

## **Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes**

Day: Wednesday  
Date: June 13, 2012  
Time: 9:00 am to 11:00 am  
Location: City/County Building  
Room: 303 (3<sup>RD</sup> Floor)

### **Attendees:**

#### **Advisory Committee:**

##### **Present:**

Mike Ayars; Gary Bergman; Ann Bleed; Jack Coogan (Chair); Steve Hatten; Paul Johnson; Mike Koberlein; Dan Kurtzer; Sarah Murtagh; Adam Prochaska (Vice Chair); Sue Quambusch; DiAnna Schimek; Cecil Steward; Meghan Sullivan; Chris Zegar

##### **Late:**

Jane Raybould

##### **Absent:**

Eileen Bergt; Tim Farmer; Casey Larkins; Jeanelle Lust

#### **City of Lincoln:**

Miki Esposito; Gary Brandt; Karla Welding; Gene Hanlon; Scott Holmes; Nancy Clark; Dan King; Sara Hartzell; Milo Mumgaard; Steve Huggenberger

##### **HDR:**

John Dempsey; Dave Traeger; Theresa McClure

##### **Public:**

Brian Kurtzer; Nick Crow; Scott Niederhaus; Jim Klein; Sarah Hanzel; Greg Kurtzer; Bruce Von Busch; Bob Stroud; Carrie Hakenkamp; Charles Humble

## **Meeting Summary**

- 1) The facilitator, Theresa McClure, acknowledged the Public Meeting Law and conducted a safety briefing.
- 2) Miki Esposito welcomed the Advisory Committee, introduced the City Staff (Management Team) and Consultant Project Team Members.
  - a) An Advisory Committee roll call was conducted; attendance is reflected above.
    - i) Advisory Committee members introduced themselves, their organization and areas of interest.
- 3) Miki Esposito discussed the Draft Charge Statement provided to the Advisory Committee as a handout.

# Solid Waste Plan 2040

- 4) Miki Esposito introduced Jack Coogan as the Advisory Committee Chair and Adam Prochaska as the Vice Chair. Their roles and responsibilities were presented.
- 5) Theresa McClure discussed the general roles and responsibilities of the Advisory Committee based on a handout provided to the committee as well as the format for meetings and standing meeting agenda.
- 6) Miki Esposito introduced the concept of Guiding Principles that would guide the Solid Waste Plan 2040 preparation. Miki indicated that the Guiding Principles were still under internal review and were anticipated to be presented in at the next committee meeting.
- 7) John Dempsey presented an overview of the key elements of the planning process and the project schedule for the solid waste management plan.
- 8) Theresa McClure described the key elements of the Public Participation Plan and identified how to access the Solid Waste Plan 2040 website. She also noted that all Advisory Committee handouts and the PowerPoint presentation used to guide the meeting will be posted on the project website. Information to be reviewed at future Advisory Committee meetings will be posted on the website approximately one week in advance of the scheduled meeting.
- 9) The Advisory Committee articulated the following during an open discussion period:
  - a) It was suggested that the Management Team and Advisory Committee consider solid waste as a utility and resource. Solid waste management should be addressed in terms of impacts it has on the whole community in terms of economic, environmental, societal, technological and policy issues, not just landfill needs.
  - b) A question was raised about broad stakeholder groups engaged in the process.
    - i) Theresa McClure indicated that the Advisory Committee was made up of representatives from the business community, waste haulers, recyclers, multi-family property owners, neighborhoods, the development/construction industry, City Council, County Board, LPlan 2040 Advisory Committee, Sustainable Lincoln Blue Ribbon Committee, Planning Commission, Keep Lincoln-Lancaster County Beautiful/LLCHD, environmental organizations/WasteCap Nebraska, higher education, young professionals, and the county/agricultural community.
    - ii) Scott Holmes reminded the Advisory Committee that it is their role to represent the interests of the stakeholder groups (above) and that the Management Team would hope they would engage others in the planning process.
  - c) It was suggested that efforts be taken to control and reduce the waste stream including managing large waste generators.
  - d) It was suggested that "solid waste" be defined.
- 10) It was noted that all Advisory Committee meetings are currently scheduled to be held on the second Tuesday of each month. The next Advisory Committee meeting will be held on July 10, 2012 from 2:30 pm to 4:30 pm in Room 303 of the City/County Building. The meeting room is expected to change beginning with the August 2012 meeting.
- 11) Theresa McClure introduced the Rules of Engagement for the Public Comment Period.
- 12) Jack Coogan opened the Public Comment Period.
  - a) Carrie Hakenkamp from WasteCap Nebraska indicated that zero waste, organic waste management and impacts of methane needed to be addressed.
- 13) Jack Coogan closed the meeting.

## Advisory Committee Meeting

Day: Tuesday  
Date: July 10, 2012  
Time: 2:30 pm to 4:30 pm  
Location: City/County Building  
Room: 303 (3<sup>RD</sup> Floor)

### Advisory Committee:

#### Present:

Gary Bergman; Eileen Bergt; Ann Bleed; Jack Coogan (Chair); Steve Hatten; Paul Johnson; Mike Koberlein; Dan Kurtzer; Casey Larkins; Jeanelle Lust; Sarah Murtagh; Adam Prochaska (Vice Chair); Sue Quambush; Cecil Steward; Meghan Sullivan; Chris Zegar

#### Absent:

Mike Ayars; Tim Farmer; Jane Raybould; DiAnna Schimek

### City of Lincoln/Lancaster County:

Miki Esposito; Sara Hartzell; Gene Hanlon; Scott Holmes; Karla Welding; Dan King

### HDR:

John Dempsey; Theresa McClure

### Public:

Dale Gubbels; Carrie Hakenkamp; Charlie Humble; Jim Klein; Jay Kurtzer; Janelle Lurt; Bob Strouf; Brad Uribe; Bruce Von Busch; Greg West; Sarah Hanzel

## Agenda

- 1) The Committee Chair called the meeting to order, acknowledged the Public Meeting Law, and conducted a roll call of attendance; attendance is reflected above.
- 2) The Chairman called for approval of the June 13, 2012 meeting minutes. The minutes were approved with no changes.
- 3) A safety briefing was conducted by the facilitator, Theresa McClure.
- 4) The Solid Waste Management System overview was presented by Gene Hanlon and Dan King and included the following topics:
  - a. Regulatory Framework
  - b. Existing System, Facilities, and Programs
- 5) The Assessment of (Basic) Needs / Status Quo was presented by John Dempsey. He also presented an overview of the topic of Minimum Levels of Service and the services and impacts of changes to the Service Area for the solid waste system.

# Solid Waste Plan 2040

- 6) The Facilitator provided an update on the elements of Public Participation and reminded Committee members on how to access the website for various information.
- 7) The Guiding Principles were presented by Karla Welding. She also discussed Plan Goals which will be discussed in greater detail at a later meeting. Plan Goals will be aligned with the Guiding Principles.
- 8) John Dempsey presented an Overview of Alternatives/Assessment including how future meeting topics were anticipated to be presented in a module format highlighting six topics. A handout was provided to further expand the topic list.
- 9) The Evaluation Criteria was presented by John Dempsey, and described as part of the process to be used to evaluate and screen different options and strategies to be included in the Plan.
- 10) The Advisory Committee asked about the following during an open discussion period:
  - a. Is the Occupation Tax different from the Tipping Fee?
    - i. Karla Welding indicated that yes, the Occupation Tax and Tipping Fee are different fees. The Occupation Tax is \$7.00/ton of refuse paid by refuse haulers. The Tipping Fee is \$14.00/ton, and is charged to all landfill users.
    - ii. Scott Holmes and Karla Welding explained some of the complexities associated with how each of these fees are assessed and collected at various City facilities.
  - b. What is the Occupation Tax?
    - i. Karla Welding explained the Occupation Tax is used to fund Solid Waste Management programs other than those involving the Bluff Road Landfill. Occupation Tax funds may be used for maintenance of the old North 48<sup>th</sup> Street Landfill and for solid waste related programs delivered by the Lincoln-Lancaster County Health Department, and to supplement user fees to operate the transfer station, composting, and North 48<sup>th</sup> Street Construction and Demolition Waste Landfill and material sales for providing recycling programs, education, and outreach.
  - c. Does the Tipping Fee sustain the small vehicle transfer station program?
    - i. It was noted that the small vehicle transfer station may be funded in part through the Occupation Tax.
    - ii. It was noted that the transfer stations also has a user fees.
  - d. More clarification was requested on charging for recyclables contained in the waste if a hauler separates it before bringing it to the landfill.
    - i. It was noted that the Lincoln Municipal Code excludes source separated recyclables from the definition of "refuse" and as such source separated recyclables are not subject to the Occupation Tax.
  - e. The Committee requested that examples of what has been successful in solid waste programs in other cities be presented to the Committee as part of the topical evaluation of alternatives.
  - f. The Committee asked if the word "integrated" was included in regulation and if it was defined.
    - i. It was noted that Nebraska's main solid waste legislation is entitle the "Integrated Solid Waste Management Act" and that USEPA uses the term integrated in describing the waste hierarchy of management options.
  - g. The Committee indicated there may be interest in reviewing and commenting on the Guiding Principles and Goals when the published list of goals becomes available.

# Solid Waste Plan 2040

- h. The Committee suggested that as part of the alternatives review process that satisfying the Guiding Principles and Goals be considered in the evaluation process.
  - i. It was suggested that some of the content of modules 5 and 6 may need to be addressed/considered through evaluation of topics in modules 1 through 4.
  - j. The Committee discussed developing a contact list of all Committee members to be shared amongst the Committee. It was agreed that a contact list of names be developed and shared between the committee, but to the extent that it included emails, it not be posted on the website.
    - i. It was noted that a Committee member could opt for not having their email included on a shared list if the list was going to be published in the public record.
    - ii. Discussion occurred as to whether Advisory Committee members could communicate amongst themselves regarding Committee topics outside of the scheduled Advisory Committee meetings. The conclusion was that communication about Committee topics among Advisory Committee members outside of the scheduled meetings is discouraged.
  - k. It was noted that Committee Members should not be distributing information to other members outside the meetings. It was requested that a protocol be established whereby the City could receive information and where appropriate distribute that information via the project website, e.g., under the tab for resources.
- 11) It was noted that the next Advisory Committee meeting would be held at the following time and location,
- August 14, 2012
  - 2:30-4:30 pm
  - Lincoln Lancaster County Health Department
  - 3140 N Street
  - Lower Level Training Room
- 12) The Chairman opened the Public Comment Period.
- a. A member of the public, Jim Klein, asked Miki Esposito to recount what she had stated at the past meeting relating to the Mayor's goals for the Solid Waste Plan. She indicated the following:
    - i. an interest in curbside recycling
    - ii. current public-private partnerships are important, and
    - iii. Public participation in the Plan development is important
- 13) The Chairman closed the meeting.

## Action Items

- 1) The City will consider developing a general flow chart to help further explain the Occupation Tax.

## Advisory Committee Meeting

Day: Tuesday  
Date: August 14, 2012  
Time: 2:30 pm to 4:30 pm  
Location: Lincoln/ Lancaster County Health Department

### Advisory Committee:

#### Present:

Mike Ayars; Gary Bergman; Eileen Bergt; Ann Bleed; Jack Coogan; Steve Hatten; Paul Johnson; Dan Kurtzer; Sue Quambusch; Jane Raybould; DiAnna Schimek; Jeanelle Lust; Adam Prochaska

#### Absent:

Tim Farmer; Mike Koberlein; Casey Larkings; Sarah Murtagh; Cecil Steward; Meghan Sullivan; Chris Zegar

### City of Lincoln/Lancaster County:

Miki Esposito; Sara Hartzell; Karla Welding; Nancy Clark; Dan King; Milo Mumgaard

### HDR:

John Dempsey; Theresa McClure

### Public:

Charles Humble; Jacob Harms; Brian Kurtzer; Greg West; Nick Crow; Sarah Hanzel; Eric Bersine; Jim Klein; Dale Gubbels; Jay Kurtzer; Greg Kurtzer; Carrie Hakenkamp; Seth Harms

## Agenda

- 1) Jack Coogan, the Committee Chair, called the meeting to order and conducted a roll call of attendance.
- 2) It was noted that a copy of the Public Meeting Law was posted on wall in the meeting room.
- 3) The committee approved the minutes from July 10, 2012 meeting.
- 4) Theresa McClure, the facilitator, conducted a Safety Briefing.
- 5) Follow-up items from the previous meeting were discussed.
  - a. The City provided clarification on the Open Meetings Act. It was recommended that committee member communication be conducted in the open meeting format. Additional materials that committee or others would like to have shared should be sent to Karla Welding, at [kwelding@lincoln.ne.gov](mailto:kwelding@lincoln.ne.gov). Information will be shared by posting it on the project website.
  - b. Explanatory information regarding the Occupation Tax will be provided to the committee via the website.

