

Meeting No. 8
Group Memory

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

February 1, 2012

Attendance:

Committee Members Present: Tom Arizumi, John Goody, Joe Lapilio,
Janice Marsters, Richard Poirier, Chuck Prentiss

Committee Members Absent: David Arakawa, Tesha Malama, George West

ENV: Steven Serikaku, Markus Owens

Consultants: Brian Takeda, Mark White

Facilitator: Dee Dee Letts

Public Present: Hersh Singer, Emi Moriguchi, Chris Goodin, Philmund Lee,
Cynthia K.L. Rezentes, Evelyn Souza

Agenda:

Welcome and Introduction

Review of Mtg. No. 7

Public Comment

Updates:

A – Methodology for new site analysis

B – Discussion and action for preliminary draft report

Discussion on next steps and timing

Summary of discussion, Committee's next meeting

Thank You and Adjournment

Meeting Notes:

The meeting was held in the Mayor's Conference Room, Honolulu Hale, starting at 9:00 AM, with a review of the following as posted on the City's website:

- Agenda
- Group Memory from the Meeting No. 7

The Facilitator next invited comments from any member of the public in attendance.

A public comment was received from Councilmember Tom Berg's Office (Philmund Lee), who thanked the Committee for all their work and asked them to go outside their charge from the Mayor and look at the bigger picture including the use of alternative technologies and other methods of disposing Honolulu's trash. Mr. Lee spoke both as a representative of Councilmember Berg and as an individual and noted that there were no members on the

Committee from the Leeward Coast and that the Committee should look at initiatives such as shipping waste off island as he noted that former Councilmember Todd Apo’s initiative to do so had been successful.

In response to the comment two members of the Committee from the Leeward Coast took exception to the comment that there were no members on the Committee from the Leeward Coast.

There were no other public comments.

The Consultants next presented the results of research requested by the Committee. The research resulted in the identification of 464 potential landfill sites within the UIC line and No Pass Zone that were either 100 acres or more, or 90 to 100 acres in size. A summary of these sites by category or group is shown in **Figure 1, Potential Landfill Sites Subject to Evaluation:**

Figure 1

	<i>Inside UIC/ No Pass Zone</i>	<i>Outside UIC/ No Pass Zone</i>
<i>Greater than 100 acres</i>	337	97
<i>90-100 acres</i>	17	13

- 100+ acres inside the UIC/No Pass Zone (337 parcels)
- 100+ acres outside the UIC/No Pass Zone (97 parcels)
- 90 to 100 acres inside the UIC Line and No Pass Zone (17 parcels)
- 90 to 100 acres outside the UIC Line and No Pass Zone (13 parcels)

Tables were next presented to the Committee showing how Screening Factors were applied to the sites to filter out those features that were present on a site that might make it unsuitable for use (see attachment). The parcels were also identified by a number designation in order to mask the actual tax map key identifiers. The Screening Factors applied to the sites were the same as previously used by the Consultants for the Committee and included the following:

1. Protection of runway airspace
2. Federal lands
3. Conservation district, i.e., any site with a conservation subzone other than the least restrictive (general) was removed
4. Board of Water Supply well capture zones
5. Commission on Water Resource Management (CWRM) well sites
6. Critical habitats / NARS
7. Impaired water bodies
8. Valued agricultural lands
 - a. Agricultural Lands of Importance to the State of Hawai‘i (ALISH): Prime, Unique or Other
 - b. Land Study Bureau (LSB): A, B or C (The Committee requested that sites with just “C” lands be added back in for the next pass)

9. Parcel contains at least one structure as noted on aerial maps (The Committee requested that this be removed in the next pass)

The Consultants next distributed a list of parcels passing all nine Screening Factors (Parcels “Passing” All Factors). This list consisted of (see attachment):

- 2 sites of 100 acres or more outside the UIC/No Pass areas
- 3 sites of 100 acres or more inside the UIC/No Pass areas
- 0 sites of 90 to 100 acres or more outside the UIC/No Pass areas
- 1 site of 90 to 100 acres or more inside the UIC/No Pass areas

The Committee disqualified several of the sites because of their current use. One site was an existing golf course and was disqualified. Two sites were adjacent to residential neighborhoods and had either prime agricultural lands or well buffer zones which would result in not enough developable area remaining for a landfill so these were disqualified. One site had valuable agricultural lands and two well buffer zones which would mean that the remaining usable area would also most likely not provide sufficient developable area for a landfill. The Committee’s review resulted in a list of only two sites for further consideration.

The Committee decided to further review the list of sites that had not previously passed through the Screening Factors to look at which of the nine factors prevented it from further consideration. This was because of the small number of sites remaining and because the Committee wished to further evaluate whether there might not be sites that could still be considered. The result of this exercise was that the Committee identified the sites below in addition to the two that passed the Screening Factors.

