

Advisory Committee Meeting 04– April 3, 2018

City and County of Honolulu
2018 Integrated Solid Waste
Management Plan Update

- ATTENDEES:**
- ADVISORY COMMITTEE (AC) MEMBERS**
- Ms. Tina Alder, Waste Management Hawaii (standing in for Mr. Brian Bowen)
 - Mr. Michael DeCaprio, Hawaiian Electric Company
 - Mr. Nick Garofalo, Schnitzer Steel Industries, Inc.
 - Mr. Dominic Henriques, RRR Recycling Services Hawaii
 - Mr. Stephen Joseph, PVT Landfill
 - Ms. Natalie McKinney, Kokua Hawaii Foundation
 - Mr. Barry Nakamoto, Covanta Honolulu
 - Mr. Michael O’Keefe, City and County of Honolulu, Department of Environmental Services
 - Mr. Lane Otsu, State of Hawaii, Department of Health
 - Mr. Steven Serikaku, City and County of Honolulu, Department of Environmental Services
 - Ms. Georgette Silva, West Oahu Aggregate
 - Mr. Joshua Stanbro, City and County of Honolulu, Office of Climate Change, Sustainability and Resiliency
- MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**
- Mr. Keone Kealoha, Kanu Hawaii
 - Ms. Doorae Shin, Kokua Hawaii Foundation
 - Mr. Quinn Vittum, Re-Use Hawaii
- CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU, STATE OF HAWAII, AND PLAN CONSULTANTS**
- Mr. Evan Bisho, City and County of Honolulu, Department of Environmental Services
 - Ms. Mariah Dailey, City and County of Honolulu, Office of Climate Change, Sustainability and Resiliency
 - Ms. Miya DeVoogd, City and County of Honolulu, Department of Environmental Services
 - Ms. Julie Leano, City and County of Honolulu, Department of Environmental Services
 - Mr. Josh Nagashima, City and County of Honolulu, Department of Environmental Services
 - Mr. John Padre, CH2M
 - Ms. Lyndsey Lopez, CH2M
 - Ms. Elizabeth Schwing, CH2M
 - Mr. Tom Parker, CH2M
 - Ms. Jennifer McRae, CH2M
- COPY TO:** City and County of Honolulu, Department of Environmental Services, Refuse Division
- PREPARED BY:** CH2M
- MEETING DATE:** April 3, 2018
- PROJECT:** City and County of Honolulu 2018 Integrated Solid Waste Management Plan Update
- VERSION:** Final

This document provides notes from the April 3, 2018 Advisory Committee (AC) meeting.

Objectives

The purpose of this meeting was to confirm accuracy of the February 13, 2018 AC Meeting 03 meeting minutes; review of comment/resolution on AC comments from Sections 3, 4, and 6; and to discuss and review the following draft sections of the City and County of Honolulu 2018 Integrated Solid Waste Management Plan Update (Plan): 1) Section 7, Public Education; and 2) Section 9, Materials Marketing and Procurement.

Summary

Topics and discussions from the meeting are summarized below.

Introductions, Agenda Overview

- Ms. Tina Alder was introduced as a representative of Waste Management Hawaii, filling in for AC member Mr. Brian Bowen. It was noted that Ms. Alder’s contact information would be added to the Plan distribution list.
- It was announced that @ch2m.com email addresses would be converted to @jacobs.com addresses on April 6. AC members can expect to receive emails from @jacobs.com addresses after this date. Emails sent to legacy @ch2m.com addresses will be automatically forwarded to the corresponding @jacobs.com mailbox following conversion.
- CH2M reviewed the meeting agenda, which is as follows:
 1. Welcome and Agenda Overview
 2. February 13, 2018 Meeting Minutes – Comments or Corrections
 3. Review of Comment/Resolution on Sections 3, 4, and 6
 4. Presentation and Discussion – Section 7, Public Education
 5. Public Comments on Section 7
 6. Presentation and Discussion – Section 9, Materials Marketing and Procurement
 7. Public Comments on Section 9
 8. Next Steps, Thank You, and Adjournment
- It was noted that Section 11, Facility Siting, had previously been slated for review and discussion at this AC meeting; however, it was determined that Section 11 content would be better presented alongside Section 8, Convenience Centers, Transfer Stations, H-POWER, Landfills, and Alternative Technologies. As such, Sections 8 and 11 will be combined into one section and presented at AC Meeting 05 on June 12, 2018.
- It was noted that only a few responses to the user fee and advanced disposal fee (ADF) polls were received. AC members were asked to continue submitting feedback via the iswmp@ch2m.com email address. Overall, it was noted that respondents were not in favor of the set fee, which would not promote source reduction. More interest was expressed in the cart size fee and the base fee for three carts.

