

Minutes – Regular Meeting  
Solid Waste Advisory Board  
August 3, 2006  
**Approved September 7, 2006**

Attendance: Al Vickers, Joe Clayton, Bonnie Norwood, Jan Sassaman, and Remus Smith

Staff: Gayle Wilson, Blair Pollock, Wanda McCain, and Bill Letteri

- 1. Adoption of Minutes from June SWAB meeting** Vickers moves to accept. Norwood 2<sup>nd</sup>. Passes unanimously.
- 2. Principles/Values for Selection of MRF to Process Orange County Recyclables and for Select of Landfill to Receive Orange County's Transferred Waste** Deferred
- 3. Fiscal 2006-07 Preliminary Budget New/Expanded Services** Wilson states that the budget has been adopted with only one change from what was talked about last time. The 3R fee recommendation was reduced by about \$200,000. The equipment reserve fund has been maintained, though it [the reserve] is only temporary because there are two things coming up. One is laying a sewer line to our leachate basin. It is still under design. That will cost \$250,000 to \$260,000. The other thing is to relocate the Hwy 57 convenience center. There will be [unknown] expense with that since we don't know where it is going. There will be budget amendments and we will be using more than all of the undesignated reserves.

Clayton asks how much are the other County departments paying for the Hwy 57 move?

Wilson replies that none of that has been decided yet. There is no cost at this point because we don't know where it is going. There has been some preliminary work done on the recycling end. On the sanitation end, they're trying to consider upgrades to the sites to roll-offs and compactors for garbage. It will matter a lot which direction they take. The cost could be in the \$400,000 to \$500,000 range excluding land. At one time there was an indication of finding a site and consolidating the Walnut Grove site with the Hwy 57 site into a double site which would have made the economics better but it appears now that they're proceeding to maintain the two sites. It hasn't gone to the full board yet.

There are some new programs we are talking about implementing – mixed paper to urban and rural curbside. It should happen some time this fall. The other is [to expand household hazardous waste program to accept waste from] Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generators (CESQG). It won't take much to get this going.

Norwood asks for an explanation on that program.

Wilson replies that the household hazardous waste program receives waste from just residents and there is another category of hazardous wastes that are from business

Minutes – Regular Meeting  
Solid Waste Advisory Board  
August 3, 2006  
**Approved September 7, 2006**

that produce small amounts of hazardous waste. These [businesses] are governed by a separate set of rules from household hazardous waste but also a separate set of rules from large hazardous waste generators that are highly regulated in a number of ways. We currently accept waste from conditionally exempt small quantity generators but they are required to pay for it. There hasn't been a lot of participation, so it was decided to pay for the small business in hopes that more would participate. The change is to stop charging for those small quantity generators to bring stuff in.

Norwood asks what kind of things they would have.

Wilson states that it could be a number of things – solvents, paint.

Pollock states that what is seen the most is paint. The threshold is 220 pounds a month.

Norwood asks when will this start.

Wilson states that it is being transitioned into now. There just hasn't been any advertising.

Sassaman asks where does the material go.

Wilson replies that there is a company, EcoFlo, that handles the hazardous waste program.

The budget is finished and we are back to routine operations.

Clayton asks if CESQG will be pushed out to the business for your electronics also.

Wilson states that that has not been discussed yet.

(Vickers states that he was part of a conversation where it was mentioned that in 2008 they will stop sending out analog signals and TVs will be landfilled. Do you have any plans for a large impact at that point.)

Wilson states that there are no plans for movement to gear up on it. We could probably handle an additional amount.

Sassaman asks what is the 3-R fee increase going to be.

Wilson states that it is only for the base fee and it will be increase by seven dollars. from \$27 per household per year to \$34 per household per year.

Minutes – Regular Meeting  
Solid Waste Advisory Board  
August 3, 2006  
**Approved September 7, 2006**

Letteri asks if the amount the fee is raised is based on urban or rural collection.

Sassaman states that we are talking about the base fee.

Wilson states that there are four different components – the base and three potential add ons. An increase was recommended on all four but the Commissioners only approved the base component.

Pollock adds that the food waste program has been so popular that there will be more added to it.

