
INDIANA SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN

**VOLUME III
TECHNICAL GUIDE
1991**

**Developed By: The Indiana Department of
Environmental Management
Evan Bayh, Governor
Kathy Prosser, Commissioner**

Indiana Department of Environmental Management
TECHNICAL GUIDE

Volume III of III
Indiana Solid Waste Management Plan

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INDIANA SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN

VOLUME III - TECHNICAL GUIDE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

●	Introduction	SECTION I
●	History of Indiana Solid Waste Management Planning	SECTION II
●	Summary of Related Legislation	SECTION III
●	Records of Public Comment During State Plan Development	SECTION IV
●	Technical Papers:	SECTION V
	- Source Reduction	
	- Recycling	
	- Composting	
	- Landfill Technologies	
	- Incineration/Waste-to-Energy Systems	
	- Other Approaches to Solid Waste Management	
	- Management of Problem Wastes	
●	Planning Reference	SECTION VI
	- Existing Indiana Solid Waste Generation and Composition	
	- Estimating Solid Waste Generation and Composition	
	- Facility Siting Considerations	
	- Funding and Financial Plans	

INDIANA SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN
VOLUME III
TECHNICAL GUIDE

INTRODUCTION

The following compilation of technical papers and planning reference documents provide more detailed information on solid waste management methods and planning issues. Information is also provided on the history of solid waste management in Indiana, and pertinent legislation.

The material presented on each topic has been derived from workpapers developed by engineers and policy analysts specializing in the various technologies and applications involved with each solid waste management approach. These papers are for informational purposes only and do not serve as an endorsement of certain solid waste management techniques.

This Technical Guide is offered as an introductory-level composite of technical and planning information that will be of use to district decision makers. It is not intended to serve as a complete tutoring resource. IDEM will supplement this guide with additional technical assistance documents and direct support from staff so that local officials have access to comprehensive services and materials.

HISTORY OF INDIANA SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLANNING

INTRODUCTION

Historically, land disposal has been the most often used method of solid waste disposal throughout the country. In Indiana, all of Indiana's local governments have relied heavily on this method for historical solid waste management. However, growing concern for the environment, increasing concern for potential groundwater pollution problems caused by leakage from landfills, and growing public fear and opposition to new sites have prompted to move towards safer, more effective solid waste management practices across the country. The dilemma has become how to handle the increasing quantities of solid waste generated each year. In Indiana, this move towards more effective solid waste management has resulted in the passage of House Bill 1240 (HB1240) in March 1990, providing the guiding force for waste planning and management for the present and for the future.

The siting and operation of sanitary landfills, as well as the responsibility for solid waste collection and disposal, has traditionally been a county government activity. The responsibility for proper future solid waste management has similarly been vested in county government, strengthened and enhanced by the enactment of HB1240 and other solid waste legislation.

HISTORICAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT

Indiana has relied almost entirely on landfills for its solid waste disposal needs. The enactment of numerous pieces of legislation as well as certain past State activities have had a progressive impact on traditional disposal methods and available alternatives.

Indiana's Refuse Disposal Act of 1965 prohibited the open dumping of solid waste after January 1, 1971. This act spurred the development and use of sanitary landfills, which are now the predominant method of waste disposal in Indiana. It also authorized counties, cities, and towns to acquire, construct, operate and maintain certain facilities for the collection and disposal of solid waste.

In 1976, the Federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act mandated that all states develop individual solid waste management plans. The goal of this act was to promote the protection

of human health and the environment through safe disposal practices, the recovery of valuable materials and energy from solid waste, and the development of local solid waste management plans that promote improved solid waste management techniques.

In 1980, the Indiana State Board of Health was given the responsibility of preparing Indiana's statewide solid waste management plan. Much of the work toward completion of the state plan was provided through contracted agreement with the State Planning Services Agency. In April, 1980, a subcommittee was formed to assist with the decision making responsibilities with regard to the development of the final state plan. In April, 1981, the Indiana Solid Waste Management Plan was adopted by the Indiana Environmental Management Board. However, the loss of federal funding, coupled with the prioritizing of hazardous waste regulation and cleanup over municipal solid waste management, prevented implementation of the adopted plan.

In early 1988, the Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) received encouragement from the United States Environmental Protection Agency to review and update Indiana's solid waste management plan. In response, the IDEM prepared a draft statewide solid waste management plan, designed as a tool to stimulate public discussion of the problems of solid and hazardous waste management facing Indiana. Volume I of that plan addressed only municipal solid waste in Indiana. Other volumes were to have considered hazardous wastes and other types of solid waste management, such as sludges, mining and agricultural wastes, and special wastes. Much of the information gathered through this effort, updated as necessary or as available, has been used in the preparation of this solid waste management plan.

In March of 1990, Governor Evan Bayh signed HB1240, a comprehensive bill designed to address the solid waste problem in the State of Indiana, into law. One of the primary purposes of HB1240 is to reduce the amount of solid waste disposed in landfills or incinerated by 35 percent by 1996 and by 50 percent by 2001. Another primary purpose is the development of a state-wide solid waste management plan which is intended to provide an information base and a framework of goals and objectives to be used as a reference in developing and implementing local solid waste management plans. A final purpose of HB1240 is the requirement that all counties form solid waste management districts, either individually or jointly, and develop plans for their solid waste management for the next 20 years.

The key dates included in HB1240 are:

- July 1, 1990** Recycling Promotion and Assistance Fund is to be established.
- September 1, 1990** A draft of the statewide solid waste management plan is to be submitted to the Environmental Policy Board by the IDEM.
- January 1, 1991** The final statewide solid waste management plan is to be adopted.
- July 1, 1991** Counties in Indiana must form solid waste management districts, either individually or jointly with any number of other counties.
- January 1, 1992** Voluntary waste reduction guidelines are to be issued by the Packaging Waste Reduction Task Force and the Recycled Paper Task Force.
- July 1, 1992** Solid waste management districts must submit their solid waste management plans to the Commissioner of the IDEM for approval.
- January 1, 1996** Date on which Indiana's goal of reducing the amount of solid waste landfilled or incinerated by 35 percent is reached.
- January 1, 2001** Date on which Indiana's goal of reducing the amount of solid waste landfilled or incinerated by 50 percent is reached.

HISTORICAL AND CURRENT DISPOSAL STATUS

In 1980, there were approximately 150 permitted solid waste landfills in Indiana. Through the steady phaseout of environmentally undesirable sites, the closing of certain sites that reached or exceeded their disposal capacities, and the increasing difficulty in siting new facilities, the number of permitted landfills has steadily declined over the past ten years. In 1990, the total number of permitted sanitary municipal solid waste landfills, excluding those located on military installations and those which receive only coal ash or waste-to-energy ash, has decreased to 79, a decline of nearly 50 percent in just ten years. Only a handful of new landfill and expansion permits have been issued by the IDEM in the recent past. In addition, one un-permitted land disposal facility is reportedly in operation in the Gary area.

In 1988, the IDEM projected that over one-third of the sanitary landfills then in operation had remaining lives of less than five years, and would be closed by 1994. Based on then-available data, over 60 percent of the existing landfills were projected to be closed by the end of 1995, leaving the total number of sanitary landfills in Indiana at approximately 33. By 1996, only 28 of Indiana's 92 counties were projected to have any landfill capacity remaining. The total state-wide remaining landfill life was projected to be a relatively short 8.3 years in 1988.

The overall landfill picture has changed little over the last two years. Currently in Indiana, there are 79 sanitary landfills permitted by the state to receive municipal solid waste. Those landfills located on military reservations and those permitted to receive only ash and byproducts from utility, waste-to-energy, wastewater treatment plants, and solid fill sites are not included in this figure. Over one-half of the permitted municipal solid waste facilities are projected to be full and closed by the end of this decade, based on a recent survey conducted by the IDEM and on information provided in numerous closure plans submitted to the State in 1989. These estimates assume that no expansions to existing facilities are granted. They are also based on current annual waste receipt rates. If landfills actually do close at the expected rate, the burden on other open landfills will necessarily increase, thereby reducing their remaining lives proportionately. Such a spiraling effect could shorten Indiana's total landfill capacity at a drastic rate in the very near future.

A complication to remaining landfill life state-wide could result due to the time necessary to permit either new or expanded landfills. It is not uncommon for five or more years to be required for a permit to be received from the State for additional facilities. In early 1990, a total of twenty-two expansion permits had been filed at the IDEM, some with applications originally submitted as early as 1985. One new landfill and several expansions of existing landfills have reportedly been approved over the past two years.

As a further complication, Indiana has seen an ever-increasing influx of out-of-state waste into its landfills, most notably from the East coast, and from the northern Illinois area. Land-disposal facilities in these highly urbanized areas are becoming more and more scarce and very expensive, and new facilities are proving nearly impossible to site due to lack of available land. Therefore, low tipping fees and available space in Indiana is highly attractive, in spite of the increased hauling distance required to dispose here. This has led to an even more rapid depletion of Indiana's available land disposal capacity.

On the positive side, Indiana has seen a surge in recycling activities over the past two years. Based on the results of a statewide recycling survey conducted in 1988, IDEM reported that there were approximately 65 recycling facilities of various types located throughout the state. Most were small, unorganized drop-off and buy-back centers, and only 29 of Indiana's 92 counties had such facilities in 1987. Nineteen of these facilities were located in Marion county alone. In addition, there was one permitted and several small composting operations throughout the state.

The results of a follow-up IDEM survey in 1990 indicated that there were over 345 recycling facilities of various types (consisting mainly of drop-off and buy-back centers, processing facilities and some municipally run curbside collection programs) throughout the state, a dramatic increase in just two years. In 1990, all but 14 counties reported some form of recycling activity or involvement. While the IDEM surveys are not all-encompassing or complete, due to the difficulties involved in obtaining complete, accurate, and timely responses from such diverse activity across the state, it is evident that Indiana counties are expanding their recycling activities at a rapid pace.

It is not known exactly how much of Indiana's waste is being recycled at this time; however, it is apparent that significant efforts are underway to increase recycling activities. Nearly all recycling efforts have been developed at the local level, without mandate from either the state or federal government. In a 1988 report, the IDEM estimated that approximately five percent of the solid waste generated annually by Indiana residents was being recycled or reused in some fashion. It is expected that this figure is somewhat higher in 1990, based on the observed increase in recycling facilities in existence across the state.

Several Indiana counties and communities also rely on transfer stations for solid waste management and disposal. In 1990, there were 42 transfer stations located in 32 counties throughout the state. Several of these facilities also incorporate some form of material recovery into their operations. Most transfer stations which include some type of material recovery are privately owned and operated.

The final form of solid waste management, waste-to-energy systems, is not predominant in Indiana, and has seen no development over the recent past. Only two large-scale municipal solid waste incineration facilities are in operation at the present time. The largest, located in Indianapolis, generates steam from the incineration process for resale to the downtown steam heating system. The second facility, located in East Chicago, is currently an incineration-only plant with plans to install energy recovery equipment in the near future. A third facility, to be located in Bloomington, is reportedly going through the planning and permitting stages. Numerous governmental and private concerns have been investigating waste-to-energy systems over the past several years as a means of future solid waste management, but none are known to be in the developmental stages at this time. There are also over 200 other permitted incinerator facilities throughout the state. All are privately owned; all are small commercial facilities serving the direct waste incineration needs of institutions such as hospitals, food markets, and animal shelters. None of these facilities is currently known to burn municipal solid waste generated by persons other than their owner or operator.

It is estimated that the two operational municipal waste-to-energy facilities in Indiana could process and burn from ten to fifteen percent (on a tonnage basis) of the estimated total municipal solid waste generated by Indiana residents in 1990, if they were fully supplied and fully operational year-round at industry-average availability rates. This range of values does not represent a total net waste stream reduction, since ash produced by the incineration process would still require landfilling.

HISTORICAL AND CURRENT LOCAL PLANNING EFFORTS

Local governments have historically been responsible for the collection and disposal of solid waste generated within their jurisdictions. As such, several planning districts have developed over the recent past for the purposes of planning for and exploring alternative methods for the future disposal of the solid waste stream. As a result of a survey conducted in 1988 by the Indiana Association of Cities and Towns, nearly two-thirds of the cities and almost one-half of the counties that responded (representing approximately 48 percent of Indiana's population) indicated they had begun considering future solid waste management alternatives. At that time, there were no regional solid waste management plans in effect in Indiana, however.

Several regional development and planning organizations have investigated the feasibility of and the planning for solid waste management, incorporating a variety of options including large-scale recycling programs, transfer stations, waste-to-energy facilities, and regional landfills. Among such entities are the Michiana Area Council of Governments (St. Joseph, Elkhart, and Marshall Counties), the Northeast Indiana Regional Coordinating Council (LaGrange, Steuben, Noble, DeKalb, Whitley,

Allen, Huntington, Wells, and Adams Counties), Indiana 15 Regional Planning Commission (Crawford, Dubois, Orange, Perry, and Spencer Counties), River Hills Economic Development District and Regional Planning Commission (Clark, Harrison, Floyd, Washington and, Scott Counties) and the Northwestern Indiana Regional Planning Commission (Lake, Porter, and LaPorte Counties). In addition, Marion County reportedly has a solid waste management strategy which relies on its waste-to-energy facility and the development of county-wide recycling programs.