February 13, 2018 Meeting Minutes – Comments or Corrections

- No comments were received on the notes from the last meeting.

Review of Comment/Resolution on Sections 3, 4, and 6

- It was noted that the comment log includes comments received through the original deadline. Several sets of comments were submitted following the deadline and will be included in the next version of the comment log to allow enough time for appropriate response.
- No comments were received on the comments/resolution on Sections 3, 4, and 6.

Section 7: Public Education

Information regarding the following components of Section 7, Public Education, was presented:

- Public education overview, including the City’s goal
- Digital content
- Flyers, handouts, and other education materials

- Public announcements and updates
- School programs
- Peer consulting and special events
- Public input and involvement
- Technical assistance and enforcement tools
- Additional strategies outside of the previous topics

AC discussion covered the following topics:

- There was a comment indicating that some types of material, which should not be disposed of in any of the three curbside collection bins (e.g. propane tanks and batteries), are being found at H-POWER and, in some cases, have caused damage to the equipment. It was recommended that public education efforts go beyond separation of waste for disposal in the three bins and include identification of waste not allowed in curbside collection bins, as well as alternate methods for disposal. It was noted that people are likely not violating curbside collection rules intentionally, rather they are simply unaware.
- There was a request to include metrics for public education programs, such as Facebook page followers, quantity of print materials distributed, quantities of materials requested by schools and teachers, and frequency of distribution, in the Plan. It was agreed that these types of information would be considered for inclusion in the Plan as available and appropriate.
- Additionally, there was a request to provide the detailed opala.org user analytics data that were collected to help provide insight into what areas are visited most and what areas may require changes to improve accessibility or attract interest. It was noted that the curbside collection schedule on opala.org seems to be highly frequented. A suggestion was made that more highly visited content could be highlighted in public education channels outside of the website. It was clarified that more traffic does not necessarily equate to areas of higher interest, and further consideration would be required to determine which topics to target for additional education.
- There was a question regarding redistribution of funding previously allocated to Opalavision on the Green Channel, which the City no longer supports. It was clarified that Opalavision is still on the website, but that the original source of this programming, the Green Channel, is no longer funded.
- There was a comment indicating that the City should commit to updating public education materials as part of the Plan, not just consider updating the materials, as many are dated.
- There was a discussion regarding the effectiveness of household hazardous waste ads. It was noted that a significant increase in household hazardous waste appointments typically follows the publication of ads. It was recommended that metrics showing the number of ads released and the number of household hazardous waste appointments scheduled following release be added to the Plan if available.
- There was a discussion regarding the effectiveness of programs (presentations and performances) geared towards schools. It was noted that there are over 176 schools on the island, yet the Plan reported that only ten presentations were conducted. School programs tend to be very effective, as children transfer knowledge to parents. It was clarified that the City reaches approximately 20,000 children per year through the Sort It Out interactive workshops, put on in partnership with Honolulu Theater for Youth (HTY). It was recommended that the Plan include more metrics on the number of children reached each year with school-program presentations, and a goal to incrementally increase the number of presentations over the next ten years.

