

Kaua‘i County SWAC Meeting Summary September 26, 2006

The following represents a summary of the presentation and discussion from the September 26th SWAC Meeting. The PowerPoint presentation made by R.W. Beck staff was passed out at the SWAC meeting and should be reviewed in conjunction with this summary.

Attendees: The following represents a list of people who attended the meeting

Name	Affiliation
1. Jeffrey Deren	Kauai Island Utilities Cooperative
2. Ron Kouchi	Kauai Chamber of Commerce
3. David Hinazumi	Grove Farm Properties
4. Diane Zachary	Kauai Planning and Action Alliance
5. Glenn Sato	County Office of Economic Development
6. Lane Otsu	State DOH Solid and Hazardous Waste Branch
7. Troy Tanigawa	County Solid Waste Division
8. Allison Fraley	County Solid Waste Division
9. Jean Camp	Resident
10. Jeff Kaohi	Resident
11. James Trujillo	Resident
12. Ben Sullivan	Apollo Kauai
13. Karen Luken	RW Beck
14. Ann Hajnosz	RW Beck

Agenda

- Present Source Reduction and Reuse Options
- Introduce Siting Strategy Process
- Present the System Cost Analysis
- Review AD and WTE Systems
- Small Group Discussions – Formulate Consensus on Preferred Components
- Agenda Items for November Meeting – Rate Analysis, Implementation Schedule, Public Education/Outreach
- Summary/Questions and Answers
- Public Comment

Meeting Handouts:

- Meeting minutes from August SWAC meeting
- Copy of PowerPoint presentation

Opening R.W. Beck Remarks

R.W. Beck staff opened the meeting with an apology to the SWAC members that issue papers for their review were not distributed in a timely manner. The reason for the delay stemmed from the highly technical nature of the last set of issue papers. Two of the papers, Source Reduction and Facility Siting, were not made available to the SWAC prior to the SWAC meeting.

ACTION ITEM 1: R.W. Beck staff made a promise to SWAC members that issue papers scheduled to be discussed at the next SWAC meeting will be available at least one week prior to the meeting. (Karen Luken)

R.W. Beck staff announced that there will be one more SWAC meeting on November 14th to discuss the complete plan, implementation plan and rate study results. The time for the meeting will be the same, 11 am – 2 pm. A location will be announced at a later date.

ACTION ITEM 2: R.W. Beck staff and County staff need to get the word out to all SWAC members that the November meeting will be the last SWAC meeting and encourage attendance by all SWAC members. (Troy Tanigawa and Karen Luken)

R.W. Beck Presentation

Source Reduction and Reuse

USEPA wants people to do this but it is the most difficult thing to do because it involves a change in behavior.

An example of changing behavior - hospitality industry – does every guest really need a newspaper dropped off at their hotel room? They are driven to do this by competition (if Marriott does this, the Hilton has to do this). Is there a way that we can talk to the industry as a whole to get them to recognize barriers to changing behavior? Once barriers are recognized, develop a pilot program to test the results of the behavior change.

The County has a number of thrift-type stores relative to the size of its population.

The Source Reduction and Reuse issue paper will be available soon. It will be available before other issue papers.

ACTION ITEM 3: Distribute Source Reduction and Reuse paper prior to November 7th in order for it to be used as a resource at the November 8th visitor industry conference on Kaua'i.. (Karen Luken)

Siting Strategy

R.W. Beck staff indicated that they had successfully sited 6 solid waste facilities using this siting strategy.

Discussed the siting strategy process. Every state has its own exclusionary criteria. Typically, the bottom 4 criteria shown in the chart – Sustainability, Suitability, Socio-Political and Nuisance – are not in state's exclusionary criteria. It takes approximately 6-7 meetings to develop the criteria. Siting Task Force needs to be educated on solid waste elements.

In terms of weighting each criteria, a decision must be made whether a quantitative or qualitative (e.g. appropriate vs. inappropriate) approach will be used.

Mitigation factors – example for Roanoke, VA was given – transfer station design incorporated architectural design elements to maintain traditional look consistent with the city's design.

Narrowing down the sites – use GIS to overlay criteria over potential sites. This narrows down the sites.

Notification of neighborhoods – siting criteria needs to be opened up to affected neighborhoods. At this point you are 12 months into the process of monthly meetings. At this point you want to ask the community, “Do you want this facility?” Most communities will not want it but some may if the benefits package is appropriate.

ACTION ITEM 5: Distribute Siting Criteria paper prior to November 7th. (Karen Luken)

System Cost Study and Rate Analysis

Baseline operating scenario was developed assuming existing operating conditions. Goal is to determine the feasibility of reducing General Fund assistance over time. This assumption needs to be made up front

The analysis was developed over the last two months. Once a final diversion scenario is determined, rates will be developed and compared to affordability benchmarks for example EPA affordability benchmark. Also, we will compare the rate to other utility bills.

