# Organics Composting Forum: Building Infrastructure and Markets

# Composting Food Wastes In Virginia



#### How Did We Get Here?

- Aug '03 EPA RCRA meeting
  - Goal 35% recycle rate by 2008
  - Paper, food scraps, yard trimmings, packaging
- Aug '06 VA Food Waste Workshop
  - Innovative case studies
- Nov '06 EPA Reg. 3 Mid-Atlantic Organics Summit
- 2007 Reg. 3 Follow-Up Meeting; MACA Conf.
- Now Quarterly conference calls to discuss infrastructure stimulation

Coker omposting & Con

#### Where Are We Now?

- Vegetative/Yard Waste
  - Good news most mulched, some composted (> 70% overall recycling)
  - Bad news Still not banned from landfilling in VA
- Food Residuals
  - Good news people are talking about it
  - Bad news very little is being recycled
- Paper
  - Good news more mixed paper recycling
  - Bad news only 25% now recycled (per VA-DEQ)

Coker Composting & Con

#### Let's Focus on Food Wastes





- VA MSW in 2007 = 16,245,465 tons (just in-state generation)
- Food Waste = 11.9% MSW stream (source: Franklin Assoc./EPA, 2005)
- VA Food Waste ~ 1,933,210 tons
  - 501.3 pounds per year per Virginian
- % Recycled = 2 3% (nationally)
- % Recycled in VA = not much

Coker moosting & Col

#### Food Losses in America

- Households 1.28 lbs/day (as MSW, excluding garbage disposals, BYC, scraps to the dog, etc.)
- Fast Food Estab. 418.4 lbs/day
- Full Service Restaurants 138.2 lbs/day
- Supermarkets 120.8 lbs/day
- C-Stores 52.7 lbs/day

Source: Jones, T.W., "Using Contemporary Archaeology and Applied Anthropology to Understand Food Loss in the American Food System", University of Arizona, 2002

Coker Composting & Cons

#### What Do We Do?

- Follow The Hierarchy
  - -Source Reduction
  - Food Rescue Programs
  - Animal Feed
  - Composting
  - Digestion / Energy Recovery
  - Landfilling / Incineration

Coker mposting & Con

# Composting

- Composting a viable outlet for food wastes
- Key issues
  - Source separation dual collection infrastructure
  - Transport distances and costs
  - Contamination a *major* issue
  - Few facilities permitted to take food wastes
  - Collection transportation efficiencies
  - Costs to develop new merchant facilities are high

## Pre-Consumer Food Waste









Composting & Consultin

## **Post-Consumer Contamination**









Copyright 2009 Coker Composting & Consulting

#### Multi-lingual Signage Needed



# Collection Transportation

- Small scale pick up trucks & carts
  - Labor intensive
- Larger scale traditional solid waste hauling vehicles used
  - Issues with leakage, fuel economy
- Need to consider transfer functions to increase hauling efficiencies to distant facilities

















#### Food waste

- Watkins Nursery/Ukrops, Chesterfield County
- DOC James River Correctional Complex (6 facilities), Goochland & Powhatan Cos.
- Royal Oak Farm, Bedford Co.
- Poplar Manor Enterprises, Floyd Co.
- McGill Environmental, Sussex Co.
- Panorama Farms, Albemarle Co.
- Washington-Lee University

Coker omposting & Con

#### FW Quantities Diverted

(tons/year)

<u>Facility</u>	<u>Diversion</u>	<u>FW Type</u>
Ukrops/Watkins	1,600	Pre-Consumer Fruits & Vegetables
DOC – JRCC	106	Pre- and Post- Consumer
Royal Oak	7,700	Food Processing residuals
PME - VT	<b>90</b> (started Jan. 2009)	Pre-Consumer
McGill	18,500	Food Processing DAF sludges
Panorama - UVA	70 (started Nov. 2008)	Pre- and post- consumer
W-L Univ.	6	Pre-consumer



















- Yard waste
  - Prince William County
  - Loudoun Composting
  - Spotsylvania County (Fredericksburg)
  - City of Danville
  - City of Bristol
  - City of Newport News
  - Virginia Peninsulas Public Service Authority (VPPSA)
  - 623 Landfill, Goochland Co.



