

Landfill Advisory Committee (LAC)
Meeting #7
Monday, April 4, 2022 – 2:00 pm
Kapolei Hale, Conference Room A

MEETING MINUTES

ATTENDANCE

LAC Members Present:

Steven Chang, Suzanne Jones, Emmett Kinney, Cynthia Rezentes, Trisha Kehaulani Watson

Project Team Present:

Dr. Roger Babcock, Jr. (ENV Director), Michael O'Keefe (ENV Deputy Director), Chris Hirota (Refuse Division Chief), Ahmad Sadri (Energy Recovery Administrator), Kelly Kehoe (Refuse Disposal Facilities Superintendent), Josh Nagashima (Project Manager), Julie Leano (Planner), Richard Nieves (Planner), Luciana Bishay (IT), John Katahira (Limtiaco Consulting Group), Mike Kaiser (HDR), Ayako Nakasato (HDR)

I. CALL TO ORDER (John Katahira, Facilitator)

John Katahira welcomed the group and called the meeting to order at 2:07 pm. It was noted that this meeting is 100% in person and no one is participating online. The technology was set up only to record the meeting.

II. ROLL CALL (John Katahira, Facilitator)

John Katahira proceeded with roll call in alphabetical order. Quorum was met with 5 of the 8 LAC members present at the meeting.

John Katahira proceeded with providing a snapshot of the meeting roadmap and noted that one more meeting is left in June (LAC Meeting #8) remains after this meeting. John noted he was made aware of neighborhood board concerns that public participation in this siting process has been limited. He mentioned that LAC meetings are only one step of the entire landfill siting process and that there are opportunities for the public to participate in the project moving forward, namely the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) phase.

Trisha Watson indicated that she shared the same concern as the neighborhood board and that she had concerns about the lack of transparency and the opportunity communities have had to weigh in. She further expressed that she does not know if she agrees that an EIS-level process offers the same opportunity as the decision making in the LAC process. John Katahira commented that transparency in the process was done to the best of the ENV's ability provided the circumstances of having to hold the meetings virtually. He also commented that recordings of all meetings have made available at the City's website and anyone has had the opportunity to provide written comments.

III. ORAL COMMENTS ON ALL AGENDA ITEMS

John Katahira reminded everyone that the meeting is being recorded and will be posted on the ENV website where information from the previous meetings and all the work to date from the LAC process is located.

He proceeded with presenting the procedures for oral testimony.

1. Firstly, public comments will be taken from each registered person. It was indicated that one (1) person registered to provide comments.
2. Each speaker will be asked to approach the front to provide their testimony at the table with the microphone provided.
3. State your name and agenda item on which you are speaking.
4. Comments will be limited to two (2) minutes. When reminded of the time limit, conclude your remarks as promptly as possible.
5. If one did not register but wish to provide comments, raise your hand to be acknowledged by the Facilitator and approach the table and microphone to speak.

John Katahira acknowledged that one individual registered to provide oral comments and called the individual up to testify.

Jay Sturdevant, Integrated Resources Program Manager at Pearl Harbor National Memorial and Hono'uli'uli National Historic Site (Park). He indicated that the Park would like to assist in finding a suitable landfill location and they have significant concerns in regard one site location near the Park. He explained the Park's significance is due to its preservation and commemoration of the only incarceration camp used during World War II from 1943 to 1946. The camp held over 360 Japanese American citizens and over 4,000 Japanese and German POWs. He added that the event was a significant tragic event in our history, and the park is there to preserve the archaeological and cultural landscape of that history; provide opportunities for the public to engage and connect with the location; and seek it as a place of healing. The Park was created in 2015, part of the presidential proclamation through the Antiquities Act (by President Barack Obama) and then was changed to a national historic site in 2019 through Congress. He indicated that the Park site itself has work to do to become a national site that can accept visitors. He concluded that they look forward to being part of the process and feel that it is critical for the park, in order to meet its mission, to be able to preserve a sense of isolation in a sense of place that can help tell that historic story.

