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.
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.

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.

The facilitator used a graphic to remind the committee where they were in the Solid Waste Plan 2040 development process.

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).

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).
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.
• Implementation Actions
  o 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.
  o 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.
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.