THE ENSCO FIASCO

by Kevin Kerecsey

This is project Earth's third installment of ENSCO coverage. ENSCO, as you may already know, is a Little Rock, Arkansas toxic waste disposal firm attempting to get permission to build and operate a three-incinerator facility in Mobile, Arizona about 25 miles southwest of Phoenix. Please see issues #1 and #2 of our newsletter for more background information.

The latest developments are mixed. It is best to be cautiously optimistic. Let's examine some particulars:

**"Public Comment Period."** Technically we have until Nov. 2 to submit our comments to the legislature. Comments should be one page, respectful and emphasize that incineration should not be considered a viable option for our state. The legislators have formed a committee consisting of Senators Robert Udall, Jesus "Chuy" Higuera, Alan Stephens and Tom Patterson, along with Representatives Henry Evans, Jim Hartdegen, Karan English, Jim Meredith and Bill English.

These are the senators and representatives who will look into the issue most, be most willing to consider informed public comment, and be able to influence their less informed colleagues to vote NO. Due to the election in early November, they will allow comments until Jan. 2, 1991. Please realize that the time you spend writing your legislator and the members of this committee will make a difference. So far, the lawmakers have gotten an earful from outraged Arizonans, but seem to only want to consider banning "importation" of toxic wastes into Arizona. This is not enough! In your letter, please state that the following items are inseparable:

1.) NO importation of wastes through Yuma, Flagstaff, and Tucson.
2.) NO incineration due to its inherent
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ENVIRONMENTAL STAKES HIGH IN ENERGY PLAN

by Sparky Watts

What does state energy policy mean? It could provide an alternative to:

Political barriers within state government to solar energy and energy conservation * elimination of the Arizona Solar Energy Commission under Mecham * $multi-billion drain on state economy for energy expenses * "dumping" of low efficiency appliances in Arizona markets because California and other states have high efficiency standards * urban heat island effect, measured as raising Phoenix temperatures an average 2 degrees per decade for past 40 years * Billions lost to increasing urban air pollution from automobile exhausts and other combustion * huge rate increases by Arizona Public Service to pay for Palo Verde Nuclear plant * spent nuclear fuel piling up at plant, no way to deal with it and no place to send it * uncertainty over
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November Schedule

1 Thurs  - Campaign For The Earth, 7:00pm
6 Tues  - Advisory Board Meeting, 7:00pm
14 Wed  - Recycling A Gift To Mother Earth, 7:00pm
15 Thur - Campaign For The Earth, 7:00pm
17 Sat  - High School Coalition Meeting, 11:00am
19 Mon  - Dolphin Committee Meeting, 6:30pm
20 Tues - Advisory Board Meeting, 7:00pm

Dec  1 Sat  - Project Earth Benefit & Party
       At The Temple Of Music And Arts

4 Tues  - Rocking K Hearing At TCC, 7:00

Every Monday - Orientation, 7:30pm
Every Wednesday - Board Meetings, 6:30pm
       - Newsletter Meeting, 7:30pm
Every Thursday - Class on Environmentalism, 7:00pm
Every Saturday - Movie night, 7:30pm
Every Sunday - Afternoon Open house to members
and non-members (call-ahead)
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changes to the immediate area and to the Phoenix population over a longer period, and 3.) support for a state-mandated "source reduction" strategy.

This three-pronged approach will allow us to develop ways to manage Arizona waste only as well as keeping our tourism-oriented state free from stack gas emissions. We the people have spoken, and we need not all be scientists to be informed on this grave issue. The legislators will listen, so please let them know your concern.

"Governor Mofford's Hazardous Waste Technical Advisory Committee." On Oct. 1, 1990, this 27-member panel decided that they couldn't decide whether ENSCO and its incinerators were a good idea. It is important to note that 16 of 27 members either work for industry or are consultants who generally work for hazardous waste-using companies. They had six weeks to sift through the facts on incineration and its negative impact wherever it exists nationwide. And yet, no firm action was taken by the panel. Giving them the benefit of the doubt, let's just say that a greater research effort could have been called forth and that it was not forthcoming.

The Legislature as a Whole. They are overburdened and underpaid and may have overlooked the dangers of siting three incinerators 25 miles southwest of Phoenix. Those persons living near incinerators are experiencing elevated infant death statistics and higher rates of illness, as are their pets, livestock and agricultural ventures. If indeed incinerators are so benign and harmless, a reasonable proposition would be to site them near country clubs or golf courses frequented by those who so eagerly and naively believe them to be safe. On paper and under ideal operating conditions, incinerators seem efficient, odorless, smokeless, and safe. In the real world, human error, equipment inefficiency and a multitude of other factors cause the best case scenarios to go, literally, up in smoke.