SWAC members were interested in the solid waste services provided by the County of Maui and how their rate was developed. They were interested in things like what kinds of services they provided. They have drop-offs for recycling and green waste. They have automated collection and manual collection. They do not have PAYT – they have a flat rate.

ACTION ITEM 6: get more info on this for next SWAC meeting. (Ann Hajnosz)

Discussion followed on PAYT versus a uniform rate. PAYT would complement a curbside recycling program where residents were charged per can for trash pick up but recycling service was free. In Kauai, this scenario is not as straightforward as it seems since a curbside recycling program would be very expensive – approx. \$12-\$15/mo versus about \$2-\$3/month.

A hybrid rate where the first can is free and there is a charge for the second can will be developed as one of the rate options.

ACTION ITEM 7: complete system cost analysis and rate design; complete Section 13. (Ann Hajnosz)

WTE and AD System Scenario Analyses

Question about whether union contracts would have to be re-negotiated if Kauai went to automated collection and did away with “uku pau” (task system). The answer is yes.

Discussion about flow control. Due to the Supreme Court decision on *Carbone versus Clarkstown*, it may not be possible to require all of Kaua’i County waste to be delivered to designated solid waste facilities via a “flow control ordinance” because it would interfere with the interstate commerce

clause, which is unconstitutional. However, some local governments have successfully instituted intrastate flow control. This being said, the ideal solution would be for the County to enter into contracts with local haulers to deliver their waste to the designated facility.

Green waste collection could be economical on Kauai. Conservatively projected revenues from mixed wastes.

Discussion on WTE quantities - how much would be processed? 95,000 tpd. These are 2005 numbers.

ACTION ITEM 8: Need commercial recycling numbers. (Karen Luken)

Discussion of AD facility in Perth, Australia.

ACTION ITEM 9: R.W. Beck to provide article to SWAC. (Karen Luken)

Discussion on revenues from bi-products. Revenues were assumed from energy and compost. No revenues assumed from recyclables. Under AD, residents would need a lot of education on what constitutes “organics” suitable for collection.

Landfill disposal costs of \$70/ton are included in the analysis.

There was a lot of discussion regarding the assumption of all commercial waste being processed at WTE. The issue of flow control came up again. Some members of the SWAC felt that this is a critical assumption that significantly impacts the financial feasibility of the WTE scenario. The costs for this scenario are already very high. If they did not get the commercial wastes, the costs per ton could be even higher.

How do we determine what “feasible” means – isn’t this what commercial haulers are willing to pay?

ACTION ITEM 10: R.W. Beck will run a scenario without the commercial wastes.

Under the AD scenario, the landfill would fill up faster than the WTE scenario – how is this balanced with environmental impacts from the WTE facility?

R.W. Beck staff updated SWAC on latest landfill capacity analysis. With the vertical expansion and no significant increase in diversion, the landfill will reach capacity by 2009. The County is beginning to pursue a horizontal expansion, which will extend the life of the landfill until 2013/14.

Is the County looking at methane gas recovery? Yes.

Is the County looking at a bio-reactor? The County can't convert the existing landfill into a bio-reactor.

Are we going to consider recycling with landfill as a scenario? This was presented last meeting.

ACTION ITEM 11: R.W. Beck will run numbers similar in format to WTE and AD scenarios for the landfill/recycling scenario. (Karen Luken)

Why is the WTE number (\$/ton) different – includes upfront pre-processing.

How are commercial recycling improvements incorporated into the scenarios? All scenarios include some increase in commercial recycling. However, the scenarios do not currently represent all of the commercial waste that was recycled in 2005 because the data was not available from DOH.

End of formal presentation. Opened up to discussion.

Questions on AD:

Storm water odor – how do you control this? Depends on how quickly you process.

Any standard related to siting near residential areas? No because applications have not been for MSW – only for agricultural and industrial use.

Question regarding WTE cost from last presentation – those numbers were incorrectly switched with AD.

AD – page 10-6 – meat products – expressed concerns over odor.

Why are we looking at AD? County asked us to look into this.

What would R.W. Beck recommend? An aggressive aerobic composting system along with landfill and WTE.

Question about European applications of AD – they don't use mixed MSW as a feedstock even in Europe.

Don't we need a landfill? Yes, it is a matter of timing. With the vertical expansion, there will be capacity until 2009-2010. With the horizontal expansion, capacity will depend on whether you implement WTE or AD.

