

1132 Bishop Street
 Suite 1100
 Honolulu, Hawai'i 96813
 O +1 808 943 1133
 F +1 808 954 4400
 www.jacobs.com

Subject **Solid Waste Advisory Committee Meeting #4**

Project Name County of Kaua'i 2020 Integrated Solid Waste Management Plan Update

Project Number D3251000

Prepared by Jacobs

Location MS Teams Virtual Meeting

Date/Time Tuesday, June 23, 2020 / 9:00 am – 12:00 pm HST

Participants SWAC:
 Keith Suga for Eli Brainerd – Pacific Concrete Cutting and Coring
 Jesse Brown-Clay – Zero Waste Kaua'i
 George Costa – Hawai'i Lodging and Tourism Association
 Fred Cowell – Kaua'i Coffee Company (Not Present)
 Allen Evans – Resource Recovery Solutions (Not Present)
 Allison Fraley – Acting Solid Waste Chief, County of Kaua'i
 Howard Greene – Gay and Robinson
 Scott Kouchi – Garden Isle Disposal
 Conrad Murashige – Shioi Construction (Not Present)
 Lane Otsu – State Department of Health Solid Waste Branch
 Keola Aki for Rick Renaud – Solid Waste Superintendent, County of Kaua'i
 Brad Rockwell – Power Supply Manager, Kaua'i Island Utility Cooperative
 Ben Sullivan – Energy & Sustainability Coordinator, County of Kaua'i

Public:
 John Harder – Zero Waste Kaua'i
 Ruta Jordans – Zero Waste Kaua'i
 Terry Kamen
 Jennifer Sifuentes – Zero Waste Kaua'i
 (808) 216-0198

Jacobs Team:
 Lyndsey Lopez
 John Padre
 Dan Pitzler
 Elizabeth Schwing

Notes

This virtual meeting was recorded and is documented in two video files. Part 1 runs from the Welcome to the break. Part 2 runs from the return from break through the meeting adjournment. The time stamp for each agenda item is shown below. Key discussion points and identified action items are summarized.

Agenda	Time Stamp	Key Item/Action
1 Welcome, Reminders, and Agenda Overview	Part 1. 00:00 to 20:10	No action. Provided overview of virtual meeting guidelines, completed group icebreaker, reviewed

Agenda	Time Stamp	Key Item/Action
<p>2 Review and Approve January 21, 2020 Meeting Summary</p>	<p>Part 1. 20:11 to 23:02</p>	<p>agenda, and described process for solicitation of SWAC and public feedback.</p> <p>Requested comments on meeting notes from Meeting No. 3. Received a request from Lane to update page 7 of the minutes to reflect that the Big Island recently approved the use of crushed glass for the operations layer of the landfill (not the working face).</p> <p>Action: Update Meeting No. 3 summary as requested and finalize for SWAC approval.</p>
<p>3 Recap of Meetings 1-3 and Current Status of ISWMP</p>	<p>Part 1. 23:03 to 25:13</p>	<p>No action. Presented overview of ISWMP development progress to date and next steps.</p>
<p>4 Implementation Plan Discussion/Review Part 1</p>	<p>Part 1. 25:14 to 1:12:06</p>	<p>For each topic area listed below, Jacobs provided an overview of enhancement opportunities proposed for inclusion in the ISWMP, anticipated implementation timing, and initial cost. SWAC Members were asked to comment on the listed items and identify any opportunities that may have been missed.</p> <p>Source Reduction. SWAC Members provided the following feedback on proposed source reduction enhancements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All proposed enhancements are doable, but additional staff are really needed to pull off implementation of source reduction items and items identified in other sections. • Consider other opportunities within PAYT, such as increasing the cost differential between large and small carts (same net revenue) or implementing billing changes to make the costs more visible to the end user. The County noted that PAYT is listed separately on the property tax bill, though residents may not see it if they pay their property tax bill through their mortgage. • COVID-19 will likely impact waste generation and source reduction in future years; however, there is no good information on exactly how. ISWMP will acknowledge the potential for COVID-19-related changes, but may need to be revisited when more information is available. • SWAC Members expressed interest in whether there is scientific data regarding COVID-19 risk reduction associated with the use of disposables in restaurants or if it's mainly a perception issue. • Action: Lane to send State Source Reduction Working Group (SRWG)'s list of studies, compiled as a result of their research. • Action: Allison to send information provided by EPA regarding use of disposables in restaurants and COVID-19 risk. • Local lodging industry is facing a source reduction backslide as a result of COVID-19 cleaning requirements. More information should be available by the next meeting as things reopen. <p>Recycling. SWAC Members provided the following feedback on proposed recycling enhancements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PCCC is open to continuing to work with the County to accept more C&D material for recycling, diverting it from the Refuse Transfer Stations (RTSs) and landfill. • Funding for the HI-5 program may be impacted by COVID-19-related budget cuts.