- Other (mostly smaller facilities)
  - Huck's Hen Blend (poultry manure)
  - Valley Pride (poultry manure)
  - Messick Farm (dairy manure)
  - Commonwealth Gin (cotton gin trash)
  - Greif Brothers (paper mill sludge)
  - Hayfield Nursery (veg. debris, manure)

Coker omposting & Consi

- Other, cont.
  - Brookfield Farm (veg. debris, manure)
  - Hale Farm (veg. debris, horse manure)
  - Rhodes Farm (cow manure)
  - Shoosmith Bros. (land clearing debris)
  - Yardworks (land clearing debris)
  - Wenger Farm (cow manure)

Coker

# Virginia Regulations

# Categories of Feedstocks

- <u>Category I</u>: Pre-consumer plant or plant-derived wastes (agriculture crop residue, livestock feed, non-food agricultural process waste, source-separated preconsumer food waste – spoiled food, food process waste – peelings)
- <u>Category II</u>: Animal derived waste material (dairy and fish processing wastes – eggs, spoiled milk, clam bellies, fish shells, and rendered animals)
- <u>Category III</u>: Animal and post-consumer food wastes with pathogen potential (source-separated wastes – restaurant wastes, institutional kitchen wastes; animal manures)
- <u>Category IV</u>: Other wastes (non-rendered animal meat slaughterhouse waste; municipal solid waste; and sewage sludge)

# Types of Compost Facilities

 Type A: confined or enclosed vessel method of composting



 Type B: windrow or aerated static pile method (If the method requires material to be stabilized or cure in piles the facility is classified as Type B even if composting performed in enclosed vessel)



# Four Categories of Composting Facilities in VA

- Yard Waste Compost Certifications
  - 9VAC 20-101-60 and 80
- Permit By Rule\*
  - 9VAC20-80-485
- Full Composting Permit\*
  - 9VAC 20-80-330
- Biosolids Composting –VPA permits
  - 9VAC25-32 Sections 310 through 760

Only employ composting processes with prior operational performance in US. Any other process requires an experimental permit (9VAC 20-80-470)

# Siting

- Outside of areas subject to base floods
- 50 feet from any regularly flowing stream
- Adjacent to or direct access to paved/surfaced roads
- 200 feet from residential area, health care facility, school, recreational park, or similar public institution
- Sites shall allow sufficient room to minimize traffic congestion and allow for proper management of leachate
- 50 feet from property line
- Type B facilities shall not be located in geologically unstable areas, where site topography is heavily dissected, or where seasonal high water table lies within 2 feet of ground surface

Coker Composting & Consultin

# Design/Construction

- If composting MSW need covered area for receiving, segregation of MSW
- Cat. IV or >700 tons/quarter Cat. I-III all receiving, mixing, composting, curing, screening & storing areas must have one of the following:
  - Asphalt or concrete pad draining to wastewater treatment facility
  - Asphalt, or concrete pad (or soil-cement pad area 6" thick, permeability 1x10<sup>-7</sup> cm/sec), and diked or bermed area to prevent run-on or run-off which is then discharged to an on-site treatment facility or discharged under VPDES permit

# Design/Construction (cont.)

- Area and appropriate equipment to segregate nonbiodegradable or otherwise undesirable components
- Type B facilities sound engineering controls on sites with springs, seeps, utility lines above and below active areas
- Roads shall be all weather construction
- Auxillary power, standby equipment, or contingency arrangements for continued operation
- Uncovered sites capture, contain & control runoff from rainfall intensity of 1-hr duration and 10-year storm event

# **Operations**

- Noncompostable material shall be disposed of at an appropriate permitted facility
- Product testing and standards:
  - Compost Stability
  - Pathogens (parasites, bacterial, fecal coliform)
  - Metals (Category IV)
  - Once standards are met, no longer a regulated waste
- Maintain designed buffer areas
- Operation Plan (types of material to be composted, bulking agent, method used, etc.)
- Maintenance
- Recordkeeping



# Closure

- Remove all waste residues, contaminated containment system components, contaminated soils, and structures and equipment contaminated with waste and leachate
- Provide a Closure Plan & Cost Estimate
  - Cost estimate based on \$70/ton solid waste on-site
  - Must assume worst-case scenario (100% solid waste)
- Provide Financial Assurance = Cost Estimate
  - Trust Fund (fully funded on Day 1) or Certificate of Deposit
  - Letter of Credit
  - Surety Bond or Insurance Policy (very hard to get)

# Yard Waste Certification

- Required for yard wastes generated off-site
- Total time for composting and storage does not exceed 18 months
- No waste other than yard waste is received
- Less than 6,000 cy in a 12 month period
- Must comply with local ordinances,
- Pose no nuisance or threat to human health or environment (9VAC20-101-60)
- Permit not required if they meet siting & operating criteria (9VAC20-101-80.C)
- Must submit Certification letter prior to receiving waste (9VAC20-101-90)

