

**Summary Minutes  
Solid Waste Management Advisory Council (SWAC)  
February 21, 2008  
Lazarus Government Center  
50 W. Town Street  
Columbus, OH 43215**

**The Following Members Announced Their Attendance at Roll Call:**

Eilert Ofstead, Statewide Environmental Advocacy Group  
Erv Ball, Health Departments  
Jack Jensen, Municipalities  
Dan Harris, Ohio EPA  
Brad Biggs, ODOH  
Steve Hill, Industrial Generators  
Tim Wasserman, Joint County SWMDs  
Karl Graham, Municipalities  
Kathy Trent, Private Solid Waste Management Industry  
Ralph Jennings, Townships

Yolanda Walker, Single County SWMDs, arrived after roll call.

Director Chris Korleski addressed the Council to start the meeting. He thanked everyone for doing their part concerning solid waste management in Ohio. Solid waste has taken a large portion of his time during his first year with the Agency as there has been some struggles with landfills maintaining compliance. He said that finishing up the newest version of the C&DD rules is a priority, and they are expected to be finalized in the near future.

The metaphor of a web was used to explain how landfills, their neighbors, the economy, industry relationships, environmental protection all have interdependence on each other. Pulling one string can have impacts on many of the other aspects. Ohioans produce a lot of waste, not unlike other states, and we take in a lot of out-of-state waste as well. We have to ask what can be done better. Current issues involve finding solutions to deal with hydrogen sulfide emissions as well as aluminum wastes.

He pointed out that HB 592, the bill that set the framework for solid waste management in Ohio, is now 20 years old. The question of whether recycling is where it should be at now in Ohio needs to be asked. Also, we need to ask what Ohio can do to make recycling better and acknowledge what is already working. The fact cannot be ignored that landfills are needed in this day and age. The status quo may change in the future and it will always be good practice to search for a better way to do business.

### **Review of the August 16, 2007 meeting minutes**

Ralph Jennings MOVED to approve the minutes from the August 16, 2008 meeting. Jack Jensen SECONDED the motion and the minutes were approved on voice vote.

### **Review of the November 15, 2007 meeting minutes**

Eilert Ofstead noted that a comment concerning the siting criteria was not included in the minutes. The comment concerned other states' requirements to evaluate the need for additional landfills in a particular area to ensure that one part of the state, such as northeast Ohio, wouldn't get more than their fair share of the facilities.

Ralph Jennings MOVED to accept the November 17, 2008 meeting minutes with the amendment. Erv Ball SECONDED the motion and the minutes were approved on voice vote.

### **Dan Harris, DSIWM - Update on Legislative/DSIWM Issues**

Mr. Harris started by explaining that neither HB 322 nor HB 378 have had additional hearings since the November SWAC meeting. HB 169, the lead acid battery legislation, passed and will become effective on April 25, 2008. The Agency has developed guidance materials and fact sheets, but little change is expected since over 90% of the batteries were already recycled through the existing infrastructure.

As the Director mentioned, a revised C&DD rule package should be completed once the final interested party comments are incorporated. In this upcoming year, some rule packages that are under review are the licensing of facilities package, the composting rules, and the fee rules. Every five years, the Agency is required to review all rules (many of which do not require any change). Rule packages to be filed before JCARR as "no change" are the residual waste rules, incinerator rules, and the regulation of select waste rules.

Mr. Harris attended the second annual New England C&DD Summit. He related how that part of the country seems to be a lot further along in the development of the infrastructure for C&DD recycling. A lot of the program was geared towards market development with grant programs and infrastructure support. The idea is to try to encourage development of regional markets, ensuring that all the players are involved, because what one state, or industry, does is not always cohesive with what the next is doing. C&DD on the east coast usually goes to one of two

types of transfer facilities. The first is considered a recycling facility, where materials are pulled off, not unlike a materials recovery facility (MRF). The second is essentially like a solid waste transfer facility, where they might pull out some metal. The waste coming to Ohio is generally from this second kind of facility. An example was given of an Ohio company that wants to use wood waste for fuel and it is cheaper for them to order it from the east coast. The economics of Ohio's landfills do not provide the incentive to separate out materials like wood.

