

**Meeting No. 9
Group Memory**

Mayor's Advisory Committee on Landfill Site Selection
City and County of Honolulu

March 16, 2012

Attendance:

Committee Members Present: Tom Arizumi, John Goody, Joe Lapilio, Janice Marsters, Chuck Prentiss, David Arakawa, Tesha Malama, George West

Committee Members Absent: Richard Poirier

ENV: Steven Serikaku, Markus Owens, Suzanne Jones

Consultants: Brian Takeda, Mark White, James Dannemiller, Emi Moriuchi

Facilitator: Dee Dee Letts

Public Present: Cynthia K.L. Rezentes, Councilmember Tom Berg, Gina Mangieri, Leila Fujimori, Philmund Lee, Chris Goodin. Other members of the public were also in attendance.

Agenda:

Welcome and Introduction

Review of Mtg. No. 8

Public Comment

Consultant's Report on Final Site Evaluation

Committee's Weighting of Community Criteria

Application of Weights to Sites to Achieve Ranking

Discussion on the Draft Preliminary Executive Summary and Final Report

Thank You and Adjournment

Meeting Notes:

The meeting was held at the Ward Warehouse Kaka'ako Conference Room, starting at 9:00 AM, with a review of the Agenda and Group Memory from Meeting No. 8. The Facilitator next invited comments from any member of the public in attendance.

The following comments were received:

- Ms. Rezentes: The Committee was acknowledged for taking on a difficult task with the following points noted:
 - Consider the impact on the communities that the various trucks would travel through when siting the next landfill. The speaker cited Kikiola as an example

where if the site were to be selected that the landfill truck traffic would pass through the entire Wai‘anae Coast.

- Because the City’s instruction to the Committee was to look at sites that would accept all waste, including construction debris, then the likelihood of even more traffic than currently going to the Waimānalo Gulch Landfill is possible. There is presently no quantification of the amount of waste that would be created by rail construction and the City needs to do this analysis.
 - If a 15-year extension is granted to the current site (Waimānalo Gulch Landfill) then the next site should not be on the leeward side.
- Councilmember Berg: Regarding Federal lands, they should be taken in to consideration for potential landfill sites. Just because the military says no, it is not a reason to stop evaluating federal sites for a potential landfill. The sites may still be able to be obtained by an Act of Congress or a Presidential Order.

The Consultant next presented the report on the final site evaluation.

First the Consultant reminded the Committee of the constraints on the level of evaluation that can be performed within the permitted timeframe, i.e., that the work was done within the limits of existing City, State, Federal and Real Estate Geographic Information System (GIS) data bases, and information from consulting with various governmental agencies. This is not a substitute for a more formal evaluation such as would be conducted for an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Therefore the 464 GIS identified sites were reviewed at a desktop level of analysis. At the direction of the Committee this resulted in the identification of 6 potential sites.

When the consultant reran the sites with the Committee’s instruction to relook at parcels that were eliminated only because they had one or more structures as noted on an aerial map, one more potential site was identified. The list of potential sites after this review went from six to seven.

Questions and answers and comments were then discussed:

Q: Why did you remove sites upgradient from existing residential areas due to drainage concerns? These are engineering issues and can be addressed and should not be removed from consideration.

A: If the potential landfill site was above an existing residential area and the drainage would have to go through the area then it was removed.

Q: How many sites were eliminated because they were in capture zones for monitoring wells?

A: When we spoke with the Commission on Water Resource Management (CWRM) they only noted if it was a well and could not further define what its specific use was. As a result they requested that we apply the 1,000 foot buffer to all CWRM well sites.

Q: Did I hear correctly that if a site is in the process, or the City is aware of development potentially moving forward on the site, that the site would not be considered – an example is Makaiwa Hills?

A: We are at present aware of the plans for the Makaiwa Hills subdivision making this site unviable.

Q: Why shouldn't runoff be addressed in the EIS process and those sites that might be impacted identified and passed through that process?

A: It was a judgment decision based on the residential site sharing a border or a highway with the landfill. It was a matter of ensuring that downgradient developed areas would be sufficiently considered in this process.

Q: Why remove these sites now?

A: We know that if it shares a border with a residential area that there might be a runoff issue.

The Committee discussed this matter and requested that the Consultant add back in the sites that were removed because they shared a border with residential developed areas. Some of the reasons for this were to recognize (1) that the exclusion did not necessarily follow the Committee's process; and (2) that a landfill can be properly engineered above such sites. The Consultant agreed to reevaluate and include the sites for consideration and weighting.

