

**CITY OF GUSTAVUS
PROJECT SCOPING and DEVELOPMENT FORM**

**DISPOSAL & RECYCLING CENTER
FY15 & FY16 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT, FACILITY PLANNING AND
LANDFILL CLOSURE PLAN PROJECT – PLANNING FOR A NEW MODEL OF
WASTE HANDLING IN GUSTAVUS
(\$70,000 over two fiscal years)**

Part 1. Project Identification

Name of project: **Solid Waste Management and Facility Planning**

Disposal & Recycling Center (DRC) Staff Contact: Paul Berry S.C.

Email: dumpmaster@gustavus-ak.gov Phone: 907-697-2118

Part 2. Project scope:

1. What is the project?

Solid waste management and facility planning for Gustavus. This planning project addresses six main areas and several additional subsidiary areas (prioritized list):

1. Running out of landfill space;
2. How to implement a transfer station at the DRC;
3. Safety and efficiency improvements to the current and future facility;
4. Landfill Closure Plan revision;
5. The Community Chest - retail space expansion and revenue enhancements through expanded thrift sales
6. Improvements to the food waste composting operation

Other subsidiary uses for the DRC's 12 acre parcel could be considered such as: expansion of the composting functionality, the designation of public parkland out of the facilities buffer areas, consideration of how to properly handle the communities' junked vehicle challenge and possible solutions for dealing with large amounts of waste generated from natural disasters.

The final plan would also list prior solid waste planning documents, ADEC solid waste disposal permits up to the current time including documents from the former Gustavus Community Association.

One subject that will not be addressed by this project is moving the existing DRC facility. This subject was thoroughly addressed by the DRC Committee and culminated in the August 8th, 2007 report [Gustavus Disposal and Recycling Center Committee Scoping Document for Moving One or More Functions of the DRC](#). The proposed solution was to move one or more functions of the DRC to the State of Alaska property known as the "Airport Triangle", a parcel of DNR property between Wilson Road and the Airport. This report was not well

received by the Department of Transportation and the Federal Aviation Administration. *(see September 10th, 2007 letter to Mayor Marchbanks from Malcolm Menzies ADOT Regional Director)*

2. Why is the project needed?

Running out of landfill space

The DRC has been receiving waste as a permitted facility for 20 years and by 2015 will reach an important juncture. The present design capacity of the disposal area: the original 1994 fenced area, will nearly be reached and important decisions will need to be made on how to address the future of our facility. The Council and the community need a comprehensive Solid Waste Plan for responsible and efficient solid waste planning and to help secure funding for any proposed solution. The City needs to avoid an ad-hoc vertical expansion or a costly lateral expansion of the landfill and balefill. Gustavus has a flat topography and the creation of an artificial mound in the center of the community is something that needs careful consideration. The use of stable three to one (3'H:1'V) slopes typical for a modern landfill, and Gustavus' high groundwater table dictate that the existing balefill/landfill footprint will have to become larger in order to go much higher in elevation and also provide usable capacity.

Key questions:

- How much waste is generated in Gustavus on an annual basis?
- How much waste is projected to be generated in Gustavus in the future?
- What areas within the DRC's 12 acres have been used for landfilling waste and how much space is potentially still available?
- How would any expansion of the landfill/ balefill area affect the other areas of operation at the DRC – is there any room for expansion?

How to implement a transfer station at the DRC

Key questions:

- What are the biggest priorities that need to be considered for operating a transfer station in Gustavus?
- How would the waste be transported and where would it be shipped to?
- How would a new facility impact its neighbors (such as traffic flows)?
- How would a new facility likely look?
- What would the initial capital costs and operational costs be and how much would waste disposal cost for Gustavus' residents if a new facility were built?

Safety and efficiency improvements to the current facilities

The efficient and economical processing of waste depends on a facility that is adequately sized, well laid out with an overall concern for public safety, operator safety and efficiency. The current building and the material storage areas located outside the building are undersized for providing all of the functionality that is asked of them and there is an unsafe mixture of operator work areas and public work areas both within and around the main building. Vehicle traffic flow problems are also occurring and a new circular traffic flow pattern with adequate parking areas needs to be designed.