# Solid Waste Plan 2040

- c. The Plan Goals will be presented at a future meeting. In advance of that meeting, they will be distributed to the committee. Following distribution there is anticipated to be a facilitated committee discussion.
- 6) HDR provided an overview of the Plan Development process including the Assessment of Needs and Modules/Topics, and noted that when the term education is used in describing future management options it is intended to reflect a level of education that will result in behavior change.
  - a. A committee member asked: "What will we end up with?"
    - i. It was clarified by the City that the role of the Advisory Committee is to provide guidance through plan development. Other public input will also be included in the process. Later in the planning process there will be a system definition document that will look at a consolidation of options into various scenarios, likely of increasing levels of diversion. Following committee and public input the plan will be drafted.
  - b. A committee member asked if the draft plan was brought back to committee for final approval after it was presented to the public.
    - i. It was clarified the committee recommendations would be presented to the elected officials, who would also have the chance to request changes. The recommendations in the plan would initially be presented in draft format.
- 7) HDR presented a synopsis of technical papers on the topics of Source Reduction topic, Zero Waste, Product Stewardship, Universal, Special and Unique Wastes, and Yard Wastes. The Lincoln-Lancaster County Health Department presented on the topic of Household and Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generator (Small Business) Hazardous Waste
  - a. The committee asked how the volume of yard waste in the landfill was calculated and if the total tonnage included woodchips and other heavy landscaping materials. It was noted that values are generally presented as tonnages and volumes were calculated using the density conversion rates used for all tons of waste received at the landfill.
  - b. The committee asked for clarification regarding the amount of yard waste in the waste stream and whether removing the 3% estimated to be in the currently disposed tonnage represented an increase in the life of the landfill by one year? HDR will examine this and provide a clarification at the next meeting.
- 8) HDR provided an update on public participation indicating that the Public Awareness Baseline Survey was currently being conducted.
- 9) Attendees were reminded that they should direct other interested parties to the website for information on past and future meetings as well as to post comments or keep apprised on progress.
- 10) Attendees were informed that the next Advisory Committee Meeting will be held on September 11, 2012. It will be held at the Lincoln/ Lancaster County Health Department. Meeting topics are anticipated to include the Plan Goals and the Recycling and Composting Module topics.
- 11) The Chairman opened the meeting for Public Comment.
  - a. Carrie Hakenkamp mentioned that the Green Team Roundtable for WasteCap Nebraska met recently and were asked to identify things they'd like to see in the

# Solid Waste Plan 2040

Solid Waste Plan 2040. She indicated she would share those comments with the committee.

- i. Carrie provided additional comments regarding Zero Waste, indicating that the definition of recycling should also consider the highest and best use of a product. She provided an example that Eco Stores may take and resell a wood door at \$15, versus a wood processor who would grind it up and sell it for landscape mulch.. She also indicated that in some definitions of Zero Waste, waste to energy does not count. She stated communities can be considered Zero Waste if they can get to 90% diversion from the landfill. She also mentioned that food waste compost is an important approach to help a community reach zero waste.
- ii. Nick Crow asked for clarification on the amount of Household and Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generator (Small Business) Hazardous Wastes in the waste sent to the landfill. He expressed concern that by aggregating different types of materials, some “less hazardous”, tended to skew the estimated percentage, 0.3% to 0.6%, going to the landfill and make it sound worse than it is.

12) The Chairman closed the meeting.

## Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

Day: Tuesday Date: September 11, 2012

Time: 2:30 pm to 4:30 pm

Location: Lincoln/Lancaster County Health Department

Room: Lower Level Training Room

### Advisory Committee:

#### Present:

Mike Ayars; Gary Bergman; Jack Coogan; Steve Hatten; Paul Johnson; Coby Mach (for Mike Koberlein); Dan Kurtzer; Sarah Murtagh; Adam Prochaska; Jane Raybould; DiAnna Schimek; Cecil Steward; Meghan Sullivan; Chris Zegar; Eileen Bergt

#### Absent:

Ann Bleed; Casey Larkins; Jeanelle Lust; Sue Quambusch; Tim Farmer

### City of Lincoln/Lancaster County:

Sara Hartzell; Dan King; Nancy Clark; Karla Welding; Gene Hanlon; Scott Holmes

#### HDR:

John Dempsey; Theresa McClure

#### Public:

Neil Sullivan; Jay Kurtzer; Matt Harms; Ann Post; Charlie Humble; Sarah Hanzel

### Agenda

- 1) The facilitator conducted the Safety Briefing and acknowledged the public meeting law.
- 2) The Committee Chair called the meeting to order and conducted a roll call of attendance.
- 3) Meeting minutes from August 14, 2012 were approved with no comments.
- 4) HDR presented information on the Plan Development and outline of the Needs Assessment. The proposed Table of Contents from the draft Needs Assessment was provided as a handout at the meeting.
- 5) An overview of the Baseline Assessment/Survey was presented. The data collection phase of the survey has been completed. The results of the Baseline Assessment/Survey would be presented at the next committee meeting. The committee was provided a copy of the survey and asked to complete it.
  - a. A question was asked as to whether the committee had reviewed the survey before it was conducted.
    - i. The answer was no.
- 6) Facilitated discussion of the DRAFT Plan Goals associated with 5 of the 6 Guiding Principles occurred. Comments from the discussion will be used to revise the DRAFT Plan Goals. The

# Solid Waste Plan 2040

revised DRAFT Plan Goals will be presented to the committee at a future meeting along with the goals associated with the Guiding Principle of Sustainable Principles.

- 7) HDR provided an update on Public Participation including that a public open house and online meeting presenting the Needs Assessment was being planned for November.
- 8) HDR provided an update on Public Participation including that a public open house and online meeting presenting the Needs Assessment was being planned for November.
- 9) An overview on the Occupation Tax as a follow up from a previous meeting. Clarifying information related to the Yard Waste technical paper was presented. A revised Source Reduction/Yard Waste technical document will be uploaded to the Solid Waste Plan 2040 website.
- 10) It was noted that the next meeting will be held at the following time and location;  
October 9, 2012  
2:30 pm to 4:30 pm  
Lancaster County Extension  
444 Cherry Creek Road
- 11) No public comments were offered at the meeting.

## Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

Day: Tuesday Date: October 9, 2012

Time: 2:30 pm to 4:30 pm

Location: UNL - Lancaster County Extension Education Center / Room B

### Advisory Committee:

#### Present:

Gary Bergman; Eileen Bergt; Ann Bleed; Jack Coogan; Steve Hatten; Paul Johnson; Dan Kurtzer; Coby Mach; Sarah Murtagh; Adam Prochaska; Sue Quambusch; Jane Raybould; DiAnna Schimek; Cecil Steward; Meghan Sullivan; Chris Zegar

#### Absent:

Mike Ayars; Tim Farmer; Casey Larkins; Jeanelle Lust

### City of Lincoln/Lancaster County:

Mikki Esposito; Sara Hartzell; Gene Hanlon; Scott Holmes; Dan King; Milo Mumgaard; Karla Welding

#### HDR:

John Dempsey; Leanne Zietlow

#### Public:

Dale Gubbels; Eric Bersin; Brad Uribe; Charlie Humble; Steve Harms; Greg Kurtzer; Beth Mann; Kelsey Palmer; Mark Hawkins; Nick Crow; Jim Klein; Jay Kurtzer; Greg West

## Agenda

- 1) The facilitator conducted the Safety Briefing and acknowledged the posted public meeting law.
- 2) The Committee Chair called the meeting to order.
- 3) The Committee Chair conducted a roll call of committee attendance.
- 4) There was a discussion regarding the meeting notes from September 11, 2012; a comment was made that the notes were not a comprehensive presentation of all comments and discussions; meeting minutes/notes were approved by a majority voice vote.
- 5) The information obtained from the Baseline Assessment/Survey was presented. Several of the survey questions and the results were discussed in detail.
  - There was some discussion of involving the committee in developing questions if there are more surveys in the future.
  - There was some discussion on whether the survey should have been expanded to include additional questions related to costs for increased levels of services.
  - A comment was made that presentation of costs should consider societal costs not just cost of services.

# Solid Waste Plan 2040

- 6) An introduction to the topic of recycling and an overview of recycling topics was made.
- 7) Presentations on residential recycling and diversion; commercial recycling and diversion; and construction and demolition materials recycling were made.
- 8) The committee asked if the Total Waste included recyclables that might be exported from the county by large commercial generators? The answer was generally “no”; the quantities presented are only those for which some record of their amount was recorded.
- 9) The committee asked if the City sees positive revenue from the recycling drop off sites? The answer was “no”, costs exceed revenues.
- 10) Presentations on recycling incentives and organic waste diversion (composting) were provided.
- 11) Preliminary information related to the site life of the City owned landfills was presented. A final version of this information will be included in the Needs Assessment.
- 12) The facilitator discussed upcoming public participation opportunities, including the Open House, the online meeting and the planned outreach and newsletter.
- 13) Revised DRAFT Plan Goals information was not covered due to time constraints
- 14) The objective of the Open House on the Needs Assessment is to provide information on the planning process and to give the public the opportunity to review and understand existing conditions.
- 15) The next Advisory Committee Meeting date and location was noted:
  - November 13, 2012; 2:30 - 4:30pm; Lincoln/Lancaster County Health Department, Lower Level Training Room. The meeting precedes the Needs Assessment Open House on the same date and at the same venue; scheduled for 6:00 - 8:00pm.
- 16) The Public Works and Utilities Director addressed the committee members and the public in attendance regarding the process and the desire for continued public participation.
- 17) The meeting was opened up for public comment. One commenter suggested the need for further clarity related to the Guiding Principle of “Embrace Sustainable Principles”. He suggested the need for further defining “sustainability”.
- 18) The Committee Chair adjourned the meeting.

## **Advisory Committee Meeting Notes**

Day: Tuesday  
Date: November 13, 2012  
Time: 2:30 pm to 4:00 pm  
Location: Lincoln/Lancaster County Health Department  
Room: Lower Level Training Room

### **Advisory Committee:**

#### **Present:**

Gary Bergman; Eileen Bergt; Ann Bleed; Jack Coogan; Tim Farmer; Paul Johnson; Dan Kurtzer; Casey Larkins; Jeannelle Lust; Coby Mach; Sarah Murtagh; Adam Prochaska; DiAnna Schimek; Meghan Sullivan; Chris Zegar (late)

#### **Absent:**

Mike Ayars; Steve Hatten; Sue Quambusch; Jane Raybould; Cecil Steward

### **City of Lincoln/Lancaster County:**

Sara Hartzell; Gene Hanlon; Scott Holmes; Dan King; Milo Mumgaard; Nancy Clark

### **HDR:**

John Dempsey; Theresa McClure

### **Public:**

Nick Crow; Dave Dingman; Greg Kurtzer; Jim Klein; Charlie Humble; Daniel Schmidt; Carrie Hakenkamp; Jay Kurtzer; Mark Hawkins; Dale Gubbels, Sarah Hanzel.