Our legislators must try to look past the short-term benefits to the state ($150,000 per year plus 2% of ENSCO gross profits) and instead show leadership and vision of the future. They, and their families will all be impacted adversely, as will the long-term outlook for tourism if ENSCO is allowed into Arizona. ENSCO has no reason to be concerned about any of these issues except for their profit-hungry company with short-term outlooks, and their families, will all be impacted adversely, as will the long-term outlook for tourism if ENSCO is allowed into Arizona. ENSCO has no reason to be concerned about any of these issues except for their chemical waste management whose profits grew from $25 million in 1985 to $115 million in 1988 are gobbling up "mom and pop" waste companies. Since 1985, due to favorable tax laws, corporate giants previously uninvolved in the field of hazardous waste cleanup are looking for a piece of the action.

Encouraging strides are being taken by concerned industry leaders, who regardless of their motives, are realizing that reducing their industries flow of toxic by-products is the wave of the future. The growth industries of the future will be those in tune with the environment. It would be to any company's advantage to start now to reduce the toxicity and volume of wastes produced. Public demand and regulatory pressure will adversely affect those who continue down the same old toxic trail. The long-term profit outlook will be rosy for those companies who can see past their need for continual short-term growth.

Future Waste Reduction Methods. Several newly developed technologies promise to allow us to safely dispose of the majority of hazardous wastes. Of course, source reduction is the key. In conjunction with source reduction, the following technologies will gradually eliminate, at least lessen, the need for incineration:

1. Bio remediation-a clumsy term for microbe waste management. Some strains of bacteria are already feasting on toxic wastes as well as oil residues at some spills. Bio remediation was developed 15 years ago and can cheaply, safely and efficiently eliminate a good 40% of toxic wastes. Let's push for it!

2. For more information, please see Newsweek June 19, 1989 and July 27, 1987; Air and Waste Resources Magazine July 1990; and Discover April 1990.

3. A pilot program using di-valent silver, one of the strongest oxidants known, with nitric acid is being developed at AEA Technology in Dunmurey, Scotland. The process was developed to destroy toxic chemicals associated with combustible radioactive waste and was found to completely destroy phenols, organophosphorus organosulfur compounds, polychlorinated biphenyls and chlorinated aliphatic and aromatic solvents. (Chemical and Engineering News Sept. 17, 1990, p. 20).

4. A solar collector using a parabolic mirror and "non-imaging concentrator" made of sapphire has been refined by the University of Chicago scientist Dave Cooke and his colleagues. They have produced sunlight 84,000 times as bright as the sunlight striking the earth. Refinements of the technique could lead to a laser fired by solar power and to newer methods of destroying hazardous wastes. (Arizona Daily Star, Aug. 31, 1990, p. 11A).

Alternatives to incineration need to be quickly developed. These three options, while
not all commercially feasible today, promise to end the deadly reign of incineration as the favored disposal technology. *Other Encouraging Signs:

+ Even before the public outcry in June, the Arizona Republic’s poll of 808 adults reported that 51% "strongly opposed" to ENSCO’s facility. Earl DeBerge of the Behavior Research Polling Center in Phoenix said "I think that certainly confirms what people’s instinct is on this, which is that Arizona ought not to be doing hazardous waste." (Arizona Republic, May 17, 1990).

+ Public and legislative opposition to Proposition 202 on the Nov. 6 ballot is heating up! Proposition 202 is funded by Browning-Ferris Industries $241,000 lobbying effort (quoted by T.J. Harrison, Principal Assistant City Attorney, Tucson). This proposition has several admirable aims, but overall gives a green light to weaken environmental laws regarding hazardous waste, and green light to importation and incineration.

While federal law prevents Arizona from totally banning importation, some classes and sources of hazardous waste can be outright prohibited. Proposition 202 would weaken those safeguards in Arizona law. The state can impose limits, standards, safeguards, fees and taxes on imported hazardous waste. This would make it financially unfeasible for ENSCO to import waste.

In the Oct. 12, 1990 Arizona Daily Star, Republican Representative William Mandell of Chandler said. "Proposition 202 is a giant step backwards in our effort to protect the environment." Rep. Kundell is a chairman of the House Environment Committee, so his opinion carries added weight.

