



---

a quarterly update from the  
CAPE COD COMMISSION

---

Volume One ■ Number One

---

---

## About This Publication...

The Cape Cod Commission and Barnstable County are pleased to send you the inaugural issue of **TALKIN' TRASH**, a quarterly update of news and notes about solid waste management issues across Barnstable County. The publication is available only in electronic form through e-mail (as a PDF file, which requires a program such as Adobe® Acrobat® Reader on the recipient's computer). Our aim is to be informative without generating more solid waste! For this first issue, we selected a variety of topics we think will interest many of you and help you in your day-to-day work. Your feedback on this initiative will help us shape this publication to serve you well. Please contact me, by e-mail or phone, with your thoughts.



Greg Smith  
Planner/Solid Waste Specialist  
Cape Cod Commission, Barnstable County  
[gsmith@capecodcommission.org](mailto:gsmith@capecodcommission.org)  
(508) 362-3828 extension 344



### Inside this issue...

Council of SEMASS Communities	___	3
Regulatory Issues	_____	4
Industry Briefs	_____	6
Cape Cod Commission News	_____	7
Local Updates	_____	7
Other News	_____	9
Did You Know?	_____	10

---

## MRIP Update: New Coordinator Hired

The state has hired a new MRIP coordinator to replace Mary Farrell, who departed late last year. Betsey Westell, formerly the Fall River Recycling Coordinator, is now the Region II Coordinator.

According to Betsey, several revisions have been made to the program. Because of the harsh economic times, the DEP has made a few adjustments to make it easier to qualify for Phase II of this year's MRIP program (between November 1, 2001 and April 30, 2002). The reporting for that time frame is due back to the MRIP coordinator by May 15, 2002. These changes may apply especially to those towns that might have decided to bow out of the last phase, or to those towns that have

...continued next page

seen a relatively small increase in tons of recyclables collected in the last six months. The specifics of the changes are as follows:

- DEP will add the 85 pounds of recyclables per capita option to the minimum criteria list for Basic Tier, Phase II (thereby adding a fourth option). Refer to the second part of the Minimum Requirements on the Blue Form. This will NOT apply retroactively to Phase I. As in the past, towns may qualify by achieving the 85 pounds/capita level for Phase II or by achieving a recycling rate of 170 pounds per capita for both phases.

- Examine the Blue (basic) or Yellow (advanced) sheets and notice that the percent tonnage increase standard was 6 percent for advanced communities but has been lowered to 5 percent.

For the Basic Tier, the 4-percent increase requirement is now 2 percent. As with the pounds/capita change, this will not apply retroactively to Phase I. If you have no sheets or information about the MRIP program, please call. If you would like to look at the paperwork, Betsey will be happy to send you the package of forms, without obligation.

- DEP will allow another option for curbside municipalities to qualify for the "16 leaf and yard waste collections" criteria. Communities that offer curbside recycling pick-up may now qualify for this elective by having 12 curbside collections AND having a drop-off center open from April to November.

Please feel free to contact Betsey at **Betseywestell@email.msn.com** (508-676-0965) with any questions you might have.

<b>MRIP Awards May 1–October 31, 2001</b>	
<b>Bourne</b> .....	<b>\$10,840</b>
<b>Eastham</b> .....	<b>\$1,608</b>
<b>Falmouth</b> .....	<b>\$16,690</b>
<b>Harwich</b> .....	<b>\$2,757</b>
<b>Provincetown</b> .....	<b>\$4,065</b>
<b>Mashpee</b> .....	<b>\$1,529</b>
<b>Truro</b> .....	<b>\$1,134</b>
<b>Total: \$38,623</b>	

## Council of SEMASS Communities Update

A COSC meeting was held on April 4 in Plymouth. Several items were on the agenda, including the following:

- A broad-based municipal coalition has put together draft legislation that will require the MA Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) to prepare an environmental impact statement prior to the implementation of any new policies, guidance documents, or regulations. As you may be aware, the

state has previously implemented two new policies (see the article on page 4): **Cumulative Impact Analysis** and **Double Liner Requirements at Landfills**. The proposed draft legislation is an attempt to rally municipal support to halt the practice of implementing additional "unfunded mandates" (i.e., **Recycling Benefit Plans**, or RPBs) while holding the state to the requirements of a full public process.