- 1) The facilitator conducted the Safety Briefing and acknowledged the posted public meeting law.
- 2) The Committee Chair called the meeting to order.
- 3) The Committee Chair conducted a roll call of attendance.
- 4) Meeting notes from October 9, 2012 were approved without comments.
- 5) Information summarizing the Needs Assessment was presented. Topics included purpose, background on the Planning Area, current management practices, historic waste generation, composition, disposal and diversion rates (current/status quo), future disposal needs and subsequent evaluations. Several questions were asked and topics discussed.
  - Comment was made that that the City ran an efficient operation
  - A transfer station was described as a facility that accepts waste, transfers it to a semi-trailer that transports it to a MSW landfill in response to a question.
  - Clarification and discussion was offered on why with a yard waste ban there was still 3 percent yard waste in the waste composition. Discussions of why yard waste was in the landfill related to seasonal bans and various definitions of yard waste.
  - There was some discussion as to why diapers were a separate category and some challenges in managing them by means other than disposal.
  - A question was asked on how much of the landfill gas was recovered by the gas collection system. The response was that the landfill gas recovery wells are only installed in capped

# Solid Waste Plan 2040

- portion of landfill and as a result it is estimate that 50% of landfill gas generated is currently recovered.
- 6) There was an overview provided of the Open House and some key areas of focus including the purpose of the Open House, the basis for the Plan, the planning process (diagram), next steps in the planning process and the schedule. There was some dialog and discussion on several topics including:
    - Why the City was undertaking the planning process
    - Why it might be important to reduce waste
    - How the plan would reflect community concerns and environmental vision and emotions
    - How can the waste that is being generated be managed in an environmentally sustainable manner
    - Possible trip to the Bluff Road Landfill
  - 7) A demonstration was provided on the on-line Town Hall meeting, some of the features and content, and how it related to the live Open House going on later in the same evening. Some items of discussion included:
    - Why we are asking the public to participate
    - Are we clearly communicating the need to get people engaged
    - Why it matters that citizens get involved
    - What is the vision that is guiding the purpose of the planning effort
    - A question was asked about how much capacity was available in the land to the east of the current disposal site. The response was disposal capacity will be discussed in the next Module.
    - There was mention of the strong and contentious public sentiment when the Bluff Road Landfill was sited.
  - 8) The facilitator provided an update on public participation, outreach and communications tools including press release and newsletters. A suggestion was made that a feature news article might be helpful.
    - Information will be provided on levels of participation in the various public meetings and comments received on-line.
  - 9) The revised DRAFT Plan Goals were briefly reviewed with a focus on edits from the prior draft based on comments received by the Advisory Committee. A comment was made that on the topic of public/private partnerships that the private sector includes both businesses and non-profit organizations. There was discussion on how to define sustainability and the economic, environmental, human aspects that make up one of the core definitions and that one core aspect should not be emphasized over another - the importance of balance. A portion of the discussion focused on sustainable quality of life (now and in the future), a healthy environment and viable economic life styles. There was also a comment that the sustainable guiding principle should "consider" rather than "embrace" sustainable principles.
  - 10) The next Advisory Committee Meeting date and location were noted:
    - December 11, 2012; 2:30 pm to 4:30 pm; Lincoln/Lancaster County Health Department Lower Level Training Room.
  - 11) The meeting was opened for public comments. One commenter provided several suggestions, including:
    - Encouraged messaging that focused on "opportunities" vs. "challenges"
    - Look at quality of life and job creation
    - Encourage entrepreneurship, job creation and education
  - 12) The Committee Chair adjourned the meeting.

## **Advisory Committee Meeting Notes**

Day: Tuesday  
Date: December 11, 2012  
Time: 2:30 pm to 4:30 pm  
Location: Lincoln/Lancaster County Health Department  
Room: Lower Level Training Room

### **Advisory Committee:**

#### **Present:**

Mike Ayars; Gary Bergman; Eileen Bergt; Ann Bleed; Jack Coogan; Tim Farmer; Steve Hatten; Paul Johnson; Casey Larkins; Coby Mach; Sarah Murtagh; Jane Raybould; DiAnna Schimek; Cecil Steward; Meghan Sullivan; Chris Zegar

#### **Absent:**

Dan Kurtzer; Jeannelle Lust; Adam Prochaska; Sue Quambusch

### **City of Lincoln/Lancaster County:**

Nancy Clark; Sara Hartzell; Gene Hanlon; Scott Holmes; Dan King; Karla Welding

#### **HDR:**

John Dempsey; Leanne Zietlow

#### **Public:**

Nick Crow; Dave Dingman; Greg Kurtzer; Charlie Humble; Greg West; Brian Kurtzer; Brad Uribe; Ann Post; Seth Harms; Jacob Harms; Carrie Hakenkamp

- 1) The facilitator conducted the Safety Briefing and acknowledged the posted public meeting law.
- 2) The Committee Chair called the meeting to order.
- 3) The Committee Chair conducted a roll call of attendance.
- 4) Meeting notes from November 13, 2012 were approved without comments.
- 5) As a follow-up to the November meeting, excerpts from the LPlan 2040 Vision statement were added to the Guiding Principles and Plan Goals document. A copy of this statement and the current version of the Guiding Principles and Plan Goals was handed out. Discussion on the "embrace Sustainable Principles" portion of the document included:
  - Possible changes to the word "political" to something such as "public policy".
  - Suggestion about using "affordable to the taxpayer" versus "economics" and discussion of whether subsequent cost/benefit analysis would help the committee better define options in terms of what might be affordable.No decision was made to change the current wording of this document, but it was noted that changes were possible in the future as part of the final plan development.
- 6) Information introducing the next phase of the discussion, the System Definition and Refinement, was presented. Three alternatives will be provided to the committee for evaluation, refinement and further discussion.
- 7) Information summarizing Module 3 -(Disposal Capacity) and Module 4 - Disposal Refinements topics were presented. Topics included: Waste Conversion Technologies; Municipal Solid Waste

# Solid Waste Plan 2040

Disposal; Construction and Demolition Waste Disposal; and Bioreactor/Bio-stabilization Technologies.

Several questions were asked and topics discussed.

- A question was asked and discussed regarding mining or re-opening portions of the existing landfill. It was noted that this is technically viable but anticipated to be very costly.
  - A comment was made that this evaluation should include “waste to product” not just “waste to energy”.
  - A comment was made that regulations could be used to further limit what is accepted at the C&D disposal site, thus encouraging more recycling.
- 8) Group discussion was held on two topical questions in the second half of the meeting. Advisory Committee members had been randomly divided into four groups for discussion purposes. Each question was asked to the four groups and following discussion each group reported on its discussion. The two topical questions that were discussed were:
- “Nationally, 34% of the municipal solid waste is recycled compared to about 18% in Lincoln. Should the Solid Waste Management Plan 2040 set a numeric goal for recycling?”
  - “The Needs Assessment describes the current solid waste management system, facilities and programs (the “Status Quo”). Should these be considered the “minimum level of service” for future planning purposes?”
- A summary of these discussions and group notes will be provided prior to the next meeting.
- 9) The facilitator provided an update on public participation, outreach and communications tools and the amount of participation that has occurred on the website including number of individuals that have viewed the website and how many individual viewed the on-line meeting.
- 10) The next Advisory Committee Meeting data and location were noted:
- January 8, 2013; 2:30 pm to 4:30 pm; Lincoln/Lancaster County Health Department Lower Level Training Room.
- 11) The meeting was opened for public comments.
- (1) First commenter stated that the public group present at the meeting discussed the same questions as the Advisory Committee discussed in small groups and offered the following comments:
    - (a) Recycling goals should be set and should be achievable, but had concerns about how you measure “recycling”. The state planning mandate set goals, but those goals were not met. How do you regulate meeting the set goals?
    - (b) Regarding the minimum level of service, Lincoln shouldn’t “go backwards”; what is established now should be the minimum that we should expect.
  - (2) First commenter also suggested (own opinion) that:
    - (a) A permanent Household Hazardous Waste Facility should be a part of the minimum level of service.
    - (b) Look at the “highest and best use” for products and how they could be reused, recycled or as a last resort, disposed of. The cost alternative should consider the future cost to replace the existing landfill.
  - (3) Second commenter:
    - (a) The goals should be a “work in progress”. The goal for the “embrace Sustainable Principles should use a different word than “political”. The word “political” can imply something that has shifting priorities.
- 12) The Committee Chair adjourned the meeting.

## **Advisory Committee Meeting Notes**

Day: Tuesday  
Date: February 12, 2013  
Time: 2:30 pm to 4:30 pm  
Location: Lincoln/Lancaster County Health Department  
Room: Lower Level Training Room

### **Advisory Committee:**

#### **Present:**

Mike Ayars; Gary Bergman; Eileen Bergt; Ann Bleed; Jack Coogan; Tim Farmer; Steve Hatten; Paul Johnson; Dan Kurtzer; Jeannelle Lust; Coby Mach; Sarah Murtagh; Adam Prochaska; Sue Quambusch; Jane Raybould; DiAnna Schimek; Cecil Steward; Meghan Sullivan; Chris Zegar

#### **Absent:**

Casey Larkins

### **City of Lincoln/Lancaster County:**

Miki Esposito; Milo Mumgaard; Nancy Clark; Sara Hartzell; Gene Hanlon; Scott Holmes; Dan King; Karla Welding

#### **HDR:**

John Dempsey; Adriana Servinsky; Leanne Zietlow

#### **Public:**

Dave Dingman; Harold Dynneson; Lori Erickson; Scott Erickson; Fred Freytag; Sarah Hanzel; Ryan Hatten; Steve Harms; Jacob Harms; Carrie Hakenkamp;; Brian Kurtzer; Greg Kurtzer; Jay Kurtzer; Scott Erickson; Don Shea; Joe Sullivan; Mark Sullivan; Dale Gubbels; Craig Gubbels; Charlie Humble

- 1) The facilitator conducted the Safety Briefing and acknowledged the posted Open Public Meeting Law.
- 2) The Committee Chair called the meeting to order.
- 3) The Committee Chair conducted a roll call of attendance.
- 4) Meeting notes from December 11, 2012 were approved.
- 5) Follow-up items from the December 11, 2012 meeting.
  - A handout was distributed and an explanation provided on how the USEPA calculates a national average for recycling and how the 18% recycling rate included in past technical papers was calculated.
  - Summary notes were distributed documenting the group activity that was conducted during the December meeting.
- 6) Information was presented on the Collection System technical paper.
  - Committee members provided comments about cost, efficiency and satisfaction with various collection programs.
  - A committee member provided comments about hidden costs that may not be reported for other cities referenced in the technical paper.

# Solid Waste Plan 2040

- A committee member commented that the current collection system employs multiple service providers for various support services.
  - A comment was also made that the existing collection system picks up large bulky items and storm damage debris at no added cost.
- 7) Information was presented on the Transfer Stations and Processing Facilities technical paper.
- Questions were asked about haul costs and travel distances in other communities relative to the rule of thumb distance in the technical paper.
- 8) Information was presented on the Markets technical paper.
- 9) The facilitator provided information on public participation, project website, and various options available to provide comments.
- 10) A presentation was provided on group decision making and polling relative to the development of various options to be used to develop a system definition and ultimately the Plan.
- A sample polling process was conducted to illustrate the process.
  - It was noted that the polling would be anonymous.
  - A presentation was provided on how the selection of topical options (described as a preferred path) would be used to develop a system definition for further evaluation and that later (following the public's opportunity to comment on the System Definition) the Advisory Committee would be involved in the development of the Plan. The process was described as providing a presentation of the issues and options, followed by an initial round of polling, followed by a short discussion and a final round of polling.
  - Discussion was held about what would constitute a "majority" vote. It was generally concluded that a 66% majority of members present would be used, when two options were available.
  - Before polling was conducted on the Municipal Solid Waste Disposal and Construction and Demolition Waste Disposal options a committee member stated that by the committee voting on the disposal options the focus continued to be on the use of the current system and not new approaches (like net-zero waste); the committee member suggested that a preferred strategy should be agreed to before polling took place on individual elements like disposal.
  - A handout summarizing the Issue, Options and Implementation Considerations for the Municipal Solid Waste Disposal and Construction and Demolition Waste Disposal topics were provided to the committee and a short presentation was made summarizing the handout materials. The handout and the presentation included information from the technical papers previously presented to and reviewed by the committee.
  - The final polling of the committee related to the Municipal Solid Waste Disposal topic resulted in a preferred path that would provide for future disposal capacity for municipal solid waste by expanding onto City owned property to the east of the currently permitted site (existing landfill).
  - The final polling of the committee related to the Construction and Demolition Waste Disposal topic resulted in a preferred path that would provide for future disposal capacity for construction and demolition waste by expanding onto City owned property.
  - A discussion of the process, including presentation of overview, issues, and options followed by voting, discussion, and second round of voting were agreed to be an acceptable tool for developing a preferred pathway and preliminary system definition. Future topics will also include distribution of technical summaries similar to what was done on the disposal topic.
- 11) The next Advisory Committee Meeting date and location were noted:
- March 12, 2013; 2:30 pm to 4:30 pm; Lincoln/Lancaster County Health Department Lower Level Training Room.