- 4. Solid Waste Management Plan Process Update** Pollock states that the next meeting is September 13. We hope to reconvene the work group to hear the second report from Jim Frey. We have been batting a scope back and forth with Jim that is largely based on you all's comments and feedback. The RecycleBank has been put to sleep. The highlight of what Jim is going to show is the way to do a step-wise approach to processing. The report will look like a narrow series of options that responds to what your concerns were and also tries to move it forward in a way that enables us to create the decision making points. It goes from a broad approach to a very narrow "if - then" steps for both the collection side and processing side. We will do as we did last time and offer a morning coffee klatch/informal meeting with staff and SWAB to come in anytime between 10 am and noon. If all goes well you should receive the report a week in advance. There will be a relatively long session that night. Dinner will be provided.

We hope that the group will begin to move toward consensus on something we can put toward the various local governments and a public hearing after that. The rough timetable is you all will see it on the 13<sup>th</sup>, you give us and Jim some feedback, and we will come back with a report, then in general it will go to the three town boards and the public hearing. We will cobble together that feedback and I don't know what the loop will look like. The outcome will be two fold. One is it informs our three-year required update to the state and the other is it sets the road map for us for our broader planning.

Sassaman states that there should be serious consideration to the plan coming back to the SWAB and coming from the SWAB to the Board of Commissioners.

Pollock states that we are open to a process that you all are integrally part of.

Vickers states that it would seem appropriate to be transferred some recommendation from SWAB.

Minutes – Regular Meeting  
Solid Waste Advisory Board  
August 3, 2006  
**Approved September 7, 2006**

Pollock agrees with Jan that the SWAB carries the water for this. The challenging part politically is that it is unclear and it is different in every case of relationship between the representative on the SWAB and their relationship to their particular elected boards.

Sassaman states that it is the purview of the SWAB to bring that through; it's been dropped into the SWAB's lap by the BOCC.

Pollock states that from the standpoint of 'next steps', we could bring you all back something like a straw schedule. We could talk about it a little now. After you all see it and we get something on the table, then is it appropriate for the public meeting with this piece and take input from the public then to the town governments then back to this group to cobble together the feedback and then it goes to the Commissioners.

Sassaman states yes.

Smith states that he's not in favor of a public hearing because they won't know what has been talked about and doesn't think anything will come out of it.

Sassaman states that there needs to be one by law. One approach is to see what the workgroup says on the 13<sup>th</sup>. It could be that the work group would be willing to let it go to a public meeting.

Letteri states that to understand the process the work group meeting is going to address the issues of the report and then from there we need to get into a full discussion as a whole county. The report is dealing with all the issues that are relevant to everyone in the County.

Sassaman states that there are certain decision points or issues that need to be brought to the public such as the MRF and/or transfer station. I don't know that we need to spend a lot of time on littler control or the details. The goal with anything that we do with the public is to get the public input on those items that decisions have to be made.

Wilson states that it may have to go to the public a couple of times. One as a part of what we are talking about now and on the 13<sup>th</sup>. The other, once it's all cobbled together and before the plan is submitted to the State.

Letteri states that before it goes to the public we want to very clearly have our recommendations in by that time. We don't want to make it a public debate.

Minutes – Regular Meeting  
Solid Waste Advisory Board  
August 3, 2006  
**Approved September 7, 2006**

Pollock states that the way this is laid out finesses one of the key problems. Build a pad first, then if economics are good it allows us not to have to endorse “MRF, no MRF”, it allows us to endorse a series of decision that would help us decide on an economic basis that don’t make sense to us. If we are getting lousy prices from others maybe we are better off building our own facility.

Clayton asks if there will be any mention of fryer oil and turning it into fuel for the fleet.

Wilson states that it hasn’t been discussed as part of the process with RRSI. In the discussion of the super-convenience center concept, staff had already talked about that.

Clayton states that I was thinking more of the commercial side where there would be a steady supply of it.

Wilson states that at some point there will be issues that come up that we may or may not have thought about that will need to be addressed. The main issue we are focused on now is waste reduction and recycling. There are a number of other subcomponents of the plan that will have to be looked at separately or after there is a recommendation. There are other issues going on other than RRSI. There is a meeting next week with the County attorney and the attorney from the Institute of Government who is going to prepare a report for us regarding franchising of collection services to help inform us of the limitations, the law, and the process. There is the final stage of negotiating a scope of work for looking at garbage collection in the unincorporated areas to determine what it might cost and what the results might be.

