

# 1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

This report summarizes the efforts of the Mayor's Advisory Committee on Landfill Site Selection (Committee) to identify and rank potential landfill site(s) for consideration by the Mayor and City Council when it prepares an Environmental Impact Statement for a new landfill site.

## 1.1 Need for a New Landfill

The Committee was convened by the Mayor pursuant to a proposal by the City and in response to a decision by the State Land Use Commission (LUC) which extended the use of the Waimanalo Gulch Sanitary Landfill until 2008. A major condition of the LUC, as part of the amendment to the City's State Special Use Permit, required that the City identify a new landfill site prior to closure of the existing site.

The provision of municipal solid waste landfill capacity is a critical infrastructure element provided by the City to its citizens. A landfill is necessary for the disposal of non-combustible municipal solid waste, and bulky items that cannot be recycled or reused. The City currently exceeds the percentages for recycled materials captured out of the waste stream of most Cities its size. Further, a landfill provides for the disposal of municipal solid waste in a secure and economic manner. There are limited areas of Oahu where a landfill will have a *lesser* overall impact. Finding these locations and ranking these sites from a community perspective was the task of the Committee.

## 1.2 Mayor's Landfill Site Selection Committee

The Mayor appointed a 12-member committee composed of citizens representing various communities and expertise on Oahu. Three committee members left the Committee for personal reasons. The final Committee of 9 members provided experience and expertise from a broad range of backgrounds that included: public and community interests; state and City officials; environmental and health sciences, legal and business professions; and others. The Committee was directed by the Mayor to rank the landfill sites. The Committee deliberated between January 2011 and April 2012, and identified \_\_\_ potential sites, and developed recommendations.

## 1.3 The Process

The process began with an inventory of approximately 43 potential landfill sites identified by the Department of Environmental Services (ENV) and consultant from the City's previous studies and investigations (See Attachment C). The Committee was also asked for nominations of new potential sites. The Committee felt it was important to expand the list of sites that would be assessed. Therefore, they requested that the Consultant identify sites

that were below the 100 acre minimum and were between 90 and 100 acres. They also requested that the Consultant look at potential sites within the No-Pass line despite a City Council Resolution that solid waste disposal sites should not be located within the No Pass/UIC line. The Committee felt that while the No Pass/UIC line was important for the protection of ground water, that without further study it would be a mistake to automatically remove all sites within this designated area. This resulted in the identification of five additional sites that were subjected to the same analyses as the original sites.

Landfill Siting Criteria to supplement those mandated by state and federal government agencies were developed to enable the comparison of key considerations for a new landfill that were important to the Committee (i.e., proximity to residences, groundwater protection, and travel distances, etc.).

Various methods and criteria were applied to determine the suitability of sites at each step. The methods and criteria included: application of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) siting criteria; consideration of whether residential or other incompatible land uses had become developed near or on the proposed site; consideration of the location of the site in relation to potable groundwater resources; the minimum site size to be economically viable; and finally, the 20 criteria developed by the Committee. During the process the Committee asked that the consultant look at sites that did not meet the potable groundwater area exclusion, i.e., the No Pass/UIC line and to identify sites that were 90 to 100 acres as noted above. The consultant then worked with BWS and CWRM to identify well sites and buffer/capture zones and identify sites that may be within the No Pass/UIC line but did not fall within these zones. The sites that remained from this exercise were then assessed as to whether they encompassed critical habitat or prime agricultural land areas in sufficient amounts to make the site non-feasible for landfill development. The remaining sites were then discussed with the Committee and further sites were removed based on their current uses, i.e., some were active golf courses, etc.

The Committee's criteria of specific factors that were important to communities were then applied by the consultant to each of the sites. The Committee started with a list of \_\_\_\_ sites after the application of the exclusionary criteria and the addition of sites within the No Pass/UIC line and those having an acreage of 90 to 100 acres. The Consultant then applied the Committee's criteria to all the sites resulting in a ranked list of anonymous sites. The Committee then weighted their criteria. The list of ranked sites was reevaluated by the application of the Committee's weighted criteria resulting in a final list of ranked sites. This list the Committee forwarded to the Mayor for forwarding to the City Council for further consideration.

The Committee evaluated the sites using a two step process. The first step was to apply the Community Criteria and weighting factors to come out with a numerical scoring of sites based on the data available to the Committee to arrive at a list of ranked sites. The second step was to discuss the various positive and negative attributes of each site. The summary of the pros and cons is presented in Section 5, Committee Evaluation and Analysis. The pros and cons were not arrived at by consensus but were a compilation of Committee members' individual thoughts and concerns.

## 1.4 Committee Recommendations

The \_\_\_\_ top ranked sites identified through the Committee process are listed in **Table ES-1, Top Ranked Sites**. The location of those sites is shown in **Figure \_\_\_\_, Location of \_\_\_\_ Top Ranked Sites**. The intent is that the top sites would be further evaluated through subsequent technical processes including an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process.

**Table ES – 1, Top Ranked Sites**

Site Name	Meets City Policy on No Pass/UIC	TMK	Acreage	Million Tons Capacity	Years of Capacity

## 1.5 Other Considerations

The Committee during its deliberations as previously mentioned decided to expand the list of potential sites to those that are located within the No Pass/UIC as established by the Department of Health and Board of Water Supply. This resulted in the addition of 5 sites and resulted in multiple ranked lists. Those that meet City Council Policy and those that do not and those that meet the 100 acre minimum and those that are between 90 to 100 acres in size. The Committee also strongly recommends that the City move aggressively to develop alternative technologies to landfilling, and continue and strengthen its waste stream diversion efforts.

With these considerations, the Committee anticipates that the City will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement to evaluate in detail the benefits and constraints of each site and determine which site should be the preferred alternative for a new landfill.