Why are we looking at AD if it has not been used for MSW? Recall that we looked at the alternative disposal matrix. State statute requires at least two alternatives – so AD and WTE were selected. Other two options that were initially presented in March were pyrolysis and MSW composting. Please see attached.

There was some frustration expressed regarding whether goals were adequately set for this process. What do we (SWAC) want to present as our findings? What is the timeline?

SWAC's work will be done in November. A draft plan will be completed by early January. Public hearings will then be held. The plan will be presented to the County Council. Remember that public hearings were held at the beginning of the process. We asked people what they liked and didn't like about the solid waste system. We used their feedback to guide and focus our discussions with the SWAC. For example, people wanted more full service transfer stations.

ACTION ITEM 12: Revisit outcome of initial public hearings to provide background and foundation of the SWAC process that was used. (Karen Luken)

General comment about SWAC process – there could have been more discussion about expectations for SWAC members. Expected some level of votes in the interim Expected SWAC to end in August, then it got delayed a month, Now it is delayed another month. What is expected of our role? How is the decision regarding AD or WTE or something else going to be made? Is the Administration just going to do what they want to do? How much will SWAC's input count?

Another comment related to the plan completed in the early 90's. This was not implemented because there was a change in the administration. Suggestion that this is what is going to happen with the current plan that is being developed.

The last plan did not have a clear implementation strategy. There needs to be a plan that ensures that things get done.

Comment regarding AD – can't support unproven technology. Regarding WTE – unless we have all the waste, the numbers are not going to work out. This needs to be looked at.

ACTION ITEM 13: Calculate WTE tipping fee based on the facility only receiving County-collected waste (residential).

Reference to landfill siting project that was developed 5 years ago – no political will to implement. One of the lessons learned in that process was to have a diversion strategy while you are trying to site a new landfill. This might appease neighborhoods into accepting the landfill.

There is still a need for a landfill no matter what you do. You don't want to get into a condemnation process so we need to be pro-active.

Question for State – do you have the authority to implement plan? It's an unfunded mandate. There is not authority to penalize. The only time the state intervened was in the aftermath of Iniki.

Wrap-up:

Source Reduction, Siting Strategy and Implementation Plan issue papers yet to come. The first two are almost ready to be sent to SWAC.

Public Education component needs to be done.

R.W. Beck will re-run numbers for WTE with no commercial waste.

Rate analysis to be completed.

Draft plan will be prepared.

Public hearings held.

Council presentation,

State approval.

What will be recommended? Don't feel like the SWAC has recommended anything. It was stated that the SWAC recommended these strategies that will be incorporated into the Plan.

Curbside Green waste

Curbside Recycling

Transfer Station upgrades and locating recycling drop-off sites at the transfer stations

Continue HHW collection events, allow small businesses and farmers to use the events for a fee

Establish Electronic collection events
Evaluate permanent facility for HHW and electronics
Centralized composting
Develop a scenario that includes PAYT
Evaluate Solid waste disposal alternative

R.W. Beck made it clear that R.W. Beck will make the recommendation with input from the SWAC. This was not clear earlier.

Was this a “done deal” relative to selection of disposal alternative – assumes it is WTE? Choice was between something not feasible (AD) and something that is very expensive. There aren’t many choices with regards to disposal of MSW.

Why aren’t alternative technologies used in other communities? Because landfill is inexpensive in the United States, it has been difficult to show the economics benefits of alternative disposal technologies.

Comment – this was the best meeting because of the interaction between members.

WTE comments:

What are health risks? State audit criticized DOH for not enforcing health regulations related to H-POWER.

Would like to know more about potential health risks of WTE.

Example of experience with early subtitle D landfills – early on, didn’t know what the health risks were – over time everyone has learned together and they know how to control risks and regulate appropriately. H-POWER has been operating for many years – feel like there is a good understanding of health risks and ways to mitigate them.

ACTION ITEM 14: Will provide information on potential WTE health risks. (Karen Luken)

Concern expressed that there is a lot more work that needs to be done to find a solution that works for our community in light of Mayor's pre-disposition to WTE.

Question about whether polling of SWAC members via email violates Sunshine Law. County staff clarified that this was not a standard way of communicating with SWAC members. Just used email to poll members regarding AD and WTE – only received two responses.

One member expressed a recommendation for WTE with aerobic composting.

Comment that this is an advisory committee – not a decision making body. All communication with SWAC is posted on website.

Discussion on role of SWAC after November. Some communities have permanent SWACs. One of their responsibilities could be to make sure that there is progress on implementation plan.

ACTION ITEM 14: R.W. Beck to provide examples of set-up of permanent SWACs at other utilities. (Karen Luken)

Next SWAC meeting scheduled for Tuesday, November 14th, 11-2. Location to be determined.

Meeting adjourned at 1:40 pm.