15 (formerly SB 324) regarding lime waste regulation to be transferred from Ohio EPA to ODNR. At the hearing, Ohio EPA provided opposition to this bill.
- C HB 3 was introduced by Rep. Blasdel and is specific to the Clean Ohio Fund.
- C SB 41 presented by Senator Carnes was introduced regarding a two year moratorium on licensing new C&DD facilities that accept out-of-state C&DD.
- C HB 95 regarding the Ohio EPA budget bill has passed through two hearings of the House Finance Committee and Agriculture and Environment Subcommittee.

Erv Ball asked Mr. Harris about HB 807, the landfill legislation. Mr. Harris indicated that a bill has not been introduced, although Mr. Harris suspects that Rep. Metzger will continue to pursue this legislation.

Mr. Rininger also asked about the state representative for Solid Waste Management Advisory Council (SWAC). Michael Canfield informed the members of SWAC that an appointment will be made in about two weeks for an ODNR advisory committee. Andrew Booker of Ohio EPA added that a request had been made for an appointment.

Kathy Trent asked questions about funding from the budget and Mr. Harris explained that so far during budget testimony no questions had been raised regarding the state disposal fee.

Mr. Harris also provided the following DSIWM rulemaking updates:

- C The OAC 3745-27-90 will have an anticipated effective date of May 1, 2001 after the rule has been final filed.
- C A public hearing for the scrap tire rules is scheduled for 10:00 a.m. on March 16, 2001. The JCARR hearing is scheduled for later in the month. Ohio EPA will respond to comments from interested parties and in particular to a facility that has indicated that they will seek invalidation of the rules at JCARR .
- C The C&DD rules are expected to be filed on April 30, 2001.
- C Solid Waste Landfill rules are expected to be proposed on June 15, 2001.
- C The members of JCARR are now listed on the website and the information for members on the House & Senate Environmental Committees is also available.

Mr. Rininger requested the information regarding the members of the House & Senate Environmental Committees to be provided to him.

DSIWM Update

Mr. Harris introduced a new employee, Britt Bowe, who is in the planning unit of the Ohio EPA.

Donna Stusek, ODNR, Recycling Economic Impact Report

Mr. Harris introduced Donna Stusek, who gave a presentation on the economic impact of recycling. The scope of the report was to measure the direct and indirect impact of recycling, as well as estimate the state tax revenues generated as a result of recycling. The direct impact included surveying 26 business categories (68% response rate) to research their operational characteristics including wages, sales, and employment of businesses directly involved with recycling. The results of the report and surveys were compared to other states and demonstrate that recycling has a significant impact on the Ohio economy. A full report is currently being produced and should be available within two weeks on the ODNR's webpage.

Mr. Rininger asked if internal recycling was included in the report and surveys. Ms. Stusek replied that the surveys included all recycling aspects of the businesses. Arthur Haddad asked about whether adjustments were made to account for how the respondents and Ms. Stusek indicated that adjustments were made. Phil Palumbo made a comment related to the market development grants for Ohio's industries. Mike Long commented on costs for recycling and transportation for states which export waste. Jane Goodman asked a question about taxes and grants from the government and Ms. Stusek explained that this report didn't include this information.

Ms. Stusek indicated that the answers to some of the more detailed questions will be available when the final document is issued. Mr. Long also asked for the total sales compared to all of Ohio's industries as part of the economic impact. Ms. Stusek indicated that this information will also be explained in the full report. Richard Williams asked when the report will be ready and Ms. Stusek said that it will be available in two weeks.

Donna Stusek, ODNR, City Recycling Survey

A second presentation was given by Donna Stusek to share the results of a survey of Ohio's most populated cities. The purpose of the survey was to identify types of recycling programs currently offered in Ohio's largest cities. Twenty-two cities were selected to receive surveys, with a 95% response rate.

The total recycling tonnage reported for curbside programs was 55,864 tons, and 10,760 tons for drop-offs. Documentation and reporting issues affected the accuracy of this data. The overall state recycling for residential and commercial waste was about 2.5 million tons and the surveyed cities' residential recycling counted for 66,624 tons of this amount. These cities include 30% of the state's population. The state's recycling rate for residential/commercial was 19% while the surveyed cities' recycling rate for residential waste was about 2.6%. The results of this survey were used to compare Ohio cities to other cities of similar size which were identified in an article in Waste News. A comment was made that the data contained in the Waste News article was not accurate for Columbus.

Mr. Haddad asked if charitable organizations collecting recycled materials were included. Ms. Stusek explained that the cities responded to the surveys and may or may not have included this information. Mr. Rininger asked if this report was available. Ms. Stusek stated that the report is available on the webpage for ODNR. Mr. Williams also pointed out that the SWMD's should do this type of reporting within their districts to include all small organizations. Mr. Hill added that in order to compare the cities in Ohio to other cities (such as the report in Waste News), the survey protocol and data collection must be similar. Ms. Stusek stated that this was the first time such a survey was conducted by ODNR, and that they are expecting to improve their methodology in the future to improve the quality of the information.

