

Meeting Minutes
Kekaha Landfill Horizontal expansion
Host Community Benefits – Citizens’ Advisory Committee
Meeting No. 3
Kekaha Neighborhood Center, Kekaha, Kauai
11 May 2009
Time: 6:00 – 9:30 PM, Hawaii Standard Time

1. MEETING OBJECTIVES

Members of the Host Community Benefits (HCB) - Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) met for the third time at the Kekaha Neighborhood Center to discuss how the CAC will accomplish the task of utilizing funds allocated by the County of Kauai to the Kekaha community for being the host community for the island of Kauai’s only municipal solid waste disposal facility, the Kekaha Landfill.

2. MEETING PARTICIPANTS

The following CAC members participated in the meeting:

Name	Voting / Non-Voting Member	CAC Member Affiliation
Allison Fraley	Non-Voting Member	Public Works Section of Solid Waste Division, County of Kauai
A. “Big Boy” Kupo Jr.	Voting Member	Kekaha Resident
Beth Tokioka	Non-Voting Member	County of Kauai
Bruce Pleas	Voting Member	Kekaha Resident
Evelyn Olores	Voting Member	Kekaha Resident
Glenn Molander	Voting Member	Kekaha Resident
Christobel Kealoha	Non-Voting Member	County Attorney’s Office, County of Kauai
Jose Bulatao, Jr.	Voting Member	Kekaha Resident
Myra Elliott	Voting Member	Kekaha Resident
Neil Pflum	Non-Voting Member	AECOM Technical Services
Randall J. Hee	Voting Member	Kekaha Resident
Robert Jackson	Voting Member	Kekaha Resident
Walter R. Stocker	Voting Member	Kekaha Resident

3. MEETING SUMMARY

The following sections provide a summary of the topics discussed during the meeting:

I. Introduction

The CAC Chair (Mr. Hee) called the meeting to order. The CAC Secretary (Ms. Olores) conducted a roll call for the members present. The agenda for the meeting was approved after deliberation with no added revisions. The Chair asked if any public participant wanted to provide

testimony, no comments from the public were received. The members read the minutes of the previous meeting and approved the meeting minutes, as written, without any additional revisions.

The Chair asked Ms. Kealoha (the County Attorney) to answer any member questions regarding the Sunshine Law. One member asked for guidance on email communication sent out on May 8th 2009 from a CAC member to six other members of the committee. The email referred to requesting a copy of the letter from CAC Chair to the Mayor for adding a line item in the County Budget for HCB funds for Kekaha. The Chair apologized for the delay in having sent the letter out to all committee members, he mentioned that the letter was available in electronic format (scanned copy) and he will send it out to all the CAC members.

Mr. Hee and Mr. Plum explained to the CAC members that a dedicated meeting minute transcriber was not available for this meeting; therefore, the members have to speak clearly into their microphones so that the dialogue is picked up by the tape recorder. He explained that if a member does not use the microphone for stating their point, the tape recorder may not pick up the dialogue and the conversation would not be on the record.

The Chair asked Mr. Pflum to facilitate the agenda item "Survey Implementation Plan".

II. Survey Implementation Plan

Mr. Pflum asked the members to refer to the survey implementation plan. He went over the steps of the implementation plan, i.e. Identify needed information, designing the survey and testing the survey (Mr. Pflum asked the nine voting members to help test the survey with Kekaha residents and send an email feedback regarding the survey questions).

One member questioned the need for having personal questions regarding demographic and financial questions on the survey. Members deliberated and did not reach an agreement and decided to move on with other portions of the agenda.

III. Survey Distribution Options

Mr. Pflum mentioned that Mr. Pleas had offered assistance with door to door survey and AECOM had proposed a mail out survey. Mr. Plum suggested that both survey delivery options (door to door and mail-out) be tried with AECOM and County of Kauai being responsible for the mail-out part (by using real property tax rolls from County records).

One member asked if a person owning multiple properties will get multiple survey questionnaires. Ms. Tokioka said the County could scrub the list to send out only one survey per property owner (if a person owns more than one property then he does not get multiple survey questionnaires). One member entered a motion to limit the survey to one survey per Kekaha property owner, but the motion was not seconded.