Agenda	Time Stamp	Key Item/Action
<p>5 Break</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should think about what materials are most effective to recycle and reconsider whether it makes sense to collect glass in the Drop Bins for recycling. <p>Bioconversion. SWAC Members provided the following feedback on proposed bioconversion enhancements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarified that the item involving issuing of RFPs and/or supporting permit modifications for food waste composting at private facilities is scheduled for 2024 to allow time for legislation around tiered regulation of composting operations to be put into effect. Raised the possibility that mulch from pallet processing could be mixed with shredded tires and used as landfill cover, but that may not be the highest and best use as it would still result in landfilling of the material. Expressed interest in a food waste ban at the landfill. Though implementation difficulty would be high and enforcement would be challenging, a ban could be effective in reducing food waste in the overall waste stream and help drive emergence of new industries (i.e. composting). Discussed that bans come in many shapes and sizes; some are required recovery, some disposal bans, some phased with generation size. Noted that one of the State SRWG recommendations is to accelerate community and regional composting. Part of the discussion includes recommending streamlining of Hawai'i Department of Health (DOH) permitting requirements for smaller facilities. <p>Special Wastes. SWAC Members did not have any comments on proposed special wastes enhancements.</p> <p>Household Hazardous Waste (HHW). SWAC Members did not have any comments on proposed HHW enhancements.</p> <p>Electronic Waste (eWaste). SWAC Members provided the following feedback on proposed eWaste enhancements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Move up the timing of the item on assessing feasibility of accepting eWaste at RTSs by one year to reflect timing of RTS improvement projects.
<p>6 Implementation Plan Discussion/Review Part 2</p>	<p>Part 2. 00:00 to 18:20</p>	<p>Public Education. SWAC Members provided the following feedback on proposed public education enhancements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promotion of the true cost of landfilling is important and will require some preliminary work to understand the cost based on data available, consider it from the consumer perspective, and present it in a way that's meaningful at the individual level. Add some funding to support preliminary work then outreach. Local businesses have expressed interest in becoming Green Businesses and receiving assistance from the County or Zero Waste Kaua'i, then sharing tips with other businesses.

Agenda	Time Stamp	Key Item/Action
<p>7 General Overview of Sections 9 and 10</p>	<p>Part 2. 18:21 to 1:00:30</p>	<p>Could the State Green Recognition Program provide this?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action: Ben to share information on the State of Hawai'i Department of Business, Economic Development & Tourism (DBEDT) Green Business program. • Increase outreach targeted toward large businesses concerning free County services such as waste stream evaluation and guidance regarding diversion options. <p>Materials Marketing. SWAC Members provided the following feedback on proposed materials marketing enhancements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise item regarding proposed use of crushed glass as landfill cover to indicate proposed use of crushed glass for the operations layer of the landfill, as was approved on Big island. • Previous attempts to use crushed glass at the landfill were unsuccessful. Could also consider scrapping that item and replacing with a strategy related to raising the advanced disposal fee (ADF). • Previous attempts to raise the ADF were met with significant legislative resistance – further consideration needed. • Revise promote compost standards item to specify state standards (not national), since compost standards are so regionally specific. <p>Refuse Transfer Stations. SWAC Members provided the following feedback on proposed RTS enhancements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification was requested regarding the decision to consider closing RTs on Sundays versus choosing a weekday given that higher residential use would be expected on weekend days. • Sundays were identified for potential closure because residential refuse collection and commercial collection are not done on Sundays so the County could close the RTs and the landfill for greatest cost savings. The County would need to do counts and analyze the impacts to residents before making a decision. • Public messaging and consistency are important when considering RTS closure. A more complicated RTS-specific closure plan would be difficult to implement. <p>Kekaha Landfill. The latest estimate we've heard is that the current landfill has 7.7 years of remaining life. The future disposal strategy for the County is uncertain. Results of a recently contracted Landfill Mining Feasibility Study should be available by early 2021.</p> <p>SWAC Members provided the following input on the Kekaha Landfill:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Note that Cell 2A and Cell 2B are both open and accepting waste. • Concern was expressed regarding the lack of backup options in the event of Kekaha Landfill closure due to bad weather, scaling issues, equipment breakdowns, etc.

