1 xxAPPEARANCES 2 Docket No. SP09-403 SUP Waimanalo Gulch Status Report 3 4 For the City and County 5 Department of Environmental Services: б DANA VIOLA, ESQ. 7 Deputy Corporation Counsel SHARON BLANCHARD, ESQ. 8 Deputy Corporation Counsel TIM STEINBERGER, 9 Director, ENVS 10 Department of Planning and Permitting: 11 RAYMOND YOUNG 12 Intervenor Colleen Hanabusa: RICHARD N. WURDEMAN, ESQ. 13 Ko Olina Community Association 14 Senator Maile Shimabukuro: WYETH MATSUBARA, ESQ. 15 BENJAMIN MATSUBARA, ESQ. 16 Also Present: ABBEY MAYER, KOCA representative 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

SP09-403 Status Report

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: All right. We're back on the record. Next item on the agenda is Docket No. SP09-403. This is a status report on a Special Use Permit allowing for the expansion and continued operation of the Waimanalo Gulch Sanitary Landfill, on a limited basis and with conditions that was approved by the Commission on October 22, 2009.

Before we get started can we have the parties note their appearances please.

MS. VIOLA: Good afternoon. Deputy
Corporation Counsel Dana Viola. Also present is
Deputy Corporation Counsel Sharon Blanchard. And I
have the Director of the Environmental Services, Tim
Steinberger.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Good afternoon to you.

MR. YOUNG: Good afternoon, Chairman

Devens. This is Raymond Young from the Department of

Planning and Permitting.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Good afternoon to you.

MR. WURDEMAN: Good afternoon. Richard

N. Wurdeman with Intervenor Colleen Hanabusa who's

present.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Good afternoon.

MR. W. MATSUBARA: Good afternoon, Chair Devens, Commissioners. Wyeth Matsubara, Ben Matsubara on behalf of Ko Olina Community Association, Senator Maile Shimabukuro. With me as representative of KOCA is Abbey Mayer.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Good afternoon to you all. I believe we did get the substitution of counsel from your office, Mr. Matsubara. Mr. Wurdeman, I understand that you are making an appearance for the Intervenor in this case.

MR. WURDEMAN: Yes, that is correct.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: I'd like to make a disclosure if I may. I do know Mr. Wurdeman. He has done some work with the union that I'm affiliated which is SHOPO. Obviously SHOPO is not involved in this matter in any way, but I make that disclosure and ask the parties if they have any concerns or objections they can raise them at this time. (pause) Hearing none we'll proceed.

We asked for this status, informational meeting for the following: In light of the recent discharges of the municipal solid waste into the ocean from the Waimanalo Gulch Sanitary Landfill, the Commission requested the Department of Environmental Services appear before the Commission to provide a

status report regarding the circumstances surrounding the recent discharges and what steps are being taken to prevent any reoccurrence.

The Commission also requested that the Department provide an update regarding the status of the City's efforts to identify and develop alternative sites to replace or supplement Waimanalo Gulch Sanitary Landfill as required by Condition 4 of the Commission's October 22, 2009 Decision and Order in this matter.

In addition, the Commission requested that the Department take this opportunity to update the Department of Environmental Services July 28, 2010 report regarding compliance with the 16 conditions contained in the Commission's Decision and Order.

On January 31st, 2011 the Commission received e-mail correspondence from Doug and Sherrill Sleeter regarding the Waimanalo Landfill.

On February 1st, 2001 the Commission received Notice and Appearance of Counsel advising that Matsubara-Kotake would appear as counsel for Intervenors Ko Olina Community Association and Maile Shimabukuro.

On February 2nd, 2011 the Commission received written correspondence via email from a

```
William and Sara Barnes. In addition, today the
 1
    Commission has received a letter dated February 2nd,
 2
    2011 from Director Steinberger which enclosed a status
 3
    report as requested. In addition, also filed today
    was Ko Olina Community Association and Maile
 5
    Shimabukuro's report on the impacts regarding the
 6
 7
    discharges from Waimanalo Gulch Sanitary Landfill.
 8
                  Did the parties get a copy of the two
 9
    filings that were submitted today? Looks like
10
    everyone -- sorry, you did not receive it?
                  MR. YOUNG: Was it handed out today or
11
    was it delivered?
12
13
                  CHAIRMAN DEVENS: It was filed today.
    We just got it a few minutes ago.
14
                  MR. YOUNG: We didn't.
15
                  CHAIRMAN DEVENS: We'll get a copy to
16
    you. The procedure today will be to allow the
17
    Department of Environmental Services to present its
1.8
19
    status report, then allow the parties the opportunity
20
    to offer brief comments and then allow for public
21
    testimony on these matters.
22
                  At this point we'll have the
23
    Environmental Services go first.
24
                  MR. STEINBERGER: Thank you.
                                                 To answer
25
    the first two points we've asked our contractor Waste
```

1 Management Hawaii. They are contracted by the City 2 and County of Honolulu to operate the landfill. then the second two issues, the City will respond to. 3 4 So if I may I'd like to let Waste Management, Mr. Joe 5 Whelan respond to those. 6 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: We're going to have to 7 swear you in first, sir. 8 JOE WHELAN, 9 being first duly sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows: 10 THE WITNESS: I do. 11 1.2 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: State your name and address, please. 13 14 THE WITNESS: My name is Joe Whelan, 44-051 Kainui Place Kaneohe, Hawai'i. 15 16 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Go ahead, sir. 17 THE WITNESS: My name is Joe Whelan. I'm the general manager of Waste Management of Hawaii. 18 We operate three landfills in the state, one here, 19 20 one on the Big Island and one on the island of Kaua'i. 21 What I'd like to do initially is just briefly go over 22 the map behind me and show you the features of the 23 landfill. And then I'll explain what happened 24 throughout the various storms. Everybody hear me 25 okay?

This is the landfill itself, the older portion. And of course the area up here is the area that was just granted the expansion in 2009. When you look at this map it's from 2008. So there's a fair amount of this gulch right here that now has a blue tone to it because that's where the excavation is ongoing.

1.0

By way of features on the map you'll see here is the ash monofil. All of ash that's generated from the H-Power plant goes to Waimanalo Gulch. It's disposed of here in the monofil.

This area here is the existing or older portion of the landfill that commenced operations I believe around 1989.

The area right here is the expansion from 2003 which are noted as the E cells. The property boundary goes up here and then comes, follows back down the ridgeline here.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Mr. Whelan, I apologize for interrupting. We're familiar with the background. We just want to know what happened. We want to know how this thing happened.

THE WITNESS: Okay. The watershed that feeds the Waimanalo Gulch Landfill is up in this area. The long-term plan has always been to divert water

that comes from here through this gulch currently through the landfill to around this landfill.

And how that diversion was going to take place is that along here there's a diversion berm that is under construction. It's about 14 or 16 feet high and goes from one side of the canyon to the other.

What it is designed to do is divert water across here to an open box culvert that runs 1500 feet or so. It will then dump into 7-foot diameter Fiberglas piping which goes along the ridgeline here and down into this existing concrete channel diverting all of the stormwater around the active portion of the landfill.

That construction period began in, I believe, November of 2009 and is under construction as we speak. Any other questions on the actual landfill itself?

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: No. You know, we're trying to get to find --

THE WITNESS: Right.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: -- out -- what this Commission knows is basically what we've heard in the media. And I can tell now personally it's been very disturbing to hear what happened. Of course we don't have all the facts.

1 |

THE WITNESS: Right.

.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: And we're just trying to find out what happened and the extent of the spill.

THE WITNESS: The first storm occurred on December 19th, according to the Palehua rain gauge. We got around 7.9 inches of rain in about 13 hours. Stormwater from that area flowed into the new expansion area and inundated cell 6.

As I just mentioned the long-term stormwater diversion channel at that time was several weeks away from being functionally complete. Which means that it wouldn't be complete from a contract standpoint, but it would, in fact, have diverted the majority of the water around the landfill and out into our existing sedimentation basin.

At that time after the first storm, because of the fact that water had ponded on top of cell 6, we then created a dam, if you will, or a berm on the south side of that cell 6 in order to keep that water from becoming a catastrophic event and leaving the site.

At that time we also brought in additional pumps, fortified all of our ditches. We reinforced the existing 36-inch diversion berm and diversion piping that were installed to handle

stormwater that fell in the cell 6 area during the time of construction of the long-term stormwater diversion channel.

On December 27 we received another major storm where we got just under 4 inches of rain in 4 hours. At that time we then, again the cell 6 area filled again with water. We reinforced the temporary berm that we constructed before, used the existing pumps, reinforced all of our diversion structures again.

The last storm, which was the major one, happened on the evening of January 12th into

January 13 where we received 10.7 inches of rain in a 24-hour period which was 7 and-a-half inches of rain in about 6 hours. The sheer volume of that amount of water again went in and filled up the area of cell 6 and caused that water to then go through the sedimentation basin and off site.

As far as our cleanup efforts: Once we realized that the storm was that magnitude on the day of the storm, the 13th, we and the City had a meeting, teleconference meeting with the Department of Health, explained the problems. At that time we then began assembling a team to start performing sampling as well as putting some warning out, warning signs at our

drainage outlet which ultimately turned into additional signs going in a north and south direction at the Ko Olina Resort.

We first discovered municipal solid waste including some amounts of medical waste had escaped the landfill later Thursday evening. At that time then we began cleaning up that waste onsite at the same time they were performing the initial sampling event as well as noticing the beaches.

The following day, Friday, we then went down to our outfall and cleaned up what we could at the outfall. Since that day, which was the 13th-- or 14th, we dispatched cleanup crews every day through Friday the 21st. Where as we were notified that there was any type of waste that was found on a particular beach, then we would send a crew out there to clean up whatever we found on the beaches.

We did coordinate with other agencies, with DOH. EPA arrived on the site on Saturday two days after the storm and were there for approximately five days. We worked well with the City Department of Health. We've had multiple meetings over that time to coordinate the cleanup effort.

The new stormwater diversion system that would have prevented the majority of this water from

inundating the facility, as I mentioned, is about two weeks away from being functionally complete. Had it been completed it would have taken most of the waste around, most of the stormwater around the landfill and not through it.

б

1.5

This diversion system is an approximately \$15 million project. So it's not something that lends itself to be done in a very short time. As I mentioned, we began construction activities in November of 2009. And that project is still underway. After completion of the entire project obviously the system will be much better suited to handle any future rainwater storms.

Currently we are in the process of pumping out our sedimentation basin and cleaning it out to put it back to the condition that it was prior to the initial storm.

We've also evacuated all of the water from the cell 6 area so that in the event that there's a storm that occurs prior to completing this new long-term diversion system, we'll at a minimum have storage capacity that is intended to keep any stormwater from again flowing off of the site. At this time I'll take some questions.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Commissioners? I had

one question. You know, on the Planning Commission's 1 findings of fact and conclusions that we had approved, 2 finding of fact 74 addresses the drainage that was 3 required to have been in place. Was there a violation 4 of that condition in this case? 5 THE WITNESS: I don't believe there is. 6 7 The company and the City --CHAIRMAN DEVENS: You have medical waste 8 9 washing out into the ocean as far as Nanakuli/ 10 Wai'anae and there was no problems with the drainage? THE WITNESS: 11 The company began constructing of the long-term drainage plan. Within 12 about 30 to 40 days of the time that we received our 13 14 approvals, our regulatory approvals to do so, we were 15 not allowed to begin construction of that long-term 16 system until we had the actual permitted approvals to 17 do so. CHAIRMAN DEVENS: 18 So as you're constructing I mean what precautions were taken? 19 20 Obviously not enough because this happened.

THE WITNESS: The actual operating permit that we have in there has provisions for this type of a storm. And there was -- there was definitely a risk during this construction period. But we were not allowed to do any preconstruction of

21

22

23

24

25

the stormwater diversion berm until we had the appropriate regulatory approvals.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: So how much discharge was there? I'm not clear on what the volume was. We have photographs that have been submitted by Ko Olina which shows quite a bit. But what was the actual discharge volume? And what exactly was discharged other than syringes and what we've seen on the news?

THE WITNESS: Most of what was discharged was municipal solid waste, which is the majority of what goes into the landfill. It did have some sterilized medical waste mixed in with it.

As a function of our daily operations medical waste and/or any other type of special waste is mixed into the landfill, the residential waste that comes in. And then every day that's covered.

In this particular case as the stormwater washed through there, it washed some of that cover off and took amount of municipal waste with it that just happened to contain some sterilized medical waste.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: How much?

THE WITNESS: We don't have any way of knowing how much waste actually left the site. The main part of the storm occurred around 1 or so I

believe on the morning of the 13th. So by the time our employees arrived at 4 or 5 there was quite a bit of water already on the site.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: I read somewhere where someone had made the statement that this was like a hundred year rain. I really found that hard to believe because no one else was saying that. I remember a few years ago when we had the 30 days and 30 nights of rain, that didn't even approach a 50-year storm. Was there anything unusual about this rain that contributed to this problem?

Storm, it really depends on the intensity of the storm. In that I believe in this case on the third storm, which was the major one, there was 10 point something inches in 24 hours, but 7.6 of that fell within a six or seven hour period. So it's the intensity of the storm that's the critical portion that causes the amount of damage rather than the actual amount of rainfall that could be over a longer period.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: So going back to my prior question. Do you have an idea of what the total volume of discharge was? I know you can't quantify the medical waste. But how about the total volume?

How much actually went down to the ocean onto Ko Olina's property and down to Nanakuli side?

THE WITNESS: We can't quantify that.

What we do know is that --

1.3

2.1

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Did you know how much was in that cell that busted open?

THE WITNESS: The amount -- the area where the water came through washed off the top of a part of a cell but we can't estimate how big that is. Once the water left that spot, which was on the northern or uphill end of the cell, it then flooded out the rest of the cell.

One key thing to remember in this case this was the third flooding of that particular cell.

And each time that happened, as I mentioned earlier, the construction at this site, which is a canyon construction, involves forming the sides of the canyon which then creates a huge amount of rock and soil.

That rock is then processed and reused in the bottom to form the areas where the liner goes.

So each time that we had a rainfall that washed down through there, washed all of this material off of the sides and the bottom and literally covered up the top of the waste cell. So we know that the entire cell wasn't affected by this storm because it

was already under 10 feet of water and had probably 10 or 15 feet of sedimentation and soil that had been deposited on top of that cell by the first couple of storms.

1.3

1.6

So only the area in the one section of the cell that was actually in the higher area that was above the waterline was actually affected. That's why it's difficult for us to determine how much was actually removed.

When you look at that part of the cell what you see is there's some lose material at the top. Certainly all the floatable material, plastic bags and bottles and things like that, are the pieces that would go first.

And in this case the same way with the plastic, sterilized plastic syringes that were predominantly what was found on the beach, those are all fairly floatable so they would have been washed out more quickly than another type of waste, say, chairs or other things that would have been in the cell at that time.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: So when did the first discharge occur?