- The DEP had been hearing considerable concern from municipal officials and others regarding the development of RBPs, which were introduced in the Beyond 2000 Solid Waste Master Plan as a way to increase the amount of waste recycled. The DEP feels that government can and has played a major role in making recycling and source reduction key parts of the solid waste management strategy in Massachusetts.

...continued next page

However, as with many activities, the DEP feels that the private sector is better suited to establish the market infrastructure and efficiencies needed to build and sustain successful recycling and source reduction initiatives. The DEP has regulatory control over the solid waste facilities only through their solid waste permits. Therefore the solid waste facilities would be required to implement RBP, which in turn affects the municipalities through both cost and implementation impacts.

As conceived, RBPs would be required as a condition of disposal facility and transfer station permits under 310 CMR 19.000, for which DEP will be proposing regulatory changes in 2002. The RBPs would modify an existing regulatory requirement that disposal facilities demonstrate that the MSW recycling rate in their service area is at least 25 percent. RBPs are intended to move disposal facilities beyond the 25 percent standard. At the November 29, 2001, Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) meeting, DEP presented the most recent draft proposal for RBPs. At that time and since that meeting, DEP has heard concerns from many municipal officials regarding how RBPs would work in practice as well as about how the costs of RBPs would be passed on. Considerable feedback on the RBP proposal has been received and several important issues need to be worked out before DEP can proceed further with the development of RBPs.

In addition, John Fischer of the DEP recently announced through an

e-mail: "The state has decided not to move forward the development of regulations for RBPs at this time. Therefore, the draft regulatory revisions to the Solid Waste Permitting Regulations (310 CMR 19.00) that DEP will propose this spring will not include RBPs. However, DEP remains committed to working to increase the role that the solid waste industry plays in recycling and waste reduction. While government will continue to play a major role in advancing recycling and source reduction, we believe that we will need a broader partnership to be successful in reaching our waste reduction goals. This partnership will need to include significant contributions from all stakeholders... As part of this effort, we will be working with you to develop alternative approaches that can increase the role that the solid waste industry plays in recycling and waste reduction and to build a productive, effective partnership across all of these groups to continue progress toward our goals." John can be reached in the Boston DEP office at [John.Fischer@state.ma.us](mailto:John.Fischer@state.ma.us) or call him at (617) 292-5632 for comments or questions.

While this may be seen as good news for those concerned that the RBP would simply be an additional cost passed on to local communities by the WTE facilities, there is concern that the state will be resurrecting the issue at some point in the future.

• COSC is seeking municipal support for legislation being filed to extend the Waste-to-Energy Grant Program

administered by MTPC for an additional three years. These funds would assist communities in further recouping those costs associated with the installation, as well as the operation and maintenance costs of pollution control technologies at the state's WTE facilities.

• A "cracker barrel" forum was held at the Morse School in Falmouth on April 24 to discuss the Energy Restructuring Act of 1997 with Senator O'Leary, Representative Patrick, and Chairman Bosley of the House Energy Committee. Several issues related to the Act were discussed, including the importance to many cities and towns with existing contracts with WTE facilities for a three-year extension to the Renewable Energy Trust Fund legislation that has been proposed by Senator Fargo.

• Finally, the Mercury Separation Plan (MSP) being implemented by the WTE facility is in the process of being extended an additional two years. This is good news, as the program has proactively removed more than 65 pounds of mercury-bearing products from the waste stream between April and August 2001. Contact Sidi Mateo at [sidi.mateo@ref-fuel.com](mailto:sidi.mateo@ref-fuel.com) for more information on the MSP plan.



## Regulatory Issues

### ■ Cumulative Impact Analysis

The DEP's Interim Risk Evaluation Guidance Document requires the developer of a new solid waste management facility, i.e., transfer stations, landfills, or the expansion of an existing facility, to assess health risk impacts to individuals living in the vicinity of the proposed facility.