# Solid Waste Plan 2040

12) The meeting was opened for public comments.

(1) One commenter stated that he would like to have city-wide litter problem addressed in this plan.

(2) One commenter spoke about “Bio-Char” and its benefits.

13) The Committee Chair adjourned the meeting.

Handouts provided at the meeting included:

- How is the 18% MSW recycling rate calculated?
- Group exercise summary from 12/11/2012 meeting
- Disposal Options
  - Municipal Solid Waste Disposal (Options)
  - Construction and Demolition Waste Disposal (Options)

## Advisory Committee Meeting Notes

Day: Tuesday  
Date: March 12, 2013  
Time: 2:30 pm to 4:30 pm  
Location: Lincoln/Lancaster County Health Department  
Room: Lower Level Training Room

### Advisory Committee:

#### Present:

Mike Ayars; Gary Bergman; Eileen Bergt; Jack Coogan; Tim Farmer; Paul Johnson; Dan Kurtzer; Coby Mach; Sarah Murtagh; Adam Prochaska; Sue Quambusch; Jane Raybould; DiAnna Schimek; Cecil Steward;

#### Absent:

Ann Bleed; Steve Hatten; Casey Larkins; Jeannelle Lust; Meghan Sullivan; Chris Zegar

### City of Lincoln/Lancaster County:

Miki Esposito; Milo Mumgaard; Nancy Clark; Sara Hartzell; Dan King; Karla Welding

### HDR:

John Dempsey; Adriana Servinsky

### Public:

Dave Dingman; Charlie Humble; Chante Earthwell; Matt Kasik; Neil Sullivan; Brady Svendgard; Bryan Pedersen; Greg West; Jim Klein; Sarah Hanzel; Seth Harms; Jacob Harms; Carrie Hakenkamp; Brian Kurtzer; Greg Kurtzer; Jay Kurtzer; Dale Gubbels

- 1) The facilitator conducted the Safety Briefing and acknowledged the posted public meeting law.
- 2) The Committee Chair called the meeting to order.
- 3) The Committee Chair conducted a roll call of attendance.
- 4) Meeting notes from February 12, 2013 were approved.
- 5) Information was provided via poster boards and handouts summarizing previously distributed information on the Vision, Guiding Principles, Waste Management Hierarchy, Regulatory Background, Evaluation Criteria and the Baseline Assessment/Survey for the convenience of the Committee members. The information has been previously distributed and posted on the project website.
- 6) A graphic depicting a continuum of solid waste management - from landfilling to resource recovery - was handed out to the Committee and included in the presentation. The continuum was discussed in the context of the forward looking aspects of the planning process and as an aide to visualizing where the City may wish to go in terms of timing and possible degrees of diversion. A facilitated discussion was then conducted on this broad concept. Among the items discussed were:
  - Should the starting point for planning be a diversion rate equal to USEPA's national average of 34%
  - The values used to estimate the City's current 18% diversion rate may be low because not all firms share their data. If all data was provided, the diversion rate may actually be higher.

# Solid Waste Plan 2040

- A concept of conservation increment financing.
  - That being a green leader may or may not bring in jobs.
  - The importance of education and behavior change in reducing waste generation.
  - That not all haulers provide recycling services.
  - There should be incentives to not make waste.
  - UNL currently recycles 51% of their waste; provides a high level of education and convenience
  - The importance of incentives, education and convenience in encouraging waste reduction and recycling
  - Convenience (space in a building) was important to provide and promote recycling
  - Rates for recycling services should not be hidden in the cost of solid waste services costs.
  - Upcoming generations were pushing for more opportunities to recycle.
  - That recycling had a greater environmental benefit than energy conservation on reducing the carbon footprint of a building
  - That environmental savings lead to energy savings lead to cost benefits.
  - It may be in the best interest of the haulers to encourage recycling.
  - If everyone recycled the price for recycling services would decrease.
  - Levels of recycling may be gradually growing in the City.
- 7) A list of implementation considerations common to most options was listed and provided. These common implementation considerations would not be unnecessarily repeated on the option papers.
- 8) The facilitator provided information on public participation, project website, and various opportunities available to provide comments.
- 9) The process for the Committee to provide input for the preferred path will now include a selection to abstain from the first and second polling events for each option considered. Additionally, the process will now include an opportunity for the Committee to discuss the topic and options before the first polling event and again after the first polling event and prior to the second polling event. The Committee may also reword listed options for each topic, or may insert or delete other options to be considered for each topic. These were changes to the process reviewed and used at the previous meeting. A handout of the Issue, Options and Implementation Considerations for the topics of Source Reduction, Toxics Reduction, Yard Waste, Residential Recycling and Diversion, Commercial Recycling and Diversion, Construction and Demolition Materials Recycling, and Organic Waste Diversion (Composting) were provided to the committee at the beginning of the meeting. These same materials had been posted on the Solid Waste Plan 2040 website approximately a week earlier. The handout for each topic and the presentation for each topic included information from the technical papers previously presented to and reviewed by the Committee.
- 10) A short presentation was made summarizing materials previously presented on the Source Reduction topic/technical papers (including Product Stewardship and Zero Waste).
- A discussion occurred on whether the polling was on all of the listed implementation options (issues/considerations) or on the overall plan direction. It was clarified the polling results and the Committee discussion will be used to formulate an overall direction (via the System Definition), not a specific, final conclusion or recommendation on the option selected. The final polling of the Committee related to the Source Reduction topic resulting in a preferred path that would expand programs that lead to greater source reduction.
- 11) A short presentation was made summarizing materials previously presented on the Toxics Reduction topic/technical papers (including Household and Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generator Hazardous Waste and Universal, Special and Unique Wastes).

# Solid Waste Plan 2040

- Following a discussion, Option 2 was reworded to be “Expand the Toxics Reduction Program and Create a Place to Provide Year Round Access”. The final polling of the committee related to the Toxics Reduction topic resulting in a preferred path that would expand the toxics reduction program and create a place to provide year round access.
- 12) The next Advisory Committee Meeting date and location were noted:
- April 9, 2013; 2:30 pm to 4:30 pm; Lincoln/Lancaster County Health Department Lower Level Training Room.
- 13) The meeting was opened for public comments.
- (1) One commenter stated that there was more than one way to measure recycling rate and that different communities calculate the recycling rate differently. The commenter felt there should be a common method of measurement established. The commenter stated the Committee was building a record at 30,000 feet and that the record has to be more than general principles; there needs to be meaningful criteria.
  - (2) One commenter stated that the business community has reached the peak of what voluntary recycling efforts can achieve and also that there were inefficiencies in the collection system. The commenter noted that it is expensive to run education programs. The commenter also stated that planning effort needs to look at how far voluntary recycling efforts can go.
  - (3) One commenter stated kids are providing incentives to increase recycling and the commenter expects levels of recycling to rise without government meddling.
  - (4) One commenter stated he has conducted surveys as part of his business and over the past 4 years he has seen interest in recycling rise. The commenter stated support for recycling.
  - (5) One commenter stated that business owners are trying to do the right thing and that there are more businesses recycling but it takes time for programs to grow.
  - (6) Several of the commenter’s thanked or complimented the committee for volunteering and for their efforts.
- 14) The Committee Chair adjourned the meeting.

Handouts provided at the meeting included:

- Vision, Guiding Principles and Goals
- Regulatory Background
- Evaluation/Screening Criteria for Solid Waste Management Options/Strategies
- Source Reduction and Recycling Options
  - Source Reduction
  - Toxics- Reduction
  - Yard Waste
  - Residential Recycling and Diversion
  - Commercial Recycling and Diversion
  - Construction and Demolition Materials Recycling
  - Organic Waste Diversion (Composting)
  - Construction and Demolition Waste Disposal
  - Municipal Solid Waste Disposal
- Baseline Assessment/Survey
- Continuum of Solid Waste Management

## **Advisory Committee Meeting Notes**

Day: Tuesday  
Date: April 9, 2013  
Time: 2:30 pm to 4:30 pm  
Location: Lincoln/Lancaster County Health Department  
Room: Lower Level Training Room

### **Advisory Committee:**

#### **Present:**

Mike Ayars; Eileen Bergt; Ann Bleed; Jack Coogan; Tim Farmer; Steve Hatten; Paul Johnson; Dan Kurtzer; Coby Mach; Adam Prochaska; Sue Quambusch; DiAnna Schimek; Cecil Steward; Meghan Sullivan; Chris Zegar

#### **Absent:**

Gary Bergman; Casey Larkins; Jeannelle Lust; Sarah Murtagh; Jane Raybould

### **City of Lincoln/Lancaster County:**

Miki Esposito; Milo Mumgaard; Sara Hartzell; Dan King; Karla Welding

#### **HDR:**

John Dempsey; Adriana Servinsky

#### **Public:**

Dave Dingman; Ryan Hatten; Drew Harms; Stacey Carter; Charles Ciparelli; Kent Kurtzer; Charlie Humble; Matt Kasik; Brady Svendgard; Bryan Pedersen; Jim Klein; Sarah Hanzel; Seth Harms; Carrie Hakenkamp;

- 1) The facilitator conducted the Safety Briefing and acknowledged the posted public meeting law.
- 2) The Committee Chair called the meeting to order.
- 3) The Committee Chair conducted a roll call of attendance.
- 4) Miki Esposito addressed the committee and thanked them for their efforts. She made several comments including: the administration supports recycling; that it was important that the committee work through the process and that the administration wants the committee to have an open dialog and does not want to be directing the discussion, and that the City has other green City initiatives that are ongoing.
- 5) Meeting notes from March 12, 2013 were approved.
- 6) Information was provided via poster boards on the Vision, Guiding Principles, Waste Management Hierarchy, Regulatory Background, and Evaluation Criteria (same as presented at the March 12, 2013 meeting) and handouts were provided summarizing previously distributed technical papers on Waste Conversion Technology Options, Bioreactor/Bio-Stabilization Landfill Options, and Transfer Station and Processing Facility Options; these were provided for the convenience of the Committee members. The information has been previously distributed and posted on the project website.
- 7) Added input was taken regarding the continuum of solid waste management (presented at the March 12 meeting). Comments included:

# Solid Waste Plan 2040

- At some point the Committee would need to address where on the continuum they thought solid waste management should be in 2040.
  - It was commented that the currently estimated recycling rates may be low.
  - That the City would have double the demand for disposal by 2040 if no changes were made to current practices.
- 8) The facilitator reviewed the process that would be used for developing the System Definition (same process used at the March 12, 2013 meeting) and the list of Options Topics that remained to be covered.
- 9) A presentation was provided of information on 2011 Disposal and Diversion rates and waste composition (based on the NDEQ 2007/2008 - 4 season waste sort and composition study at the Bluff Road Landfill) -The information reviewed was previously presented in the October 12, 2012 Advisory Committee meeting and was presented as part of the overview on the various recycling and diversion topics.
- A question was asked on when the NDEQ waste composition study was done; it was answered that between fall of 2007 and fall of 2008 four sorts were conducted. A committee member commented that they thought the composition of waste had changed since the study.
  - A question was asked about whether the 75% estimate of recoverable metals meant that it was technologically recoverable or if there were markets; the answer provided was that the values presented were from the firm conducting the waste composition study and the sorting that occurred largely reflected their judgment that the metals could be clean enough to be easily recycled.
- 10) A short presentation was made summarizing the topic of Yard Waste and the varying definitions used in law, regulation and ordinance.
- A discussion occurred on several aspects of the various options including:
    - i) Would more yard waste help landfill decomposition process or is it "more stuff in the way"? A partial answer was given that landfills are generally operated to discourage decomposition.
    - ii) Does ornamental plant waste go to the landfill or composting area?
    - iii) A comment was made that the federal government set up yard waste ban legislation because they feared landfill closings.
    - iv) In answer to a question it was noted that the majority of vegetative waste from storm events was diverted from disposal.
    - v) Are there regulations on organic material?
    - vi) Does yard waste take up volume in the landfill or does it decompose? The general answer was that it both takes up space and a portion of it decomposes.
    - vii) How long does it take for the City to create a compost product at their current site?; this was answered that from the time material is received until it is ready to be distributed varies by material but an overall average might be 6 to 9 months.
    - viii) There is a potential trade-off between energy production and land used up. Potential energy recovery must be weighed against other risks; it is not just composting at the lowest cost.
    - ix) How much of the methane generated in the landfill is collected?; it was answered that this is function of the amount of area capped but an overall estimate including both capped and active areas might be 50%. If grass and leaves were to be accepted year round the City would have to make additional expenditures to capture the gas from these waste streams?
    - x) Once a landfill is capped how long does the decomposition process go on?; it was answered that by some estimates 100 years or more, at a declining rate.

# Solid Waste Plan 2040

- xi) How much of the landfill has a gas recovery system?; it was answered that 60 acres out of the over 120 acres currently constructed has a system installed - this corresponds to the area to final grade that has been capped.
  - xii) How much landfill space is available on the City owned property to the east in comparison to the Bluff Road site?; it was answered that that has not been estimated but overall land area is about the same and so usable area would be assumed to be approximately the same.
  - xiii) Banning yard waste year round would require all citizens to subscribe to yard waste collection;
  - xiv) What would happen if someone had one small twig to dispose of during the winter?
  - xv) How much increase methane would result if all yard waste were placed in the landfill?
  - xvi) The possibility of extending the season for during which yard waste was banned to keep people from saving it up until the ban is off (e.g., March) and how much this would divert;
  - xvii) If it is banned what would happen to it; some bans create incentives for improper management.
  - xviii) How rapidly does it yard waste degrade and how much methane does it produce;
  - xix) Net economic benefit from alternate management approaches;
  - xx) Net impact of seasonal waste hauling
  - xxi) What materials would be affected (varying definitions of yard waste) or would it involve all yard waste
  - xxii) Could paper be added to the yard waste composting operation;
  - xxiii) What additional infrastructure would need to be added if it were banned;
  - xxiv) Other discussions touched on examples of bans and how costs are built into programs (e.g., tires); whether bans might work to control litter from film plastic bags; percent of waste which is film plastic; biodegradable bags.
  - The final polling of the Committee reflected a nearly even number of members split between maintaining the status quo and banning yard waste disposal at the City's landfill year round. In both rounds of polling there was very little support for allowing yard waste disposal at the City's MSW landfill year round.
  - Based on the absence of a clear majority this topic was tabled and additional information and clarifications will be provided at the next Advisory Committee meeting.
  - The committee asked that additional information be provide when this topic was brought back to the Committee.
- 11) A short presentation was made summarizing the topic of Residential Recycling and Diversion and the various program types' currently in use or considered in the technical paper on this topic.
- A discussion occurred on several aspects of residential including:
    - i) A suggestion that the City needed to do more recycling;
    - ii) That convenience, technical support, and infrastructure has cost implications.
    - iii) One Committee member didn't like the language of Options.
    - iv) Prior to polling a clarification was provided on the term "Universal Recycling". It was clarified that consistent with the technical paper on Residential Recycling and Diversion [presented at the October 9, 2012 meeting] that the term, as used in the polling of Options, referred to a program where the availability of recycling services was mandatory (must be provided to all residents) but the participation was voluntary; this was distinguished from the a "mandatory recycling" system where participation was not voluntary.
    - v) In response to a question on what a program might cost it was stated that the Baseline Survey indicated that the current costs were in the range of \$10 per house for households that subscribed to the service; in terms of what a universally available

# Solid Waste Plan 2040

program might cost it was noted that the technical document on *Residential Recycling and Diversion* included additional cost information on various recycling programs operating in the region.

- The final polling of the Committee related to the Residential Recycling and Diversion topic resulting in a preferred path that would include residential curbside recycling to be provided to all single family and duplex dwellings City wide.
- 12) In a review of upcoming topics one committee member commented the calculated 75% C&D waste diversion rate presented in the technical paper on the topic may be overstated based on his work with a separate group looking at other diversion opportunities. Another member suggested costs were important.
  - 13) The members of the Committee and those present from the public were reminded of the project website and the opportunities and methods available to provide comments.
  - 14) The next Advisory Committee Meeting date and location were noted:
    - May 14, 2013; 2:30 pm to 4:30 pm; Lincoln/Lancaster County Health Department Lower Level Training Room.
  - 15) The meeting was opened for public comments.
    - (1) One commenter stated that the Committee should be aware of Agenda 21 and suggested it was the law and asked if the Solid Waste Plan 2040 would be in accordance with that agenda. The commenter suggested that the committee become familiar with Agenda 21 and commented that the amount of resources being thrown away was not sustainable.
    - (2) One commenter noted that his firm had made a substantial investment in providing recycling service (education, promotion and equipment), and asked the committee to consider that in formulating recommendations. The commenter stressed the importance of education and suggested that any recommendations coming out of the plan should include recycling.
  - 16) The Committee Chair adjourned the meeting at 4:18 PM.

Handouts provided at the meeting included:

- Waste Conversion Technology Options,
- Bioreactor/Bio-Stabilization Landfill Options, and
- Transfer Station and Processing Facility Options

## Advisory Committee Meeting Notes

Day: Tuesday  
Date: May 14, 2013  
Time: 2:30 pm to 4:30 pm  
Location: Lincoln/Lancaster County Health Department  
Room: Lower Level Training Room

### Advisory Committee:

#### Present:

Mike Ayars; Gary Bergman; Ann Bleed; Jack Coogan; Steve Hatten; Paul Johnson; Dan Kurtzer; Jeannelle Lust; Coby Mach; Sarah Murtagh; Adam Prochaska; Jane Raybould; DiAnna Schimek; Cecil Steward; Meghan Sullivan; Chris Zegar

#### Absent:

Eileen Bergt; Tim Farmer; Casey Larkins; Sue Quambusch

### City of Lincoln/Lancaster County:

Milo Mumgaard; Karla Welding; Gene Hanlon; Scott Holmes; Nancy Clark; Dan King; Sara Hartzell

#### HDR:

John Dempsey; Adriana Servinsky

#### Public:

Dave Dingman; Kent Kurtzer; Charlie Humble; Matt Kasik; Bryan Pedersen; Jim Klein; Seth Harms; Carrie Hakenkamp; Craig Gubbels; Dan Rice; Brian Kurtzer; Greg West; Neil Sullivan; Jay Kurtzer; Scott Niederhaus; Scott Zajicek; Greg Kurtzer; Marti Franti; Dale Gubbels; Ann Post

- 1) The facilitator conducted the Safety Briefing and acknowledged the posted public meeting law.
- 2) The Committee Chair called the meeting to order.
- 3) The Committee Chair conducted a roll call of attendance.
- 4) Meeting notes from April 9, 2013 were approved.
- 5) Information was provided via poster board and flow chart of where the Planning Process stands relative to the System Definition, Open House/Public Meeting and the Draft Plan. A review was conducted of previously presented information on the relationship between the Options versus the System Definition versus the Final Plan and it was noted that the Committee will have additional opportunities to provide input on various options before the final plan is developed.
- 6) The facilitator reviewed the process that would be used for developing the System Definition (same process used at prior meetings) and the list of Options Topics that remained to be covered.
- 7) A handout was provided with supplemental information on Yard Waste. A presentation was provided on clarifications of the term Yard Waste and the additional information in the handout.

# Solid Waste Plan 2040

- A comment was made about considering accepting yard waste year round if the overall system approach is to give serious consideration to energy recovery.
  - The final polling of the Committee fell a few percentage points below the 2/3 majority in identifying a preferred path which would involve maintaining the status quo. The Management Team will consider options to address the lack of a 2/3 majority on this topic.
- 8) A short presentation was made summarizing the topic of Commercial Recycling and Diversion and the various program types that were considered in the technical paper on this topic.
- The term “provided” in the polling option was clarified to mean “provided by ordinance” which would mean it would be mandatory that it be provided to all multi-family dwellings, businesses, industries and institutions either as hauler provided or commercial institution provided.
  - A discussion occurred on several aspects of commercial recycling including:
    - i) Recycling options and programs may differ by business types.
    - ii) Whether it represented an increased cost to waste generators; it was noted that this may be specific to the generator and type of waste they produce.
    - iii) That implementation may need to occur through ordinance revisions and the building permit process for new/remodeled commercial construction.
    - iv) That infrastructure may not always accommodate additional recyclables storage containers and that currently building permits for new commercial construction do not require space be set aside for waste (and recycling) containers.
    - v) That a future transfer station (if determined feasible) may be an opportunity to further support commercial recycling by providing opportunities for waste diversion/separation
    - vi) A question was asked as to whether commercial recycling would allow businesses to self-haul recyclables; this was identified as an implementation consideration.
  - The final polling of the Committee related to the Commercial Recycling and Diversion topic resulting in a preferred path that would include commercial recycling to be provided to multi-family dwellings, businesses, industries, and institutions.
- 9) It was requested that future meeting agenda’s clarify what topics will be discussed, to allow the public better opportunity to understand what will be discussed.
- 10) A short presentation was made summarizing the topic of Construction & Demolition Materials Recycling and Diversion and the various existing and optional program types’ that were considered in the technical paper on this topic.
- Several committee members noted that beyond the 75% recycling level estimated using recycling rates for concrete and asphalt that recycling rates for other C&D materials may be relatively low.
  - The question was asked if concrete and asphalt could be excluded when calculating the C&D material recycling rate. The City noted that there is not sufficient data available to do that, however it is believed that only a small amount of C&D material other than concrete and asphalt is being recycled.
  - One committee member noted that he did not like or understand the options available for the committee to consider.
  - The final polling of the Committee related to the C&D Material Recycling and Diversion topic did not result in a preferred path selection and the Committee asked that the question be reframed to focus on materials other than concrete and asphalt brought back to the Committee.
- 11) A short presentation was made summarizing the topic of Organic Waste Diversion (Composting) and the various existing and optional program types that were considered in the technical paper on this topic.