We are also looking at how the garbage is being collected in the non-residential sector and identifying all the different companies that are doing that now. What would be gained if it were consolidated into fewer players. Would there be any cost-benefits? Would it entice some to sign up if it were voluntary? Or would you require everyone to pay for the service if they used it or not. Another issue is, if the convenience centers remain, what would they look like. Are they going to be expanded into more full service? Will household hazardous waste be accepted?

Pollock states that there is the PAYT discussion that marries up to that. You tell people you can sign up voluntarily for garbage collection. They might respond, “I’d rather go to the convenience center (where I don’t have to pay)” then does that mean you have to pay there? The other part of that is what happens to that. Also do you give people in rural areas graduated sizes of carts unlike the towns where you already have a single size cart, you can tell the franchisees, “You must offer a 30 or 60 or 90 gallon cart.” There are many opportunities that create more complexity at the same time.

Minutes – Regular Meeting  
Solid Waste Advisory Board  
August 3, 2006  
**Approved September 7, 2006**

Wilson states there is also waste collection at each of the municipalities. That it is a complicated issue. Right now we are trying to deal with the fundamental details of some of the components of the plan.

Letteri states that at the meeting on the 13<sup>th</sup>, it would be important to have a summary of the key issues that the plan needs to deal with and which of those are essentially resolved.

Wilson agrees.

Letteri asks for clarification on the schedule for the final plan. Where will things be at the end of the year?

Wilson states that a timeline will be hard to do. Sequencing might be easier. I would like for the waste reduction and recycling component completed by December or January. There are other issues that have to be dealt with like the transfer station.

- 5. Utilization of Durham Transfer Station/No Orange County Transfer Station** Wilson states that in March we presented the advisory board's report recommendation for a transfer station to the BOCC. At that time the Commissioners charged me and the manager with contacting and meeting with the city of Durham to discuss two possibilities. One, "Is Durham interested in developing a second transfer station in the south or southwestern Durham County that could be shared by Orange County?". Secondly, "Would Durham County be willing to accept Orange County's waste at their existing transfer station.?"

The meeting was held. Durham stated that they did not have plans to develop a second transfer station but they would be willing to take our waste at their existing transfer station. However, presently they do not have enough capacity to handle Orange County's waste. They requested that we do an analysis for them that would include working with their [recycling] contractor, Tidewater Fiber, to find out their intentions on expanding their local processing and if we could somehow promise them our recyclables or in some other way influence them to expand their processing capabilities then perhaps Durham could recycle more and free up space at their transfer station.

My suggestion to the assistant manager was to do an evaluation on, "Should Durham County [City] have capacity, is it advisable for us to take our waste there?" If the answer is 'no', the other analysis isn't needed. The report is nearly complete. The handout you've received is information from each of the Towns and County of what the impact would be to deliver their waste to the Durham transfer station. For the Towns of Chapel and Carrboro it is an extremely costly maneuver. For Hillsborough

Minutes – Regular Meeting  
Solid Waste Advisory Board  
August 3, 2006  
**Approved September 7, 2006**

it was a slight cost. However there are a number of other issues that have been raised. I am going to recommend, if allowed by the manager, that the notion of using the Durham transfer station be discarded and ask for guidance to either to proceed to develop and permit a transfer station on the property on Eubanks Road or to direct staff to identify another location to expeditiously acquire a new piece of property and move.

Clayton states that there is no information from UNC.

Wilson states that UNC would have the ability to instruct their contractor to take it to the cheapest place possible if they had to go to north Durham. They are not a part of the interlocal agreement. Many would interpret the interlocal agreement as the County being responsible for providing a local alternative.

Smith states that that is basic fact. That is the reason there is one.

Wilson states that there is another issue. If we wait another six or eight months, we won't have a transfer station ready by the time the landfill closes.

Letteri states that this group seems to be unanimous in their feelings about this, shouldn't that be articulated some how to the Board.

Sassaman states that it was. We recommended a transfer station on Eubanks Road.

Letteri asks was that prior to the possibility of going to Durham. If so maybe this group should say that we've entertained and have further arguments about going to Durham.

Sassaman states that we could do that at this meeting.

Vickers states that Carrboro isn't interested in going to Durham.

Sassaman adds Chapel Hill isn't either.

Clayton states that being that all of us have been around this for some time we knew Durham wasn't large enough. It wasn't deeply studied, because we knew the answer.

