

SWAC Meeting Notes – October 20, 2008

Meeting started at 11:07am

Recess 12:42pm to 12:55pm

Resume meeting 12:55pm

Meeting ended 1:50pm

Present: Barbara Bell, Paul Buklarewicz, Christine Dochin, Jes Foster, Mike Kaha, Alex Leonard, Steve Okoji, Shon Pahio, Nimr Tamimi, Ted Vorfeld, DOH Rep: Lane Otsu

Absent: Mike Gleason, Russell Ruderman

Staff Present: Bobby Jean Leithead-Todd, Nelson Ho, Mike Dworsky, Terin Gloor, Suzanne Andrade

Consultants: Dan Pitzler, Marc Dexter

Approval of September 22, 2008 Minutes:

Motion by Alex Leonard, seconded by Jes Foster

Adjournment:

Motion by Ted Vorfeld, seconded by Jes Foster

Agenda

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

- Introductory remarks
- Statements from the public on agenda items - no statements
- Approval of minutes from September 22, 2008 meeting
- New Business
 - CH2M HILL presentation of the draft Collection and Transfer section of the ISWMP update
 - Results of SWAC ranking of Recycling, Bioconversion, and Markets options
 - 2009 SWAC meeting schedule
 - Barbara Bell's September 21, 2008 letter to fellow Solid Waste Advisory Committee members
- Announcements - none
- Adjournment

Discussion

Discussion about Collection and Transfer Presentation

- Look for ways to increase payloads from recycling and transfer stations above the current 10.9 ton average. New recycling and transfer stations will have the capability to accommodate larger, walking floor trailers which would increase payloads.
- What are the operating costs of upgraded stations? Hard to say at this time - would depend on the services provided.
- Positives of recycling and transfer stations: centralized locations that help provide recycling opportunities.
- Would the current \$139/hh/ mo. cost of transfer system pay for curbside service? Probably not.
- Do costs increase for multi-stream collection? Yes.
- Norm LeMay: Economies of scale are important in collection. Multiple haulers with few stops on a block makes costs go up dramatically. Current system makes efficient collection challenging.
- How does non-competitive franchise system with rate regulation work? Who collects from whom? Discussion ensued about different ways this is done in various states.
- Could there be a hybrid system with optional collection service in designated franchise pickup zones? Yes, this could be a transitional strategy.
- Do any condos haul their own trash? It may happen, but it's uncommon: multi-family and condos all generally have collection service.
- Haulers do not get a diversion credit for hauling from condos because the diversion credit is based on single-family residences.
- It was suggested that garbage plus recyclables makes the most sense for collection. Green waste may be less necessary because many handle materials on site and there are transfer locations accepting materials.
- If commercial businesses were allowed to deliver waste at recycling and transfer stations, the County would need to consider if the charge be the same as at landfill, or higher to handle the additional costs.
- Does Hawai'i DOH have additional requirements if station volume exceeds 40 tons/per month? Some minor changes, but not substantive effects to operations.
- Some concern expressed that there is not a specific chapter in plan for commercial waste.
- Some surprise that annual savings would be only \$200-400,000 if station operating hours are reduced. We should note that adding full-time attendants would increase costs: thus if we think full-time attendants are needed, the savings from reduced operating hours would be greater.

-
- Higher payloads for hauling waste from stations would lower costs.
 - Station operating hours should be tailored to specific situations: many people want to deliver waste after work: some like to deliver in morning on the way to work.
 - Suggestion: record customer delivery times to assess when customers use stations most frequently. The Solid Waste Division has done this in the past and could be done again if there are specific questions that need to be answered.
 - Residents may just drop off waste at the gate if it's not open when they arrive. Some expressed that this would probably not be a long-term problem – people would eventually adjust.
 - Phased implementation of station operating hour changes may reduce the total volume of complaints.
 - For PAYT at stations, would need to limit large items like furniture so store owners don't use stations designated for residential use.
 - Accepting money at stations would not be a good idea. One reason is auditors generally want more than one person handling money to prevent theft, which would substantially increase station operating costs.
 - Mike clarified that the Ocean View station is still under litigation. Concerns were expressed by two persons that live near the proposed facility.
 - Reasons for suggesting stations for closure include availability of other options, reconstruction needed, and road safety.
 - Closing some stations may increase load size and result in savings.
 - Quality vs. quantity of service is an important consideration.
 - User complaints about closing stations would occur.
 - If larger loads, could we haul from Hilo side to Kona?
 - Hauling to the final destination is best vs. multiple transfers.
 - Compacting recyclables could require additional staff to operate compactor. It would be best if transfer station attendants could operate compactor.
 - One concept the County is considering, is to compact loads at some more central stations i.e., loads from smaller remote stations would be dropped off and compacted at another station rather than going straight to landfill.
 - The consultants were asked what constitutes a "large" transfer station. Hard to generalize, but many stations are 500-1,000 tons per day – some are 3,000 tons per day.
 - If curbside, what should the County do with transfer stations? Could be converted to address bulky items.
 - One idea for curbside would be to put bins at the end of collector roads to serve persons in very rural, hard to get to, areas.

-
- Norm LeMay: Changing to curbside would take a long time and be politically challenging. A franchise system with rate regulation would eventually result in fewer, more efficient haulers.

Discussion about Ballot Results for Recycling, Bioconversion, and Markets Options

- One SWAC member expressed a preference for the “ranking” method that was used for source reduction options over the 1-5 method used for recycling options.
- How do you enforce mandatory recycling? It was discussed that enforcement could be minimal to none – some increase in recycling would occur simply because “it’s the law”.
- Support for recycling is good, but carrots and sticks are needed for it to work well.
- Mandate recycling for commercial as well as residential, and include bans at the landfill.
- If there was a differential tip fee, the fees should be used to help enhance recycling.
- Standardizing ballots statistically would be possible.
- Considering assigning an “effort factor” to each alternative. For example, some alternatives can be implemented without much cost. Define by cost and effort and deciding what to do and how much you’ll spend.
- Need to understand relationships between options and where contradictions occur, how options affect each other.
- A decision map or flow chart might be helpful for prioritizing options.
- What are the goals and drivers – it’s important to identify cost savings in proposed program.
- The economy and politics factor into development of a plan.
- Education is an important component to gaining public acceptance of the plan.
- Include evaluation of “do nothing” option i.e., what would it cost to continue our current path?
- What things to emphasize to County Council
 - Upgrading some but closing other transfer stations
 - Challenges of hauling/collection/transfer operation in geographically remote regions
 - Changing permits and reconstruction of transfer stations
 - Mandatory recycling (permit issue is a precursor)
- Pilot study for modifying one chute for recyclables.