Attendees:
Tara Albert – NHDES Solid Waste
Chris Beling – USEPA Region 1
Erin Daley – Lakes Region Planning Commission
Melanie Doiron – NHDES Solid Waste
Mike Durfor – NRRA
Laura Filiau – NHDES Solid Waste
Evan Ford – UNH
Scott Hazelton – Town of Sunapee
Lara Hooper – NHDES Water Division
Judy Houston – NHDES Water Division
Pam Hoyt-Denison – NHDES Solid Waste
David Jeffers – Lakes Region Planning Commission
Bob Kelley – Seacoast Farms
Sarah McGraw – NRRA
William C. Meagher, III P.E. – Loureiro Engineering Associates
Todd Moore – NHDES Solid Waste
Marc Morgan – City of Lebanon
Felicia Morrissette – RMI
Cynthia Nelson – NHDES Pollution Prevention
Lauren Noether – NHDES Solid Waste
Michael Nork – NHDES Solid Waste
Mark Richardson – Town of Hampton
Jessica Saturley-Hall – Upper Valley Compost Co.
Olivia Saunders – UNH Coop Extension Service
Kim Scamman, P.E. – Blue Farm, LLC
Kristen Simard – Star Island Corporation
Michael Simpson – NRRA/Antioch University
Matt Smith – UNH (research scientist)
Lisa Stevens – BCEP Solid Waste
Cheri White – NH Dept of Ed
Melissa Zych – NHDES Pollution Prevention
(more came in after the start of the meeting – see sign-in sheet)

9:00 am Welcome & Opening Remarks by Michael Nork

- Nearly a year since we kicked off, slow process but some progress to show for our efforts – our group is dedicated and cohesive.
- DES has sent 2 staff to Maine Compost School to increase Solid Waste Bureau's technical capacity
- New Hampshire was represented at this year's US Composting Council annual conference (1/22/18 – 1/25/18)
- Group introductions, general comments/questions

9:12 am Subgroups commence meeting separately

DRAFT

Rules/Regulatory Subgroup:
Present: Pam H-D, Jessica Saturley-Hall, Judy Houston, Kristen Simard, Felicia Morrissette, Matt Smith, Kim Scamman, Bill Meagher, Todd Moore (notes)

Intro (Pam):
Goal. Identify issues for siting, design, operation:
What is good.
What needs updating
What are the gaps

Focus on requirements for siting, design, operation. Not permitting. Permitting will be second.

Matt & Kim: requirements significant. Imagined a farmer being overwhelmed.
PHD explained rules.

Jessica: Described her operation. Rules onerous for starting operation in NH. She has started a business in Upper Valley offering curbside collection of food scraps as well as drop-off locations. Hauls materials to a VT composter. Biggest stumbling block to processing in NH are restrictions on meat & dairy. Perhaps allow for exemptions on farm, or for facilties handling up to a certain volume? This is big issue!

Setbacks:
1. 50 from uncapped landfills, with exceptions noted.
   Judy OK, Kim not OK. Client wants to operate near a temporary cap.
   Agree some protections for the landfill appropriate
   DES: these protections may be in place through the landfill permit.
   Conclusion: likely able to remove: DES has protection
2. 100 to Property Line
   Judy: NHDES setbacks for wastewater residuals can be reduced w/ permission of abutter.
   Perhaps can make this change for compost facilities?
   Matt? What if a facility is built, but then that permission removed?
   Bill: State shouldn't have to worry – the composting business would have to adjust.

Pam: NHDES would not want to permit facility then get involved in local property use dispute
Matt: one option, have setback for active/waste/compost, but less for others. But that makes it more complex
General discussion re: local zoning & DES requirements. DES focus = environmental.
Judy : other than to protect sensitive receptors, setbacks needed for access and to minimize nuisance issues, e.g. odors, noise.
Kristen: Possible health concerns also a reason for setbacks? What's science behind a setback?
Todd: Setbacks should be required assuming sensitive receptor next door - worst case.
Define facility & have setbacks from
Jessica: What is the purpose of the setback.

Pam: minimum = local setback.
Jessica: may be different for different types of facility.
Kim: Is it in US Composting Council model rule?
Make setbacks from waste handling operations, not from property boundaries, buildings or other non-active appurtenances
Jessica: USCC guidance on buffers defers to local zoning requirements – no universal standards
Kim: specific requirements for siting next to sensitive receptors (make it case specific – but hard to anticipate future development on adjacent properties)
Kristen: should the issues be addressed through operating criteria

General re: setbacks

General setbacks (1, 2, 3, 7, 8) possibly covered by performance requirements. Work on performance requirements. See if any setbacks still necessary. Look also @ USCC and NRCS guidelines/models.

Water setbacks (also performance requirements). Kristen: have general setback, allow less based on certain process controls/design.

Pam: Noted the setbacks may have come from landfills. Landfills essentially forever and Setbacks from LF are to protect cap condition and protect contained waste. Rules in place before data on engineered caps so limited the uses allowed on top. But now allowing more uses of caps with review of prop. operations/structures and can issue waivers.

