

NEW HAMPSHIRE: WHEELABRATOR ABANDONS 500 TPD INCINERATOR PROPOSAL IN EXETER BECAUSE OF STRONG LOCAL OPPOSITION. "Blaming the strong local resistance to its proposal, **Wheelabrator Technologies Inc.**, has abandoned plans to build a waste-to-energy plant in Exeter. The company did not renew its option to buy the proposed plant site - 100 acres off Route 101 owned by Yankee Greyhound Inc. The option ran out yesterday. 'We are going to let the option expire because we feel the circumstances (for business) are more favorable in other parts of the country,' Bruce Keough, the managing director of **Wheelabrator Technologies**, said in an interview yesterday. The cost of overcoming the resistance -which included a lawsuit filed by a group of Exeter residents- had already reached 'a few hundred thousand' dollars, according to Keough. Plans for the garbage-burning, electricity-producing plant, first proposed a year ago, have been stalled since the suit was filed in February. Though the suit was filed against the Exeter Board of Adjustment, which approved a variance from town height restrictions for the proposed plant, **Wheelabrator** joined the litigation in the town's behalf. It is highly unlikely that **Wheelabrator** will develop plans for an incinerator elsewhere in Exeter "in the near future," Keough said. Before it made such plans, the firm would need assurance that it would not face court action... 'It's great news,' said Bill Tappan, the main plaintiff in the suit and president of the anti-incinerator group **Stamp Out Smokestacks (SOS)**. He said he believed his group was 'a determining factor' in stopping **Wheelabrator's** plans. 'Without **SOS**, there was no opposition,' he said." The Exeter News-Letter, 11-1-88. Exeter is "just down the road a piece from **Wheelabrator's** headquarters in Hampton, NH." For more information from **SOS** contact either Bill Tappan at 603-778-8868 or Page Brown at 603-778-1119.

NEW HAMPSHIRE: 66% OF MANCHESTER'S VOTERS REJECT MASS-BURN INCINERATION. The Nov. 8th referendum on the ballot read: "Do you agree that the city of Manchester should fully implement a municipal solid waste plan which includes mandatory city-wide separation, recycling and composting without utilization of mass-burn incineration?" (See **Waste Not #23**). There are 12 wards in Manchester. Each ward had a majority YES vote. 66% of the voters said YES. For more information contact Greg Janas of **Smart Alternatives for the Environment (SAFE)** at 603-668-4208.

NEW JERSEY: CAPE MAY COUNTY OVERWHELMINGLY REJECTS INCINERATION BY A 73% VOTE. On the Nov. 8th ballot, the non-binding referendum read: "Should a mass-burn incinerator be built anywhere in Cape May County?" (See **Waste Not #13**). Eleven out of 16 towns had this referendum on the ballot. The results: **22,441 against; 8,333 for.** In Upper Township, Cape May County, the question on the ballot was: Do you favor 100% recycling? Upper Township voted **4 to 1** in favor of 100% recycling. **Ogden Martin** continues the pursuit to build a 500 tpd mass-burn incinerator in Cape May County. Cape May County is a prime vacation spot for beachgoers in the summer months. Three months out of the year the waste stream generated in the county may approach 500 tpd. But the other nine months sees a dramatic decrease in waste tonnage. Cape May County is considering importing garbage from Philadelphia to make up the tonnage for the proposed incinerator. A county-wide debate was scheduled for November 4th. David Sussman of **Ogden Martin** had agreed to the debate. But neither Mr. Sussman or any other **Ogden Martin** representative appeared at the debate. Owen Murphy of the **Environmental Response Network** did appear, and on behalf of county residents spoke out against the dangers of incineration. For more information contact Owen Murphy, **Environmental Response Network**, 432 Asbury Avenue, Rear Apt., Ocean City, NJ 08226, tel 609-398-4030.

NEW JERSEY: 60% OF OCEAN COUNTY VOTERS REJECT MASS-BURN INCINERATION. 18 towns in Ocean County had a variety of referendums, individually written, concerning waste

Printed on recycled paper, naturally

incineration. 13 out of the 18 towns said no. In total, 60% of the voters in the 18 towns said no. Lakehurst, Ocean County, had 452 vote yes to incineration while 450 said no. For more information on Ocean County contact Jean Burnett of **Stop All Incineration Now (S.A.I.N.)**, 715 Chesapeake Drive, Forked River, NJ 08731, tel 609-693-8703.

MINNESOTA POLLUTION CONTROL AGENCY (MPCA) STAFF CRITICAL OF HEAVY RELIANCE ON INCINERATION.

"Twenty staff members of the MPCA have criticized the state's increasingly heavy reliance on incineration to solve its garbage problems, saying the potential effects on public health and the environment are not fully known. In a memorandum sent Tuesday to their boss, MPCA Commissioner Gerald Willet, the staff members said state and county decision makers have not given enough attention to recycling, waste reduction and other alternatives to burning garbage. They noted that incinerators can emit toxic wastes such as dioxin, and that incinerator ash also contains contaminants. They stressed that, in evaluating proposed incinerators to determine if they should receive operating permits, the MPCA has 'placed great emphasis on the human health risks associated with dioxin and other toxic emissions.' However, they said, 'Many environmental effects of pollutant emissions are incompletely understood...The bottom line is that we cannot fully evaluate all the potential environmental impacts of many toxic pollutant sources. Given these uncertainties, the question arises as to where the burden of proof lies...(Health) risk assessment is not likely to provide definitive answers anytime soon, if ever'...

In the memo, the staff members charges that Minnesota's 'track record on policy and regulation in the area of waste management has not been admirable.' They said that is due to many factors, including 'the rapidly changing waste-management scene, legislative inaction in areas such as container deposits, and the waste-management policy and regulatory structure within state government.' All too often, they charged, 'There has been insufficient study and planning for efficient waste management.'...Fourteen major incinerators are operating, being built or planned in Minnesota, including the big plant under construction in downtown Minneapolis under the sponsorship of the **Hennepin County Board**. The first such incinerator began operating in 1982 as part of the state's overall plan to reduce its reliance on landfills, which are a major source of ground water contamination. If, as planned, all those plants are in full operation in the early 1990's, they will burn at least half of Minnesota's municipal solid waste. An even larger amount, probably 80 to 85%, of the garbage generated in the seven-county Twin Citys metropolitan area will be incinerated. According to MPCA staff members, Minnesota will then have a heavier per-capita reliance on garbage incineration than any other state...the **Hennepin County Board** gave preliminary approval on a 4-3 vote to a proposal from the owner of the Minneapolis incinerator to transfer its ownership to a subsidiary of **General Electric**. Under the complicated arrangement, the new owner essentially would make equity payments into the project required from the current owner, **Blount Inc.**, in exchange for **Blount's tax benefits** from the project. **Blount** would lease the plant from the **G.E.** subsidiary and operate it. Star Tribune, Minneapolis, MN, 11-4-88. For more information contact Leslie Davis, **Earth Protector**, 1138 Plymouth Building, Minneapolis, MN 55402, tel 612-375-0202.

Waste Not # 29

*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