

SWAC Meeting Notes – May 4, 2009

Meeting started at 11:00 a.m.
Recess 12:40pm to 12:50 p.m.
Reconvene meeting 12:55 p.m.
Meeting ended 2:20 p.m.

Present: Alex Leonard, Shon Pahio, Nimr Tamimi, Ted Vorfeld,
Steve Okoji, Christine Dochin, Paul Buklarewicz, Mike Kaha,
Russell Ruderman, Jes Foster

Absent: Barbara Bell, Mike Gleason

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

Consultants: Dan Pitzler, Marc Dexter

DOH Rep: Lane Otsu

Approval of April 6, 2009 Minutes: Motion by Alex Leonard, seconded by Paul
Buklarewicz

Adjournment: Motion by Jes Foster, seconded, seconded by Christine Dochin

Agenda

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

- Call to Order and Announcements
- Statements from the public on agenda items – one speaker (a representative of Sustainable Kohala) stated his opinion that incineration or new technologies would be quite expensive and money better spent on zero waste.
- Approval of minutes from April 6, 2009 SWAC meeting
- Unfinished Business
 1. Comments, questions by SWAC members on previously presented materials
 2. Finalize Goal Statement for draft Plan
- Informational Items
- Future Agenda Items
- Meeting Announcements
 1. Tuesday, June 2, 2009, Aupuni Center Conference Room

101 Pauahi Street, Hilo, Hawai'i

- Adjournment

Discussion

General Discussion

- Alex asked about landfill SHSL expansion – are the feasibility studies completed? Lono responded that an initial feasibility study has been completed and is currently undergoing review by the Department. Much additional work would be needed to permit the expansion.
- Mike Kaha asked for an update on WHSL composting facility. Linda said that due to budget constraints, RFP will not be awarded; instead the mulching operation will be moved to WHSL.
- Ted asked if all mulch is used; what about the tonnage? Linda provided last year's tonnages and responded that in West Hawai'i, the County has had to do marketing to find users for mulch. In East Hawai'i, all mulch is used immediately. An ordinance is in place to implement 25% of current tip fee per ton of organics at County landfills.

Discussion and Vote on IRSWMP Goals

- Dan asked the group if they had any objections to the sustainability definition. No one had any objections. He asked the group about the zero waste compromise language. There were no comments from the group. Jess motioned to accept; Paul seconded the motion. Outcome: Motion carries unanimously, and the IRSWMP goals were accepted by the committee.

New Business – Conversion Technologies Overview and IRSWMP Residuals Management Strategy

- Russell asked if there are any advantages in terms of CO₂ emissions from the conversion process. Ted responded that there are no advantages compared to other thermal technologies; however, other emissions such as dioxin have to be dealt with.
- Jess asked if there is a way to make the RFP wording for a new technology advantageous to zero waste. Lono responded that every vendor to date has asked for some assurance of waste flow.
- Jess asked if put-or-pay can be integrated to come up with shortfall. Lono responded that the County and vendors must manage the risk. Mike D. said that the Bale & Barge company is meeting with Mayor Kenoi; they are making money on back-haul – still an option. Mike K. wanted to know how Bale & Barge fits into conversion technology or path for Hawai'i County scale of operation (efficiency and cost). Lono wanted to know who else is doing barging? Dan responded that waste is currently being barged from Alaska to Washington State, and they reviewed barging, train and trucking for Portland Oregon recently. Steve wanted to know what NYC was doing.
- Angela asked how greenhouse gas legislation would affect the technologies, in particular their economics, is future strict legislation for LF GHG possible? Dan responded 'yes'.

According to Lono, the cost of landfilling will go up over time. Angela would like specifics for each technology on how it fits zero waste model. Ted responded that capital costs would also be required for zero waste activities.

- Zero waste seems to be missing from the discussion about new technologies. Dan responded that the new technologies are just one possible element of the plan. Put energy to zero waste effort and it would reduce waste now. Remember that zero waste is the “path” to zero waste.
- Ted asked if Council is going to issue RFP. Lono responded that it appeared likely that this could occur. Ted said that it didn’t make any sense to issue RFP – so point out the issues.
- Alex said that SWAC would like to make a recommendation as to the best option. If recommendation is no RFP, the fall back position is to make sure they do a proper evaluation. Mike K. said “If RFP, then decide” slide alleviates many of his concerns. Recommends that the council have this slide in front of them.

Discussion of 3 Residuals Management Strategies and Recommendation

Alex proposed discussing the 3 strategies slides then voting to prioritize them. Dan facilitated a round-robin discussion where each SWAC member discussed likes and dislikes of the strategies and prioritized them one through three. After the initial round of discussion and voting, the strategy to issue an RFP for a new conversion technology was the lowest priority for all SWAC members. The favored strategy was evenly split between trucking and expanding the South Hilo Sanitary Landfill (SHSL).

Additional discussion ensued during which a number of issues were clarified. Paul suggested that if trucking was done that it be mandated that the trucks use biofuel. In response to a question about operations, Lono clarified that the Konno decision requires County staff to operate the landfill face at any facility in the County. He also mentioned that before lining landfill cells in East Hawai’i, they should model the leachate volume (to estimate financial liability of expansion).

After additional discussion, the group came to consensus that the preferred strategy would be to: (1) Evaluate South Hilo Sanitary Landfill (SHSL) expansion, with preliminary engineering and detailed cost estimate; (2) Get State Department of Health buy-in on wetlands treatment (Shon pointed out that leachate treatment is new and that is the reason landfill is back on the table.)

Ted asked if wetlands treatment is not viable, is there enough life in SHSL to switch to trucking? Lono responded ‘minimal, but yes’. Ted asked if there is time to get the 7-acre cell at SHSL ready to go in 3 years. Lono responded yes, but not in 2 years. Also, they can do the engineering, permitting, and cost estimates for both the 7-acre cell and quarry sites concurrently.

Linda suggested calling quarry site acquisition resource park (LF, Maintenance Facility, Disaster debris).

Alex proposed that SWAC adopt the three residuals management strategies discussed in the following priority order:

-
1. Expand the SHSL
 2. Truck waste from the SHSL to the WHSL
 3. Issue and RFP for a conversion technology

Russell seconded the proposal. Vote: Adopted unanimously.

Shon feels that if they only voted on residuals then other items could be perceived as less meaningful. Dan pointed out that this is strictly for residuals; after Zero Waste initiatives. Russell said he shares Shon's concern and that they should make sure that when it gets to sound bites, they show equal emphasis on Zero Waste initiatives. Mike D. said that they may need another meeting to go over the implementation plan details. Ted pointed out that the executive summary should make things clear. Terin pointed out that today's vote was to recommend No RFP to the Council. Shon said that he would like an Executive Summary in layman's language.

Information Items for County

- Green Team County Cross-Collaboration with Departments.
- Paul: Art in Recycling.

Future Agenda

- Implementation Plan Review
- Public Meetings