Kim: Any universal setback requirement in rules that applies to all types of facilities? E.g., all solid waste facilities required to be located within "X"?

Pam: Setbacks from private wells – don't see any.

Jessica: Keeping in mind different types of operations (septage vs food scrap composting).
Have scalable requiments. (100 lb vs 10,000 lb).

USCC, NRCS, Felicia noted VT has scalable requirements.

Jessica: look at all rules with: why is underlying requirement. Can/should they be scaled.

Next Steps:
Another meeting to focus on design/operating requirements.
- Kim – longer meeting.
- Jessica: phone meeting. Smaller subjects more often

Next Step = Conference Call:
Focus on design criteria
Basis of requirements.
Scalability
Reference existing standards/guidance where possible.
2-4 weeks out.
Matt: Bob Rynk / SUNY Cobbleskill – composting manual being updated.
Matt: will try to see when it is coming out

DRAFT

Jessica: Invite someone from USCC to join next call/meeting?

NRRA Pilot Subgroup:

Present:

Marc Morgan (MM)
Michael Simpson (MS)
Bob Kelley (BK)
Lara Hooper (LH)
Mark Richardson (MR)
Mike Durfor (MD)
Scott Hazelton (SH)
Lisa Stevens (LS)
Evan Ford (EF)
Laura Filiau (LF)
Mike Nork (MN)
Jessica Saturley-Hall (JSH)
Melanie Doiron (LMD) – notes

Jessica Saturley-Hall: (Came in for a few minutes) As a compost company wanting to expand, NH regulations need to change. Interested in working with Pilot Subgroup to do a composting pilot at Lebanon Landfill. Her company has been collecting residential food scraps for over a year now and there is little contamination. They take all food, nothing else (no paper, etc.).
MD: Working with **SH** of Sunapee. Hoping to locate composting pilot at the Sunapee Transfer Station. Existing, well-run facility, will introduce food scraps. PowerPoint presentation on siting, design and operating requirements compared to reality/challenges of Sunapee's site.
MM: He went through the rules and asked, why? Pilots should answer the why on the rules.
MS: Some rules have no scientific backing.
MM: 20% food scraps, why?
MN: many site, design, operating requirements are universal for all solid waste facilities, and several are sourced from requirements for landfills, and not always applicable for composting. The rules were also mirrored on the federal sludge requirements (503 rules). We should build a new framework for the rules.
MM: What do we need to accomplish? What questions do we need answered? Composting rules for meat and dairy were based on an MSW composting operation in Hooksett, that DES didn't want happening.
MD: Overarching goal is to promote more composting in state. There are different rules for different sites, scales. Landfill vs Transfer Station, etc. Case study will answer some questions.
There are 3 pilot models the group would like to pursue:

- Show small, rural community can compost efficiently (Sunapee). Does it have the capacity? Demonstrate diversion potential.
- Medium-scale public facility with regional coverage (Lebanon, BCEP), on site disposal/composting
- Privately-owned facility providing hub-spoke model (Jessica S-H, Seacoast Farm)

These models will push the boundaries to show we can do this. Are the challenges the same across all?

SH: Sunapee is a facility that can take advantage of composting, Can save tax payers money. Went through the slides (see ppt presentation)
There are some challenges on site. Described the site. Leaves are stored on the top right of the site. Town purchased a leaf vacuum (chops leaves w/ impeller), collected the leaves and left them over the winter. They composted nicely. >360 cy collected from town properties + 100-160 cy from residents.

Went over the siting criteria. Cannot meet all of the criteria and would require waivers. Questioned some setbacks. Why? Science behind them?

BK- Odors are part of biological process. **MS**- setbacks can be designed to mitigate impacts. Prevailing winds also a consideration.

MN- What does Sunapee want to do? Let's focus on rules later.
SH- Proposed composting area is outlined in red on the site map.

PowerPoint slides
Slide 6- Compost design requirements- **MN** says we should start from scratch and put together guidance to accompany rules so it is easy to understand.
Slide 7- Design Features. **SH**- should be case for case for drainage systems.
Slide 8- General Requirements- may not all be applicable
Slide 9- General waste- Leachate **BK**- if properly managed, Nitrogen metabolized in the compost process. It shouldn't leach out.
SH- monitoring wells for Landfill present. Would put in micro wells if needed. Leachate should not be an issue for small operation. Pilot- some may not apply. He will micromanage the area and focus to get information, such as operational issues, such as odor and turning.
MN- issues with meeting requirements of the rules (setbacks, etc.)? Propose alternative methods and justify your case so DES can grant reasonable waivers
Slide12- (b) stockpile L &Y waste is now on packed soil.
Slide 13- proposed area for compost operations. Windrows and finished compost. L&Y waste will be only items in back area.
Slide 14 to 20- Traffic Control, buildings on site
Slide 21- Leaf and yard waste are managed every day. Need to control what goes in.
MD- Sunapee is a well-managed site.
SH- concrete block wall to pile leaf and yard waste against. Chipper – use L & Y for bulking agent. Education/ signage are important.
Slide 23/ 24 Drainage & equipment **MN & MS** – no mention in rules of soil type, depth to bedrock or water table, pad design specs
Slide 25- Leaves from leaf and yard waste collection. Only part of what was brought in. 40 ft. x 18 ft. - about 150 yds. about 1/3 of what is brought in.
Slide 26- stamp by qualified engineer. Engineer is restricting. (**BK**) This may be the reason why there is no food waste being composted in NH. (**MM**) Need GW permit and engineering stamp.
MN- there can be exceptions for small scale facilities.
Slide 28/29- General requirements- already doing.
Slide 30- Compost quality standards - **BK**- focused on sludge- not applicable to yard waste. **MS**- PFRP needed for pathogen reduction, no science behind particle size requirement under class A compost **MD** - What is animal manure? Cat and dog waste- is it an issue? Question is why- class AA/A quality standards need to be updated.
Slide 33- Prohibited waste - **MM** why (i) liquid waste? Why not able to take it? Wood - clean C&D- carbon source (**MS**)? Contaminated soils - what is this, contaminated with what?