- There was a discussion regarding the state of the school grant program. It was clarified that the budget has not allowed for school grants for over five years and that the school grant program should be removed from the existing programs portion of Section 7. It was noted that the City would like to restart the school grant program and recommended that it be discussed as a future strategy in the Plan to support inclusion of the program in the annual budget. Further, it was noted that past grants have provided wonderful ways to educate – an example given was events with the “worm lady” to teach children about vermiculture composting systems.
- There was a question as to whether the City was responsible for managing contacts for peer consultants and if metrics regarding their performance were collected. It was noted that peer consultants are listed on opala.org and are comprised of businesses who have demonstrated model source reduction and recycling programs. Furthermore, it was clarified that the program is maintained by ongoing relationships with the businesses rather than periodically soliciting applications. The intent is that peer consultants are a volunteer resource, therefore metrics are not formally tracked.
- There was a discussion on Tour de Trash and other facility tours. Due to the program’s success, it was requested that the Tour de Trash event be scaled up. The City agreed with this suggestion and proposed including it as a strategy in the Plan. It was noted that improvements and expansion are currently in the works; there is the opportunity to transport more patrons with larger vehicles. There was additional clarification that outside of Tour de Trash, many schools request facility tours from the City. The City coordinates tours but asks the schools to provide their own transportation. These tours are run year-round. Furthermore, it was brought up that other facilities lead their own tours as often as several times per month. Tours are typically age-restrictive (12 years and up) due to safety reasons, PVT Landfill excepted as visitors are confined to a bus. It was noted that many solid waste facilities (including PVT Landfill on the island) have started using drones to provide viewing from different vantage points without safety risks. Since solid waste facilities have been providing tours outside of Tour de Trash, it was considered that facilities located near one another could coordinate their own solid waste roadshow. It was noted that further collaboration between solid waste facilities and the City could create a more comprehensive educational experience during tours and provide another avenue for public education. In response to a question about decreasing the impact of Tour de Trash on participating facilities, it was suggested that the proposed public education coordinator could give tours at solid waste facilities instead of facility staff or at least collaborate and provide materials that could be used to share information during the tours.
- During the discussion on Tour de Trash, concerns were brought up about how to engage all age groups since facility tours tend to be age-restrictive. It was noted that the HTY program is geared towards younger audiences, as are some print materials such as activity books. The City also noted that it conducts presentations on solid waste facilities for children unable to attend tours due to age and that collaboration between solid waste facilities and the City would be most welcome to improve presentation content. Furthermore, it was clarified that the City does include information for children on the opala.org website, and with the planned redesign, hopes to improve accessibility to public education tools for each age group. It was recommended that a long term public education plan be developed as part of this Plan to help allocate budget. The Public Education Plan would include an evaluation of all current engagement tools and gauge their effectiveness at reaching targeted audiences. It was suggested that the Plan include a rough outline of what exists and what is needed in terms of public education.
- It was noted that PVT Landfill does presentations at schools and has been providing college scholarships for the past 15 to 20 years.
- There was a request to add a measurable goal for the expansion of community events (e.g. frequency, attendance).

- There was a question as to how the Environmental Concern Line is advertised and whether there are metrics on call volume and call topics. It was clarified that the Environmental Concern Line is promoted through the opala.org website. Additionally, City staff receive reports from the public directed through the Refuse Division's call system and via email. It was suggested that the City consider providing other avenues for reporting such as phone app, text, or email. In particular, the effectiveness of the 311 app was noted, though it was unclear whether the Refuse Division would be able to receive reports via the app. The 311 app is easy to use and includes geolocation of reports.
- There was a question on public surveys related to what they were used for and what changes they have resulted in. It was clarified that the City has worked with Costco to run intercept surveys and hired a third party for curbside recovery surveys. One result of the surveys was that residents found the term "corrugated cardboard" confusing. Thus, residents opted to dispose of cardboard in gray bins instead of blue bins. The City then simplified the term to "cardboard." It was noted that the City plans to utilize surveys during the upcoming bulky item curbside appointment pick up and Keehi soft bulky item drop off pilot programs. It was recommended that the City notes this in the Plan.
- There was a discussion on enforcement mechanisms for curbside collection. It was noted that it is becoming increasingly important to enforce disposal compliance to ensure that clean material is delivered to recyclers. There was a question regarding effectiveness of enforcement mechanisms. The response was that these mechanisms have been quite effective since there is the risk of cart removal. An overview of the enforcement sequence was given. Another question brought up the usage of fines for repeat offenders and whether fines could be a revenue generator for the City. The City responded that fines are not currently issued for bin contamination violations, but that there are fees for incorrect setout of bulky items (untimely, unacceptable items). It was noted that revenue generated from fines would likely be minimal, but fines could help with enforcement. Fines could also work well with a cart fee system, should that type of system be implemented as currently proposed. There was an inquiry as to whether fines and fees need to be backed up by an ordinance to allow enforcement. It was confirmed that an ordinance would need to be passed to assess fines, and that the Plan should reflect this. Additionally, it was brought up that removal of a resident's cart may result in illegal dumping or assessment of a fine may be a result of others illegally dumping on a resident's property.
- It was requested that the strategy "Evaluate ways to increase funding for public education programs and initiatives" be changed to "Pursue ways to increase funding..."
- The City noted that there were no cuts to the public education budget during the first round of 2019 budget cuts. However, there are more rounds of budget cuts to come and there were already some cuts to related budgets such as printing and mailing.
- It was noted that businesses could use the City's public education materials to educate customers.
- There was a comment on how the social media portion of the Plan is understated. Social media campaigns have the potential to be very effective. There was a suggestion to post entries highlighting specific topics/materials on the WasteLine blog and then broadcast the blog link. Additionally, it was noted that the Stormwater Branch does well with their social media and could serve as examples of effective tools.
- A participant observed the difficulties of educating councilmembers, State senators, and similarly ranked officials on recycling matters. Officials are concerned about C&D debris recycling but there are no State requirements for tracking recycled C&D debris, thus metrics documenting quantities of City C&D debris recycled are not currently available. LEED projects have a documentation requirement and are already tracking tonnages of C&D debris that are recycled on those projects. A project-by-project tracking requirement would require additional resources and tonnage prices would likely increase by \$3 per ton.

