

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
February 2, 2006
Approved March 2, 2006

Attendance: Linda Bowerman, Al Vickers, Joe Clayton, Bonnie Norwood, and Jan Sassaman

Staff: Gayle Wilson, Blair Pollock, Wanda McCain, Rob Taylor, Paul Spire, Tom Draney and Rebecca Holdway

Guest: Ed Shuffler

1. **Adoption of Minutes from January 5 SWAB meeting** Norwood moves to accept. Clayton 2nd. Passes unanimously.
2. **Possible revisions to 2006 SWAB meeting schedule** Sassaman states that we are scheduled to meet the first Thursday of every month except July. The commissioners are concerned that for those [Advisory] Boards where there are Board members that are liaisons there is a conflict with the BOCC meetings and the representatives can't meet. They requested a change in meeting times to avoid those conflicts. Barry Jacobs is our liaison with the Board. I spoke with Barry and we decided to keep the schedule as it is. In the event that there is an agenda where we specifically want and need Barry's input we will contact him to see if he has a conflict. If need be we will reschedule the meeting or move the agenda item to another date.
3. **Principles/Values for Selection of MRF to Process Orange County Recyclables** Wilson states that items 3 are 4 are related. At the November 9 BOCC meeting an assignment was made for the SWAB to draft some principles/values that would govern the decision as to where we would transfer our waste and the decision of utilizing a merchant MRF. I have done a rough draft of principles/values that would govern Orange County to deliver materials to a MRF.

Sassaman states that the original request was for principles/values for the selection of a MRF. Where did the landfill come in?

Wilson states that it was separate request.

Draney states that there were volunteers from last month's meeting for this task.

Clayton states that the County's standards should not be higher than anything it holds itself to. I looked at how many companies deal with recyclables or solid waste issues that the County has contracts with. I ask if we could coagulate what are the requirements for these. While some companies like Eco Flo that do hazardous waste have more stringent requirements, I also want to know what the County's policies are for itself. For example, does the County use temporary labor to pick up trash and if they're exempting themselves from their own standard when they contract out. I want to know if we are going to hold someone that does recycling, which is a very low-

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
February 2, 2006
Approved March 2, 2006

skilled job, at a higher standard, than we are holding our current contractors and ourselves.

Wilson states that what you have said is accurate but in my position I have to deal with the task at hand. If they read the minutes they will see that it has been identified as an issue by the group.

Vickers states that this could be added to the contract the same way as an insurance requirement, should there be a clause requiring the contractor to pay a livable wage? I don't know if we are the people to decide that for the contractor. It is a policy for the BOCC.

Sassaman states that we have been asked to comment on it. Do we as a group believe that employees of contractors in the solid waste area should make a living wage, however we define that?

Clayton asks do you want to consider what the current policy is?

Sassaman replies no; I've asked it independent of current policy.

Vickers states that the County has to make the decision on the contracting in general. It should not be the solid waste people alone. What we should stick to is performance standards. We are getting into an area that the County should administer to all contractors across the board.

Clayton states that I believe that they should be paid a living wage, but they should not be held to a standard higher than the county holds itself to.

Bowerman asks do you think the County should lower their standards?

Clayton states that no one said that we have to decide on a living wage. That was brought up here. To say that we follow County standards on living wage is an answer.

Sassaman states that it is an answer that says "We won't give you advice on the living wage issue." Which tells me that we should not bring up the issue of living wage.

Norwood states that one of the Commissioners becomes heated regarding the MRF issue and the biggest complaint is employees and their working conditions. I don't know that we have the right to dictate to someone else how to fly.

Sassaman states that we need to make a decision on the living wage or leave it alone.

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
February 2, 2006
Approved March 2, 2006

Vickers notes there are legal issues such as indemnification for the County on any incidents.

Wilson replies that is a standard clause in County contracts.

