Alternative Technologies Subcommittee Meeting Minutes – 06/24/2022

Attendees: Rep. Karen Ebel, Duncan Watson, Eric Steinhauser, John Tuthill, and Jim Malley

1. Representative Ebel joined the group to share thoughts and provide a bit of guidance on how we might prioritize or add certain aspects that tie Alternatives to key sections of the SWMP.

2. Duncan was emphasizing that **infrastructure** (we need to define the term more specifically since it can cover so many broad areas – markets, SWM districts, equipment, and facilities, etc.) is going to be a major issue – incorporating more into Goal 3 to specifically address infrastructure increases will be vital.

3. The infrastructure discussion led to thoughts that an increased focus on creating active engaged solid waste management districts. Encouraging the formation and use of solid waste management districts should be a major part of Goal 3.

4. These districts could be a major way to encourage and incentivize towns to collaborate more on mutual interests and increasing their overall bargaining power in terms of solid waste collection, solid waste recycling programs and contracts, etc.

5. Duncan was suggesting an RFP type mode where NHDES releases an RFP or a series of RFPs to encourage proposals that would address what the state wants to achieve whether it be RFPs to encourage building of infrastructure, or RFPs encouraging the development of a regional advanced recycling campus, etc. The following sentences developed by Duncan related to RFPs and infrastructure can go into Goal 3 and Goal 6:

   "The state shall facilitate the development of a request for proposal(s) to site one or more advanced materials recovery and reuse (AMRR) facilities (or campuses) in the state that will have capacity of receiving 1,000 or more tons per day of mixed solid waste. The facility can employ advanced technologies which have potential to achieve more than 70% landfill diversion through processes such as recycling, composting, anaerobic digestion, pyrolysis, and other appropriate emerging technologies developed for the chemical recycling of plastics. The costs, revenues and net financials for the facility owner/operator will use typical cost estimating and financing models with a period of analysis done for 10-to-20-year life to determine viability. The facility owner/operator shall assist SW generators to access alternative outlets for disposal/reuse of MSW from the time of their waste stream commitment to this new AMRR until it is operational. Furthermore, the facility owner/operator shall be encouraged by the state to issue a performance bond specific to each SW generator committing to use the AMRR facility to guarantee the promised and stated performance the AMRR facility will deliver."

6. How do we tie these RFPs (item 5) or advanced technologies to emerging grant and funding opportunities that will become available such as a part of recent federal Bipartisan Infrastructure Law which will provide an unprecedented $375 million in funding for the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to develop new recycling and reuse grant programs and initiatives?

7. Representative Ebel encouraging that we need to develop away to bringing together all the aspects of alternatives to the traditional limited diversion MRFs and the landfilling options.

8. The NHDES should revamp their Research and Development permits to allow the attempts at new things. Historical models that have been used and were successful was the EPA Innovative and Alternative Technology program that spurred innovative technologies in the municipal wastewater field and the EPA Superfund Innovative Technology Evaluation (SITE) programs that spurred innovative technologies in the hazardous waste remediation field.

9. Encouraging ways in which more funding and grants can be made available to NHDES and other solid waste professional education, training, and development to allow the regulatory community to be an informed and provide major input to innovative technology solutions.

10. Expanding Goal 6 to further encourage the connection to climate change and tie in energy.

11. Encouraging appropriate sections of the SWMP Goals 6 and 7 to more strongly focus on social and environmental justice issues that are a key factor in MSW solutions such as siting landfills. Goals 4, 6 and 7 can also emphasize sustainable solutions and discourage the shipment of NH generated SW out of state for landfill disposal or other non-sustainable SW alternatives.

12. Adding language to the SWMP on the alternative option termed Landfill mining – perhaps including into Goal 6 with two components: a) a phased landfilling where one of the cells after a period of degradation would then be mined for potential materials that would be valuable; and b) recovery by mining or removing the large number of small old landfills and town dumps that had unlined landfills. This could do a significant amount of remediation and in particular

13. Goal 6 – how do we educate the profession moving forward and the investors and society to consider much more – up in the front introductory – under plan priorities on page two. We could weave together a broad philosophy where the SWMP embodies the major emerging concerns of decision-making that focuses on sustainability, social justice, climate change, landfilling public benefit analysis, out of state waste.

14. Goals of the SWMP become actionable when tied to requirements placed on the actual entities that are responsible for SW programs. Whether it be required reporting or licensing or other forms of enforcement that will be where the SWMP translates into actions.