Trisha Watson inquired whether the Park has plans to expand its site or its boundaries. Jay Sturdevant responded that Congress established the authorized boundaries of the Park and that they would need to go through Congress to expand the boundaries. He has not heard discussion on expanding the boundaries and noted that the Park does not own all the land within the boundaries yet.

Trisha Watson inquired what an appropriate boundary for the Park would be in regard to the relative isolation boundary that the site represents. Jay Sturdevant responded that this is a challenge for the Park as well as other parks that commemorate the Japanese American incarceration around the country. He indicated the approach would be to work with surrounding partners to provide the benefits and needs of the area. They are legislated to work within their boundaries, and outside the boundary, they must ensure that the public is aware of the significance of the Park and how the historic story may be impacted. The intent of the Park is to provide an experience of the camps and have a sense of the broader landscape that connects outside of the Park's boundaries.

Trisha Watson inquired whether any cultural landscape studies have been conducted. It was indicated that a cultural landscape inventory is in progress. Trisha Watson requested a copy of the cultural landscape report and other data be provided to the City (Josh Nagashima) as it becomes available to help the LAC in the process.

An opportunity was offered for other participants to provide comments before proceeding. There were no other comments at the time.

John Katahira proceeded to the next agenda item to approve the prior meeting minutes.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

John Katahira requested a motion to approve the meeting minutes for LAC Meeting #6 held on March 7, 2022. A motion was made by Cynthia Rezentes to approve the meeting minutes. Suzanne Jones seconded the motion. There were no objections from the committee members and the minutes were approved for the record.

Trisha Watson inquired about Corporation Counsel's attendance in the meeting. Josh Nagashima responded that Corporation Counsel is not in attendance and indicated that they represent and advise the City and are not providing a representative for the LAC. John Katahira clarified if the concerns discussed during Meeting #6 were discussed with Corporation Counsel and their response shared. Josh Nagashima confirmed. Trisha Watson commented that she also contacted Office of Information Practices (OIP) and does not feel like some of the concerns that were brought up throughout the meetings have been adequately discussed, which is why she asked about Corporation Counsel's attendance.

V. PRESENTATION – Objective Criteria Evaluation and Site Scores/Rankings (Josh Nagashima, ENV PM)

Prior to the start of the presentation, Trisha Watson commented that she contacted OIP related to the first bullet point on the slide presentation, "Weights submitted by LAC blindly and anonymously". She expressed concern whether any of the LAC work should be done anonymously in accordance with the Sunshine Law and indicated that a formal request be submitted to OIP. She continued that this came up in the first meeting, but she doesn't feel that it has been adequately addressed. Josh Nagashima responded that he can put in a request with OIP. He further added that Corporation Counsel did not indicate any issues with the scoring process and defined it as a means and method process. Trisha Watson further expressed her concern that this process being done anonymously goes against the spirit of the Sunshine Law.

Josh Nagashima commented on the concern raised with regard to the opportunities for the public to be involved in the process. He noted that all the LAC meetings have been open to the public, a residential poll was completed in the beginning of the process, the website advertised public comments and the City has been accepting comments at any point in time throughout the process. He indicated that the intent was to create an open process to the fullest extent possible to address issues up front and is open to suggestions on improving the process.

1. Objective Criteria Evaluation

Josh Nagashima opened the presentation with a refresher on the scoring process. He explained that the LAC submitted their weights blindly and anonymously through MS Forms after Meeting #5. The subjective ratings were also completed and submitted anonymously after Meeting #6, and were based on the LAC member's experience and expertise. At approximately the same time, the objective criteria ratings were being determined by the City and were based on the measurable parameters. Using both the subjective and objective ratings and weights, the City calculated the scores for each criteria for each site using the formula (Score = Average Weight x

Average Rating). Each site score was then calculated as the sum of all the criteria scores which resulted in a final score. The rankings of the sites were determined by their final scores. The spreadsheet of the weights and ratings were provided to the LAC and posted on the website.

