

**Ohio Solid Waste Management Review**  
**Phase II Kick-Off Meeting Notes**  
**July 16, 2012**

**Waste Management Technical and Programmatic Issues**

- Lime sludge – liquid or solid?
- Waste energy
- Recycling
- Permitting: Siting tech review
- **Recirc. Leachate** – Limits?
  - Don't eliminate completely
- Industry works well with local stakeholders to address environmental impacts
  - Host agreements
- Bioreactors – proceed cautiously; work with USEPA
- Small, old closed landfills – still need monitored?
- What is meant by licensing? Implications, process?
- Need certainty in terms of what is accepted as waste.
- Market for recovered materials varies over time. Can become burden on local community when market drops.
- Illegal dumps using C&DD rules to hide illegal activity. Need to define C&DD for law enforcement.
- Financial assurance to address problems with C&DD facilities.
- Better Point of Origin information from haulers

**Roles of Various Entities**

- Value of SWD – education; data collection; HHW/special collection days
- Industry challenge – when SWDs do what competes with industry
- SWDs facilitate new project/facility (not in place)
  - Response – only concerned if flow control imposed as condition
- Role for SWDs where industry does not serve
- Increased communication between the SWDs and health departments and EPA – timeliness; good info, but not always timely.
- Health Departments – continued important role – textbook reviews

**Other Big Picture Changes**

- Close gap between tire dealer and tire haulers

**SWMD Planning Issues**

- Question value of planning process
  - Value for state to know – annual reports
  - Expense going into planning: Is it worth it?
- How does EPA use plans? What is value?
- Timing between reporting and planning
- Scale back plan? Holds responsible/accountable
  - Could be a lot easier
- EPA comment: sets decision structure
  - When works correctly: and goals and measures; ways to evaluate outcomes => goals; puts issues on the books

## **Ratification**

- Veto is fair for some municipalities
  - “good for us; good for county”
- Access to info reduces Public Notification requirement need
- Distribution of info is often challenge
  - (how ensure distribution and access vs. provision)
- On right track with draft

## **Data**

- Add licensed junkyard
- Waste industry and haulers – question the value of reporting
- Nice to have vs. need for making decisions

## **Reporting**

- Centralize, uniform, electronic – make it easier to do good reporting
- Reporting keeps aware of what we’re doing. Agree with all the reports
  - Hard to create uniform reporting with such variance among SWM districts and sub-entities
- When EPA reports back, report against goals -> know what direction going in for/toward state goals. Info is what is needed by SWMDs and industry.

## **Role of State Plan – Solid Waste Action Committee & Format**

- State goals – avoid mandates, putting goals in statute
- Statute may overstep bounds of purpose, especially regarding recycling
- Date can be misleading. Must be cautious about interpreting
- More incentives, less mandates/command and control
- Goals to increase recycling may be counter-productive (e.g., % access to recycling)
- Is district plan necessary if we have state plan?
- What’s driving need for planning? If not capacity, what are the issues and goals?
- Law – less prescriptive regarding role of SWAC and what goes in state plan
- Does district structure work? How can you know until you have big picture of waste issues across state? Putting cart before the horse?
- Consortium – can lead to monopoly when they get too big.
  - Solution? When company wins bid for consortium in one part of district, they can’t compete for other areas of district.
    - May be too controlling of market

## **Not Covered Yet**

- Recycling
  - E-waste
  - Storm water management
  - How long do you have to monitor small landfills?
  - Combine landfill and recycling

- Flow control – 53 SWD to 8 – How's that going to work?
- Waste for economic development
  - Diversion – measure of success
  - Fees
  - Funding ranges – guidance
- Health department funding – stable
- What happens when you lose fees (revenues)?
- Revenue vs. expenses – Revised district authority
- Division of labor between divisions of OEPA
- Beneficial use
- Districts work together better – How?
- Keep carbon out of landfills (carbon footprint)
  - Sequestration (+)

### **SWMD Revenue**

- Districts should not have authority to make requirements of waste haulers that may favor large haulers
- Waiver fee – charge waste producer to take outside district
- Flat fees favored by industry
- Accounting for diverted waste?
- Fee should not determine where waste gets disposed. Should be based on service
- Fees should not incentivize out-of-state waste coming to Ohio
- Can OEPA have experts look at fee issues to make recommendations?
- Reuse programs/composting as alternative revenue generation.
- Ways for recycling to be viewed as revenue generation
- Eliminate operator training program

### **SWMD Funding – General**

- No requirement to reduce fees to consumer when fees are reduced. Not always direct connection
- Transparency by industry regarding fee increases

### **Sheets Marked A – F**

Sheet A:

- Diversion rate increase
- Recycle items commodity
- Restructure fees (x3) – not on disposal
- What it should look like in 10 years
- Flow control problems with reduction in number of waste districts down to eight
- No more us vs. them

Sheet B:

- Fair market place/flow control

- Financial resources to reach goals
- Simple and effective planning infrastructure
- District rule making authority
  - Siting and operational

#### Sheet C:

- Funding Framework
  - BOH
- Regulatory framework for material management
  - CDD
  - Industry waste
  - Residual waste
- Flow Control
- Technical issues
  - Mega landfills
  - Waste-to-Energy

#### Sheet D:

- Recycling/Recycling rates – increase
  - Make more of a commodity
- Alternative fuel
  - Waste-to-Energy
- Lack of demonstration plants
  - Funding for plants
- Mandate landfills to conduct recycling activities/goals
- Repeal mandated recycling rates
  - Flow control vs. curbside

#### Sheet E:

- Keep commodities being recycled
- Establish funding/funding mechanisms for community recycling programs
- Take advantage of economies of scale so programs are cost-effective for everyone involved
- Need sustainable funding
- Goals – Receive more credit for certain items (i.e. HHW) for reaching a goal
- Keep districts open to dynamism. Do not have rigid plan

#### Sheet F:

- Rename “Solid Waste Management” District to something like “Materials Resources Management”
- Move toward zero waste through
  - Improved programs
  - Improved rules
  - Improved infrastructure and processes

- Better guidelines
- Incentives and grants and loans
- Define need and purpose of Solid Waste Management Districts and many other issues will fall into place
- Develop consistency between different divisions
- Maintain flow control → retire public debt
- Wholistic:
  - W & E
  - LF Gas → Electric →
  - Recycle/Reuse/Reduce
  - Diversion
  - Compost
  - Divert funding for P/C care

### **Most Important**

- What is our goal ten years from now? Where do we want to get to?
- Technical aspects – Day with OEPA and experts
- Flow control – public sector: debt; private: fair market place
- Recycling – See as commodity. Re\_\_\_\_\_ to flow control.
- Economics – fee structures; end use for recycling
- Economic drivers imports, especially flow control

### **Other Issues**

- Mixing yard waste and trash – don't allow at any point in waste stream
- Sharps – require seller/manufacturer to collect
- Grease from restaurants
- Solidification (lime sludge)
- Industry doesn't necessarily support specific programs (e.g. EPR, PAYT)
- Landfill can't be point of compliance for banned articles (e.g. plastic bags)
- Ensure recycling centers are actually recycling