

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE  
MEETING SUMMARY

JOHNSON COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL DEPARTMENT  
OLATHE, KANSAS  
WEDNESDAY, September 12, 2007  
6:00 p.m.

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chairperson Ruth Hopkins.

CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

Committee members present were: Tom Stewart, Tom Ireland, Mike Clagett, Floyd Danner, Cheryl Scott, Gerry Miller, Ruth Hopkins, Mike Clagett, David Green, and Elaine Giessel. Others present included Bill Franklin and Shelly Schneider of Franklin Associates; Megan Laha, County Manager's Office; and Cindy Kemper, Betsy Betros, and Maureen Deeds, Johnson County Environmental Department (JCED).

MINUTES APPROVAL

Ruth Hopkins entertained a motion to approve the August 8, 2007, Solid Waste Management Committee (SWMC) minutes as written. A motion was made and seconded, and the minutes were unanimously approved.

5-YEAR SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN DEVELOPMENT

Cindy Kemper stated that the main topic of the meeting is to develop recommendations on future waste disposal options for the County to include in the Solid Waste Management Plan (plan). The committee also needs to further discuss comments received since the last meeting on the residential waste reduction and county role sections of the draft plan. Finally, the Committee needs to review new sections of the plan added since the last meeting related to commercial and C&D waste reduction strategies. The October meeting will be devoted to a final review of the entire draft plan before it is distributed publicly. Ms. Kemper stated she will be taking the draft plan "on the road" to share it with others and seek their comments during October and November.

Future Disposal Options

Shelly Schneider presented a PowerPoint slideshow to the Committee about the current disposal infrastructure and future disposal options. The presentation highlighted the location of landfills in the region, estimated remaining life of Kansas landfills, landfill economics, transfer stations, mixed waste processing, MSW composting, combustion waste-to-energy, and alternative technologies.

Ms. Kemper and Ms. Schneider posed three questions to the Committee and entertained discussion on each one.

1. The Johnson County Landfill will close and other disposal options must be found. What future disposal options does the Committee favor for the County and why?
  - After discussion, general committee consensus was that landfilling and transfer stations will remain the most feasible and least expensive short-term solution, but that the County should track and continue to evaluate alternate technologies for the longer term such as waste-to-energy.
  - After discussion, general committee consensus was that reliance on the private sector for future waste processing and disposal is preferable, but the County should further evaluate whether some public control over waste flow might provide advantages to the County in ensuring adequate and affordable disposal capacity.
  - After discussion, general committee consensus was the Plan should not specifically prohibit the siting of a new landfill in the County, but should indicate this is unlikely due to urban growth and land values. It was acknowledged that one or more new transfer stations are likely to be needed in the County.
  
2. What strategies should be pursued over the next 5-10 years to prepare the County to implement the preferred disposal options?
  - After discussion, the general committee consensus was that the County should further evaluate opportunities for multi-jurisdictional partnerships to the extent that they might benefit Johnson County. It was noted that the County's primary responsibility is to provide for disposal capacity for the County's waste.
  - The committee acknowledged that additional technical studies are needed over the next 5-10 years to determine actual costs and benefits of various disposal options.
  - The committee expressed support for including language in the plan that establishes criteria for determining whether permit applications for new solid waste facilities should be found consistent with the plan. Criteria discussed included a facility's commitment to provide recycling or otherwise reduce waste, a facility's history of complying with environmental requirements, and the operational knowledge of the facility applicant.
  
3. What roles should the various parties including county, cities, and the private sector play in the future of waste disposal in Johnson County?
  - The committee expressed support for continuing to rely upon the private sector for waste disposal where possible, but acknowledged that the County may need to assume an ownership and/or operational role should private sector plans fail to meet the County's needs.
  - The committee recognized that under state law, the County plays the lead role in assuring for future disposal capacity, but that significant coordination will be needed with other private and public partners.

### Residential Waste Reduction and County Role Recommendations

Ms. Kemper summarized comments from committee members received since the August meeting. These comments pertain to the residential waste reduction and county role recommendations and measures in the draft plan. Several members expressed a desire for a recycling goal that exceeds the national average and for a stronger county role in leading waste reduction efforts. It was the general view of the some members that progress toward more waste reduction would be difficult, if not impossible, to achieve without strong county leadership and county-wide solutions. After discussion, the committee agreed as follows:

- The recycling goal in the plan should be to exceed the national average recycling rate. In response to questions, Ms. Schneider pointed out that the County could exceed the national rate with aggressive implementation of yard waste diversion, volume-based collection rate structures and increased commercial recycling. Ms. Kemper reported that according to KDHE, there are no adverse consequences to the county for failing to achieve the recycling goal. She also noted that KDHE desires counties to track and report waste disposal rates, rather than recycling rates, and that the plan could commit to tracking waste reduction in both ways.
- The county, cities and homeowners associations need to speak with one voice and largely act in concert when implementing waste reduction measures on a county-wide basis. The county should play a stronger role in leading this effort. Language should be modified in the plan to communicate this.

### Review of Commercial and Construction/Demolition Waste Reduction Portions of Plan

In light of the time, Ms. Kemper suggested that the committee communicate with Ms. Schneider as soon as possible if they have any comments on this portion of the draft plan.

### OTHER BUSINESS

The Plan adoption schedule was shared as follows:

October 3 - Plan presentation to City Administrators Group  
October 3 - Plan presentation to Council of Mayors  
October 10 - Plan presentation to Solid Waste Management Committee  
October 18 - Hold a meeting with KDHE to present and review the draft Plan  
October 23 - Plan presentation to Solid Waste Stakeholders Group  
October 25 - Plan presentation to BOCC  
November 7 - Public hearing on Plan  
November 14 - Adoption of Plan by Solid Waste Management Committee  
December 6 - Adoption of Plan by BOCC

Solid Waste Management Committee Minutes  
September 12, 2007  
Page 4 of 4

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the SWMC is scheduled for Wednesday, October 10, 2007. The JCED will provide a light dinner served at 5:30 p.m. followed by a 6:00 p.m. meeting. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

Prepared by: Maureen Deeds  
Date: 09/12/07