

1	MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION LAND USE CO
2	CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU
3	TRANSCRIPT
4	WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2024
5	
6	The Planning Commission held a meeting on
7	Wednesday, September 18, 2024, 1:30 p.m., in-person and
8	remote meeting at Fasi Municipal Building, 6th Floor
9	Conference Room, 650 South King Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
10	Chair Meatoga III presided.
11	
12	COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Pane Meatoga III, Chair
13	Ryan Kamo, Vice Chair
14	Hilarie Alomar, Member
15	Melissa May, Member
16	Kai Nani Kraut, Member
17	Elena Bryant, Member
18	Jason Woo, Member
19	
20	COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED: Nathaniel Kinney, Member
21	[prior notice given]
22	Joy Kimura, Member
23	[prior notice given]
24	

1	DEPUTY CORPORATION	COUNSEL: Rozelle Agag
2		(Advisory to the Commission
3		
4	COMMISSION STAFF:	Gloria Takara
5		Secretary-Reporter
6		
7	DIT STAFF:	Gregory Cieless, WebEx Management
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

## PROCEEDING

2.1

2.4

CHAIR MEATOGA III: Okay. Aloha, everyone and welcome fellow Commission members to the September 18, 2024 meeting of the Planning Commission. For our listeners and for the record, I'm Chair Pane Meatoga III. First order of business is to welcome our new Commissioner, Mr. Jason Woo to the Planning Commission.

Would you like to say a few words?

WOO: Nope. I'm just glad I made it on time for my first meeting, and I'm honored to serve where I can, but thank you.

CHAIR MEATOGA III: Thank you. We appreciate you for taking up the calls. The following members are physically present here in the 6th Floor Conference Room, myself Chair Meatoga and Commissioner Woo. Joining us remotely are Commissioner Hilarie Alomar, Commissioner Kai Nani Kraut, Commissioner Melissa May and Commissioner Ryan Kamo. For members who are participating remotely, please confirm that you're alone, if there's anyone else present with you at this time in the area that you're at. We'll start with Commissioner May.

MAY: Hello. Commissioner May, I'm here and nobody is around me at this time.

CHAIR MEATOGA III: Thank you. Commissioner Kraut.

2.4

KRAUT: I am in the corner of a hotel, so I am in this space, but I am in a public space, but I'm kind of all by myself in a corner.

5 CHAIR MEATOGA III: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner 6 Kraut. Commissioner Alomar.

ALOMAR: Aloha. Commissioner Alomar, I'm here alone and present.

CHAIR MEATOGA III: Thank you. Commissioner Kamo.

KAMO: Thank you, Chair. I can confirm that I am alone, and I am present.

CHAIR MEATOGA III: Thank you. All right. I believe with that we do have quorum. Present here today is the Planning Commission and DIT staff to manage and support this Webex audio-visual platform. Also joining us remotely today is our Commission attorney, deputy corp counsel Rozelle Agag. Rozelle.

COUNSEL AGAG: Good afternoon, Chair and Commissioners.

CHAIR MEATOGA III: Thank you. Couple of housekeeping matters. For those present here in the Conference Room, bathrooms are located on the ground floor next to the elevators, and we have this Conference Room until 4:00 p.m. At this time I'd officially open up the hearing. For the record it is now 1:32 p.m. And just as a

reminder for us Commissioners we need to identify ourselves
first before we speak or make any motions. With that being
said, the first item on the agenda is the approval of the
minutes.

First, because Commissioner Melissa May was not present at the August 7, 2024 meeting, can you attest that you have reviewed and understand the records of the August 7<sup>th</sup> meeting board materials, transcripts, and Webex recordings?

 ${f MAY:}$  Yes. I have reviewed all the materials and transcripts from the August 7 th meeting, Commissioner May.

CHAIR MEATOGA III: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner
Woo, did you have a the chance to--

WOO: No. I did not, so I'll be abstaining.

CHAIR MEATOGA III: Thank you. Okay. All right.

Commissioners, do I have a motion to approve?

**KAMO:** Chair, this is Vice Chair Kamo, I make a motion to approve the minutes as previously circulated.

CHAIR MEATOGA III: Thank you. Do I have a second?

ALOMAR: Commissioner Alomar, second.