# Solid Waste Plan 2040

- Committee discussion included various types of organic materials that might be targeted by such a program and current efforts (food collection programs from grocery stores) that divert usable food to feed hungry people locally.
  - One Committee member expressed concern that food waste would freeze inside of storage bins in the winter.
  - The final polling of the Committee related to the Organic Waste Diversion (Composting) topic resulting in a preferred path that would develop and support programs to reduce the quantities of organic, especially food waste, going to the City's MSW disposal site.
- 12) A short presentation was made summarizing the topic of Waste Conversion Technologies, including a nationwide perspective, as well as issues and challenges in implementing this option for energy and resource recovery. This presentation was a summary of information that was discussed and presented in the technical paper on this topic.
- It was noted in the presentation that the cost per ton is anticipated to be significantly higher than the current landfill tipping fee.
  - It was commented that LES would need to be a partner if such an option were considered.
  - A question was asked if such a facility would cost \$100-\$200 million. It was noted that no capital cost estimate had been prepared, but that such facilities were very capital intensive to implement. The technical paper was referenced as providing an example where the cost per household might increase in the range of \$12 per month for such technology.
  - A comment was made that the first county in the US to declare bankruptcy was in Alabama and was caused by a waste conversion system.
  - The final polling of the Committee related to the Waste Conversion Technologies topic resulting in a preferred path that would include pursuing the development of waste conversion technology(ies) as a part of a long-term strategy for energy recovery and resource conservation.
- 13) A short presentation was made summarizing the topic of Bioreactor/Bio-Stabilization Landfill, including potential long-term benefits, as well as issues and challenges in implementing this technology. This was a summary of information that was discussed and presented in the technical paper on this topic.
- Concerns were raised about the amount of water required, even if the water were from waste water sources.
  - Some Committee members wanted to consider the option to see how it would relate to the overall System Definition.
  - The final polling of the Committee related to the Bioreactor/Bio-Stabilization Landfill topic resulting in a preferred path that would not give further consideration in the Systems Definition to pursuing the development of a bioreactor/bio-stabilization technology for use at the City's MSW Landfill.
- 14) A short presentation was made summarizing the topic of Transfer Station and Processing Facilities, the existing programs, the difference between transfer stations and processing facilities, options for combined facilities, and the many items that might be accomplished via such facility(ies). This was a summary of information that was discussed and presented in the technical paper on this topic.
- Discussion included the following:
    - i) A question was asked as to whether facilities were fully enclosed. The response was that such facilities are required to conduct activities inside a building and typically such buildings include doors that would allow them to be fully enclosed (doors are typically open during operations).
    - ii) One Committee member commented that he did not think they were cost effective.
    - iii) A comment was made that there would be a benefit in terms of less fuel used.

# Solid Waste Plan 2040

- iv) Such a facility could host other function such as a household hazardous waste facility or processing center.
  - v) Loads of waste delivered to transfer stations could potentially be sorted for recycling if they contained large volumes of recyclables (e.g., high concentrations of corrugated materials).
  - The final polling of the Committee related to the Transfer Station and Processing Facilities topic resulting in a preferred path that would consider the development of a municipal solid waste transfer station if a feasibility study shows it can be cost effective.
- 15) The next Advisory Committee Meeting date and location were noted:
- June 11, 2013; 2:30 pm to 4:30 pm; Lincoln/Lancaster County Health Department Lower Level Training Room.
- 16) The meeting was opened for public comments.
- (1) One commenter discussed the many attributes of anaerobic digestion of organic waste, costs, energy production, and possible system scenarios related to the City.
  - (2) One commenter asked about more detail on future agendas, offered assistance from her firm on various waste diversion matters and indicated a desire to look at the overall management of a waste from a systems approach.
  - (3) One commenter noted his firms efforts to obtain permits to increase the quantity of food waste they could compost, in combination with their current livestock waste composting efforts.
- 17) The Committee Chair adjourned the meeting at 4:35 PM.

Handouts provided at the meeting included:

- Yard Waste - Additional Information

## **Advisory Committee Meeting Notes**

Day: Tuesday  
Date: June 25, 2013  
Time: 2:30 pm to 4:30 pm  
Location: Lincoln/Lancaster County Health Department  
Room: Lower Level Training Room

### **Advisory Committee:**

#### **Present:**

Mike Ayars; Gary Bergman; Jack Coogan; Tim Farmer; Steve Hatten; Paul Johnson; Dan Kurtzer; Casey Larkins; Jeannelle Lust; Coby Mach; Sarah Murtagh; Adam Prochaska; Sue Quambusch; Jane Raybould; DiAnna Schimek; Cecil Steward; Chris Zegar

#### **Absent:**

Eileen Bergt; Ann Bleed; Meghan Sullivan

### **City of Lincoln/Lancaster County:**

Milo Mumgaard; Karla Welding; Gene Hanlon; Scott Holmes; Nancy Clark; Dan King; Sara Hartzell; Frank Uhlarik

#### **HDR:**

John Dempsey; Adriana Servinsky

#### **Public:**

Dave Dingman; Charles Humble; Jim Klein; Carrie Hakenkamp; Dale Gubbels; Jay Kurtzer; Greg Kurtzer; Ann Post; Sarah Hanzel; Nancy Hicks

- 1) The facilitator conducted the Safety Briefing and acknowledged the posted public meeting law.
- 2) The Committee Chair called the meeting to order.
- 3) The Committee Chair conducted a roll call of attendance.
- 4) Meeting notes from May 14, 2013 were approved.
- 5) A handout was provided on Construction and Demolition Material Recycling – Additional Information.
- 6) A presentation was provided on Construction and Demolition Material Recycling including: the current system, the unknown quantity of material currently being accepted at the Bluff Road MSW landfill, and program options that might be applicable to increasing the quantity of material being diverted.
  - A comment was made about clarifying definitions on C&D waste and some ongoing cooperative research being done locally that may lead to more information on quantities of material being generated as well as a reference to EPA data suggesting 40 percent of waste stream is C&D material.

# Solid Waste Plan 2040

- A comment was also made that the committee had not heard from the contractors/businesses regarding costs and that more time may be needed for the committee to fully understand the issue. The committee was referred to prior technical papers and discussions on this topic.
  - A comment was also made that there is a need to better manage C&D materials, but it all takes time, space and added effort.
  - A comment was made that education is key and it can work without regulatory changes.
  - Several examples were provided for the terms like support (e.g., education, promotional materials, supporting the private effort) and develop (e.g., pilot programs, co-located facilities, public/private partnerships, incorporation into existing government construction projects) and reference was made to the prior presentation slide on program options.
- 7) After discussion, the final polling of the Committee related to the Construction and Demolition Waste Recycling topic resulting in a preferred path that would “develop/support programs to reduce the quantities of construction and demolition waste going to the City’s disposal site(s).” It was noted that this will be incorporated into the final version of the System Definition.
- 8) The facilitator used a graphic to remind the committee where they were in the Solid Waste Plan 2040 development process.
- 9) A presentation was provided on the Draft System Definition, including the purpose, its use in the public open house process, the information included on each Option (strategies, quantitative/qualitative goals, benefits, cost considerations, capital costs, operating costs, funding, and diversion), some of the limitations in summarizing all options in a comparative format, and key table from the Draft System Definition (3 diversion scenarios, evaluation/screening criteria, cost information including annualized costs, implementation actions).
- 10) The committee was invited to ask questions and to identify clarifications for incorporation into the final System Definition. Comments are summarized below relative to the overall System Definition as well as the various tables used in the presentation. Comments and requests for clarification included:
- How frequently is a plan updated? The response is that a common approach is to review the status and update it on approximately 5 year intervals.
  - “Implementation” will take work and be the biggest challenge, especially for source reduction.
  - The three scenarios presented are based on the concepts presented relative to the Solid Waste Management Continuum and the progressive program leading to greater diversion of waste from landfills and a fully integrated approach to solid waste management.
  - **Evaluation Criteria**
    - A question was asked as to how an up- or down-arrow was assigned to a particular item in the evaluation criteria. The response included that it was based on the more detailed evaluations including in individual technical papers as well as whether the preferred path would represent a significant change from the status quo (up or down from the more detailed criteria that make up each category of evaluation). Several examples were discussed (e.g., down-arrows on waste conversion technology indicated that the added costs, public opposition, need for waste flow control ordinances and other factors would pose significant challenges).

# Solid Waste Plan 2040

- In response to a question it was noted that the reason “Yard Waste” contained all dashes was that the preferred path was status quo; this would suggest no significant changes.
- A comment was made that up versus down arrow definition for each criterion might be helpful.
- It was noted that an upward arrow should have been included under Residential Recycling under that “Economic Impacts” column.
- **Cost**
  - A suggestion was made to clarify the two columns to identify that these were ranges and possibly that they related to the range of division rates.
  - A question was asked as to whether the annualized costs include capital improvement costs? It was suggested that it be clear when costs are for capital (bonding/financed costs) versus operations; it was also suggested that it be clarified that annualized costs and cost/household/month be defined as cost increases.
  - It was suggested that the reference recycling costs being “\$0 or less” be clarified to identify that these would represent “no increase”. It was also suggested that additional explanation be provided to clarify the “\$0 or less” so that it did not suggest that recycling is free. An explanation was provided as to how the “\$0 or less” was determined, including the Baseline/Assessment Survey costs for current waste collection and recyclables collection in Lincoln compared a program that included franchised or contracted solid waste and recyclables collection similar to what is being done in Bellevue and Ralston, Nebraska and other locations.
  - A question was asked about Seattle’s solid waste program costs. The response was that Seattle’s program is substantially different than in Lincoln (including hauling waste by train to the desert for disposal), but that costs were not available that could be shared at the meeting.
  - A question was asked about whether the dollars values include only City+3mile radius or does it include other villages in the county? This will be clarified in the final document. It was noted that the City does have inter-local agreements with the villages within the County.
  - In response to how annualized capital costs were estimated the response was that it was generally based on a 20-year amortization period.
  - In response a question on how the “\$5.1 - \$7.1 million” for Residential Recycling was estimated, it was note the dollar per month values were multiplied by the approximately 84,000 single family to four-plex dwellings in the County. The demographic value used will be noted in the final System Definition.
  - A clarification was requested on details that make up each of the options for a “permanent facility” for household hazardous waste?
  - A clarification was requested on the use of “2013\$” to indicate that the values were being expressed in 2013 dollars.
  - A request was made to provide separate estimates for “income” related to options for Waste Conversion Technology and Organic Waste Diversion. It was noted that this may be complicated because such values are often facility and location specific.

# Solid Waste Plan 2040

- **Implementation Actions**
    - A question was asked about the meaning of the dashed line on “funding” under landfill/disposal options and could it also be labeled “no”? The response provided was that this was intended to indicate that there was not a new sources of funding anticipated? A further review will be conducted to determine how to best clarify this question.
    - In response to a question it was noted that the dash corresponding to Source Reduction/Markets was intended to indicate that “markets” were not applicable to this topic?
  - At the conclusion of the discussion on the System Definition a comment was made that on Page 6 in document the footnotes provided to clarify the word “provided” includes the word provide and that there were two definitions for the word provided in the same table. It was noted that the footnote language came directly from the prior Advisory Committee discussion and how they were recorded in the meeting minutes. This will be reviewed in the final document.
  - There was a concern expressed that the public will be confused by all the definitions and that there was a need for clarity on words such as “available”, “mandatory”, “provided”, “required”, and “voluntary”.
- 11) A committee member suggested rewording the preferred path on Residential Recycling and Diversion, and Commercial Recycling and Diversion. After discussion the committee vote affirmed the previously agreed upon wording.
- 12) The facilitator reviewed the anticipated public participation schedule and tools that will be used to engage the public, in addition to those that have been used throughout the planning process (e.g., website, comment (phone) line).
- 13) The facilitator provided a short presentation on the process for developing recommendation and some general examples of how recommendation might be developed (e.g., goals, systems/facilities/program, and general). The general discussion included the following:
- Will the committee vote?
  - Will there be some form of consensus building
  - The committee can use management team as a soundboard after generating ideas/input and for help refining the process, distilling thoughts, addressing concerns, etc.
  - Would the process preclude older ideas from being reentered into the process.
  - The Committee may choose to prioritize recommendations.
  - It would be helpful if the committee could be reminded of of preferred path decisions and other relevant information.
  - It was suggested that the process for developing recommendations may include two working sessions: 1) suggest ideas/concepts (Advisory Committee), 2) management team develop wording for suggested ideas/concepts, 3) finalize (Advisory Committee).
- 14) The next Advisory Committee Meeting date and location were noted:
- July 9, 2013; 2:30 pm to 4:30 pm; Lincoln/Lancaster County Health Department Lower Level Training Room.