A map of the six (6) potential landfill sites was presented:

- Area 2, Site 1
- Area 3, Sites 1, 2 and 3
- Area 6, Site 1
- Area 7, Site 1

The objective criteria were defined as being based on unbiased quantifiable facts and observations and is not influenced by personal feelings, prejudices, perceptions, or desires.

Trisha Watson inquired where the definition of objective criteria came from. Josh Nagashima responded stating it was an online dictionary definition.

The average of the objective criteria weights were presented for each criteria. The average weights were based on responses from six (6) LAC members.

The objective criteria final average ratings were determined based on measurable criteria. The following criteria values were highlighted:

- “Time” is the same value for all the sites due to no additional time being identified.
- “Important Agricultural Lands”: Four (4) sites were identified to not be within Important Agricultural Lands and rated “6”.
- “Wells within 1,000 feet”: Four (4) sites were identified to have no municipal wells within 1,000 feet and rated “6”.

Site 6.1 was revealed as the top ranked site based on objective criteria scores.

Suzanne Jones requested clarification that all sites above the No Pass Zone criteria have a rating of zero, which essentially means this criteria is not included in the evaluation because all sites have the same rating even though the criteria highest weighted issue of importance. Josh Nagashima indicated this is the case and that the importance of the No Pass Zone criteria will weigh in when comparing the sites scores to the maximum scores, which can be the basis for the LAC’s recommendation. John Katahira adds that there will be an opportunity for each of the LAC members to write a statement addressing their concerns, which will included in the final report. Trisha Watson expressed support for Suzanne Jones’ concerns.

2. Site Scores and Rankings

The subjective criteria final average ratings and scores were presented. It was noted that all eight (8) members provided input on the subjective criteria scoring.

Site 3.1 was revealed as the top ranked site based on subjective criteria scores.

The Final Site Rankings and Total Scores were revealed as follows:

- Rank 6 (Score 3,596) – Area 2, Site 1 Hale’iwa near Kawaihoa Road (Trisha Watson asked if this was the Kamehameha Schools land, which was confirmed.)
- Rank 5 (Score 3,634) – Area 3, Site 3 Wahiawā
- Rank 4 (Score 3,685) – Area 3, Site 2 Wahiawā
- Rank 3 (Score 3,841) – Area 3, Site 1 Wahiawā
- Rank 2 (Score 4,061) – Area 7, Site 1 Kapolei/Waipahu near Kunia Road

(Trisha Watson asked if this was the site near the Hono'uli'uli National Historic Site, which was confirmed.)

- Rank 1 (Score 4,200) – Area 6, Site 1 Wahiawā near Kunia Road

Trisha Watson sought clarification on whether the top three (3) ranked sites would proceed to the EIS process, assuming none of the sites would not be eliminated due to the drinking water issue. Josh Nagashima stated that is what is being considered. Cynthia Rezentes clarified if the Mayor has final authority and can accept the LAC recommendations or decide differently. Josh Nagashima confirmed. Trisha Watson further inquired where the LAC can provide input on the rankings for additional consideration. Josh Nagashima indicated that the report contents would be discussed later in the presentation and would outline where the LAC can provide their group and individual recommendations.

John Katahira provided a brief explanation on the numbering of the landfill sites. He explained that the process started with twelve (12) large areas which was subsequently reduced to seven (7) areas. Site numbers were then used to identify the landfill sites within each of the larger areas.

Trisha Watson questioned why expanding Waimānalo Gulch was not provided as an option. Josh Nagashima confirmed that the City would not be pursuing an extension and made the assumption that the landfill will be out of capacity by the deadline if C&D is accepted.

VI. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION – Landfill Advisory Committee Report and Potential Benefits for Landfill Host Community

1. Contents of the Landfill Advisory Committee Report (Mike Kaiser, HDR)

Mike Kaiser explained that the next step in the LAC process will be to draft the Landfill Advisory Committee Report that documents the process engaged in by the LAC, details the scoring process, records the results, and binds together the supporting documents from the process.

