

KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON, BACKS AWAY FROM INCINERATOR PROPOSAL. According to the **Washington Toxics Coalition**, "The lack of public acceptability for incineration was given as the reason for the (King County) Executive backing away from 'energy resource recovery.'" King County had attempted to site 3 mass-burn incinerators which would burn a total of 6,000 tpd. (Seattle is in King County, but Seattle was independent of the County for waste management. Seattle dropped its plans to build an incinerator, which would have been the 4th in the county, in July -see **Waste Not #s 15-16**). According to the **Valley Daily News**, WA, 10-11-88, "...In what amounts to a major policy reversal, King County Executive Tim Hill announced Monday he wants to delay looking at the building an incinerator until 1992. In the meantime, Hill proposed tough recycling goals requiring residents and business to recycle 65% of their garbage by 2000. Hill also set interim goals of 35% recycling in 1991 and 50% by 1995...Public outcry against the plan convinced the council, and now Hill, to consider recycling as a first option." According to Gabriella Uhlar-Heffner of the **Alliance for Solid Waste Alternatives**, "...After the outpouring of public sentiment in January 1988 the King County Council split with the Executive Branch and ordered the County Solid Waste Division to prepare a 'programmatic study' of all solid waste management options including different levels of recycling...In June the Solid Waste Division issued a draft programmatic environmental impact statement which was clearly biased in favor of incineration. The two public hearings on the study once again turned out angry and this time well educated County residents...The unity of local community and environmental groups has been key in the derailment of the incineration proposals of Seattle and King County -it is what the industry most fears." The **Alliance** is comprised of 7 local community groups and 3 environmental groups: **Washington Toxics Coalition**, **Puget Sound Chapter of Sierra Club** and **Greenpeace**. For more information contact Gabriella Uhlar-Heffner, 22906 100th Avenue S.E., Kent, WA 98031. Tel: 206-859-8790.

"PLASTICS RECYCLING ACTION PLAN FOR MASSACHUSETTS" is the title of the Mass. DEQE's Division of Solid Waste new report which gives an in-depth overview of plastics' recycling and a framework for integrating plastics into the Mass. statewide recycling program. Included in the report is a guide to resins, collection systems, technologies, markets, a detailed Action Plan, and a comprehensive overview of European plastics' recycling. This report is well referenced and packed with information. Available for \$7.65 (includes postage) from: State House Bookstore, Room 116, State House, Boston, MA 02133. For more information on orders call 617-727-2834.

BIODEGRADEABLE BAGS. If people want them, they are out there. They are called brown paper bags. They are recycled, recyclable, biodegradable and/or compostable. Why replace a product with a proven track record of over 100 years? Chiefly because of the chemical giants of our age, the plastics industry. According to an interview with Robert Lenz (**North Country This Week**, NY, 10-26-88) the degradable plastics appearing on supermarket shelves today are not biodegradable. The plastics "are made by mixing cornstarch with petroleum-based polymers. These plastics decompose in the environment - but leave behind a non-biodegradable residue." Plastic recycling of PET soda bottles, which account for nearly all the plastics recycling today, are not recycled back into new soda bottles because of the degradation of the plastic in the recycling process. The recycled plastics from items like soda bottles are being extensively used to replace materials that were once biodegradable, such as: backing for carpets, filling for sleeping bags and winter coats, and other single use goods. What we are being faced with is a 'fait accompli' of a corporate plastic take-over of biodegradable materials. According to Karl Kamena, director of public affairs for **Dow Chemical**, "...plastics are a desired source of fuel to generate energy in municipal waste-to-energy plants...He

Printed on recycled paper, naturally

said incinerator operators would prefer to use plastics instead of other municipal garbage for plant fuel," Environment Reporter, 4-15-88, pg. 2458. If Legislators allow plastic recycling for single-use non-biodegradable items, then the incinerator operators preference for plastics will soon be fulfilled. (EC).

TOXIC NEWS is a new weekly newsletter published by George Baggett. A key feature of **Toxic News** is "Toxin of the Week." By focusing on individual toxins, with a rundown of regulatory threshold limits, known health effects, and research associated with each toxin, **Toxic News** provides us with data that citizen groups find hard to come by. **Toxic News # 1** was first published on September 21, 1988, and focused on benzene; #2 freon 113; #3 methyl ethyl ketone; #4 carbon monoxide; #5 methylene chloride; #6 trichloroethylene. **Toxic News** offers environmentalists well researched information and is an excellent compliment to Dr. Peter Montague's invaluable newsletter **Hazardous Waste News**, soon to celebrate its 100th issue. George Baggett is offering the first 20 issues of **Toxic News** for \$10. After issue number 20 George will decide whether or not he will continue the newsletter on a weekly basis. For a subscription write: **Toxic News**, P.O. Box 3133, Kansas City, Kansas 66103. Each \$10 subscription will provide the newsletters from the first issue.

TWO NEW REPORTS ON INCINERATION FROM THE CITIZENS CLEARING HOUSE FOR HAZARDOUS WASTE

(CCHW) written by Stephen Lester and Brian Lipsett. **"Solid Waste Incineration: The Rush to Burn"** (\$9.95) documents environmental, economic and health problems of solid waste incineration. Includes detail on the key corporate players in the business, alternatives and the industry's track record. The second report deals with hazardous waste and is titled: **"Incineration: The Burning Issue"** (\$8.95). Recent EPA efforts to blackmail states and communities into building new toxic waste incinerators - whether they're safe or needed or not - make this one of the most difficult challenges we face in the movement to get industry to reduce its toxic output. A must for any community that already has such a facility and an essential tool for any community targeted for a new one. Please include \$1.50 for postage. VA residents add 4.5% sales tax. Send to: CCHW, Box 926, Arlington, VA 22216.

"TOXIC CHEMICALS IN THE GREAT LAKES BASIN ECOSYSTEM: SOME OBSERVATIONS." This report is essential reading for residents living around the Great Lakes area. The authors, Tom Muir and Anne Sudar, focus on the effects on human health from toxics in the air, land and water in the Great Lakes region. Muir-Sudar "reported unusually high rates of cancer, birth disorders and circulatory diseases on the Canadian side of the Great Lakes ... (they) summarized the results of the Great Lakes health studies and concluded that fish and wildlife have been hurt by toxic chemicals and that 'people are being affected as well.' Canada's top federal environmental agency, Environment Canada, released the report but called it conjectural. Still, American and Canadian scientists are calling the Muir-Sudar report potentially a landmark work..." Watertown Times, NY, 9-18-88. To obtain a copy of this report write to: Tom Muir, Environment Canada, Center for Inland Waters, Burlington, Ontario, Canada.

Waste Not #27

*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 Connett, Editors
82 Judson Street
Canton, New York 13617
(315)379-9200

Printed on recycled paper, naturally