Other counties are actively investigating the formation of single or multi-county solid waste districts at this time, as a result of the mandates of HB1240. The level of such effort will necessarily increase dramatically following the issuance of the statewide solid waste plan.

Many municipalities across Indiana have also investigated the feasibility of alternative solid waste management strategies. Such investigations are reportedly in the planning or pilot program stages, and it is not known whether any full-scale or successful alternative waste management facilities have been implemented at the municipal level. It is also reported that many municipalities not connected to regional planning organizations working specifically on solid waste management are interested in organizing with the surrounding counties to address the problem jointly.

Existing regional planning districts or commissions do not necessarily have to form into solid waste districts under HB1240. However, it may prove beneficial in some areas to consider this possibility. Although existing planning commissions have not yet developed or implemented solid waste management plans or programs, it is highly likely that their past efforts and existing intergovernmental relationships would form a solid basis for the development of the solid waste management districts mandated by HB1240. Many of the past planning efforts undertaken by such commissions could be beneficial in helping newly formed solid waste districts develop and implement their ultimate solid waste management plan on a timely and cost effective basis.

SUMMARY OF RELATED LEGISLATION

RECORDS OF PUBLIC COMMENT DURING STATE PLAN DEVELOPMENT

**SUMMARY OF COMMENTS
FROM PUBLIC MEETINGS**

**INDIANA SOLID WASTE
MANAGEMENT PLAN**

June 1990

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

I. SCOPE OF PLAN

A. State self-sufficiency in waste disposal.....	1
B. Disposing of out-of-state wastes.....	1
C. Illegal dumping.....	1
Scope of problem and need.....	1
Causes of illegal dumping.....	1
How to stop illegal dumping.....	1
D. Special and hazardous waste.....	2
Hazardous waste.....	2
Special waste.....	3
Small quantity generators.....	3
E. Other.....	4

II. CONTENT OF STATE PLAN (PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES)..... 4

A. Education.....	4
Who to target.....	4
Type of information needed.....	4
Best educational methods to employ.....	5
B. Source reduction.....	6
Waste reduction incentives.....	6
Excessive packaging.....	6
Regulations/Surcharges.....	6
C. Recycling.....	7
Problems/Barriers.....	7
Ideas for program design.....	7
Recycling participation incentives.....	8
Recycling mandates and regulations.....	9
Recycling market development.....	10
D. Composting.....	11
E. Incineration.....	11
F. Landfills and other facilities.....	12
Siting and permitting - state role.....	12
Siting and permitting - district role.....	13
Siting and permitting - public participation.....	13
Siting criteria.....	13
Landfill regulations.....	14
Bans.....	14
Other regulations.....	15
Inspection and enforcement.....	15
Other facility issues.....	16

III. STATE PLAN PRIORITIES..... 17

A. Hierarchy of solid waste management alternatives...	17
B. Recycling and source reduction goals.....	18

IV. STATE PLAN DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION..... 19

A. Public and district involvement.....	19
Management of public meetings.....	19
Promote public involvement.....	20
B. Private sector involvement/protection.....	20
C. State administration/IDEM - public relationship....	21
Relationship/Responsiveness and accountability....	21
Staffing.....	21
D. Research and technical assistance.....	21
Technical assistance information should include...	22

V. STATE PLAN: CRITERIA FOR CREATING DISTRICTS, DISTRICT GUIDANCE AND EVALUATION..... 23

- A. District composition..... 23
 - Concerns..... 24
- B. District board of directors..... 25
- C. Public involvement in district plans..... 25
- D. State instructions for district plans/Criteria for plan evaluation..... 26
 - Advice on guidance for district plans..... 27
 - Criteria for evaluating plans..... 27
 - How state will deal with non-compliance..... 28

VI. VOLUNTARY GUIDELINES VS. MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS..... 28

- Voluntary guidelines and incentives..... 28
- Mandates, regulations, and surcharges..... 29
- Inspection, monitoring, and enforcement..... 29

VII. STATE FINANCING

- A. Mechanisms for acquiring funds..... 30
- B. How should funds be used..... 30
- C. Criteria for allocating..... 31
- D. Adequacy and accountability..... 31

VIII. DISTRICT FINANCING..... 32

- A. Mechanisms for acquiring funds..... 32
- B. Willingness to pay..... 33
- C. Business and economic development issues..... 33
- D. How will costs be divided/Who should pay..... 34

KEY..... 34

INTRODUCTION

On March 20, 1990 Governor Evan Bayh signed into law House Bill 1240, a comprehensive bill to address the solid waste dilemma. HB 1240 is designed to protect the environment, encourage development of environmentally sound business and industry, and enable Indiana to effectively manage its own solid waste future.

HB 1240 mandates creation of regional solid waste management districts and places responsibility for guidance, review and coordination on the state. Part of the state's job is for the Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) to develop a solid waste management plan covering the next 20 years.

To ensure that the plan meets the needs of Indiana's citizens, IDEM conducted public meetings around the state in May 1990 so that people could give the state their comments, concerns, and ideas.

IDEM held meetings in fifteen Indiana communities:

- Bloomington (B)
- Columbus (C)
- Evansville (E)
- Fort Wayne (FW)
- Hammond (H)
- Indianapolis (I)
- Jasper (J)
- Lafayette (L)
- Madison (M)
- Muncie (M)
- Peru (P)
- Richmond (R)
- Sellersburg (S)
- South Bend (SB)
- Terre Haute (TH)

The following text is a compilation of the comments recorded at these meetings. People's own words have been used in the statements, except for minor editing for clarity or paraphrasing when often repeated comments are combined.

The comments are grouped according to general subject matter. Each is followed by a letter which represents where the statement was made (per list above). If readers wish to obtain copies of individual meeting reports, they can be obtained from the IDEM.

Public participation in these meetings has already helped the state, and given staff good suggestions (see page 19) about how to run the next round of public meetings:

- * All meetings will be tape recorded.
- * More notice will be given to people about the meetings, with greater publicity.

IDEM welcomes questions and comments about the development
a solid waste management plan Indiana. If you wish to attend a
meeting or register your point of view, please contact Becky
Schenk at (317) 232-8165.

I. SCOPE OF PLAN

A. STATE SELF-SUFFICIENCY IN WASTE DISPOSAL

- o State should be self-sufficient in waste disposal capacity. (J,C)
- o State should have control of waste disposal (S)

B. DISPOSING OF OUT-OF-STATE WASTES

- o It's important to deal with out-of-state wastes. (J,B,FW)
- o Deal with out-of-state wastes first. (TH)
- o Get expert help to deal with issue. (B)
- o Examine liability of receipt of out-of-state waste. (B) 1
- o Out-of-state wastes can't be controlled; therefore landfill bans are not enforceable. (R)
- o Investigate hauler practices and check on how many violations they have, (E)
- o Tighten security and strictly enforce regulation of out-of-state waste. (E,H)
- o Out-of state waste is filling up landfills. (TH)
- o Continue efforts to stop flow of out-of-state waste (e.g., beverage containers). (SB)
- o How much Indiana waste goes out-of-state? (R)

C. ILLEGAL DUMPING

- o Scope of problem and need:
 - Illegal dumping is a major problem, particularly in rural areas, and the state must address it. (TH,S,J,I,MD)
 - There are 131 dumps in Martin County. (J)
- o Causes of illegal dumping:
 - Private haulers are the problem. (B)
 - Bans at landfills on items like tires and refrigerators cause illegal dumping. (TH)
 - Increases in tipping fees cause illegal dumping. State must be careful about raising fees. (J,I,B,SB)
- o How to stop illegal dumping/mitigate its affects:
 - State needs to do more surveillance and enforcement. (TH,B,MD,C)

- Districts should have free day for private citizens to dump wastes - once a week or month. (J)
- Need mandatory collection for unincorporated areas. Put service fees in tax base so that everyone pays. (J, SB, TH)
- Publicize fact that it's a problem; create community ethic against it. (J,B)
- Publicize the prosecution of illegal dumpers. (J)
- Need funding structure such as local option tax to raise funds to clean up illegal dumps. ((S)
- Need more collection and recycling. (B)
- State and local government should help private landowners clean up illegal dump sites. (E,C)

D. SPECIAL AND HAZARDOUS WASTE INCLUDING HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE (HHW)

o Hazardous waste:

- Water contamination is key issue. What are other states doing about it? (especially pesticide pollution.) (I)
- State needs to be self-sufficient in disposal of hazardous waste. (C)
- Promote HHW collection programs (e.g., "Tox-Away" days). Provide guidelines to districts on how to implement. (E,P,H)
- Help reduce cost to homeowner/user for HHW disposal. (FW)
- Need to take initiative and stringently regulate small-scale hazardous waste. (L)
- Need to know how to transport, store, and dispose of household hazardous waste (HHW). (J)
- HHW collection must be complemented with education on reduction. (SB)
- Have concern about low-level radioactive waste in landfills. (TH)
- Recycling may increase the concentration of HHW. (J)
- HB1240 must relate to hazardous waste laws. It will fail otherwise. (L)
- Redefine household items such as batteries and HHW containers as non-hazardous. (I)
- Disposal of hazardous waste should be inspected on-site throughout the working day. (E)
- Go to the source of pollutants; responsible parties should pay to support areas affected by their pollution. (H)
- Isolate hazardous waste while looking for a solution. (FW)
- Definitions for municipal solid waste should not allow hazardous wastes through loopholes. (L)
- Need fencing and attendant at collection

centers to prevent dumping HHW. (J)

o Special wastes:

- Merchant should provide for disposal or recycling of batteries. (J)
- Tires, batteries, and other problem wastes are market barriers. (B)
- Keep wastes like appliances and batteries out of final disposal facilities. (SB)
- Regulate special wastes, regardless of EPA load. (FW)
- Tires are a local problem (Terra Haute); siting a processing plant is difficult. (TH)
- Need to know how to store and dispose of tires. (S)
- State must help districts manage tires. (P)
- Reduce tire use by promoting public transit... (e.g., rail). (H)
- License tire disposal facilities and require tire retailers to prove they use a licensed facility. (H)
- Support new and proven technologies to recycle tires; e.g., rubber asphalt for repaving. Recognize the constraints of these technologies. (H, SB)
- Consider a central collection facility for tires which would serve the whole state. Tires could be stored to be mined when a recycling option found. (SB)
- Use deposit system for all types of batteries. (?)
- Promote and help establish collection facilities for used oil. (C)
- Petrification of medical waste should be mandated, except for radioactive materials. (H)
- District board should have control of variances for special wastes. (SB)
- Put foundry sands on special wastes list. Investigate recycling foundry sands. (FW)
- Eliminate "special waste" category to allow "proper" management of incinerator ash. (FW)

o Small quantity generators (SQG):

- Must address disposal of wastes from SQG's. Other states don't have SQG loophole. (L, FW)
- Cover SQG's in state plan. (P)
- Develop ways to keep local communities regularly informed (every 2 - 3 months) about types of SQG waste generated in the region. (P)
- Clarify district's power to control reporting of SQG's. (P)

E. Other:

- This should be national passion! (H)
- This must be part of a national solution (e.g., the push for recycled paper affects the timber industry which is already heavily subsidized). (FW)
- HB1240 is a good start - glad Indiana is not the last state. (FW)
- The goals will be difficult due to lack of public concern. "People don't give a damn." (B)
- Concerned about HB1240 being unconstitutional. Don't mislead the public. (P)
- Marion County exemption from HB 1240: the exemption was not granted to meet the requirements of the county's incineration project. Rather, the county is exempt because it already has a solid waste management plan. (J)

II. CONTENT OF STATE PLAN (PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES)

A. EDUCATION

o State needs to educate people about solid waste management - it's the key to success. (E,P,H,J,TH,M,C,FW,M)

o Who to target:

- Citizen/consumer. (P,H,TH,S,L,I)
- Business, industry, manufacturers. (S,L,J,I)
- District boards. (TH,S,I,E) 4
- Government. (I)
- Children, pre-school and older. (E,MD,S,SB,M) 5G4
- Farmers. (P)

o Type of information needed:

- Truthful, complete overview of what happens to waste, solid waste management alternatives and issues. Right questions to ask. (E,P,I,J,TH,R,M,SB)
- Complete cost analysis of solid waste management: true life-cycle costs of alternatives, "hidden costs" of solid waste, complete cost of collection and disposal services, etc. (B,L,MD)
- Information on the seriousness of solid waste management problem. (SB)
- Why people should recycle. Include economic analysis showing savings = avoided cost disposal + cost of virgin material, energy and water. (TH,I,SB)
- Promote biodegradable products. (L)
- Need recycling "yellow pages," an updated list of facilities, programs, end-users,

- products, product suppliers, where to go, etc. (J,B,R,MD,SB)
- How laws and ordinances can obstruct recycling (e.g., permit procedures for recycling centers; technical definitions of different types of waste). (I)
- Why we need source reduction. (J,B,FW)
- Packaging and source reduction. (MD)
- Environmental impacts of waste; prevention of HHW (e.g., incineration of batteries). (TH)
- Environmental impacts of incineration. (I)
- Landfill characteristics, problems and safety. (J, FW)
- Don't promote landfills and don't send mixed messages. (FW)
- Landfill siting and permitting process. (P) 1
- Alternatives to landfills; e.g, digester technologies (H)
- Topographical and geographical maps to districts and the public. (E)
- Yard waste composting. (P)
- Agricultural recycling (e.g., composting and newspaper for animal bedding. (P)
- How consumers can impact recycling: power of individual to drive market. (SB)
- How public can report waste management violations. (SB)
- Give official specific examples (case studies) of successful solid waste management programs. (E,R,P,H,J,B)
- Get consumers involved in changing industry products through purchasing patterns. (B,I,S)

o Best educational methods to employ:

- Use existing educational institutions (public schools, universities, local extension service, etc.) Provide materials and resources. (I,J,S,TH,B,P)
- Disseminate information and materials to other existing organizations such as trade organizations, civic groups, businesses, etc. (I,B)
- Need publicity campaign through media: newspapers, television, radio, etc. Provide materials like announcements, press releases, logo, and the like. (H,E,P,C,MD,B,TH)
- Turnover in newspaper reporters makes this a difficult medium for information campaign. (J)
- Invite public to tour facilities. (J)
- Educate using examples from around the world. (L)
- Mandatory classes for district officials. (E)
- Use resources in the ad industry to survey consumer attitudes. (SB)

B. SOURCE REDUCTION

o Waste reduction and reuse is key. (S,R,FW)

Incentives:

- A pay-per-sticker system on trash bags would encourage reduction. (B)
- Need to change societal desire for throw-away products. (TH)
- Look at whole picture and explore reuse first. (e.g. cars, appliances). (SB)
- Establish democratic control over industrial processes which generate waste. (SB)
- Look at recoverability and reuse options for whole waste stream. (FW)
- Develop barter system for trading materials for reuse. (B)

o Excessive packaging:

- People should buy products in appropriate quantities to reduce waste. (S)
- Encourage production of more freeze-dried food to reduce waste. (S)
- Public needs to avoid disposable and overly packaged goods. (S)
- Need state award for good packaging. (B)
- State should provide incentives to business to reduce packaging. (Don't bash industry) (B,R)
- Educate business about packaging reduction. (E)
- Get state and industry to agree on voluntary packaging standards. (C)
- Promote durable goods. (C)

o Regulations/Surcharges:

- Regulate/stop junk mail. (C,MD)
- Develop mechanisms to include disposal costs in the price of a product (e.g., tax). (H,MD,TH,J)
- Institute pre-disposal tax on materials; that are difficult to dispose of (e.g., batteries, pallets). (C)
- Pre-disposal tax would be most effective if charged at purchase point. Try to avoid "profit taking" by manufacturers. (SB)
- Initiate local or state uniform packaging standards to reduce packaging. (B)
- Lobby for plastic bans at all levels of government. Promote use of glass instead of plastic. (E)
- Need tax incentives and penalties to support packaging reduction. (C)
- Don't make taxing structure too complicated. Could get ridiculous. (SB)

C. RECYCLING

o Problems/Barriers:

- Convenience of throw-away products is a problem. (J)
- Collection centers are inconsistent and lacking in rural areas. (J)
- Travel distance inhibits recycling. (J)
- Lack of public officials participating in recycling is a problem - encourage their participation. (TH)
- Scavenging law inhibits reuse/recycling of landfilled materials. (TH,FW)

o Ideas for program design:

- Don't lose sight of private sector in recycling initiatives. (FW)
- Recycling data should be based on weight data vs. volume. (B)
- Consider ways to encourage recycling in apartment complexes. (I)
- Manufacturer of the products should recycle the products. Promote industry innovation in production processes to complete recycling loop (e.g., Heinz). (B,SB)
- Involve recycling scrap industry in planning and ensure they can compete. (B)
- Need fencing and attendant at collection centers to prevent dumping HHW. (J)
- Foster local recycling industries. Recycling systems must be local. (J,MD)
- The legal profession is a good target for recycling because they generate a lot of paper. (J)
- Need source separation for recycling to succeed. (S)
- Support mechanical separation of recyclables, especially for commercial/industrial loads. (L,SB)
- Automated recycling has problems: disincentive to reduction, contaminated materials, disincentive to public awareness, denies public the opportunity to meet recycling goals. (SB)
- Promote/provide incentives for large storage and processing centers; consider regional recycling processing centers. (L)
- Address recycling of newsprint. (J)
- Remove barriers to siting recycling facilities (i.e., zoning) and simplify permitting process. (I)
- Need deposits on recyclable containers. (S,R,P,H,MD,M,TH) See also "Recycling mandates and regulations" below.
- Emphasize "whole system" recycling: use

- recycled plastic bins, change state procurement policies. (L,R)
- Recycling needs to be convenient; e.g., frequent collection, provide containers, take many items, etc. (S,TH,E,F,MD)
- Need to concentrate on product generators; have them produce recyclable products (also less waste and less toxic by-products). (L,R,SB)
- Need to examine environmental impact of recyclers (monitor them). (S)
- Involve professional recyclers in planning to avoid problems; coordinate with state's new recycling association (IRA). (R,B)
- Consult experts. (M)
- Each county needs a collection center regardless of cost. (MD)
- Need sufficient resource and population base for a recycling program to be efficient. (MD)
- Promote collection systems which minimize number of containers. (FW)
- Investigate creative transport systems. It is a big problem (e.g., container leasing to ocean transport). (FW)
- Consider landfill mining. (FW,TH)
- State needs to examine wastes generated in producing recycled material. (TH)

o Recycling participation incentives:

- Balance recycling and reduction incentives: realize that incentives to recycle could actually defeat source reduction objectives by giving a reason to perpetuate recyclable materials and packaging. (P)
- State should identify incentives and institute them for individuals and businesses. (J,S,B,FW)
- Need recycling labels. (B)
- Convenience is necessary incentive. (B,TH).
See also "Recycling problems/ideas" above
- State should provide financial incentives to manufacturers to encourage recycling, and to buy recycled products (loans and grants; tax breaks to increase profitability). (S,I,R,M,E,P,C,TH,FW)
- Consider impact on industry: processing changes, price changes, etc. Give them time and money to explain to their customers and stay competitive. (P)
- Need to change manufacturing processes to promote recycling (paper glued to glass, etc.) (S)
- Help HHW/SQG's by recycling plastic jugs. (J)
- Need to set up recycling awards. (B)
- Financial incentives are needed to shift solid waste economics and drive recycling. (R)
- The incentive for manufacturers is already there

- (lower cost of commodity), but expansion is the key (retooling). (M)
- Fee to promote recycling needs to be higher than current fee. (MD)
- Make recyclers pay less for waste collection service than non-recyclers. (E, P, H)
- Need economic support for businesses during start-up of recycling programs. (MD)
- Increasing visibility and neatness of recycling centers will encourage participation. (E)
- Work with homebuilders to encourage new home designs with recyclables storage systems. (SB)

o Recycling mandates and regulations: See also Section VI. "Voluntary Guidelines vs. Mandatory Requirements"

- Recycling must be mandatory for people to participate. (P, TH, MD, S, SB, M)
- Flow control but not mandatory recycling is a contradiction. Flow control is an obstacle to healthy recycling. (I)
- Charge fee on those who don't recycle. (TH)
- Need tax tied to disposal cost and recyclability. (E, S, FW, B)
- Use product taxes to fund R&D on ways to reuse and recycle those products. (FW)
- Tax virgin paper products; explore other ways to affect the subsidies given to the timber industry. (SB, FW, B)
- Require that recycling service providers take less profitable materials as away to help small counties get broad recycling services. (P)
- Require industry to recycle. Levy fines for non-compliance. (MD)
- Penalties will not drive manufacturing reuse of recyclables, must have economic incentives instead. (L)
- Require newsprint recycling by requiring newspapers to use minimum % of recycled paper - or develop other means to get business to use recycled paper. (B, R, E, P, S)
- Mandate that industries consume certain percentage of recycled material. (P)
- Make labeling of plastic by type mandatory. (TH, S)
- Require labeling indicating level of recycled material in product and if product is recyclable. (MD, FW)
- Legislate deposit mechanisms (i.e., "bottle laws") for all types of recyclable containers. This will work. (S, R, P, H, MD, M, TH)
- Require fast food packaging to be recyclable. (E)
- Mandate that plastic packaging contain recycled materials. (P)

o Recycling market development:

- Market development is a key to recycling success. Don't start prematurely: must have markets before collection. (L, S, R, M, E, P, C, MD, SB, FW)
- Pre-sell recyclables to ensure strong markets. (MD)
- Markets must be stable and sustainable. (R, M)
- State needs to play major role in market development (research, create, educate, incentives, etc.) (B, S, J, TH)
- State needs to develop "new" markets (e.g., refuse derived fuel, plastics, insulation from newsprint, etc.). (S)
- Develop market for newspaper. (E)
- Identify means to promote markets for paper/wood pallets. (SB)
- Help communities attract recycling industries. (C)
- Help communities attract recycling industries. (C)
- By excluding the largest waste stream (Indy) from the waste stream we are discouraging recycling industries from moving into the state. (L)
- Need incentives to businesses (e.g., financial) to create markets. (C, I, J)
- Encourage reuse of material within generating community. (FW)
- Contaminated materials are a barrier to marketability. (L)
- Must be able to transport volumes of materials to industry cheaply. (L)
- Paper and plastic are problematic to recycle because of market constraints, lack of guarantees. (I)
- Need to find solutions to unavailable markets for recyclables. (S)
- What to do with recyclables when markets fluctuate? Can they be stored? (J)
- State needs to network recyclers with end users; e.g., provide list of suppliers of recycled products. (B, S, MD) See also Section II, Education- "Type of information needed"
- Need more use of recycled products by state and local government. (B, TH)
- State should purchase recycled paper. (J)
- 10% price difference between virgin and recycled paper is not enough. State must carefully examine situation before setting buying patterns. (SB)
- State should be buyer of recycled products. (C)
- State could promote recycling by becoming a central warehouse for recycled products. (M)
- Schools should buy food products in recyclable containers. (E)

- Some federal policies are barriers: depletion allowances, subsidies for virgin materials. (B)
- Regional markets are available for newspaper (Brownsville; newsprint & cardboard; Cruthersville: insulation from newsprint) (R)
- Network recyclers (big and small) with users. (MD)
- Help communities attract recycling industries. (C)
- Consider ways to develop barter system for recyclables. (C)
- Need cooperative marketing system between state and districts and among districts. (FW)

D. COMPOSTING

- o Don't repeat mistakes. Composting permitting may be slowed by IDEM process. (J)
- o Clarify permit requirements and operation guidelines for composting. (H)
- o Composting can begin right away! (R)
- o Combine wood waste and sewage sludge - needs permit as sludge disposal process. (J)
- o Inform people about use of grass clippings on lawn rather than bagging them for disposal. (P)
- o Investigate Crown Point mulching program. (H)
- o Determine standards for materials to be composted. (FW)

E. INCINERATION See also Section III. State Plan Priorities

- o Issue of disposal of incineration ash, including its cost, needs to be addressed. (J,R, FW)
- o A resource recovery plant is heavily monitored and has less environmental impact than burning high sulfur coal. (I)
- o Incineration is not in conflict with recycling glass and metal. (I)
- o Paper and plastic are good fuels for incinerators, and because incinerators require high tonnage of fuel, this alternative is in conflict with recycling. (I)
- o Impose moratorium on waste incinerators. (H,I)
- o Establish a joint state forum to seek ways to reduce incinerator fallout across state lines. (H)

o Because incinerators produce toxic ash they should be eliminated as an option. (H)

o Incineration is a bad idea: disincentive to reduction and produces toxic pollution. (SB)

F. LANDFILLS AND OTHER FACILITIES

o Siting and permitting - state role:

- Proper siting is an important issue. (J)
- Siting is a very sensitive issue; state should not advise on this at all. (I)
- State is involved enough already in siting process. (B)
- Concerned siting issue will be a disincentive to forming multi-county districts. (I)
- State should take proactive role in helping communities find acceptable sites. (E,P,H)
- State should select sites for landfills. (P)
- Explore idea of a "suitable site" survey for the whole state. (I,S)
- State should not select landfill sites - increased bureaucracy requires more staff and regulation. (I)
- Need statewide standards and "blue print" for siting. Have more specific parameters. Be very clear and have enforceable schedule so protracted litigation avoided. (C,S,FW)
- State should not allow local control to thwart facility siting. (TH)
- State should support siting by districts. (B)
- Apply state IDEM expertise to permitting. (J)
- IDEM should develop criteria for permit review priority. (B)
- Need to shorten time for and give priority to permit review and approval. (M,J,R,H)
- Don't cut corners on permit process - protect people. (M)
- Because zoning is a barrier to siting, provide model zoning ordinances to help. (B)
- Clarify the relationship between the county zoning ordinances and district powers regarding suitability criteria for landfills (e.g., ground water table, soil, surface water/flood buffer zones, well heads, etc.) (I,FW)
- Protect against bait and switch land development or facility operation: allow rezoning of site if that site is purchased within a specified period or if there is a change in ownership. (P)
- Need to restrict siting of facilities until recycling issues are addressed. (M)
- State should pay for environmental impact

- statements when siting a facility. (MD)
- Stipulate that applicants for expansions or renewal permits must have demonstrated "good character" in current operation. (P)
- Examine the efficacy of having a statewide siting authority comprised of an expert board instead of local siting authorities. (?)
- Provide revised cost analysis and schedule for landfills based upon new regulations. (FW)

o Siting and permitting - district role:

- Districts need power of eminent domain for locating facilities. (S,TH,B)
- Districts need power to zone to site facilities. (TH)
- Zoning restrictions are too easy to change (zoning officials are elected). They should be harder to revise. (TH)
- Local issues inhibit siting landfills now. Multi-county district may complicate matters. (R)
- Districts should submit proposed landfill sites for IDEM review. (E)
- Give counties control, require county approval. (FW)
- Combine district efforts with private enterprise. (FW)
- It's too easy to get a landfill permit: make it harder. (FW)
- It is not too easy to get a permit and they should be encouraged when necessary. (FW)

o Siting and permitting - public participation:

- Siting and permitting process should be fair and appear fair. Needs to be open process with public participation. (B,TH,S,MD)
- Need public input on siting criteria. (S)
- IDEM should provide siting hearings on local issues. (TH)
- Keep public informed of permit status. (E)
- Officials don't trust that people will help. (FW)

o Siting criteria:

- Most important issue is surface water contamination from landfills. Reinforce position (Clean Water Act) that wetlands will not be used for facility sites. (FW,I)
- Put all sites under the NPDES permit to give leverage over control of surface water and to deal with ground water contamination. (FW)
- Give county's "need" priority over private landfill development. (FW)

- Include need as part of criteria. (TH)
- Locate facilities near inexpensive labor source. (S)
- Examine total environmental impact of a facility, including animals and habitats (wetlands). (J,FW)
- Need suitable physical environment. (J,B)
- Enforce strict geological requirements. (FW)
- Explore feasibility of mining dump pits. (S,I)
- Landfills in strip pits are problems - "dumping grounds." (J)
- Should consider aesthetics of site. (S)
- Should consider convenience. (J)
- Sites should be categorized by type: demolition, municipal solid waste, HHW. (J)
- Facilities should be of adequate size and number within districts. (J)
- Need adequate utilities; also roads, suitable transportation grid. (B)
- Facility must promote public good with minimum impact on people residing near facility. (S)
- Buffer zones around landfill are important for people and water resources. Provide social land use features. (FW)
- Compensation for people directly affected by a facility is needed (e.g., tax break, insuring fair market value of property.) (S,TH,P,B)
- Use existing facilities efficiently before developing new ones. Use existing government facilities as sites. (C,MD)
- Ensure adequate capacity for demolition debris; also pursue recycling for demolition debris. (FW)
- Address landfill needs as a statewide problem. (FW)
- Make landfill design affordable. Consider total costs and avoided costs. (FW)
- Make it hard to site a facility without recycling. (FW)
- Try to build on county borders, because no county wants another's waste. (FW)

o Landfill regulations:

- **Bans:**
 - * Prohibit recyclables from landfills. (B,R,C)
 - * Outlaw disposable diapers. (TH)
 - * Ban yard waste from landfills. (H)
 - * Ban plastics from landfills. (P)
 - * Override RCRA regulations; ban HHW and SOG's from landfills. (E,FW)
 - * Ban demolition waste from landfills (set up separate fill). (FW)
 - * Ban all biodegradables. (FW)

- * Use bans cautiously - explore other options.
(B)

- Other regulations:

- * Need to be innovative - can we change regulations as waste stream changes? (?)
- * Consider potential to change or relax landfill regulations if content of the waste stream can be permanently altered.
(M)
- * Certify all waste, including in-state, is non-infectious and non-hazardous. (MD)
- * Certify landfill operators; revoke certification if there are violations. (E)
- * Require public ownership of landfills to protect public well-being and control costs.
(P,H,FW)
- * Even industrial landfills should be publicly owned. (P)
- * Requiring public ownership could alienate corporate cooperation. (FW)
- * Publicly owned landfills should be privately operated to be more cost-effective.
(P)
- * Restrict the use of backhauling in garbage trucks - should be dedicated to one material (steel, compost, etc.) (P,J)
- * Coordinate with IOSHA in their material and waste management efforts. (P)
- * Need better groundwater protection - require very strict technical standards. (P,C,H)
- * Require diversion of groundwater away from landfill sites. (H)
- * Restrict expansion of landfills to those facilities with maximum recycling. (FW)
- * Determine standards for biodegradables.
(FW)
- * Establish moratorium on additional industries which would produce pollutants, until an area's existing landfills are in compliance and remediation is complete.
(H)

- Inspection and enforcement:

- * Need full-time inspector at landfills; more stringent inspection. (B,R)
- * Need better enforcement; inspectors should be monitored - perhaps by citizens - to ensure fair and effective enforcement. (P,R,FW)
- * Need better ways to enforce bans on materials. (MD)
- * IDEM needs adequate resources and inspection staff for enforcement. Spend what it takes.
(E,P,H,L)
- * Provide thorough training for inspectors

- (e.g., clinometer use, reading site plans, etc.). (P)
- * Improve support from Attorney General's office for enforcement. (P)
- * Focus on areas already polluted by existing landfills. (M)
- * Increase fines and strengthen penalties for violators. (E,P,H)
- * Don't deal down to an agreed settlement - hold them to the letter of the law. (H)
- * Elevate violations from civil to criminal status. (M)
- * Consider ways to apply RICO to prosecute intentional and reported polluters operating solid waste facilities. (H)
- * Limit procedures that warn, but do not act. (H)
- * Publicize names of convicted violators and prohibit violators from receiving future permits. (P)
- * Environmental law violators should be refused permits (include subsidiaries). (FW)
- * Regulations will not protect environment unless districts are vigilant. (FW)
- * Enforcement is key - Right to Know must be enforced. (FW)
- * Establish moratorium on additional industries which would produce pollutants, until an area's existing landfills are in compliance and remediation is complete. (H)

o Other facility issues:

- Require landfill sites to also be material recovery sites. (L)
- Put a material recovery facility in every county. (FW)
- Hazardous waste siting authority does not work. (B)
- Consider how to address problems, management and on-going operation of existing landfills. (L,J)
- Collecting disposal fee up front does not guarantee proper disposal of material. (J)
- Enhance landfill site with compaction - provide financing for equipment. (J)
- Post closure charges are high to discourage small landfills (retroactive). This hurts small landfills. (J)
- Make landfill design affordable. (FW)
- Need to address problem of monopoly over disposal facilities. (FW)
- Leave it to private enterprise. (FW)
- Recycle landfill sites: develop land for other use. (B)

III. STATE PLAN PRIORITIES

A. HIERARCHY OF SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

- o Priorities of reduction, recycling, and then final disposal are correct. (J,H,M,MD)
- o Recycling/composting, reduction, then landfilling and incineration will be most likely priorities for districts. (S)
- o Make reduction and recycling equal priorities: start right away with education. (FW)
- o Goal of plan is integration, not hierarchy. (I)
- o Hierarchy is implicit in stated policy. Be careful of what people say. (I)
- o Need alternatives to landfills. (J,H)
- o Need more emphasis on waste reduction (packaging guidelines). Reset priorities to reduction, recycling, other. (TH)
- o Recycling and waste reduction should be a top priority without consideration of cost effectiveness. (TH)
- o Priorities overfocussed on reduction and recycling; landfills need more emphasis. (P,M)
- o Redefine "final disposal" as storage. (FW)
- o Emphasize comprehensive solution, including landfilling and incineration as legitimate options. Must deal with decreasing landfill capacity. (L,J,B,SB)
- o Don't just stick to politically glamorous waste reduction and recycling, bite the bullet and take care of the 50% that needs to be disposed. HB1240 overly focused on waste reduction and recycling. (M,L,I,SB)
- o Landfills will always be a necessary part of solid waste management strategy. Make provisions to help districts operate safe, cost-effective, long-lasting facilities. (P,M)
- o Consider incinerators as option to manage non-recyclable percentage of waste (e.g., Japan). (SB)
- o Need moratorium on incineration and automated separation to give time reduction and recycling to work. (SB)
- o Need 10-year moratorium on incineration to allow reduction and recycling to work and to allow time to address toxic nature of ash. (SB)

- o Outlaw incinerators. (FW)
- o There is not enough progress on ensuring landfill capacity. (M)
- o Flow control will be critical. (I,R,SB)
- o Flow control is a bad idea: it is disincentive to reduction. Need volume for projects. (SB)
- o Place incinerators after landfills on priority list. (B)
- o Effective recycling could eliminate need for incinerators. (R)
- o Eliminate incinerators from list. (H)
- o Including incineration is counter to the law's intent to promote reduction and recycling. (SB)
- o Do not interpret HB1240 to read that incineration is the least preferred method. Rather, reduction and recycling are preferred methods. (L)
- o Consider moratorium on incinerators to give other approaches a chance. (I,H)
- o Incinerators should be considered hazardous. (FW,SB)
- o Recognize two agendas: reduce dependence upon tipping fees, and recover material and save resources. (I)
- o Hierarchy is inflexible. What is technically part of the legislation and what is interpreted. (I)

B. RECYCLING AND SOURCE REDUCTION GOALS

- o Government needs to take a strong stand on recycling. (I,TH)
- o It's important to deal with excessive packaging to reach goals. (J)
- o Paper and yard waste are importantly local issues. (S)
- o Energy recovery should not the emphasis on energy conservation and recycling. (I)
- o Composting of yard waste and food waste should be emphasized. (J,R)
- o Take time to plan and don't set goals too high: 35% is reasonable. (R)
- o Move as quickly as possible to extend landfill life. Set

moderate goals. (R)

o Reduction goals of 90% would be ideal. (M,FW)

o A 35% goal is attainable, especially if yard and other wastes are composted. (R)

o 50% is a reasonable goal. (C)

o Up recycling goal to 50% by 1991 and 90% by 2000. (FW)

o Encourage districts to exceed goals; may be limiting expectations with set goals. (E)

o Time line is too long: attempt 50% by 1996 and mandate recycling by 2000. (P)

o Make recycling goals reasonable and achievable in each area (25 to 35% goal). Too strong a goal will drive illegal dumping. (FW)

o Goals should include waste generated by private industry. (E)

o Goals should be mandatory, (MD)

o What is reference point for HB1240 goals: don't count established recycling (e.g., auto recycling); do count current efforts to implement community recycling - don't penalize communities for being progressive. (C, SB)

o The goals will be difficult due to lack of public concern. "People don't give a damn." (B)

IV. STATE PLAN DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

A. PUBLIC AND DISTRICT INVOLVEMENT IN DEVELOPING STATE PLAN

o Management of public meetings:

- Comments should be taped and transcribed verbatim, not summarized in writing. (FW,L)
- Provide more notice to people about the public meetings. (P,M,FW,H)
- Improve publicity of second round of IDEM meetings (e.g., notify unions, advertise in weekly shopper, mail notices to entire IDEM: "interested party" list). (P)
- Make sure that the input from the meetings goes straight to IDEM. (P)

o Coordinate with soil conservation groups. (B)

o Coordinate with other states to find national solutions (e.g., haul waste to national landfills in less populated states out west). (H)

o Promote public involvement (F,H,E,C)

- Give more notice of public meetings on the state plan, landfill hearings, etc. (E)
- Hold meetings at local level as district forums. (SB)
- Make task forces accessible to public; require district representation. (MD)
- Citizens need more control of siting process. (M)
- Use team to formulate effective plan. (M)
- Very important to provide mechanism for public to take part in decisions - especially regarding landfill siting issues. (L)

B. PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT/PROTECTION OF PRIVATE INTEREST See also Section II., State Plan Content

- o Consider existing recycling operations. (J)
- o Privates must make money. (L)
- o Government can help develop plan which motivates manufacturers from profits to environmental safety issues. (TH)
- o Keep private industry involved; IDEM should foster relationship with industry. (I,FW)
- o Need tax break for industries that process recyclables. (J)
- o State should provide subsidies for recycled products. (J)
- o Recognize immediate needs for business/industry waste disposal; they must be able to plan ahead. (C)
- o Give decision makers a leg up in evaluating private vs. public bids (contracts). Cost is the issue. (L)
- o Plan should help private industry equip itself for more advanced sorting and processing of materials. (R)
- o Give private sector a chance to achieve goals before spending public money. (R)
- o Work with industry to establish clear waste disposal guidelines from the outset. (R)
- o Protect small operations - don't give large businesses the edge. (?)
- o "Hands-off" approach by government would be the best protection for small recyclers. (C)

o Need to accept problems as well as benefits of industry.
(J)

o State should provide financial incentives to manufacturers to encourage recycling, and to buy recycled products (loans and grants; tax breaks to increase profitability).
(S, I, R, M, E, P, C, TH, FW)

o Consider impact on industry: processing changes, price changes, etc. Give them time and money to explain to their customers and stay competitive. (P)

C. STATE ADMINISTRATION/RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN IDEM AND PUBLIC

o Relationship between IDEM and public
/Responsiveness and accountability:

- Recognize recent improvements at IDEM - more responsive, better attitude. (P)
- Recognize that IDEM must be given adequate staff and authority to do a proper job. (P)
- IDEM needs to improve its relationship with citizens - provide honest answers and timely communication on facility permit process. (P)
- State responses are not consistent; they must make a commitment to effort. (J)
- State needs a quick decision/response time.
(B, P, J)
- State needs a cooperative, positive attitude.
(B)
- State must provide honest answers; don't mislead. (P, SB)
- State must provide strong leadership. (I) 1
- State needs to organize sharing of information. (B)
- Communication is essential. (SB)
- State should hold regularly scheduled meetings with districts (open forums). (TH) 1
- IDEM should provide support for local/regional in decision making. (B)
- Specify how IDEM will deal with crucial transition period required for district level planning. (C)

o Staffing:

- Hire more IDEM staff and reduce turnover to increase efficiency. (P, M)
- Give IDEM the resources and staff needed to do a good job. (P, SB)
- Need more staff for enforcement. (L, E, P, H)

D. RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

o Districts need effective technical assistance.
(I, B, MD, H)

- Technical assistance is the best incentive. (I)
- Technical assistance must come early. Help manage district start-up operations. (B,P,H,J)
- Put same energy into technical assistance as into writing the plan. (I)
- Technical assistance should be provided on-site if necessary. Make it hands-on and direct (I,H)
- Locate IDEM staff person in every district. (SB)
- District decision makers need technical assistance. (SB)

o Enable people to provide informed, instructive participation (easy to underestimate effort and cost of such a public service). (L)

o Need technical support for receivers and processors of recyclables. (B)

o Use our universities. (E,H,SB)

o Need task force to examine plastics recycling. (MD)

o Technical assistance information should include:

- Cost information. (L,H)
- Costs, overhead, and fees for operating facilities to give realistic view. (I)
- Expert, objective analysis of differing perspectives, issues, and problems. (L)
- Expert opinion on incinerators. (L)
- Current recycling and waste reduction technologies. (P)
- Clear explanation and interpretation of regulations and permit requirements. (TH)
- How to use local funds to develop local markets. (I)
- Requirements for scale/data. (B)
- On-going information on what other counties and districts are doing. (I)
- List of effective consultants; guidelines for selecting consultants. Perhaps license them or have an approved list. (L,P,MD)
- Accurate reports from private hauler about waste stream volume - can't wait for state report. (L)
- Phone number to stop junk mail. (R)
- Technical advice on all aspects of solid waste management planning. (R)
- Information on successful solid waste management systems around the world; e.g., Japan builds homes with recycled plastic lumber. (E,R)
- Information on other programs such as the City of Peru automated recovery program and the Crown Point mulching program. (H,P)

- How to conduct an effective public awareness campaign. (P)
- What to do with collected materials. (C)
- Differences between design of urban and rural programs. (C)
- Legal assistance (legal council at county level underinformed.) (H, SB)
- Specific technical programs; i.e., composting. (H)

o Format for technical information should be:

- Lists of questions and training sessions. (I)
- Sample documents or pieces which could be assembled in different configurations; e.g., how Marion Right to Know Plan was used. (I)
- Toll-free hotline, hotfax, updates. (I, B)
- Recommendations of technical task forces. (H)
- Need central state information center on solid waste management issues. (SB)
- Models of successful programs. (E, P, H, J, P, R, B)

o Research:

- Recycling (S, MD)
- Existing technology - don't re-invent the wheel. (E, P, H)
- New and emerging technologies. (J, SB)
- Problem-solving tips from experts. (L)
- What has been done elsewhere? What works? Other states (i.e., Ohio, Illinois) and other countries (i.e., Japan, Switzerland). (E, P, H, J, B, R)
- Deposit laws of other states. (J)
- Existing resources such as EDF booklet on recycling. (R)
- Pyrolysis may be way to convert tires and other wastes into fuel. (H)
- Alternative uses for recyclables. (C)

V. STATE PLAN: CRITERIA FOR CREATING DISTRICTS, DISTRICT PLAN GUIDANCE AND EVALUATION

A. DISTRICT COMPOSITION

- o Evaluate specific alternatives involved with single or multi-county approach. (L)
- o Volume of waste generated will affect formation of districts. (S)
- o Multi-county districts should include counties of a similar size. (B)
- o Need conflict resolution between county governments. (B)

- o Need to analyze local waste system, etc. before decisions can be made about regionalization. (S)
- o IDEM should create districts if counties can't do it themselves.- (TH)
- o State should redistrict in areas where single-county or small districts cannot support projects cost-effectively. (P)
- o Small counties may need to "marry" larger ones to give district and adequate tax base. (M)
- o Regional approach will be necessary to make some solutions cost-effective. (SB)
- o Political pressures will be too much for regional approach: no county wants another ones waste. (FW)
- o Don't let districts get too large: 1 - 3 counties may be reasonable - 10 county districts would be too expensive because of transportation costs. (P)
- o High multi-county transportation costs will be counterproductive to recycling and reduction goals. (MD)
- o Multi-county districts are less feasible than single-county districts because of politics. (P)
- o Single-county districts more reasonable because landfills of multi-county districts would be publicly owned and therefore more costly; also these facilities would be shorter lived. (P)
- o Since landfills are costly operations, only multi-county districts will be able to develop landfills cost-effectively. Need to coordinate/pool all facilities in a region. (P,MD)
- o Each county should be an individual district. (SB)
- o Concerns:
 - Who gets the facility? (B)
 - Small counties are left out because of population; some counties too small for single county districts. (B,J,M,L)
 - Small districts will have high costs. (J)
 - Small counties may not have landfills or close markets. (R)
 - Different values exist between counties. (B)
 - What are the incentives for a "have" county to join with a "have not" in forming a regional district? (S,J)

- Regionalization will tend to maintain facilities in counties where now located. (S)
- Multi-county district formation and operation will be hindered by county politics. It will take time for counties to get together. (TH,R)
- Don't give all power to state - balance state and local needs. (R)
- Don't allow districting to reduce responsibility of local governments. (H)
- Be realistic about what people will really do. (M)
- State must coordinate all solid waste facilities in a region. (MD,J)
- Protect counties from inequitable treatment; e.g., becoming "dumping grounds". (L)
- How can counties share the burden and benefits of facilities? (I)

B. DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS

- o District boards need to be representative of populace (good cross section). Avoid conflict of interest. (TH,C,SB)
- o Board members should be elected, not appointed. (TH,C)
- o Turnover of elected district officials is problem. A district advisory board could be stabilizing force. (SB)
- o Districts need better informed representation. (TH)
- o Require private citizen slots on the board. (C)
- o Make it hard to withdraw from a multi-county board; there will be disruption if multi-county districts lose a member. (TH)
- o Expertise on board should be verifiable. (C)
- o Should have an environmentalist on the board. (SB)
- o Board members should have personal liability and accountability. (C)
- o Responsible behavior by district board is crucial. (FW)
- o State should help districts establish advisory groups (board members don't have time to learn everything). (SB)
- o Advisory boards should be as non-political as possible. (SB)

C. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT IN DISTRICT PLANS

o Ensure that citizens are participants in district decisions. (L)

o Include the needs of farmers and ensure they fit into overall plan. (MD)

o Plans should be considered legitimate only if planning process has included public adequate review and input. (Publish draft for review before its adopted.) (FW)

D. STATE INSTRUCTIONS FOR DISTRICT PLANS/CRITERIA FOR PLAN EVALUATION

o Clarify/explain:

- IDEM's criteria for evaluating, approving or disapproving plans. (L,I,H)
- That districts do not have 100% control within a district. (L)
- How state will coordinate state plan and district plans. How local plans will be integrated into state plan. What structure will enable integration? (S,I)
- Level of protection for party. (L)
- Inter-county relationships and limits. (L)
- Who can decide to accept out-of-county waste? Must waste generated in district be disposed of in district? Specify legal constraints to inter-county commerce. (L,R,TH)
- Districts' legal powers. (P)
- Will district power supersede county zoning? (FW)
- Political parameters. (L)
- Process for obtaining regular proof of landfill capacity. (L)
- How to address current restrictive contracts. (TH)
- Powers of district as a fiscal agent: will two counties apply district fees as sanitation line-item? (R)
- How will districts dovetail with existing sanitation districts? (R,M)
- How to incorporate existing hauling systems (private and public)? (R)
- District's power to control reporting on different waste streams (e.g., SQG's). (P)
- Clarify that waste reduction/recycling goals can be achieved using composting of biodegradables. (P)
- Clarify how laws and ordinances can obstruct recycling (e.g., permit procedures for recycling centers; technical definitions of different types of waste). (I)
- What will task forces do?
- How will compliance be measured? Don't spend too many resources chasing numbers. (J)

o Advice on what to include in guidance for district plans:

- Be flexible: give enough options to accommodate the unique conditions and needs of different areas of the state. (I,B,M)
- Recognize local conditions which may not feature broad public support. (L)
- Require districts to complete plan according to milestones. (TH)
- Allow enough time for counties to learn more and act locally. (R)
- Need to understand existing recycling and education efforts in county. (R)
- Districts should be given power on whether to accept waste from other districts. (E,TH)
- State should set guidelines and restrictions for all districts to follow. (E,P)
- Address how tipping fees assessed. (?)
- Provide very specific guidance (e.g., models) (M)
- Set non-negotiable goals and avoid evasive "weasel" words. (FW)
- Be more specific about terms in definition of "local need." (M)
- Require districts to hire an environmental expert as consultant for planning. (C)
- Give districts a context e.g., current solid waste/landfill situation. (P)
- Offer guidelines for planning which are based on local data: e.g., close scrutiny of industrial and commercial waste stream. (FW)

o Criteria for evaluating plans:

- Be patient. (FW)
- Don't let one local area obstruct a larger solution - make locals keep big picture. (L)
- Recognize that overall goal may be met by different levels in different districts. (L)
- Recognize differences in district and regional alternatives. (M, FW)
- Can't permit too many exceptions to stated goals and priorities without jeopardizing the reason behind forming districts. (TH)
- Make sure plans are consistent from district to district. (M,MD)
- Need to examine if waste flow can support facilities. (J)
- Examine where facilities will go within a district. (S)
- Consider water sheds and county boundaries; also flow of out-of-state wastes. (I)
- Make sure standards for measuring performance are clear - districts shouldn't need consultants to understand rules and prepare plan. (P)
- Consider impact on existing taxing units within counties (e.g., sanitation districts) (M)

- Protect smaller counties from large population centers. (M)
- Give sufficient time for districts to reach goals. (SB)
- Remember that "regional" is relative: would work for marketing but may be problem with transportation. (FW)
- How will compliance be measured? Don't use too many resources chasing numbers. (J)

o How state will deal with district non-compliance:

- Use positive, incentive approach. (SB)
- Consider mandatory measures as option. (I, SB, M)
- Use plan format to achieve goals. Punishment should be limited for failure to meet goals. (B)
- State action for non-compliance takes blame off of local government. (B)
- Fine non-complying districts. (C, E)
- State should govern districts to ensure compliance. (E)
- Withhold funds from non-complying districts. (E)
- State should not interfere. (P)
- Suspend district's funding until area landfills are in compliance. (H)
- Raise tipping fees if district doesn't meet goals. Economic incentive to reduce and source of funding for alternatives. (SB)

VI. VOLUNTARY GUIDELINES VS. MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS

See also Section II., State Plan Content

o Voluntary guidelines and incentives:

- State should only provide education, nothing else. (B)
- Grassroots needs leadership from the state. (L)
- Stress incentives not laws. (I)
- Incentive is the carrot first; use stick only if necessary. (B, SB)
- Find positive incentives for public participation in source reduction; but be cautious about penalizing people for non-compliance - this will drive people to illegal dumping. (L)
- Consider some incentive to soften impact of local change - give local officials a break.
- Need incentives to industry to reduce waste and recycle (tax break). (J, E)
- Reduce inventory tax on recyclables. (TH)
- Make sure incentives work and are not disincentives. (E)

- Provide financial assistance to start new recycling businesses. (P)
- Incentives to industry for recycling must outweigh incentives to use virgin materials (P)
- provide incentives (financial, etc.) to districts which comply with state goals. (E)
- provide incentives to universities for R&D on recycling technologies. (E,C,MD)

o Mandates, regulations, and surcharges:
See also Section II., State Plan Content

- Why wait for voluntary goals to work - make them mandatory. (B)
- Recycling should be mandatory. (TH,P,MD,S,SB,M)
- State should stay out of the process of mandates. (B)
- Regulations inhibit new technology by increasing costs. (J)
- State needs to examine the effects of the retroactive regulations on planning. (B)
- Need restrictions on excessive packaging. (J)
- Government should set standards for materials labeled "biodegradable." (S)
- Require industry to recycle and levy fines if they don't. (MD)
- Legislate deposit mechanisms (i.e., bottle bills) to spur recycling. (P)
- Increase in emission controls is needed. (MD)
- Use banning from landfills cautiously - explore other options. (B)

o Inspection, monitoring and enforcement:

- State needs to show it can enforce regulations. (TH)
- Increase enforcement and inspection of SQG's. (I)
- Consider how to involve counties in active monitoring of SQG's. (I)
- Address responsibilities and powers of inspection officers. (S)
- Enforcement should take place at point of generator and hauler. (B)
- Require a high degree of environmental control at facilities. (B)
- Districts should be able to require compliance with solid waste management program. (TH)
- Cost to clean up is the responsibility of the highway department and the sheriff: need uniform enforcement. (J)
- In Pike County sanitarian is sheriff's deputy. (J)
- Fine abusers. (MD)

- Not possible to punish violators. Too cumbersome and expensive. (R)
- Increased enforcement is critical. (L)

VII. STATE FINANCING

A. MECHANISMS FOR ACQUIRING FUNDS

- o Need increased fees at landfills. (I)
- o HB1240 surcharge is too low at \$0.50/ton - should start at \$5.00/ton. (E)
- o Businesses should pay proportionally to private citizens, according to the amount of waste they generate. (E,S,J)
- o Should pay for generation of waste over a specified volume. (S)
- o Set up voluntary contributions to recycling fund. Recognize role of private industry as partner and funding partner. Need seed money to be effective. (C,SB)
- o Tipping fee increases should be decided by a "landfill commission" which controls solid waste disposal like a utility. (FW)
- o Avoid subsidizing waste management industry with higher tipping fees. (I)
- o Help make tipping fees more equal to out-of-state fees. (I)

B. HOW FUNDS SHOULD BE USED

- o Funding is upside down on priorities list. (B)
- o Take fund monies to develop continuously recyclable materials. (TH)
- o Fund recycling efforts. (H,B,I)
- o State should finance citizens contesting environmental issues (siting permit issues, enforcement, etc.). (TH)
- o State must provide direct financial assistance for district projects. (P,M,C,FW)
- o Subsidize the cost of reduction incurred by districts (equipment, enforcement, etc.) (S)
- o Fund a consumer advocate to resolve solid waste management issues. (TH)

o Use funds for prevention. Although initially higher, costs are less than clean-up of ground water. (Look at willingness to pay for water treatment.)

