

**Solid Waste Master Plan Workgroup on Siting Waste Diversion Facilities
Summary of Meeting #2 – March 11, 2009**

1. Jamie Doucett of MassDEP reviewed the notes from the first workgroup meeting and summarized the notes from the Organics Summit session on Organics Regulatory and Policy Discussion
2. The workgroup discussed how to address the barriers to siting diversion facilities that were identified at the 1st meeting:
 - Exempt Recycling Facilities (<100 tpd)
 - Eliminate the 100 tpd size limit
 - What are the risks in comparison to other non waste related businesses with no limits that are controlled at the local level?
 - Need to define “co-mingled” and “single stream”
 - Whether material is source separated shouldn’t be an issue – focus more on what characteristics of materials could cause a problem and less on whether source separated
 - Recycling as a manufacturing operation. If we are really concerned with putrescibles, focus on % putrescibles? That is the issue with organics.
 - Southbridge as an example of a sham “recycling facility”
 - What is coming in the front door of a facility?
 - E-waste example – what is a solid waste vs. what is a recoverable material. What if we only regulate as solid waste if being sent for disposal?
 - Where does public health come into the picture in determining how we regulate activities? What is a reasonable risk to take and what is not?
 - Question about whether a small municipal recycling center can take a limited amount of bulky waste for disposal from citizens without being regulated as a transfer station. Permitting as a transfer station would be a burden to the municipality, which is only trying to get the material handled properly
 - Towns want to be able to co-host facilities together (recycling and collecting certain wastes) without being regulated under site assignment and permitting
 - Quantity vs. quality issue. Confusing as to what exactly the 100 tpd limit applies to – paper? All other recyclables except paper? Is paper recycling exempt, or only when separated from other recyclables?
 - Issue of single-stream vs. pre-sorted recyclables and which is better
 - How does the 100 tpd paper exemption apply to paper in a single-stream MRF
 - Seems like we’re trying to get at qualitative issues using quantitative limits
 - Local zoning and BOH authority over noisome trade still have a role, even where exempt from site assignment, so locals don’t lose all control
 - Determination of Need (DON) Process:

- Clearly a concern about what kind of process is used for managing waste (or maybe the materials processed?)
- Particular concern over any high-temperature treatment process – e.g., anaerobic digestion vs. gasification of waste
- Should define certain core values:
 - Protection of public health and safety
 - Resource conservation issues/concerns (using material as fuel is not resource conservation)
- Can we move specific technologies, once proven, into conditional exemption category to provide greater assurance to those building such facilities? Yes, encourage identifying processes to add to conditional exemptions
- Feasibility issues with new technologies – how do you permit them without a track record of what is emitted, how they operate, problems encountered, etc.?
- Pilot projects vs. cost of doing the pilot – any way to look at the science before a facility is built? How to evaluate? Science advisory board?
- Alternative concept is that rather than try to exempt a bunch of things from site assignment, fix the site assignment process so it works better and more effectively
- Local residents and officials need access to objective scientific analysis
- Scale of facility and limits – what is the scale or magnitude of impacts if limits on size are removed?
- Small composting – encouragement
 - List of materials is very restrictive
 - Definitions of food waste, vegetative waste, and other materials need to be looked at and possibly changed
 - Increase the amounts of certain material categories
 - Should have training for small composters – who would do it and cost issues
 - Get more farmers involved by changing regulations
 - DEP has a database of food waste generators – needs to be publicized
 - VT example?
 - Definitions of vegetative waste and food waste don't seem to include supermarket waste – need clarification
 - Can a BUD be used to add a material to a composting operation? No BUD category specific to composting currently
 - Need handbook for organic waste recycling
 - Difficult feed-stocks will only go to large facilities that are able to effectively deal with odor issues (fish wastes, for example)
- Interagency Review
 - Do we need an interagency review of various technologies with MassDEP, DAR, DOER, etc, along lines of what we currently do

with DAR on on-farm composting operations. Similar to RECs issue.

- Local acceptance
 - How to get locals involved so don't become entrenched and fight every facility
 - Excluding BOH doesn't help make things easier
 - Tool of demonstration projects is useful for new technologies and materials
- Develop a process with creates a clear roadmap for facility developers in the future
 - Benefits or incentive?
 - Credits for activity in Mass vs. if done elsewhere. Cap and trade concept. Replacing oil – get credit
 - Look at whole range of facilities from small and low-tech to large and higher tech
 - Maybe matrix for different processes/materials and the appropriate permit process
 - Should consider different regional needs and try to identify more proactively what is needed on a regional basis
 - DEP should not determine technology winners and losers, but should ensure that any project that goes forward is protective of public health
- Homework:
 - What do we look at when a technology is new and how do we ensure information is good information prior to proceeding with/allowing development of a full-scale facility?
 - Hierarchy of technologies:
 - Energy technology vs. recycling as material
 - Health and environmental impacts (including residuals)
 - Resource conservation
 - Should incentivize recycling and build less of some other technologies