The Guidance Document requires that a new landfill, a new cell/phase at an existing landfill, or the expansion of an existing landfill prepare a quantitative and qualitative health risk assessment for that facility in order to evaluate the potential health impacts to existing or hypothetical individuals living or working in the surrounding area. The threshold for performing this risk assessment is whenever the throughput permit limit for the facility is more than 150 tons per day (tpd). The assessment requires a quantification and characterization of potential emissions (gaseous and fugitive) from a facility as well as air dispersion modeling of them so that the extent of their impact to the surrounding area can be determined from a health risk standpoint. From a qualitative standpoint, the guidance requires that a cumulative health risk assessment be prepared that assesses the emissions from the solid waste management facility plus other nearby commercial/industrial facilities within a one-mile radius. It should be noted that the guidance requires that the

cumulative assessment be completed even if there are no other sources within a one-mile radius. Sources near the solid waste facility that are included in the qualitative assessment would include such operations as truck and bus depots, auto salvage shops, and junk yards. These other nearby sources are not being required to perform such an assessment even though these sources could have impacts that are more extensive than the proposed solid waste facility.

Solid waste transfer stations that are modified and have a throughput limit greater than 150 tpd are required to perform a qualitative cumulative health risk assessment per the guidance. As with the qualitative assessment for a landfill, the qualitative assessment requires that impacts of nearby sources be assessed with those of the facility as to their total potential impact.

The qualitative impact assessment requires that all solid waste facilities implement various "best management practices" to minimize potential impacts from the solid waste facility onto the environment. The guidance does not impose anything on the nearby facilities to implement additional control measures even if the qualitative assessment shows them to be a significant source of environmental impact. Consequently, these other types of

sources (truck depots, auto body shops, junk yards) may be permitted to operate in the same exact location as where a solid waste facility is proposed and be a significant source of environmental impact, however, they would not be required to complete a health risk assessment. The DEP seems to be using the qualitative assessment as a tool to impose on all solid waste management facilities the requirement to retrofit their diesel-powered vehicles (e.g., front-end loaders) to be low-emission vehicles independent of need. The DEP seems to be requiring low-emission vehicles at a solid waste management facility even if it is adjacent to a large truck depot while the truck depot is not required to retrofit their equipment. Facilities that are located in unpopulated and rural areas are also being asked to retrofit their diesel-powered equipment.

There is a significant cost to prepare these health risk and cumulative assessments, however, the DEP has not done a cost-benefit analysis as to its need. Also, the DEP did not go through a formal public process before imposing this interim guidance and has held the permit process of those already in the process until these assessments were completed. There is not one regulation in place that requires these assessments.

...continued next page



## ■ Double Liner Requirements for All Landfill “Authorizations to Construct” Issued after 12/20/00

The Beyond 2000 Solid Waste Master Plan stated that the DEP would require the use of double liners for all landfill capacity that was constructed after December 20, 2000. The Master Plan also said the DEP would use existing regulatory authority to implement this requirement until the solid waste regulations (310 CMR19.000) were revised. An interim guidance document is being used by the DEP for determining double liner requirements until the regulations are revised to incorporate new requirements.

There are three primary scenarios to consider when applying the double liner standard. The first scenario is where liners will be constructed over new or virgin areas where no previous solid waste has been placed and there is no existing liner. The second scenario is where additional wastes will be placed where there is no liner under the existing waste. The third scenario is where additional waste will be placed over waste where there is an existing liner already in place.

The primary environmental advantage afforded by double liner systems over single liner systems is the leak detection/secondary collection function of a double liner system. A leak-detection function allows the performance of the primary liner to be constantly monitored. A leak through the primary liner will be stopped before it reaches groundwater by the secondary liner. The secondary-collection system between the primary and secondary liner will remove this

leachate and allow for its quantity and quality to be monitored. A leak-detection system can “protect” the capacity of the area being monitored by unequivocally demonstrating that the liner is functioning properly. If a leak should develop, corrective actions can be implemented to repair and stop the leak. The DEP intends to require this leak-detection function, wherever it is reasonably practical to do so, in all landfill capacity constructed after the effective date of the Master Plan (12/20/00).