Landfill Closure plan revision

Is the current closure plan flexible enough to reflect the changes that will be proposed in the new Solid Waste Management Plan? How much money should the City have in the closure fund? The Closure Plan for the DRC will need to be revised to reflect any changes proposed in the Solid Waste Management Plan.

Thrift sales/ Community Chest - retail space expansion and revenue enhancements

With the Community Chest and the DRC at two separate locations instead of being adjacent to each other, inefficiencies and expenses occur moving materials between facilities. Opportunities for members of the public to buy used goods while disposing of their waste at the DRC or for the public to properly pay for disposal of their un-usable goods at the Community Chest are missed as well. With better retail space (layout and available area) the Community Chest could provide more thrift sales and thereby provide more support with the operational costs of the DRC. Combining all or a portion of the operation of the DRC and Community Chest into one facility is an important consideration in this proposed plan.

Improvements to the food waste composting operation

The current composting operation would be carefully reconsidered to address on-going, undesirable issues of odor control, seasonally working in ankle-deep mud and run-off control. Issues of bird control, and visual aesthetics important to all Gustavus residents, would also be addressed. The question of whether the new composting facility would be larger than the current 6,600 sq. ft. area and use the same passive ventilation-static pile process or utilize a more compact, equipment dependent, active ventilation in-vessel process could be addressed as well.

If the opportunity allows this planning project could address the issues behind expanding the current food waste composting program to include the composting of residual bio-solids from the National Park Service's Bartlett Cove sewage treatment plant, composting fish waste from charter boat operations, and composting mixed waste prior to being packed in shipping containers for shipment. The purpose of this last item is to find a means of addressing volume reduction and odor control for stockpiling waste in shipping containers for months at a time.

3. Where did the idea for this project originate?

DRC Manager/ Operator Paul Berry.

4. Is this project part of a larger plan?

This project has elements mentioned in the 2005 Gustavus Strategic Plan.

5. What is your time line for project planning?

Because of the large scope of this project, planning it is scheduled to occur over FY15 & FY16.

1. Information gathering, preparing for 1st public presentation (summer/fall 2014)
2. 1st presentation to the public: solicit input and volunteers for possible steering committee (fall 2014)
3. Refinement of original plan based on input (winter 2014-15)
4. 2nd presentation to the public – here is how the process has incorporated input from the first phase. Second opportunity for input (summer 2015)
5. Presentation of report to the council with recommendation(s) (winter 2015-16)

6. What is your budget for the planning process?

See Part 5

Will you be using a consultant?

Yes, professional help with new solid waste management and facility plan is estimated to be around 55% of the project total.

7. What is your rough estimate of the total cost of the planning and final product? Planning costs are estimated to be \$70,000. Cost for final product is not known at this time.

Parts 3., 4., 5., 6. Project Investigation and Development

Parts 3.- 6. refer to social, environmental, and financial impacts of various options. These questions will help you document your consideration of alternatives and your choice of the option providing the best value for the community. Your goal is to generate alternatives and to make a recommendation from among them. Return to Part 3., “Summary” after applying Parts 4. - 6.

Summary:

1. What alternative approaches or solutions were considered? Make a business case for your top two or three options by discussing how effectively each would fulfill the project goals, and by comparing the economic, social, and environmental costs vs. benefits for each one.

The no-action alternative would be the continuing series of short term fixes to existing problems, without reference to an overall plan for the future. The initial cost would be lower than developing a new facility or methodology, but the cost of making the changes down the line, when there are no options, will likely be much greater than if they had been addressed when first recognized. It is felt that a future Council facing a waste disposal crisis would have less, and more costly options to consider and much less time to consider them in.

2. What solution was chosen as the best and why is it the best?

The proposed solution of drafting a new Solid Waste Management and Facility Plan is considered the best solution because it chooses to actively explore a new waste handling methodology and produce a tangible plan for the Council and community to

consider before all the space available at the DRC for disposal is consumed.