# Solid Waste Plan 2040

15) The meeting was opened for public comments.

- a) One commenter mentioned Research Triangle Institute decision support tool for solid waste life cycle analysis approach to managing solid waste; that it incorporates benefits and costs and enables evaluation of program approaches.
- b) One commenter cautioned the Advisory Committee that the process is not complete and noted that input and comment received at this stage of the planning process is important.

16) The Committee Chair adjourned the meeting.

Handouts provided at the meeting included:

- Construction and Demolition Material Recycling – Additional Information
- Handout from a Committee Member on suggested language change to the Preferred Path for Residential Recycling and Diversion, and Commercial Recycling and Diversion.

## Advisory Committee Meeting Notes

Day: Tuesday  
Date: July 9, 2013  
Time: 2:30 pm to 4:30 pm  
Location: Lincoln/Lancaster County Health Department  
Room: Lower Level Training Room

### Advisory Committee:

#### Present:

Mike Ayars, Gary Bergman, Ann Bleed, Jack Coogan, Tim Farmer, Paul Johnson, Dan Kurtzer, Casey Larkins, Jenelle Lust, Coby Mach, Sarah Murtaugh, Adam Prochaska, Sue Quambush, Jane Raybould, Diana Schimek, Cecil Steward, Megan Sullivan, Chris Zegar.

#### Absent:

Eileen Bergt, Steve Hatten

### City of Lincoln and Lancaster County Staff:

Nancy Clark, Gene Hanlon, Sara Hartzell, Milo Mumgaard, Frank Uhlarik, Karla Welding

### HDR:

John Dempsey, Adriana Servinsky

### Public:

Charles Humble, Greg Kurtzer, Gordon Petrie, Ann Post, Sarah Hanzel, Jim Klien, Jay Kurtzer, Brian Kurtzer

- 1) The facilitator conducted the Safety Briefing and acknowledged the posted public meeting law.
- 2) The Committee Chair called the meeting to order.
- 3) The Committee Chair conducted a roll call of attendance
- 4) Meeting notes from June 25, 2013 were approved with corrections (misspellings and punctuation errors).
- 5) An overview was provided of the major changes between the Draft and Final System Definition.
- 6) The remaining schedule was reviewed. Motion was made and approved to move the August meeting from Tuesday, August 13, 2013 to Tuesday, August 27, 2013 at the Lincoln-Lancaster County Health Department Training Room from 2:30 to 4:30 pm.

# Solid Waste Plan 2040

- 7) Draft presentation boards for the Open House and Virtual Town Hall meeting were previewed and discussed.
  - A comment was made about the importance of upcoming meetings (and meeting materials) as an initial effort to educate the public about changing the management of solid waste from a largely collection and disposal program to a comprehensive and integrated management system.
  - Several comments were made that it was important to avoid jargon and use of acronyms; keep presentation in simple English and define terms, if needed.
  - Comment was made that topic area boards should provide information on how households or businesses would be impacted.
  - In developing recommendations it was noted that the committee could provide as general a recommendation or as much detail on specific programs as they wish. It was noted that many of the details (and costs) of specific programs would need to be worked out as part of the implementation. It was also noted that the cost and benefit information provided was intended to reflect reasonable expectations, but that until the final details are determined (during implementation) that it was not possible to provide precise estimates of costs.
  - A question was asked on whether the public will be given an opportunity to comment on the recommendations made by the committee. The response provided noted that when the plan goes to elected officials there will be opportunities for the public to comment on the specifics of the plan.
  - A question was asked on how comments would be received from the public. The response provided indicated that at the Open House comment forms will be provided to those who attend. The Virtual (On-Line) Town Hall meeting will have several means to provide comments.
  - A comment was made that Mind Mixer had been used on other projects and it proved difficult to navigate the site and some instructions or tips on how to navigate the site would be useful.
  - A comment was made that when costs for residential curbside recycling are presented that show no increase in costs it is important to explain that the option for City-wide franchise or contract collection reduces costs by increased collection system efficiency (when compared to the current free market system) and these costs reductions off-set the added cost for recycling services.
  - A question was asked if alternative approaches to solid waste and recycling collection and their estimated costs would be presented to the public as part of the public meetings. The response included that it was stated that one of the guiding principles of the planning process was that collection would remain in the private sector and that the costs identified in the System Definition would be presented.
- 8) An overview was provided of the strategies that would be utilized for making people aware of the opportunities to comment on the Solid Waste Plan.
  - A comment was made that beginning Septembers 1, 2013 the landfill and occupation tax fees will be going up a total of \$4 per ton and that the public is unaware of this increase and a press release needs to be sent out related to this increase.
  - A comment was made that in the publicity for the public meetings it is important to outline that households and businesses would be impacted.
- 9) The discussion on developing the recommendations for the solid waste plan was tabled until the August 27<sup>th</sup> meeting.
- 10) The meeting was opened for public comments. None were provided.
- 11) The Committee Chair adjourned the meeting.

## Advisory Committee Meeting Notes

**Day:** Tuesday  
**Date:** August 27, 2013  
**Time:** 2:30 pm to 4:30 pm  
**Location:** Lincoln/Lancaster County Health Department  
**Room:** Lower Level Training Room

### Advisory Committee:

#### Present:

Gary Bergman; Eileen Bergt; Ann Bleed; Jack Coogan; Tim Farmer; Steve Hatten; Paul Johnson; Dan Kurtzer; Casey Larkins; Jeannelle Lust; Coby Mach; Sarah Murtagh; Adam Prochaska; Sue Quambusch; Jane Raybould; DiAnna Schimek; Cecil Steward; Chris Zegar

#### Absent:

Mike Ayars; Meghan Sullivan

### City of Lincoln/Lancaster County:

Nancy Clark; Gene Hanlon; Sara Hartzell; Scott Holmes; Dan King; Milo Mumgaard; Frank Uhlarik; Karla Welding

#### HDR:

John Dempsey

#### Public:

Dave Dingman; Dale Gubbels; Corbin Bogle; Charles Humble; Kent Kurtzer; Greg West; Jim Klein; Carrie Hakenkamp; Greg Kurtzer; Jay Kurtzer; Jordan Pascale

- 1) The Committee Chair conducted the Safety Briefing and acknowledged the public meeting law posted on the wall.
- 2) The Committee Chair called the meeting to order.
- 3) The Committee Chair conducted a roll call of attendance.
- 4) Meeting notes from July 9, 2013 were approved.
- 5) Information was provided on the various methods used to promote public involvement and input. Information was also provided on the Public Comments report that included two Attachments. The first contained comments received via the project website, email, phone voicemail and mail since the project started. The second summarized the results from the Virtual Town Hall and the Open House meetings.
  - 60 people attended the Open House and 390 people visited the Virtual Town Hall website with 109 participating.

- A summary of responses to survey questions was presented along with a list of the additional ideas provided by the public.
- 6) The Committee Chair reviewed the Advisory Committee Charge Statement and the Vision, Guiding Principles and Plan Goals.
  - 7) The Committee Chair outlined the process for making recommendations.
    - A two-thirds majority vote (of those present) would be used to establish recommendations.
    - Committee member would have 3 minutes to make a motion for a recommendation; a second must be made; allow 5 minutes for discussion and then call the question and vote on the motion.
  - 8) The first category of recommendation discussed was to identify an overall waste reduction and recycling goal for the community:
    - Variations included a discussion that the goal should be more than recycling; it should encompass re-use, re-purpose and other means of diverting waste from disposal. Options discussed included:
      - i) Improving recycling rate to 30% by 2018; Improve recycling rate to 40% by 2025; Improve recycling rate to a minimum of 50% by 2040. It was noted that there should be a reassessment and evaluation at the first milestone (e.g., 2018 or 5 years) to possibly set new target based on what had been achieved to that point.
      - ii) Decrease waste deposited in landfill by 10% over current per capita disposal rate by 2018; Decrease waste deposited in landfill by 20% over current per capita disposal rate by 2025; Decrease waste deposited in landfill by 30% over current per capita disposal rate by 2040;
      - iii) Following a discussion the Management Team was directed to identify the local metric for the committee to consider at the next meeting.
  - 9) The Committee Chair asked for a motion to make the Preferred Paths identified in the System Definition as recommendations for the Plan with the understanding that the Committee can provide additional recommendations to expand upon each of these recommendations. Following discussion the motion passed.
  - 10) The Committee Chair opened the floor to motions dealing with any of the Preferred Path Recommendations.
    - A motion was made and seconded on the topic of Education, that: targeted educational programming be developed dealing with each Preferred Path Recommendation. Following discussion the motion passed.
    - A motion was made and seconded on the topic of Education, that: a financial commitment be made by the City to provide staffing and resources to educate individuals and businesses as part of the implementation of the plan recommendations. Following discussion the motion passed.
    - A motion was made and seconded on the topic of Commercial Recycling, that: businesses not be required to pay for or use a recycling service if they don't wish to. Following discussion the motion failed.

# Solid Waste Plan 2040

- A motion was made and seconded on the topic of Residential Recycling to: evaluate, and if feasible, implement a volume and frequency based pricing system to be adopted for both recycling and waste. Following discussion the motion failed.
- 11) The next Advisory Committee Meeting date and location were noted:
    - September 11, 2013; 2:30 pm to 4:30 pm; Lincoln/Lancaster County Health Department Lower Level Training Room.
  - 12) The meeting was opened for public comments.
    - No comments were provided
  - 13) The Committee Chair adjourned the meeting.

## **Advisory Committee Meeting Notes**

**Day:** Tuesday  
**Date:** September 10, 2013  
**Time:** 2:30 pm to 4:30 pm  
**Location:** Lincoln/Lancaster County Health Department  
**Room:** Lower Level Training Room

### **Advisory Committee:**

#### **Present:**

Mike Ayars; Gary Bergman; Eileen Bergt; Ann Bleed; Jack Coogan; Tim Farmer; Steve Hatten; Paul Johnson; Dan Kurtzer; Casey Larkins; Jeannelle Lust; Coby Mach; Sarah Murtagh; Adam Prochaska; Sue Quambusch; Jane Raybould; DiAnna Schimek; Cecil Steward; Chris Zegar

#### **Absent:**

Meghan Sullivan

#### **City of Lincoln/Lancaster County:**

Nancy Clark; Miki Esposito; Gene Hanlon; Scott Holmes; Sara Hartzell, Dan King; Frank Uhlarik; Karla Welding

#### **HDR:**

John Dempsey

#### **Public:**

Corbin Bogle; Nick Crow; Dave Dingman; Carrie Hakenkamp; Ryan Hallen; Sarah Hanzel; Charles Humble; Kent Kurtzer; Jeff Kettleson; Jim Klein; Brian Kurtzer; Jay Kurtzer; Jeremy Kurtzer; John Niederhaus; Scott Niederhaus; Ann Post; Greg West

- 1) The Committee Chair conducted the Safety Briefing and acknowledged the public meeting law posted on the wall.
- 2) The Committee Chair called the meeting to order.
- 3) The Committee Chair conducted a roll call of attendance.
- 4) Meeting notes from August 27, 2013 were approved.
- 5) The Committee Chair reminded the Advisory Committee of the Charge Statement and asked committee members to keep in mind that they are to reflect the views of the community and stakeholders in the deliberations on recommendations.
- 6) The Committee Chair stated that a two-thirds majority is needed to approve any recommendation and that abstentions are treated as "No" votes.
- 7) An explanation was provided to the committee on the data available for determining the annual per capita disposal rate and that it is calculated by

dividing the total solid waste disposed in municipal waste landfills by the population; the population estimate is provided by the Planning Department.

- The per capita disposal rate for 2011 was calculated to be 2,150 pounds per person per year.
- The Lincoln-Lancaster County Planning Department uses this metric in their annual Community Indicators publication.