The DEP is requiring a double liner design for future landfills even if there is evidence that an existing landfill's single liner design is operating properly. All landfills have groundwater monitoring wells that are placed up-gradient and down-gradient of the landfill. These wells allow an understanding if there is a problem with the landfill. As few, if any, landfills in Massachusetts are showing a problem, why is it necessary to require more liners? While additional liners might

be a good idea, where is the cost/benefit of this practice? Instead of mandating additional liners, perhaps the DEP should be more restrictive with the application of existing regulations if a landfill is shown to be a problem. Requiring groundwater monitoring on a quarterly basis versus every six months, or requiring that a landfill be capped sooner to prevent leachate from potentially being generated might be two better alternatives. Also, the interim guidance that is being applied before the regulations are changed to double liner systems is requiring that a liner system be installed on the side slopes of an existing landfill to separate the new double liner design from the old single liner design. While this side-slope liner system would be a good idea if the landfill were not working, it is not necessary if the landfill is operating. Refer to the Web site [www.state.ma.us/dep/bwp/dswm/files/dbeline.htm](http://www.state.ma.us/dep/bwp/dswm/files/dbeline.htm) for more information on this issue.



## Industry Briefs

### ■ Ferrous Steel: Moderate Optimism Returns to Recycling Markets

As is well known, the prices paid and the overall demand for scrap ferrous (steel) has crashed in recent months. This is due particularly to the onslaught of relatively inexpensive, foreign steel imports that make their way to the US from Europe, China, Japan, Malaysia, and Russia. Domestically, inventories at processing yards are high due to weak demand at steel mills across the country. However, the demand for nonferrous (aluminum) metals has improved in recent months as consumption has increased. This is principally due to manufacturers gearing up for the seasonal demand of beverage containers.

Locally, it is not easy to get rid of municipally recycled steel, particularly white goods with CFCs. However, there have been considerable changes to those local industries that purchase municipally collected scrap steel and white goods. The list at right details those local industries that do accept ferrous materials as well as white goods with CFCs. Contact Jim Boyle at [Jboyle@townofbourne.com](mailto:Jboyle@townofbourne.com) for more information.

### ■ OCC Market Heats Up

According to recovered paper processors, a number of domestic consumers of OCC were forced to boost bale prices in mid-April. Low inventories in the recycling pipeline, coupled with healthy export demand for OCC, resulted in a price jump of \$10 to \$15 per ton in several regions. Processors are optimistic that the market surge will continue in the fifth month of the year.

### ■ Plastic Reclaimers Express Concern about Opaques

Opaque white PET bottles are a growing problem for plastic reclaimers, says an industry group. The Association for Post-Consumer Plastic Recyclers reports that its members, which include more than 90 percent of the PET bottle processing capacity in North America, have found white PET to be "very detrimental" to bottle recycling. "Although newer sorting technology is capable of identifying white PET from other PET colors, all current sortation technology capability does not identify and remove it uniquely." White PET is a contaminant for natural PET in many applications, such as bottle-to-bottle use. APR urges bottle designers to avoid using white PET.

### ■ Consumers May Bear PC Recycling Costs

Electronics makers have moved a step closer to incorporating the cost of recycling in new PCs, peripherals, and TV sets, according to an agreement reached last

