

**Facts about the Coos and Curry Counties Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) and Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Hazardous Waste Generator (CEG) Final Management Plan of 3/28/08**

**By Craig C. Filip, Solid Waste Reduction Analyst, Department of Environmental Quality - Eugene**

A brief chronology of the Coos and Curry Counties HHW/CEG Waste Management Planning Project

- 1) This final Plan is the culmination of a process, funded by DEQ, which began in 2003. It was overseen by a duly-appointed advisory committee consisting of representatives of Coos and Curry Counties, operating under a signed intergovernmental agreement between the two counties.
- 2) In 2003, Coos County submitted an application for Household Hazardous Waste planning grant funds to DEQ. This application was subsequently approved and funded in the amount of \$10,000 and contracted in Spring 2004.
- 3) Due to the ensuing illness and death of the county's HHW/CEG Waste Planning Project manager, the contract for this project was terminated by DEQ in June 2005. Coos County maintained its strong desire to move forward with the HHW/CEG Waste Planning Project despite this setback and a new contract was issued by DEQ in January 2006.
- 4) Following some initial delays, the consulting team of Kies Strategies, et. al. (the "Consultant") was hired to write the Plan and submitted a briefing paper including descriptions of 5 HHW/CEG waste management alternatives for consideration by the Coos County Household Hazardous Waste Planning Committee (HHWC) in June 2006.
- 5) Curry County applied for a Household Hazardous Waste planning grant in Summer 2006 and was awarded \$15,000 in grant funds in November of that year, with the understanding that it be used to plan for HHW and CEG waste management jointly with Coos County. Craig Filip also became the DEQ project officer for this grant at that time.
- 6) DEQ terminated the second HHW planning grant agreement with Coos County in March 2007 in order to write a new grant agreement incorporating Curry County and its \$15,000 in grant funds and move forward with a joint HHW/CEG Waste Management Planning Project. This third contract was finalized in March 2007, and subsequently extended three times through June 2009.
- 7) The HHWC met six times between June 2006 and November 2007 to review and advise on research and draft plan materials prepared by the Consultant, culminating in a recommendation to submit the final draft plan approved by the Committee to the Coos County Board of Commissioners for approval and adoption. The Plan was formally submitted by then HHWC Chair Steve Allen to the Coos County Board of Commissioners on December 10, 2007 for their consideration and approval.
- 8) At a meeting of the Coos County Board of Commissioners on March 5, 2008, the HHW/CEG Waste Management Plan was adopted with minor changes. These changes were incorporated into the final version of the Plan dated March 28, 2008. This adopted version of the HHW/CEG Waste Management Plan was forwarded to the Curry County Board of Commissioners on June 13, 2008. At their meeting on July 7, 2008, the Curry County Board of Commissioners passed a resolution adopting the 3/28/08 version of the HHW/CEG Waste Management Plan.
- 9) Between August and December 2008, the Consultant drafted a model intergovernmental agreement (IGA) between all Coos and Curry County jurisdictions to implement the Plan.
- 10) On January 22, 2009, Craig Filip of DEQ met with Steve Allen and Cheryl Westgaard of Coos County to present the model IGA for their review and comment. This draft IGA was subsequently forwarded to the respective legal counsels of Coos and Curry County for final drafting.
- 11) Between May and September 2009, Craig Filip of DEQ met with all city councils of the 10 incorporated cities of Coos and Curry Counties to present the Plan and answer questions.
- 12) On November 5, 2009, a final draft version of the intergovernmental agreement between Coos and Curry Counties and the 10 incorporated cities of the two counties to implement the Plan was issued for signing by all parties. This IGA is currently under revision.

## Some brief remarks on Plan implementation

- 1) DEQ has retained \$95,000 for construction of the permanent HHW/CEG management facility envisioned in the Plan, the only such funding withheld from budget cutbacks. This grant money must be applied for and at least one other County (Lincoln) is potentially eligible and able to apply. If Coos and Curry Counties are not positioned to take advantage of this funding, and the Plan not implemented as a result, this funding (if not awarded to another county) will be reallocated within the Agency and the facility grant program suspended indefinitely.
- 2) DEQ anticipates a shortfall in our solid waste operating budget for the foreseeable future. This has meant a suspension of state-sponsored HHW/CEG waste collection events for 2010 (along with our solid waste grant program). Gold Beach and Reedsport had been in the "queue" for events this year.
- 3) All Plan cost estimates are in 2006 dollars. All estimates for HHW and CEG wastes collected are based on historic information from DEQ of agency-sponsored events held in Coos and Curry Counties since 1991.
- 4) Plan targeted and accepted wastes include:
  - a. Poisons such as pesticides;
  - b. Heavy metals such as mercury and mercury-containing products including thermostats, thermometers and fluorescent light tubes, certain batteries and automotive switches, and nickel-cadmium batteries;
  - c. Flammables such as solvents, fuels and flammable solids; and,
  - d. Corrosives such as strong acids and bases, and reactives (e.g., pool chemicals).
  - e. Paint: Historic collection figures for waste paint are shown in Plan Appendix C, Tables 1 and 2. In summary, latex paint has represented 20% of all HHW collected in Coos and Curry Counties between 1991 and 2001 and oil-based paint represented 39% of this total. CEG-generated oil-based paint represented 48% of all CEG waste collected by DEQ in Coos Bay in 1998. Last year at the DEQ-sponsored HHW collection event in Coos Bay on May 29, the figures for latex and oil-based paint collected were 9% and 35%, respectively.
- 5) Since adoption of the Plan by Coos and Curry Counties, H.B. 3037 took effect July 1, 2010 and established a state-wide pilot program for the recycling of household paint (see fact sheet forwarded with this summary). This bill, sponsored by the American Coatings Association, establishes a state-wide collection system similar to the Oregon E-Cycles program, whereby waste paint is collected and recycled, burned for energy recovery or disposed under a system paid for in the main by paint manufacturers. This program will likely lower the cost of Plan implementation significantly by taking waste paint out of the HHW/CEG wastestream to be managed under the Plan.
- 6) According to DEQ records, there are 7 self-declared CEGs in Coos County. However, given that self-identification of CEG status to the Agency is voluntary, and that any business is capable of generating hazardous waste, it is likely that there are potentially hundreds of unidentified CEGs in Coos County.
- 7) A review of Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes for businesses in Coos County reveals numerous classifications likely to generate hazardous waste, such as sawmills (8), sign manufacturers (9), wood kitchen cabinet and countertop manufacturers (7) machine shops (7), printers (7), and many others including automotive repair businesses (55), motor vehicle and parts dealers (38), gas stations (28), and building materials & garden equipment & supplies dealers (38).
- 8) According to DEQ records, there are 755 Coos County residents who receive their drinking water from a public water system utilizing a groundwater source. This number grows to 11,523 if Curry County residents on public drinking water systems drawing from groundwater are included. Groundwater systems are vulnerable to contamination from illegal dumping and burial of HHW and CEG waste.
- 9) According to DEQ records, there are 54,431 Coos County residents who receive their drinking water from a public water system utilizing a surface water source. Surface waters are more susceptible to the impacts of contaminated stormwater run-off from improper use or disposal of household and businesses-generated hazardous wastes than are groundwater systems.