

SWAC Meeting Notes – February 2, 2009

Meeting started at 11:10am

Recess 12:35pm to 12:40p

Reconvene 12:40pm

Meeting ended 2:20pm

Present: Barbara Bell, Paul Buklarewicz, Christine Dochin, Mike Kaha, Alex Leonard, Steve Okoji, Shon Pahio, Ted Vorfeld

Absent: Mike Gleason, Russell Ruderman, Jes Foster, Nimr Tamimi

Staff Present: Lono Tyson, Mike Dworsky, Terin Gloor, Linda Peters, Suzanne Andrade

Consultants: Dan Pitzler, Ron Terry

Zero Waste Consultants: Richard Anthony, Rich Flammer

DOH Rep: Lane Otsu

Approval of December 15, 2008 Minutes: Motion by Ted Vorfeld, seconded by Paul Buklarewicz with changes as noted

Adjournment: Motion by Paul Buklarewicz, seconded by Mike Kaha

Agenda

In accordance with the agenda, this meeting included the following topics:

- Introductory remarks
- Statements from the public on agenda items – two speakers made statements made about the need to consider risk and uncertainty in evaluating options, support for the zero waste strategy, and support for source separation instead of spending big dollars on new technology.
- Approval of minutes from December 15, 2008 meeting
- New Business
 - CH2M HILL presentation of the draft Administration and Funding section
 - Summary results of December public meetings
 - Voting exercise to establish importance weights for objectives used to analyze residuals management options
 - Goals and objectives for the ISWMP update
 - Presentation of draft Zero Waste plan
- Announcements - none

-
- Adjournment

Discussion

Discussion about Administration and Funding Section

- Tasks are never “easy”. We should not insinuate otherwise.
- Illegal dumping – changing from criminal penalty to civil would have many advantages. Then, the County wouldn’t have to rely on police to enforce. Could use attorneys and have Department staff issue citations.
- User pay impact to poor. Now poor have little to throw away and little access to recycling. Dan indicated that he thought it would be worse under user pay.

Discussion about Weighting Process

- What do ratings on safety mean? A good discussion about the importance of safety and that some processes may be inherently safer than others regardless of how well systems are designed. The human element is always a concern. Worker safety is also *immediate*. Public safety is also a direct issue. Could you look at difference in insurance rates for different systems. Dan said he’d look, but such information is typically hard to generalize by technology or system. Dan will run a sensitivity on worker safety at 50 points as well as the consensus value.
- There was divergence of opinion on the relative importance of minimizing greenhouse gas emissions. Most felt it was quite important, but two SWAC members felt strongly that the relative impact of landfills on overall global warming was miniscule and it shouldn’t be something we focus on too much.
- Cost of abatement of Green House Gases is an issue that needs to be considered. Dan said that would be included in costs.
- Water quality was seen as important because of unlined landfills and the sensitive ocean environment.
- Jobs issue – is it really government’s function to generate lots of jobs? Lots of low-paying (e.g., pick line) jobs may not be all that welcome.
- Cost – some believe it’s most important of all factors, but most don’t. Dan will run sensitivities on cost.

Goals

- Ted felt that we should strike greenhouse gas minimization as a goal. He also would prefer a native Hawaiian word rather than zero waste – Ho`oiki, li`i, ha`a ha`a – imply a more attainable goal than zero waste. It was suggested that we check with language expert at University of Hilo for proper interpretation of words and assistance with this.
- There was a discussion about how we could work on the goals within the legality of Sunshine laws. It was agreed that it would be best for ideas to go through Mike and back to SWAC members.

Zero Waste

- Value of materials – it needs to be clarified that these values do not include transportation costs to markets. Lono requested more detail on all cost assumptions. Rick clarified that you’re currently burying the \$10 million of value in materials in County landfills.
- Barbara felt that reuse had higher value than shown here on the island.
- Many of the programs decentralize costs
- Lono – be sure to not say that things are “easy” for the County.
- How do zero waste and the ISWMP relate to each other? Will one dilute the other? Barbara thought we would integrate the ZW plan into the ISWMP prior to presentation to Council.
- Barbara requested timelines that specify logical sequences for programs. Rick felt that the ZW and ISWMP programs can mesh well. There are many common elements.
- Jon Olson said that the Puna Community Development Plan followed zero waste principles.
- Lono noted the problem of losing institutional memory as time goes on.
- Barbara stated that if we “invest” in ZW vision, politicians and the community will support it more than standard infrastructure upgrades.
- Lono – don’t implement programs without proper infrastructure, funding, and staff.
- Barbara – timeline will help keep the horse ahead of the cart.
- Mike and Dan discussed implementation plan section – we plan on bringing forward three thematic implementation plans for SWAC consideration. Preferred plan will probably be a blend of the three.
- Bob Jacobson will ask for Council acceptance of the ZW plan by resolution. He understands that the Council sees zero waste as a goal, not an absolute.
- James Weatherford said no significant residual left over if ZW is implemented – and that we must acknowledge that some solutions are mutually exclusive. Dan and Rick clarified that there will still be some residual waste to be managed for many years.
- There was some interest in a motion to accept ZW plan at least in principle, but there was no second. Alex stated that he needed more time to read and think about ZW study, in particular the organics ban and how it would work. Shon felt they needed more time. Lono felt that public input would be very important also.
- Bob Jacobson wondered why Pay As You Throw was a goal? The response was that this was not a previously stated County policy or goal, but rather something that SWAC was considering as a guiding principle.