

## 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