THE WITNESS: The first discharge?

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Yeah. When did it

first start flowing out of the --1 . 2 THE WITNESS: Sometime during the night. We don't know that. 3 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: On what day? 4 THE WITNESS: On the 13th. 5 When the big storm hit it happened during the night. We don't know 6 when it started. As soon as we saw the conditions at the site at that time, our first concern is for the 8 safety of our employees because it was a pretty strong 9 event. 10 The contractor has been working around 11 12 the clock just to get back in there to redo the damage from the first two storms and now this third one. 13 14 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: So on the 13th at 15 about what time did you first get notice that something was going wrong? 16 17 THE WITNESS: Well, as soon as we arrived at the site. 18 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Which is about what 19 time? 2.0

THE WITNESS: Probably, I think my first employees arrived there around 5:00 or so in the morning. Then shortly after that management was there probably by 6:30 or so. At that time we assessed the upper portions of the canyon because we were concerned

21

22

23

24

25

about our employees as well as any catastrophic events as far as -- if you'll recall I had mentioned that at the time of the first storm we actually built a temporary dam so that any water that was impounded in the cell 6 area would not leave the site.

If it had left the site it would have ran down the back side of the HECO power plant and into the ocean which would have been an uncontrolled discharge.

Once the company realized that our equipment as well as our employees were safe, then at that time we began taking evasive actions to keep any uncontrolled discharges from occurring. And then at some point after that is when we realized now we have water that is actually -- and waste material that is discharging.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: At what time was that determination made?

THE WITNESS: I would say it was sometime in the afternoon. We did meet with --

21 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: At about what time?
22 THE WITNESS: I don't have an exact

23 time.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Once you realized that medical discharge had escaped the dump, what, if any,

warning was given to the community, the folks at Ko Olina, the folks down on the Leeward coast? What, if any, warnings did your company take to at least warn the people that we may have syringes out there, we may have blood components floating around in the water?

THE WITNESS: We met with the Department of Health at noon on the day --

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: I'm not talking about the Department of Health. I'm talking about the community at large. What efforts did your company make to give at least some warning to the community that there was this danger out there?

THE WITNESS: Once we decided -- or we didn't -- once collectively the decision was made to put warning signs up at the beach or at the outfall area was our main concern because that's where material would have left the site -- then we assembled those signs from one of the departments at the City and we put those up at around 4 or 5:00 that afternoon.

We didn't realize or find out that there was medical waste involved in it until around that same time, 4:00 or 5:00 in the afternoon because we were dealing with huge amount of water that was leaving the site.

Once we realized that there was medical waste in there we had already put up warning signs saying that there's potentially contaminated material that is leaving the site. We also started a sampling program at that time.

Then the next day we had a crew down at our outfall because by that time we realized that there was some sterilized medical waste that had gone off of the site. And we began cleaning that up.

The evening of the storm on the 12th we also began a cleanup on own site at the same time they were doing the sampling and putting the warning signs up to make sure that whatever was on our site wouldn't continue to go off site and further impact our neighbors.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Okay. Commissioner Lezy, you had a question?

COMMISSIONER LEZY: Thank you, Chair.

Good afternoon. Thank you for your testimony. I want
to see if I can understand kind of the chronology of
some of the events and the actions that were taken by
Waste Management in response to those events.

You've testified three storms.

Obviously the final storm of the three was the one that apparently put the cell over the top as far as

the discharge was concerned. You were aware or your 1 company was aware by the time of the second discharge 3 that the cell was retaining water, correct? flooding and retaining water. 5 THE WITNESS: Yes. COMMISSIONER LEZY: When did that occur? 6 7 When were you aware as of the second storm that that 8 problem existed? THE WITNESS: Once the first storm hit, 9 the cell was inundated with water. At that time is 10 when we built the additional berm. 11 When the second cell was -- I mean the second storm came it added more 12 13 water on top of what was already there. So at that time we reinforced that berm so that it would hold 14 15 more water. Then prior --COMMISSIONER LEZY: When was that? 16 17 THE WITNESS: Actually after the first storm then --18 COMMISSIONER LEZY: The second storm and 19 the reinforcement, when did that occur? 20 THE WITNESS: On the 27th. 21 22 COMMISSIONER LEZY: So that was 23 approximately two weeks prior to the event, the storm event that caused the discharge, correct? 24

THE WITNESS: Yes.

25

During that time 1 COMMISSIONER LEZY: period what sort of evaluation, if any, was performed by your company to determine the risk of: Well, if 3 there's a further storm, if we have a similar type of 4 a storm, is there a possibility that the cell, the 5 berm's been built could fail or the cell could end up 6 discharging waste? 7 THE WITNESS: Yes. That's why we built 8 the berm in the first place. At the time of the first 9 cell there was no berm there -- or the first storm. 10 And the water came up from probably a foot of 11 12 overtopping the existing containment area. COMMISSIONER LEZY: I understand that. 1.3 14 But what I'm asking you is you have provided us with a 15 chronology of events. And it sounds like in each instance it was kind of dodging a bullet. The first 16 17 time it flooded and fortunately there was no discharge. 18 The second time it flooded and there had 19 20 been some sort of work done to build a berm to 21 strengthen the cell to avoid a discharge. that's the key, right? 22

third event. More rain, more water and there's an

Yes.

COMMISSIONER LEZY: You then get to the

THE WITNESS:

23

24

25

actual discharge. So what I'm wondering is what sort of an evaluation was done in order to quantify what the risk was that there would be a discharge if there was more rain and more water ended up in the cell?

THE WITNESS: Well, in the first place we would have no, no forewarning that a storm of the third magnitude would be coming. The requirements that we go under are for 24-hour storms. And that's what the site is designed for.

In this particular case the actual long-term diversion, even though the requirements were for 24-hour storm, it was actually -- the specifications were for a hundred-year storm. The problem was it just wasn't completed at that time.

COMMISSIONER LEZY: I'm talking about the steps that you folks actually did take. You actually undertook efforts --

THE WITNESS: Right.

COMMISSIONER LEZY: -- to avoid what happened. What I'm trying to find out is how you reached the decision to do what you did and why there was an obvious shortcoming in what was done.

THE WITNESS: Just to back up a little.

Once -- I would say back in October prior to the rainy season we doubled the shifts so that that long-term

1 | diversion would be complete. It just wasn't.

COMMISSIONER LEZY: I understand. I'm not particularly interested in the long-term diversion project. What I'm interested in is the efforts that you folks took once you had the first event.

THE WITNESS: Right.

COMMISSIONER LEZY: After you had the second event and then you had the third event, what was done in between the second and the third event to evaluate: Jeez, we just dodged a big one here? What do we need to do to make sure that if it rains more since obviously the cell was retaining water at that point --

THE WITNESS: Right.

COMMISSIONER LEZY: -- what do we need to do to make sure that there is no potential for discharge?

What was done to evaluate that and address it?

THE WITNESS: There is a 36-inch drain line that by design runs underneath this new cell that's part of the expansion. During the first storm, that overtopped and was silted in due to the amount of material that came down.

After that we went out and evaluated why

that happened. And we cleared the area and built a berm up above it to try to stop any water that would be coming down.

At the same time we also built a -right in front of it we built a very large structure
out of boulders that would act as a velocity changer,
if you will, where when the water came down the canyon
it would hit this pile of boulders and cause it to
divert around to where this inlet was.

At the same time then we also reinforced at that area another berm that we had constructed in the first storm to make sure that we had a little dam behind that so that it would never get into the cell in the first place.

All of that failed because of the magnitude of that storm.

me, then, that there could have been an evaluation done based on the magnitude of the storm that actually did occur, that would have allowed you to address problems and to have avoided this event?

THE WITNESS: No. I'm not saying that.

I'm saying that after the first storm we took evasive actions on the available 36-inch outlet that we had that was designed to handle this water because it had

failed the first time. And we -- our contractor went back in there and beefed up that area to keep that from happening a second time.

COMMISSIONER LEZY: So do I understand you to say, then, at least in your company's estimation that this event was unavoidable?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

б

COMMISSIONER LEZY: With regard to this permanent diversion project, as part of the planning for that were any of the particular cells within the landfill identified as being at risk for flooding in this type of event?

THE WITNESS: It wasn't an actual identification of the cells. However, our operating permit contemplated that during the construction of this long-term diversion system there could be periods when there would be either no means to convey the stormwater around the existing landfill cells; or that a storm could cause stormwater to overflow into the cell 6 area, which it did in this case, which would allow, then, that water to flow out from the active area of the cell.

COMMISSIONER LEZY: So there was an acknowledgment prior to any of these storms that cell 6 was particularly at risk for this type of an event?

THE WITNESS: There was an 1 acknowledgment in our permit that stated until this 2 long-term diversion is completed there could be some 3 risk, yes. 4 COMMISSIONER LEZY: Was there some 5 particular reason why then cell 6 didn't simply stop 6 7 accepting MSW during the time period that the long-term diversion project was being finished? 8 9 THE WITNESS: Cell 6 is the only area of the landfill that has capacity at this point. 10 after the first storm no more waste went into the cell 11 6. 12 COMMISSIONER LEZY: It couldn't, right? 13 14 It was flooded with water. 15 THE WITNESS: Right, yes. But that was after the first storm. So from a practical standpoint 16 there was no waste that could have gone into the cell 17 6 area. 18 19 COMMISSIONER LEZY: My last question to Do you have any understanding or personal 20 21 knowledge as to why medical waste sterilized or otherwise is it not incinerated? 22 23 THE WITNESS: I believe the rules for 24 incineration were changed several years ago. 25 that's not my area of expertise. I know that at the

site we have -- medical waste is considered a special waste where it has to be pre-characterized under record of federal standards. And that's what we do. That's our standard practice.

COMMISSIONER LEZY: And what does that mean?

1.7

THE WITNESS: It means that a generator of medical waste has to fill out characterization forms and get that waste stream approved both by federal regulations and by the terms of our permit.

And then they certify on each load that comes into the site that it has, in fact, been rendered noninfectious.

Most of the companies use autoclaving, but I'm not sure whether that's the requirement or any method that allows them to make that statement is acceptable. All of the sterilization process is overseen by the Department of Health.

COMMISSIONER LEZY: All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Any other questions from the Commission? One thing you answered in response to Commissioner Lezy was that this was unavoidable. I have a real hard time believing that this was unavoidable.

What it sounds like to me is that you folks went ahead with this construction, did not take any proper preventive measures and just hoped it wasn't going to rain. And when it did you folks were caught with your pants down. And this is what happened. Isn't that really what happened in this case?

THE WITNESS: No, I wouldn't characterize it that way at all in that this --

б

1.7

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: I know you wouldn't characterize it that way. Isn't that really what happened, though, in this case? There were no preventive measures in place while this construction was going on. It rained. And it wasn't an unusual rain by any standard. And we have this massive discharge. And there was just a lack of urgency, in my mind, with the public not knowing the extent of the discharge and what was actually contained in that discharge.

I was shocked when I heard that there were needles on the beach at Ko Olina, down in Nanakuli flowing down to Wai'anae. I was also shocked to see that people were picking that up with their bare hands and in slippers. And yet there were no warnings out there to the community warning about

those dangers. What's the response to that?

1.5

whenever we had a call, which we did, from any beaches along the western side of the Leeward Coast, we dispatched a team to go out there. And we didn't just pick up medical waste. We picked up any storm debris that we saw except for tree limbs or wood or that kind of thing. But everything else we picked up. And we continued to go every day to those same beaches until we no longer saw the waste material.

We established a hotline, I believe it was on Sunday, that people could call in, which they did. And as soon as we got a call on our hotline or from any other source we would dispatch a team to go out there and check it out.

We also talked to lifeguards at the various beaches that had lifeguards. And we continued doing that for several days after we last saw any type of medical waste.

As far as the actual storm itself, this long-term diversion plan was proposed over 10 years ago. We're just in a position now, or as of 2009, where we could actually go out and begin the construction on it. We can't do that unless we have the appropriate permits.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: And I understand that. But over the last 10 years couldn't you have thought of what the preventive measures were going to be while the construction was going on instead of leaving everything open the way it was? I just can't believe that no preventive measures could have been taken to avoid this. I don't buy that this was unavoidable. I hear what you're saying, but it doesn't make any sense to me.

1.1

You know, this was a very tough decision for this Commission to have extended the permit. The parties were here. It was a difficult decision that this Commission had to wrestle with. The very fears that the community raised before this Commission were realized by this spill. And then it comes back to us as a Commission because we passed it.

And that's the reason why we wanted this informational meeting because we need to know what happened. There's conditions that we approved. I see finding, Condition 74 it talks about drainage. And this was a drainage problem from what you're describing to us. And I still don't understand, you know, why this wasn't prevented.

You know, I see Mr. Williams on TV; he's obviously distressed. He didn't get the call from you

folks. He's worried about his community. 1 worried about his employees. They're out there picking up the waste. Obviously there was a lack of communication to at least warn people like him who was 4 here opposing this but expressed these very fears and then look what happens. I mean what happened out 7 there?

2

3

5

6

Ω

9

10

11

12

13

1.4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

THE WITNESS: That's what I've attempted to explain to you.

I hear you, but it's CHAIRMAN DEVENS: not making any sense to me.

THE WITNESS: We put warning signs up on the day of the storm. As a matter of fact while we putting the warning signs up the City had instructions to, I believe, double or triple the amount of them.

So as we learned more about the extent of any waste material, whether it's medical waste or not, that left the site, we believe we took appropriate actions to make sure that people knew, first of all, what was going on.

Remember this was also at a time where the entire island had an advisory notice put out each day by the local weather stations warning people not to go in the water because it was a major storm, not just at the landfill but around the island itself.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Well, you know, putting up warning signs and telling someone that there may be needles sticking in the sand to me are two different, radically different types of warnings in my mind.

Let me ask the parties if they have any questions for the witness since he was put under oath.

Ko Olina, you folks have any questions for this witness?

MR. W. MATSUBARA: Chair, going to Commissioner Lezy's concerns regarding the first what they call a storm. I'm looking at the investigative report by the Clean Water Branch. It was attached as KOCA's exhibits. And it refers to an investigation done in response to that first storm.

And Commissioner Lezy, with all due respect, stated they were luckily fortunately dodge-able, and there was no discharge. But I noticed in this report, I know it's not final, but it does say that there was a discharge of water. And that was done in response to the accumulation of water in this cell.

Now, I can understand maybe there may be situations where rainfalls may come and you can do only certain things. But what this report indicates

is that this was a response by your department, a decision made by your department to remove water from this cell, not stormwater, but remove water from a cell and put that into the storm drain.

So my concern would be, you know, we're talking about stormwater entering cells here. But now there's actually a conscious decision made to remove water, whether it may be infected or not I don't know. And I'm sure there will be further investigation to determine that.