3. Identify your funding source(s).
 - How will the project be funded initially, and for its operating life?

Funding is anticipated to come from the City. The cost of construction and operating any preferred alternative would be addressed in the plan itself.

- Is there a matching fund requirement? Please provide details.

Not for the planning phase

Part 4. Environmental, Social, Financial Impacts

1. Project Impacts Checklist

Will this project affect:	No	Yes (+/-)	Maybe
Environmental quality? (+ = impact is beneficial; - = harmful)			
• Climate change		+	
• Streams/groundwater quality		+	
• Air quality			X
• Soils/land quality		+	
• Fish/wildlife habitat, populations	X		
• Plant Resources (timber, firewood, berries, etc)			X
• Invasive or pest species			X
• Neighborhood character		+/-	
• Noise or other environmental impacts		+/-	
• Environmental sustainability		+	
• Hazardous substances use		+	
• Community waste stream		+	
• Light pollution at night	X		
Recreational opportunities?			
• Public land use and access			X
• Trails/waterways		+	
• Parks		+	
• Public assembly/activities	X		
Education/training/knowledge & skill development?		+	
Public safety?		+	
Public health?		+	

Medical services?	X		
Emergency response?	X		
Economic performance & sustainability?		+	
• Employment of residents		+	
o Short-term (i.e. construction)		+	
o Long-term (operating and maintenance)		+	
• Cost of living reduction		+	
• Return on investment		+ non\$	
• Visitor opportunities/impressions/stays / purchases		+	
• Competitive business environment	X		
• Support for existing businesses		+	
• New business opportunities		+	
• Economic sustainability		+	
• Attractiveness of City to new residents/businesses		+	
City government performance?			
• Infrastructure quality/effectiveness/reach (more people)		+	
• Existing services		+	
• New services		+	
• Cost of City services		+	
• Tax income to City	X		
Transportation?			
• Air	X		
• Water	X		
• Roads	X		
Communications?			
• Internet	X		
• Phone	X		
• TV/radio	X		
Other? (type in) impacts on neighbors (noise, odor, visual)			

2. How does this project provide benefits or add value in multiple areas? (e.g. benefits both to the environment and business performance.)

An improved, more attractive DRC facility, designed for noise abatement, will enhance the environment around the site. It will also provide for better public and staff safety, and will be more responsive to the waste stream disposal needs of both residents and businesses.

3. Are other projects related to or dependent on this project?

- Is this project dependent on other activities or actions?
- If yes, describe projects, action or activities specifying phases where appropriate.

This is a planning project. So any action based on the adoption of the plan by the Council would be effected by this project.

4. Will the project require additional infrastructure, activity, or staffing outside the immediate department or activity? (E.g. will the construction of a new facility require additional roads or road maintenance or more internal City staffing?)

No

5. What regulatory permits will be required and how will they be obtained?

For planning no permits are required. Any proposed changes to the existing facility would necessitate changes to the ADEC solid waste permit.. This issue would be addressed as part of the planning process.

6. What are the estimated initial (e.g. construction) and continuing (operational) costs of the project?

Cost for project planning is estimated to be \$70,000. Construction and operating costs will be determined as part of the planning process.

Is an engineering design or construction estimate necessary?

Not known at this time.

Will operation of the project generate any revenue for the city such as sales and user fees, or new taxes? If so, how will the new revenue be collected?

The DRC as an enterprise fund of the City generates user fees and product sales. However, the DRC is a public service and is not a commercial business resulting, generally, in a net loss of money in the operating process. Currently a portion of the community does not use the DRC, but it is hoped that an improved, attractive, and more efficient facility that combines the DRC and the Community Chest into one location will become the choice for a wider portion of the community, and with greater income from disposal fees we may be able to rely less on City taxes for operating costs.