Coker Composting & Const

# Vegetative Waste Permit-By-Rule: 9VAC20-101-120

- Requires submittal of:
  - Documentation of legal control of property
  - Certification from local government
  - Disclosure Statement
  - Certification that sites meets siting criteria
  - PE certification that facility was designed & constructed in accordance w/regulations, operations plan, and closure plan
  - Proof of Financial Responsibility if required
- Permit Fee: \$390; Annual Fee: \$500

Coker omposting & Con

# Solid Waste Permit-By Rule: (9 VAC 20-80-485.A.4)

- Solid waste composting facilities receiving less than 700 tons per quarter (2,800 tpy)
- Must submit Notice of Intent to Operate, description of type of facility and material to be composted, certification of site criteria and design/construction, Operations Manual and Closure Plan
- Financial Assurance required
- Demonstrated results of Public Participation
- Permit Fee: \$390; Annual Fee: \$500

# Full Solid Waste Permit 9 VAC 20-80-330

- Composting facilities that receive more than 700 tons per quarter of compostable material
- Part A permit for siting; Part B permit for design, construction, operation, and closure
- Financial Assurance required
- Part A Permit Fee: \$4,180
- Part B Permit Fee: Cat. I = \$6,850

Cat. I-III = \$10,550

Cat. I-IV = \$12,670

Annual Fee: \$500

# Amendment 7 SW Regulations Possible changes forthcoming

- No full permit requirement only PBRs
- Expand exemptions for agricultural operations receiving yard waste and manures from off-site (but not FW....yet)
- Revise waste categories
  - Include veg debris & YW in Category I
- Revise testing requirements (more flexible)
- Inclusion of vermicomposting

Should be out for public comment in Summer 2009

Coker mposting & Con

# What Do We Do Next?

- Remove obstacles
  - Government/regulatory
  - -Economic
  - Technical/infrastructure
- Educate
  - Regulators
  - -Public

# Removing Gov't./Regulatory Obstacles

### Local Governments

 Develop zoning ordinances that define composting, composting facilities and acceptable land uses by right, or by conditional approval

## State Governments

- Streamline regulations/permitting programs
  - Allow small on-farm FW composting with registrations
  - Put biosolids & solid waste composting under same regulatory program
  - Require all FW composting to meet PFRP and VAR
  - Increase flexibility for meeting financial assurance
  - Require operator training & certification
- Train all regulators in the basics of composting and organics diversion



# Removing Economic Obstacles

# Federal Government

- Expand USDA/SBA grant/loan guarantee programs to backstop private capital
- Subsidize market rates for state IRBs
- Tax credits for compost capital expenditures
- Promote/incentivize "brownfield" programs for FW composting in urban areas
- Expand USDA/NRCS cost-share programs to encourage compost use
- Require subsidized alternative energy projects to use composting for residuals

# Removing Economic Obstacles

## State Governments

- Require "Pay-As-You-Throw" solid waste programs in all municipalities
- Encourage Resource Management Analyses of solid waste alternatives by providing guidance
- Promote Industrial Revenue Bond programs for composting facility construction capital
- Monetize GHG emissions reductions from waste diversion from landfilling

Coker

# Removing Economic Obstacles

## State Governments

- Monetize GHG emissions reductions for carbon sequestration in compost-amended soils
- Ensure State Agency and contractor compliance with EPA CPG and USDA BioPreferred programs
- Require DOTs and other Agencies to use composts certified by USCC's Seal of Testing Assurance program

# Removing Technical Obstacles

- Develop alternative collection mechanisms
  - Dedicated small-scale FW transfer stations
    - Allow for more efficient collection in urban areas
    - Allow for more efficient transfer to distant merchant composters
- Encourage co-digestion with other substrates for biogas production
  - Pre-processing of OFMSW needed; technologies still need to be optimized
  - Co-digestion with sewage sludge at WWTPs
  - Co-digestion with animal manures on-farm

Coker omposting & Cons













# **Education & Outreach Needed**

- GHG emissions reductions from
  - Diversion to composting from landfilling
    - (~ 0.87 MT CO<sub>2eq</sub> per ton diverted, over 10 yrs with 75% efficient gas collection in Yr. 3)
  - Usage of compost as soil amendment
    - (~ 0.35 MT CO<sub>2eq</sub> per ton incorporated)
- Physical, chemical, biological benefits of healthy compost-amended soils
- Avoided future costs of replacing consumed landfill air space

# Coker Composting & Consulting

# Maybe Someday?



# Questions?

Craig Coker Coker Composting & Consulting Vinton, VA (540) 890-1086 cscoker@verizon.net www.cokercompost.com