Questions that arose during this process included:

Q: What does adjacent to residential mean?
 A: It means it shares a common boundary

Q: Why were structures on the land included as a filter? Would like to see this removed as a filter.
 A: Will remove as a filter. (The Committee removed this as a filter when they relooked at sites as noted above)

Q: Why are we excluding sites based only on class “C” agricultural lands?
 A: The Committee asked the Consultant to add back sites with just class “C” lands as the disqualifier (The Committee also removed this in their reevaluation of the sites)

The site numbers that remained in or were out based on the Committee’s review and evaluation are summarized in the following table:

Site Number	In or Out	Reason for Inclusion or Non-Inclusion
44	Out	Located in an existing park
144	In	Some acres in conservation but may have enough remaining acreage to be viable
147	Out	Most of site in high conservation district classification and well capture zone area

158	In	Possesses critical habitat and well capture zone areas and may have enough land to work around – Reevaluate
168	Out	Most of parcel in conservation and prime agricultural land
177	In	Some conservation and class C Agricultural lands but might work – Reevaluate
178	In	Some conservation and A,B and C Agricultural lands but parcel might be big enough to provide for a landfill after these uses are taken out – Reevaluate
179	In	Class C agricultural lands – Reevaluate
180	In	Class C agricultural lands – Reevaluate
181	In	Other agricultural lands – Reevaluate
225	In	Conservation, well sites and b and c agricultural lands but site might be big enough to accommodate all uses – Reevaluate
231	In	Conservation and other agricultural lands but site might be big enough to accommodate all uses – Reevaluate
236	Out	Prime agricultural land and well capture area
253	In	Prime and unique agricultural lands but parcel may be big enough to accommodate all uses – Reevaluate
271	In	Conservation, critical habitat but site might accommodate both uses – Reevaluate
272	In	Conservation, critical habitat but site might accommodate both uses – Reevaluate
327	Out	Conservation, well zones , prime agricultural land
329	In	Critical habitat, well capture zones but might accommodate all uses – Reevaluate
332	In	Conservation, well zones but might be large enough to accommodate all uses – Reevaluate
338	In	Conservation, wells, prime agricultural but might be large enough to accommodate all uses – Reevaluate
346	In	Conservation, wells capture zones but might be large enough to accommodate all uses – Reevaluate
358	In	Conservation, critical habitat, well zones and prime agricultural but might be large enough to accommodate all uses – Reevaluate
360	In	Conservation, critical habitat, prime agricultural, well zones but might be large enough to accommodate all uses – Reevaluate
399	In	Conservation, well capture and agricultural lands but might be large enough to accommodate all uses – Reevaluate
409	In	Conservation, critical habitat, well capture zones but might be large enough to accommodate all uses – Reevaluate
422	Out	Conservation, well capture, prime agricultural but might be large enough to accommodate all uses – Reevaluate
427	In	Conservation, well capture area, prime agricultural but might be large enough to accommodate all uses – Reevaluate
430	In	Conservation, well capture zones but might be large enough to accommodate all uses – Reevaluate
442	Out	Conservation zone but might be large enough to accommodate all uses – Reevaluate
449	Out	Conservation, well capture, prime agricultural but might be large enough to accommodate all uses – Reevaluate
464	Out	Conservation, well capture, critical habitat but might be large enough to accommodate all uses – Reevaluate

As noted above, the Committee asked that Sites 179, 180 and 181 be reevaluated by the Consultants because they were removed because they only contained Class C Agricultural Land. The Consultants were also asked to take a second look at the inventory to make sure that other sites were not disqualified solely because they were identified as Class C Agricultural Land or might include structures.

Questions that arose during this process included:

Q: What does the X mean?

A: X means that 25% or less of the land area falls under that Screening Factor.

Q: How much of the land falls under each of the factors?

A: Would need to run another analysis to determine.

Consultant's Homework:

The Committee asked the Consultants to do one more pass with the following factors as they might affect sites for use as a landfill:

- Determine how much land area falls under the disqualifying factor and if the remaining contiguous land area is 100 acres or greater; please include it the final list of potential sites.
- Reevaluate all sites that were removed from study solely because of the Class C Agricultural designation
- Reevaluate all sites that were disqualified because they had a structure

The Facilitator then passed out a draft outline of the final report's major sections. Below is the draft outline:

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction and Purpose of Mayor's Advisory Committee
3. Process for Evaluation of Landfill Sites
4. Committee Siting Criteria
5. Committee Evaluation and Analysis
6. Committee Recommendations
7. Other Committee Considerations

The Facilitator asked that Committee members think about the following items for the final report:

- Any recommendations that the Committee would like to make to the City in their report
- Any minority reports any members of the Committee might want to include
- Whether the Committee wanted to include a section on Host Community Benefits. The Consultants will forward the previous section on Host Community Benefits for the Committee to review.

The meeting closed with a discussion on the potential date, time and place for the next meeting which is tentatively set for March 7, the first Wednesday in March at 9:00 AM at Kapiolani Community College. This meeting will be an all day workshop, lunch will be provided.

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 AM

Attachments:

- (1) Tables: MACLSS Site Analysis Tables
- (2) Table: Parcels "Passing" All Factors
- (3) Revised Draft Outline: Report of the Mayor's Advisory Committee on Landfill Site Selection, City and County of Honolulu, February 1, 2012