

## **Chapter 2**

### **1<sup>st</sup> Questionnaire survey to EPIs**

## 2. 1<sup>st</sup> Questionnaire Survey to EPIs

This survey questionnaire was prepared during the 1<sup>st</sup> mission (March 2002). The survey form (appended) was sent to the 42 EPIs, following approval from MoWEP. The majority of responses were received in the JICA Study Team office by 06 June. 41 replies were received. No replies were received, even after further request, from Bucuresti and Mehedinti EPIs.

### 2.1 Objectives of This Questionnaire

The objectives of this questionnaire were focused on the waste department and hazardous waste issues. In particular:

- Waste legislation and implementation capacity
- Waste classification and compliance by Industry
- Staffing of the waste and hazardous chemicals unit
- Status of county level waste management plans
- List of 10 most important hazardous waste generators with annual arisings and stock and confirmation of presence of PCB and/or asbestos on site.
- List of hazardous waste contaminated sites

### 2.2 Questions Asked in Questionnaire

Questions asked in this questionnaire are listed below:

**Q1.** What is the Romanian legislation that primarily relates to **hazardous waste**?

**Q2.** Which Document and/or List are you currently using for the classification of **hazardous wastes**; what is its date?

**Q3.** Department for Waste Management and Hazardous Chemicals? How many persons? What is their experience? Qualifications? Specialised training?

**Q4.** Have you completed your county waste management plan? Please may we have a copy?

**Q5.** Please make a list of the 10 major enterprises (*Please make a list or use table attached to this questionnaire*), that are registered with your EPI that are generators of **hazardous waste**, and indicate whether if they were selected they would be prepared to accept a Factory Visit?

**Q6.** Please make a list (*see attachment to this questionnaire*) of the major sites in your county that are known to be contaminated with **hazardous wastes**. (*Storage areas listed in response to the above question need not be included again*).

### 2.3 Questionnaire Responses

The responses to the 1<sup>st</sup> EPI questionnaire survey are summarised in table 2.3.1 and described further below.

**Table 2.3.1 Summary of Responses to 1<sup>st</sup> EPI Questionnaire**

Issue	Response			
<b>Responses</b>	41 / 43 EPIs	146 sheets	>200 comments	
<b>Waste &amp; haz'chem department'</b>	72 persons with average 10 years	60 graduates; 50% chemical engineers	Many other disciplines inc. 6 chemists	All Plans drafted; 9 awaiting approval
<b>Industrialised Counties (14); &gt;5000te/a waste</b>	Alba, Arges, Bacau, Brasov, Cluj,	Constanta Dambovita, Hunedora,	Mare Mures, Mures,	Prahova, Sibiu, Tulcea, Valcea, Vaslui

### 2.3.1 Waste Legislation and Implementation Capacity

The purpose of this question was to verify our understanding about which Romanian legislation is regarded as the core legislation for waste management; also to receive feedback from the EPIs (who have the responsibility for implementation of this legislation) about barriers / needs for implementation of this legislation. Nearly 200 comments were received. These have been categorised according to type of issue as follows:

Category	Number of responses
• Financial mechanisms (eg fiscal incentives for those who recycle wastes)	8
• Infrastructure needs (eg need for ecological storage and treatment facilities)	17
• Institutional needs (eg guidance notes and training required)	35
• Legislative needs (eg secondary legislation to support implementation)	42
• Logistical needs (eg more staff, transport, sampling/analytical capacity)	8

From this list we would identify the most important needs are to support the implementation of the correct use of the waste classification, and to start the monitoring of hazardous wastes to validate the quality of the data provided to the National database.

### 2.3.2 Waste Classification and Compliance by Industry

The quality of data provided in the responses was quite variable. Typical of the poorer responses was:

- Lack of differentiation of hazardous wastes
- No waste coding provided
- Inconsistencies between annual arisings and quantities stocked

Nine (9) responses noted that the ability of industry to report and classify wastes in accord with the legislation was extremely variable. The larger enterprises with environmental departments tended to be more proficient. Estimates of the percentage of enterprises non-compliant / non-understanding of the waste classification ranged from 20 to 70%.