MM- Lebanon LF- not in printed slides- Takes food and yard waste, dead animals, does not take Lebanon sludge (only sludge from Hanover & Hartland). L&Y waste (shred). 10 to 15,000 yds. of compost

collected. Takes leaves from anyone. Uses "compostable" bags. Windrows- start to finish takes 4 to 6 months. Stable product? Maybe not, but doesn't have to be – uses for bank stabilization at landfill. Taking in brown paper fiber as new carbon source (residuals from Cascades paper mill in NY). Works well as an amendment.

MD- Go through the rules-ask why? What are the challenges?
MN- Challenges should be identified, need a plan/outline, then DES will see if a waiver is needed. Proposal as to why an issue is so, what is reasonable alternative? What are the barriers? What needs to change?

Next:

SH put together a model for small community- Sunapee (400 residents/ up to 7500 seasonal)

- Put together an Outline/Plan for the Pilot Project
- What is the Scope of the Project
- What are methods? Objectives?
- Where taking the food waste from, what kind of food waste?
- How will this pilot benefit the department and ongoing regulatory review?
- Identify the challenges and BMPs
- What do you need to do to make sure it is successful
- DES will determine what waivers/ modifications needed
- Start Education Campaign April

SH & **MD** to collaborate on writing outline/proposal to be submitted to NHDES for review

Other potential project: Hub & Spoke model – Lebanon Landfill on-site?

<u>Education & Outreach Subgroup</u>:

Present:

Tara Albert	Cheri White
Chris Beling	Dave Jeffers
Erin Daley	Olivia Saunders
Sarah McGraw	Melissa Zych
Cynthia Nelson	Lauren Noether (notes)

Members of the E&O Subgroup reviewed draft of "Education Plan." Discussed action items to move forward. Roles and action items have been assigned within the document (*see Education Plan, attached*). Each member of the group will review the entire document using Track Changes, and will update their action items where identified. Updates/comments due back to Tara Albert by 2/14/18

11:15 am Subgroups reconvene as larger group

DRAFT

Education/Outreach report out:
Tara had pulled together bones of plan. Meeting discussed how to put a plan together – without talking about what the content would be.
Group has homework. 2 weeks turn in to Tara & Lauren N. (Tara & Lauren will collate)
No next mtg scheduled, look @ results of homework first.
Melissa Zych - for Pilot Project: Any outreach needed? Task for E&O group? Scott Hazelton reply: he will be working on outreach. Won't work on it much until receives approval.

Pilot report out:
Mike D. - looked at siting & design criteria relative to proposed composting at Sunapee TS. Scott H. (after town meeting) will present proposal to NHDES. NHDES will review/respond w/what approvals required.
Pilot will include review of existing siting/design/operation criteria.
Scott H: Common thread = Pilot Subgroup and Rules Subgroup looking at similar issues – could coordinate more between each other

Rules report out:
Todd Moore – looked at siting requirements. Discussion about reason/justification for some setback requirements. May look to NRCS/USCC guidance. Also discussed need to scale requirements based on size of operation. Next time group will delve into looking at design requirements, will hold conference call – to be scheduled (invite someone from USCC to be on call?)

General Comments from Group:
Pam: subgroups should revisit the deliverables originally set out to accomplish, assess progress toward those deliverables

Scott H: pilot group needs to work closely with regulatory group.

Michael Simpson: Pilot = obtain useful data. Research to inform rules group.

Jessica: Goal pilot is to obtain information to inform updates of rules.

Michael Simpson: Suggest E&O group look @ CT, MA, VT outreach programs. They are well-established – no need to reinvent the wheel.

TMA: agree. That was discussed by E&O group.

Jessica S-H: Experienced with E&O outreach at individual/household level. Her company has performed a lot of research, collected data from working with households, addressing questions, etc. Willing to share information.

Chris Beling: VT has established universal symbols, e.g., green apple symbol for food scraps – consistent messaging & branding region-wide

11:45am Adjourn

DRAFT