...continued next page

#### Ferrous Steel Recyclers

Zion South, Middleboro, MA  
508-946-2383

AW Martin, New Bedford, MA  
508-992-7828

Brockton Iron & Steel, Brockton, MA  
508-586-4640

Mid-City Scrap, Westport, MA  
508-675-7831

BFI, Tyngsborough, MA  
978-649-7564

CJ Mabardy, Cambridge, MA  
617-354-7580

CK Appliance, Worcester, MA  
800-679-5551

CRT Recycling, Bridgewater, MA  
508-230-8090

CSG Services, Marlborough, MA  
800-527-7648

Energy Answers, Pittsfield, MA  
413-443-7373

George Apkin, North Adams, MA  
413-664-4936

Greylock Ice and Fuel, Adams, MA  
413-743-1020

Interstate Refrig Rec., Foxboro, MA  
508-560-5735

Millis Industries, Millis, MA  
508-376-8700

Turner Trucking, Lynn, MA  
871-595-3741

Waste Management, Woburn, MA  
781-933-2113

Winthrop Steel, Fitchburg, MA  
978-343-3627

WTe Recycling, Greenfield, MA  
413-772-2200

A and E Metals, Fall River, MA  
508-679-8333

CT Metals Industries, Monroe, CT  
203-268-5909

week. This agreement, developed in a forum that includes computer and consumer-electronics manufacturers, calls for the development of a "front-end financed system" to support the collection, reuse, and recycling of used electronic devices. Thus, if the system is adopted (by September 2002), the cost would likely be factored into the price tag that the consumer sees when shopping for a new PC or television.

This is good news for both consumers and the environment, as recent news reports have discovered that a large percentage of recycled computers and peripherals end up in Third World countries to be broken down. This process causes significant amounts of pollution to the local environment.

—Information regarding OCC and PET markets obtained from Recycling News update e-mails, April 2002

---

## Cape Cod Commission News

### ■ Co-composting Consultant Chosen

On March 7, 2002, the engineering firm of Wright-Pierce was selected to be the consultant to undertake the feasibility study for the co-composting facility for five Upper Cape towns (Provincetown, Truro, Eastham, Wellfleet, and Orleans). Wright-Pierce will be teaming with CGK/BC and Commonwealth Resources Management Corporation. Michael Giggey, vice-president of Wright-Pierce, met with representatives of Barnstable County on April 3, 2002, to discuss the formulation of a draft scope for the project. Barring any legal issues associated with the draft scope or contract, the contract should be signed in the near future and work should commence in the spring 2002. As outlined in the RFQ, the study must be completed within a six-month time frame.

### ■ Cape Cod Annual Recycling Analysis

The Cape Cod Annual Recycling Analysis has been completed for both 2000 and 2001. The analysis provides a snapshot of each town's recycling and solid waste stream, and identifies those markets where materials are delivered by each town for disposal or marketing. The Recycling Analysis is available on the Cape Cod Commission's Web site at:

[www.capecodcommission.org/waste](http://www.capecodcommission.org/waste)




---

## Local Updates

### ■ Eastham Transfer Station Redesign

Article contributed by the Eastham Recycling Committee

Engineering plans are literally on the drawing boards for a long-term redesign of the Eastham Transfer Station. Funds for the engineering plan were approved at the 2001 Eastham Town Meeting, and Weston & Sampson Engineers, Inc. (in conjunction with ATP Environmental) are currently working on finalizing the plan. At the Eastham Town Meeting to be held in October, it is possible the plans will be considered for funding approval.

During the past two years the collection of recyclables has doubled and now includes mixed paper, cardboard, and other items of interest including designated items of hazardous waste. In order to encourage more recycling (and more cost avoidance for trash disposal) and make Eastham's operations more efficient and cost effective, the town is proposing this redesign of the Eastham Transfer Station. The underlying objective for the redesign is to maximize the reduction of trash and to maximize cost avoidance. The current transfer station was built at a time when recycling involved one recycling roll-off container, which was located in one small corner of the facility. Currently, although still in the same area, nine recycling locations

...continued next page

are required. The recycling area is totally located in dirt, which makes moving and dragging equipment a crude process. It also makes using the area difficult for recyclers due to awkward access to the drop-off points. Driving and safe pedestrian access is a complicated and precarious situation. During the summer this situation becomes critical as the population and related vehicular traffic expands by a multiple of five or six. The current recycling area is too small and is without any utilities such as power and water. In sum, it is impractical to implement a new design in the current location.

Transportation costs have escalated due to the increased volume of recyclables and the higher prices paid for hauling both trash and recyclables. The situation is aggravated by the low density of some recyclables and the lack of equipment and related power to compact loads effectively. Very significant reductions in the number of transport trips to market can result in very significant and recurring cost avoidance by utilizing compactor roll-offs to compact and transport most recyclables.

The compactor roll-offs are equipped with receiving hoppers, which provide easy access for users and can make recycling much more attractive to more people. The new design provides for compactor roll-offs to be adjacent to each other at right angles to the sidewalk and with hoppers directly at the sidewalk. Walking and carrying distances are significantly reduced for users. The easier it is to recycle, the

more people will do so. As such, less trash will be generated. The less trash that is generated, costs can be avoided by paying less in tip fees to SEMASS.