It was discussed how, with Ohio's landfills having such low tipping fees, the C&DD recycling industry struggling because it is more economical to send it out of state for disposal. The fact that C&DD funds are used to help fund health departments and the Agency does not help to incentivize options other than disposal. It was mentioned that there is an effort going on now to push for C&DD facilities to accommodate recycling at the same site, ODNR was looking at the possibility of grants for support of such projects. On the east coast, they regulate all types of facilities, including recycling. We have to look at what we can do from the disposal side of the problem. Some states prohibit the disposal of lumber, for example.

### **Patrick Lanaghan – Overview of the Belmont Jefferson Regional Solid Waste Authority**

Mr. Lanaghan started by providing an overview of the demographics for the Authority. He noted how the Authority's staff consisted of only one part-time coordinator back in 2005. Today, the organizational chart consists of a full-time Director, with a fiscal officer and a special events coordinator both working part-time for the Authority. The Authority took each of the Recycling and Litter Prevention Offices under their wings when the ODNR funding was lost. As far as servicing, the Authority operates as one organization rather than the two separate counties. Each of the counties' Keep Ohio Beautiful offices consists of a director, an educational specialist, and three or four drivers/laborers.

These changes were a result of the Authority's previous solid waste management plan update, and by the fact that Apex Landfill in Jefferson County started receiving waste in 2005. The amount of fees collected by the Authority has increased dramatically each year since then. The quantity of out-of-state waste has also increased significantly each year, with almost one million tons being received in 2007. Currently, the Authority has a contract fee of fifty cents per ton of waste received from other states, which lasts through 2008. They are considering raising the Authority's tiered disposal fee, currently \$1/\$2/\$1.

The landfill has been a source of some problems, including odors and litter, since it has been in operation. The Apex landfill was recently sold to Environmental Logistics Services and the new company is planning to tackle these problems.

The landfill receives most of its waste by rail and essentially sits on top of a hill, which contributes to the odor problems. Furthermore, the road system is not ideal. In fact, the nearest town of 600 people, New Amsterdam, does not even ship their waste to the landfill. Much of the area's waste is still disposed out-of-state in West Virginia. It is expected that the company will get a contract to accept some waste from New York City, which will increase the disposal numbers even more.

The presentation provided details of the various programs throughout the District such as education and promotional efforts, HHW and electronic collections, clean-up activities, and special event recycling. The recycling rates within the Authority have nearly doubled. The budget was examined as well, showing how the landfill fees have become the primary source of funds.

### **Steve Sargent, Rumpke Recycling – Recycling Market/Waste Management Trends**

Mr. Sargent explained how he's been in the waste industry for many years and was present when Rumpke Recycling Company was created in 1989. He has seen many fluctuations in the markets for different materials since that time. Recycling rates are driven by three major things: legislation, market growth, and technology. He then provided a quick overview of the legislature that has affected recycling in Ohio.

The markets can attain stability if they are fueled by domestic and export demand (which is increasing dramatically). Looking at the fiber market, the domestic processing capacity has decreased significantly. At the same time, China has emerged as a market and is consuming more than 27 million tons of domestic fiber (one fifth of all recovered paper). The domestic trend has been to shut many of the smaller paper mills and they are being replaced by larger, regional facilities. In general, plastic markets have seen an increase in demand. Markets for new materials have been added, such as film plastic. Plastic bottle recovery rates are on the increase as well. Metal markets have always been the most consistent for demand and the recycling rates continue to rise as well. A response to the demand for some material streams has been direct consumer involvement in the collection, such as the paper retrievers or aluminum can collection points often set up at schools or businesses. These programs bypass the existing recycling infrastructure because the value is high enough to warrant the collection.

The innovations in recycling technology have allowed additional materials to be gathered from the waste stream. Source-separation is not always economical so mechanical separation provides the ability to have single-stream collection programs. In single-stream collection, all the recyclables are combined in one truck or container allowing for increased collection efficiency and flexibility for

growth. Some new technologies, such as advanced finishing screens and paper recovery, should allow increased recycling from the commercial sector. Many new programs are incentive-based, and award the recyclers for their actions. New data collection technologies, such as radio frequency identification tags, are being used to complement the programs.