CHAIR MEATOGA III: Okay. Thank you. Hearing a motion and a second, is there any discussion, any objections, any reservations? [no response] All right.

Hearing and seeing none, Chair votes aye, and the minutes of

25 the August 7, 2024 meeting as previously circulated has been

approved. Thank you, Commissioners.

1

21

22

23

24

25

Next, we have our status hearing for the Waianae State Special Use Permit, 2008/SUP-2, Waimanalo Gulch 3 Sanitary Landfill. Pursuant to the Land Use Commission Decision and Order dated August 23, 2024, as well as the 5 6 Planning Commission's May 15, 2024 Decision and Order, Condition No. 2, the Applicant shall report quarterly to the 8 Planning Commission in-person, to report the efforts it is 9 taken and plans to take to identify an alternative landfill 10 site by December 31, 2024, and to answer questions from the 11 Commission and the community. Reports shall include but are not limited to the following information. Reports should 12 include but are not limited to timelines, milestones, 13 schedules of tasks for the specific plan to have a site 14 15 selected by December 31, 2024; list of potential sites under consideration; list of obstacles their ability to choose a 16 17 site; reporting on the investigation of alternative technologies for the landfill. So with that, ENV would you 18 please introduce yourselves? 19 20

DR. BABCOCK: Yeah. So good afternoon,

Commissioners. Thank you for being here, and my name is

Roger Babcock. I'm the Director of the Department of

Environmental Services for the City and County of Honolulu.

And this is our 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter update for 2024 to you, the

Planning Commission, the City's efforts to identify an

alternative landfill site.

1

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There is a set of slides that is--there's handouts for those present, and this will become part of the records afterwards. So, I do represent the City administration and then specifically Environmental Services, ENV. We take care of wastewater and solid waste. And on the solid waste side, we have about 450 people that are working, that are public servants working collecting refuse from all the residents, transporting it, getting it to H-POWER, converting it to electricity and ash, and then disposing of the ash in the Waimbnalo Gulch Sanitary Landfill, the only municipal solid waste landfill on the island. And, of course, we do need a new landfill. And, so today I'm going to go through some of the--our efforts to date and our timeline for finishing this I will note that, you know, this is a task that multiple prior administrations have not been able to accomplish over the past 20 years, but the Mayor in this administration is committed to identifying the new site before the deadline and getting this done. So we are gonna get this done, so I'm gonna now present where we are right now.

Okay. So, second slide shows a timeline. I should advance the slide myself. Thank you. Yeah. So this shows the timeline, the vertical bar, and it shows milestones, those are the diamonds and schedule of tasks.

So it starts off with the milestone of the August 23<sup>rd</sup> 1 2 Decision and Order by the Land Use Commission to extending the deadline to identify the site from--It was December 31, 3 4 2022, and now it's extended to December 31, 2024. 5 course, that went through the Planning Commission and on its way to the Land Use Commission. So, here we are on 6 7 September 18 with our 3rd quarterly progress update to you the Planning Commission. The tasks that need to happen next 9 that are ongoing are the completion of a study, the 10 consultant is doing for us called the O'ahu Landfill Siting 11 Study Supplemental Technical Memorandum. It's nearly 12 completed, will be done, you know, before the end of the 13 month.

We continue to evaluate alternative sites, meaning looking at restrictions and obstacles, locations, size, distance, and proximity constraints, site characteristics, availability, costs, environmental, cultural, and socio-economic constraints and issues. So, we potentially could make and announce a decision prior to that next milestone.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

2.4

25

The next milestone says November, would be the fourth quarter update to the Planning Commission, if needed, if we haven't completed the work prior to that. If it's not completed by then, we will be here, and we'll tell you what we've done since then, and then we will, then after that we

would then continue the evaluations, make the decisions and announce the selection prior to the final milestone there, which is December 31st of this year to identify the alternative landfill site.

Okay. So, I'm gonna move on then now and present potential sites that we have either been considered and ruled out or are still under consideration. So this table list shows the sites and some of the restrictions and obstacles associated with them. The first six sites that are listed, named Area 6, Site 1; Area 7, Site 1; Area 3, Site 1, 2, and 3; and Area 2, Site 1, are all sites that were evaluated by our Landfill Advisory Committee that operated from 2021 through 2022.