### **2.3.3 Staffing of the Waste and Hazardous Chemicals Unit**

The number of staff employed in this department of the 40 EPIs that responded was 72, of which approximately 70% held a graduate level qualification – the remainder being technician level. The average experience level was ~10 years. The most prevalent profession is that of the Chemical Engineer (29), followed by Chemist (6). There were ~20 other types of engineer (eg hydro-technical, land engineers), but also an economist, legal expert, geophysicist amongst others. The number of staff in the 'Waste & Hazardous Chemicals' department ranged from zero (Ilfov and DDBRA) to 4 (Alba). There was no obvious correlation between staff numbers and workload as represented by quantity of waste arisings.

The EPI ROF requires updating to provide the accountabilities of this department. Then it would be appropriate to evaluate the staff requirements to fulfill their tasks.

### **2.3.4 Status of County Level Waste Management Plans**

All EPIs have completed their waste management plans at county level. Most had been approved; nine (9) were in the approval process as of June 2002. A preliminary review of these plans indicates that industrial and hazardous waste is a relatively small content in these Plans.

### **2.3.5 List of 10 Most Important Hazardous Waste Generators With Annual Arisings and Stock**

The questionnaire requested information about the ten (10) major hazardous waste generators in the County. The responses ranged from two (2) to (28). The total annual arising reported amounted to 1,114,514 tons with 18,053,412 in stock. These are not regarded as accurate values. [Clearly the major survey of hazardous waste generation sources survey in Section 1 of this Volume is a core activity for this task.] The objective of this aspect of this questionnaire was solely to indicate the major industry types and location.

The responses confirmed that PCBs are in enterprises in at least 30 counties, with varying quantities. We are aware that the MoWEP Waste Directorate are compiling an accurate inventory of this issue in accord with GD 173/000.

### **2.3.6 List of Hazardous Waste Contaminated Sites**

Hazardous waste contaminated sites are a primary subject of the Survey, and are reported in Section 5. The objective of this aspect of this questionnaire was solely to provide a preliminary indication of the number, distribution, and contamination types in Romania. The responses indicated that at least 26 counties recognised the existence of hazardous waste contaminated sites, some of quite substantial area.

## EPIs Questionnaire to Chief Inspectors

# NATIONAL HAZARDOUS WASTE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Date: 23 March 2002

*The Study Objective is to strengthen hazardous waste management system in Romania at both governmental and private sector levels. This is an 18-month JICA funded project. Our counterpart for this Study is the Ministry of Waters and Environmental Protection. The main outcomes will be a Strategic Master Plan and short-term Action Plan for hazardous waste in Romania. It may also include up to 3 pilot projects including 3Rs (reduce, reuse, recycling). A 2-page description of the Study is attached. Please note that the Study will also include visits to enterprises that generate and/or manage hazardous wastes during June 2002.*

We need and, would appreciate having, your input to this project in the form of responses to our questions below. We request your assistance by completing this questionnaire and returning it to the project office at the address below **by 15 April 2002**:

Contact person: Badita Petroica  
Address: JICA Study Team  
Tel / Fax:  
Email:

*We would like you to assist us by answering the following 6 questions (by ticking the appropriate  or providing the information requested).*

1. What is the Romanian legislation that primarily relates to **hazardous waste**? (*Please write in space below*)
2. Which Document and/or List are you currently using for the classification of **hazardous wastes**; what is its date? (*Please write in space below*)
3. Department for Waste Management and Hazardous Chemicals? How many persons?  
1            2            3
  - What is their experience?
  - Qualifications?
  - Specialised training?
4. Have you completed your county waste management plan:                    YES  NO 
  - Please may we have a copy?
5. Please make a list of the 10 major enterprises (*Please make a list or use table attached to this questionnaire*), that are registered with your EPI that are generators of **hazardous waste**, and indicate whether if they were selected they would be prepared to accept a Factory Visit?
6. Please make a list (*see attachment to this questionnaire*) of the major sites in your county that are known to be contaminated with **hazardous wastes**. (*Storage areas listed in response to the above question need not be included again*).



