

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