And, so their--in the report which was called the O'ahu Landfill Study and Landfill Advisory Committee Recommendations final report, which has been submitted previously, I believe into the record. So those sites are, as shown here are still under consideration and the restrictions and obstacles associated with those are that they all are in the No Pass Zone, and they also have additional, some of them have additional things. They are in a, either in a well capture zone, that's Area 6, Site 1; and Area 7, Site 1. The ones in Area 3, Sites 1, 2, and 3 in Wahiawa are located in prime agricultural lands. And the last one, Area 2, Site 1 is in Haleiwa near Kawailoa Road.

It's also in No Pass Zone. It's on prime agricultural land, and it is quite remote, a remote location.

1

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Continuing on then the sites, the rest of the sites on this page and this table, these are all Federal lands, and you'll note that each of these for various reasons has been eliminated from further considerations. this includes the area--Sorry, these are not all Federal The first one, the area adjacent to the Waimanalo lands. Gulch Sanitary Landfill is not Federal land, but it has been, it is located on the west side and administration has made it clear that the -- a new site would not be selected on the west side of the island where the current landfill is. The next three, the last three on this page of this table are Federal lands. And the first one is the area east of the community of Maile, and that's the Lualualei Federal property. The other, the next one is the Waipio Peninsula, the City's Soccer Complex is currently located and the last one is the area in the West Loch Annex, also known as Iroquois Point area. These are all Federal lands. either on the west side, and they've been eliminated from consideration. For example, Lualualei or they've been rejected by the military. And, I think the Waipio one was in the news even. So those, the rest of those on that page have been eliminated from further consideration. at the top of the page, the top six are still under

consideration as potential sites to be named.

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

The next page shows a continuation of this table, and it lists other sites that are under consideration. the sites are listed and then the restrictions and obstacles are a little bit different, so it requires some explanation. These sites are restricted by Act 73. So none of these sites on this table, on this page are currently available without modification to State Act 73. State Act 73 provides several restrictions. One of them is conservation lands and the other one is a 1/2 mile buffer between a landfill and a residence, a school or a hospital. And, so in order to make these sites possible some modification of Act 73 is required. And that's really what's shown in the table on the right hand column. So, all of them, the first four require a modification to eliminate the conservation district restriction and to reduce the 1/2 mile buffer down to a 1/4 mile buffer. If that's done, then those four are possible. There's an area near Waiamanalo Country Farms, there's an area near University of Hawai'i, West O'ahu; the Pali Golf Course, and the HC&D South Quarry and adjacent Those become possible sites only if those modifications to Act 73 are made, which would take State Legislative action.

The next six sites identified on this table, the

1 lower part of the table require in addition to removing the conservation district restriction to make the buffer go to So if there's no buffer these additional six sites become possible. So just to be clear, you've got to eliminate the conservation district and the buffer restriction entirely. So that frees up the -- makes possible of HC&D North Quarry, some area in the Waiahole Forest Preserve and Farmland, area occupied by the Hawaii Youth 8 Correction Facility in Olamona School, area near Castle Junction and Pali Highway, the Royal Hawaiian Golf Club, and 10 the Hawaii Prince Golf Club. It's noted that the Hawaii 11 Prince Golf Club is also in a, in a flight path which would 12 probably result in challenges from the FAA for that specific 14 site.

3

5

6

9

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Continuing on then to, so that that's the end of the list of our potential sites that we're still under consideration or have been eliminated for further consideration. This slide just shows a listing of some of the obstacles, kind of an all in one place that affect our ability to choose a site, which is one of the things that we need to report on. So, we've broken it up into Federal regulations, Act 73 and other state regulations and some other things. So Federal regulations that affect our ability to choose a site include airport runway buffer zone, wetlands, floodplains, fault areas, seismic impact zones,

and unstable areas. So those are all in Federal law. Act
73 is State law. That includes the 1/2 mile buffer zone for
residences, schools, and hospitals, the conservation
district, and the other state regulations related to tsunami
zones. So we cannot locate in a tsunami zone.

In addition to that a restriction which was, which played into many, most of the sites was--Many of the sites that were evaluated and eliminated were on Federal lands, so that is a difficult obstacle. There's also what we call developed and undevelopable land where there may not be a residence or a school or a hospital currently, but it has already been, such developments have been approved. And we also have the No Pass Zone as another obstacle affecting our ability to choose a site.