Mike Kaiser presented the outline of the report contents as follows:

- Section 1 – Executive Summary
 - 1.1 Introduction
 - 1.2 Need for a Landfill Site and History
 - 1.3 Landfill Advisory Committee
 - 1.4 The Site Identification Process
 - 1.5 The Evaluation Process
 - 1.6 Findings and Committee Recommendations
- Section 2 – Introduction
 - 2.1 Need for a Landfill Site
 - 2.2 History and Lead up to the Landfill Advisory Committee
- Section 3 – Landfill Advisory Committee
 - 3.1 Landfill Advisory Committee's Role
 - 3.2 Members of the Landfill Advisory Committee
 - 3.3 Overview of the Committee's Process
 - 3.4 Public Outreach and Incorporation into the LAC Process
- Section 4 – Identification of Potential Landfill Sites
 - 4.1 Prior Landfill Siting Studies
 - 4.2 Parameters and Restrictions for Landfill Siting

4.3 Geographic Information System (GIS) Based Evaluation

- Section 5 – Site Scoring Methodology
 - 5.1 Site Evaluation Criteria
 - 5.2 Landfill Site Evaluation Method
 - 5.3 Data Gathering and Tabulation
- Section 6 – Findings and Committee Recommendations
 - 6.1 Results of the Scoring Process
 - 6.2 Site Ranking
 - 6.3 Committee Recommendations
 - 6.4 Community Benefits / Future Public Outreach

Supplemental information would be provided in the appendices of the report and would include LAC meeting supporting documents, minutes, and written public comments. It would also include the individual LAC member statements on the selection process and results (if any).

Josh Nagashima commented on the parallel effort of continuing the current LAC effort and simultaneously requesting an extension from the LUC for the landfill site naming deadline. After LAC Meeting #6, it was determined that the extension process is more complicated than initially thought. Therefore, ENV invited the individual members of the LAC to provide written statements to be included in the appendices to support their positions. The statements could summarize any hardship and concerns the committee members had in naming a new landfill site. This would be outside of the recommendations that are put forth by the committee as a group.

Mike Kaiser described the report process beginning with LAC Meeting #7. The next steps would be to complete the Draft Report by mid-May followed by a review period by the LAC prior to Meeting #8. Based on the comments from the LAC, the Draft Report would be edited and finalized and presented to the Mayor.

Trisha Watson inquired as to who will be writing the report. It was noted that HDR and its subconsultant together with the City will be drafting the report.

Suzanne Jones commented that the LAC comments will be included in the appendices and questioned how the body of the report would reflect the extensive discussion and controversy that occurred at each meeting with regard to all potential landfill sites being over the aquifer, the presentations by the Board of Water Supply and other relevant discussion. She was concerned that it appears the LAC comments are being relegated to the appendices as opposed to being discussed in the body of the report.

Trisha Watson sought clarification from the previous meeting on whether the LAC has the power to vote to not recommend any of the sites. Josh Nagashima responded that a motion is not necessary and opened up the discussion to see if that is what the committee wants to do as a whole. If this is the case, it was noted that this recommendation against any of the sites can be written into the recommendations. He added that the discussions were captured in the minutes, and highlights could be included in the recommendations section. Suzanne Jones inquired if the minutes will be included in the appendices. Josh Nagashima confirmed.

Suzanne Jones reiterated her question on where in the body of the report would it capture the discussions reflecting the controversy over having the landfill options all be above the No Pass Zone. She commented that this is a deviation from past selection processes and inquired whether the report would show that the City is now considering these sites due to limited options imposed by Act 73 and that the LAC is uncomfortable with the sites presented to them. Josh Nagashima explained that the discussion and process on how the sites were narrowed down will

be captured in Section 4 – Identification of Potential Landfill Sites. Section 4 will describe the applicable laws and limitations. He clarified that the recommendations or comments related to the discussions will be captured in Section 6.3 – Committee Recommendations. He added that Section 6.3 will be written based on the discussions in today's meeting as well as the discussions that took place in the other meetings. The LAC will then be able to provide comments individually to the City, and comments will be incorporated into the final report as appropriate.

Trisha Watson reiterated her question on the ability to make the recommendation to not recommend any of the sites with the majority present and meeting quorum. She stressed that it should be clear in the report that the committee does not want to recommend any site above the No Pass Zone.

