

**Summary Minutes  
Solid Waste Management Advisory Council (SWAC)  
May 14<sup>th</sup>, 2001  
ODOT, Room A  
1980 West Broad Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43223**

**Members in Attendance:**

Virginia Aveni, Statewide Environmental Advocacy Org.  
Erv Ball, Health Departments  
Mike Canfield, ODNR Director's Designee  
Arthur Haddad, Counties  
Mike Long, Single County SWMDs  
Phil Palumbo, Joint County SWMDs  
Edward Paul, Private Recycling Industry  
John Rininger, Jr., Municipalities  
Joseph Sykes, Townships  
Kathy Trent, Private Solid Waste Industry  
Richard Williams, Townships

By phone: Sally Beals, Municipalities

**April 16<sup>th</sup>, 2001 Meeting Minutes Approved**

The meeting was chaired by Erv Ball. The first order of business was to review and approve the April 16<sup>th</sup>, 2001 meeting minutes. John Rininger MOVED to approve the minutes, Phil Palumbo SECONDED the motion. The minutes were approved on a voice vote.

**Update on Legislative Issues**

Andrew Booker explained that there had been little movement on any related legislation since the previous meeting. The budget bills have continued to provide challenges for the Agency although the DSIWM is fee-based, therefore is not impacted directly by cuts to GRF funding.

Mr. Palumbo asked about the OEPA's perception of the landfill moratorium legislation. Mr. Booker explained that the Director has stated in the past that he would oppose legislation that is related to siting criteria.

**DSIWM Update**

Erv Ball asked whether there was any update on the status of the new chief for DSIWM. Mr. Booker said that the Director had conducted interviews for the position and added that Barb Brdicka had resigned from the Agency which resulted in restructuring the responsibilities in the Director's Office.

Mr. Booker also added that two new positions in the planning unit are in the process of being posted.

Mr. Booker said that an update on the C&DD rulemaking will be provided at the next

meeting. Ms. Aveni asked when the rules will be adopted or sent to JCARR and Mr. Booker explained that he thought the rules were filed although he was unsure of the exact status.

### **QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FOR STATE PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **Andrew Booker, Ohio EPA, Ch. VIII Household Hazardous Waste**

Andrew Booker opened the floor to comments on the draft chapter which had been handed out and presented at the previous meeting. Mr. Ball asked whether OEPA had received any comments and Ernie Stall replied that he hadn't received any feedback. Mr. Stall also requested any written comments.

### **STATE PLAN CHAPTER UPDATES**

#### **Andrew Booker, Ohio EPA, Ch. III Goals #3 through #7**

Mr. Booker continued his presentation on the recommendations for the goals chapter from the previous SWAC meeting held April 16<sup>th</sup> where he provided updates on Goal #1 (Access) and Goal #2 (Percentage).

The OEPA recommends no change to Goal #3 which is to provide informational and technical assistance on source reduction. In addition, the OEPA also suggests no change to Goal #4 which is to provide informational and technical assistance on recycling, reuse, and composting opportunities. Mr. Booker explained that these two goals are collectively considered the education goals.

Michael Long questioned whether a way to measure source reduction had been considered and if more research should be designated to the issue. Mr. Booker answered that source reduction is challenging to document and calculate. However, the Agency will continue to review the process.

Mr. Booker also explained that the USEPA doesn't include source reduction in the recycling calculation and Ohio is one of the few states which allows the opportunity for source reduction credit. The current system for source reduction credit allows for crediting the tonnage only for the year that it was documented.

Mr. Ball asked if there were any examples which could be cited. Mr. Booker replied that industrial generators may show a reduction in waste generation due to changes in processes as a result of waste audits. Other examples include reduction in commercial packaging. However, source reduction for the residential sector is difficult to demonstrate. Mr. Ball asked whether yard waste may be included for residential and Mr. Booker explained that a case study may be used.

Mr. Rininger asked if the Material Exchange would fit into these goals. Mr. Stall said that this is an example of recycling, not source reduction.

Ms. Aveni asked if the goal would require districts to have volume-based or fee-based systems such as PAYT. Mr. Booker explained that ODNR monitors these programs and districts as a whole generally don't participate in these programs, but several individual

communities have these systems. Mr. Canfield added that Franklin Co. SWMD's program may be part of this goal and referred to Mr. Long's program of the test program for the separated bins.