Letteri states that it would seem helpful to formalize that again.

Wilson states that if you all want to do something, you can vote to reaffirm your earlier recommendation.

Sassaman suggest that it be part of the next agenda.

Wilson states that it will have gone to the Board by then. I can give you all an update.

Letteri suggest doing a resolution tonight.

Norwood states that if everything is moved out of county, what effect that would have on “Joe Public” as a whole? Will Joe Public now be concerned about recycling if it’s [the landfill] not his backyard? Will I be more or less likely to recycle if it’s going to Durham - will I care any more?

Wilson states that my report touches on an issue related to that. What comes to our facility whether it is a landfill or transfer station is scrutinized to see there is no hazardous waste and material but also to make sure that the waste and materials delivered is consistent with local ordinance. Durham is not going to care if cardboard is in the load, or aluminum cans.

Clayton moves to authorize the department to write a straw resolution to consider and vote on to send to the County Commissioners reinforcing the initial choice of transfer station.

Smith 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Motion passes unanimously.

## **6. Programs/Services Update**

*Solid Waste Legislative Update* Wilson states that there were a lot of solid waste related Bills introduced this year, many of them with the objective of stopping or interfering with large mega landfills on the east coast that are intended to receive waste primarily from the northeast. Three of the Bills passed -- one which I referred to earlier, Senate Bill 951. There were some changes, but it was adopted. What that Bill does is require a local government, town or county, who is going to discuss changes in collection that may impact in a significant way or displace a private hauler to follow a very detailed process of notifying all the haulers and involving them in all the discussions and if a decision isn’t made on it in six months from the time of discussion the notification process has to start over. If the decision is made to franchise, there is a waiting period of 15 months from the time of decision or the requirement to buy out each individual hauler based on their gross receipts for the pervious six months.

One other Bill that passed made some revisions to the existing law regarding issuing disposal franchising. This will make it more difficult for private companies to site landfills in local governments.

Minutes – Regular Meeting  
Solid Waste Advisory Board  
August 3, 2006  
**Approved September 7, 2006**

The third piece of legislation adopted was a one year moratorium on new landfills in the state. The Environmental Review Commission was tasked to initiate a number of studies on solid waste related issues.

*September Work Group Meeting* Previously discussed.

*Landfill Gas Study* Wilson states that the consultant is tentatively scheduled for the September 12<sup>th</sup> [BOCC] meeting to make a presentation on one half of the study that they are doing. They have been asked to do a study on providing energy for county facilities on Eubanks Road, which will potentially include a school, a new animal shelter, our operations center and possibly a transfer station. That part is done and will be presented at a future meeting. The other half of the study is to evaluate the feasibility of providing energy pipe line gas to Carolina North, the University facility. We have been instructed that before that study is done to meet with the University. We are in the process of setting up the meeting with the University.

Sassaman asks if the SWAB will get a chance to look at the study before it is presented on the 12<sup>th</sup>.

Wilson states that you are welcome to see the report.

*Highway 57 Convenience Center* Wilson states that the owner of the property has sent formal written notice that the lease will not be renewed.

Smith asks as of what date.

Wilson replies August 31, 2006. The owner has a contract to purchase that expires tomorrow. If that company doesn't buy his property there is another company that has a second right of refusal and then has three days to buy it. Either company may be willing to let the site stay. We have been looking for temporary sites. One commissioner has suggested combining a park with the convenience center.

Smith asks who operates the Hwy 57 site.

Wilson states that there is a combined operation. The solid waste management department services and manage the recycling part of it. The public works department manages the garbage and the site attendants work for public works.

*Wastecon* Wilson states that the SWANA annual national conference is in Charlotte this year. I have some free passes if anyone is interested.

Minutes – Regular Meeting  
Solid Waste Advisory Board  
August 3, 2006  
**Approved September 7, 2006**

*Solid Waste Operations Center* Wilson states that an update will be given to the BOCC on the August 22 meeting. We will be informing them where we are and that it will be going out for bid.

*HHW Hours Expansion* Pollock states that on July 1 as part of the budget the household hazardous waste collection started opening Monday – Saturday. The early returns are that Mondays are getting popular quickly.

## **7. Other Businesses**

Clayton moves to adjourn. Norwood 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Adjourn 9:00pm

Next meeting: September 7, 2006  
Southern Human Service Center