Andrew Booker, Ohio EPA, Landfill Capacity

Andrew Booker of Ohio EPA presented an overview of the updated capacity information. The 1998 Facility Data Report (1997 data) is the most recent hard-copy publication. The 1999 report, containing 1998 data, is available through the DSIWM webpage. In addition, the 2000 report will also be ready soon containing 1999 data. If there are any questions regarding the facility data reports, contact Jamie Zawila of Ohio EPA.

Tables from the Facility Data Report show the facilities present in each SWMD and their available capacity in cubic yards and years. An estimated capacity of 22.3 years was calculated based on data through December 31, 2000. This estimation doesn't include new facilities with PTI's such as Apex and Harrison County Landfill which have been approved but are not yet constructed. The table that was distributed includes all licensed facilities while the map presented includes only publically available facilities.

Mr. Canfield asked whether there were any proposed facilities in the southwest part of the state. Mr. Harris gave a couple of examples of anticipated expansions or proposed new facilities in the area.

Ernie Stall, Ohio EPA, SWMD's Program Updates

Mr. Harris introduced Ernie Stall of Ohio EPA who presented information about the type of programs that SWMD's are implementing. Most of the information provided was received through the 2000 Annual District Report which contains 1999 data. The purpose of this update was to demonstrate the variety of programs offered throughout the state. Recycling opportunities were listed and included the collection opportunities and curbside services as well as the different education programs. In addition, there were strategies listed for specific waste streams.

There were several concerns raised about the data which seemed to have low numbers compared to the number of programs funded through ODNR grants. This issue brought up questions about the format of Annual District Reports and how they may be changed.

Mr. Canfield brought up the concern of how legislators and others might interpret what is happening in the SWMD's based on this information. Mr. Long added that an inventory of the programs and their cost effectiveness may be more helpful. A "recycling report card" was discussed as a way to portray the progress of the individual districts.

STATE PLAN CHAPTER UPDATES

Ernie Stall, Ohio EPA, Ch. IV Restrictions

The focus of the presentation was on the recommendations of the 1989 and 1995 State Plan restrictions on yard waste, scrap tires, and lead-acid batteries. The management capacity for restricted waste streams included an inventory of the Class III and Class IV composting facilities. There has been a significant increase in Class IV facilities. There are several facilities involved with scrap tire recovery, storage, and disposal.

Ohio was compared to other states which have restrictions. Massachusetts has an extensive ban on many different materials and maintain the bans through strict monitoring and enforcement. These bans are credited to increases in recycling rates for Massachusetts.

There are no major changes in the content of the draft chapter for restrictions in the State Plan. The language may be different and re-worded but the content and concepts are the same as the previous State Plan. The sections on lead-acid battery and scrap tire bans were updated and a section was added to discuss capacity for restricted waste streams.

Mr. Long asked about the relevance of scientific reports and the potential impact which is referenced in the section for HHW.

Barb Brdika, Assistant Director, and Andrew Booker, Ohio EPA, Ch. V Siting Criteria

Barb Brdika presented the Director's standpoint on landfill siting and informed the members of SWAC that his current position remains to be focused on the technical aspects of siting, meaning those items directly associated with protection of human health and the environment, leaving local political jurisdictions to address the other issues, such as socioeconomic impacts. The Agency continues to hold the same position as it has in the past; although all information is considered by the Director prior to making a decision, including the socioeconomic concerns related to a facility, it overall remains a technical decision.

Andrew Booker continued the presentation with an update on the draft chapter of the State Plan that addresses siting criteria. The siting criteria of solid waste facilities are designed to protect surface, ground, and drinking water. The recommendations from the 1989 State Plan and proposed changes to the existing siting criteria rules were reviewed. These rules pertain to national and state parks, the new variance rule, separatory liners for vertical expansions over unlined areas.

A new section was added to address the local and regional impacts of facilities. This section includes details for the local impacts of facilities such as noise and traffic. Zoning, host community fees, SWMD rulemaking authority, and negotiated agreements are tools available to SWMD's that are also discussed in this section.

[

There were several inquiries regarding the clarification of the siting criteria for national historic areas, siting facilities outside of plan (private/public), zoning fees, new federal requirements, and the amount of host community fees. Mr. Booker explained that the intent of this section is to provide guidance to the SWMD that have identified a capacity need and are looking to identify that need. Mr. Harris added that he was unaware of any legislative discussion for the amount of fees involved.

Agenda Items for April 16, 2001 Meeting

Potential agenda items discussed:

- C Ch. V Siting Criteria (EPA Recommendations)
- C Ch. IV Restrictions (EPA Recommendations)
- C Ch. III Goals (EPA Recommendations)
- C Scrap Tires Waste Flow (EPA Recommendations)
- C Ch. VIII Household Hazardous Wastes (EPA Recommendations)
- C Specialty Items Recycling (Electronics)
- C Recycling Accessibility & Rules
- C Organic Waste Diversion (Food composting)
- C Clean Your Files Event

The next meeting scheduled is on April 16, 2001 in the ODOT building.

Respectfully submitted: _____
Erv Ball, Vice Chair

Minutes approved on: _____

Certified by: _____
Kathy Trent, Secretary