Mr. Long asked whether the anecdotal information would be updated in the chapter. Mr. Booker explained that Mr. Stall has been updating this information using examples from around the state.

Mr. Booker presented the recommendations for Goal #5, which is to provide strategies for scrap tires and household hazardous waste. The first recommendation for the goal is to add yard waste and lead-acid batteries to the list. Currently, the statute requires that SWMDs address restricted waste streams which include yard waste, lead-acid batteries, and scrap tires. The changes to the goal would not require additional requirements but is intended to reduce confusion and be consistent with the statute.

Mr. Booker also discussed a second suggestion for Goal #5, to add a provision that SWMDs will address electronics specifically as a part of the HHW strategy. Mr. Booker explained the rationale and also gave examples of ways that SWMDs may meet this requirement.

Sally Beals asked why the yard waste was included with HHW when the districts are encouraged to compost. Mr. Booker clarified that yard waste is defined in the statute as a restricted waste stream, not as a household hazardous waste.

Ms. Beals also asked if the recommendation would require districts to provide electronics collection events and she explained how Montgomery County handled their permanent drop-off facility. Mr. Booker reiterated that the provision may be met by simply providing a brochure or list of outlets available and that districts would not be required to hold collection events due to financial limitations. Mr. Long added that there are many issues besides staffing involved with permanent facilities, including building code issues. Mr. Booker suggested that districts with permanent HHW collection facilities share information at a SWAC meeting once the State Plan has been completed.

Mr. Rininger also asked whether the prison refurbishment program would be included. Mr. Stall said that the program is already explained in Ch. VIII, which covers Household Hazardous Waste.

Mr. Booker presented Goal #6 which is the annual reporting of plan implementation goal and recommended no changes. This goal will be changed to Goal #8.

Mr. Booker continued the presentation to introduce a new Goal #6 which would require districts to evaluate the feasibility of incorporating economic incentives into source reduction and recycling programs. He gave several examples ranging from PAYT programs to incentive-based grant giving to monetary rebates for citizens. The purpose of the new goal is to encourage SWMDs to evaluate the influence of economic incentives and disincentives on recycling behavior. Mr. Booker explained that districts that pursue the Access Goal already are required to do this.

Several questions from both the audience and SWAC members were raised regarding the added goal and requirement. Mr. Booker emphasized that the goal is just asking districts to evaluate the options and not necessarily to implement new programs. He repeated that most of the SWMDs are already required to meet this requirement since they are pursuing the Access Goal, and there haven't been any complaints for five years. Ms. Trent suggested that the requirement be left in the Format (the document that specifies the contents of SWMD plans), but also suggested that the requirement be added into the requirements related to the Percentage Goal instead of making it an additional goal.

Additional questions were raised regarding this goal. Mr. Booker clarified the difference between evaluating the feasibility of incentives and how this is different from cost-effectiveness for specific projects. Several members continued to indicate support for the goal. An informal vote was taken with six members in favor of keeping the goal and three members opposed to including it. Ms. Trent explained that she is supportive of the evaluation however she is unclear of exactly how this would be accomplished by districts. Mr. Booker concluded the discussion by stating that the goal would be drafted into the chapter, to be reviewed by SWAC.

Mr. Booker presented the recommendation for Goal #7, the optional Market Development Strategy. Ohio EPA's suggestion was to not change the goal. A member of the audience asked about a requirement for the procurement of recycled products. Mr. Booker responded that he is hesitant to add this as a requirement for districts, however it may be identified in the chapter as one option for meeting the goal.

Mr. Long suggested that rather than spending money to buy recycled products, he'd rather spend money on bringing manufactures to Ohio that utilize recycled materials in their production.

Mr. Booker presented the current and proposed state strategies. Several of the current state strategies were removed although the intent is to continue to pursue them (it was felt that it was unnecessary to continue to identify them as specific strategies at this time). The proposed new state strategies include: a state-specific waste characterization and generation study; exploring improved reporting for processors and industrial generators through voluntary partnerships and mandatory reporting; economic burden and cost-effectiveness of programs; studying alternate access credit for recycling opportunities and participation; publish the Facility Data Report and Planning Summary Report every other year and make the data available every year on the Ohio EPA website; establish a waste reduction and recycling goal for state agencies; develop and implement a plan to increase state agency procurement of recycled content products and; establish a procedure whereby Ohio EPA notifies ODNR when a SWMD is not in compliance with its solid waste management plan.