Okay. So finally the last thing to kind of report on here is, before we take questions is, is to report on our investigation of alternative technologies for landfill.

I've put a list here of the things that we report on, actually semi-annually we report on efforts, what's going on with the landfill and its fill rate and all other things like that including our investigation of alternative technologies.

So some of the alternative technologies are basically things that would be our alternatives to H-POWER. These include plasma arc, gasification, thermal

- 1 depolymerization, multiphase microwave treatment, microwave
- 2 | plasma, and pyrolysis. So those are all alternative
- 3 combustion or non-combustion related volume reduction and
- 4 or pretty much elimination processes. So we continue to
- 5 look at these. We do entertain proposals for information
- 6 from vendors and companies that are, that propose these
- 7 | things, and we evaluate those as they, you know, as they
- 8 come in to us.
- 9 In addition to that, we have looked into and
- 10 | continue to look into the possibility of shipping waste
- 11 off-island.
- Even though that is unlikely to be a complete
- 13 | solution or any of these to make it possible to not have a
- 14 | landfill at all, we continue to look at these as
- 15 possibilities for essentially reducing, perhaps greatly
- 16 reducing the amount of material that needs to, that we need
- 17 | to landfill. But we do need to have a landfill, and we do
- 18 need to site one.
- So, I think with that, the last slide just says
- 20 thank you and ask for any questions. Be happy to answer any
- 21 questions that you have.
- 22 CHAIR MEATOGA III: All right. Thank you.
- 23 Questions from Commissioners?
- KRAUT: Hi, this is Commissioner Kraut. I have a,
- 25 | if you could pull up the site selection, I had a couple of

questions on just better understanding how that analysis is being done through this current study. That page right there.

1

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Obviously, the first part of those sites had been gone through a process and not recommended. So how is this study addressing the No Pass Zone when that was a hard no in the previous? I can't remember what it was called, the Landfill Site Selection task force or whatever it was. So that would be my first question. How is this study dealing with No Pass differently than the previous evaluation?

DR. BABCOCK: Yeah. Thank you. So thank you for the question. So what we're doing is continuing to look at the restrictions and in this case you're specifically talking about the No Pass Zone, and so we're continuing to look at these sites. These are all sites that are in the No Pass Zone, but otherwise are possible or potential sites that can be used. Unlike the ones on the next page which are ones that would require Act 73 modification. So we continue to look at these and try to figure out really the feasibility of these sites, which one, you know, could be the best or multiple ones could be the best, and what, how we could do that in a way that would be the most protective of the environment and resources and to be able to use one of those places as a site for the next landfill.

So, I hope that answers the questions?

**KRAUT:** Maybe in a roundabout way; yeah.

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DR. BABCOCK: Thanks. Sorry. I can answer, I can add a little bit to that. So it really isn't different.

It's just more thorough investigation of each of those sites. So site characteristics is sort of, you know, much more detailed.

KRAUT: I guess because when you look at the milestones that you've laid out; sorry, again, this is Commissioner Kraut, when you look at the milestones and still working to meet the deadline, obviously appreciate the complexity of this very long process that has occurred and continues to occur, that when I look at the sites that you're presenting to meet that deadline, the second page as you point out is not feasible. So the only way to meet the deadline -- And I want to make sure I understand it at a minimum that the sites on the No Pass seems to be the only ones that would be contending at this point, because if the lower part of those sites have been eliminated and the second page requires Act 73, then those are the only sites that are actually gonna get you to your, to meet the special condition on the current permit.

So just kind of trying to understand how, looking at these sites will allow you to actually have a site selection by the deadline that's imposed on the condition that was approved. So I'm not sure, sounds like you're

taking a harder look but, I guess that's the--The only thing I can see is those are the ones you're gonna have to choose one of those or the condition is not gonna be met.

So, my second question to that does have to do with the second page. When you're looking at buffers or reducing or looking at a modification to the buffers, when you have to make those modifications, what is within the zone or are you looking at cost considerations or like you said certain facilities that are within the 1/2 mile that are not within the 1/4 mile? Kind of trying to understand how you're eliminating, defining those buffers and saying this is what our modification should the Act would be to use these sites. Just trying to understand that a little more, if you could elaborate on that.