Dr. Roger Babcock provided clarifying statements on why the Waimānalo Gulch expansion was not considered. He explained that the order and the special use permit requires that the Mayor name a new site by December 31, 2022, and that the Waimānalo Gulch close permanently in 2028 and receive no further waste after that date. He commented with respect to the recommendations that Section 6.3 is the section where the LAC will provide their recommendations. The City will provide a draft of the report, but it was clarified that this section would contain the LAC's recommendations. Trisha Watson commented that her understanding was that the LUC did allow for consideration of expanding of Waimānalo Gulch. Dr. Babcock confirmed that this is not the case. He further clarified that the site rankings and scores are completed and cannot be changed. They were based on a process that was followed and will be in the report. The LAC can disagree with the process and provide a write up in the recommendation section in the final report. The final report will be provided to the Mayor where he will determine next steps. The Mayor has a deadline to provide a response to the State Land Use Commission by the end of this year.

Cynthia Rezentes asked for confirmation that ENV will not be pursuing a district boundary amendment for the Waimānalo Gulch site. Dr. Babcock confirmed that ENV has no intention of pursuing it at this time. He indicated that the Mayor can, however, ask ENV to do otherwise at a later time. Cynthia Rezentes further commented that she thought this whole process as an "open switch." Dr. Babcock adds that creating the LAC and obtaining recommendations for the Mayor is an important step in the process of identifying a new site.

Josh Nagashima commented that everyone was placed in a difficult situation with the increasing groundwater circumstances. Suzanne Jones commented that the LAC was put into a position of evaluating on other criteria, even though the one criteria they found unacceptable for all the sites had no reflection on the score (all above the No Pass Line). She reiterated that the most important criteria had become a wash and the LAC was asked to continue the process to complete the evaluation regardless of that circumstance. She stated that the LAC is saying that they are not comfortable with any of the locations though no vote was taken. Trish Watson explained that she was in agreement.

Emmett Kinney commented that it was his understanding that the LAC would proceed with the ranking and that the ranking is not the same as a recommendation. The recommendation would be none of the sites. Suzanne Jones asked whether this could be voted on today and further asked what would be next. Josh Nagashima mentioned that would be the recommendation brought forth. Suzanne continued that if they were to vote that none of these sites were acceptable to the members of the LAC, doesn't that render the ranking a moot issue. Cynthia Rezentes commented that the ranking will still need to be part of the report, with the committee's recommendation that the LAC does not recommend any of the sites. Josh Nagashima adds that the report will document the process and it will be up to the Mayor.

Trisha Watson commented that she would like to vote and have action taken and moved to have the committee recommend that none of the six proposed sites are acceptable due to their location in proximity to the No Pass Line. Suzanne Jones seconded. Steven Chang commented that Act 73 is a law and the No Pass Zone is a policy. He noted that it is the committee's best interest to follow that policy, but indicated there is also the possibility that we may have no other choice, and there is no place where you can put a landfill, what can be done. One of the site options may have to be considered, maybe one that poses the least threat to the community. He stated that landfills have been placed over No Pass Zone in the past. He explains that there is the concern of whether we can comfortably say the landfill built in a location is absolutely going to protect the environment, and there have unfortunately been examples of bad management that exasperated the problem and made it a pressing issue. He indicated that it may come down to choosing between the lesser of evils or be challenged with resolving piles of debris from natural disasters (e.g., hurricanes, earthquakes).