But this is just from the first storm
that we had assumed was a dodge of the bullet. So the
concern would be what -- not only what methods or what
protocols are you establishing to prevent rainfall but
after the rainfall is in these cells what
accommodations or what are you doing to also ensure
that the removal of this water into the ocean in that
area was appropriate?

THE WITNESS: Just to back up a little bit. No water from within the cells themselves was discharged. What we're talking about is stormwater that had accumulated on top of the cells, in this case cell 6, one cell.

And as I mentioned as the first storm, second and third storm progressed it deposited more

and more and silt on top of the cell which further
isolated it from the water sitting on top. We're not
talking about water that was actually in the cell
itself during cell operations.

Concerning the pumping or not, until the report was filed we were cooperating with the Department. However I'm not going to comment on that because, as you mentioned, the Department has an investigation that's ongoing.

MR. W. MATSUBARA: Are you aware of this investigative report compiled by the Department of Health Clean Water Branch?

THE WITNESS: I'm aware of it. I haven't read the entire thing. But I know that it's out there, yes.

MR. W. MATSUBARA: I'm not making accusations. They are. They're making accusations that the water that was discharged was leachate and it did contain MSW.

THE WITNESS: We don't believe that. That's, like I said, that's something that's under investigation. And I can't really comment on what their Department has planned or what the ultimate outcome of that investigation is.

MR. W. MATSUBARA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Mr. Wurdeman, did you have any questions of this witness?

MR. WURDEMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. You know, this investigation that Mr. Matsubara is just referring to, you're saying that none of this is true? You're saying the Department of Health alleged were clear violations of the conditions that were imposed by this Commission by the City and County of Honolulu and Wastewater Management (sic) are you denying all of these allegations in the state of Hawai'i Health Department report?

THE WITNESS: No, I'm not denying or admitting them. I'm merely stating that because this is an investigation that is ongoing I believe the Department made that statement. It would not be prudent for me to comment on it at all.

MR. WURDEMAN: And, Mr. Chair, I'm referring to Exhibit 5 of Ko Olina's packet here. The Chairman asked you earlier during the questioning about Condition No. 74 and asked you point blank if that had been violated. And you said, "No." But you referenced the January rainfall and discharge, correct?

THE WITNESS: I don't have a copy nor am

I familiar with Condition 74 is. So if you want me to

comment on that you'll have to read it to me. 1 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: I have it. Do you 2 3 want me to read it? 4 MR. WURDEMAN: If you could, 5 Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Sure. 6 7 MR. WURDEMAN: I'd appreciate it. 8 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: 74 reads as follows "Drainage for the property is intended to capture 9 stormwater and divert it around the landfill if it 10 originates offsite, surface runoff or into the 11 12 existing sedimentation basin if it originates onsite 13 surface runoff. The sedimentation basin is designed 14 to allow stormwater to settle so that dissolved solids 15 that come off the landfill can settle out in that basin. 16 17 "The water's eventually discharged to the ocean subject to state of Hawai'i Department of 18 19 Health permitting requirements under the National 20 Pollution Discharge Elimination System. A third-party 21 company takes samples to ensure compliance with 22 certain discharge limits. In addition, DOH inspects 23 Waste Management's ditches and slopes." 2.4 THE WITNESS: And what is that from?

Yes?

CHAIRMAN DEVENS:

MS. VIOLA: If I may point out 1 Condition No. 74 is a finding of fact. 2 3 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Correct. 4 MS. VIOLA: It's not a conclusion of law, so it's not necessarily a condition that was put 5 6 upon the parties in the compliance requirement. a finding of fact, not necessarily a conclusion. 7 8 I'm not sure -- I mean in terms of -- well, I have 9 some questions relating to this. But in terms of a requirement it's a finding not a conclusion. 10 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Right. 11 You're 12 correct. MR. WURDEMAN: So the finding of fact 13 was, Mr. Chair, what was adopted by this Commission 14 15 and what was required of them to comply with, correct? CHAIRMAN DEVENS: That's my 16 17 understanding. That's correct. MR. WURDEMAN: Also the paragraph 75 18 while we have the document out, if we could reference 19 20 that as well. CHAIRMAN DEVENS: I don't have that one 21 22 with me, I'm sorry. Okay. 23 MR. WURDEMAN: It reads, 24 "Leachate does not come into contact with stormwater. The stormwater, surface water system is separate from 25

the leachate collection system."

б

The January rainfall that the Chair had asked you about previously, does that violate paragraph 75 as I have just read? Was there any leachate coming into contact with stormwater as indicated in this paragraph?

THE WITNESS: I wouldn't want to reference whether as indicated in the paragraph. But it is our understanding that leachate, which is inside of the cells, was not affected by this storm.

MR. WURDEMAN: Was that situation of leachate and stormwater coming into contact with each other present during the December rainfalls that were the subject of the state of Hawai'i Health Department investigation?

THE WITNESS: As I earlier testified I haven't read the entire investigation. And it's still ongoing. But my understanding is that at no time through any of these storms did leachate that was in the cells contact stormwater that was on top of the cells.

We have a system in place which is an automatic system that pumps out leachate from all of the cells. And that leachate is taken to the wastewater treatment plant for appropriate treatment

and disposal under their own permits. 1 So stormwater is discharged routinely 2 3 from the site under our NPDES Stormwater Discharge Permit. 4 5 MR. WURDEMAN: How about this statement in the Health Department investigation where it reads 6 7 that, "There's clear evidence that leachate was purposefully discharged into the landfill's stormwater drainage system"? Are you familiar with that 9 10 reference? I'm hot familiar with that 11 THE WITNESS: 12 reference, no. 13 MR. WURDEMAN: Would you admit or deny 14 that allegation? 15 THE WITNESS: I would not because this is still under investigation. 16 17 MR. WURDEMAN: Well, that's what the 18 investigators are alleging. THE WITNESS: That may be true. 19 20 MR. WURDEMAN: You're aware of the situation out at Waimanalo Gulch, correct? 21 22 THE WITNESS: I am aware of the 23 situation. And I've just testified that we do not 24 have leachate that is in our cells that is pumped off 25 as stormwater. We have a separate system for that.

1 MR. WURDEMAN: It also says in this 2 report by the Health Department, "In conclusion it 3 appears that the landfill owners and operators, including the City and County of Honolulu and Waste 4 5 Management, violated Hawai'i water pollution rules and 6 regulations by discharging water pollutants to state waters without authorization." Are you familiar with that reference in 8 9 the Health Department report? THE WITNESS: As I've stated before I 10 have not read the entire report, no. 11 MR. WURDEMAN: You're not familiar with 12 that reference having been made? That's a pretty 13 strong conclusion. As you sit here today you're not 14 familiar with that reference? 15 THE WITNESS: As I mentioned I haven't 16 completed a review of that report. And the contents 17 of that report, as I understand today, is still under 18 19 investigation. 20 MR. WURDEMAN: So you have no idea 21 whether the investigators ever came to that conclusion 22 as you sit here today? I don't know what they 23 THE WITNESS: came to conclude becuase as I mentioned I haven't 24

finished my review of that report.

```
MR. WURDEMAN: Well, it's three pages.
 1
    I mean how long did it take you to review the report?
 2
 3
    We're not talking about a hundred-page document.
    We're talking about a 3-page investigative report.
 4
 5
    What did you do, read the first page and stop after a
    couple minutes? What are we talking about here?
 6
 7
                  THE WITNESS:
                                I already testified that I
    was aware of the report, but I have not completed my
 8
    review of it.
 9
                  MR. WURDEMAN:
                                 Going back to paragraph
10
    74 that the Chair read to you aloud.
                                           There was a
11
    sentence in there: "A third-party company takes
12
    samples to ensure compliance with certain discharge
13
    limits."
14
                  A third-party company. Was a third
15
16
    company party involved in taking samples to ensure
17
    compliance in either December or in January of this
18
    year?
19
                  THE WITNESS:
                                 There was a third-party
    company who obtained samples on the day of the storm.
20
                  MR. WURDEMAN: Which storm are we
2.1
22
    referring to?
                                 The major storm on the
23
                  THE WITNESS:
    13th.
24
25
                  MR. WURDEMAN: What about in December,
```

```
1
    was a third-party company involved?
 2
                  THE WITNESS:
                                 I don't recall if there
 3
    was or not.
                  MR. WURDEMAN: You don't recall?
 4
 5
                  THE WITNESS:
                                 I don't recall, no.
    know that there was in this one because we had an
 6
 7
    actual discharge.
                  MR. WURDEMAN: You have Health
 8
 9
    Department investigators out there.
                                          They're coming to
10
    these strong conclusions about intentional acts in
    their report. And there's requirements of you to have
11
    third-party companies take these samples to ensure
12
13
    compliance.
                 And you made no efforts to ensure whether
    or not that was done in just, what, six weeks ago.
14
    You don't even know whether or not that was done.
15
                  THE WITNESS: We have an NPDES discharge
16
    permit with certain requirements that come along with
1.7
18
    our operating permit. We comply with the terms of
    those permits.
19
20
                  In the case of the larger storm, the
21
    last one, because we had such a volume of water,
22
    stormwater leaving the site, we on our own took an
23
    additional set of samples.
                  MR. WURDEMAN: Okay. But you don't know
24
```

if a third-party company did, correct?

1 THE WITNESS: A third-party company took 2 those on our behalf, yes. 3 MR. WURDEMAN: What company was that? THE WITNESS: I can't tell you that. Ιt 4 5 was a third-party company. 6 MR. WURDEMAN: So that was for both 7 January and December that was done? THE WITNESS: No. That's what I just 8 stated. We did that at the last storm but I don't 9 know if we did at the first two. 10 MR. WURDEMAN: So January it was done 11 but you don't recall the name of the company. 12 THE WITNESS: I recall the name of the 13 company. I'm just not willing to give that to you 14 because it's a contractor that works for us. We don't 15 routinely give out --16 MR. WURDEMAN: What privilege are you 17 asserting to not provide that name? 18 THE WITNESS: I'm not an attorney so I'm 19 20 not gonna answer that question. 21 MR. WURDEMAN: Mr. Chair, I'd ask that the witness be --22 Sir, you're under oath 23 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: 24 before this Commission. I don't hear you asserting any type of privilege, and I'm not aware of any 25

privilege that would apply. If you want to consult with the City attorneys we'll give you that time to do so. Ms. Viola, do you want to take a short break and allow him to consult? Why don't we take a 2-minute break.

(Recess was held.)

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: We're back on the record. Before we took a short break, Mr. Whelan, we gave you an opportunity to consult with your representatives. Do you have a response to Mr. Wurdeman's last questions?

THE WITNESS: I do. And thank you for allowing us to have a few moments to clarify.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Sure.

THE WITNESS: On the advice of counsel I will give you the name of the contractor. It was AECOM, A-E-C-O-M.

MR. WURDEMAN: And that was in January,

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. WURDEMAN: December was AECOM under

22 | contract with your company?

THE WITNESS: Were they under contract

24 | with us?

correct?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

19

MR. WURDEMAN: Yes.

| 1 | THE WITNESS: Yes. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. WURDEMAN: Did they take samples? |
| 3 | THE WITNESS: I testified already I'm |
| 4 | not sure if they did or not. |
| 5 | MR. WURDEMAN: Who in your company would |
| 6 | know that? |
| 7 | THE WITNESS: Our environmental manager |
| 8 | would most likely know that. |
| 9 | MR. WURDEMAN: Who's that? |
| 10 | THE WITNESS: Justine Lodick. (phonetic |
| 11 | spelling) |
| 12 | MR. WURDEMAN: Now, you entered into an |
| 13 | agreement just recently with the EPA, correct? EPA |
| 14 | has been involved? |
| 15 | THE WITNESS: Yes. |
| 16 | MR. WURDEMAN: And you entered into |
| 17 | your company entered into an agreement on or about |
| 18 | January 25th, 2011 with the EPA on what you should be |
| 19 | doing to resolve this issue? |
| 20 | THE WITNESS: Yes, we did. |
| 21 | MR. WURDEMAN: And do you recall if in |
| 22 | entering into that agreement if a Mr. Robert Longal |
| 23 | (phonetic spelling) who's Mr. Robert Longal? |
| 24 | THE WITNESS: He is, he's in management |
| 25 | at Waste Management out of our LA market group office. |

| 1 | MR. WURDEMAN: And he has authority to |
|----|---|
| 2 | enter into agreements on behalf of Waste Management |
| 3 | Hawaii? |
| 4 | THE WITNESS: He would. |
| 5 | MR. WURDEMAN: He would. |
| 6 | THE WITNESS: I don't recall his exact |
| 7 | title but, yes. |
| 8 | MR. WURDEMAN: Okay. And did you have a |
| 9 | chance to read that agreement that Mr. Longal entered |
| 10 | into with the EPA? |
| 11 | THE WITNESS: I did. |
| 12 | MR. WURDEMAN: You did? |
| 13 | THE WITNESS: Yes. |
| 14 | MR. WURDEMAN: You're intimately |
| 15 | familiar with what's required of you in |
| 16 | THE WITNESS: I'm familiar with what's |
| 17 | in there. |
| 18 | MR. WURDEMAN: And it's set forth in |
| 19 | this agreement, correct? |
| 20 | THE WITNESS: It is. |
| 21 | MR. WURDEMAN: I'm talking about the one |
| 22 | signed January 25th, 2011 signed by Mr. Longal and |
| 23 | also representative of the US EPA, correct? |
| 24 | THE WITNESS: That is correct, yes. |
| 25 | MR. WURDEMAN: And are you familiar with |

```
1
    a provision in that agreement in which it states, "The
 2
    conditions described in the findings of fact above
    constitute an actual or threatened release of a
 3
    hazardous substance from the facility, " and then they
 4
 5
    reference varies provisions under CIRCLA, "and may
    present an eminent and substantial endangerment to the
 6
 7
    public health or welfare or the environment in
    accordance with section 106A of CIRCLA 42 USC 9606A."
 8
 9
    Are you familiar with that?
                  THE WITNESS:
                                 I am familiar with that.
10
    And I believe the term "hazardous substances" refers
11
    to municipal solid waste and/or medical waste.
12
13
                  MR. WURDEMAN: Okay. And you admitted
14
    to that, correct?
15
                  THE WITNESS:
                                 I'm admitting that I know
16
    what's in the order.
17
                  MR. WURDEMAN: Your company admitted to
    that, what I just read, that provision.
18
19
                  THE WITNESS: We signed the order.
                                                       Wе
20
    did sign the order.
21
                  MR. WURDEMAN:
                                  I'm sorry I only have one
22
    copy, Mr. Chairman.
                         I could provide additional
23
    copies, but if I could make a copy of this EPA
24
    agreement as part of the record I'd appreciate it.
```

CHAIRMAN DEVENS:

25

Sure. We'll have

Mr. Hakoda make the copies and have it attached.

1.

11.