- There was an inquiry as to the purpose of including a section on the mayor’s committee for landfill siting. The response clarified that it was an example of a forum in which the public could provide input.
- There was a discussion on home composting workshops. It was observed that along with education on composting, the County of Kauai provides free home composting equipment to residents. There was a request for the City to provide composting equipment in addition to workshops. City staff noted that the idea to provide composting equipment is good, however, requires funding.
- It was reiterated that the Plan is for ten years, thus, it is important to add incremental steps and goals.
- It was reiterated that the Plan should provide more information on the effectiveness of ongoing programs, allowing for continued tracking over time. It was stated that public education is not only the provision of tools but also communication from the Refuse Division to the public.
- There was a question from the public regarding the differences between types of materials accepted for recycling from commercial sources like schools and types of materials accepted from residents, and whether it might be confusing to children who are learning about how to recycle at school and at home. The City confirmed that materials accepted from commercial and residential sources are indeed different. It was suggested that commercial and residential recycling programs be made more consistent to avoid confusion and possible contamination.

Comments received from the public included:

- There was a request from the public for more metrics with which to measure the success of public education programs. Additionally, it was noted that non-profit organizations currently promote composting and provide compost bins, but would appreciate support from the City in the form of funding for composting equipment and education.
- There was a request from the public for more C&D debris education for contractors. It was observed that many C&D materials (even new materials) are thrown out when they could be recycled or reused. King County, Washington was used as an example of a municipality that performed workshops and distributed print materials to contractors as a form of education.
- There was a recommendation to require inclusion of C&D debris recycling information with each demolition permit issued as a strategy in the Plan.
- There was an inquiry from the public as to whether the City has considered soliciting email addresses to move toward communication via electronic means. It was noted that this would not only save paper but could also cut down City efforts to print and distribute. The City responded that their business recycling compliance forms will be electronic next year, reducing the volume of paper mailed by half, with the ultimate goal of going completely electronic.
- There was a recommendation that the City utilize some of the many publicly available resources to improve the effectiveness of social media campaigns. It was reiterated that more specific goals are needed in the Plan to allow evaluation over the next ten years.

Section 9: Materials Marketing and Procurement

Information regarding the following components of Section 9, Materials Marketing and Procurement, was presented:

- City, State, and commercial roles in the recycled materials market
- Challenges for recycling in Honolulu
- Post-consumer paper

- Post-consumer glass
- Post-consumer non-ferrous and ferrous metals
- Post-consumer plastic
- Green waste
- Additional organics such as food waste and biosolids
- Electronic waste
- Ash
- Concrete

Additional information for used oil, post-consumer tires, and untreated wood was provided in the slide deck, but was not presented due to time constraints.

AC discussion covered the following topics:

- Regarding Slide 22, Challenges for Honolulu, it was noted that the costs for electricity may be outdated. Costs are more on the order of \$0.24/kWh for Oahu versus \$0.12/kWh on the mainland.
- There was discussion on China's recent initiative to limit acceptance of recyclable materials. A comment was made that China had just enacted a 25 percent increase to the tariff for scrap aluminum. Another participant noted that if even one bale of materials is found to be contaminated or possesses too much moisture, the whole shipment is rejected and must be hauled back. There was a question as to whether recyclers have changed their strategies as a result of China's initiative. One participant stated that they are trying to wait it out a bit and are currently storing materials with low value in the current market.
- There was a discussion on market conditions and how to alleviate pressure on recyclers when markets are down. It was commented that it is more expensive to dispose of material at H-POWER (at the reduced \$70 per ton tipping fee) than to ship paper off-island at a loss. It was noted that there has been talk of sending recyclables to H-POWER, but current contracts do not allow disposal of non-contaminated recyclables at H-POWER and the discussion would need to cover fees. Questions were asked regarding the structure of the current recycling contracts and inclusion of a renegotiation option in the Plan. The response was that contracts are currently written to hold the contractor responsible for recycling all material, but perhaps special considerations for varying market conditions need to be added. City ordinance requires a recycling program and State statute requires diversion, but it was noted that waste-to-energy is not addressed in the State statute, therefore it is unclear whether sending material to H-POWER counts as diversion. One commenter cautioned that when assessing the option to send recyclables to H-POWER, the comparison of costs between electricity and recyclables market must be carefully evaluated and specific levels on what/when to send must be set to avoid excessive fluctuation.
- There was a discussion on an ADF for glass and the beneficial reuse of glass. It was noted that glass is the biggest issue compared to other recyclable materials; the recycling price hasn't changed much but shipping costs continue to increase. It was noted that the request for proposal (RFP) for the beneficial reuse of glass is planned for release in August. It was recommended that the RFP link be broadcast to the AC, on-island Accelerators, companies on the mainland, and other traditional and non-traditional service providers to increase the chances of a successful proposal. It was noted that a successful proposal will have full responsibility for ensuring that the glass makes it to the end market. A comment cautioned that when evaluating proposals, reviewers must be cognizant of costs to implement beneficial reuse technologies. Glass used to be incorporated into asphalt; however, there were various problems including operational challenges and the fact that asphalt containing

glass is not recyclable. Additionally, a participant noted that utilizing glass as base coarse for construction poses health and safety risks. Another participant responded that the glass must be rounded for base coarse application and that it is possible to do.

- Regarding progressive laws and specifications allowing the use of recycled materials, there were several comments indicating that if a contractor is given a choice, they will likely default to the material they are familiar with. Without legislation mandating new practices, there won't be much change.
- Regarding ash, it was noted that all coal ash from AES is reused.
- Regarding concrete, it was noted that West Oahu Aggregate has been washing and processing used concrete into sand for reuse in their ready-mix products. Process water and residual material are also recycled back through their systems. Metals are sent to a metal recycler.
- Regarding e-waste, it was noted that the State regulations are dated and do not cover many types of e-waste. Barriers to voluntary e-waste recycling include different recyclers taking different types of e-waste and not taking some types, making e-waste recycling confusing and inconvenient. It was acknowledged that additional regulation is needed for change, but noted that ongoing State efforts have been met with significant pushback.
- It was noted that the RFP for ash and auto-shredder residue (ASR) has been published on the City's procurement website. The City has received many questions on the RFP to date, thus, the proposal deadline may be delayed.
- Regarding plastic, it was noted that the main issue is contamination. Additionally, plastic film prices are down and plastic clamshells cannot currently be recycled. In general, polyethylene terephthalate (PET) and high-density polyethylene (HDPE) are still viable markets. Concern was expressed that changing the materials allowed in the blue bin to exclude materials not currently viable could lead to public education challenges down the road should those markets become viable again.
- There was a comment that paper markets are currently down, but are anticipated to make a recovery.
- There was a discussion on potential strategies for green waste. It was noted that California has been successful in utilizing large quantities of compost by requiring use of compost on public projects. It was suggested that the City would have to mandate use of compost on public projects in order to increase the market; landscapers currently make their own compost and will not switch voluntarily. It was clarified that Hawaiian Earth Recycling's contract requires marketing and utilization of all product, and the City has no responsibility to market it currently. It was recommended that strategies focus on upstream generation/collection efforts such as reducing contamination through public education centered on not bagging green waste (as well as other recyclables).

Comments received from the public included:

- There was a public comment recommending that source reduction, specifically banning of foam and plastic straws, be included in the strategies for plastic.

Recent Events

- Bill 28, regarding changes to refuse service charges, was discussed. Bill 28 would increase rates for transfer stations and landfills, but leave the H-POWER rate the same. In general, the committee felt that the rate changes were significant. There was concern that H-POWER diversions would cause huge fees for commercial customers through no fault of their own. It was recommended that the bill include a qualifier to cover situations when facilities are directed away from H-POWER. The AC was urged to submit any comments during the public comment period for the bill.

Next Steps

- The schedule for the next meeting was discussed. It is anticipated that there will be one large section to review.
- Given that the AC meeting time ran past the allotted three hours, there was an informal poll on willingness of the AC to extend the AC meeting time to four hours in the future. The consensus of those in the room indicated that this was acceptable.
- It was reiterated that any additional comments and concerns should be sent to iswmphonolulu@ch2m.com.