EXXON VALDEZ OIL SPILL PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Title: Waste Oil Disposal Facilities

Project Number: 94417

Lead Agency: ADEC

Cooperating Agency: None

Cost of Project, FY94: $232.2K **Cost of Project, FY95:** $399.5K

Project Start up Date: February 1, 1994 **Duration:** Multi-year

Geographic Area: Prince William Sound and the Gulf of Alaska

INTRODUCTION

Vessels in Prince William Sound and the Gulf of Alaska, especially in the zone affected by the *Exxon Valdez* oil spill, generate large quantities of used motor oil and other lubricants. In spite of regulations and enforcement actions to the contrary, a substantial (but unknown) amount of this waste oil finds its way into the marine environment. During the recovery phase of the spill it is desirable to eliminate additional sources of hydrocarbon contamination to the marine environment. The ports of Whittier, Homer, Seward, and Valdez all support increasingly large fleets of pleasure and recreational craft in addition to the resident and transient commercial fishing fleets. Cordova and Kodiak are seasonally among the busiest fishing ports on the West Coast. Villages such as Tatitlek, Chenega Bay, Port Graham, English Bay, and the Kodiak Island villages are home port for small-scale commercial fishing and subsistence-use vessels.

Proper disposal of used oil has long been viewed as a problem throughout the area. Handling, storage, and transportation of used oil has carried considerable cost and potential liability, especially under now-outdated federal regulations that routinely placed almost all waste oil under hazardous waste handling regulations. While some communities have waste oil collection facilities, others do not. Even at these few sites with collection facilities what to do with the waste oil once it is collected remains a major problem.

Nationwide, regulatory and financial issues have discouraged people from properly disposing of waste oil; more often than not, waste oil was illegally dumped in landfills, sewer systems, or other open sites. In 1992, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) estimated that 170 million of the 190 million gallons of waste oil generated in the nation found its way into the environment due to improper disposal; this represents approximately 16 times the amount of oil spilled by the *Exxon Valdez.* On August 12, 1992, EPA changed its classifications regarding waste oil recycling and disposal, eliminating many of the regulatory

disincentives frustrating the development of good waste oil handling and disposal in the nation.

The change in federal rules offers the Trustee Council an opportunity to support a project that would reduce the amount of waste oil entering the marine environment in the area affected by the *Exxon Valdez* oil spill. Reducing or eliminating other sources of hydrocarbon contamination in the spill area is desirable as it will help resources injured by the spill recover quickly.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. Resources and/or Associated Services

The entire restoration effort would be enhanced by the successful implementation of this project. By providing an environmentally acceptable method of waste oil disposal the continuing introduction of hydrocarbons into the marine environment would be reduced thus permitting natural recovery to continue as quickly as possible.

B. Objectives

To reduce the incidental introduction into the spill area ecosystem by providing a preferred method of disposal of waste oil products.

C. Methods

This project would create a waste oil recycling and/or disposal pilot program in a few communities that wish to participate. Depending on the success of the program this year, it will be proposed for expansion in future years. Communities could propose to use marine pollution control grants from the Trustee Council to purchase equipment for recycling and/or disposing of waste oil depending on what method(s) the community felt most appropriate to the local conditions. Volume of waste oil, distance from recycling centers, the need or opportunity for re-use of oil, and the costs (in terms of both money and mechanical complexity) of continuing operation would be among the criteria used to evaluate proposals from the communities.

Communities wishing to participate in this program would submit proposals. An evaluation committee would review the applications for technical and regulatory feasibility. Awards would be made and the communities would begin installation.

These facilities would be wholly owned by the local organization or government that applied for the funding. Maintenance and operation would be paid by the communities through user fees, assessments, or cost-recovery plans (e.g., reuse of waste oil for heating municipal facilities) depending on the wishes and resources of the communities. The facilities would be monitored, information collected, and a report prepared detailing the success or failure of the project.

D. Location

Communities within the spill affected area.

E. Technical Support

A small amount of computer support would be required in collecting the data reported by the grantees and storing it in a data base. The information would be utilized in preparing a report for the Trustees as to the relative success of the project.

F. Contracts

Six contracts (or grants) will be let for the best project proposals. A contract with an accounting firm to oversee expenditures and pay appropriate bills incurred by participating communities will be needed.

SCHEDULES

February 1994	Prepare proposal packets and scoring criteria
March 1994	Send out proposal packets to communities and advertise
April 1994	Receive submittals, convene proposal evaluation committee, review and rank proposals, notify recipients, negotiate grant/contract awards
May - June 1994	Communities proceed with equipment purchases and development
July - August 1994	Project manager visit communities
September 1, 1994	Receive first project reports from communities
December 1, 1994	Receive second operations report from communities

EXISTING AGENCY PROGRAM

None

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE/PERMIT/COORDINATION STATUS

The Trustee Council would provide grants to individual communities. Contract/grant stipulations would require that these communities comply with all applicable NEPA regulations.

PERFORMANCE MONITORING

On-site visits will be made by the Project Manager. Fiscal oversight will be contracted with an accounting firm. Participating communities will develop individual reports. Individual reports will be compiled into a formal report for submission to the Trustees.

FY94 BUDGET ($K)

	ADEC
Personnel	49.6
Travel	19.9
Contractual	142.9
Commodities	2.4
Equipment	0.0
Capital Outlay	0.0
Subtotal	214.8
General Administration	17.4
Project Total	232.2
NEPA Compliance	0.0

Mark Brodersen –
– each unit costs about $20.0k e
to get it installed