

**Meeting No. 5
Group Memory**

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

May 12, 2011

Attendance:

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

Committee Members Absent: None

Consultants: Brian Takeda, Gail Atwater, Mark White, Jim Dannemiller

Facilitator: Dee Dee Letts

Agenda:

Welcome and Introduction

Review of Mtg. No. 4

Public Comment

Discussion on Landfill Site Selection Criteria

Consultant's Next Steps

Thank You and Adjournment

The meeting was held in the Mayor's Conference Room, Honolulu Hale, starting at 9:00 AM, with a review of the agenda. The consultants then reported back to the committee on issues raised at the previous meeting.

- Copies of letters sent to the Department of Health and the Board of Water Supply requesting further information and assistance were provided to the committee. No response had been received from either agency at the time of the meeting.
- The consultants presented information on the Kunia area and its suitability for a landfill site. Maps were provided showing the tax map keys, state land use district, and agricultural ratings. Lands mauka of the State Agricultural District including the gulches are in the State Conservation District. All lands in the area were identified as agricultural lands of the highest quality. The area is also located in the state and city's underground injection control and groundwater protection zones. The Committee briefly discussed the information presented and no further action to consider this area was deemed necessary.

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

Dr. Bruce Anderson submitted an e-mail resigning from the Committee on May 5, 2011 due to his new position which requires his full attention. Dr. Anderson's e-mail was shared with the Committee.

The Committee next reviewed the community criteria identified at the last meeting and discussed the language, descriptions, and opportunities for consolidation, or deletion of criteria. Below is a summary of the major changes (see attached Final Criteria List):

Summary List of Changes to Criteria

- The Committee was reminded that Criterion 1 – Potential for Worst Case Scenarios was moved from a criterion to a discussion point on worst case scenarios for the top ranked sites based on the individual characteristics of each site. This change will be included in the Committee’s Report.
- Combined Criterion 3 – Location Relative to Educational Institutions, Health Care Facilities, or Parks and Recreation Facilities; Criterion 4 – Location Relative to Health Care Facilities; and Criterion 5 – Location Relative to Public Parks and Recreation Facilities.
- Combined Criterion 8 – Location Relative to Commercial Facilities and Local/Visitor Attractions, and Criterion 9 – Location Relative to Visitor Attractions.
- Combined Criterion 13 – Wear and Tear on Highways and Roadways which affects Roadway Usage, and Criterion 14 - Effect on Roadway Usage. The Committee requested that roadway congestion be included in this criterion and asked “Where does the residential road begin?” Residential roads will be evaluated on a case by case basis, but generally would begin on the secondary road serving the residences.
- Moved Criterion 15 – State Land Use Designation (SLUD) and County Zoning, to an item of discussion in the Committee’s Report. The land use designation for a site does not by itself constitute a criterion because it can be changed. The Committee’s Report should also discuss land use patterns discussed in the City’s adopted Sustainable Communities Plans.
- Moved Criterion 16 – Ceded Land and Hawaiian Home Lands to a discussion item in the Committee’s Report.
- Changed Criterion 17 – Location Relative to Identified Community Disamenities so that it will be based on ahapua‘a boundaries rather than distance from the site. The Committee compiled a list of disamenities to include:
 - Existing landfills – closed and open
 - Power plants
 - Prisons, Juvenile Centers, Correction Facilities
 - Public Housing
 - Quarry Sites
 - Shelters
 - Waste Water Treatment Plants
 - Treatment Plants
 - Slaughter Houses
- Deleted Criterion 18 – Ingress and Egress to Landfill Site as it would be the same for each site.

- For Criterion 19 – Location Relative to H-POWER the Committee asked if there was a time element that should be considered based on the amount of time it takes ash to solidify in the trucks. Steve will check on this and get back to the Committee.
- Deleted Criterion 20 – Storm Water Control as it is covered in Criterion 21 – Effect of Precipitation on Landfill Operations, and Criterion 22 – Landfill Development, Operation and Closure Cost.
- Criterion 21 – The Committee asked the consultants to include peak rainfall events and not just average rainfall.
- Criterion 22 – The cost of operations needs to include the cost for storm water control. Cost factors should include: costs of a system necessary to handle peak storm events, the cost per mile to H-POWER, displacement costs, and purchase costs.
- Deleted Criterion 23 – Opportunity Cost as it would be covered in zoning and other land use discussions.
- The Committee developed a new criterion, Displacement Costs, to assess costs associated with the displacement of a current land use, including but not limited to, impact on the local economy, tax base contributions, and costs to move the land use. This should include situations where an existing land use is stopped before a resource is exhausted.
- Combined Criterion 25 – Location Relative to Wetlands, and Criterion 29 - Location Relative to Areas in the Natural Area Reserve System (NARS).
- The Committee asked that Criterion 26 – Location Relative to Listed Threatened and Endangered Species include critical habitats identified by DLNR and U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service to insure coverage of both fauna and flora resources.
- Moved Criterion 27 – Location Relative to Groundwater Resources to serve as a filter.
- Moved Criterion 28 – Flooding Potential to serve as a filter.
- Deleted Criterion 30 – Location Relative to Class “AA” Waters and modified Criterion 22 – Landfill Development, Operation and Closure Cost, by adding costs for stormwater controls to address discharges to Class “AA” waters of the State.
- Changed Criterion 31 – Surface Water Resources, by changing the measurement to include the “potential to discharge untreated storm water runoff from a landfill site to an identified perennial or intermittent stream...”
- Combined Criterion 34 – Soils Suitable for Use as Daily Cover, with Criterion 22 – Landfill Development, Operation and Closure Cost.

The Committee next discussed the weighting process. Each Committee member will be assigned a given number of votes or points but only one vote or point per Committee member would be allowed to be given to any single criterion. In general the process will work like this:

Point values will be provided by the Consultants for each criterion but the weighting assigned to each criterion will be decided by the Committee in a closed-door meeting without the Consultants present.

The Consultants will work independently to complete the site data sheets providing scores for each criterion. The Committee will receive the results of the completed site data sheets but the landfill sites will remain anonymous, identified only with an alpha descriptor, e.g., A, B, C... The Consultants will answer any questions about how the criteria were measured and applied to obtain the point values.

After all questions from the Committee have been answered the Consultants will be presented with the Committee's weighting of the criteria, performed in an earlier step. The Consultants will next apply the weighting to each criterion to arrive at the final score for each landfill site evaluated. This is planned to be accomplished during the course of one of our meetings.

The preparation of the site data sheets and the analysis to complete them, including a summary of the results, is estimated to be completed in about two months. The Committee will be notified of progress being made during this period.

The meeting came to a close with a reminder of the date, time and place for the next meeting, which is tentatively set for July 21st, 9:00 AM. (Note: This meeting date has been changed to July 19th, 9:00 AM, and will be held in the Mayor's Conference Room). There will be no meeting the month of June to allow the consultants to prepare the data information sheets and conduct related research.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 PM.

Attachment