Clayton asks staff if there is enough tonnage to require recycling merchants to have our material only be touched by full time employees with full benefits making more than \$9.17 hour. I don't think the tonnage is there to pull that string. Then you force it to be a MRF that is built and managed by Orange County. If you set principles and then back away from it you are in trouble. We should keep it at what is acceptable to the County for their own internal policy.

Sassaman states that that tells me that we ignore the issue of living wage.

Clayton states that no, I think we should tell the county to implement it across the board then all standards are raised.

Sassaman states that that's fine and we do that by saying that this is the principle we believe in and that the county should bring their standard up to what we think is appropriate.

Vickers states that if you say that is what we believe in, basically you've said that the MRF is no longer an issue because it's not economically viable if the County goes it alone and pays a livable wage. If you compare it to market rate wages, those will be much less. You can't get a merchant facility to change their wage. If you say it's a livable wage then it's County operated and if it's County operated then it's questionable whether it's cost effective when you pay a livable wage.

Sassaman states that I don't know if we know that. Tom do you have an answer that?

Taylor clarifies Vickers question. If the county operates it's own MRF and paid the employees a livable wage would that fact alone make the MRF unviable?

Draney states that we have not finished that analysis. The analysis that we are doing is using a living wage with the county.

Clayton states that the County uses temporary labor now. When the county adds programs and need labor, enough labor is not provided and you have to use temporary labor as stopgaps.

Taylor clarifies that when employees become temporary employees of Orange County, their wage goes to \$10.00 per hour, but the County also uses contract

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
February 2, 2006
Approved March 2, 2006

temporary labor for which they pay an agency \$8.52 per hour and the employee gets \$6.50 per hour.

Clayton states that it's a holistic approach, there will be a high turnover at the MRF and they will nitpick you on the number of employees. I believe in looking at the entire picture instead of a little bit at a time.

Sassaman states that we are skating around the question. Do we want to say that the contractors that we hire must pay their employees a livable wage? This is a philosophical question.

Clayton states it is realistic to expect our staff to know if the people they contract with [pay] a livable wage. I don't think that Paper Stock Dealers or any other company will turn their books over to you to prove it. I believe that everyone should make the livable wage but I don't think we have the juice [to force others to do that.]

Vickers asks do we know what Paper Stock Dealers pays their employees where we take the paper now?

Wilson replies no. I assume they pay them as little as they can get by with.

Vickers states that we can't practically say that we require a livable wage and still be viable.

Sassaman asks then what does that do the discussion of a livable wage? It puts it in the closet and forgets about it.

Wilson states that one way to look at is a company could agree to a living wage but they will make it up somewhere else. I would hate for them to increase the pay and cut back on health and safety of the facility. There is no end to this discussion.

Sassaman states that even if you require your contractors to pay a living wage, what about the subcontractors and sub-sub contractors. Why don't we jump over the hurdle of the livable wage and look at the other principles and values associated with MRF and landfill? Let's not get hung up on this and get on with it.

There is general verbal agreement on this around the table.

Norwood asks if it would be appropriate to state in the contract that we would be allowed to visit at any time to see how the people are getting treated?

Wilson states that would be reasonable.

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
February 2, 2006
Approved March 2, 2006

Sassaman suggests that the volunteers [on the SWAB] come back to the next meeting with a draft set of principles and values given the assumption that the employees are paid a living wage and not addressing a living wage for contractors.

Clayton adds that they should focus on environmental health and safety and community relations.

Sassaman adds community issues and other environmental issues.

Pollock suggests that you could use health insurance and worker safety training in the requirements in the bidding process.

4. **Principles/Values for Selection of Landfill to Receive Orange County's Transferred Waste** Discussed with item 3.