MR. WURDEMAN: Now, there was some kind of deadline -- and prior to today I was getting a lot of my information from the media as well as was the Commission apparently -- but was there some sort of deadline as far as meeting certain regulations that the EPA had set forth that was set forth yesterday? I think that was referenced.

THE WITNESS: The intent of the administrative order on consent, and the key word is "on consent" is because when EPA arrived at the site on Saturday, January the 15th, two days after the storm we were already -- the City and Waste Management were in the middle or the midst of our plan for both containing and correcting anything that happened on site as a result of the storm in addition to our activities as far as cleaning up any material that had left the site.

EPA, as I mentioned, arrived that Saturday. They spent the rest of the day there. They were there all day Sunday from probably 9 until 7:00 that night, and were back again Monday until probably 1 or 2:00.

The result of that was this order that you're referring to. However, all of the terms that

were in the order were already being undertaken at the time that the order was signed.

1.1

To answer your specific question, there was a set of deliverables that were due yesterday and those deliverables were, in fact, sent in to the department yesterday.

MR. WURDEMAN: What do you mean by that?

THE WITNESS: You asked me if there were deliverables that were due yesterday according to the terms of the order. And my answer is yes they were due and they were delivered.

MR. WURDEMAN: So what specifically was delivered? That's my question.

THE WITNESS: There were five or six work plans and reports, status reports that were in there that were delivered. I probably can't recall all of them. I know there was one that was a work plan to restore the sedimentation basin to the level or the efficiency status that it was before the first storm.

There was one on the hydraulic head in cell 6. I believe we were supposed to submit the facility health and safety plan. I can't recall the names of the other ones. I think there was a documentation of what we had done for the beach

cleanup. There was several other statements in there, but I don't recall exactly all of them. I believe there were six or seven altogether.

R

MR. WURDEMAN: Let me go back to the allegations of that State Health Department investigation that you apparently didn't fully review yet.

MS. VIOLA: Chairman?

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Yes. Go ahead.

MS. VIOLA: I just wanted to note that this is an investigation that's ongoing. And the State actually -- the City has not received a copy of this from the Department of Health yet. There's no indication to us that they are in the process of finalizing any kind of enforcement action.

So in deference to the Department of Health who's not here to answer these questions, I think it's premature for counsel to be asking questions of the potential respondent if they do end up doing an enforcement action.

At this point we don't have the final report, the final document or final enforcement action from the agency. So to ask him any questions in terms of him interpreting a document that's not finalized I think would be supposition at best.

And at this point he's correct in stating that he doesn't -- to protect himself because there may be potential litigation that he should not be answering questions trying to predict what the Department of Health is thinking in its report.

1.6

1.7

appreciate your statements. What I understood

Mr. Wurdeman to be asking was just generally whether

or not he agreed as to whether or not these

allegations are true or not. And if that's something

he doesn't know or doesn't have the answer to he can

answer that way.

MS. VIOLA: And I would object in the sense that this may be potential enforcement action. At this point for him to deny or admit is premature. So I would object to any kind of admission or acknowledgment in regards to anything that's in that report that again the city has never seen before up to this point.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: And he can answer that way if that's the way he wants to handle that question. What I understood Mr. Wurdeman to do is just trying to figure out if any of this information or allegations contained in the report were true or not based on whatever knowledge this witness may have.

1 But your points are well taken.

MS. HIRAHARA: Chair, if I may? My name is Lisa Hirahara and I represent Waste Management.

And I have advised my client not to answer these questions because it is an ongoing investigation. And we haven't even gone through it yet.

So I would just like to -- it hasn't been authenticated. DOH is not here to authenticate the report. And my client has been instructed not to answer.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: What's the basis of not answering?

MS. HIRAHARA: It's a pending investigation.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Right. But we're also looking into it right now as well as a Commission because this matter did come before us. And we're trying to seek answers.

MS. HIRAHARA: This particular matter was not on your agenda.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: It was to get information and he was offered as a witness. And he's given testimony under oath trying to explain what happened. We're just trying to get to the bottom of all this.

1 MS. HIRAHARA: That's fine, but I object 2 on the Waste Management's behalf. CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Mr. Wurdeman. 3 4 MR. WURDEMAN: What makes you believe 5 that this is an ongoing investigation? Is there something in the document that says this is a 6 7 preliminary report, not a final report? 8 THE WITNESS: I told you I hadn't 9 completed a review of the document. 10 MR. WURDEMAN: Would you like me to show 11 you a copy of the document? And you can show me where --12 13 THE WITNESS: Not necessarily. I still wouldn't comment on it because, as both counsel has 14 15 already stated, it's something -- that document is under investigation or the situation is under 16 investigation and that's a preliminary document. 17 18 don't know what the Department of Health is doing in their investigation. 19 20 MR. WURDEMAN: Well, it says 21 "Investigation report." It's three pages. 22 signed off by members of the Health Department on 23 January 4, 2011 for date of investigation 24 December 23rd, 2010. Is there anything that you

recall in your review, preliminary review of this

report, that this isn't their final report? 2 THE WITNESS: As I mentioned I haven't 3 reviewed the report. But I'm not gonna comment on it 4 because I do know from general -- the consensus if not 5 anywhere else but here that there is an ongoing б investigation. MR. WURDEMAN: What leads you to believe 8 that this isn't a final -- I mean they signed off on it. It doesn't say this was a preliminary draft. THE WITNESS: I don't know what's in 10 there. 11 MR. WURDEMAN: Do they say that the 1.2 investigation is ongoing? What makes you think that 13 this isn't a final report from the Health Department 14 1.5 of violations in December of 2010? THE WITNESS: I'm not going to comment 16 on what's in that or why I would think a certain way. 17 I haven't reviewed that. I've explained that to you 18 several times. I don't know what's in there. 19 20 would I comment on what's in there when --21 MR. WURDEMAN: May I approach the witness, Mr. Chair? 22 23 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Yeah. Mr. Wurdeman, if you don't mind me just asking the witness: What 24

would be the end result of this investigation? Would

```
it result in civil fines or something else?
 1
                  THE WITNESS: I don't think we know that
 2
 3
    at this time.
                  CHAIRMAN DEVENS: If it should be a
 4
 5
    violation sustained the allegation --
 6
                  THE WITNESS: If could be some --
 7
                  CHAIRMAN DEVENS:
                                    Hold on, let me get
    the question out because the court reporter's going to
    get angry at us in a little while.
                                        What would be the
 9
10
    end result if the violations are sustained?
                                                  Is it a
    civil fine that you're looking at? Or is it something
11
12
    else?
                                It be could be civil.
                  THE WITNESS:
13
    could be other. I'm not an attorney so --
14
15
                  CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Does it involve any
    criminal action?
16
17
                  THE WITNESS: I don't know that.
                                                     I 'm
18
    not an attorney.
                  CHAIRMAN DEVENS: You don't have to be
19
    an attorney to know if something's criminal or not.
20
    Has anyone told you that there's criminal implications
21
    from this investigation?
22
                                No one has told me that.
23
                  THE WITNESS:
24
                  COMMISSIONER CONTRADES: Excuse me,
25
    Mr. Chairman. The counsel has already told him not to
```

answer. I mean he said I don't how many times he's not gonna answer. Why are we continuing this? I don't get it. He said he's not going to answer. She's told him not to answer. If she was my counsel and told me not to answer I wouldn't answer. So why are we continuing? He's not going to say anything! It's ridiculous!

1.1

MR. WURDEMAN: With all due respect, Mr. Contrades, usually if there's a reason not to answer there must be some legal basis for asserting that.

COMMISSIONER CONTRADES: I'm not a judge. I'm not in court. Okay? I mean I have never in my life, and I've been on this Commission six years, ever had such a situation. This is not someplace we're gonna hang somebody.

I'm terribly insulted by what you're doing. I really am. Because I would never treat a man like that. He said, "I cannot answer." She told him not to. She told him not to. Why would he answer? I wouldn't answer. If somebody tells me not to, they're my representatives, I'm not going to stay anything more.

And why don't you ask her, who is representing him, why she doesn't want him to answer

if that's what you need? But the continuance of this 1 is wasting my time. That's how I feel. It's wasting 2 3 my time. And I'm insulted by the way you're treating this man. 4 5 MR. WURDEMAN: You know what? With all 6 due respect, Mr. Contrades, I think the community of 7 the Leeward Coast is insulted by what happened to them. 8 COMMISSIONER CONTRADES: I'm sure they

OMMISSIONER CONTRADES: I'm sure they are. I'm sure they are.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. WURDEMAN: And we have -- we have -- as Intervenors we have an obligation to get to the root of this.

COMMISSIONER CONTRADES: But not to continuously badger somebody. You don't have that obligation.

MR. WURDEMAN: I have an obligation to represent --

COMMISSIONER CONTRADES: He already said, "I'm not going to answer." Why do you continue asking him the same questions?

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Tommy, let me just -I was just trying to establish what the bases are. I
think we're ready to move on.

25 | COMMISSIONER CONTRADES: Thank you.

```
MR. WURDEMAN: I'll defer to the Chair
 1
    on this matter. I'd like to make some concluding
 2
    remarks, however. I do believe that it is clear from
 3
    the investigative report of the State Health
 4
    Department as attached as Exhibit 5 as well as the EPA
 5
    report that they admitted to previously, that there
 6
 7
    are clear violations of 74 and 75 that we discussed.
                  MS. VIOLA: (off mic) Excuse me.
 8
 9
    this testimony?
10
                  MR. WURDEMAN:
                                  I'm just making a
11
    concluding remark and I'll be done.
                 MS. VIOLA: It appears to be testimony
12
13
    and conclusive.
                  CHAIRMAN DEVENS:
                                     If you can kind of
14
15
    wrap it up, Mr. Wurdeman. I was going to give the
16
    director if he had another person that you folks were
17
    going to call to give further explanations.
    the plan?
18
                  MS. VIOLA: And I apologize but I would
19
    like to ask a few questions of Mr. Whelan first.
20
21
                  CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Of course.
2.2
                  MR. WURDEMAN: I'll hold off on my
23
    comments.
24
                  CHAIRMAN DEVENS: But there was also
25
    going to be one more witness you were going to call?
```

MS. VIOLA: 1 Yes. 2 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Fine. Is that all the 3 questions you have, Mr. Wurdeman? At this time, yes. 4 MR. WURDEMAN: 5 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Planning, did you want 6 to ask any questions, sir? 7 MR. YOUNG: No. 8 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Ms. Viola, you want to ask some follow-up questions? 9 MS. VIOLA: Thank you. 10 Mr. Whelan, could you tell the Committee what is the normal 11 rainfall for the entire year that Waimanalo Gulch 12 13 experiences? THE WITNESS: Yes. We normally receive 14 15 19 inches or thereabouts of rain per year. 16 particular set of three storms deposited 22 inches of rain in just over three weeks. 17 18 MS. VIOLA: So would you characterize

THE WITNESS: I would definitely say it's unprecedented both in the volume and the short amount of time. And I also mentioned in my earlier testimony that the final storm, which was the larger one, dropped 7.6 inches of rain in about six hours time. So as I mentioned the intensity is the one that

that as an unprecedented storm in its intensity?

19

20

21

22

23

24

causes the most amount of damage.

MS. VIOLA: So Chair Devens had asked you to compare it to the 40 days -- I know a few years ago we had 40 days of rain. How would you compare it to that?

THE WITNESS: This would be much more devastating because if you had a 40-day period where it never stopped raining, but the intensity of the rain was such that the existing infrastructure or roadways or ditches or anywhere else on the island would have been able to handle that.

In this particular case we had an area that was closes to two miles square, I believe, in the upper watershed dropping rain that came down through the landfill which, again, this is a gulch which means that it has very high sides on both sides.

So you had a very large watershed that came through a very limited amount of spatial area in a very, very short time. And that total amount of rainwater was enough to overcome the design that was approved for that location.

MS. VIOLA: And at all times during the storms, all three storms, had the drainage that was in place, was that as required by the permit or your permit with DOH?

THE WITNESS: Yes. We are required to maintain 24-hour, 5-year storm and that's what the landfill is designed for.

MS. VIOLA: So at the time of the storms and during the expansion you had the drainage that was required by the permit.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MS. VIOLA: Are you aware of any test results from any of the tests of the stormwater that was released?

THE WITNESS: Yes. I believe I testified that the water was tested on the day of the release.

MS. VIOLA: Right. Are you aware of the results of those tests?

THE WITNESS: I am, yes.

MS. VIOLA: And what were the results?

THE WITNESS: The results came back. It stated, and I believe they were in a press release that was issued by the Department of Health at that time, that stated that while the water results testing that was done not only on site but in the area at our offsite outlet that they were within the realm of what you would expect to see during a major storm around the island.

And as I testified earlier there was a significant brownout around the island or a brown advisory for several days after this storm.

б

MS. VIOLA: And Chair Devens also asked you about an estimate of the total waste that was discharged. And I heard that you said that you couldn't quantify that. But could you tell the Committee how many bags you did collect in your clean up?

THE WITNESS: Yes. We collected during the week-long process approximately 55 or so 40-gallon trash bags full of waste. And out of that we probably had a gallon to a gallon and-a-half or so of sterilized medical waste. The majority obviously of what we picked up at all of the beaches was material.

MS. VIOLA: Finally, in your dealings with EPA throughout the negotiations that you mentioned, did EPA indicate to you at any time their impression of your cleanup efforts?

THE WITNESS: Yes they did actually.

During the course of their time with us both of their inspectors as they were exiting the site made a point of telling not only the City but Waste Management representatives that we had done a good job in

assessing what needed to be done both with onsite restoration of the site as well as our beach cleanup.

The intention -- and they further stated that the intention of the administrative order was to document what we had done and to formalize our plans as we move forward to continue with our restoration activities.

In addition to that I had an e-mail over the weekend from a lady from EPA congratulating us on the job that we had done during the cleanup activities.

MS. VIOLA: No further questions.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Mr. Whelan, can I ask you a quick question and we'll move on to the Director's next witness. Are there preventative measures that are being put into place now? I assume the construction is still ongoing?

THE WITNESS: Yes. As far as the diversion that we spoke of earlier, back in October we had increased the number of shifts to try to get it finished before the rainy season.

The contractor, though, was in the field the day after the storm doing double shifts, again to try to get this thing back in place as soon as possible. And I believe that the current date is

about 10 days from now that it will be functionally complete, which would mean that in the event of another storm of this magnitude the amount of water from the watershed above us would go around the active landfill and not through it.

1.8

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Commissioners have any further questions for this witness? Commissioner Heller.

COMMISSIONER HELLER: Just wanted to follow up on one point. In response to a question from counsel, you indicated that you were in compliance at all times during the whole period of the three storms with the requirements of your permits.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HELLER: Now, just want to make sure I understand. With respect to that berm that was under construction but not yet finished, are you saying that you were in compliance while it was in its unfinished state? Or that you would be in compliance once it's finished?

THE WITNESS: We were in compliance while it was being constructed per the terms of our permit. And just a point of clarification. We're speaking about the diversion drainage swale that will take the water around the landfill.

