

Meeting No. 3
Group Memory

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

March 10, 2011

Attendance:

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

Committee Members Absent: John DeSoto

Consultants: Brian Takeda, Gail Atwater, Mark White

Facilitator: Dee Dee Letts

Agenda Timeline:

9:00 Welcome and Introduction
9:10 Public Comment
9:20 Overview
9:30 Prior Alternative Landfill Sites
9:45 Questions and Answers
10:00 Break
10:20 Review of Criteria for Evaluation of Landfill Sites
10:50 Questions and Answers
11:00 Criteria Areas, Next Steps
12:00 Adjourn

The meeting was held at the Fasi Municipal Building, 9th Floor, starting at 9:00 AM, with a review of the agenda and the agreed to guidelines for the group. It was announced that: (1) David Cooper has resigned from the Committee due to pressing commitments that prevent him from completing his service; and (2) John DeSoto has been unable to attend the past three meetings and so will be removed from further service on the Committee. Both will be thanked for their willingness to serve. Due to the amount of time the Committee has been working together and the amount of information shared neither position will be replaced.

The Committee next invited comments from any member of the public in attendance. There were no comments.

Answers to questions raised from the previous meeting were shared.

The City is asking the group to rank sites that will handle all material (Municipal Solid Waste (MSW), Construction and Demolition Debris (C&D), and H-POWER Ash/Residue). Accordingly, due to the cost of siting, studies and Operations & Maintenance (O&M), it is infeasible for the City to consider multiple sites for each of the different waste streams; and,

Because the Waimānalo Gulch Sanitary Landfill (WGSL) is not under consideration in this process, a presentation by LUC staff regarding this issue will not be scheduled.

The meeting continued with Brian Takeda from R. M. Towill Corporation (RMTTC) providing an overview to the Committee regarding the selection of a landfill site and previously identified sites. He clarified that sites ranked will have to handle MSW, C&D, and Ash, and reiterated that the Committee should not consider the WGSL expansion as a possible site. The Committee's charge from the City Administration is to rank sites as to their potential to be the next landfill site for O'ahu.

An unfiltered list of all the possible landfill sites was provided to the Committee so that the Committee could understand how the filtering process would be carried out. The following criteria for evaluation of landfill sites were provided. Key points covered included the following:

1. RCRA-D criteria
2. Converted to developed land
3. City considerations
 - a. Developed land
 - b. Located within groundwater protected Underground Injection Control (UIC) and Board of Water Supply Pass/No-Pass zones
 - c. Landfill capacity
 - d. Federal/State/Private Ownership as constraints
4. Community Factors

Brian also informed the Committee that at the next meeting he will present the sites that passed the first two filters.

After the presentation the Committee asked questions and raised some issues:

Q: Would like to review and consider sites that were eliminated because they were above the UIC line.

Q: Please define the Pearl Harbor aquifer?

Q: The requirement for a site to dispose of C&D waste are less restrictive and therefore development of such a site would be cheaper and easier to site so should the Committee consider a separate site for C&D waste?

A: The Administration has asked the Committee to identify one site for all waste streams.

Q: Since the City is asking for a 15 year extension at Waimānalo Gulch, should ranking of the sites be based now or 15 years from now?

A: The site is to replace or supplement the WGSL site so the site should be chosen with the best current waste stream information we can supply.

Q: When does the new landfill site come into play?

A: This depends on the timing for the extension of the WGSL which requires time before the Land Use Commission LUC and several other variables.

Q: Do we have to consider sewage sludge?

A: City and County has entered into a contract with a private contractor to divert a majority of the sewage sludge currently taken to the landfill by converting it to a usable by-product, but sewage sludge still should be considered.

Q: What is the goal of the group?

A: To identify and rank sites that will handle all waste streams as the next landfill site for O‘ahu.

Q: Does the City want weigh in from Committee on whether an expansion is better than a new site?

A: This is not within the scope of what the Committee is being asked to do as the City will be addressing the matter of the future of the WGSL. Ultimately the Committee’s Final Report to the Mayor should contain its ranking of sites without the Waimānalo Gulch.

Next Mark White of Pacific Waste Consulting Group gave a presentation on the criteria needed for new landfill sites. Key points covered included the following:

- Siting criteria for MSW and C&D Landfills
- C&D Debris Disposal Need Estimate
- Collection District of Origin MSW Going to the Waimānalo Gulch Sanitary Landfill
- Landfill Area and Capacity

After the presentation the Committee asked questions and raised issues:

Q: What capacity are we seeking?

A: The City is looking for 15 years of capacity based on current waste disposal projections. However, because the City wants to maximize the use of the site, the landfill is planned to be operated longer if there is still capacity remaining.

Q: Is it feasible to backfill a site?

A: Yes, but it will depend on several factors.

Q: Selected sites should be considered even if they are mauka of the UIC line

A: The City Council passed a Resolution that no sites mauka of the UIC should be considered, however if there are such sites after the exclusionary criteria are applied we can revisit that issue.

Q: Should we look at sites that were eliminated based on cost?

A: Cost was not an exclusionary criteria

Q: The City should consider the addition of the WGSL in this process given its capacity. If it doesn’t the City would be shooting itself in the foot. Why is it not being considered?

A: The WGSL was not included as a part of the Committee’s charge as it was evaluated in the last process and the City is moving forward with its request for expansion – this group is to rank sites in view of the need for a next landfill site.

C: The problem with including WGSL is that besides the instructions given to the Mayor’s Advisory Committee, if it is included: it would cause the Committee to focus on

Waimānalo Gulch and all of the issues associated with it including past problems and its capacity; and if we do this we will never adequately look at or address the issue of a new site.

The Committee then moved on to discuss the rest of the agenda.

The Committee asked for a cost matrix of all potential sites including:

- Development of the site
- Operation costs
- System costs
- Transportation costs
- Lost opportunity costs
- Social costs
- Transfer of Development Rights

The Committee was then asked if they had any other sites that they would like to recommend as potential landfill sites. One suggestion was received, windward side of the Wai‘anae Mountains west of Kunia. The Committee also asked if a map of O‘ahu could be provided at the next meeting.

Finally, the Committee was asked to provide community criteria that should be considered during the evaluation process. Below is a listing of the criteria suggested (the Committee asked that they be grouped by topic area by the consultants so this has been done):

Community

- Physical impact on adjacent lands, including but not limited to visual, traffic, noise, odor etc.
- Proximity to schools, health clinics and parks
- Proximity to residential units and visitor attractions
- View planes
- Dust

Legal

- Ceded land issues and Hawaiian Home Lands
- Environmental Justice Issues

Infrastructure

- Multiple egress and ingress
- Proximity to H-POWER
- Storm water control
- Wear and tear on transportation infrastructure
- Roadway capacities

Economic

- All Costs

- Opportunity cost
- Proximity to economic opportunities
- Closure Costs
- Proximity to resource recovery opportunities

Environmental

- Wetlands
- Endangered species
- Groundwater
- Flooding
- Precipitation
- Proximity to protected areas
- Proximity to State Class “AA” waters
- Hydrology and Geography of site
- Climate change

Cultural

- Archeology
- Cultural and Historical Sites

Land Use

- Important agricultural land
- Roadway capacity

Other

- Energy change uses
- Use after closure
- Post closure opportunities
- Worst case scenario

The meeting came to a close with a reminder of the date, time and place for the next meeting, which is March 31st, from 9AM to 12PM in the Mayor’s Conference Room.

The Committee also asked for a more detailed agenda before the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30AM.