Mr. Sargent said that there are some challenges to the future growth of the recycling industry. The long term stability of the export markets is one of them. Education and accessibility are essential for programs to be fully functional. Contamination rates are another concern. New packaging is continually emerging that does not fit the markets and separation technology that are currently being used. Single-stream collection has its unique challenges as well, with more of the burden being shifted from the home to the MRF. With the need for a market for the broken glass that comes along with single-stream recycling, Rumpke operates a sorting facility just for that material in Dayton. It separates the glass to levels that can be used to make fiberglass insulation.

### **Ernie Stall, Ohio EPA-DSIWM – State Plan Update-Education Goal and Siting Criteria**

Concerning the siting criteria portion of the State Plan, Mr. Stall explained that he received comments from one SWAC member since the last SWAC meeting, where he had presented on the topic. It was asked if there are any additional comments and an inquiry was made as to why gravel pits are specifically identified in the criteria. Back in the 1970s and earlier, geology was not a criteria for choosing landfill locations, and often times gravel pits were chosen because there was already a hole in the ground. At this point of the state plan revision process, SWAC will be moving on from the siting criteria.

Concerning the education goal of the state plan, Districts are required to provide informational and technical assistance on source reduction as well as assistance on recycling, reuse, and composting opportunities. The requirements are the same as those established in the 1995 State Plan and they give SWMDs maximum flexibility as far as programs. Many SWMDs have traditionally focused on awareness education. Since there are no minimum standards for meeting the goals, a wide variability in programming exists among the SWMDs and some of the tools Ohio EPA believes to be necessary are not being provided statewide. The challenge is to set a minimum standard while still maintaining flexibility for the Districts. Also, the programs should promote changing behavior instead of awareness and would utilize the planning process to make it more meaningful and useful.

Ohio EPA requested input from SWMD coordinators at a SWMD/Ohio EPA Workgroup Meeting and informally concluded that some sort of menu system may make sense. A particular SWMD would pick types and/or specified number

of programs from the menu. A focus group of education professionals, including District educators, ODNR, OEEF, and Ohio State convened to discuss the education goal and what makes good recycling/waste reduction education. Conceptual ideas (i.e. best practices) and programmatic ideas (i.e. model programs) were brainstormed and evaluated and five target audiences were identified:

- Residents
- Schools,
- Industries,
- Institutions and commercial businesses,
- Communities and political leaders.

The recommendation concerning the goal was to focus on outreach, not just education. Also, it was agreed that there should be two parts to the outreach goal: statewide standardization, and an outreach and marketing plan. In order to achieve some statewide standardization, the goal will specify those programs that, at a minimum, all SWMDs will provide:

- Web page,
- Comprehensive resource guide,
- Infrastructure inventory,
- Speaker/presenter.

For the outreach and marketing aspect of the goal, SWMDs will be required to select a priority area and provide outreach to the appropriate target audiences in the context of the priority area. More emphasis should be stressed on assessing the existing infrastructure and its needs and providing outreach with that in mind, making sure not to encourage an activity if the infrastructure necessary to allow the activity does not exist. Also identified for successful outreach programs were having measurable outcomes to achieve, understanding that different audiences have different needs, using a consistent and frequently repeated message, focusing on changing behavior not just promoting awareness, and evaluating results/outcomes. In summary, the new outreach plan will name the specific programs that all SWMDs will provide, and will contain an explication of the requirement to develop an outreach and marketing plan.

Mr. Wasserman indicated that he ran the minimum requirements by many of the SWMD coordinators and three of the four requirements are not troublesome, but a webpage requirement may be a financial burden for some. It was explained that this requirement is a minimum bar that the majority of SWMDs already do. The education goal has not changed in 12 years and it's time to make education programs more effective – not just making people aware, but getting them to recycle by following some best practices. It was discussed how it is good to see things moving forward and it was also asked what Ohio EPA could do to help the SWMDs more. One example was to utilize Ohio EPA's website more for information sharing.

**Agenda Items for the May 15, 2008 SWAC meeting**

- With the analog to digital television switch coming soon, e-waste would be a pertinent topic
- Impact of the budget situation
- How the Environmental Protection Fee has been used
- ODNR should have the list of grant recipients available

Karl Graham MOVED to adjourn the meeting.  
Brad Biggs SECONDED the motion.

Respectfully submitted: \_\_\_\_\_  
Erv Ball, Vice Chair

Minutes approved on: \_\_\_\_\_

Certified by: \_\_\_\_\_  
Kathy Trent, Secretary