(TH)

o Use funds to support public-ownership of landfills. (P)

o Use funds to keep HHW out of landfills. (E)

o Make sure the \$0.50 fee cycles back to communities. (SB)

o Divert violation fines to IDEM for specific solid waste management actions. (FW)

C. CRITERIA FOR ALLOCATING FUNDS

o Need state funds regionally. (J)

o Distribution of grant monies should be equitable. (R)

o Design distribution formula. (FW)

o Consider allocating money according population or other criteria that would be fair. (SB)

o Grants to private industry should not be matching fund - this would not allow the small industries to grow and compete with larger firms. (?)

o Avoid making districts compete - provide funds for each district. (H)

o Grants for private industry should not be matching funds - this wouldn't allow small businesses to grow and compete with larger companies. (?)

o Allow public groups to apply for funds for projects within districts. (H)

o Need rebate structure to promote county efforts - dollars for tons recycled. (FW)

o Offer achievement grants to districts based on achieved goals. (SB)

o Tie school cooperation with state funding. (M)

D. ADEQUACY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

o Existing funding systems are inadequate. (P)

o Examine the adequacy if the new fund. It will be critical. (I)

o Make the commitment - be willing to finance the necessary changes. Don't go halfway. (H)

o District loan of \$20,000 is not enough for planning - need more. (TH)

o The public needs an explanation of where funds go; e.g., education and financial disclosure statement. (S)

o What money is being spent on contract with R.W. Beck and Associates engineering consultants? (FW)

VIII. DISTRICT FINANCING

A. MECHANISMS FOR ACQUIRING FUNDS

o Districts can tax. (J)

o Apply flat disposal fee for community/industry (protect competitiveness. (FW)

o Don't use property taxes - allow system to tax people directly or charge a user fee for their services. (P,FW)

o Allow user fees to be used by districts to finance projects. User fees must be fair, perhaps based on volume of waste generated. (P, FW,E,S,J)

o Districts need to have power to levy sales tax to pay for solid waste management. (P)

o HB1240's "pass-through provision" makes the surcharge structure futile, since most existing contracts are fixed costs and long term. The state should mandate that all hauling contracts be reopened within 1 - 2 years to allow a surcharge. (P)

o Remove all "grandfather" clauses on operating facilities (don't even allow 5-year cycle). (H)

o Could use out-of-state waste to subsidize district waste management. (J)

o Regionally, tip fees should be higher. (B)

o Should pay for generation of waste over a specified volume. (S)

o Complex fee structures are confusing and costly. (B)

o If facilities are to be successfully financed through revenue bonds, then districts must have flow control. (I,FW)

o Marion County tried new tip fees - with no success.

(I)

B. WILLINGNESS TO PAY

o Handling solid waste management will be costly. Cost will be big barrier to public support. (R)

o Experience shows that, yes, people are willing to pay for effective, environmentally sound solid waste management. (E,P,C,I,J,R,SB)

o We say yes, but don't always mean it. (B)

o Experience shows industry will support extra dollars. (I)

o A recent survey shows that people will pay or not depending upon total economic model (jobs, etc.) People need to know this (I,R,SB)

o Ability to pay varies greatly among counties. (TH)

o People unclear in this area. (R)

o People should know there is a cost to not taking action. (P)

o Public is willing to pay for public ownership of landfills. (P)

o Consumer will pay either up front or as embedded (hidden) cost for products and services. (C)

o People need to know the costs of clean up: the "hidden" costs. (SB)

o Don't put fees on consumers - put them on manufacturers. (FW)

o Payment may need to be mandated. (SB)

o Even if people aren't willing, we can't wait. We must recycle. (SB)

C. BUSINESS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ISSUES

o Need incentives for economic development in region for recycling. (S)

o Give priority to recycling business start-up; also to mature industry. (SB)

o Need to assess economic impact of recycling goals. (B)

o Disposal cost to industry has an economic effect

on the region. (J)

D. HOW COSTS WILL BE DIVIDED/WHO SHOULD PAY

- o Need to levelize costs of solid waste management among disticts. (TH)
- o State needs to share financial responsibility. (B)
- o Emphasis on local planning and enforcement unfair because insufficient funds provided to do it. (R)

KEY:

B = Bloomington
C = Columbus
E = Evansville
FW = Fort Wayne
H = Hammond
I = Indianapolis
J = Jasper
L = Lafayette
MD = Madison
M = Muncie
P = Peru
R = Richmond
S = Sellersburg
SB = South Bend
TH = Terre Haute

**SUMMARY OF COMMENTS
FROM PUBLIC MEETINGS**

**INDIANA SOLID WASTE
MANAGEMENT PLAN**

July 1990

Record: 7/23/90
EVANSVILLE, INDIANA

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT
INDIANA STATE SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN

** PLEASE NOTE:

We have tried very hard to record the proper name and affiliation of each contributor. Please grant us grace for unintentional mistakes.

Jim Daniels
Izaak Walton Ig.
Education/T. Assist.

- Advertise public meeting two weeks before.
- Develop a complete list for mailings.
- Initiate programs for product substitution as way to reduce hazardous waste generation.
- Need mechanisms to tip consumers about product recyclability and environmental impacts (logo is a start)
- Look at Walmart, Earth Day package systems as models for product.
- Use state's phosphate ban as model for effective ban.

Related Comment:

State should support a national program of product logos.

Mr. Daniels

- Institute disincentives if virgin materials are used - give manufacturers a tax burden.
- Look at connection between sludge and enforcement of industrial effluent regulations. Ensure that fines are sufficient.
- If municipal sludge is used in co-composting operation - ensure pretreatment effectiveness.
- Check codes for barriers to effective recycling/source reduction.
- (Page 34, New Rules, last bullet) add "quality" to documenting requirements (e.g.: identify amount of recyclables or materials with other uses.)

Public Comments: Evansville, July 1990

John Blair
Valley Watch

- (Page 34) Enforcement: extend time limit for liability on closed landfill facilities - add 15 years to 30 year limit.
- There is more to protecting the environment than dollars. Keep perspective on value of land - aside from potential as landfill.
- Ban incineration: not an option.
- Sent draft too late
- Plan overburdens 50¢ surcharge
- re: funding
- raise surcharge (e.g.: \$10/T) to give plan more of a foundation.
- Target "Below Level Nuclear Waste", like CEHW.
- Keep public involved as the policy evolves
- User fees should be applied to drive source reduction; state should mandate that districts apply user fees.
- Technical assistance: siting assistance
- IDEM should address flood plain control (re: landfills) as part of rulemaking.
- Supports bottle bill (because of steel being introduced into new containers)
- State should re-negotiate for new copy machine service contract.
- Be careful of how you approve "recycling" facilities - don't give problematic operations too much room - slow down enough to control impacts.
- Page 26 - be very cautious about co-composting of sludge.
- Clearly define what is safe and how sludge will be evaluated for metals.
- Consider problems with landfill "mining" which might disturb hazardous materials (e.g.: asbestos)

Public Comments: Evansville, July 1990

- Incineration: All evaluation of incineration should include "total cost" (including: hazardous waste disposal for ash) → this will make incineration prohibitive.
- Alternative Methods:
 - Don't miss innovative options; encourage invention/testing - e.g.: provide short-term (six months) R&D permits.
 - Adjust granting to invest more in invention (work with office of Science and Technology to reduce constraints).
- Problem Wastes
 - New Rules: batteries
 - New Rules: CEHW
Change language to "promulgate" rules to: HW=HW
- Rethink how we ensure that district Boards are more influenced by public - give public proper access.
- Document is good step forward - but remain skeptical.
- General concern: structure of 1240 puts power in hands of wrong persons
- Need more public forums.
- Illegal dumping - offer "free day" at fill each month to encourage legal dumping - should be part of permit process (mandatory).
- There should be a total moratorium on all pending permits until all rules are finalized and applied - don't "grandfather" anymore.
- Promote effective local enforcement by withholding 1240 funds or other state funds when district are not effective in compliance with district plan/state laws.
- Bottle bill will be effective.
- Don't be in such a hurry.
- Let "stockpiles" of commodity drive markets - just awkward stage.

Mr. Gist

Mr. Roehm

Public Comments: Evansville, July 1990

- Should mandate that districts provide convenient collection locations.
- If it is not convenient it won't work.
- Should be mandated that all Indiana citizens manage your own yard waste in the back yard.
- Siting: all facilities should be sited along highway to force enforcement by highway patrol.
- Prioritize enforcement of daily cover regs.
- Prioritize enforcement - it is critical if rules are to mean anything.
- Clarify what local agencies are responsible for - make local district aware of what they are responsible for.

(Jasper)

- Prioritize enforcement of illegal dumping
- ADF's and "bottle bill" structures could be effective for all kinds of materials - but must give retailer the incentive.
- "Good character" criteria for permit applicants should be retroactive.

Gordon Barnett

- ADFs should not be at district level/no equity.
- Markets are critical.

Dale Baker, Wright

- Find ways to increase law enforcement officer's leverage - current system frustrating.

FYI: New Litter Abatement Group in VB County.

- Find way to tap existing volunteer base to support local recycling efforts.
 - State can leverage existing technical assistance mechanisms
 - State should try to tap volunteer knowledge by establishing a state board of action volunteers. (allocate funds to ensure participation - travel, etc.)
- Look at existing technical assistance mechanisms (e.g.: EPA Hotline) and local resources.

Public Comments: Evansville, July 1990

- Related Issue: recommend that HEA 1240 be restructured to give citizen representatives a vote on District Boards.

Catherine Barren
(now living in Fla.)

- Illegal dumping - Recommend using helicopters and stiff fines, as well as confiscation of vehicles.
- Glass recycling technologies need to be researched.
- Inform general public about controversies and problems with each management option.
- concerned about regulation of "captive sites"/private landfills

Response:

Such sites are fully regulated under all applicable landfill management laws; however, are not addressed in HB1240.

Nan Harden,
Bridge Alliance

- Appliances should be targeted as a problem waste - can be reused through reuse center (scavenge).
- Add kitchen waste to education effort (not just yard waste).
- Clarify how reasonable it is to:
 - Leave clippings on lawn;
 - Compost kitchen waste with leaves;
- This is low technology, simple.
- Do not support sludge compost products.
- Target areas with degraded topsoil as "market".

John Vadnal
U of E Professor

- Tax products based on:
 - Total amount of packaging
 - Percent of advertising budgetUse tax to provide funds for recycling and an incentive for reduction.

Sean Connoly

- Structure tax incentives to recognize recyclability of product/packaging to drive use of reusable packaging.

Public Comments: Evansville, July 1990

Vaughn Wilson
Save our Land and
Environment
Tammi Ryan
Cole

- Ban styrofoam
- In-house programs - practice what you preach.
- Supports bans on all recyclables
- Two year to ban - 12 months to implement.
- Need clear, cooperative system to provide information [to citizens]

Tony Bitter,
Citizen

- Education is critical
- User fee structures will be important - it takes money (fine or incentive).

Greg Kissell,
Industry

- Work with industry - don't sell them short - but help them succeed. Look at cooperative efforts versus bans. Help develop markets first.
- Give it time: Five years.
- Yard waste ban would take us halfway to our state goal.
- Would recommend centralized composting at district level.
- Support co-composting of sludge.

Kay Gries

- Education is the key to household hazardous waste control, but there must be a place to take them before you can ban them.

