

PUBLIC MEETING NOTES
Energy/Compost Facility Action Plan
Presented by
City of Palo Alto
in conjunction with
Alternative Resources, Inc.
(April 25, 2012)

1. Can we take the excavated (garbage) and dispose of it somewhere else?
 - Yes. Either a Class III or Class II landfill.
2. Could the energy/compost facility pad be made higher?
 - Yes
3. Could the energy/compost facility pad be visually pleasing?
 - Yes. This requirement can be added to the performance specifications under “design”.
4. Could we put some of the material in a berm – visual barrier, as much as possible?
 - Yes some excavated fill can be used to create visual barriers such as berms.
5. Need to look at pipes under the road. (Could be problematic.)
 - There is a 10” and 8” landfill gas line that runs under the road about 3’ to 5’ below the ground surface. There is also a 10” water line under the road that is about 5’ bgs. These pipes could be impacted if the area has to be excavated.
6. A higher mound would allow for a better view.
7. Is the hill walkable?
 - Trails can be added to the hill or mound to make it easier to walk up. The trails can be made to run at diagonals such as switchbacks.
8. Need to meet landfill requirements, park design and processes.
9. How can you proceed?
 - Need to know acreage and cost by January 2013. This is a difficult task to decide on how much acreage is needed. The City with the assistance of ARI will survey possible companies prior to releasing the RFP to gauge size requirements.
10. The full 10 acres needs to be available.
11. Should avoid full capping.
12. Future expansion needs should be considered.
13. Consider terracing.
14. Consider all technologies.
15. Need approval from regulatory agencies.
16. Make the footprint decision earlier.

17. Don't want to cap and then un-cap.
18. Can we move faster?
 - Obstacles to speeding up the process include lack of resources (staff and funding). The City will require the assistance of a consultant, such as ARI, to assist in the consideration process. The City will be hiring two new staff to the Zero Waste Group that can assist in the project.
19. Compost drop-off and give away area should be provided to public.
20. Reduce CO₂.
21. Use the dollars from Stanford that are designated for sustainability on this project.
22. Anaerobic digestion would be cheaper than shown.
23. Tie in the anaerobic digestion project with the RWQCP Master Planning.
24. Minimize traffic on Embarcadero Way.
25. Asking Council to make decisions ahead of cost information.
26. Want to make the two speak to each other.
27. Reduce frequency.
28. What are the final elevations (including final cap and vegetative soil) of the various cover options?
 - 10 Acre (Figure 1): Highest elevation is **80** feet above-mean sea level (MSL).
 - 10 Acre Alternative (Figure 2): Highest elevation is **90** feet above-MSL.
 - 7 Acre (Figure 3): Highest elevation is **60** feet above-MSL.
 - 7 Acre Alternative (Figure 4): Highest elevation is **60** feet above-MSL.
 - 5.4 Acre (Figure 5): Highest elevation is **60** feet above-MSL.
 - 3.8 Acre (Figure 6): Highest elevation is **60** feet above-MSL.

29. How many acres will the excavated fill take up?

Size of Development Area (acres)	Volume of Fill to be Excavated (cubic yards)	Amount of area excavated fill will be spread over (acres)
10	242,850	TBD
7	68,500	TBD
5.4	22,450	TBD
3.8	0	0

30. Is there a reason we can't go to a 90' height on 10 acre alternative excavation?
 - No. Landfill consultant recommends installing shelves (breaks in the slope) to ensure slopes are stable.
31. Concern about earthquake, is 90' height stable?
 - Landfill consultant says yes as long as there are breaks (shelves) in the side slopes.

32. Where will the road go for a 3.8 acre development option?

- Entrance to the facility as stated in Measure E is from Embarcadero Way.
Final facility design will dictate location of the actual road into the facility.