Mr. Pflum said that a small duplication is inevitable to get both the residents and property owners covered. The door to door survey will target Kekaha residents and the mail-out survey will target Kekaha property owners. In cases where the owner is also the resident, he/she shall receive two questionnaires. The identifier for door to door and mail-out survey questionnaires can be kept separate to identify whether the response is being provided to a door to door survey questionnaire or a mail-out survey questionnaire. The survey could have a suggestion that the person fill-out only one survey questionnaire.

A motion to use real property tax for mail-out and door to door distribution methods was entered and passed by the CAC.

Members discussed that there should be a mailing address/point of contact from where a Kekaha resident who has not received a survey could obtain one.

The Chair suspended the rules in order to record a public testimony. A member of the public raised the following main points:

- He clarified that he was not a resident of Kekaha.
- He stated that HCB is not supposed to be a license to keep expanding the landfill and he hoped that the current expansion is the last one for the Kekaha landfill.
- He stated that doing both a house to house survey and mailing out the survey, in his view, invalidates the survey because a person has the possibility of voting more than once.
- He felt that the projects outlined in the survey were not specific enough. He anticipated the survey listing specific projects.
- He felt one vote per household was not sufficient and including only homeowners was not sufficient in his view.
- He hoped that the CAC would resolve their matters expeditiously.

Mr. Pflum clarified that it is essential for duplicate questionnaire to be sent to each property in order to include both owners and residents. He stated that in his plan, each property would get two votes, but it is for the members to vote on that issue.

IV. Survey Question Finalization

The Chair asked Mr. Pflum to facilitate the finalizing of the survey questions. Mr. Pflum went over the projects that were already identified by the CAC members and AECOM as potential survey questions. He asked the members to deliberate the list and add other projects to the list.

The Chair suspended the rules for taking input from the public for project ideas.

Members of the public suggested the following projects:

- One member of the public stated that he is not a member of Kekaha, but a big contributor to the racing community on the West-side. He said he is involved with many projects at the race track at Mana. The upcoming projects fall into the community benefit category as they keep the youth from racing illegally on the streets. He suggested projects such as resurfacing the racing track, maintaining fences and expanding the paved area of the track could be funded through HCB. He suggested having street racing nights where racers and audiences could participate at the track in a safer environment.
- A member of the public stated that heavy rains and bad weather cause severe flooding in Kekaha along the vicinity of the school. The area also has banks and grocery stores. He felt drainage improvements could be initiated with HCB funds so that parents picking up their children are not facing a flood hazard.
- A member of the public asked if the liability insurance for individual projects is being discussed in the survey questions. Mr. Pflum clarified that liability insurance

would be covered in the costing of the project once a short-list of projects is obtained from the public survey.

- Another member of the public asked that HCB funds be utilized for beautification projects for Kekaha (such as a Kekaha Gateway) and for managing trash on the roads.
- The Chair asked the member of the public if the list he had presented to CAC members earlier was sufficiently covered in CAC's potential projects list. A CAC member mentioned that the original list from the public member (presented on 4/13/2009) had included the following projects: swimming pool, skate park, motor cross track, park improvements, soccer, gym, hibiscus garden, and photo voltaic farm. Of these everything except the photovoltaic farm was already included on the potential survey questionnaire.

Mr. Pflum discussed with individual public members to concisely summarize their projects into one line, so as to add to the list.

CAC members also discussed other specific projects that needed to be added to the domain of potential HCB projects.

Mr. Pflum then asked the CAC members to deliberate the projects that were identified and streamline the list to a simpler smaller list; so that the survey recipient is not overwhelmed by a large list of projects. CAC members discussed the projects to combine similar projects together, remove duplications, and add specifics to general project ideas.

It was decided by CAC member votes that a survey recipient can mark five of the projects from the list as their top picks. Each marked project has equal weight.

The following is the final list of projects that was approved, after deliberation by the CAC members, for inclusion in the survey:

1. Improve the Kekaha Community Center (wellness center, ceiling fans, picnic pavilions, meeting facilities, etc.).
2. Begin funding for a community pool.
3. Agriculture/Aquiculture sustainability programs (community gardens/ponds).
4. Community beautification (hibiscus park, create Kekaha gateway, trees and landscaping, trash removal, etc.).
5. Drug awareness programs.
6. Complete the Kekaha Gardens Park.
7. Career re-training (displaced workers).
8. Renewable energy programs/projects (solar, photovoltaic, wind, etc.).
9. Revitalize youth programs and Kekaha Park (equipment loan program).
10. Skateboard park/Rollerblade rink.