Dixie Wagner

- Economic incentives are the most effective; user fee structures will be important.
- Expand use of task forces to research success stories around country.
- "Good Character" rule should include "weighting" system to use in evaluating gravity of offense - Don't make it relative to other operators. The fact that an operator made a mess is more important than the fact that they cleaned it up.
- (Page 31) Siting criteria should be as stringent as possible

Public Comments: Evansville, July 1990

- Clarify what powers of district boards to control siting process.
 - Make public health and safety the most important consideration in every policy.
 - (comment in connection with Mr. Roehm's) Prioritize enforcement - it is critical if rules are to mean anything.
 - (comment in connection with Mr. Roehm's) Clarify what local agencies are responsible for - make local district aware of what they are responsible for.
 - Educate local officials about their power/responsibility.
- Jack Donnally
CEHW and Household
Hazardous Waste
- Look at Florida program "Amnesty Days" to collect hazardous wastes (statewide).
 - But all districts must act together so that materials don't end up in other districts. (inter district cooperation will be critical.)
- Phillip Tzschope
Recycling Industry
- Buyback recycling is already a healthy industry - what we need is support in education.
- Charles Gwaldney
- Consider the amount of energy required to produce and dispose of a product - this will drive change
 - Energy = money.
- Christine Terry
- Citizen's Advisory Committee has targeted yard waste.
 - Contact Christine for more info on all CAC activities- 426-5597
- Vick McBride
- Supports strong "good character" rule.
 - Use other state's computer records to research violations.
- John Mottley
- Residue asbestos in C&D debris needs to be addressed - is still hazardous -

Public Comments: Evansville, July 1990

- (Interrelated regulation): work with DNR to identify or add rules for underground/strip mining which may involve closed or active landfills.
- Identify underground mines as site constraint for landfill.

Record: 7/23/90
TERRE HAUTE, INDIANA

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT
INDIANA STATE SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN

- Would like District plan workshops open to public.
- Coordination with bordering counties (regional planning).
- What types of maps are being developed?
- What about addressing out-of-state waste?
- Would like to see more focus on banning materials from disposal (al., tin, glass, etc.).
 - need State to take lead and ban by reasonable date.
- Need to focus on market incentives.
 - e.g. charge for non-recyclable waste pick-up.
- Consider source reduction prior to consumption.
 - label products for durability.
 - discourage disposables (bans, sales tax, etc.).
- Like separation of waste collection/disposal from property taxes.
- Need industry to design appliances for durability.
- Lack of repairability (need more services).
- Need everyone to reduce (shared responsibility).
- What waste stream is affected by goals?
- How will State control household infectious waste? (make needles reusable).
- What is State doing to assist with market creation?
- Recycling goal too high for current markets.
- Possibly provide subsidy for use of paper-based insulation.

Public Comments: Terre Haute, July 1990

- Need to develop newsprint recycling (de-inking).
- Need to change attitudes and standards to open up markets. (perceived unsanitary, etc.)
- Need to make information available on plastics recycling (types, processes, etc.).
- How and where to recycle used motor oil.
- Will bureaucrats get along and expedite siting permits.
- Will State provide incentive to municipalities to facilitate recycling? (Page 25 wording is weak)
- Need to make recycling easy to achieve participation levels required (on local level).
- How is State going to handle illegal dumping? Needs to be addressed (higher costs = illegal dumping).
Who will clean up?
- How will recycling bottlenecks be addressed?
- How will recycling be used in local economy?
- How does State see material handling and processing facilities being located (local, district, regional)?
- State needs to provide guidelines for District formation (need formation mandation).
- What about protection of out-of-district waste flow.
- Plan has ambiguity in "good character and "need" definitions.
- Can State own industrial/municipal facilities?
- Who is going to certify waste non-infectious?
- Does State anticipate private or municipal composting?
- Pay-as-you-go yard waste collection is a good idea.
- State needs to set up compost markets. (mandate State to use compost).
- Why doesn't Indiana ban wood waste?
- Local ordinances may interfere with at-home composting.

Public Comments: Terre Haute, July 1990

Landfilling

- State needs to eliminate regulations restricting salvage of construction/demolition sites (no sales tax)

Incineration

- How do new rules affect existing facilities? Emission guidelines should apply to existing facilities.
- Would like to see ban of metals with (in?) incinerators.
- Will State require that recycled paper it purchases contain easily removable ink?
- Education process needs to filter into other agencies. (extraneous paper generation) (need duplex copying).
- Need incentives for purchasing equipment that can use recycled paper.
- Has State examined citizen education process and funding?
- Use lottery funds for education of public.
- Need high degree of emphasis on education.

Problem Waste

- Need to address oil leaked by autos.
- Need to provide tire storage area and landfills etc.
- Tires are stockpiled since no one wants to pay for proper disposal.
- Need to provide incentive for private business to handle tires.
- Need to restrict tire sizes (uniformity).
- Individual counties and State need to take care of own waste.
- State needs an education program to address waste battery handling/disposal.
- Review truck tire inspection regulations governing truck operation.

Record: 7/24/90
COLUMBUS, INDIANA

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT
INDIANA SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN

- Does plan focus on litter aspect of SWM? (bottle deposits, etc.). Needs more emphasis.
- Target for State procurement policies is needed.
- Need to address commercial/industrial waste.
- Population factors for waste reduction should be factored into percentage goals.
- New business waste impact review should be considered (district level).

Education

- Draft needs to focus on business, especially industry (leans too much toward domestic waste).
- Provide guidelines for teachers but allow hands-on.
 - Provide incentive by permitting local creation/application.
 - Provide teachers flexibility.
- Cost increase may provide effective educational tool.
- Need research into cost/reduction relationship.

Objectives (page 9)

- Possible use for recyclables.
- Emphasis on true cost of disposal.
- Problems with packaging.
- Pay attention to mass/energy balance of waste handling.
- Incineration priority needs to be higher.
 - Education on incinerator benefits/disads.

Technical Assistance

- State should provide as much technical assistance support as possible to Districts.
- State technical and financial assistance for industry to gear-up to produce recyclables.
- Be consistent and reduce references to those that can be placed in appendices.
- Design and engineer packaging to reduce it to minimum levels.
- "Durable packaging" contradictory.

Objectives (P. 14)

- Need to examine non-recyclable packaging (alternatives to cereal box etc.).
- (Page 16) 3rd. "•"- differentiate business and industry.
- In house 3rd "•" - should read "advocate" rather than "support".
- How is hauler going to enforce waste reduction.
- Need bottle deposit law.
- Need to identify problems now and determine who's responsible. (landfills etc.)
- Develop a penalty for mismanagement rather than deny on "good character" review.

Recycling

- Need to look to SE Asia and other areas as markets for recyclable materials (need more emphasis).
- Need network listing for end-users and processors of recycled materials.
- Reporting system for waste generation disposal seems to have loopholes.
- Put "teeth" in regional SWM planning requirements.
- Larger buffers for landfill sites.
- Lack of State policy support for control of out-of-state waste.
- Unless flow control is put into Districts' hands, districts can't adequately determine waste origins, fill rate.

Composting

- Section needs to deal with MSW composting (more focus, rather than yard-waste only).
- Need to include organics in alternative technology (animal feed).
- Plan needs to urge separation of different types of compostables

Landfilling

- Need additional technical assistance on leachate treatment methods. (need treatment reg's)
- A system for collection and treating methane gas.
- Research use of synthetic cover materials (fabric).
- Research on landfill mining, balefill.
- Streamline permit process.
- Need actual permit process schedule to expedite facilities and facility planning.
- Have zoning rules vs. District interests been considered?

Incineration, Problem Waste, District Planning

District/County Needs

- Need more clarity on District's power over local sanitation Districts.
- Proxy should be able to do District Board voting.
- Need to educate adults since they as group lack awareness or understanding of SWM needs.
- Need to address how to get counties to actually act.
- Counties that own their own landfills need to know costs for landfill extension to determine whether multi-county District is more preferable solution.

Recommendations to Districts

- (Page 58) Recommend that majority of Districts have access to a final disposal facility.

Public Comment: Columbus, July 1990

- Markets for recyclables is of primary importance to success of recycling. (encourage market development first).
- Plan needs to address other waste streams (foundry sand).
- Districts should be single county at first for elected official accountability.

Record: 7/24/90
GARY, INDIANA

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT
INDIANA SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN

Barb Hooper
Hammond

- Northwest Indiana has limited access to Indiana news - therefore, target Chicago media with educational outreach.

FYI: IDEM NW Regional Office
Gainer Bank Building
5th and Broadway
(late summer, 1990)

Q: Need timelines for action.

A: Need to wait for legislature to fund proposed actions during next legislative session.

Q: When will format be ready?

A: Will be part of plan adopted January 1, 1992.

- Publish list of where communities can get grants for recycling programs (e.g.: solid waste solutions)
- Be sure to clarify what regulations apply to different types of facilities (e.g.: recycling)
- Remember markets in bordering states.
- Address ambiguity of whether paper-derived-fuel would qualify as recycling or would be subject to ban.

- Supports yard waste ban.

Mark Reshkin
Porter City Solid
Waste Committee

- Without technical assistance soon, counties will be forced to become single city/district.
- Especially need siting tools to determine site suitability.

Response:

- Survey of County official's needs is underway.
- Siting suitability map should be prepared by Fall.
- IDEM needs funding to get this rolling.

Johnny McWilliams
Gary

- Re: capital for district projects - suggest/support low interest loans program to build facilities (not plans).

Herb Barber
Porter City Planning
Comm.

- Recommend that siting tool (map) be generated as soon as possible.
- Don't penalize communities that are already recycling.

George Versal
Crown Point

- Supports listing the new statutes, but also include existing statutes.

FYI:

IDEM
1-800-451-6027

- Try to help districts and cities avoid confusion.
- Remind people that tax dollars are used, regardless of who implements.
- Clarify that counties can institute landfill tipping fee surcharge to help fund plan.
- Suggest approaching local cable stations to promote awareness/education.
- Investigate impact of recycling related to dioxin in paper mill effluent.
- Be specific:
 - Specify what levels of contaminants will be allowed in composting:
 - Specify what standards will be applied to co-composted sludge.
 - Specify what materials will be recycled through district plans.
 - Specify what percentage of each material will be required to be recovered and recycled.
- Supply effective waste stream data (help find non-threatening reason to collect proprietary data).

- Address conflict of 1240 goals with currently exempt practices/operations (e.g.: "captive sites") - especially concerned with open burning of construction debris.
- Consider designating landfill capacity as "natural resource" to protect from out-of-state waste.
- Market Development
 - Contact all possible papermills.
 - Publish list of commodity specs which will be required by each market.
- Investigate mechanism to resolve conflicts between counties/districts - promote cooperation to ensure success - may require rules, mediation, binding arbitration, etc.
- Re: accountability for use of the 1240 monies.
 - Establish a public record (published in paper or mailed to interested parties or filed in library or filed in permit file)
- Re: tire recovery

Q: Where are funds available?

A: Recycling Promotion and Assistance Fund.

Pete Coleman
Hammond

Recommendations for state management system:

- three [mixed waste materials recovery] plants should be developed at (Lawrence, Marion, Miami) to handle all Indiana waste.
- Use inmate labor
- Markets in South Dakota/Minn
- University research programs
- Bottle bill
- Don't make districts plan and implement (too expensive)
- Support mechanisms to reduce non-recyclable packaging.

- Target disposable diapers: education on cloth alternatives and issues.
 - Check out the tire recycler in East St. Louis.
-

Rep. Charlie Brown
Legislator

- Clarify that General Assembly does support the success of HB 1240 and is operating under constraints to control the budget.
 - Remember to work with Chicago media to get information to northwest Indiana - emphasize positive information and more complete information on state legislation/agency action.
-

Sen. Ferree
Legislator

- Clarify that:
 - Local control is critical to move cost-effective plan,
 - HB 1240 was a start; will be adjusted.
-

Patty Eavis
PALS

- Recommend higher surcharges on tipping fees; state needs more money if it is to have a serious plan.
 - Support bans of wastes such as styrofoam.
 - Consider how bans may affect incineration projects - they will encourage out-of-state waste flow.
-

Elly Earnhart
Porter County

- Clarify how to implement user fee structure.
 - Consider mechanism to charge "captive sites" to help fund state effort - they are part of problem, they should be part of solution.
 - Target medical waste/clarify how state will address - include nursing homes
 - Suggests that District Board structure be reconsidered. Should include additional town representatives and operations representative.
-

William Miller

- Supports education emphasis: emphasize consumer discretion.
- Bottle bill is needed.
- Supports careful procedure to implement effective bans

Carl Miklusk
Highland

- Encourage faster pace to work with business to promote recycling industries/markets.

(e.g.: tires) - Get some interim guidelines and policies so small businesses can get going NOW!
-

Craig Grabow

- Supports emphasis on reduction/recycling, versus landfill.
- Siting: education and market development are the key.
- Supports prioritizing household hazardous waste collection/ treatment programs.
- Create a follow-up mechanism that will keep people informed on changes/progress in state and district plans (mailing list).

Doreen Carey

- Re: technical assistance - Need economic incentives to encourage political will to initiate local recycling.

e.g.: 1. Don't make districts compete for grants.
2. Reward districts for early success or for aggressive recycling plans.

Related Remarks:

- Make plan flexible
- Local level approach is only way to be effective.

Q: How has old Office of Technical Assistance changed?

A: Now Division of Pollution Prevention and Technical Assistance.

Bob Bittke
Commercial
Business Person

- Promote commercial recycling - give businesses data on costs and possibilities.