5. **Transfer Station Planning** Wilson states that Ed Shuffler of Olver Inc. who is with one of our consulting firms and is presently performing a feasibility study regarding a transfer station at the current Eubanks Road property [is with us]. Sometime ago the Commissioners indicated that they would expect a recommendation from the SWAB on a location for a transfer station. We have an area being considered on our property on Eubanks Road and we wanted to determine whether it was feasible to construct and operate a transfer station on that site. If the answer is no we will have to enter some type of siting process to identify property in which to develop a transfer station. If the answer is yes the question then becomes is this where the SWAB wants to recommend that it be developed. At some point you will need to make that recommendation.

Shuffler [shows slides of different types of transfer stations and explains how they operate.]

Draney asks what is the payload on the trailers when they leave?

Shuffler replies roughly around 20 tons.

Draney asks if all the compaction is provided by pushing it in there?

Shuffler replies yes.

Wilson states that there are two basic methodologies for transferring waste – gravity feed where you push or load into a trailer; the other is compactor type where there is a compactor with an extruder that pushes the waste into a truck. In the last couple of decades most have gone towards the gravity feed and away from compactors.

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
February 2, 2006
Approved March 2, 2006

Shuffler states that the beauty of the gravity feed is you can use a standard trailer, you don't have any components within that can break down like you do with a compaction unit. Most facilities now use this gravity feed concept which also helps because you can't as easily overload the trailer as with the compaction equipment.

Draney asks if the trailers are opentop?

Shuffler replies yes.

Draney asks how do they off load the material?

Shuffler replies they would have a blade up front that they pull waste out or have a walking floor.

Spire states that a lot of the large landfills have a tipper where you back the trailer onto and it just tips it up.

Shuffler states that this simple system is the 'save your equipment' design. We are looking at a totally enclosed, 2-hopper facility for Orange County. The reason for this is to try and see if this fits on this site and want to make sure that it's got what you need [refers to map of transfer station on Eubanks Road]. From everything that we are seeing, we don't believe we have a problem getting this facility on this site.

Norwood states that it doesn't look like it would be easy to pull in or out of the new entrance. Will there be an entrance and exit ramp.

Shuffler states that the 100 ft buffer dictates the curvature. We are mimicking the existing curvature and widening it to a flare at the opening.

Norwood asks if a semi will be able to pull out without crossing the center line because they do cross it now.

Shuffler replies we are looking at adding a turn lane and widening the center lane, but we're not getting to that level of detail now with the planning people.

Sassaman asks what is the estimated daily tonnage through put?

Shuffler replies that we are looking at 600 tons peak per day which would average to 300 tons. The tricky part about a transfer station is where the waste is delivered.

Clayton asks what is the footprint in acreage?

Shuffler replies that he has never run that number exactly.

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
February 2, 2006
Approved March 2, 2006

Draney estimates that it's about 3 ½ to 4 acres.

Spire notes that we will encroach on the currently used vegetative waste dumping and storage area that is now used on a daily basis.

Sassaman asks about the facility's parking.

Shuffler notes that the amount of parking is dependent on where you're going to dispose waste, the distance to the landfill will determine how many trucks and trailers you need to keep on site.

Wilson states that we are going with a facility that will last about 25 years that will need two bays. It would not have made sense to build a one bay facility that might last twelve to fifteen years. I am a little uncomfortable about the constraints on the site. The property is very intensively used. We think it could function. It would help if the yard waste is located at land clearing/storm debris management facility where this wouldn't be the only place yard waste would come and take a little pressure off the high intensity space. With moving the convenience center across the road we are assuming some significant improvements. We are assuming roll offs and compactors, no front loading containers. This would be much more efficient but it costs more, so if the Commissioners only want to replicate what exists now, we will do that.

Shuffler notes that the convenience center is a one-way flow through to make it more efficient.

Pollock asks if there are any transfer stations that run both recyclables and garbage.

Shuffler replies that there is one that has a dual hopper system and one of the hoppers was used for cardboard and select loads that are placed to the side and those are loaded when there is enough to make a trailer full.

Pollock clarifies will there be space on the floor.