Cynthia Rezentes commented that given the discussion by Steven Chang, the committee cannot in good conscience recommend a new landfill be placed above the No Pass Line. She added that she is assuming all the information and ranking will still be in the report and it will be up to the Mayor to determine whether he will take the LAC's recommendations and seek the district boundary amendment for Waimānalo Gulch (which she is not in favor of) or which of the six sites the Mayor will select based on the ranking. She continues that she doesn't think there will be no options for the Mayor in that sense and that the question becomes one of what we believe as citizens who live here and our belief as to the betterment for the entire island. She indicated that ENV has not looked at all options and technologies that are being looked at elsewhere, which do not do landfills as much as other types of composting. She brought up the plasma arch scenario and how we know that doesn't work on a large scale basis. She also clarified that in a natural disaster, the backup location is outlined in the Integrated Solid Waste Management Plan (ISWMP) where material is taken to the Nānākuli PVT B landfill location, where expansion of the landfill was halted. She expressed that it would end up back in her community again. Josh Nagashima added that the location as meant to be a temporary storage. Cynthia Rezentes explains that she understood, but it would still end up back in her community until it is figured out what to do with the material. She states there are plans in place, but she doesn't necessarily agree with them because the already overburden community will be burdened.

Trisha Watson concurred with Cynthia Rezentes and added that there are still options available such as amending Act 73 and further evaluating Federal lands. She indicated that there are federally controlled lands that are below the No Pass Line. She also commented that more discussion should have been centered around the initial criteria developed in the scoring process. The LAC was not involved in establishing the criteria and added that this should specifically be in the recommendation. She further commented in regard to the community benefit package that the benefits should not only benefit the community it will be placed in, but there should also be a community benefit fund that allows support to the Wai'anae community who has held this burden of the landfill for decades. She states that even if another site is found outside the west side, and even with technology improving that allows less impact, this community will still be carrying the burden for decades to come. . She summarized that the LAC recommendation should not be limited to the opposition of all the sites, but that is should also include alternatives.

Suzanne Jones commented that Act 73 along with the time constraints that were placed upon the process by the LUC eliminated potential sites that might have been below the No Pass Line. She is in favor of providing the City leverage to go back to the LUC and Legislature to seek additional time and release the City from some of the scheduling constraints in order to pursue or consider other more suitable locations. She indicated that there might not be as much leverage if the LAC does not take a vote and make a strong statement.

Cynthia Rezentes commented that there are four (4) new commissioners coming on board at the LUC out of a total of nine (9) board members. She indicated that she is concerned there is likely not enough time to educate and bring the new commissioners up to speed for a decision to be made by the end of the year. She commented that the process in siting a new landfill has had issues since the 1998 announcement to expand Waimānalo Gulch in lieu of closing it.

Josh Nagashima commented that letters of interest were sent to the federal government, and the City is trying to meet a deadline that was imposed on them. He continued that based on the discussion a recommendation can be formed that the LAC agrees on. Trisha Watson pointed out that state lands that are federally controlled were removed from consideration which might be a different process than federal owned lands.

Trisha Watson wants to ensure that discussion from all the meetings is captured in the report and requested to see the recommendation language as soon as possible and prior to the next meeting. It was requested that the section be provided in a Word document so that edits can be made in track changes. Josh Nagashima states that it can be provided as a Word document, and reiterated that it will be provided two weeks before the next meeting. Cynthia Rezentes sought clarification on the 6-week timing of the report being provided to the LAC. Josh Nagashima commented that the recommendation section can be provided earlier and in advance of the rest of the report for immediate review and comments. Trisha Watson sought clarification on the individual statement deadlines. Josh Nagashima explained that the LAC should have an idea of the report contents after the recommendations are provided and clarified that LAC statements should be provided by June 5th, the Sunday before the meeting.

Suzanne Jones clarified that the recommendations will be provided to the LAC for review and that members will provide individual comments that will be added to the report. She indicated that the LAC would complete their voting right now.