The traffic flow is designed so that reusable materials and recyclables are dropped off by users prior to reaching the trash hoppers. All vehicles will pass the entry control point and follow the same traffic pattern. Vehicles stop in the parking lane adjacent to the drop-off points for reusable materials and enter a marked parking area adjacent to the Stock Exchange. At the recycling location two lanes are available for parallel stopping to drop off recyclables. From the recycling area, all lanes lead to the trash drop-off, the metal pile, the tire/white goods concrete pad, and to the exit road. The intent is to provide a simple traffic flow and easy access to drop-off/pick-up points. A large concrete slab for C&D wastes and other possible future use and the current leaf/yard waste drop-off and composting area can be reached from the exit road.

The redesign is based on a complete relocation of the recycling area to provide for easy recycling and efficient operation. It is set up so five compactor roll-offs can be utilized and so that changes can be made as appropriate over the long term. Roadways and the operating areas are paved and electric and water will be made available where appropriate.

Recycling is critical to reducing trash and to avoiding costs. The design is focused on making recycling easy. Our recent experience and results elsewhere indicate that people respond to

improvements in recycling opportunities and that tonnage increases in recycling result in tonnage decreases in trash to SEMASS. Each ton of trash reduced provides a cost avoidance of the tipping fee of \$37.51 for Eastham. This achieved cost avoidance repeats into future years. Additional future increases in recycling will result in additional cost avoidance. In the long term we can reasonably expect that the cost of processing our trash will at least double whether the trash is incinerated or composted.

Compactor roll-offs are critical in avoiding costs. Many, many trips to market can be avoided and result in cost avoidance, which repeats into the future. The redesign provides the appropriate area at the Eastham Transfer Station that makes it possible to utilize this equipment. The combined cost avoidance made possible by increased recycling/reduced trash and by utilization of compactor roll-offs can very possibly offset over a roughly 10-year period the full capital cost of the redesign of the Eastham Transfer Station.



## Other News

### ■ Household Hazardous Waste Management

Don't know where to get rid of household hazardous products/waste? Go to [www.capecodcommission.org](http://www.capecodcommission.org) and click on the buttons for "Commission Programs" and then "Solid and Hazardous Waste Management" for a list of the 2002 collection dates. All 15 towns are participating this year. In addition to being able to dispose of the usual kinds of household hazardous waste, residents will again be able to turn in mercury-containing thermometers and other devices. For more information, contact Marilyn Lopes of the Cape Cod Cooperative Extension at [mlopes@umext.umass.edu](mailto:mlopes@umext.umass.edu).

The Web site also has a copy of a chart developed by Marilyn Lopes that describes other programs available at local transfer stations for disposal of wastes including batteries, tires, fluorescent tubes, bulky items, and used oil. Finally, the site has a copy of the 2001 Household Hazardous Waste Report that provides a summary of data from last year's events, as well as trend information back to 1995.

### ■ Report on White Goods and Mercury Now Available

The Department of Environmental Protection held workshops in 2001 on proper removal of mercury switches from common household items including gas stoves, washing machines, chest freezers, electric ranges, and commercial water heaters. As part of this program, the Franklin County Solid Waste Management District wrote a final report to the DEP that provides a lot of detail about which appliances (including which brands) were found to contain mercury switches. A copy of the report is posted on the Commission's Web site.

### ■ Recycled and Environmentally Preferable Products Guide

Looking for hazmat cleanup services, or an environmental consultant? The state's Operational Services Division (OSD) maintains a variety of contracts for environmentally preferable products and services that can be accessed by municipalities. The list includes companies that perform environmental compliance and testing services as well as products including recycled antifreeze, re-refined motor oil and lubricants, CRT recyclers, and companies that provide Integrated Pest Management systems. The OSD publishes a guidebook twice yearly with the contract information, or they can be accessed via the Internet at [www.state.ma.us/osd/enviro](http://www.state.ma.us/osd/enviro). Have questions about the contracts? You can contact either Marcia Deegler or Dmitriy Nikolayev at (617) 720-3356 or (617) 720-3351. They can also be reached by e-mail at [marcia.deegler@osd.state.ma.us](mailto:marcia.deegler@osd.state.ma.us) or [dmitriy.nikolayev@osd.state.ma.us](mailto:dmitriy.nikolayev@osd.state.ma.us).