11. Improve the Kekaha Beach Park (pave parking area, build rest rooms, landscaping).
12. Improve the Kikiaola Boat Harbor (parking and picnic areas).
13. \$1,000 max per person, educational/vocational scholarship trust fund.
14. Perpetual trust fund for projects over current funding level of \$650,000 (pool, mini-mall, gym, etc.)
15. Build a motocross track.
16. Improve existing Mana Drag Strip (re-pave track, fence, expand pit area).
17. Improve drainage on Kekaha Rd.
18. Create access corridors from Kekaha to hills for recreational and emergency use.
19. New cemetery.
20. Fund land acquisition for public beach front park (Kingdoms, East Kekaha).
21. Create grant for non-profits.
22. Improve Old Government Road (bike or walking path/future two-lane road).
23. Revolving loan/grant fund for small business development.
24. Increase life guard presence in Kekaha.
25. Other: _____

Members deliberated about adding personal questions to the survey questionnaire. Based on one CAC member's suggestion, question regarding household income was removed from list of personal questions. Based on another member's suggestion a question asking "how many people live in this household?" was added to the list of personal questions. It was decided to add note stating the personal information questions are optional.

V. Door to Door Survey Changes

The Chair asked for clarifications regarding the door to door survey (who is in-charge, how it is organized, how controls are put in). The Chair also asked regarding the Surfrider group and which other groups might participate in the process.

Mr. Pflum noted that he could work on designing the control number structure for the door to door survey (i.e. coming up with the survey control numbers); but he expects Mr. Pleas (who had mentioned Surfrider group as potential door to door survey providers), or some other CAC member, to be in-charge of coordinating the actual door to door survey process.

Mr. Pleas stated that he had spoken to the President of the Surfrider chapter of Kauai, and the organization had agreed to help with the door to door survey delivery process. Mr. Pleas elaborated that Surfrider is a third party voluntary group with approximately 400 local members (www.surfrider.org), who would provide the volunteers to deliver the survey to households. He mentioned that other groups can assist the Surfrider group with the survey delivery process.

Other members of the CAC raised the point that persons administering survey in Kekaha neighborhood should be familiar the community, so that the locals show positive response. They believed that a third party survey provider may not be welcomed in the community. They also suggested that for the survey to be effective, the person visiting houses should be able to administer an oral survey (explain the survey to each resident being approached).

Mr. Pleas stated that the Surfrider group may not be the right organization for the door to door survey because they will not meet the criteria mentioned by other CAC members (i.e. familiarity with local residents and administering an oral survey).

Mr. Bulatao, volunteered to be the point of contact for answering resident concerns regarding the survey. He stated that his cell phone number could be added to the survey questionnaire as the point of contact for answering questions from residents regarding the survey.

Ms. Fraley mentioned that it could take approximately 400 man hours for administering the survey, if a surveyor spends 20 minutes per household at Kekaha. Mr. Bulatao stated that the local organization "E Ola Mau", could step in to administer the survey and accomplish the task. Mr. Bulatao stated that in his capacity as E Ola Mau's advisor; he can affirm that Olamau will be responsible for the door to door survey. According to Mr. Bulatao, there are 15 to 20 active members for E Ola Mau during every meeting of E Ola Mau and they have access to about 75 other members.

Based on the discussion, the CAC members voted to pass a motion that Mr. Bulatao will coordinate the door to door distribution of the survey and E Ola Mau will be the local organization that will administer the survey. E Ola Mau will have 5 weeks to complete the administration of the survey.

VI. Task Assignments and Next Meeting Date

The Chair assigned Mr. Pflum with the task of emailing out the finalized survey questionnaire to the CAC members for member comments and coming up with a timeline for production and administration of the survey.

The next meeting of the CAC was scheduled for **August 10th 2009** between **6:00 PM and 9:00 PM** Hawaii Standard time. The alternative meeting date was set for **August 17th 2009** between **6:00 PM and 9:00 PM** Hawaii Standard time.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 PM Hawaii Standard Time.