33. The entrance road into the E/C Facility will be from Embarcadero Way.

34. Is it possible that we will encounter hazardous waste when the development area is excavated?

- Yes it is possible if we have to over excavate to make a pad. The Palo Alto Landfill is an unlined Class III Landfill. Prior to the passage of 40 CFR Section 258 (RCRA Subtitle D) it was permissible to dispose of household hazardous waste into the Palo Alto Landfill. After the passage of Subtitle D Class III (unlined) landfills could no longer accept household hazardous waste. It is possible to encounter hazardous waste and have to dispose of it in a Class II or Class I landfill.

35. Members of the public are in support of increasing the height of the landfill to 90'.

36. Could some of the excavated material be used to create berms around the E/C Facility?

- Yes.

37. When does the postponement of landfill capping start and end?

- Start: July 2012 & End: July 2013.

38. Does any change in the design of Byxbee Park have to go through Parks and Recreation Commission for approval?

- Yes. If the project moves forward it would go through Site and Design Review which includes CEQA. As part of the review process the project would be reviewed by the Parks and Recreation Commission.

39. How can we go out for an RFP if we do not know how much acreage we need for an E/C Facility?

- As part of the next steps in the Action Plan we hope to go to Council and request a contract amendment with ARI. ARI could then perform a telephone survey of potential vendors and determine interest and basic performance specifications such as acreage needed. This will help in writing up an RFP and giving us a preview of the size needed by a vendor. Once we receive back proposals we hope to have two pieces of additional information – how much acreage is needed and how much will it cost.

40. How much more fill (cubic yards) is needed to bring remaining Phase IIC up to final grade? TBD.
41. Walt Hays: Full 10 acres should be preserved for E/C Facility; 90' tall landfill is ok; cap all remaining portion of landfill except 10 acres.
42. Delay of capping is good because it keeps our options open.
43. Need to determine how much area is needed for a facility in order to determine how much fill has to be excavated. Propose to conduct a survey and go out for RFP to help narrow this down.
44. It might be good to keep the 10 acres even if the facility does not require it this will allow for future expansion in case we decide to take organic materials from surrounding Cities.
45. Terracing of the 10 acres is still a possibility.
46. Stanford Project to convert organic materials to biochar makes the RWQCP a good site.
47. What are the plans for the digestate?
 - Is there a use for biochar technology to process the digestate? We could include this requirement as part of the performance specifications and hope vendors include a way to handle digestate in their proposals.
48. Can we request an RFI by January 2013?
 - Yes but it will cost more money and take longer to get an answer.
49. It would be good to make the footprint decision earlier.
50. Voters would not be happy if we cap then have to uncap a portion or whole 10 acre area.
51. How can we put an E/C Facility in sooner than later?
52. Facility design should include a drop off location for the public to bring their organic materials (i.e. green waste).
53. There should be a place at the facility for the public to come and pick up compost.
54. Reason for supporting the E/C Facility is the reduction in GHG emissions vs. exporting.
55. The Stanford Hospital Project has sustainability funds that were given to the City. Could the City utilize some of this funding for E/C Facility Project?
56. Need to tie together the E/C Facility actions and the biosolids facility actions. Refuse staff with meet with RWQCP to discuss this further.

57. Updated to the Feasibility Report shows cost of export is \$1 Mil. Higher than previous calculations.
58. Gasification cost is not truly known because there are not many of these types of facilities.
59. What are the local processing options for digestate?
- Digestate can be used for land application or as alternative daily cover at landfills.
60. Can the E/C Facility process digestate?
- Yes but it can be expensive and the by product has a limited use.
61. Scheduling question E/C Facility 2013 needs to connect with the biosolids RFP.
62. What is the food scrap pilot program?
- It is still being developed.
63. If food waste is removed from garbage can residents and commercial reduce their garbage service?
- A reduction in the amount of materials placed in the garbage bin could allow residents or commercial clients to reduce the size of their collection bins thereby reducing the cost of their service.
64. Can the frequency of garbage pickup be changed?
- The current hauling contract does not allow for a reduction in frequency. The City would have to renegotiate with Green Waste to allow for more frequency options.
65. Who can participate in the food scrap pilot program?
- Still needs to be developed.