C: Waimanalo Gulch Sanitary Landfill was an engineering problem that could have been addressed as was proposed in the design. This means that as an engineering issue a potential landfill site should not be removed for reasons having to do with the presence of downgradient developments.

Q: The problem at Waimānalo Gulch appears to be because it was engineered incorrectly; could proper engineering on a site mitigate runoff problems?

A: Waimānalo Gulch was properly engineered to address runoff, but the combination of delays combined with an extraordinary rainfall event during the construction of the drainage control system created the problem.

C: The cost of development which is one of our criteria would address this issue and therefore potential sites should not be removed from consideration.

C: Should we look at sites that were eliminated just because of [Land Study Bureau] B agricultural lands?

Q: Can you tell us now how many sites were eliminated just because of the runoff question and how many just because they are [LSB] Class B agricultural lands?

A: Give us a minute and we will do the best we can now – the consultant worked with their data base on laptop and came up with 6 sites that were eliminated due to runoff concerns by sharing a common border or street with the proposed sites. The group decided that these should be reconsidered as the community criteria on closeness to residential development would address this in the ranking process. There were no sites identified that were eliminated just because of the [LSB] Class B agricultural lands.

Q: Why are we giving up on federal lands just because we get a letter from the branch of the service that it is not available?

A: If they are not willing to declare it excess then it is difficult and time consuming to pursue with a small chance of success. The current processes available to obtain Federal lands would be a Congressional Act or a Presidential Executive Order. We have been informed that both processes are very difficult to obtain and process, and could add years to the siting process.

C: We should contact someone who knows the process. As it is not impossible, these sites should not be automatically removed.

Q: What do you mean by federal sites?

A: Non active military or other federal sites owned by the U. S. Government.

Q: Parcel 62 is an example of federal lands it is 379 acres and is classed as B agricultural lands – shouldn't we look at these – can you tell us how many there are?

A: There may be 66 or more parcels and it is not possible with our current level of detail to say how many are active military and how many are not as they were eliminated early.

C: You need to look at this and especially check if any of the parcels have been declared excess or surplus federal land.

The group had extensive discussion about adding back in federal lands. Some Committee members felt that they were unlikely to be available and that the complex and long process that would need to be pursued was not viable and that they should not be added back in. One Committee member noted that they had accomplished consulting work for the military and based on their experience it would not be time efficient to pursue these lands due to the length of the process and low likelihood of success.

Others felt that in the interest of doing as thorough a job as possible, and to have a highly defensible product, that the Committee should ask that the Consultant add back in any federal sites that passed all the existing screening factors for further analysis. This action was agreed to by the Committee in part because of the difficulty of finding appropriate land on O'ahu for landfilling and not wanting to miss any alternatives. The request is that only federal lands outside the UIC line be looked at.

The Committee next reviewed the Community Criteria prior to performing the weighting exercise. Jim Dannemiller of SMS reviewed the criteria noting only a few changes:

Criterion 7 – Wind Direction: Changed to address average wind direction

Criterion 20 – Quality of Agricultural Lands: Removed at the request of the Committee based on the consideration of agricultural land in the Screening Factors.

The Consultants and the City excused themselves from the meeting while the Committee weighted the criteria. The Committee weighted the criteria individually and then as a group. The Committee discussed the results of the group weighting exercise and after much discussion on the pros and cons associated with the weights requested the Consultant's advice on how the weighting would work when there are some remaining equally weighted criteria. Jim Dannemiller advised the Committee that even with tied votes, it is possible to further refine the weighting exercise so that there would be no tied weights between the criteria. The Committee used the guidance offered and reweighted the remaining criteria to establish a separate weight for each of the remaining 19 criteria.

The results of the weighting were not shared with the City or the Consultant at this time as the Consultant still needs to assess and run the criteria in relation to the sites that were added back onto the list due to the day's discussions.

The Committee next discussed the draft report and identified any general recommendations they wanted to add to the report. The following discussions were proposed to be added:

- There needs to be a discussion as to why the Committee felt it was necessary to look for sites inside the UIC line/No Pass Zone.
- The City needs to adopt a philosophy that everything that goes into a landfill may become a resource that can be recovered in the future – they need to take this philosophy into account when they advertise for an operator – to ensure that the operator selected will prepare the use of the landfill for the future recovery of disposed materials via mapping or other techniques.
- Host Community Benefits should be embraced as a concept and details should be negotiated with the affected community.

The meeting ended at about 2:30 PM. The next meeting was set for early April starting at 9:00 AM with a place to be determined.