John Katahira sought clarification on how the process is different with regard to the state owned lands that are leased to the federal government as opposed to the conservation lands. Steven Chang requested examples of such lands. Trisha Watson stated that army leased lands have leases expiring by 2029 which are not primarily conservation lands as an example. She noted discussion should also be had on land that is not being fully utilized and below the No Pass Line. By amending Act 73 there could be more geographic diversity in the sites being considered. Josh Nagashima confirmed that there were limited options when the federal lands were considered. Trisha Watson inquired if there were any viable federal lands. Josh Nagashima responded that there were three or four. Steven Chang asked how many more sites were made available if the half-mile buffer from Act 73 was reduced. Josh Nagashima responded that only one additional site was potentially available when reduced to one quarter mile. Trisha Watson asked what the potential result would be of amending the law to add the general zoned conservation lands. Josh Nagashima responded that he did not recall and that it would have to be looked at. She indicated she had previously raised the question why general sub zones would not be considered given that they primarily have invasive species and do not have high conservation value. She added that she still had concerns that IALs were in consideration, and equal consideration was not given to general subzone conservation lands. She continued that she would amend Act 73 to protect higher tiers of land with higher conservation value and the general subzone land do not have that for the most part. She continued that general subzone lands should be considered. Suzanne Jones inquired if the half-mile buffer included commercial areas. Josh Nagashima responded that it only included schools, hospitals, and residential areas.

Dr. Roger Babcock commented that the federal lands were identified on the GIS map with the exclusions in gray (shown on a map). The restriction on all conservation lands is in Act 73. Trisha Watson clarified that she would recommend this as an amendment to Act 73. It was

further commented that the only site that opened up when the restriction of half-mile buffer was reduced to a quarter-mile was in Waimānalo (not Waimānalo Gulch).

A discussion regarding the GIS interactive map at the City website took place.

Trisha Watson commented that she would have liked to have seen the No Pass Line in the interactive map and indicated this should be in the recommendations. Cynthia Rezentes added that the map only reflects Act 73 restrictions and not all federal restrictions. Josh Nagashima presented the interactive map and pointed out areas where the federal government lands are not feasible (e.g., established munitions magazines site with plans to expand further west, size restriction, and an area near the PVT site).

Suzanne Jones asked whether any residential areas had only one house or a small community that might be a potential or more suitable site through eminent domain of the properties. Cynthia Rezentes indicated that most of the housing areas are near the coast lines. Josh Nagashima stated that most of the coastline were highly populated, and indicated that this can be looked at again and added to the LAC recommendations. Trisha Watson agreed that it can be put in the recommendations and inquired if a vote can be made.

John Katahira explained that the interactive map is available on the ENV site at www.honolulu.gov/opala/newlandfill and that the criteria can be turned on and off. Josh Nagashima restated the locations that were looked into and discussed earlier were the Waipī'o location, 'Ewa location and the Lualualei location. These areas are outside of the No Pass Zone that are federal controlled. He commented that the Waipio location is in a tsunami inundation zone and the landfill could not be permitted in that area. He also confirmed that munitions magazines exist in the peninsula area site and the Navy is expanding the facility to the west.

John Katahira circled back to the motion for the committee to recommend that none of the six proposed sites are acceptable due to their location in proximity to the No Pass Line. A roll call voting was made and resulted in five (5) yeses. It was noted that one (1) of the yesses was made with reservations. A breakdown of the votes is presented below:

1. Emmett Kinney – Yes
2. Trisha Watson – Yes
3. Cynthia Rezentes – Yes
4. Suzanne Jones – Yes
5. Steven Chang – Yes with reservations

2. Potential Benefits for Landfill Host Community (Josh Nagashima, ENV PM)

Josh Nagashima presented the Landfill Host Community Benefits (HCB). He noted that providing benefits for the West side to compensate them for the lengthy process over the years can be a recommendation made by the committee.

HCB was defined as follows:

- “Cash payments or in-kind gifts that are paid to a community by the developer for the right to site a landfill within a community’s jurisdiction” – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- “The cornerstones of Host Community Benefits are mitigation (alleviation of landfill impacts such as landscaping and revegetation to alleviate visual impacts), and compensation (just payment to offset living near the landfill).” – County of Kauaʻi

The presentation continued with the City proposing to create a HCB committee that will establish HCBs with the LAC making recommendations for the committee. The HCB committee will be formed as early as possible during the EIS process. Trisha Watson reiterated that HCBs should

also include the community that has borne the burden of a landfill in addition to the prospective community.