The actual berm or dam that I referenced 1 is only -- it's not in our permit -- it's only something that we did as a preventive method after we 3 saw the results of the first storm and while it was actually still raining. We were concerned that there 5 would be an uncontrolled release. So at that time 6 7 then we constructed a berm to keep that water on site. 8 COMMISSIONER HELLER: Okay. I apologize if I got the terminology wrong. The swale that was 9 under construction --10 11 THE WITNESS: Yes. 12 COMMISSIONER HELLER: -- you're saying 13 that while it was under construction but not yet 14 completed you were at that point in compliance with your permits. 15 THE WITNESS: We were. That actual 16 language was written into the permit. 17 COMMISSIONER HELLER: So, in other 18 words, operating without the protection fully in place 19 20 is still in compliance with the permits. 21 THE WITNESS: Yes. 22 COMMISSIONER HELLER: Thank you. 23 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Any other questions? 24 COMMISSIONER TEVES: I have a question. 25 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Go ahead,

```
Commissioner Teves.
 1
                  COMMISSIONER TEVES:
                                        Thank you,
 2
    Mr. Chairman. Mr. Whelan, how long has Waste
 3
    Management been operating the Waimanalo Landfill?
 4
                  THE WITNESS: Since the beginning of the
 5
           I believe the landfill opened in 1989. And
    site.
 6
    we've been the contractor since then.
 7
                  COMMISSIONER TEVES: Okay.
                                               And how
 8
    often does this medical waste wash down to the beach?
 9
                  THE WITNESS: To my knowledge we've
10
    never had a release of any solid waste from the site.
11
    Certainly I don't believe there's been ever a case
12
    where medical waste has gone off the site.
13
                  COMMISSIONER TEVES: So this would be
14
15
    the first time.
                  THE WITNESS:
16
                                Yes.
17
                  COMMISSIONER TEVES: Except for the
    hundred year storm.
18
                  THE WITNESS: Yes.
19
20
                  COMMISSIONER TEVES:
                                        This is the first
21
    time with medical waste.
                  THE WITNESS:
22
                                 Yes.
                  COMMISSIONER TEVES:
                                        And no other time?
23
24
                                Not to my knowledge no.
                  THE WITNESS:
```

We did canvass employees internally to try to

determine that. And there was no evidence to show that that ever happened before.

COMMISSIONER TEVES: Thank you.

THE WITNESS: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Commissioner

Contrades.

1.2

COMMISSIONER CONTRADES: I have finally found this investigation report from the Department of Health Clean Water Branch. I don't know who I'm supposed to ask this question to because it doesn't state who it was sent to or where it was supposed to go to. But it is correct. It's only three pages long.

And I just wanted to read for the record. It says on Page 3 "In conclusion, it appears that the landfill owners and operators including the CCH and Wastewater Management violated Hawai'i water pollution rules and regulations by discharging water pollutants to state waters without authorization.

"Further enforcement actions may be required to ensure remediation of the violation. At this time the DOH/CWB will pursue enforcement action in the form of a Notice of Apparent Violation and requests for information. Further escalating the enforcement action may also be forthcoming as updated

information regarding this case is received." 1 I'm not an attorney. But if somebody 2 read that to me I'd be very careful of what I said. 3 4 Another point I'd like to make to everybody here: The reason we have this hearing is 5 because this Commission, upon reading all of that 6 7 stuff that went on in the newspapers and all the accidents that happened, we were very concerned 8 because we were the ones that was involved in the 9 approval of giving them the opportunity to stay open 10 11 to 2012. And we did this because we also are 12 13 concerned. But I'm also concerned in treating people fairly. I don't know where this came from. 14 know who it was addressed to. I don't know how 15 anybody got it. And I only received it today. 16 this doesn't say anything to me as far as: Yes, they 17 did something wrong. 18 19 There is an ongoing investigation. 20 would like to know what happened also. But I think we 21 should treat people fairly here. That's all I have to 22 say. CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Any other questions? 23 24 Director, you want to move to your next witness?

MR. STEINBERGER: Yes.

1 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Mr. Whelan, thank you for coming down. We appreciate it. 2 3 THE WITNESS: Thank you for your hospitality. 4 5 MR. STEINBERGER: Mr. Chair, we have a 6 short summary that we put on a PowerPoint because we 7 wanted to go over the 16 conditions. So for members that are sitting here outside of the Commission so 8 9 they could actually see the wording of the 16 conditions. 10 We thought it would be prudent if we 11 were able to project that up on the wall so people 12 could see. If you can just bear with us for a couple 13 of minutes. 14 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Of course. 15 MR. STEINBERGER: Or perhaps if you'd 16 like to take a short recess. 17 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Yes, why don't we take 18 19 a short break and we'll reconvene when you're ready. 20 (Recess was held. 3:30) 21 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: We're going to go back on the record. Director, if you're going to be 22 23 narrating I've been advised we still have to put you under oath. 24 MR. STEINBERGER: Yes, that's fine. 25

1 xx

TIM STEINBERGER,

being first duly sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: I do.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: And if you could just state your name for the record.

THE WITNESS: For the record my name's Tim Steinberger. I'm the director of the Department of Environmental Services for the City and County of Honolulu.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Thank you very much.

MR. STEINBERGER: First off I'd like to thank the Commission for inviting us here today. As I had discussion with Mr. Davidson shortly after the event at the Waimanalo Gulch I felt it would be appropriate that we come in and give an update to this Commission. And then shortly after we received this left from you.

Today I'm here to address the items that have to deal with the movement towards selecting an alternative to replace or supplement the Waimanalo Gulch Sanitary Landfill which was from Condition 4 of the 16 conditions. And then also just to go through all of the 16 conditions to present to you the status.

You did receive from us a report. It's an update of our annual report in which we did, we have provided written in there as well.

So if I may, first off just very quickly this is some information that this Commission probably knows more than it really wants to know about.

But as you know the landfill began operation in about 1989 and our operator is Waste Management Hawaii. It does operate under a permit issued by the Department of Health.

Primarily we receive MSW, the bulk of it being bulky type trash, also ash and residue from H-Power. Right now we're seeing about 400,000 tons annually coming into the landfill.

This is just a quick breakdown of what the landfill sees. Again, in MSW the number that we are operating at now's about 163,000 tons annually. This is a -- oh, incidentally, that FYO6 is incorrect. It should be fiscal year 10. This has been quite a bit of a drop from the last data that you saw. I believe it was more around 650 tons a day. As you can the islandwide recycling has taken quite a bite out of the amount of MSW that's going into the landfill.

So if I may go into where we are right now as far as the selection process. We have gone

through, and this occurred back in, starting back about, I'm going to say last summer 2010 -- we did start identifying potential members to sit on the committee which is going to be tasked with finding an alternate or a supplemental site for Waimanalo Gulch. That committee process went though an identification utilizing the consultant that we had put on board earlier. And also our staff provided input as well as some other people from throughout the city.

That list went over to the Mayor's office in about October of 2010. The approval of the list came back to us. And at that time we sent out letters of invitation to those people. So they had not been contacted up until about December 20, 21st timeframe, asking them if they could participate.

We were looking for a committee of about 12 people. And specifically when we were looking at who would qualify for this type of a position we were looking at two areas. First, we wanted individuals that had a background in community involvement, and they could bring to the table an understanding of issues and concerns that would be important from a community's point of view.

Second was to ensure that the majority of the committee members could understand the

technical issues and the complexities involved in siting a new landfill, including but not limited to the environmental and legal issues.

The first committee that was established back in, I believe it was 2003 was made up about 16 committee members. And many of those people did not have a very good technical background. So in the end they had to establish a technical advisory group utilizing the consultant and other sub-consultants to provide information to the members, which just added sometime to the overall process.

So at this time we were looking more for a diverse group of people that already had substantial knowledge in various issues.

The present committee is designed to balance the committee and technical needs again to provide more meaningful discussion at the table before any recommendation goes over to the mayor.

This is the list of Advisory Committee members. As you can see there's quite a few notable people in there that have a fairly strong background in environmental issues, as well as people who are known to be very active in the community. Bruce Anderson, who served as the former director, actually Deputy Director for Department of Health. Also David

Arakawa who's now an Executive Director with the Land Use Research LURF. Thomas Arizumi, he recently retired from the Department of Health. He was in the Environmental Management Division.

David Cooper. He's with the Hana Group. It's an infrastructure support services. He also has knowledge of the Leeward area.

John DeSoto, former councilmember. He's been very active in the Leeward community.

John Goody. He actually was with the military for some years. He's now working with Belt Collins as an environmental planner.

Joe Lapilio. Again he's an urban and environmental planner. He's got a pretty good knowledge of the Wai'anae Coast issues in the community.

Tesha Malama. She's with HCDA. And she's a Director with that Kalaeloa group that's doing the development out on that side of the island.

Janice Marsters. At the time I believe she was one of the directors of the local Sierra Club I'm not sure if she still sits on that board or if she's just at this time associated with them. But she is also an environmental geologist with quite a bit of background in dealing with these types of issues.

Richard Poirier. He used to be with State Planning, knows Coastal Zone Management quite well.

Chuck Prentiss. He used to be the executive secretary for the Planning Commission for the City and County.

And then George West. He's a retired Ameron executive.

So these people were 12 people that were selected out of the many people that were invited.

Not everybody could commit as much time that was required. We were looking at seven meetings with this committee. So it is quite a bit of dedication of time and service.

And as was indicated at the opening meeting if you're on a jury at least you get paid, but for this group you do not get paid, but you're still sitting in there just as much time as though you were on a jury.

This is our advisory committee schedule. We had our first meeting on January 20th. And this was -- an overview was presented. Our next meeting is going to be on February 10th. And this is going to be a tour of the island's waste facilities. This will be both H-Power, Waimanalo Gulch, and we also requested a

tour of PVT. And I believe we did get authorization from the PVT manager to bring the committee up there.

б

Ω

2.4

On March 10th we'll be looking at the engineering report. This will be the first time that the sites that have been identified, potential sites have been identified, will be presented. So we have not even seen those sites yet. That will come on the 10th of March from the consultant.

Also we'll be presenting the previous landfill sites. And this committee does have the ability and the authority to request additional information. They also may suggest additional sites to be considered and ask the consultant to go through the process again when they went to put this list together for them.

On March 31st again there will be request for additional community criteria, consultant description of the process.

May 12 review of alternative sites, distribute evaluation sheets and they'll weigh the criteria. This is what they call a double blind type process. They're really looking at establishing a criteria that they feel is important for the siting of the landfill. And once that's established, then it pretty much sets the stage as to what site is the best

suited.

б

June 23rd results of the analysis.

Reveal sites selected by the committee. And then they will establish what the content of the report that's going to up to the mayor will be.

And then on their last meeting,

July 21st discuss the draft report, revise for the final and then submit to mayor.

Now, this schedule is, the schedule that we've put together, it may be longer. So right now we're looking at this report going in towards the end of July. But given that some of the issues that may occur or perhaps not every member of the committee may be able to meet all the time, it may extend as late as August or early September. So that's where we are on this.

As far as the previous sites these were the sites that were shown to the committee back in 2003, 2004 timeframe. So these are all of the old sites. I don't know at this point which one of those sites is still available. Some of the sites may have been taken off. I do not know at this time if any new sites have been added on.

There was a bit of an issue about a letter that went out -- or two letters that went out.

One went to the federal government and one went to the state of Hawai'i, having to do with two sites over towards Waimanalo and Bellows. Those two sites actually appeared in the 2003/2004 timeframe. And similar letters were sent out to the federal government and the state asking if those sites could be placed on the consideration list. At that time both the federal government and the state replied that, no, they could not be placed on there.

The reason we ask that permission is because the county does not have the authority to condemn federal or state land.

Now, just before I go into the conditions. When the Order came out from the Land Use Commission in 2009 as far as Condition 4, we had already put money into the budget in the fiscal year 10 budget which went through approval in March, April, May timeframe of 2009 to procure, so we could secure a consultant to start doing the work, the preliminary work that is needed before you can present something to a committee.

So the motivation behind going forward at that time was because of the County's Integrated Solid Waste Management Plan had already identified the need to start the process because the process is quite

1 long.

'Cause once you actually select the site it's then going forward beyond that and getting the site and getting the permits for the site and then constructing the site. So we knew at that time that it was going to be a timely process. So that's why in 2009 we already started the process.

And the condition under Condition 4 I believe it said that we had to start the process in November of 2010. We actually got a head start on it by one year.

If I may, is there any questions on this
before I move on? Or you want me to --

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: You can finish your presentation and we'll call for questions.

MR. STEINBERGER: Okay. As far as the 16 conditions: Condition 1 which is, "The Applicant shall obtain all necessary approvals for the Department of Health, Department of Transportation Commission, Water Resource Management" --

MS. ERICKSON: Could you please slow down.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Yes, we've got the court reporter.

Slower? 1 THE WITNESS: I'll start over. "The Applicant shall obtain all necessary approvals 2 3 from the State Department of Health, Department of 4 Transportation, Commission on Water Resource Management and Board of Water Supply for all onsite 5 and offsite improvements involving access, storm 6 7 drainage, leachate control, water, well construction 8 and wastewater disposal." At this time all of those applicable 9 permits and approvals have been obtained. 10 11 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: If I can suggest instead of having to read each condition, because we 12 13 have the conditions and they are part of the record --14 MR. STEINBERGER: Yes, yes. 1.5 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: -- I think the record will be clear enough if you just want to say this is 16 the condition. Just say Condition 2 and whatever the 17 status you want to report. 18 That would be fine. MR. STEINBERGER: 19 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: That works for you. 20 MR. STEINBERGER: That'd work for me 21 just fine. Thank you, Chair. Condition No. 2. This 22

part of the solid waste management plan. And that was

measures and management plan have been provided as

has to do with dust control.

23

24

25

The dust control

1 | issued by the Department of Health.

Condition No. 3, which has to do with the indemnity, so noted.

Condition No. 4, I just went through so I'll go straight to Condition No. 5.

Condition No. 5 again looking at alternative technologies. I'll give you an update where we are on this right now. We were able to successfully move forward and award a contract for the construction of the third boiler out at H-Power.

What this does is it provides us with an additional 300,000 tons annually of processing municipal solid waste. It also allows us to increase our power generation by an additional 32 megawatts. So at that time we'll be looking at putting somewhere in the neighborhood of about 80 megawatts onto the grid.

For sludge reuse, a contract has been issued. The contract is not just sludge reuse. It also indicates, involves green waste and food waste and sludge. So that contract is issued and the contractor is now preparing an EIS. That is scheduled to come online in 2012 as well.

For the materials recycling, we completed the final phase of the curbside rollout. We

also came out with an RFP for looking at possibilities of reusing the ash that's produced at H-Power as well as the fly ash at H-Power. Unfortunately we did not get any respondents to those RFPs.