Part 5. Project Budget

Proposed Budget Line Items

Construction project Budget estimate	Cost	Operational budget estimate (annual)	Cost
Administrative	\$0.00	Personnel	\$0.00
Project management	5% \$3,500.00	Benefits	\$0.00

Land, structures, ROW, easements	\$0.00	Training	\$0.00
Design permitting and inspection	\$0.00	Travel	\$0.00
Site work	\$0.00	Equipment	\$0.00
Construction materials	\$0.00	Contractual	\$0.00
Construction labor	\$0.00	Supplies	\$0.00
Equipment	\$0.00	Utilities	\$0.00
Contingencies	15% \$10,400.00	Insurance	\$0.00
Other: Consultants	47% \$33,000.00	Repair & maintenance	\$0.00
Other: Travel	29% \$20,000.00	Heating	\$0.00
Other: Training	3% \$2,400.00	Other (list)	\$0.00
Other: Public Outreach	1% \$700.00		
		Total direct costs	\$0.00
Total	\$70,000.00	Indirect costs	\$0.00

Budget notes:

Project Management (rounded)

4 weeks Assistant Operator time to provide support at DRC \$1,800

10 weeks, 6 additional hours per week Manager/ Operator \$1,610

Consultants

220 hours @ \$150 per hour

Travel

8 travel units: 1 person, 2 – 3 days: airfare, accommodation, per diem \$2,500 each

Training (rounded)

SWANA Managing Transfer Station Systems + exam \$1,405

US Composting Council 5 day Composter Training Program \$1,000

Public Outreach

Informational mailings to all residents, Facebook page support

Updated Latest Estimate* Budget Line Items Date: _____

Construction project Budget estimate	Cost	Operational budget estimate (annual)	Cost
Administrative	\$	Personnel	\$
Project management	\$	Benefits	\$
Land, structures, ROW, easements	\$	Training	\$
Design permitting and inspection	\$	Travel	\$

Site work	\$	Equipment	\$
Demolition and construction	\$	Contractual	\$
Waste disposal	\$	Supplies	\$
Equipment	\$	Utilities	\$
Contingencies	\$	Insurance	\$
Other (list)	\$	Repair & maintenance	\$
Other (list)	\$	Other (list)	\$
Other (list)	\$	Other (list)	\$
		Total direct costs	
		Indirect costs	

* Use this form if there are significant budget changes during development of the project.

Part 6. Jobs and training (required by some granting agencies)

1. What service jobs will be needed for operation and maintenance?
To be determined in planning effort
2. How many full-time, permanent jobs will this project create or retain?
Create/retain in 1-3 years
Create/retain in 3-5 years
3. What training is necessary to prepare local residents for jobs on this project?
In-house training in waste separation, recycling, composting, hazardous waste handling, processing, shipping and operating safety will be needed to train future workers.
4. How many local businesses will be affected by this project and how?
Any business generating waste processed by the DRC will be affected by this project.

Part 7. Business Plan (upon Council request)

Upon Council request, please prepare a business plan for the operating phase of your leading option(s). Plans will differ according to the nature of the project.

Part 8. Record of Project planning and development meetings

1. Please document the manner in which public input was received.
 - Public comment on agenda items at committee or Council meeting
 - Special public hearing
 - Dates and attendance for the above.
 - Written comment from the public (please attach)
2. Please use the following chart to document committee meetings, Council reports, and so on. Did the committee make recommendations or requests? Did the Council make requests of the committee?

Meeting record

Event (Meeting of committee, Council report, etc.	Date	Agenda Posted (date)	Minutes or record Attached ? (yes/no)	Outcome Rec to Council, requested action of Council, etc.	Number of attendees
DRC Committee	12/14/11	12/07/11	Minutes		3
DRC Committee	12/19/11	12/07/11	Minutes		4
City Council	1/12/12		Minutes	Resolution 2012-05	
City Council	1/10/13		Minutes	Resolution 2013-05	

Part 9. Feedback to the Council

With the understanding that this form must be adapted to a variety of projects, please provide feedback on how the form worked for your committee. Thank you for your suggestions.