

**Solid Waste Master Plan Workgroup on Performance and Viability of Technologies
for Residual Waste
Summary of Meeting #3, April 9, 2009**

Introduction

Eighteen people attended the third and final meeting of the Solid Waste Master Plan Workgroup on Performance and Viability of Technologies for Residual Waste.

Southern California Conversion Technology Demonstration Project

Coby Skye, from the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, joined the meeting via phone to speak about the Southern California Conversion Technology Demonstration Project.

Los Angeles County has completed a phase 1 report that reviewed potential technology providers and companies and prioritized them for further consideration. The County then completed a phase 2 report that identified four companies that could successfully develop a project that would meet Los Angeles County's requirements and needs. These included three thermal conversion processes (gasification or pyrolysis) and one anaerobic digestion process. All can divert more than 85% of the incoming materials from landfills, generate energy, produce products, and meet rigorous air quality standards. Regulation changes will be needed and not entirely clear how projects will be permitted, so may do as pilots to allow development of a permitting pathway. The County is now in negotiations with these companies on developing a facility and is expected to break ground on a facility construction by the end of 2009.

The County will continue to push efforts to maximize recycling and believes that these technologies will be compatible with the County's high recycling rate, including providing the opportunity to pull out some additional recyclables through the conversion process. They also are planning to co-locate conversion technology facilities with recycling facilities. Los Angeles County sends 12 million tons of trash/year to landfills, and they would like to shift tonnage from landfills and waste export to conversion technologies, which will help to meet long-term waste management capacity needs.

Additional information can be found at www.socalconversion.org, and Coby Skye can be reached at (626) 458-5163 or cskye@dpw.lacounty.gov.

Review and Discussion of Comparison Chart

Participants made the following suggestions and comments for the summary chart:

- MassDEP should group together and reconcile responses for each type of technology in order to make the chart clearer and easier to understand. This should include putting units in consistent terms and characterizing types of sources (e.g., actual facility data versus second hand reports).
- MassDEP should clarify the parameters for each set of data. For example, what feedstock is the data from? What are the sampling frequencies and protocols?

- MassDEP should not decide what technologies are economically viable and which are not. This would be decided by the market and facilities would need to obtain financing in order to be built.
- Participants made several comments about the scale of facilities. It was suggested the facilities such as anaerobic digesters should be smaller to be located closer to feedstock materials, such as large sources of food waste. However, for residual mixed MSW, it was suggested that these facilities may need to be at a larger scale.
- Conversion technologies can be more flexible than municipal waste combustors, in that they can create fuels or other materials, and not just electricity.

Other Comments

- MassDEP should place greater emphasis on creating financial incentives for waste reduction and greenhouse gas avoidance and place less emphasis on back-end residuals management. It was mentioned that the United Kingdom has a 70 pound/ton landfill avoidance tax and provides credits for diverting materials from landfills.
- Massachusetts Solid Waste Master Plan should be consistent with the state's energy policy in how it addresses using waste materials for energy.

Next Steps

MassDEP will fill in the spreadsheet with all available information, reconcile information that is in different terms (i.e., different units), and send the revised spreadsheet to workgroup participants and post it on the MassDEP website.