

To: Climate Action Reserve

Re: Comments on the Organic Waste Composting Project Protocol, Public Review Draft, Version 1.0, May 7, 2010

From: Angel Arroyo-Rodríguez, AICP, RS
Environmental Specialist
Division of Solid and Infectious Waste Management
Ohio Environmental Protection Agency
Columbus, OH

Section 2.2 Project Definition

Support change to BMP #1 as it provides flexibility, but establishes a BMP standard to follow when a state doesn't have a comparable standard.

Support addition of BMP #2, however language could be clarified to make a distinction between managing waste upon receipt and incorporation into composting process. I support the suggestion of increasing the incorporation time up to 72 hours to allow for weekends and long holidays. However, it should be required that the material at least covered with a layer of bulking material (wood chips, shredded yard waste, finished compost) by the end of the day it was received if the food waste will not be incorporated into composting process on the same day it was received.

I suggest the addition of language similar to what the US Composting Council suggests as an incoming materials management BMP, as cited below:

"If mixing isn't immediately possible, start by covering the load with a layer of high-carbon materials or finished compost until mixing and incorporating into permanent piles is feasible." (Page 16)

Food scraps with high water content can be assumed to become anaerobic easily, starting at collection and during transportation depending on how long they were stored at collection. In this situation they can release methane, so a good safeguard practice would be to cover as recommended above. The USCC recommendation is targeted to prevent odors and vector attraction, but we must not forget that the processes that produce odoriferous compounds will also produce methane and NO₂, so any practice that controls odors, should also control GHG emissions.

Section 3.4.1 Additionality – Performance Standard Test

Support the inclusion of the definition of "soiled paper waste", as it reflects standard practice and promotes additional diversion of organic wastes even if they might not be as much of GHG contributor as food scraps. I want to suggest that you add a clarification, a footnote, or expand the definition as to allow the inclusion of wax-coated-cardboard. Just like pizza boxes are difficult to recycle due to contamination with

grease and food, wax-coated cardboard is also difficult to recycle with other corrugated cardboard due to the wax. Groceries stores and restaurants have significant amounts of wax-cardboard from the shipping of food items. The wax-cardboard is desirable in the collection as it adds bulk and can maintain aeration even if not much liquid is absorbed by it. Once received at the composting facility and everything is shredded, it will help meet the C:N ratios needed for aerobic composting.

Also suggest you consider adding source-separated industrial food wastes. Although it is true that most of it is land applied or otherwise composted or used by the generator, there are some industrial food wastes that are not suitable for land application and end up in a landfill. A common example is off-speck pet food. Is not easy to land apply due to vector attraction concerns. Whenever possible, manufacturers try to send it to composting facilities. It will be just as easy for the manufacturer to document the waste was going to a landfill as it will be for a grocer. Proof that the food waste is source-separated and a description of it is very easy to obtain as the manufacturer has to prepare a Materials Safety Data Sheet (MSDS), describing the waste and how it was produced. In fact, this should be easier than the residential and commercial food waste. Not including these food wastes will be a missed opportunity for CAR.

Regarding eligibility and historically diverted wastes, please consider this scenario:

At the start of a project, a grocer was already diverting 15% of the food scraps it generated, so this waste is not eligible. The reason they were only diverting 15% was because they didn't include any waste that was in plastic bags (ready to eat salads, breads, etc.) or in small plastic containers (yogurt, cottage cheese, etc.). Three years later all those bags and containers are made of compostable plastics so they can easily put them in the compostables bin. Now they can achieve diversion of up to 80% of their food waste. Can the grocer now apply to get credit for the 65% difference? Will this be considered a separate project or an amendment to a project? Is unlikely this scenario will happen in the next 2-3 years, but is not unthinkable that it could happen within the next 10. Please have this in mind for future revisions to the protocol.

Section 3.4.2.1 Local and Municipal Regulations and Ordinances

My comments are in regards with the removal of the option of "Implementing a Project in Conjunction with a Local Mandate". I understand CAR's approach to only crediting those projects that go above and beyond what is required and for that reason a local jurisdiction that enacts food waste or organics disposal bans will fail the Legal Requirement Test. However, I believe that this approach is in contradiction with emerging trends in materials management by local jurisdictions for the following reasons:

1. Establishing a residential organics collection can require expenditures in buying collection bins, new collection trucks or retrofits, improvements to transfer facilities, establishment or improvement to compost facilities, and educational

campaigns. Municipalities and private companies (haulers and composters) can't justify these expenditures when programs are voluntary and participation is likely to be low. In order to ensure the investment pays off, local jurisdictions are considering mandating the diversion.

2. Municipalities are looking at green jobs for their economic development efforts. Organics diversion can provide a range of jobs. Ordinances are a way to promote the establishment of this industry. This is what sustainability is all about after all.
3. If a state has just a goal, but a local jurisdiction goes "above and beyond" by enacting a local ordinance. How is that any different than a grocery store company, now establishing a company policy to make all their stores divert food waste? The analogy is: state = industry; local jurisdiction = grocery company.

What if a local jurisdiction enacts an ordinance after the protocol is established? Could it be a regional project? Looking ahead even further, what will happen to the protocol and CAR when banning organics becomes the social norm in the US, just like it is now in the EU? Is the current approach setting you in a model similar to using landfill tipping fees to fund recycling activities? So you recycle more, landfill less, but have less funds to maintain recycling efforts. Of course, you can always change your approach later.

Section 5.1.1.2.1 Residential SSO Waste Stream Characterization

Very much support the site-specific waste sampling requirements. They are simple to do and will provide the information in an uncomplicated manner. As many municipalities and companies put more emphasis on measuring their progress in environmental sustainability, waste sorts or characterizations are becoming common practice. Waste characterizations are the simplest and more accurate way to obtain this data. After a few years, we will be able to have enough data as to be able to extrapolate general content rates. In the mean time, this is the most sensible and meaningful approach to quantify food scraps for the protocol.

I suggest the same requirements are offered as an option for the commercial SSO characterization, for the "generator provided waste characterization" alternative. This will give them guidance and ensure everyone is doing it the same way. Long term it will allow you to determine if there any significant difference in composition between residential and commercial with real comparable data. You will most likely be the only ones with such information!

Section 6.1 Monitoring In-coming Eligible Waste Streams

A weight scale is the most accurate and preferable method, but not all facilities have the funds to install them. A couple years ago, the Ohio EPA Environmental Education Fund gave a grant to the Organics Recycling Association of Ohio and the Ohio State University to prepare a manual on best practices for measuring materials at composting facilities through various methods. I will send a copy for your review and hopefully this can help you decide if you want to include additional methods. Alternatively, you could

add language similar to the time and temperature BMP footnote allowing other methods as allowed in their states.

These are my comments. I reviewed all the other changes listed in the summary and agree with them.

Thanks for the opportunity to collaborate and learn from you!