

## Consultant List for Baltimore City

[Note: in order to save space the following terms have been shortened as follows: 'Northeast Maryland Waste Disposal Authority' is 'NMWDA' or '(the) Authority', 'Capabilities - Zero Waste Planning - Authority Consultants' is 'shortlist']

### NMWDA Shortlisted Consultants

The following is a list of the consultants the Authority has on their shortlist in order with the coinciding document named "Capabilities - Zero Waste Planning - Authority Consultants" and is meant to be read screen to screen.

#### 1. Geosyntec Consultants

Geosyntec is inexperienced in Zero Waste. Their proposal to the Authority for on-call consulting lists their first "approach to developing sustainable solutions is based on... consideration of project impacts and methods to reduce, reuse, or recycle existing building materials and wastes for energy production." No legitimate Zero Waste practitioner would include "wastes for energy production" (incineration) as a preferred approach.

Their proposal touts experience with "Pay-as-You-Throw" (PAYT) systems, yet can only cite their work in Frederick County, MD, where they do not have PAYT, and where Geosyntec recommended against it even being considered.

Their work in Frederick County in 2016-17 demonstrated their inexperience. They couldn't even use established terms correctly. They recommended anaerobic digestion over aerobic composting, which any experienced Zero Waste practitioner knows is less appropriate for food scraps and yard waste. They discouraged the county from building a large-scale composting facility because it was an "undue capital risk" -- which is ironic since using wastes for energy production, which they apparently like to develop, is far more of a capital risk than a (relatively low tech) composting facility. They claim that their work in Frederick was to guide the county's future waste management strategy based on the Maryland's Zero Waste Plan, but they recommended against most of the core pieced needed for a Zero Waste system and limited their study to composting -- just one component of a Zero Waste system. Finally, they claim they have "experience helping our clients understand emerging technologies in waste management," yet they recommended to Frederick County two experimental processes, citing two examples -- both of which had already failed at the time: a mixed waste processing facility in Alabama, and a "waste-to-biofuels facility" in Florida. Both of those proposals were also far more of an "undue capital risk" than a centralized composting facility.

#### 2. Kessler Consulting

Kessler is the consultant that incorrectly included incineration as an option for Zero Waste planning in the SWANA/CRRA training they conducted for the Authority and other attendees. Incineration is very clearly excluded from the internationally peer-reviewed Zero Waste definition and Zero Waste Hierarchy developed by the Zero Waste International Alliance and used in green business certification internationally.

### 3. HDR

HDR has the best history in Zero Waste planning of all other consultants on this list. They have a good history of reaching out to other Zero Waste consultants to assist them in making plans and have developed comprehensive measures that will reduce transition costs and generate revenue.

However, HDR was the consultant that proudly did the engineering work to get the first new trash incinerator built in North America in 20 years, over massive community opposition: the Durham-York Energy Center in Ontario, Canada. See [www.hdrinc.com/portfolio/durham-york-energy-centre](http://www.hdrinc.com/portfolio/durham-york-energy-centre)

HDR were also the consultants for the Authority's proposed 1,500 ton/day trash, tire and sewage sludge incinerator in Frederick, MD, which residents fought for eight years before stopping it in 2014. It was stopped when Carroll County Council (which had partnered with Frederick County) paid \$1 million to back out of the contract, which was such an economically bad deal for the two counties. No other counties would take their place, so the proposal collapsed despite having all required permits.

"Since the Beck report was issued, Frederick and Carroll Counties paid a combined \$398,000 to HDR Engineering to explore only the Waste To Energy (WTE) incineration option." See: [www.frederickcitizen.com/today030907.html](http://www.frederickcitizen.com/today030907.html)

Helped advance unproven, experimental, and expensive types of incineration (such as gasification and plasma) and solid waste "conversion technologies" in Los Angeles, New York, and other communities where it was ultimately rejected. Supported incineration programs elsewhere, such as Hillsborough County, FL, which they feature in their proposal. Their proposal states that they "have pioneered progressive plans for cities," yet 3 of the 4 localities they list rely heavily on waste incineration in communities of color, one of them being the largest in the nation, which lacks 2 of the 4 common air pollution control devices that most incinerators use. The proposal also touts their work assisting Peel Region, Ontario in an effort to site a trash incinerator which local officials voted 17-5 to cancel in 2015 after spending 5 years and \$7.2 million on planning.