 - Help locate central markets.
-

Debra Solivais

- Target steel as recyclable commodity (remember local market potential).
- Consider impacts of bans to avoid market gluts (realistic timelines/good information to businesses)

Public Comment: Gary, July 1990

- Provide guidelines to businesses on what to expect/ what is marketable and who is buying materials.
 - Create an incentive to help businesses buy recycled.
-

Herb Barker

- Re: problem waste
 - Target low-level radioactive waste and conditionally-exempt hazardous wastes.
 - Recommend training volunteers to help collect and dispose of these wastes.
 - Give generators a convenient, affordable way to reclaim/dispose.

Marie Hornack
Hobart

- Promote preference for recycling based on source separation. Only this approach will make the needed behavior changes.
- Mixed waste processing should not be allowed as recycling.
- Find ways to prioritize recycling versus refuse-derived-fuel alternatives.

Record: 7/25/90
FT. WAYNE, INDIANA

PUBLIC COMMENTS TO THE DRAFT
INDIANA SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN

State Level

- Does plan focus on litter aspect of SWM? (e.g.: bottle deposits, etc?)
- Need to ban recyclables from disposal as a way to address O-S-W need date for action.
- Strongly encourage IDEM to move aggressively on K-12 Education curriculum.
- Use recycled products now.
- Districts need IDEM's cooperation now for success.
- How can State and business exert influence on manufacturers to produce machines that can use recyclables (xerox, computer prints, etc.)
- Prison labor feasibility study should examine private enterprise use of labor.
- Boards need eminent domain.
- Private citizens face liability (advisory committee).
- Goals and dates are not aggressive enough.
- Shouldn't permit landfill siting without recycling facilities first.
- Concerned that Districts will be forced to put cost burden on tax payers.
- Need to determine how fast Districts can actually move.
- State needs to provide "cookbook" approach to planning for Districts.
- Districts need to be able to limit out-of-district waste .
- Need avenue for process appeal.
- State needs to provide Districts with technical assistance.

Public Comment: Ft. Wayne, July 1990

- HB1240 gives Districts impression that plan approval depends on preparation by consultants.

Public Education

- State needs to contact surrounding states for guidelines and assistance.
- Recycling businesses needs funds now.
- Recycling businesses are ready for State-provided materials.
- State needs to spend money up front to address SWM problems.
- State needs to educate decision makers. (other agencies, etc.)
- Key to success of SWMP is education of youngsters.

Technical Assistance

- Plan fails to detail how IDEM will address staffing problems of permitting process.

Source Reduction

- Plan fails to detail how policy will be prosecuted.

Recycling

- Need to know if State is going to provide incentives for businesses utilizing recyclables in manufacturing to locate in Indiana.
- All packing material should be marked for recyclability.
- Plan needs to emphasize priorities to reach goals. (ex: priority of recycling facility siting over possibly much needed landfills, etc.)
- Need to clarify that plastics have sub-classifications (1A-1B blow mold vs. pressure mold) which affect recyclability.
- Will biodegradables be penalized since they don't promote recycling.

Composting

- Need to address agricultural use of composting (land-application).
- Look at placing yard waste composting areas on farm land (farmers place clippings as is).
- Decentralization of composting process best method.
- Need IDEM to issue a strong recommendation on land-application of waste water sludge.

Landfilling

- Intro., 2nd paragraph - misleading statement about closure due to environmental compliance)
- Need to emphasize "total picture" of SWM.
- Need more government involvement for recycling to work.

Incineration

- Should address incineration of waste wood only - add 3rd class of materials that can be incinerated.
- Incinerators should be banned since produce hazardous (toxic) waste.

Problem Waste

- Need convenient waste oil collection centers.
- Waste oil exchange when buying new oil. Need legislation to encourage or require businesses that sell to collect.

Other Issues

- Is consideration being given to agricultural hazardous waste?
- Provide rewards to successful recyclers (rebates per ton, etc.)
- Creation of an office that matches needs of an area to available opportunities in legislature and/or from other areas. (e.g. unemployment - recycling facilities).

Record: 7/25/90
KOKOMO, INDIANA

PUBLIC COMMENTS TO THE DRAFT
INDIANA SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN

- John Brugh
Logansport
- Plan is remiss in not referencing critical need for public ownership of final disposal facilities (landfills).
 - Need to control flow of:
 - out-of-state
 - out-of-district refuse.
- Steve Daily
Kokomo
- Plan is good starting point.
 - Need clear, realistic funding strategy outlined in Plan.
 - Concerned that not all local governments are affected (i.e.: Marion County exclusion)
 - Need specific waste stream data in Plan
 - Legislation does not give municipalities enough autonomy in own planning.
 - Flow control for districts is critical.
 - Must fund adequate staffing and salaries for IDEM (quality control)
- Sen. Steve Johnson
- Public education:
 - Clarify that better solid waste management will cost more.
 - Clarify that individuals and business will be part of the solution.
 - Technical assistance:
 - Be careful to seek staff who have hands-on experience, or better, identify potential for contracting with targeted academic/private experts to allow flexibility.

Public Comment: Ft. Wayne, July 1990

- Don't promote over-capitalized plans - encourage districts to:
 - + Apply people-centered solutions,
 - + Remain flexible by avoiding 20-30 year amortized projects - think small, phased-in.

Phil Hood, Landfill
Owner/Operator

- Careful not to put small landfills out of business - keep in mind what a policy will cost an operator.

Bill Thompson

- Help counties protect publicly owned landfills from becoming a district landfill.

Judy Rhodes
League of Women
Voters, Lafayette

- Plan seems overly broad - hard to judge where priorities will be applied - Plan should clarify where monies will be applied in enacting different plan elements in the State Action Plan.

- Should put the most dollars into source reduction.

Q: How do you find and express cost?

A: IDEM will provide estimated costs for different options, and/or directly help districts generate real costs - this will help reframe public awareness and discussion.

Sonya Margerum, Mayor
W. Lafayette

- Use cost for a unit of garbage to express cost.
- Help districts effectively effectively involve public in on-going planning.
- Plan is very broad.
- Recommend early emphasis on source reduction and recycling - this approach will make final disposal issue smaller.
- Market development is critical -
- Re: procurement
 - Would be more cost-effective to give tax break to companies that use recyclables than to apply a 10 percent procurement preference system
 - Also recommend incentives for newspapers with recycled content
- Need state assistance for siting regional landfills

Public Comment: Ft. Wayne, July 1990

- e.g.: use a state bidding process to identify counties with interest in being facility "host"
 - e.g.: financial incentives for counties with site.
 - Support targeting of household hazardous waste - consider label/sticker to identify and educate.
- Sue Scholer
Tippicanoe
- Need more specific timetable so that districts will understand what tools will be available from state and when.
 - Would support low-bid process to facilitate siting.
- Steve Reuter
Indianapolis
- State should not lose sight of need to increase quality enforcement and assistance in maintaining landfill capacity.
- Bob McGinn,
City Council,
Tippicanoe
- Siting assistance is critical - must have some kind of landfill, regardless of what is reduced or recycled - siting is such a difficult prospect.
- John Bittner,
Kokomo
Freelance writer
- Re: Recycling
 - Start with government procurement system
 - Get 100 percent participation before resorting to mandated content standards.
 - Check conflicts with other laws
e.g.: fiber content requirements for newspapers may conflict with the first amendment
- Ann Falcon
Lafayette,
Waste hauling
industry
- Re: Waste audits
 - Don't require audits - let businesses decide for themselves - supports outreach and education.
 - Consider potential inequities in applying variable rate fees for customers with different quantities of non-recycled waste (e.g.: how will hauler "credit" subscription customers?)
 - Don't fine hauler [for banned materials in the load] - fine generators. [Hauler fines] won't work - too cumbersome and points finger at wrong person. Hauler is not the problem - don't slow hauler down, costs will go up.

Julian Pugh
Cass County
Environmental League

- Clarify the district requirements to publish costs for collection and disposal.
- Prioritize municipal, publicly owned landfills for siting or expansion permits - this will give most leverage in controlling out-of-state waste flow.
- Clarify that "local need" should be based on population, potential growth, businesses/industries
- All waste should go through MRF's before final disposal - this will safeguard haulers, operators and public.
- Recommend "new rule":
 - Require haulers to post the content (i.e.: "Hazardous Waste", "MSW", "Special Waste") on large letter sign at side of truck.
 - Penalize hauler if load is different than posted sign indicates (e.g.: \$5,000 fine).
- All MRF's should be complimented by local industry/facility to remanufacture glass.
- Small communities should have transfer stations to feed into MRF - transfer station should have a processing center.
- State should fund MRF.
- Ownership should go to county or private company.
- Supports inspection of loads at landfill (per Cass County program).
- Support bottle bill.
- Clarify who is in charge.
- What role and authority does each level of governments have (district board, zoning board, etc.)?
- Plan should follow the legislative intent, not IDEM's interpretation of HB 1240.
- For the record: Marion County is exempt because it already has a plan.

Stu Rhodes, Council
Marion County

Public Comment: Ft. Wayne, July 1990

- To share Marion County experience: Districts must have flow control if the project will fly - also need power of eminent domain.
- Re: education - focus on changing consumer demand to drive supply of recycled recyclable goods.
- Will support low interest loans for recycling enterprises.

Tim Gale,
Cass County

- (Page 21) FYI: Plastics coding will be effective January 1, 1992.
 - Concerned with enforcement.

Mike Busch
Cass County,
Commissioner

- Concerned with lack of emphasis on landfill capacity must emphasize municipal ownership.
 - Plan should specify percentage of total budget where dollars will be applied
 - Clarify what "new rules" will require additional legislative initiative to give IDEM the authority to implement new rules - would support broad authority if that would make it work (e.g.: can IDEM institute bottle bill?)
 - Would support bottle bill.
 - Re: Market Development
 - Plan should be more specific - policy is too broad - consider potential problems and complexities - currently too simplistic for final plan
 - Re: Refuse routes
 - Counties do have power to designate refuse routes.
 - Consider one IDEM ombudsperson assigned to specific set of districts.
 - Identify ways (legislative guidance) to close loopholes that currently exist in designating liabilities for landfill ownership/operation when violation occurs -
- Q: Will a district have to pay the 50¢ surcharge if district doesn't need funds from the surcharge?
A: Yes, in the interest of statewide equity.

Public Comment: Ft. Wayne, July 1990

Dallas Ressler,
Tipton City
Commissioner

- Supports emphasis on recycling but Plan does not stress that almost everything is recyclable. Plan should be more aggressive
- Clarify how state can help counties protect their own publicly owned landfill resource.

Jim Parks
Marion County

- Plan should include very specific waste stream data - districts and state need a realistic benchmark to evaluate success.
- \$2 million is not adequate - must generate much more substantial funds - therefore Plan should account for specific staffing needs and projected expenses which will be incurred for each program.
- Anticipate the difficulties (political) inherent in current structure which may promote inter-county discord.
 - e.g.: complications inherent in requiring districts to increase taxes.
 - Recommend a bulk appropriation from general fund, in perpetuity, to support district planning and administration.

Ike Hollingsworth,
Russiaville

- Consider related issues which apply to some recyclable/recycled products (e.g.: fire risks of paper, insulation)

Q: Will state license consultants

A: No, but will produce a list and set of consultant evaluation guidelines.

Pat Stevens
Marion County

- Clarify what percentage of funds will go back to communities.
- \$2 million is probably not adequate to cover all that is provided.

Dennis Anglin
UAW 292, Kokomo

- Clarify if there are provisions to give district control over transport of out-of-district waste through that district.

Response: Counties can already designate transportation routes for waste hauling.

Public Comment: Ft. Wayne, July 1990

Helen Hollingsworth
Russiaville

- Keep an updated record of where communities are finding markets for their recyclables.

Carter Leonard
Jay County

- Re: Siting
 - consider mechanisms to compensate host neighborhoods near disposal facilities (landfills) (e.g.: tax incentives, reimbursements, relocation, larger set backs (2,000-3,000 feet set back))
- Be more specific about how government will address the concerns of their citizens. Have some compassion.
- State should clarify options for host community compensation which are available to districts and individual citizens.

Shirley Hipsher
Wabash County,
City Zoning Board &

- (page 61) Re: Siting
 - State must give help with siting - try to avoid poor sites.

Citizens Alert
Comm., Wabash County

- Supports technical tools such as the siting map.
- Consider new rule for technical consultant licensing. We need better quality control, protection with regard to technical professionals.
- Related issue: Educate all enforcement agents, including law enforcement officers.

Steve Dooley,
Town Council
Recycling Committee

- Supports State's effort to implement HB 1240 clause which requires out-of-state waste to be certified harmless.

Don Clark,
Fulton County

- Supports enforcement of "good character" requirements.

Pat Montgomery,
County Council
Peru

- Recommend that state provide conflict management services (e.g.: mediation, arbitration) to assist with inter-county, district, municipal conflict.

Public Comment: Ft. Wayne, July 1990

Linda Gale,
Cass County

- Re: Education
 - Recommend that the state discourage use of the term NIMBY - educate others about real concerns of landfill/incinerator neighbors - increase sensitivity.

Vicki Leonard,
Jay County

- Re: "Good Character" requirement
 - Q: Will past history in other states be considered?
 - A: Yes.

- Clarify definition of "local need"

Shirley Hipsher

- Recommend that "good character" requirements be applied with an emphasis on accountability.