Question. So if we go back all the way to the first slide, this is a graph that the Landfill Advisory Committee used and was created during that process that shows those various restrictions. The kind of tan color is the 10,000 feet away from runways of airports. There's the green, which is the conservation land, there's the dark blue, which is the tsunami inundation, and then there's a lighter blue color, which is the 1/2 mile buffer. So those, those things are really composed of a bunch of circles, the light blue. And if you make those circles smaller, the light blue ones or

eliminate them ones. I'm sorry, if you go to the website, you can turn them off and see what happens. Then that does make some other places available. I would note that the, that everything on that second part of that table also is outside of the No Pass Zone. So they, if you, if you make that change they become available, and they're outside of the No Pass Zone.

1

2

3

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So that's what that exercise is about. I hope that explanation makes sense. So by reducing it from a 1/2 mile those circles all get smaller, they're now a 1/4 mile, and then if you eliminate them all, then all of those disappear. And then that means that there are residences generally that are closer, that are very close then to those sites. And then it doesn't look at--The other that's kind of unstated here is that from our previous things that we've mentioned, the landfill site has to be a hundred acres. That's the site of the landfill to last 20 years of our current waste load that goes there as well as also taking C and D waste when C and D waste landfill PVT closes. that's how it's sized. So we do need a hundred acre plot, and then the buffer is outside of that. Or if there's no buffer, then that that's how it fits. So these are basically plots of land that become available that are, where there's a hundred acres that will fit on there. It doesn't look at cost or ownership or other things like that.

- 1 It's just identifying land spaces, which is essentially the
- 2 exercise that's depicted in this picture here. It's just
- about space and restrictions, nothing else. It doesn't look
- 4 | at slope or anything else, you know, like that. And then we
- 5 had to go through there and figure out where are there
- 6 | hundred acre pieces that where we could fit a landfill.
- 7 KRAUT: Okay. I have one last question,
- 8 | Commissioner Kraut. So in this graph depiction, is there a
- 9 color code of those sites on the page 2 that makes it a
- 10 | little easier? I'm assuming it's not the pink, like is it
- 11 the orange?
- DR. BABCOCK: Yeah. Thank you for that question.
- 13 No. Those sites are not depicted on this picture. This
- 14 picture from that the Landfill Advisory Committee used and
- at that time they were not considering any relief of Act 73.
- 16 | So my follow-up comment.
- 17 KRAUT: Okay. Go ahead.
- DR. BABCOCK: Okay. Yeah, sorry. So we've done
- 19 | that separately, and we've referred to that report which
- 20 | will be done at the end of this month. It just needs to be
- 21 | finalized. That's where it has graphical depictions of all
- 22 these sites that are in this table.
- 23 KRAUT: Thank you. Commissioner Kraut, again,
- 24 that would be helpful in trying to understand or digest the
- 25 information that you presented. So I'm glad to hear that

- 1 it'll be in the memo coming out. That's all I have, Chair.
- 2 Thank you.
- 3 CHAIR MEATOGA III: Thank you. Other questions from
- 4 Commissioners?
- 5 MAY: Commissioner May, I just had a clarifying
- 6 question about the second slide of candidate site.
- 7 DR. BABCOCK: Okay.
- 8 MAY: So when it says no buffer, it just
- 9 | means--Well, a 1/4 mile buffer means less than the 1/2 mile
- 10 buffer that the Act imposes, right? It still would have a
- 11 | 1/4 mile buffer from the uses specified in the Act, and then
- 12 no buffer means it would have zero buffer, it would just be
- 13 | adjacent to that. Is that correct?
- DR. BABCOCK: Yes. That is correct.
- 15 MAY: And can you remind me what the uses are that
- 16 there's the buffer between, was it residential areas?
- 17 DR. BABCOCK: Yes. Thank you. There are
- 18 basically residential property lines, schools, and hospitals
- 19 | are what's specified in Act 73
- 20 CHAIR MEATOGA III: Any follow-up questions,
- 21 Commissioner May?
- MAY: No. Thank you.
- 23 | CHAIR MEATOGA III: All right. Any other
- 24 questions from the Commissioners? [no response] Okay. I'll
- 25 throw out a question. So, your alternative list that you

had, I think was second to the last page. Is this in any 1 specific order? You have shipping of waste off-island. that based on like, I guess the cost, is there a rationale to the order here? It looks like it is, but I'm not sure.

