

Trash... continued from page 1

Intractable problems exist with the present design of all landfills. Little or no decomposition occurs. Although the EPA mandates structural design, containment, and responsibility rules for the leachates and gases (methane) that do occur, no presently designed landfill is a good idea. Global methane emissions from landfills, mostly from the developed countries, are one of the largest sources of greenhouse gases. Landfills provide ideal conditions for methanogenesis, with lots of organic material and anaerobic conditions prevalent. How about the smell and rats for the adjoining neighborhoods? Ask those in Wilmington downwind from Cherry Island.

Our Waste Stream

OUR total yearly residential solid waste in Delaware equals **372,195 total tons statewide** (2003 data). This RSW waste stream excludes municipal solid waste (which in most cases goes into landfills too) and any industrial waste. RSW is divided into 2 parts: 'Product Waste' (discarded durable and non-durable goods, and packaging) = 238,847 tons, which 33% is paper (21% of the total) and 'Miscellaneous Waste' (133,348 tons, composed of miscellaneous, food and yard waste), which is 67% yard waste (25% of the total). *Thus, 2 categories, paper and yard waste, are nearly 50% of the total residential/commercial waste stream!*

Recycling Efforts in Delaware also NO GOOD by any standard

The present amounts diverted from landfills through Recycle Delaware is 4.5% (17,000 tons) general 'Recycles' and 3.3% (12,400 tons) paper. Actually "personal recycles" (carried into the landfills) has more activity (33,800; 9.1%)! Recycling in Delaware is dismal, as compared to other states (e.g. NJ 50%).

The Future Decisions -What to Do?

After researching landfills for this article, speaking with knowledgeable people, and attending one of the simultaneous meetings held by DSW on August 20, I would like to offer the following *personal* opinions and ideas for consideration (I'm sure there are many other good ones out there):

1. Concerning Cherry Island landfill:

- Expansion Project should not be allowed; present problems should be

cleaned up..

- Ban waste from southern New Castle County (Kent County wants it).

2. **The status quo DSWA should be sunsetted and a new entity formed** (same employees) covering all waste disposal methods simultaneously. (HomeLand Security did it.) The new entity still gets paid by weight for all trash picked up (including suggestions below) and all waste generated in the state must go through this entity.

3. **Statewide Education Campaign** on waste disposal, recycling etc etc.

This should also include **Full Cost Accounting**, which includes external and internal costs. It is a pricing tool for goods and services reflecting all environmental costs, including what happens during their production, use, and whether they are recycled or simply disposed of. That helps put market incentives and public awareness in place for environmental protection.

4. **PHASE IN PROGRAMS (6 months-1.5 years)**

- **BAN both paper and yard waste** (50% of the waste stream) from all landfills (Green Delaware's original suggestion) - the easiest immediate solution for extending any landfill life; many municipalities throughout the US have chosen this option.

- Begin **mandatory state-wide CURBSIDE recycling**. At the 8/20 meeting (Carvel Office Bldg) Tom Houska mentioned (when asked) that recycling could reduce landfilling by 90% (to 50-75,00 tons, from a 525,000 total)!

- Begin payment for waste disposal by weight at the **curbside**. People will start leaving packaging material at stores; they will also start shopping with their own bags (new business: reusable bags with logos?).

- Consider waste disposal as important to people as roads for their cars - which we subsidize. Even out Trash disposal rates in the state; northern Delaware rates are much higher. Addition of a graduated subsidy by income level "off the bill" at tax time would help lower income taxpayers. Even renters (and IRS short form taxpayers) would benefit because with the new rates, costs will rise. People would then "buy into" the process.

Landfills, in the present design should be saved for the most intractable waste. We're running out of places to "move on" to in the US AND that new landfill might be in your backyard.

Delaware River Dredging

continued from page 3

ects, this project would not be economically justified even if all of the Corps' current assumptions regarding project costs and benefits were correct.

4. Project Beneficiaries: Clearly, some of the benefits to this project will accrue to non-U.S. entities. Although the Corps is not required to analyze the extent of this incidence, it is certainly relevant within the broader context of appropriate federal policy. Benefits accruing to U.S. firms and consumers will probably not exceed project costs even in the Corps' base case.

5. Outstanding Environmental Issues: The Corps' Reanalysis Report and the associated documents available on the Corps' Web site do not address any of the environmental concerns raised as recently as August, 2002. Some state permits must still be obtained. And the Corps has failed to take necessary steps to comply with applicable environmental laws, including the Clean Air Act. The potentially large environmental impacts create project uncertainties that have not been adequately incorporated into estimated total costs.

6. Flawed "Independent" Review: The "independent" review process is demonstrably flawed. The independent review panel did not have all information and perspectives regarding the project, did not have the opportunity to provide its own assessment of the project, and their role was terminated before all of the issues raised were resolved. In some cases, important questions raised by the independent review panel were not directly addressed, and issues raised by the panel, which resulted in a benefit cost rate less than 1, were dismissed by the Corps as "unrealistic."

Additionally, throughout the process the Corps has decided to derive optimistic conclusions from the available facts. The Corps has also selectively accepted or rejected the views of shippers and other affected firms, to maximize the expected project benefits.

In summary, the Corps has been unable to refute the GAO conclusion, or our

conclusion, that the Delaware River deepening project is not economically or environmentally justified. Considering that the Army Corps has already spent more than \$20 million studying this project, and many serious concerns remain, it is unlikely that any new deepening project for the Delaware River of similar scope can ever be justified. **We recommend that Congress de-authorize the Main Channel Deepening project for the Delaware River rather than wasting any more taxpayer funds to study an inherently flawed proposal.**

The economic analyses contained in this report were conducted by Dr. Robert Stearns. Dr. Stearns is currently teaching courses in economics and conducting research at the University of Maryland's School of Public Affairs. Previously he had served as Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) where he worked on a wide variety of Corps of Engineers Civil Works issues. His total federal service covered 20 years as a transportation economist for the Department of Transportation, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the Assistant Secretary of the Army. Previously, he had spent 10 years in academia. He received his PhD in economics from Yale University and his BA in mathematics from Swarthmore College.

Dr. Stearns was Commissioned by the Delaware Riverkeeper Network and the National Wildlife Federation to conduct this economic analysis. Environmental and complimentary information in this report were provided by Maya K. van Rossum, the Delaware Riverkeeper and David Conrad, Water Resource Specialist with the National Wildlife Federation.

For Additional Information:

Delaware Riverkeeper Network
www.delawareriverkeeper.org
P.O. Box 326
Washington Crossing, PA 18977
215-369-1188

National Wildlife Federation
www.nwf.org
1400 16th Street N.W., Suite 50
Washington, D.C. 20036
202-797-6697