8) Sample language for an overall waste reduction and/or recycling goal was distributed to the committee. This provided three examples of goal language. Following discussion the following motion was made and seconded.

- Reduce the per capita rate of municipal solid waste disposed of in landfills to:
  - 1,940 pounds per capita per year by 2018
  - 1,720 pounds per capita per year by 2025
  - 1,510 pounds per capita per year by 2040

Metric: 2011 rate is 2,150 pounds per capita per year. This is calculated by dividing the total municipal solid waste sent to disposal in landfills (from Lincoln and Lancaster County) by the current Lancaster County population (estimates prepared by the City's Planning Department). The recommended goal should be revisited and adjusted in 2015 and every five (5) years thereafter.

Following discussion the motion passed.

9) The Committee Chair opened the floor to motions dealing with any of the preferred paths.

- An initial comment was made the City should identify the amount of C&D waste going into the Bluff Road Landfill. The Committee acknowledges it may be necessary to collect additional data on the amount of C&D waste that goes to the Bluff Road Landfill.
- A motion was made and seconded to approve the following two recommendations:
  - The city and county should collect data relevant to the effectiveness of each preferred path and should use the data to analyze adjustments in the goals set by this committee.
  - A reporting system should be created and adopted to measure recycling rates. Reporting should be required by ordinance, said reports should occur on an annual basis and should be required as part of operating a recycling service.

Following discussion the motion passed.

- A motion was made and seconded to approve the following two recommendations:
  - The City should gather programmatic data related to each of the preferred paths.. This data can be based on record keeping, experience, or other sources and would be used as part the periodic reviews of the Solid Waste Management Plan.
  - The City should collect additional data on C&D waste, recycling, and diversion rates and the amounts disposed of in the City of Lincoln.

*Following discussion on this second recommendation an amendment was moved and seconded that: The cost of data*

*collection shall not be a financial burden on those businesses involved with C&D waste. Following discussion the amendment failed.*

Following discussion on the original two recommendations the motion passed.

- 10) A question was raised regarding an option of allowing a minority report to be included with the recommendations. Under this concept the report would be written by members of the committee.
  - It was discussed that criteria would need to be developed to allow for a minority report. For example what percent of a “no” vote would be needed to allow for a minority report.
  - Also noted was that no discussion is currently anticipated to be included in the final plan explaining why a super majority of the Advisory Committee voted in favor of a recommendation.
  - The Committee Chair indicated that he did not think it would be appropriate to allow for minority reports.
  - Discussion on this topic was postponed for further discussion following development of recommendations.
- 11) A motion was made to have “to-go” containers in businesses and restaurants be recyclable and/or compostable. There was no second.
  - Alternative wording was suggested that the City look for ways to encourage / increase recycling and source reduction of single use disposable products such as: (committee to suggest laundry list of products). The committee was encouraged to think about identifying “low-hanging fruit” options for inclusion in this recommendation and discuss them at the next meeting.The motion was tabled for future discussion.
- 12) A motion was made and seconded that:
  - The City of Lincoln is encouraged to locate and secure a site for the construction of a second transfer station if supported by a feasibility study. Following discussion the motion passed.
- 13) A motion was made and seconded that:
  - The City of Lincoln is encouraged to establish an “Eco-Park” at either the existing North transfer station or a future Transfer Station if supported by a feasibility study. The “Eco-Park” could be a permanent facility for the collection and storage of HHW. It could also be a one-stop shop for the recycling, repurposing and disposal of items that one may collect when selling a house, cleaning a garage, or engaging in a remodeling project. The “Eco-Park” could include drop-off facilities for the recycling of traditional recyclables (glass, plastic, paper, metal) but also for the recycling/repurposing of wood, yard waste, clothing, used construction materials, appliances, latex paint, and electronics). Following discussion the motion passed.
- 14) The next Advisory Committee Meeting date and location were noted:
  - October 8, 2013; 2:30 pm to 4:30 pm; Lincoln/Lancaster County Health Department Lower Level Training Room.

15) The meeting was opened for public comments.

- One commenter indicated that the reduction in the per capita disposal rate goal should be more aggressive than a recycling rate goal since the per capita rate includes waste diversion activities. The commenter stated that the low hanging fruit for recycling includes cardboard, plastics, paper and food waste, which are the major components of the waste stream. The commenter stated that state grant funds are available to help offset the cost of developing facilities such as household hazardous waste and recycling provisions in a Transfer Station.
- A commenter stated that the existing private collection system has served the community well and that there had been assurances that the current hauling system would not be disrupted; the commenter was concerned about language in the System Definition/System Definition Excerpts regarding contracting or franchising the collection of recyclables or garbage and recyclables.
- A commenter indicated that the public does not see what the private waste haulers do to keep Lincoln clean. He passed around photos of garbage overflowing containers at residential and commercial business locations to illustrate what refuse hauling firms encounter.
- A commenter asked the question on how the analysis of an Eco-Park identified in the last recommendation would be funded and whether a study is currently underway.

16) The Committee Chair adjourned the meeting.

## **Advisory Committee Meeting Notes**

**Day:** Tuesday  
**Date:** October 8, 2013  
**Time:** 2:30 pm to 4:30 pm  
**Location:** Lincoln/Lancaster County Health Department  
**Room:** Lower Level Training Room

### **Advisory Committee:**

#### **Present:**

Gary Bergman; Eileen Bergt; Ann Bleed; Jack Coogan; Tim Farmer;  
Steve Hatten; Paul Johnson; Dan Kurtzer; Casey Larkins; Jeannelle Lust;  
Coby Mach; Sarah Murtagh; Adam Prochaska; DiAnna Schimek; Cecil  
Steward; Chris Zegar

#### **Absent:**

Mike Ayars; Sue Quambusch; Jane Raybould; Meghan Sullivan

#### **City of Lincoln/Lancaster County:**

Milo Mumgaard; Karla Welding; Gene Hanlon; Scott Holmes; Dan King;  
Sara Hartzell, Frank Uhlarik

#### **HDR:**

John Dempsey

#### **Public:**

Stacey Carter; Dave Dingman; Dale Gubbels; Corbin Bogle; Charles  
Humble; Jim Klein; Sarah Hanzel; Nancy Hicks; Greg Kurtzer; Jay  
Kurtzer; Matt Kasik; Bryan Pedersen

- 1) The Committee Chair conducted the Safety Briefing and acknowledged the posted public meeting law.
- 2) The Committee Chair called the meeting to order.
- 3) The Committee Chair conducted a roll call of attendance.
- 4) Meeting notes from September 10, 2013 were approved.
- 5) Proposed recommendations from committee members and compiled by the Committee Chair and Vice Chair were distributed. The document will be available on the project website as "Additional Proposed Committee Member Recommendations Handout", but is referred to in these meeting notes simply as the "document".

- 6) Discussion occurred regarding the formation of a Commission for Waste Management and Conservation and recognizing waste as a resource with extractable value.
- 7) A motion was made and seconded to recognize waste as a public resource with service, value, and safety as the cornerstone. Following discussion, motion failed.
- 8) It was noted that the recommendation suggested by committee members and included in the “document” would be preserved in the documents which comprise the plan development process.
- 9) A motion was made and seconded to table the “document.” Following discussion, motion failed.
- 10) A motion was made and seconded to adopt minimum material collection standards for residential and commercial recycling which include metals, fiber, plastics and glass. Following discussion, motion failed.
- 11) A motion was made and seconded to allow discussion on the recommendations from the “document” at next month’s meeting but not allow new recommendations. Following discussion, motion failed.
- 12) The Chair asked for any additional recommendations from the Committee. None were offered.
- 13) The Chair indicated that he and the Vice-Chair will refine the recommendations that have been approved by the committee for the next meeting.
- 14) The Chair proposed moving the November Advisory Committee meeting from November 12<sup>th</sup> to November 5<sup>th</sup> due a schedule conflict. It was also suggested that the start of the meeting be moved up to 2 pm. Following discussion there was agreement to move the next meeting to November 5<sup>th</sup> and that it will begin at 2 pm.
- 15) The chair opened the meeting to public comment.
  - One commenter asked that the materials for the next meeting be posted on the website before the November 5<sup>th</sup> meeting.
  - One commenter indicated that in the previous meeting he distributed photos of piles of garbage and mentioned that one photo was on property owned by a specific management company. The commenter clarified that he did not want to imply that the management firm was a bad landlord or was improperly managing waste.
- 16) The Committee Chair adjourned the meeting.

## **Advisory Committee Meeting Notes**

**Day:** Tuesday  
**Date:** November 5, 2013  
**Time:** 2:00 pm to 4:00 pm  
**Location:** Lincoln/Lancaster County Health Department  
**Room:** Lower Level Training Room

### **Advisory Committee:**

#### **Present:**

Eileen Bergt; Ann Bleed; Jack Coogan; Steve Hatten; Paul Johnson; Dan Kurtzer; Casey Larkins; Jeannelle Lust; Coby Mach; Sarah Murtagh; Jane Raybould; Sue Quambusch; DiAnna Schimek; Cecil Steward

#### **Absent:**

Mike Ayars; Gary Bergman; Tim Farmer; Adam Prochaska; Meghan Sullivan; Chris Zegar

#### **City of Lincoln/Lancaster County:**

Nancy Clark; Miki Esposito; Judy Halstead Gene Hanlon; Sara Hartzell; Scott Holmes; Rick Hoppe; Dan King; Milo Mumgaard; Frank Uhlarik; Karla Welding

#### **HDR:**

John Dempsey

#### **Public:**

Stacey Carter; Dave Dingman; Dale Gubbels; Corbin Bogle; Madalyn Gotschall; Charles Humble; Jim Klein; Sarah Hanzel; Ryan Hatten; Nancy Hicks; Greg Kurtzer; Jay Kurtzer; Matt Kasik; Bryan Pedersen

- 1) The Committee Chair conducted the Safety Briefing and acknowledged the posted public meeting law.
- 2) The Committee Chair called the meeting to order.
- 3) The Committee Chair conducted a roll call of attendance.
- 4) Meeting notes from October 8, 2013 were approved.
- 5) A brief presentation summarizing the planning process and milestone events to date was provided. A copy of the Solid Waste Plan Summary document, previously posted on the website, was distributed to the committee.
- 6) The Chair recognized the work of the committee in developing the recommendations. He asked for any comments regarding the Plan Summary.

- A motion was made to review the original preferred path language for yard waste and delete the phrase “long-term consideration may be given to banning grass and leaves year round” if it was not a part of the originally adopted preferred path language. Following discussion, motion was approved.
  - It was commented that the Advisory Committee had not reviewed questions in advance of the community Baseline/Assessment Survey.
  - A Committee member asked that the final Plan document clearly reflect that plan was developed from input by the public, the consultant, the City’s project Management Team, and the Advisory Committee.
  - A question was asked as to whether the Committee would see the full version of the solid waste management plan (includes all historic papers, agendas, presentation, comment reports, etc.). The response was that it will be available on the project website.
  - A motion was made to add the two footnotes associated with the preferred paths that were in the System Definition summary to Table S-1 in the Plan Summary document. Following discussion, motion was approved.
  - A Committee member stated that some committee members have concerns regarding implementing some of the recommendations in the plan and those concerns have not been addressed in the Plan. The Mayor’s Chief of staff indicated that the Advisory Committee members would be provided an opportunity to meet with Mayor.
- 7) A motion was made and seconded to approve the Solid Waste Plan 2040 Summary. Following discussion the motion was approved.
  - 8) The Mayor’s Chief of staff thanked the committee for their hard work and stated that this may be the end of the committees work in developing recommendations but it also is the beginning of the administration’s work to implement the recommendations. He stated that the Solid Waste Plan sets goals and that setting goals is an important element of the Mayor’s “Taking Charge” program.
  - 9) The Committee thanked the Chair and Vice-Chair for their work with the Committee.
  - 10) The Chair opened the meeting to public comment. None were provided.
  - 11) The Chair adjourned the meeting.