Я

2.4

We also had an RFP for looking at dealing with the residue that is generated. This is this kind of grainy material that comes out. And that one too we did not have any respondents.

There was also an RFP out for a demonstration project. We are looking for somebody who we would provide the land to and they would build their facility. And we would pay them so much per ton to process MSW in what has been defined as an alternative project for such things as plasma arc, or pyrolysis or one of these.

We had a lot of people, contractors show up at our meetings, but we didn't have anybody who -- an actual developer willing to step forward and build one.

As far as the offisland shipping, we awarded that contract. There was an environmental assessment that was prepared by the USDA which would allow it to be shipped to the Roosevelt landfill in Washington. This was challenged by the Yakima Indian Nation. And at a later date it was also challenged by

the Friends of the Columbia River. And as such the contractor was unable to perform in his contract.

1.0

2.0

The end result was that the EA was withdrawn as well as the permit was withdrawn from the contractor. And to this date the various non-government organizations continue to solidify in closing the entire West Coast to shipping. So right now Oregon and Washington is closed. But the last one that we heard was that they were not -- they were going to continue to pursue shutting down the whole West Coast. And I haven't heard anything more in that respect for probably six or seven months. So I don't know if they're still actively pursuing it or not.

As you all know the facility was severely damaged by fire as well as some of the equipment. The facility itself has been deemed unusable. They believe it to be a risk.

The last time I talked to Department of Planning and Permitting, they said they were most likely going to issue a condemnation on that particular building because they felt it was unsafe.

So as it is now the HWS Hawaii Waste Shipping was unable to ship any of the material out. What we ended up doing with them, and this is mostly 'cause they came in and represented that they were

bankrupt and they had no more money, and the investors would put no more money into the facility. We came to an agreement that if they would take their bundles of MSW, and there were some 20,000 tons at the time. And it was well publicized. I think the news media did such a good job of publicizing it I don't have to go in to much detail on this.

б

But the agreement was that they would break the bales apart. They would separate everything that was combustible out and they would take it up to H-Power. And that material that could not be burned would then go to Waimanalo Gulch. The whole idea was to stay in the spirit of the original contract award which was to minimize the burden on the gulch from MSW.

What was delivered to the shipping company was mostly bulky trash that we pick up along the curbside as well as convenience center waste, which is material that homeowners bring in generally on the weekends. So that was the nature of what they were dealing with.

So they did manage to separate and dispose of the bulk of it, some 13,000 tons. It's my understanding they have about 7,000 tons still remaining and they're unable to process at this time

because they do not have what the Department of Health requires, which is an environmentally enclosed area.

2.3

So right now they're on hold. So nothing has been processed. But hopefully they'll come to some resolution with DOH and they'll get this cleared up.

Condition No. 6. The subsequent reports will be submitted on June 1st of each year.

Condition No. 7, which is the closure sequence. The closure sequence "A" will be completed and the final cover will be applied by December 31st, 2012.

Condition No. 8, which has to do with the timeframe. The Solid Waste Management permit that's been issued by the Department of Health requires that the landfill operations be confined to 7:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. In the event that there is an extended outage of H-Power and the need arises, we would petition the Department of Health to extend those hours during that period of time.

Condition No. 9, the coordination with Hawaiian Electric will be done. Again, to ensure that the landfill construction and the operations are adequately separate from the overhead lines.

Condition No. 10. This is the Honolulu

Ordinance 21-5.680. We were advised by the Department of Planning and Permitting that since the property is property that's designated for public use that this particular ordinance does not apply to Waimanalo Gulch.

1.0

Condition No. 11 so noted.

And Condition No. 12 also so noted.

Condition No. 13. The respective notifications will be made prior to determination of the use of the property as a landfill.

Condition No. 14. This is the provision that the municipal solid waste shall by allowed at Waimanalo Gulch up to July 31st, 2012. The date restriction on the acceptance of MSW at Waimanalo Gulch was appealed to the Circuit Court of the First Circuit. On August 3, 2010 the court denied ENV's request to strike Condition 14.

ENV timely appealed to the Intermediate Circuit Court of Appeals that portion of the decision which affirmed the July 31st, 2012 date and for the acceptance of MSW at the landfill. And this case is still currently pending at ICA.

Condition No. 15. This is having to do with the Honolulu City Council and the City

Administration reporting to the public every three

months. On August 3rd, 2010 the Circuit Court of the First Circuit issued its order modifying this condition by substituting the Department of Environmental Services for the City Council and the City Administration.

That order was not appealed. The status of the efforts of the Environmental Services in regard to the continued use of Waimanalo Gulch Sanitary Landfill, including any funding arrangements that are being considered by the City Council and the City Administration, are reported to the public during public hearings. And these are conducted every three months.

Which leads us into Condition 16. For Condition 16, again, I won't repeat what I just said earlier, but the Circuit Court did take the City Council out of it and designate Environmental Services.

As of the date of this report we've had four public hearings. And they have been held at Kapolei Hale, the first one being on July 21st, 2010. The second one April 21st, 2010. The third one July 21st, 2010 and another one on October 19, 2010. So these, again, they were all held out at Kapolei Hale.

The first meeting, the one in

January 21st, was held about 2:00 in the afternoon.

It was determined that perhaps that was too early

because we had nobody show up for that meeting from

the public. So the time was changed to be later in

the afternoon so that it would allow people to get

home from work. And if they so wished to attend they

could.

1.3

It was also brought up that we should probably be finding ways to encourage more people to show up at these meetings. So what we did was we shifted it to Honolulu Hale to make it a more central location. And the reason we did that is because we sent out a request to the Neighborhood Commission to notify all the Neighborhood Boards of these meetings that were coming up. So this way we could expand the base of people that perhaps would show up at these meetings.

At this meeting on January 18th we had one person from the public again attend. So we've been averaging about one person from the public per meeting. And I do have to back up a little because on the July 21st meeting the person who showed up was actually a person who was marketing a product as opposed to wanting to listen what was going on with

the landfill. And that's where we are at this point. So I'm open to questions.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Thank you very much.

Also thank you for taking the time to be here, present us to with that information. Commissioners, any for Director Steinberger? Commissioner Contrades.

COMMISSIONER CONTRADES: This may sound like a little bit of a crazy question considering you're a professional and I'm not. But I have this question that's been bothering me for a long time. The boilers can handle how much municipal waste?

MR. STEINBERGER: Well, the current facility right now at H-Power can handle a little over 600,000 tons a year. So right now we are pushing just about between 600,000 to 610,000 tons a year through that facility. The contract is more in the neighborhood of about 560,000.

So that kind of boils down to we're putting in about 2,000 to about 2500 tons daily through the H-Power facility. We generate a little over 50 megawatts. And I believe about 3 or 4 megawatts are used for internal running of the facility and the rest goes on the grid.

COMMISSIONER CONTRADES: So when the new boiler comes on how much more will it be taking?

MR. STEINBERGER: We will be putting an additional 300,000 tons annually into -- so we'll be at a total of 900,000 tons. That's if we continue running the first two boilers at the 600,000 tons. So we'll be up to about 900,000 tons at that point with an additional generator set which gives us an additional 32 megawatts. So at that time we'll probably be putting out close to 80 megawatts on the grid.

COMMISSIONER CONTRADES: And how much municipal waste does the City and County have total?

MR. STEINBERGER: The total amount that the -- actually it's been dropping and part of that is because of the recycling program. But the City has been generating about 3,000 tons a day in MSW.

COMMISSIONER CONTRADES: So isn't there a way that you guys could do it so that all of the municipal waste goes down to your boilers down here?

MR. STEINBERGER: You know, that would be great if we could. The only problem is there's a few things that we always have to deal with. Not everything can be combusted and converted into power. There's also several items out there that you cannot take to the H-Power such as dead animals, for instance. Those you can't run through.

Other items such as -- if you drive around and you'll see what's on the street side, toilets and bathtubs and old sinks and these type of things, these just do not combust. So they would not be going in there.

1.0

The other item that we end up is a lot of material like shattered glass, little bits of glass and sand and rocks and these type of things. So those are, you know, a lot of the items that just cannot go in there.

COMMISSIONER CONTRADES: So how much of that is generated per year that you cannot burn and you must bury?

MR. STEINBERGER: Well, right now based off of what's coming through the current boiler you'll notice we're seeing about 250 tons a day of residue, of material that can't be burned that goes from H-Power on up.

The total loading right now to Waimanalo Gulch on an annual basis is about 163-, 164,000 tons annually. So it's way down. It's about, like I said, from what we showed on the graph it's about 400 to about 450 tons a day coming into Waimanalo Gulch. Years ago it used to be closer to 1300 tons a day.

COMMISSIONER CONTRADES: Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Commissioner Lezy. COMMISSIONER LEZY: Thank you, Chair. 2 3 Good afternoon, Director Steinberger. Thanks for your 4 testimony. Just one follow-up question. On the site 5 selection committee, the Department of Environmental Services at this point has no idea what the potential 6 sites are? MR. STEINBERGER: Well, let's say that, 8 9 you know, we are overseeing the consultant contract. I as a political appointee do not. We established a 10 fire wall between this committee and anybody on the --11 as far as the mayor's office and such so as not to 12 influence the decision of this committee. 13 appearance I've had at the committee was that first 14 15 meeting to welcome everybody. And I believe the Managing Director was also there. And then at that 16 time we left. 17 18 COMMISSIONER LEZY: All right. Thank 19 you. I'll pose the question that I posed to Mr. Whelan to you. And that is: Why is it the 2.0 medical waste isn't incinerated at H-Power? 21 MR. STEINBERGER: At this time I'm going 22 to have to give you my best thought on that. And I 23 believe it's because Covanta, who's the operator of 24

the facility, does not want to take that type of

235

material in. But again I would have to verify that. 1 COMMISSIONER LEZY: 2 Okay. Thank you. Then the last question I have for you, and it's a 3 little bit of a sandbag, but I think that I read 4 recently in the newspaper that Mayor Carlisle 5 mentioned at some event that he attended that it's the 6 intent of the City and County to come back and request 7 for a further extension of the operating life of 8 9 Waimanalo Gulch. And I appreciate that Environmental Services is appealing the Circuit Court's refusal to 10 strike Condition 14. 11 Can you tell us today, though, if, in 12 fact, you fail to prevail on that appeal if it is the 13 intent of the City and County to come back and ask for 14 the date restriction to be extended? 15 16 MR. STEINBERGER: Yes. I can affirm 17 that. COMMISSIONER LEZY: Do you know when the 18 City and County intends to file its request to modify 19 that condition? 20 MR. STEINBERGER: Well, it was our 21 original intent to actually go to the Planning 22 Commission basically starting this process over again 23 in January of this year, the past month. However, 24 with the change in administration and several events 25

that have occurred that have been rather distracting, 1 we were not able to start that process. So we're hoping to be back with the 3 Planning Commission February but certainly no later 4 than March of this year. 5 COMMISSIONER LEZY: All right. Thank 6 7 you very much. CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Any other questions? 8 Commissioner Jencks. 9 COMMISSIONER JENCKS: Mr. Steinberger, 10 thank you for being here today. A couple questions on 11 the berm that Mr. Whelan talked about. It's on the 12 mauka side of the main facility. Do you know when the 13 14 permits were applied for to construct that berm? MR. STEINBERGER: You're speaking of the 15 west berm, the stabilization berm? 16 COMMISSIONER JENCKS: Yes. 17 MR. STEINBERGER: No, I don't have that 18 information. That would be better requested of 19 20 Mr. Whelan. COMMISSIONER JENCKS: But the permits 21 would have been processed by the City and County, the 22 23 grading permits and those permits? MR. STEINBERGER: Well, those permits 24

would have been -- yes, they would have been processed

by the Department of Planning and Permitting, that's correct.

COMMISSIONER JENCKS: Does anybody from the City and County know when those permits were applied for and how long it took to get those permits issued?

MS. VIOLA: I don't have that information right now but we could get that for you.

COMMISSIONER JENCKS: I'd like to know.

I'm just curious. It sounds to me as though if that facility had been constructed, permitted and constructed on a timely basis maybe we wouldn't be sitting here today.

MR. STEINBERGER: Okay. If I may clarify, you're asking about the west berm. Or I'm believing what you're asking about is the west berm. But I think what you're really asking about is the water diversion ditch.

COMMISSIONER JENCKS: That's correct.

MR. STEINBERGER: That allows us to collect the offsite water. And it's my understanding that as soon as Waste Management received their permit to move forward and be able to go back into that area they at that point applied for those permits.

COMMISSIONER JENCKS: But we don't know

today what the permitting process time took to get those permits.

1.8

MR. STEINBERGER: I would not be able to answer that. Again, I think that perhaps Waste Management would be the one who could best answer.

COMMISSIONER JENCKS: I'd like to know what those dates were. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Any other questions?

Director, I had a quick question if I may on the written status report that you submitted to us today. On Page 5 you make a reference or represent that only "a small amount", and those are the words in the report, "small amount of sterilized medical waste was discharged."

Again, if I heard Mr. Whelan's testimony correctly, and I hope I'm not misrepresenting what he said, I thought he said they could not really determining the amount or volume of waste that came out of that cell that broke loose.

MR. STEINBERGER: And I heard the same thing as far as the total volume of MSW. I think that perhaps the better term in that report should be "The medical waste that was recovered by Waste Management".

Again, I believe that when Waste

Management went out they had requested that everybody

who found medical waste to call them and they would come pick it up. And I believe that came down to what they actually recovered.

R

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: And on the same page there's a statement referring to how much medical or -- strike that -- "There was a recovery of two syringes and a vial. And that was the most medical waste that Waste Management found on any beach on any day."

Is that any one day or is it over the whole entire period up to now that is all that's been recovered as far as syringes and vials?

The reason why I'm asking this is if I look at the evidentiary photographs submitted by Ko Olina, one photograph alone has more than a handful of syringes in a bucket.

I'm just wondering how am I supposed to be reading that or we as a Commission should be interpreting this.

MR. STEINBERGER: Well, you know, I think what they were indicating was by location as opposed to not the total stretch of beach. But again I think that it's best answered by Waste Management.

I can tell you what the City did from this their side. The lifeguards were notified. The

Department of Parks was notified. There was sweeps done at the beach. They actually came out with prisoners also and did a walk through of the City beaches looking for material. And that material was to have been turned back over to Waste Management.

And I believe that one of the requests from EPA was that Waste Management segregate all of the medical waste from all the other material that they had picked up. But again perhaps that's best answered by Waste Management.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: I appreciate that.

Let me see if the parties have any questions for you.

Mr. Matsubara.

MR. W. MATSUBARA: Just briefly, Chair Devens. Thank you. Director Steinberger, thank you very much for the update and the status report. I just want to follow up. It was very comprehensive.

But Page 11 Condition No. 10 there's two parts, you addressed the first part. And I just wanted to confirm the second section of Condition 10.