Ms. Aveni asked a question about the strategy to establish a WRR goal for state agencies and the executive order for the Governor related to this issue. Mr. Booker replied that the order was never signed and didn't know of any intention for it to be signed soon. Ms. Aveni made a formal request that the Governor sign the executive order and expressed her strong support for this initiative.

Mr. Long made a suggestion for an additional state strategy related to alternate energy issues. He submitted in writing the following proposed state strategy: "Study the potential impact of increased energy costs on waste, recycling, and reduction; evaluate new or emerging technologies for WRR, particularly those that provide energy recovery; evaluate landfill bioreactor technologies; provide technical assistance as required."

#### **Ernie Stall, Ohio EPA, Ch. VII Scrap Tires**

Mr. Stall presented the draft chapter and explained that this chapter had the most changes in it of any State Plan chapter. Since the *1995 State Plan* update, scrap tire rules have been passed which is explained in the chapter. Updates for the recommendations from the *1995 State Plan* and the history of scrap tire management have also been added to the chapter.

Mr. Stall explained the shift of the focus on scrap tire management from the past to the present. He included methods for recycling, reuse, and energy recovery in the draft chapter. This discussion included information on tire derived fuel (TDF) and other beneficial uses for tires, including the progress of research and development. Also, the proposed change in the scrap tire fee has been included in the chapter.

A discussion of the responsibilities of compliance and compliance monitoring is also discussed in the draft chapter. Mr. Stall said that the chapter includes information about open dump abatement and removal, with a specific focus on the Kirby tire site.

Both Ms. Aveni and Mr. Canfield asked about the facility that is using TDF. A member of the audience said that the Southwestern Portland Smith had conducted test burns using TDF. He commented that there was some citizen opposition as the result of the facility using the tires for energy. [Note: The facility referenced in the chapter is Champion International Corporation-Hamilton Mill located in Butler Co.]

Mr. Canfield asked whether there was a list of end users and processors for scrap tires now that the responsibility for the scrap tire market development program is being transferred from ODOD to ODNR. Mr. Booker explained that there is a list of recovery facilities, but not a list of end users. Mr. Canfield also said that there is free educational information available for use by the districts from the National Scrap Tire Association.

Mr. Long asked whether the scrap tire situation seemed to be a winning battle in regards to the tire flows for disposal and recycling/reduction. Mr. Stall explained that the estimated numbers tend to have large errors and Mr. Booker said that it seems more tires are being used for beneficial use. Bob Large from Ohio EPA will be asked to speak to SWAC more about the scrap tire issue.

#### **Andrew Booker, Ch. I Introduction**

Mr. Booker presented the first chapter of the State Plan which includes the purpose of HB 592 and a historical perspective of the challenges that the Plan addresses. These challenges include landfill regulations, generation, capacity, and out-of-state waste.

Mr. Booker explained that the introduction chapter provides an overview of the change in data from 1995 to 1999, and explains trends related to the data. The chapter also includes

changes since the adoption of the *1995 State Plan* such as incinerators closing, HB 473, and FGD production at power plants. Requirements of the solid waste management planning process have also been included in the chapter, which is the same text used in the *1995 State Plan*.

### **Logistics for Upcoming Meetings**

Mr. Booker expects that the draft State Plan will be completed by the end of June in order to provide for a thirty-day public review and comment period, followed by five public hearings held throughout the state. The formal draft of the State Plan should be ready in August to be approved by SWAC.

Mr. Williams asked if there will be many revisions and changes in the State Plan. Mr. Booker answered that the EPA may receive additional revisions, but there won't be many changes. Mr. Williams also asked about reappointments and nominations for the SWAC members whose term expire in June. Mr. Booker replied that the reappointment process has been initiated internally.

### **Agenda Items for June 12<sup>th</sup>, 2001 Meeting**

Potential agenda items discussed:

1. Implementation Chapter
2. Market Development Chapter
3. Revisit Goal chapter for comments and questions

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

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

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