

## SWAC Meeting Notes – December 15, 2008

---

Meeting started at 11:10am

Recess 12:30pm to 12:40pm

Meeting ended 2:00pm

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

**Absent:** Russell Ruderman

**Staff Present:** Bobby Jean Leithead-Todd, Mike Dworsky, Tiffany Pacheco

**Consultants:** Dan Pitzler, Marc Dexter

**Approval of November 21, 2008 Minutes:**

Motion by Christinie Dochin, seconded by Jes Foster

**Adjournment:**

Motion by Mike Gleason, 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 November 21, 2008 meeting
- New Business
  - CH2M HILL presentation of the draft Residuals Management section of the ISWMP update
  - Presentation of evaluation process for residuals options - multi-criteria decision analysis and analysis of risks, including discussion of draft objectives hierarchy and performance measures
  - Goals and objectives for the ISWMP update
  - Solid Waste Advisory Committee preferences for the HHW/e-Waste section
  - December public meetings and next steps
- Announcements - none
- Adjournment

---

## Discussion

### Discussion about Residuals Management Presentation

- In bale and barge, what type of materials have been proposed for backhaul? (aggregates – not aware of any others) Is the backhaul guaranteed? (Yes, but if problems arose with backhaul, contractor would lose money and eventually it would become the County's problem as well.)
- How long would we need to “wait and see” on emerging technologies? (would probably be some good information available when next plan update is being conducted i.e., 5 years.) That might be about right to allow the County to address other issues like current landfills and trucking etc.
- How many tons/day can these technologies process and how well do they scale down? (All are somewhat capital intensive, but they're less so than mass-burn WTE. Facilities proposed in LA and Ottawa are in the 300-500 tpd range.)
- If additional recycling occurs, how long could landfills last? (Hard to say exactly, but adding 5-10 years to life of WHSL wouldn't be too surprising.)
- Does any technology eliminate landfill? (No, some have the potential for less than 10% of total to landfill.)
- If we used the \$ we would spend on technology instead on diversion, our options may improve in future years.
- Path forward – an action plan is necessary. “Wait and see” doesn't work well as policy. We need to spin this to be seen as an action plan – could be if presented correctly. Ruling out options would be perceived as taking action.
- As an island society we have an opportunity to demand the implementation of zero waste principles. Is zero waste a trend in other areas also? (Yes, many communities are moving this way such as San Francisco, Seattle, Vancouver B.C. and many smaller ones as well.) Can you force producers to take more responsibility? (It's a complex process, but it's growing in popularity.)
- We should consider setting a spending benchmark.
- How would you implement expansion of SHSL, and how would it affect contract with WHSL? (As discussed, it would be first a lateral expansion, then expansion into quarries. It should have no effect on WHSL contract.)
- What is minimum tonnage in WSHL contract? (if less than 150 tpd average in a month, the County is required to negotiate an increase in tip fee, but it's not a firm “put-or-pay” like the recent WTE proposal would have required.) The County should use caution with any put or pay provisions in any future procurement.
- Can the modular WTE systems produce energy? (Yes, but challenges doing this cost-effectively in remote area with small quantities and a reluctant electric utility.) The issue of negotiating cost/unit with utility keeps coming up. How can we make this a non issue? (Bobby Jean described the utility-PUC renewable energy relationship. Ted and

---

Bobby Jean pointed out some of the complex issues that affect the willingness of the utility to take on more new renewable load. For example, wind is quite variable and requires pretty much full backup with other sources; the utility doesn't need any more baseload and has already maxed out the proportion of renewables it's required to take; the advantage of pricing at avoided cost or average cost varies with energy prices. For H-power contract was a challenge: the mayor had to twist arms to get an appropriate price.)

- Council member Greenwell commented that maybe political clout isn't what needed, instead it's a "better picture". In the big picture, there is money available at the Federal level to address near shore reef and endangered specie issues. The County should actively attempt to make solid waste part of a bigger environmental management issue and use Federal money to develop an MBT system. The soil products could be use to provide good bedding underneath any new golf courses and limit used of pesticides that wash out to ocean and damage the marine ecology. Could also be used to for growing crops as part of a biodiesel production facility. The Federal money is available NOW and the County needs to go after it quickly.
- How far from residences do MBT facilities need to be located? (Depends on atmospheric conditions, but improperly run facilities can be smelled from 1-2 miles away. The key is to operate the facilities well and prevent anaerobic conditions that cause odors. A lower-tech MBT might be feasible if you were at least 5 miles from any sensitive receptor.)
- Need to do something in the Ka`u area. Mike pointed out that Waiohinu design may be included in the design for Pahoia, which would reduce the time needed to build the facility.

### **Discussion about Value Modeling Analysis**

- In objectives hierarchy, should we include something about public convenience? (Could be important for collection versus transfer issue, but probably not if focusing just on landfills or recovery systems.)
- Are liability and avoided costs included? (Avoided costs are included, but liability is a risk issue that would be part of the risk analysis.)
- It was agreed to add an objective for reducing the quantity of waste going to landfill. Beyond any cost implication, it's a good thing to extend the life of existing landfills and not have to go to new locations.
- Do all options meet Federal/state requirements? (Yes, that's the assumption.)

### **Goals**

- PAYT is becoming a preferred option for many on SWAC, but we'd need a really good plan including implementation. It's bound to be controversial.
- Mike D. thought that PAYT was not really a goal, but more an option under the right circumstances.

- 
- Another suggestion that many liked: State that SWAC prefers no new RFP on conversion technology until we reach a reasonable diversion rate.
  - Did zero waste resolution come with a plan? (Draft implementation plan is currently undergoing County review.)

### **Mission Statement**

- Include the triple bottom line concept.
- Barbara clarified that the “model” concept means for other island communities and the cultural aspects of behavior change.
- Educational value of HI-5 and similar programs is high.

### **PAYT Discussion**

- PAYT may have to be phased in over time.
- There’s general agreement on SWAC on PAYT as a concept: Mike believes that there’d be many implementation challenges not yet foreseen.
- PAYT could be seen as a double payment – property tax AND when delivering material.
- Coupon distribution system discussion: What about renters? – would need to get coupons from owners.
- What about an on-site vending machine or honor system with sign up?
- PAYT would make it clear that it’s not free to throw away refuse.
- People may appreciate getting something for their taxes.
- Should we make PAYT coupon system a plan recommendation? Mike D. thought implementation would be difficult today without fully staffed transfer stations.
- Would need to have an illegal dumping education program, thus implementation would not be immediate (implementing too quickly would ensure failure).
- Plan would require some consulting to develop specific recommendations on how to implement. Probably would want to include a pilot project.
- Plan goal could be PAYT and should include a general implementation plan.
- This could be combined with reduced hours and possibly closing some stations. The current economy might provide a good rationale for reducing level of service from transfer system.
- How does PAYT affect recycling rates? (Evidence is 5-13%.)
- Home based composting combined with ban on organics and free units to residents would be a good plan.
- Legislation may be required to implement PAYT.

---

**Other Issues**

- Dan presented results of SWAC member ballots for HHW/e-Waste options.
- Lane gave an update on the status of e-Waste legislation.
- Barbara asked for any additional comments on the goals statement.
- Mike presented the 2009 meeting schedule: it's possible that Council could change some dates, but we should make plans to follow the schedule until informed otherwise.