

VICTORY IN LOUISIANA. 240 TPD MASS-BURN IN MANDEVILLE denied air and solid waste permit applications by the State Dept. of Environmental Quality (DEQ). **Environmental Resources Inc. (ERI - Slidell, LA)** who had proposed the 240 tpd incinerator was denied its permits because of: "zoning", "an unacceptable risk associated with development and operation of what is basically an unproven incineration system. Specifically, the incinerator is not proven state-of-the-art design. The primary chamber may actually be retrograde... Dept. of solid waste policy is directed toward maximum recycle of waste... (ERI) has no experience with the type of project proposed," (6-7-88 DEQ letter to ERI). The location of the incinerator would have been less than 1/2 mile from the state run **S.E. Louisiana Psychiatric Hospital**, which has a children's wing, and operates a school on the grounds. The steam produced by the incinerator would have been sold to the hospital operated by the Louisiana Dept. of Health & Hospitals (DOHH). The hospital would have still needed its own boilers as backup. The ash would have gone to a regular unlined landfill operated by ERI. The landfill is on vacant school board property and is adjacent to the proposed incinerator site. On July 1, 1988, the DOHH lodged a suit against ERI PETITIONING FOR \$58,588 in damages due to: removal of 5,600 cubic yards of topsoil and dirt from hospital property, damage to timber and for restoration of the property's topography. The solid waste for the incinerator would have come from St. Tammany Parish. (Louisiana is the only state in the Union that uses the term Parish instead of County). The incinerator would have handled the wastes from about 150,000 residents. The municipalities of Covington and Slidell were not going to send their wastes to the incinerator. The incinerator would have been the first one in Louisiana. **Crochet Equipment Co.** (Baton Rouge) were to build the furnaces. Crochet has built hospital and industrial furnaces, but not furnaces for municipal solid waste. This was also ERI's first venture into incineration. Two major vocal proponents for the incinerator were jurors (legislators) from St. Tammany Parish. These two jurors were defeated in the November elections. In late December, at their last meeting as lame ducks, they pressured the Parish to ask the DEQ to issue the permits for the incinerator. For more information contact either Willene Glasgow, 447 South Vermont St. Covington, LA, tel: 504-892-6483 or Gloria Englehardt, 25 Samatha Drive, Covington, LA 70433, tel: 504-892-0226.

IMMINENT DEFEAT FOR INCINERATION IN SEATTLE. The City Council of Seattle has turned its back on incineration. The Mayor is also backing off. The Mayor will make formal recommendations on July 26, 1988. In 1987 Seattle was pursuing a 2,000 tpd incinerator. In May 1988 the Environmental Impact Statement for a proposed Seattle incinerator looked at various sizes, including a 500 tpd. According to opponents, at this rate of downsizing there will be no need for one. In Nov. and Dec. of 1987 there were 7 meetings about the project. Approx. 1,500 people turned out for each and every one of them. This helped the City Council take a dramatic shift away from incinerations. Seattle has paid \$1,325,000 to **Gershman, Brickner & Bratton** (Washington, D.C.) as consultants to the Seattle Solid Waste Utility from 1983 to present. After the well attended meetings in Nov/Dec the Seattle Waste Utility was directed to present alternatives to incineration (see below). **Gershman, Brickner & Bratton** did not participate in the preparation for the alternatives.

SEATTLE'S "RECYCLING POTENTIAL ASSESSMENT AND WASTE STREAM FORECAST". This is one of the most comprehensive overviews for the non-incineration alternatives for the handling/disposal of solid waste. It overviews five recycling scenarios (see chart overside), market conditions, product bans (for scenarios 4 & 5), environmental impacts and long range waste stream forecasts. It graphically details a 20 year scenario for five options ranging from 42% to 76% recycling, costs out each scenerio for **total system cost**

Printed on recycled paper, naturally

which includes administrative, planning, collection, hauling, landfilling (tip fee and closure), and recycling for commercial and residential waste disposal for the City of Seattle.

RECYCLING LEVEL AS A % OF WASTE GENERATED:	TOTAL SYSTEM COST OF WASTE MANAGEMENT (1987 Cost per ton)					
	1988	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010
1. 42.1% recycling	\$131	\$134	\$131	\$127	\$126	\$124
2. 49.9% recycling	\$131	\$133	\$124	\$120	\$119	\$116
3. 72.7% recycling **	\$130	\$167	\$139	\$137	\$135	\$134
4. 60.2% recycling	\$128	\$125	\$110	\$105	\$104	\$101
5. 77.9% recycling	\$128	\$128	\$117	\$ 99	\$ 98	\$ 94

** "Scenario 3 is a high-tech alternative that deviates from the general strategy employed in the other four scenarios of separating different materials so each may be recycled to achieve its best use. In Scenario 3, all waste not recovered by the existing residential curbside recycling program, would be processed in an in-vessel composting plant. The 27.3% of the waste that would be disposed represents the non-compostable fraction of the waste stream" (pg. II-22).

This assessment was prepared by the Seattle Solid Waste Utility with **Resource Conservation Consultants, CCA Inc., Fernandes Assoc., SCS Engineers, and Sound Resource Management Group**. It is available for \$9.46. Ask for the DEIS, Volume 2, Recycling Potential Assessment and Waste Stream Forecast from Seattle Solid Waste Utility, 710 Second Avenue, 750 Dexter Horton Building, Seattle, WA 98104, Tel: 206-684-7666.

HAZARDS TO FISH, WILDLIFE AND INVERTEBRATES: SYNOPTIC REVIEWS. A series of Biological Reports on contaminant hazards are being published by the Fish & Wildlife Service of the U.S. Dept. of the Interior. Ronald Eisler has written reports #1-12,14. Edward Odenkirchen wrote No. 13. They are an excellent source of information on contaminant hazards to fish, wildlife and invertebrates. They are free. #1 **Mirex**, # 2 **Cadmium**, #3 **Carbofurans**, #4 **Toxaphene**, #5 **Selenium**, # 6 **Chromium**, #7 **Polychlorinated Biphenyls**, #8 **Dioxin**, #9 **Diazinon**, #10 **Mercury**, #11 **Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons**, #12 **Arsenic**, #13 **Chlorpyrifos**, #14 **Lead**. Available from Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Laurel, MD 20708. Tel: 301-497-0513

Waste Not #15
*A publication of
 Work On Waste USA,
 a non-profit corporation dedicated to the
 promotion of sound resource
 management policy.*

*Annual Subscription Rate: \$25.
 Students & Seniors: \$15
 Consultants &
 for-profit organizations: \$100.*

*Letters, articles and calls from the public
 welcome.*

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED

Paul & Ellen Connert, Editors
 82 Judson Street
 Canton, New York 13617
 (315)379-9200

Printed on recycled paper, naturally