I'm not alluding that you purposely did it. I know you had a lot to cover in a short period of time. But there is a second part to Condition No. 10. And that relates to "....any and all applicable rules and regulations of the State Department of

25 rules and regulations of the State Department of

Health that WGSL will be in compliance with the requirements."

MR. STEINBERGER: Correct.

MR. W. MATSUBARA: I just wanted to confirm. And today you were present when there were certain comments made regarding possible Department of Health investigations. Has your Department on its own intending to ensure that the operation is complying with the Department of Health?

MR. STEINBERGER: Well, the Department receives copies of the permits that are issued to Waste Management. And it is the -- we have a project manager that oversees the contract. And as part of their management, obviously they would request or inquire with Waste Management as to the compliance.

We have not received or the Waste

Management has not received any type of violations
that were associated with this particular incident.

So at this time I would say that they have been compliant.

MR. W. MATSUBARA: I understand that, that you have not received anything. But based on today's testimony there's some possibility that there may be some allegations. Has your Department made a determination going forward to do your own independent

```
looking into the matter? I'm not asking -- all I'm
 1
    asking is do you intend to do it or something?
 2
                                                     I'm
    just asking.
 3
                  MR. STEINBERGER: If I may just clarify.
 4
    You're asking if we are going to conduct our own
 5
    independent investigation on this?
 6
                  MR. W. MATSUBARA: Correct. Regarding
 7
    compliance with the Department of Health regulations.
 8
                  MR. STEINBERGER: Well, at this time
 9
    we're deferring to the Department of Health.
10
11
                  MR. W. MATSUBARA:
                                      Okay.
12
                  CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Is that all,
    Mr. Matsubara?
13
                  MR. W. MATSUBARA:
                                      Yes.
14
                  CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Mr. Wurdeman, did you
15
    have any questions for this witness?
16
                  MR. WURDEMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Good
17
    afternoon, sir. Could I ask who performed the EIS's
18
19
    to date for the City and Waste Management out at
    Waimanalo Gulch?
20
                  MR. STEINBERGER: The EIS I believe was
21
22
    prepared by R.M. Towill Corporation.
23
                  MR. WURDEMAN: Okay. And I'm looking
    at -- and they performed, what, at least a couple of
24
```

the last EIS's that were done?

```
MR. STEINBERGER: Well, that I cannot
 1
    answer for sure because I do not have that information
 2
    in front of me.
 3
                  MR. WURDEMAN: Do you know if they
 4
    conducted the last EIS that was performed?
 5
                                     I only know that they
 6
                  MR. STEINBERGER:
 7
    conducted the EIS that was relevant to this latest
    expansion.
 8
                  MR. WURDEMAN: Okay. And I'm looking at
 9
10
    the status report that was prepared by your
    department. On Page 2 it indicates, I quess on
11
    June 25, this is current status, the first paragraph?
12
13
                  MR. STEINBERGER: Okay, yes.
                  MR. WURDEMAN: It says, "On June 25,
14
    2010 the City contracted consultant R.M. Towill Corp.
15
    to facilitate the landfill site selection process..."
16
17
    Do you see that?
1.8
                  MR. STEINBERGER:
                                     Yes, I do.
19
                  MR. WURDEMAN: Do you see a conflict at
20
    all between R.M. Towill serving as a facilitator in
21
    the selection process of the landfill sites and being
22
    the same entity or company that did this last relevant
23
    EIS?
                  MR. STEINBERGER: Ah, no, I don't really
24
25
    see a conflict on that. It's not unusual for when you
```

hire a consultant that when you're looking for a 1 facilitator to assist a committee, that that is part 2 of their contract. 3 MR. WURDEMAN: That's all I have for the 4 5 witness. CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Dawn, did you have any 6 7 questions? 8 MS. TAKEUCHI-APUNA: No questions. 9 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Anything else you want to ask, Ms. Viola? Okay. Commissioners, anything 10 11 else of this witness? We appreciate it very much that 12 you took the time to prepare the report and give us 13 the update today. 14 MR. STEINBERGER: Thank you very much, 15 Chair. 16 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Do the parties want to 17 add anything else, add any comments or anything else? 18 Otherwise we're going to move into public testimony. 19 If you want to add anything to the record you can do Mr. Matsubara, did you want to --20 it at this time. MR. W. MATSUBARA: Thank you for the 2.1 opportunity and the Chair and for the Commission for 22

today. Mr. Wurdeman, did you want to add anything?

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Thank you for coming

coming forward and asking for a status.

23

24

MR. WURDEMAN: Yes. Thank you also to the Chair and the Commission members. I know this is a very sensitive topic for all, not only for you in making your difficult decisions, but also for the community that has to deal with what it had to deal with this last month.

1.3

2.0

I would just respectfully -- I'm not sure where the Commission intends to go with this discussion today. But I would respectfully ask that the Commission consider what appears to be some very clear violations not only in January, that the Chair and other Commission members had raised, but also December.

And certainly if it's helpful for the Commission to request further information from the State Department of Health in its decision-making process, that's certainly something that all of us would respectfully request the Commission to consider doing.

But it is a very serious concern and not only -- I just recently learned that not only did all this medical waste go out on the beaches of the Leeward Coast as many in this room had learned, but that there were these violations apparently that had been ongoing even prior to that date. And this wasn't

just a one-time too much rain in a 24-hour period.

This seems to be a problem that had been ongoing from December.

MS. VIOLA: Excuse me. I object to that. That was not discussed, so I don't think it's appropriate for him to draw conclusions from violations that were not discussed in today's hearing.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: I understand. He's just making statements for the record. We're not going to be making any kind of decision here today. It was more for informational and to get the point of view from the City and Waste Management, which we sincerely appreciate. But I'm just asking for any other comments that they want to make for the record. You'll be able to respond if you need to.

MR. WURDEMAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: I'm sorry,

18 Mr. Wurdeman.

1.4

MR. WURDEMAN: And that's all I ask of the Commission, to take into account all these different issues that have arisen today, many of which we're only learning about for the first time. And I'm confident that you will take the appropriate action.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Let me reassure you Mr. Wurdeman, that this Commission, we take our

obligation to the public very seriously. We have some oversight responsibilities. And we were very distressed as everyone else was when we found out what happened. And that was the catalyst for asking what happened.

And I think we have more information today. I think there's still many questions that aren't answered. But I do want to assure you and the public that we definitely take this seriously. It's very distressing to all of us on this Commission to have heard and seen what we did in the media. We do appreciate your being here today and we do appreciate your comments.

MR. WURDEMAN: Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Ms. Viola, do you want to add anything more?

MS. VIOLA: Just briefly. I also want to thank the Chair and the Commissioners for having this hearing today. And I would just first of all object to any characterization there's been any establishment of clear violations here today for the record.

The City's position is that this was an unprecedented storm or a series of unprecedented storms that severely impacted the landfill. And that,

as testified today, Waste Management at all times they were compliant the drainage permit requirements as dictated by the DOH. And that essentially this was unavoidable. They were faced with a rainfall that they couldn't anticipate or they couldn't prepare for.

б

1.0

1.3

If we were to require all landfills to construct in anticipation of any possible occurrence, any possible rainfall, flooding, any kind of catastrophic event, then we'd never have any construction. We wouldn't have working facilities.

So I think that's what happened in this present case. It was unfortunates, of course, that there was a release of medical waste, but it wasn't due to any mismanagement on the part of Waste Management of the City. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Just to reassure you we're definitely not making any such finding at least as of this time. But I also want to emphasize that we have a real concern for the Leeward community when things happen out there. They have this dump in their backyard. There was a lot of pretty strong feelings expressed to this Commission about shutting it down and we passed on it. It's still within our jurisdiction.

So that was another primary reason why

we wanted to at least try and get more information so the public knows that we are concerned about it. We do worry about that community. 'Cause they always seem to be getting the short end of the stick in my opinion. That's my personal opinion.

But we do appreciate you coming, the Director for taking the time. We know you have your hands full. We do appreciate the steps that you're taking to try and rectify the situation. We're just hopeful that it does not happen again. I know no one wanted it to happen. But just hoping that it does not happen again and that we are taking the steps to avoid that. I see Ken in the audience. Ken, if you want to add anything?

MR. WILLIAMS: No, appreciate it,

16 | Chair. Thank you.

2

4

5

б

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

19

20

21

22

24

25

MR. STEINBERGER: Chair?

18 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Yes.

MR. STEINBERGER: We do have, if the Committee is interested, if this Commission is interested, we do have copies of the packet that was handed out to the selection committee. So if you all

23 were interested we can provide the copies.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: We would appreciate that. Can we provide copies to the other parties as

250

well? 1 MR. STEINBERGER: Yes. Well, we have 2 3 enough --CHAIRMAN DEVENS: We'll make them. 4 MR. STEINBERGER: 5 We'll just leave it б with Riley, maybe? CHAIRMAN DEVENS: We'll make sure the 7 Thank you very much. Holly, 8 parties also get a copy. 9 you want to take a short break? We have public witnesses. 10 Okay. (Recess was held. 4:20) 11 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: (4:30) We're going to 12 13 go back on the record and take public testimony at 14 this time. I believe we have about 10 witnesses that 15 have signed up. If there's anyone out there that 16 wants to give public testimony, please let us know. 17 Dan, you want to call the first witness. MR. DAVIDSON: Sure. And let me inform 18 19 the testifiers due to the lateness of the hour and the fact that the air conditioning has been turned off, 20 21 we're going to limit public testimony to 2 minutes 22 each. 23 This is a status report. And certainly 24 there will be other opportunities in the future.

appreciate everybody's understanding of that. First

25

1 | testifier is Greg Nichols followed by Chuck Krause.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I believe Greg

- 3 | Nichols had to leave.
- 4 MR. DAVIDSON: Chuck Krause, go ahead.
- 5 | Followed by Edwin Arellano. Sorry.
- 6 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Chuck, can we swear
- 7 | you in first?
- 8 CHUCK KRAUSE,
- 9 being first duly sworn to tell the truth testified as
- 10 | follows:

1

- THE WITNESS: Yes.
- 12 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Your name and address,
- 13 | please.
- 14 THE WITNESS: My name is Charles or
- 15 | Chuck Krause, 92-1498 Ali'inui Drive in Kapolei.
- 16 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Go ahead. You have
- 17 two minutes.
- 18 THE WITNESS: Okay. I'm here today
- 19 | because I do have some concerns as not only a resident
- 20 but as a business operator on the West Shore. I'm the
- 21 | general manager of Ko Olina Marina so I've seen some
- 22 | of the repercussions of the out-spill, especially for
- 23 and, in particular, to my boat operators. So I'm here
- 24 | to pose a couple questions and/or comments to the
- 25 | Commission and to the general manager of the landfill.

One would be: Is Waste Management preparing to establish any sort of a relief fund for the businesses that have been financially affected from this out-spill? Because I can tell you that two of our major boat companies have lost thousands of dollars as a result of this. And when an incident like this happens, in most cases there's some sort of relief fund for those who can prove that they do have financial loss.

2.2

Also, I just returned from the 2011 Boat Show in Seattle. And I was absolutely amazed. I had a booth there for Ko Olina and for Ko Olina Marina. I was amazed at how far-reaching this bad news has spread. When you're spending 10, 12 hour days in a booth representing one of the most beautiful places in the world to have people continually coming up and say, "Aren't your beaches contaminated with medical waste? What was that all about?"

I would then ask again: Is Waste

Management prepared to participate in any public

relations effort to help us reestablish the reputation

that not only Ko Olina but the west side of O'ahu has

maintained for years and years and years as having

some of the nicest beaches in the world? If the

general manager --

| 1 | MR. DAVIDSON: 30 seconds, sir. |
|----|--|
| 2 | THE WITNESS: Okay if the general |
| 3 | manager and the counsel have classified this out-spill |
| 4 | from the third storm as unavoidable, I don't know how |
| 5 | this Commission in good faith can permit the continued |
| 6 | use of the landfill at this particular site. If we |
| 7 | can't guarantee that this isn't going to happen, then |
| 8 | obviously another site has to be chosen to avoid |
| 9 | what's just happened to the West Coast of O'ahu. |
| 10 | Thank you. |
| 11 | CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Thank you for your |
| 12 | testimony. Parties have any questions for this |
| 13 | witness? Hearing none, Commissioners? None. Thank |
| 14 | you very much for taking the time to be here today. |
| 15 | Next witness. |
| 16 | MR. DAVIDSON: Edwin followed by Charles |
| 17 | Leonard. |
| 18 | EDWIN ARELLANO, |
| 19 | being first duly sworn to tell the truth testified as |
| 20 | follows: |
| 21 | THE WITNESS: Yes. |
| 22 | CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Name and address. |
| 23 | THE WITNESS: Edwin Arellano, 1084 |
| 24 | Pu'uwai Street, Honolulu, Hawai'i 96819. |
| 25 | CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Go ahead. |

THE WITNESS: I'm here on behalf of Hawaii Biowaste. And I'm here to voice some concerns about not having an open landfill. The reason is we process about 4-tons of regulated medical waste and foreign waste at our facility. If we do not have any open landfill at this point we cannot receive any more and process them. So it is a concern.

Я

1.0

1.6

I can honestly say that in two days without pickup at the hospitals and dialysis clinics they were overflowed. So that is my main concern at this point. There is no place for us to discharge any treated waste.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Thank you very much.

Any questions for this witness? Hearing none,

Commissioners? Commissioner Lezy.

COMMISSIONER LEZY: I'm going to ask you the same question, Mr. Arellano, I asked two other witnesses today. And that is, do you know why medical waste is not incinerated on this island?

THE WITNESS: That I'm not sure why it's not accepted at H-Power. But I believe the concerns are maybe needle sticks. As they go through conveyor belts they tend to stick, any sharp material.

At our facility we process pathological and chemo waste through high temperature process which

is similar to incineration, which is pyrolysis. 1 That's about 30 percent of the waste that we receive from our facility it goes through that process. 3 for H-Power I believe that's probably one of their concern. I'm not sure. Because we did ask them 5 before but it's not, it's one of those waste they 6 7 don't accept at this point. 8 COMMISSIONER LEZY: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Any other questions? 9 Hearing none, thank you for being here. Next witness. 10 MR. DAVIDSON: Charles Leonard followed 11 12 by Lee Mansfield. 13 CHARLES LEONARD, 14 being first duly sworn to tell the truth testified as 1.5 follows: 16 THE WITNESS: I do. 17 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Please state your name and address. 18 My name is Charles 19 THE WITNESS: 20 I live at 1910 Ala Moana Boulevard unit 19C. 21 I'm president of Rolloffs Hawaii. Been in the

industry 30 years at the executive level of two major corporations for 20 years overseeing landfills, developed landfill projects, so I have a very clear understanding of this issue. But one thing I haven't seen is the kind of impacts over the past three months with trucks waiting in line because of the closure of not only Waimanalo Gulch but H-Power and the timing of such which created 3-hour waits at Waimanalo when H-Power was closed and then we're still -- I was out there yesterday -- we're still incurring 3-hour waits at H-Power because of this issue. So the domino effect is devastating.