Josh Nagashima explained the HCBs for the current Waimānalo Gulch Sanitary Landfill. The City provided \$3 million for non-profit grants managed by the Department of Community Services. The recommendations for distribution were made by a 10-member committee of West O'ahu residents. Another \$3.5 million were allocated for City Parks construction projects for West O'ahu. These were all funded by the City's general fund. Cynthia Rezentes requested to verify the figures presented and its funding source.

Josh Nagashima then presented the HCBs for the outer islands. Kaua'i County had HCBs for the Kekaha Landfill. The starting allotment was \$650,000 for the Kekaha Community and totaled approximately \$2.5 million based on a Civil Beat article. A Citizen Advisory Committee managed the funds. Hawai'i and Maui counties did not have any known benefits.

Examples of HCBs from the US EPA Report in other jurisdictions were presented:

- Free or reduced curbside collection, disposal, or recycling services
- Household Hazardous Waste Drop-off Days
- Annual Spring Clean-Up
- Container Rental and Disposal Services
- Hiring preferences
- Funding
 - Flat dollar amount per ton
 - Percentage of per ton fees

Steven Chang inquired whether Kailua should also be considered in the HCB package. Trisha Watson responded that the entire county should have a post community benefit group which includes communities that host landfill sites. She added that for the record she likes hiring practices and is in favor of the host communities receiving preferences.

Cynthia Rezentes commented that the Waimānalo Gulch Sanitary Landfill HCBs were supplementing the City's needs and were for the City's benefit rather than the community's benefit. She would like to see the community voice and establish their own benefits. Josh Nagashima responded that the City hopes to avoid pitfalls by establishing a host committee as well as receiving recommendations from the LAC. Cynthia Rezentes suggested to have individuals from the community be on the HCB committee and create a guideline on how the funds should be used. She shared her experiences and provided examples from another community committee that she participates on. Trisha Watson added that creating an endowment may be beneficial because it will sustain for years.

John Katahira asked how far back the LAC would consider going to provide HCBs for past landfill host communities. Trisha Watson indicated communities that have active landfills be considered and potentially creating weighted criteria for those communities who have disproportionately borne the burden of a landfill.

Suzanne Jones asked whether landscape is a benefit or standard landfill management practice to mitigate view planes. Cynthia Rezentes commented that it appeared management was not in the plan to mitigate issues such as odors, traffic, and unsightly plastic bags and that landscaping should be a part of management. Josh Nagashima responded that the City plans to take the lessons learned from the past and consider them in the design. One proposed thought is to present designs to the community for their feedback. Trisha Watson commented that landscaping should not be a part of community benefits and is in support of an advisory body to be engaged during the design process for basic mitigation and to avoid adverse effects.

Suzanne Jones commented that a potential community benefit could be to collaborate with solar parks to offset electrical costs for the surrounding communities. Josh Nagashima indicated this has been part of discussion and that recycling operations as well as other uses in the half-mile buffer have also been discussed. Cynthia Rezentes commented that there may be dust impacts on the PV panels generated by landfills.

Trisha Watson inquired about the plan to close and the remediation approach for Waimānalo Gulch. It was noted that vegetative cover is required for 30 years.

It was indicated that the report and recommendations could be separated into the HCB and Waimānalo Gulch benefits.

VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- LAC Meeting #8 June 6, 2022, 2pm (Tentative) – Final Meeting
- LAC report to be provided to LAC 2 weeks prior to Meeting #8. LAC recommendation section to be provided prior to the entire report draft.
- At Meeting #8 there will be discussion on report edits before finalizing the report. Individual committee statements are due June 5, 2022, prior to the meeting.
- It was confirmed that a transmittal to the Mayor is not being prepared. LAC has concerns that the report alone will not communicate their issues of the sites. It was indicated that discussion will take place and that this can be discussed further in Meeting #8.
- An audience member asked whether the next meeting can be provided virtually. Josh Nagashima indicated that they will look into having a hybrid meeting for next meeting.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

John Katahira requested a motion to adjourn the meeting. Suzanne Jones made a motion to adjourn. Cynthia Rezentes seconded the motion. No objections were noted and John Katahira adjourned LAC Meeting #7 at 4:04 pm.