

ASH IN OHIO: THE ANSWER TO POLLUTION IS DILUTION. Two incinerator operators in Ohio have adopted a very simple way of solving the toxic ash dilemma. In **Akron**, the operators of the RDF facility are simply mixing the ash with cement kiln dust ("to neutralize the cadmium!"), and in **Columbus**, the operators are mixing the ash with sand prior to doing the EP Tox Test. After this "scientific treatment" the ash is dumped into an unlined landfill.

MASSACHUSETTS: WHEELABRATOR TO RAISE TIPPING FEE 500% AT THE 1500 TPD MASS-BURN INCINERATOR IN SAUGUS. "Salem, Beverly and other member communities of the RESCO (Refuse Energy Systems Co.) waste disposal plant were told FRiday it will soon cost nearly \$80 more per ton to dump trash at the Saugus plant, an increase of about 500%... The increases will cover the installation of state-mandated pollution control devices, acid gas scrubbers, at RESCO's trash-to-energy plant. The costs, which include expenses of heightened environmental guidelines imposed last year by the state, are to be paid over five years. A key concern, still unresolved, is how much the state will contribute to the spiraling costs associated with the environmental-related state law, signed into effect in December 1987. Community officials also learned at a briefing Friday that it could cost the 19 communities upwards of \$60 million to dispose of its waste elsewhere when RESCO shuts down for 18 months, starting in July. The controversial shut-off period is mandated by Chapter 584, a law championed by environmental activists. Some city and state officials are expected to lobby to extend the deadline to 1991 to allow RESCO to take the communities trash... RESCO told member communities Friday that the estimated base tipping fee in 1991 will be only \$22. But there are two expensive additions, which will be paid over a five-year period. First it will cost an additional \$39.71 per ton to cover the acid scrubber retrofitting. Second, it will cost between \$32 and \$40 per ton to cover the 'ash management' guidelines imposed recently by the state Department of Environmental Quality Engineering. Add the three figures together, and you get a total 1991 tipping fee of between \$93.10 to \$103.04..." The Salem Evening News, MA, 1-14-89, front page. (See **Waste Not # 12**, "Saugus Communities Fighting Pollution Control Because of Costs").

CONNECTICUT: WHEELABRATOR'S 2250 TPD MASS-BURN INCINERATOR IN BRIDGEPORT ACCEPTING HOSPITAL WASTE THAT TRIGGERED RADIATION ALARMS. "A tiny amount of radioactive material was detected inside a large load of Yale hospital trash as it was being brought into Bridgeport's new waste-to-energy plant, providing proof of the system's radiation screening ability, state officials said Monday. After the radioactive material triggered an alarm at the plant last Thursday, the trash was returned to a hospital loading dock, where radiation control specialists pinpointed the source and removed it from the garbage. The source was an eight-inch plastic tube containing a small amount of a radioactive isotope." New London Day, CT, 3-14-89.

INCINERATION VS RECYCLING: 3.2 TIMES AS MUCH ENERGY IS SAVED BY RECYCLING AS IS GENERATED BY BURNING. In a 3-22-88 letter to Frank C. Barry, Dr. Thomas G. Winter, a Professor of Physics wrote: "I would like to emphasize the striking contrast between recycling and mass burn from an energy-perspective. Consider the paper-component of urban waste. This is about 30% by weight of total waste and, both for recycling and mass-burn, is a very desirable component. **Mass Burn:** The heat of combustion of paper (1) is 7572 BTU/lb, or 15 megaBTU/ton. Converting this to kilowatt hours and assuming a conversion efficiency to useful electric energy of 30%, the burning of paper can be shown to yield 1300 kW hr/ton. **Recycling:** The energy saved by recycling paper (2) (as compared to starting from scratch) is 14.4 megaBTU/ton. This is equivalent to 4200 kW hr/ton. **Comparison:** It is seen that 3.2 times (=4200/1300) as much energy is saved by

Printed on recycled paper, naturally

recycling as is generated by burning. The matter is even clearer if one includes items such as aluminum and glass which generate very little energy by burning but which, particularly for aluminum, produce a large energy saving by recycling. **Conclusion:** The Energy Committee is concerned with maximizing energy production and energy efficiency -- improving insulation, boiler efficiency, etc. The Waste-to-Energy Subcommittee deals specifically with that aspect of energy relating to waste. The choice to our subcommittee and the committee as a whole is clear: Recycling is much more desirable than mass burn using our own energy criterion. Other arguments, such as lower costs and less environmental degradation, lead to the same conclusion." Dr. Winter teaches at Pennsylvania State University, Wilkes-Barre Campus, Lehman, PA 18627. References:
(1) Principles and Practices of Incineration, ed. R.C. Corey (Wiley, 1969) p. 7.
(2) Pennsylvania Recycling Manual, Governor's Energy Council, p. 5.

NEW YORK: FOSTER WHEELER MANEUVERS FOR AIR EMISSION VARIANCES FOR PROPOSED 450 TPD BROOME COUNTY INCINERATOR.

Written into the "Solid Waste Disposal Service Agreement between the Broome County Resource Recovery Agency and **Foster Wheeler Broome County, Inc.**", dated 10-19-88: "The DEC Part 360 permit to construct/draft permit to operate the Facility shall provide that, in the event the Facility exceeds the emissions limitations stated therein for organic compounds and trace metals, DEC enforcement relief will be afforded if the actual emissions levels are shown not to present a significant public health risk." (Page 30). For more information contact Alicia Culver, **New York Public Interest Research Group**, 601 N. Cayuga Street, Ithaca, NY 14850. Tel: 607-277-5214.

NEW YORK: BROOKLYN'S INCINERATION PLAN DISGUISED AS RECYCLING.

"By a vote of 7 to 0, the Environmental Protection Committee of the New York City Council voted March 13th to put a proposed recycling ordinance before the entire City Council. A vote is expected by March 28th. The proposed ordinance, Bill 952A, would require the NYC Department of Sanitation to recycle 25% of the City's garbage within five years. Larry Shapiro, Toxics Projects Counsel of the **NY Public Interest Research Group (NYPIRG)**, called the bill "sugar coating on the bitter pill of incineration." A telegram to the City Council from the state DEC Commissioner Thomas Jorling, stated, according to the NY Times (3-14-89), that the plan "will 'go a long way' toward winning his approval of the city's proposal to build a huge incinerator at the former Brooklyn Navy Yard." Robert Muldoon, Chair of the Solid Waste Committee of the NYC Sierra Club, called 952A "an incineration plan disguised as recycling." NYPIRG has drafted amendments to 952A which were submitted to the NYC Council calling for 60% recycling within 10 years and 90% within 20 years. The amendments are also supported by the NYC Sierra Club, Staten Island Citizens for Clean Air, Work on Waste, Williamsburg Assoc. of Safety and Health, and Brooklyn Recyclers Against Garbage Incineration." Memo to **Waste Not** from Jim Quigley. Jim works at the **Center for the Biology of Natural Systems**, Queens College, Flushing, NY 11367. Tel: 718-670-4192.

Waste Not #47

*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.

Canadian Subscriptions: \$30

*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