Agenda	Time Stamp	Key Item/Action
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When WMH was managing the landfill, it was part of their contract to provide a wet weather pad. May not have been happening, but recommend implementing as a strategy to allow disposal during rainy conditions. • Action: Allison will investigate compactor breakdown history, current plans for inclement weather, and what else could be done to improve the situation. Include information and strategies to improve reliability in Section 9 of the ISWMP. <p>Disposal Options. Future long-term disposal options include continued operation of a Subtitle D landfill on Kaua'i (either through mining of the closed Kekaha Landfill Phase I area, developing the proposed Ma'alo Road Landfill, or developing a new landfill at another location), use of alternative technologies (such as waste-to-energy [WTE]), or waste export (locally, to H-POWER or the Hawai'i County Landfill, or to mega landfills on the mainland).</p> <p>SWAC Members provided the following input on disposal options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why isn't export to H-POWER considered feasible? Isn't the City and County of Honolulu paying a penalty for not meeting the minimum waste supply requirements? Perhaps there is an opportunity for partially subsidized disposal. Response: The County did recently reach out to H-POWER to discuss potential waste disposal. Both the City and County of Honolulu's ordinance and their contract with Covanta prevent H-POWER from accepting waste from off-island. Waste export to H-POWER is not necessarily impossible, but it is not legally feasible at this time. It's also quite expensive because of transport, handling, and H-POWER tip fees. Also, during prior discussions, the City and County of Honolulu discussed a requirement to take back ash for landfill disposal on Kaua'i. Additionally, there is a lot of opposition to expansion of H-POWER, so the City and County of Honolulu likely would not agree to accept waste generated off-island long term. Note also that both the County and H-POWER would have to meet DOH permitting requirements to export waste from Kaua'i to H-POWER. • Any examples of successful small-scale WTE facilities elsewhere? Kaua'i generates a relatively small amount of waste and cannot support a huge super-efficient WTE facility. Response: Small scale thermal plants do exist in Alaska; however, they struggle to meet air quality requirements and are expensive. Landfilling is much cheaper at relatively smaller scale facilities. • Concern was expressed that the conversation around long term disposal options has been going on for a long time without much progress. It is important to truly understand the cost of each option and how it would meet Kaua'i's long term disposal needs (i.e. would it replace a landfill? Defer development of a new landfill)? • Does the ISWMP address emergency situations (i.e. hurricanes)? Consider adding discussion of a construction or inert landfill to the ISWMP - could also address disposal of ash from WTE.

Agenda	Time Stamp	Key Item/Action
<p>8 Public Comments</p>	<p>Part 2. 1:00:31 to 1:11:16</p>	<p>Response: Emergency situations are typically addressed in Disaster Response Plans, not the ISWMP. The County has identified some potential sites for immediate placement of waste generated during an emergency, and is still working on it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hawai'i is in an air quality attainment area - is it possible that air quality emission limits are less stringent than in other locations, making WTE less costly than anticipated? • When analyzing WTE, keep in mind that Kaua'i already runs on 100% renewable energy for up to nine hours during the midday period. There is no base load to keep a WTE facility running 24 hours per day, which will increase costs. • A better understanding of the cost delta between a C&D/inert landfill and a conventional municipal solid waste (MSW) landfill would be useful. Response: Unless the landfill is only used for truly inert material (i.e. asphalt, rocks), requirements are not much different for a mixed C&D landfill and an MSW landfill. • Public perception or landowner willingness may be different for a C&D/inert landfill than an MSW landfill. • Will the final ISWMP discuss diversion goals and the contribution of individual proposed enhancements to meeting those goals? Response: The final ISWMP will discuss diversion goals such as the Zero Waste Resolution and the Aloha+ Challenge, but will not attempt to estimate the diversion associated with individual proposed enhancements in the ISWMP or establish a new diversion goal. One concern with goals is that funding needs to be available to meet them, and historically, substantial new funding has not been made available. <p>The following public comments were received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support was expressed for all of the composting enhancements included in the ISWMP. • Zero Waste Kaua'i would welcome the opportunity for pilot projects and feels that now would be an ideal time to kick those off as hotels and resorts ramp back up, instead of waiting several years. • Interviews with restaurants indicate that some have found pig farms very eager to take their food waste and others cannot find pig farms willing to take food waste. Would it be possible to set up a brokering system to connect interested parties? Additionally, is it legal for pig farms to take food waste? Composting requires a permit. Response: County staff indicated that there are rules and regulations for pig farms, but smaller farms may not be meeting them, and they're not always enforced. • In response to the request for more immediate compost demonstration project funding, it was noted that DBEDT's annual grant program will be accepting proposals starting in July, which could offer a more immediate source of funding for compost projects with visitor industry partners.

Agenda	Time Stamp	Key Item/Action
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was requested that the ISWMP lead off with a MAJOR focus on reduction, propose a method to develop a baseline against which reduction efforts can be measured, and include specific elements that can be carried out locally (some with State & National coordination) to maximize up front actions to reduce waste generation. • A comment indicated that the ISWMP should include recommendations / mandates to maximize the diversion of all wet organics from the landfill, detail the landfill, environmental, public health and economic benefits of doing so (especially minimizing methane generation) and make specific recommendations for phased in implementation. • It was stated that the ISWMP should include a specific element addressing climate change and the specific greenhouse gas emissions reduction associated with reduced consumption, both outside of our immediate jurisdiction and within the County.
9 Schedule and Next Steps Moving Forward	Part 2. 1:11:17 to 1:12:21	SWAC Members will receive a draft on the ISWMP for review in mid-July and the next SWAC meeting is scheduled for mid-September.
10 Adjournment	Part 2. 1:12:22	No action.