1.4

As far as the rain impact, our disposal bill in the month of December went up \$83,000 in one month. Same volume, same number of container yards. So it's water weight. So I can tell you there was significant rainfall during that time.

Whether it was a devastating event for them, I'm sure it was, but it's been tremendously devastating to the entire industry. So I don't think everybody realizes the kind of domino effect you're talking about if you're considering even closing this landfill without an option.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Any questions for this witness? Hearing none, Commissioners? None. Thank you very much.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

MR. DAVIDSON: Lee Mansfield followed by

. Cynthia Rezentes.

2.2

LEE MANSFIELD

being first duly sworn to tell the truth testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: I do.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Give us your name and address, please.

THE WITNESS: Lee A. Mansfield, 839

Kaipi'i Street, Kailua, Hawai'i. I'm manager of

Hawaii American Water. We own and operate the

treatment plant that serves the community of Hawai'i

Kai. We serve 35,000 residents.

I'm here just to stress the importance to us of having an open landfill and a future landfill for the disposal of the sewage sludge we generate at our facility.

We generate about 5 to 6 tons of sludge a day. Currently we have stockpiled that sludge in our drying beds. And it's beginning to impact our capacity to process the wastewater sludges. So I appreciate the work the Commission's doing. And again just want to emphasize the importance to us of having a means of disposal. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Any questions for the witness? Hearing none, thank you very much.

MR. DAVIDSON: Cynthia Rezentes followed by Patricia Patterson.

CYNTHIA REZENTES,

being first duly sworn to tell the truth testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: You name and address.

THE WITNESS: Cynthia Rezentes, 87-149
Maipela Street, Wai'anae, 96792. Thank you for having
this hearing. I think it's very important that we all
had the opportunity to hear what was stated.

As you know I've been an opponent of continuing this landfill. One of the things that I would like to share with you is we've heard today that this was unavoidable; nobody could foresee that this kind of storm event would happen in this area of the island.

I would like to remind everybody that this is not unprecedented along the Leeward Coast. In 1996 we had some massive rains in Makaha Valley that had not been seen before to the point where we had a landslide that ended up in the Towers, the first floor of the Towers in that building.

As a child growing up in that area we have had massive storms. So I don't believe that

there should have been -- there should not have been foresight that major storms do hit the Wai'anae Coast, whether it's 25-year storms or 100-year storms. And I think that especially with the facility as important as this is if it's going to stay open they need to take the highest level of safety concerns under advisement for the sake of the community.

б

1.0

1.5

We've been saying that all along. And I'm going to continue saying that because this community, our community was impacted severely by this. Not just the brown water and that runoff and whatever was in the bacteriological content, whether it was enterococcal or choleriform counts that were experienced along there, but the waste also that came down.

There should not be, "Well, 25 year storm is good enough." That is not good enough for out there. I'm sorry. Not when you're dealing with this kind of waste. Not when you're dealing with this kind of facility that has the potential of being an extremely... it can... if it's not managed properly we can literally close off that coast if anything happens and it affects that road.

There's nothing in my mind that is too great from an engineering standpoint to be able to

take into account things which should have been expected, because this is not the first time the Wai'anae Coast has had a hundred-year storm or a 50-year storm within the last 10 years.

1.9

MR. DAVIDSON: Thirty seconds.

THE WITNESS: So I would ask, again I really appreciate the fact that you've had this hearing, that you've allowed us to bring some of this information out. And I would encourage you to make sure to help protect our coastline and our folks by putting the conditions on to make sure that we are protected. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Any questions for the witness? Hearing none, thank you for being here.

MR. WURDEMAN: Could I ask?

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Yes, Mr. Wurdeman.

MR. WURDEMAN: Good afternoon,

Ms. Rezentes. You're an engineer, correct?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I am.

MR. WURDEMAN: You know, in fact I know because I've studied the (inaudible) cause I represent some victims on the North Shore in 2008 during a huge flood. And I know that the Wai'anae Coast was also impacted just two years ago by that same rainfall. Undoubtedly that was a much bigger storm than what

thank you for your comment. 2. 3 THE WITNESS: Thank you. CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Thank you very much. 4 MR. DAVIDSON: Patricia Patterson 5 followed by William and Sara Barnes. 6 7 PATRICIA PATTERSON, ន being first duly sworn to tell the truth, testified as

happened a month or two ago is my understanding.

10 THE WITNESS: I do.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Your name and address,

12 | please.

follows:

1

9

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE WITNESS: Patricia Patterson otherwise known as Pat, 84-755 Ala Mahiku, Makaha. I don't live at the Towers but the plantation just below. And I'm glad the Towers was there or we would have gotten all those rocks.

Several things that I noticed. You know, this landfill was engineered in 1985 for 25-year storm. Why not a hundred years at that time? And nobody mentioned liners today. Some of 'em came out of there. Liners do decompose eventually.

And they talk about cell 6 but they also talk about cells within that cell 6. And that was really confusing to me to read about that. And I

think that ought to be clarified and named something other than "little cells" or "mini cells".

And I wonder how often the Department of Health representatives go and inspect that landfill and whether anyone's on site 24 hours a day. It didn't sound like anyone was there from early in the morning until 5:00 when they came to work. I think that ought to be considered.

They talk about a hotline about we could call if we saw something. I don't know how they advertised that. I didn't see anything about a hotline to call.

And mainly I want to say to the Commission please don't extend that again, not the limit or the time. But be fair. Have every community in this state take care of their own opala. Don't let that committee select one site. Have them find a site for each of our communities at least on this island. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Any questions for this witness? There are none. Thank you very much for being here.

MR. DAVIDSON: William and Sara Barnes.

I don't know if each of you is going to speak.

MR. BARNES: I will speak for both of us.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: I'll swear you in. 1 WILLIAM and SARA BARNES 2 being first duly sworn to tell the truth testified as 3 4 follows: MR. BARNES: Yes. 5 6 MS. BARNES: Yes. 7 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Please state your name and address whoever's going to speak. 8 MR. BARNES: William and Sara Barnes, 9 92-1001 Ali'inui Drive at Ko Olina. Thanks very much 10 for having this hearing and for the opportunity to 11 We are homeowners and residents of 12 speak before you. 13 Kaiulani which is the closest residential community to the Waimanalo Landfill. It's directly across the 14 Farrington Highway and has suffered from the various 15 failures of the landfill over many years. 16 These include blowing dust and dirt on a 17 frequent basis, toxic runoff and closed beaches and 18 19 even loose trash in plastic wet bags that blow on 20 windy days. Trucks entering and leaving the landfill 21 are also an additional source of heavy dirt and dust 22 23 on the property.

just to show the proximity of the landfill to both

24

25

I've brought along a few photographs

Kaiulani and the rest of Ko Olina including the new Disney resort and I'll circulate those. The photos demonstrate how close the excavation activities of the landfill are to our homes and to the community.

R

While at once it may have made a great deal of sense to have the landfill in this area 21 or 22 years ago when it was a sugarcane field and there was no Kapolei, we have a very different situation today, an opposite situation.

What was deemed acceptable 21 years ago
I think is not acceptable now. So planning needs to
start to think about how in the longer run O'ahu can
meet its landfill needs but not do so by putting the
landfill immediately adjacent to a sizeable community.

Ko Olina is now a multi-million dollar resort as many of you know. And in short previous testimony employment center bringing millions of tax dollars to the city and the state and adding substantially to O'ahu's tourists industry.

Next I'd like to just say it's been difficult for us to watch today City representatives defend energetically Waste Management, almost acting as their legal counsel in defense. And at the same time indicate that they do not see themselves as having any responsibility for initiating any testing

to be in compliance with the various conditions that this Commission has asked. And instead regarded as a matter that should be handled by the Department of Health at the state level.

Curiously enough I have a letter dated

January 28th from the governor who responded to a letter that my wife and I wrote to him on the subject of the Gulch in which he said, "As you may know it's managed by the City and County of Honolulu.

Appreciate your concerns. However, all decisions directly affecting the landfill or discharge of medical waste are under the jurisdiction of the City and County of Honolulu."

Presumably, therefore, we all ought to be able to look to Mr. Steinberger and his colleagues at the City to take proactive efforts to make sure that plenty of testing and plenty of oversight and energetic regulation of this landfill is taking place.

MR. DAVIDSON: Sir, 30 seconds.

THE WITNESS: Thank you very much. We did not hear that today. But going forward we understand the Mayor's Advisory Committee will base its recommendations on pre-identified selection criteria. Mr. Steinberger has shared some of those criteria on Monday with the City Council. Much

266

depends on making sure the selection criteria defined 1 with sufficient precision, clarity and weighting so 2 that a new alternate or second landfill site can be 3 4 picked and we do not get a repeat of the situation of some years ago where simply the Waimanalo Gulch was 5 6 reselected once again. Thank you very much for 7 listening to us today. Appreciate it. CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Did you want to make 9 your pictures part of the record of this proceeding? 1.0 THE WITNESS: Yes. Could we? 11 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: We will do that, sure. 12 THE WITNESS: Thank you. CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Any questions for this 13 There are none. Thank you very much for witness? 14 1.5 being here. MR. DAVIDSON: Clair and Peter van 16 17 Wingerden. 18 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: If we can first swear 19 you in. CLAIRE AND PETER VAN WINGERDEN 20 21 being first duly sworn to tell the truth testified as follows: 22 23 MR. AND MRS. WINGERDEN: We do. CHAIRMAN DEVENS: State your name and 24 address. 25

MS. VAN WINDGERDEN: Claire and Peter Van Wingerden, 92-1001 Ali'inui Drive, Kailani in Kapolei. We too are residents of Kailani at Ko Olina. We live directly below the dump. We look at it every day. And we live directly above the pipe that falls into the water. So we have a very good viewpoint of the spill and its effects. And we are very concerned not just about the environmental impact which is, of course, a major concern and the public health impact.

2.3

2.4

We are also concerned, as one of the other witnesses has said, about the economic impact on the resort and on the people who work there and who live in the area.

We would strongly urge that the landfill be closed in 2012 as at one point was planned. We were very disappointed to hear that there would be a plan to appeal that closure. We don't feel that the continuation of the dump can be justified given the proximity to both Ko Olina, which has greatly grown since the landfill was placed there, but also to the entire Wai'anae Coast. Thank you. And thank you very much also for looking into this so deeply. Appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Thank you for being here. Any questions for these witnesses? There are

none, thank you very much. Our last witness. 1 MR. DAVIDSON: Alice Greenwood. 2 3 ALICE GREENWOOD, 4 being first duly sworn to tell the truth testified as 5 follows: 6 THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. 7 CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Your name and address. THE WITNESS: I live at 87-576 8 Kula'auponi, Apartment C-102. I'm part of an 9 10 organization called Concerned Elders of Wai'anae. is our oldest. She's 8 years old. And I'm the 1.1 12 youngest. I'm 6. Sorry. (Laughter) 13 Anyway, our issues has always been about the landfill, yes. We were concerned because of the 14 traffic, the dust, whatever was impacting our 15 community. And we considered Ko Olina as part of that 16 community 'cause it's in the range where we go home 17 18 to. 19 Anyway here I have a bunch of papers. 20 And I know the landfill started in 1989. And I'm looking at these papers. And it's saying gee, 21 June 4th, 2010 61 pages, page 39 to 41 mentions all 22 about E6, the one we're talking about and we're 23 concerned about. 24

25

And it tells me that there's supposed to

be a berm. And this is by the Department, State of Hawai'i Department of Health and got the names that the people that had testified here on it.

2.0

And it says that there's going to be -- and remember we got a deadline June or July 2012 -- over here says, they talk about the west drainage system cell E6.

And then the ending part says, "During construction of surface water systems the permittee shall ensure that existing stormwater collection and conveyance are significant to manage 24 hours on 25-year storm events."

Now this is part of the closage (sic) that they're supposed to be doing. And they got a deadline, 2012. And then all of a sudden I hear about that's June 4, 2010. Saturday December 18 in another report says "E6 last operated 12-inches layer." And that was the last operation of this day. It was covered.

"Sunday December 19th heavy rain. The landfill intermediate pump stormwater which accumulated in the landfill E6 cell into the landfill's stormwater drainage system." This is mentioned on Tuesday December 23.

Now from June 4th, that's five months to

Saturday December 18th -- I mean one month later

December 19th. December 23rd we get the ones that you

guys read. We got that report.

Then December 28 this report says it's already gone to the Pacific Ocean. That's December 23rd. Tuesday December 28 we have another storm. Okay? January 4 that's when this thing is signed, January 4th, stating that "We have a problem here guys." And I was shocked.

б

January 10th we get message that there is medical waste which all was verified in here in these documents. They already have the medical waste in E6.

I don't blame us for being worried, not Pat and I. We're only 8 and 6. Can you imagine our children and our grandchildren that's using those beaches? We're lucky we found 'em onshore. What about out in that ocean?

You know, I'll put it this way. I was homeless 2007 and '8. I didn't realize when some of the children came up to me and told me they found needles, I thought gee, these guys doing drug things around here.

Could that have happened during that timeframe and not let any of us know what was

```
1
    happening? Like I said I'm not concerned about
 2
    myself. My time is limited. I am very concerned
    about our children. Please, it's got to be more
 3
    management than what's going on. If it's too big
 4
    then, like Pat says, spread it around. Maybe that's
 5
 6
    the problem.
                  Thank you.
                  CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Alice, I know you've
 7
    sat through this whole agenda today. And we
 8
    appreciate your concerns and being involved in the
 9
    process. We really do.
10
                  Any questions for this witness? Hearing
11
12
    noun I believe that is the last witness for the day.
13
    Thank you very much. Parties want to add anything
    else for the record before we wrap up? Commissioners?
14
1.5
    Yes, go ahead.
16
                  MS. VIOLA:
                              Can we get copies of
    whatever was submitted?
17
18
                  CHAIRMAN DEVENS: Sure.
                                           Riley will give
    you whatever you'll need.
19
20
                  MS. VIOLA:
                              Thank you.
                  CHAIRMAN DEVENS: That's it.
21
22
    stand adjourned. Thank you very much for being here.
23
24
        (The proceedings were adjourned at 5:00 p.m.)
25
                           --000000--
```

1.

CERTIFICATE

I, HOLLY HACKETT, CSR, RPR, in and for the State of Hawai'i, do hereby certify;

That I was acting as court reporter in the foregoing LUC matter on the 2nd day of February 2011

That the proceedings were taken down in computerized machine shorthand by me and were thereafter reduced to print by me;

That the foregoing represents, to the best of my ability, a true and correct transcript of the proceedings had in the foregoing matter.

DATED: This 14th day of February 2011

HOLLY M. HACKETT, CSR #130, RPR Certified Shorthand Reporter

Hally Mr. Huckett