

EPA WILL MANDATE MATERIAL SOURCE SEPARATION AS PART OF BEST AVAILABLE CONTROL

TECHNOLOGY. "Under strong pressure from industry, the Environmental Protection Agency today (Nov. 30) proposed a compromise regulation aimed at reducing the burning of garbage 25% by forcing incinerator operators to recycle it. The proposal, now being circulated for public comment, gives incinerator operators more time to comply than the agency had originally sought and puts some of the burden for recycling on cities, counties and towns. The proposal took into account some objections of incinerator industry officials who had seen a draft of the regulation...The incinerator industry, which has a multibillion-dollar investment at stake, did not want to be saddled with having to sort garbage to separate glass, metal, plastic, paper and other recyclable materials...But the (Federal Office of Management and Budget) and most of the industry were apparently reassured by the compromises to which the EPA agreed. Among these were a provision that gives incinerator operators two more years, until 1994, to show that they are complying with the rule; gives more of the recycling responsibility to municipalities; opens the possibility that the final regulation could call for less than 25% recycling, and relaxes the limits on emissions of toxic substances from incinerator smokestacks...The recycling plan, which is to go into effect in a year, is part of a broader regulation on incinerator emissions that a Federal court had ordered released for public comment by today. The deadline was a result of a suit brought by the State of New York and the Natural Resources Defence Council, an environmental group, under which the EPA is required to regulate incinerator emissions. The public has 75 days to comment. The regulation says its requirements will be superseded if Congress passes comprehensive legislation on solid waste by 1994. The industry and local governments favor such legislation...Allen Moore, president of the National Solid Wastes Management Association, which represents many disposal companies...supports the proposed recycling provision. But **Wheelabrator Technologies Inc.**, a leading builder of plants that burn waste and generate power, dissented from that view. 'We believe Federal initiatives to advance recycling are essential,' said Rodney C. Gilbert, **Wheelabrator's** president and managing director, 'but we don't believe they have a part or place in an air emissions standard'..." New York Times (National) 12-1-89, pg A-30.

NEWLY FORMED COALITION, GRASSROOTS ALLIANCE FOR SOLID WASTE SOLUTIONS, CALLS EPA'S PROPOSALS INCONSISTENT WITH GENUINE POLLUTION PREVENTION.

At a November 30th press conference in Washington, DC, hosted by Ralph Nader, the **Grassroots Alliance** issued a stinging critique of EPA's 'New Source Performance Standards.' While applauding any effort to focus on the front end of the waste problem they characterized EPA's paltry 25% recycling goal as being inconsistent with a genuine effort at pollution prevention. "The best way to prevent air pollution from incinerators is to avoid burning resources in the first place...a careful look reveals that this proposed EPA policy will lead to and provide legitimacy for incineration and landfilling of the remaining 75% of the waste stream...the new standards will in fact perpetuate the fallacy that discarded materials should be disposed of as 'waste' rather than utilized as raw materials...If the federal government is serious about pollution prevention, it should ban garbage incineration and require municipal governments to ensure that all recyclable materials are in fact recycled..." Statement from an 8-page **Grassroots Alliance** release prepared by Larry Shapiro of the N.Y. Public Interest Research Group with technical assistance and support from: George Baggett, Harriet Barlow, Dr. Henry Cole, Lisa Collaten, Dr. Paul Connett, Jessica Cowan, Walter Hang, Arthur Kell, Steven Romalewski, Neil Seldman, Tom Webster, and Matt Bregman. The **Grassroots Alliance for Solid Waste Solutions** is a new coalition of local, state and national organizations. For a copy of their release and for more information contact Neil Seldman, Institute of Local Self Reliance, 2425 18th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20009. Tel: 202-232-4108.

Printed on recycled paper, naturally

VERMONT: STOP PRESS - IN REFERENDUM VOTERS SAY NO TO REVIVE BANKRUPT AND IDLE RUTLAND INCINERATOR.

On December 12, voters from the 25 towns making up the Solid Waste District, voted against a \$19.5 million bond to revive the Rutland incinerator. The votes: 5,414 NO and 2,870 YES. In a second vote on the December 12th referendum, on whether to allow a local garbage conglomerate, **The Meridian Co.**, to run the facility, residents voted 4,876 NO and 2,861 YES. Since the 240 tpd Vicon incinerator in Rutland went bankrupt in August 1988, the Bank of Japan has been left holding the bonds on this defunct incinerator (it operated only nine months). The Bank of Japan has intimated that if residents don't vote for this bond issue they will revive the incinerator as a medical waste incinerator.

MISSISSIPPI: CITIZENS OF PIKE COUNTY UNITE TO DEFEAT MEDICAL WASTE INCINERATOR PROPOSED BY WASTE MANAGEMENT INC.

"Becky Ray knew a new day had come to Pike County when ladies' clubs and black Muslims joined forces to oppose a proposed medical waste incinerator. 'We had all walks of life,' said Ray, a member of Citizens for a Clean Environment, which recently defeated the waste incinerator proposal by **WMI Medical Services of the South**...Ray said the unlikely coalition collected more than 9,000 signatures against the incinerator. Although the county has 26,500 registered voters, only about 14,200 voted in the 1988 presidential election. 'There was finally an issue that was so much bigger than anything else,' she said. 'Education doesn't generally worry people without children, but the issue of the air we breathe and the water we drink allowed us to bring all types of people together. There was also the fact that some people in the community decided the community was not sophisticated or intelligent enough to decide for ourselves,' she said. 'They misjudged us, terribly. Our town leaders misjudged us.' County supervisor Theodore Bullock said the intense opposition killed the proposal. 'Ninety percent of the county didn't want that thing,' Bullock said...**WMI's** plan initially got an enthusiastic reception from local business and political leaders, who were told the facility would produce \$250 million in revenue... 'Everybody supported it because of the revenue it would provide for the county' until the opposition surfaced, (Supervisor) Marks said. 'It isn't often this many people will come out against something.'" Group member Ben Weathersby said the defeat represented "the first example of people in Pike County forgetting all their political, philosophical and racial arguments to work together." **WMI** filed a permit application to build the incinerator in June 1989. Another group member Dr. Robbie DeCoux asked the Pike County Board of Supervisors on November 2nd "to hold a referendum on the proposal. Five days later, supervisors began to waffle in their support of the plan. But the board wasn't entirely ready to change: a motion to rescind a July 11 vote supporting the incinerator was defeated 3-2. On Nov. 8 supervisors voted 4-1 to file suit to force the state Department of Environmental Quality to withdraw a permit issued to **WMI** for a medical waste transfer station at the site of the incinerator. Supervisors learned about the transfer station, which operates independently of the

proposed incinerator, after the permit was granted. On Nov. 14, supervisors asked **WMI** not to build the incinerator. That vote was seen as the end of the project, since **WMI** officials on Nov. 10 said the company would withdraw from Pike County without public support." **WMI** withdrew its permit application on Nov. 18. The Clarion-Ledger, Jackson, MS, 12-4-89.

Waste Not # 80

A publication of
Work On Waste USA,
a non-profit corporation dedicated to the
promotion of sound resource
management policy.

Annual Subscription Rate: \$ 35

Students & Seniors: \$ 25

Consultants &

for-profit organizations: \$100.

Canadian subscriptions: \$US40

Letters, articles and calls from the public
welcome.

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