### ■ Mattress Recycling Program at Conigliaro Industries

Conigliaro Industries has recently begun a mattress recycling program at the Framingham, MA operation. The company was recently awarded a \$50,000 Recycling Investment Reimbursement Credit Grant by the Massachusetts DEP. The grant will be used to cover the costs for the development and start-up of a Mattress Shredding and Recycling Plant at the Framingham facility. The new plant will be capable of processing up to 143,000 mattresses and foundations per year. For more specifics, contact Greg Conigliaro at (888) 266-4425, or [www.conigliaro.com](http://www.conigliaro.com).

### ■ PAYT Workshop

Representatives of the DEP will hold a workshop on "Pay-As-You-Throw: A Strategy for Municipalities in Tough Economic Times."



The Department of Environmental Protection is offering five free spring workshops on the direct benefits of implementing a Pay-As-You-Throw (PAYT) program. Help your community make an informed decision on the design, costs, and benefits of implementing this innovative waste diversion program. The program will be held in the Barnstable Town Hall on May 23 from 1:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.

...continued next page

This new workshop includes:

- examples of how communities currently use PAYT to reduce waste and save disposal costs;
- PAYT full-cost accounting analyses for the host communities (presented by Tellus Institute using actual municipal solid waste data);
- open Q&A forum addressing your concerns about PAYT implementation;
- eligibility requirements for PAYT grants from DEP; and
- practical advice from representatives of PAYT communities throughout the state.

Preregistration is required. Contact [joseph.lambert@state.ma.us](mailto:joseph.lambert@state.ma.us) for more information, or call him at (617) 292-5778.

---

## Did You Know...



...**New York City is proposing an 18-month moratorium on the recycling of glass, tin, and plastics** due to fiscal constraints in the budget proposed by Mayor Bloomberg? “While paper recycling generates enough revenue to cover the costs of recycling them, there are presently not enough viable markets for plastics, glass, and metals,” reports the head of the city’s Department of Sanitation.



...**Manufacturers are phasing out the use of arsenic in the treatment of many wood products** as the result of a voluntary agreement made with the EPA on Feb. 12, 2002? Manufacturers agreed to stop using the chemical for residential use by the end of 2003. Manufacturers have also agreed to begin using a new generation of wood preservatives that are not made of arsenic, a potential cancer-causing chemical. Between 25,000 to 30,000 tons of arsenic have been used to treat wood in Florida since 1970. And, as arsenic-treated wood is currently exempt from hazardous waste disposal regulations, much of it winds up in unlined C&D landfills, which can lead to the leaking of arsenic into groundwater.



...**If your local school has chemical management problems associated with unsafe chemical storage practices**, or the presence of aged and unstable hazardous materials, help may be available from the Massachusetts Office of Technical Assistance (OTA)? OTA has established a pilot program that pairs up businesses (as mentors) with local schools. Schools benefit by using business expertise to address chemical management issues and by receiving assistance in school chemical clean-outs. For more information, contact Denise Zambrowski at OTA (617) 626-1071 or [denise.zambrowski@state.ma.us](mailto:denise.zambrowski@state.ma.us).

**TALKIN' TRASH** is published quarterly by the Cape Cod Commission/Barnstable County. It is distributed free of charge only through e-mail as a PDF file. To be added to the e-mail distribution list, contact Greg Smith, Planner/Solid Waste Specialist, Cape Cod Commission, P.O. Box 226, Barnstable, MA 02630; phone: (508) 362-3828 extension 344; e-mail: [gsmith@capecodcommission.org](mailto:gsmith@capecodcommission.org). Additional information about Cape Cod solid and hazardous waste issues is available on the Web: [www.capecodcommission.org/waste](http://www.capecodcommission.org/waste)