

Kekaha Landfill Phase II Vertical Expansion Draft Environmental Assessment

Public Comments

July 22, 2013

Following are the paraphrased questions and comments received during the public meeting held in Kekaha on July 22, 2013, after the Draft EA was published. The paraphrased questions and comments were annotated on poster paper in front of the meeting attendees, who were encouraged to verify that this transcription is correct, once it is posted on the County's solid waste website.

1. What is the duration of the expansion? Why are we going higher before we do what has already gone through the process? If the (Lateral) EA was done in 2007, there was plenty of time to get all the approvals, was it not done? Why is Cell 2 not ready yet?
2. If we get this (Vertical) EA approved for the additional 5.3 years, will it get us to the new landfill, or do we also need the Cell 2 lateral approval?
3. Regarding new and future expanded diversion programs, including Pay As You Throw (PAYT), Material Recovery Facility (MRF), and Curbside Recycling Program, I think those are in the wrong order. The MRF and curbside recycling should be in the top of the diversion efforts, they should be fastracked because I'm already paying as I throw and I don't need to pay any more as I throw. The key to keeping this landfill from getting full is to divert [municipal solid waste (MSW)]. We really need to move forward and I think the population is ready to do it.
4. I have concerns on the proposed side slopes. I was present during all the expansion proposals meetings and the DOH was very skeptical on the slope of the existing expansion to 80 feet. We are now looking at an increased slope. The 3.5:1 slope has had major runs in it all the way down to exposing the rubbish. It has happened and will happen again. I am questioning whether the County has enough resources and money if there is a large event again for the entire area to go down at that slope and the clean-up. Historically, it did erode. A solution to that is possibly a plastic mesh that will stabilize the slope.
5. Will the current liner handle this amount of weight?
6. Currently, the entrance to the landfill is on the westside (the PMRF side) of the facility. I'm wondering if it would be feasible to change the entrance to the east side. That is a County Road. Therefore, if the slope did come down it would not come down on the road. It gives the landfill a bigger footprint.
7. In pages 2.1 and 2.2 of the Draft EA discussion of the alternative to Excavate Phase I to Construct a New Subtitle D Base Liner System, it cites construction and high costs as reasons for not moving forward. There is no explanation of "construction and high costs." That needs to be addressed. I would like to know what construction and the high costs explained.
8. Phase I is in a SMA are and unlined. Phase I may be seeping into the ocean. You also have to take into effect the erosion we've had on this side over the last two years. If this continues at

the present rate, we could have a serious problem with Phase I with getting closer and closer to the ocean. Is it safe to leave Phase I in place? What have the monitoring stations been showing? I need to be shown why they can do landfill reclamations on the mainland and we can't do it here. It is going to have a health and safety, odor and gas contamination release but that would be over the short-term and monitored by EPA Standards. What is happening in the long-term?

9. The DEA was not available on the website- problem downloading DEA from County website.
10. You talked about a mitigation effort of landscaping. Does this landscaping include full irrigation? Where does the water come from? Are you diverting water from the farming areas for the irrigation?
11. Pre-closure improved views with entrance landscaping and by vegetating the finished slopes of the landfill is a waste of dollars. This is a desert and everything gets brown. You guys don't maintain what is currently out there so why spend money on it? I would spend money on putting a net up to keep the slope from coming down and to plant some grass seeds. Let nature water it.
12. Post-closure landscaping is also a waste of money. I would rather have the money used for recreation. What I envision now since it is a landfill, instead of something like Kakaako and putting the people on it and having the landfill gases come out, let's use it as what it was originally designed for back in the 1970's before it was taken away from the community, as a recreation area for motorbikes and ATVs. Let's make it a usable area.
13. Is the County aware that the PMRF Southern launch pad is proposed to become active? The Southern launch pad is 1500 feet from the landfill and is within the danger zone. The Draft EA is currently accepting public comments.
14. I don't agree with waiting until the landfill is finished for landscaping. If you put a net up, the net is not going to hold back erosion or the slope sliding down. What is going to hold that back is roots. Grasses should be planted up to 80 feet right now. And if you make this a motorbike park the tires are going to be spinning the dirt, etc. Who is going to take care of that? We need someplace for motorbikes, but the upkeep has to be figured into the plan.
15. Is the new landfill site a guarantee? It could be a long time before the new landfill is in operation and sooner or later the County is going to have to do something with Phase I.
16. How is the County going to clean up the mess if a tsunami impacts the current landfill? The dump was there already, but there needs to be some sort of protection for the people.
17. The Host Community Benefits (HCB) need to be equal to what is actually going on in Kekaha.
18. We need to reverse the order of the diversion efforts and make composting and recycling number one.
19. Build a waste to energy plant and burn everything.
20. Is it a federal regulation to cover the landfill trash with soil?

21. Kauai has several dump sites. Those dumps were never dug up and many are still there. What are the public health issues of these dump sites? Does the County know about them? Who is responsible and who tracks these sites?
22. How many thousands of gallons of potable water are used at the KLF? Limited to 31,000 gallons a month as per Draft EA.
23. Will expansion include active separation of MSW to maximize the landfill gas production? e.g. stockpile material that will eventually be banned from the landfill in the future, and start the recycling process now.
24. Where is groundwater going now?
25. Is the construction and demolition material in a separate area at the landfill? Can it be dug up and recycled somewhere to utilize the space for more trash?
26. The County needs to make sure that they are still moving forward with the new landfill even with the KLF expansions.
27. On the Draft EA pages 3-18 and 3-19, it says that site groundwater is non-potable and not suitable for irrigation. That needs to be looked at as that puts a damper on trying to drill a well and irrigate.
28. Shrimp farm contaminations are showing up in the monitoring at the KLF. We need to get our quarter of a million dollars back for those nets we paid for so we can break even. Also, Phase I is leaking periodically as stated in the EA 2012 monitoring results.
29. On page 4-7, it states that KLF is not presently visible from the shoreline. "See Appendix C- The maximum height of the facility would increase 35 feet with the proposed action, thus increasing visibility from surrounding areas other than the shoreline." That is a wrong statement. You can see the dump from the shoreline at Pakala. You can see the dump from the shoreline along here. That needs to be revised.
30. What happens to the infrastructure of the KLF when the Kekaha landfill is closed? Will it be turned over to the community?
31. KLF would be a good place for a transfer station after the landfill is closed.
32. There needs to be an active scavenging group at KLF taking out the recyclables.