**HDR's good work on the Austin, Texas Zero Waste Plan was due to their bringing in Zero Waste experts to be part of their team -- experts which the Authority specifically rejected for consulting on these RFPs in Maryland.**

4. MSW Consultants

MSW Consultants have taken some Zero Waste training. They're the most qualified of these very limited list of engineers.

5. SCS Engineers

SCS Engineers, like HDR, has experience promoting both problems and solutions. They're currently helping build a new, experimental and controversial "trash-to-biofuel" facility in Maine that includes waste incineration. They also drafted the Zero Waste Plan for Prince George's County, which is largely good, and is the result of significant public participation. The Zero Waste Plan was pursued only after a GBB-led effort toward incineration was rejected by the county in 2016. In the plan, however, they state that incineration ("waste-to-energy") is part of an integrated plan: "An integrated resource recovery program may include recycling, waste-to-energy, composting, and other components."

6. Gershman, Brickner & Bratton (GBB)

GBB has the worst history in Zero Waste and solid waste planning in regards to sustainability and environmental protection. Their plans consistently are pro-burn and they have a long track record of supporting, working with and enabling incineration. On page 32 (marked 28) of the shortlist in discussion of their Maui County planning they indicate their use of incineration directly and on page 33 (marked 29) they say they are "investigating technologies to convert waste to electricity." which is another code term for incineration.

In every community they consult with, they promoting incineration in some form or another. They're the leading pro-burn consultants in the U.S., and are the ones chosen to present the state of the "waste-to-energy" industry at annual waste industry conferences. In their presentations to the industry, they state that gasification and pyrolysis are "high" risk because of "previous failures at scale, uncertain commercial potential, no operating experience with large-scale operations... and subject to scale-up issues." Yet, they consistently promote these technologies to local governments, as they did in Prince George's County. Note that the Authority's RFP also specifically lists gasification as something Montgomery County should evaluate and consider.

Prince George's County contracted with GBB to examine solutions for when their county landfill closes. The county spent over \$200,000 for GBB to lead them toward a who's who of "waste-to-energy" vendors of every stripe, of which 16 submitted proposals, and this was narrowed down to seven, including the two largest incinerator corporations, Covanta and Wheelabrator, plus some companies with experimental technologies such

as trash-to-ethanol. At the end of the day, the county's urgent need for an alternative to their landfill (which was supposed to close by 2020) disappeared as they found they have room until at least 2027, given increased recycling, composting and other positive Zero Waste efforts that divert trash from the landfill. In August 2016, the county abandoned all of the vendors and the entire GBB-led contract process, found a way to extend the life of their landfill, and pursued a Zero Waste Plan with public participation.

### **Recommended Zero Waste Consultants**

[Neil is willing to make introductions as needed]

1. Ruth Abbe Associates
  - a. Ruth Abbe
  - b. [www.buzzfile.com/business/Abbe.And.Associates-LLC-510-521-0505](http://www.buzzfile.com/business/Abbe.And.Associates-LLC-510-521-0505)
2. Liss and Associates
  - a. Gary Liss
  - b. [www.garyliss.com](http://www.garyliss.com)
3. Rick Anthony Associates
  - a. Rick Anthony
  - b. [www.richardanthonyassociates.com](http://www.richardanthonyassociates.com)
4. Waste Zero  
(consults with local governments to develop "Pay As You Throw" programs)
  - a. Kristen Brown
  - b. [www.wastezero.com](http://www.wastezero.com)
5. Sound Resource Management
  - a. Jeff Morris
  - b. [www.zerowaste.com](http://www.zerowaste.com)
6. Urban Ore
  - a. [www.urbanore.com](http://www.urbanore.com)