5 Can you clarify on that?

2

3

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DR. BABCOCK: Yeah. Thanks for the question, Chair. There really isn't any order. The ones, all the ones above that, the six above that are all, I would say volume reduction, combustion, sort of non-combustion technologies that would be an alternate essentially an alternative to H-POWER.

> CHAIR MEATOGA III: Okay.

DR. BABCOCK: And the last one is completely different, and so it's, yeah, they're very, they're not the same things. There's no reason why it's in that order. of these would be very expensive.

The Boiler 3 at H-POWER; Boiler 3 is about a \$500 million, you know, 900 ton per day facility. So any of these would be, you know, very, very expensive to do. Shipping of waste off-island has been evaluated in the past, and we, and there was even a pilot; there was a contract order and a pilot program that was initiated that was not successful. However, just in the big scheme of things, it is still something that is worth evaluating in order to just sort of close the loop on all the options. And it could be,

there could be various flavors of that. It could be MSW, it could be ash, it could be part of the load, it could be non-combustible things, it could be lots of other things. We already do ship hazardous waste, you know, as a county, and as a state. There's no hazardous waste disposals, so we--that's why we don't put hazardous waste into your gray cart. You have to wait for the household hazardous waste day, collection days. And that's all collected and then a contractor, you know, disposes of those. Those are shipped to the mainland. So shipping is not a completely strange thing to do, but it is, in general, we would say that would not be a complete solution and enable us to say, we do not need to have a landfill at all.

CHAIR MEATOGA III: Right. I guess according to the list, you mentioned that, you know, a lot of vendors come and solicit you for these types of technologies. Is there anything you're specifically pursuing in this list that you think has legs to help with the issues and from this whole list which ones are closed or you feel have a good shot of making it here in Hawaii?

DR. BABCOCK: Yeah. That's a great question.

Thank you for that question. So, you know, these are all, we would call these emerging technologies. So there are none of these that are in operation anywhere in the world at the scale that would be needed in Hawaii. And so we do

continue to monitor that situation, and it's a big deal 1 2 worldwide, you know, to do these things. And there are some places actually either in design or may be in early 3 construction, and we are ready to go visit. As soon as there's an operating one, we're ready, you know, to visit 5 it. There are some extremely small facilities that have been, that are doing a few hundred pounds per day or a ton 7 8 per day kind of capacity, which, you know, it would not be helpful, really for us. So, I would say we continue to monitor these and what we tell people, as soon as you're 10 ready to take us to, to see something at scale, we want to 11 see it and observe it and then talk to the operators and 12 13 make sure that this is something that's, you know, that's feasible for us. We don't want to be the first in the world 14 to be doing something, you know, that's very emerging. 15

CHAIR MEATOGA III: I'll jump back to the potential sites for your Act 73 sites. You know, so let's say your group comes out and one of the recommendations is to use one of the sites. So would you guys be actively pursuing a bill to amend Act 73 this next legislative session?

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DR. BABCOCK: That would be what we would have to do. Yes.

CHAIR MEATOGA III: Okay. That's all my questions that I had. Commissioners, any other questions for ENV?

WOO: Hi, this is Commissioner Woo. So, I just want to better understand about the buffer. So the 1/2 mile buffer that's required, if it is reduced to a 1/4 mile buffer, is there some, do you have any idea, if that would kind of eliminate the effectiveness of the buffer? Like is a 1/4 mile sufficient to, I guess maintain the purpose of the 1/2 mile buffer?

DR. BABCOCK: Yeah. Thank you for that question. I think it's a difficult question, you know, to give a real definitive answer. The length of the buffer is kind of arbitrary to decide, you know, what that is, a 1/2 mile is less than 3,000 feet, a 1/4 mile is less than that 1,500 feet. I think that would be for, I think it's basically a political, it's a political question and whether it should be a 1/4 mile or 200 feet or 10,000 feet, or something else then is a decision that was basically, I believe a political decision during the formulation of Act 73.