And to end our lengthy ENSCO update on an urgent note, here’s a little about El Dorado, Arkansas, home to ENSCO’s incinerators. El Dorado is a little town with 11 EPA Potential Hazardous Waste Cleanup Sites. ENSCO is one. Recent crib death statistics are frightening. Workers ailments and high blood-levels of PCB are common. Mayor Larry Combs said the plant has not attracted new industries to his community and "If they had an election I’d say 75-80% of the people here would vote to run the plant out of town." Let’s make sure the mayors and town leaders of Mobile, Casa Grande, Chandler, Tempe, and Phoenix don’t have to make such a statement in the future!

Please--vote NO on Proposition 202, write and call your legislators and spread the word..."Keep ENSCO and its incinerator out of Arizona!!!"

TUCSON COOPERATIVE WARHOUSE HOLDS ANNUAL MEETING AMID CONTROVERSY

Anyone interested in the future of food coops in Tucson may wish to attend the Tucson Cooperative Warehouse (TCW) annual meeting Nov 3-4. Although TCW and the Food Conspiracy are theoretically separate entities, they are, for the foreseeable future, inextricably intertwined. The same person, Vince Ciccarelli, a former drug store chain executive, is effectively the CEO of both stores. TCW is also the financial backer of the Food Conspiracy’s new health food supermarket on Grant and has agreements thus which it provides the Conspiracy much of its product line. It is therefore unavoidable that decisions made at these meetings will directly affect the Food Conspiracy as well as cooperative buying clubs throughout a five state area.

Some of the potential controversies include: (1) Opening the large new store is a large financial gamble which could make or break both operations. (2) On the positive side, it could make a wider variety of goods available at lower prices, on the other hand it could lead to decisions based on profits before people instead of the other way around. Some people seem to think this is already a problem. (3) There is some concern that some Food Conspiracy practices are afoul of TCW by-laws. Whether or not this is already true, it is bound to come up. TCW as the financier is going to have some control over Food Conspiracy policy. (4) Is a coop more or just an economic approach? Are there some social impacts? Should there be? (5) With such a large financial gamble there is bound to be a variety of pressures brought about by real or perceived financial necessity.

(6) There are questions concerning whether or not some of the products being sold or under consideration are appropriate and questions of packaging.

There are others, but I think you get the picture. The July 4-10 issue of the "Tucson Weekly" has a more detailed article. The point here is that food policy is central to grassroots, socially conscious, environmentally sound communities. A lot of time, money, and energy have gone into building what we have. It seems imperative that the local community practice some hands-on influence.

There will be a potluck Nov 3, at 6 pm at Project Earth, 127 W. Drachman (Tucson Inn) to discuss these issues. Visiting and local TCW owner/members, employees and patrons welcome, whether you have a dish to bring or not.

The TCW membership meeting will be Nov 3-4 at the Quality Inn University, 1601 N. Oracle starting 8 am (registration) Sat and 8:30 Sunday. Saturday is mostly information and workshops with the business meeting on Sunday. Non-members may not be allowed formal input, but lobbying and supporting opportunities should abound. Also, voting for two new board members will be held on Sunday. For more Info: 884-9951
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precedent and should raise concerns among anyone concerned with biological and environmental sensitivity regardless of ones position on the scopes.

This rider was based on an earlier Biological Opinion (BO) granting the UA pretty much what they wanted without very much hard data on the effects. The Gov Acct Office (GAO) later questioned the BO and asked the US Fish And Wildlife Service (USFWS) to review their finding. They concluded the criteria requiring a new BO were met according to the ESA. This should have meant that a new BO would have to be prepared and construction halted pending the outcome, which could very well have found against construction. However, the rider stated that further biological study is unnecessary for construction to continue and supersedes the ESA according to the judge. Apparently we need to get Congress to reaffirm their commitment to the ESA.

Representative Studds claims that the intent of the rider was not to circumvent the ESA and introduced legislation (HR 5603) to this effect. So far it has been stalled but would pass if the Arizona delegation would support it. Maybe we should "lean" on them.

The bottom line regardless of ones stand on the scopes is that there are still a lot of unknowns. You would think that an institution "dedicated" to the pursuit of truth and knowledge would be more concerned with gathering and analyzing all the facts.

Citizen of Democracy: A Visual Documentary of Activism

This art exhibition by local artist Michael Schwartz will continue through Nov 2nd at the 830 Gallery, 1015 East 6th St,