But other length, you know, buffers, like for example, the airport comes from airport runways is 10,000 feet, which is roughly 2 miles. That has to do with protecting from birds, you know, birds trying to get into the engines and stuff like that or planes and, you know, so there's some basis for that but, you know, it's in Federal rules. So, even though, even those I think they're somewhat arbitrary, they're not completely arbitrary, but they're not

necessarily based on some sort of sophisticated computer
model or some other thing like that.

2.2

WOO: Thank you. This is commissioner Woo. So I think you said that other specific considerations haven't been really been looked at slope, exactly what it needs to be buffered from those specifics.

So, is the next step to get more detail and specifics about each of these sites to see if any of these are eliminated as not feasible for whatever reason?

DR. BABCOCK: Yeah. That's a good question. So the answer is yes. We're working on additional analysis of these sites as well as the other sites, including, you know, like soil conditions, drainage, you know, slope, various constructability sort of, you know, limitations or issues.

And then, yes. So you're right, that's what we're doing with all the sites, they're still under consideration.

WOO: Thank you.

CHAIR MEATOGA III: All right. Any other questions from commissioners? All right. Last call, any other questions from Commissioners? [no response] All right. Hearing and seeing none, thank you very much ENV.

At this time we're going to start public testimony. Telephone participants can press \*6 to unmute and remute themselves. Please mute your devices except when to testify. We ask for your patience as there may be a

1 delay. We ask that you say your full name, spell both your

2 | first and last names and start your testimony. If you have

3 already submitted written testimony, please do not read or

repeat it. Instead summarize or you may add anything new.

5 Each speaker may not have anyone read their statement and

6 | will be limited to 2 minutes. Let's begin. First, we will

 $^{\prime}$  take public testifiers present here in the Conference Room,

8 and I do not see any registered. Do I have anyone

9 registered?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

2.2

23

24

25

SECRETARY-REPORTER TAKARA: Nope, no.

CHAIR MEATOGA III: Okay. All right. Next, do we have anyone joined remotely who would like to provide oral testimony? Okay. Anyone online? [no response] If you have testimony, please unmute yourself, make yourself known, turn on your camera. Okay. Hearing and seeing none. At this time Commissioners, do I have a motion to close public

WOO: Motion to close.

testimony portion of this meeting hearing?

CHAIR MEATOGA III: Okay. Commissioner Woo motion to close. Do I have a second?

KRAUT: Commissioner Kraut, I second.

CHAIR MEATOGA III: Okay. Commissioner Kraut second. Thank you. Is there any discussion, any objections, any reservations? [no response] All right. Having and seeing none, Chair votes aye, public testimony portion of

```
the public hearing is now closed. Since we have no
 1
     decision- making or vote at this time Commissioners can
 2
     comment or ask questions again. Any follow-ups that you
     have for ENV? But if not, Commissioners, then Planning
     Commission will report back to the State Land Use Commission
 5
 6
     for today. So any follow-up questions? [no response]
     Okay. Having and seeing none, Commissioners, thank you for
     your time. Any announcements, Commissioners, before we
 8
     close our meeting? [no response [ Okay. No announcement
 9
     then, do I have a motion to adjourn the Planning Commission
10
11
     September 18, 2024 meeting.
                     Commissioner May, motion to adjourn.
12
               MAY:
               CHAIR MEATOGA III: Okay. I have Commissioner
13
     May. Do I have a second?
14
15
                    I'll second, Commissioner Woo.
16
               CHAIR MEATOGA III: Thank you. Any discussions,
     objections, reservations? [no response] All right.
17
     Hearing and seeing none, Chair votes aye, the Planning
18
     Commission for the September 18<sup>th</sup>, 2024 meeting is now
19
     adjourned. It is now 2:11. Thank you very much, everyone.
20
     [bangs gavel]
21
               [the meeting was adjourned at approximately
22
     2:11 p.m.]
23
```

24

25

1	I certify that the foregoing is a
2	true and correct transcript of the
3	proceedings, prepared to the best
4	of my ability of the meeting
5	held on Wednesday, September 18,
6	2024.
7	
8	Buffe
9	Gloria Takara $\ell$
10	Secretary-Reporter
11	
12	Oct. 1, 2024
13	Date
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	