Shuffler says generally there will be except at peak load times.

Norwood states that as a member of the Animal Board, there are times when we need to dispose of boxes of frozen animals. How would they be disposed of with the transfer station. You don't have to worry about it with the landfill.

Wilson states that the goal now is timing the opening of the transfer station with keeping the landfill open. We would like to be able to get this designed, permitted

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
February 2, 2006
Approved March 2, 2006

and built before the landfill reaches capacity to preserve capacity for those difficult or impossible to transfer items [like dead animals].

Sassaman asks what specifically is needed from this board.

Wilson states that the Commissioners asked that the SWAB make a recommendation on the location of the transfer station. My interpretation of that is to examine this area and to determine if it will work and if so you have the option to recommend that a transfer station go here. If you are convinced that this is not the best place for it, your other recommendation would be that you do not recommend a transfer station go here and that the County initiate the process to locate another site.

Sassaman asks the Board if anyone sees a problem with that location?

Vickers states that there is no question that the transfer station will fit on the site but have you looked at the distances of where the waste is being generated opposed to the transfer station.

Wilson states that there hasn't been a scientific analysis but based on 27 years of experience this is about as good as it gets location wise. The waste generation may shift a little over time but now it is primarily Carrboro and Chapel Hill. It is also close to the interstate. The transfer station will be expensive. We can build a cheaper one and handle the waste. In our opinion we wanted a closed facility to minimize the odor, any blowing litter and so that when you travel Eubanks Road you would not see garbage. We would like to make it an asset to the committee.

Vickers asks if the cost involved to make Eubanks Rd. four lanes been considered.

Wilson states that we will not make it four lanes. There will be turning lanes.

Spire states that the only additional traffic generated will be the transfer trucks.

Sassaman states that I must raise the issue [raised] in last month's minutes. Randy Kabrick noted that in a conversation with Bill Strom it was suggested that Randy petition the County Commissioners from the Town to direct the SWAB to look at whether there might be a potential landfill in Orange County. If we petitioned the Commissioners they would probably say no. I don't know what the Town would do. I just want to remind us of this fact.

Wilson states that the transfer station that we are talking about you could buy the land and permit the landfill for the same amount.

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
February 2, 2006
Approved March 2, 2006

Sassaman asks if there is a motion regarding the transfer station? Or would you like to get a copy of the drawing and consider it for the next meeting?

Vickers states that while I have seen the option of Orange County having a transfer station in-house, is there any option to contract for a transfer station. Is there in reality any other options at all?

Wilson states that there are other transfer stations, a couple in RTP and the one in Durham. It is not practical to use one of those facilities because there will be garbage trucks going to the transfer station, which will significantly increase traffic, increase litter, the cost of fuel and the time for travel it is not practical.

Clayton states that I believe we knew it would be tight but we need to make a decision. I strongly believe we could have a landfill in this county but I know it's not going to happen. This is the site.

Norwood asks if there is a need for a bigger facility in the future what do we do about that?

Wilson states that the reason that it is this size is because we think it will last 20 to 25 years. That site will not hold a larger building.

Taylor asks how would not having a landfill or transfer station impact the interlocal agreement?

Wilson states that the interlocal agreement commits the county to provide disposal of county generated waste.

Vickers states that I agree that we should recommend to the Commissioners that we do this. My question is when do we advise each jurisdiction of our recommendation – before or after?

Wilson states that that is a good point because we don't want to get everyone excited and then the County decides to go into another direction. Another point is at what time do we tell the community? At some point we will want to have a forum to give them an opportunity to ask questions and see what we are planning.

Sassaman states that to address Al's point, the Commissioners have asked us to make a decision either way. It is my intention to direct staff to write a letter for my signature to the Board of Commissioners with copies to Mayors and Town managers. This will be informing them.

Vickers moves to endorse the concept of the transfer station at the Eubanks location.

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
February 2, 2006
Approved March 2, 2006

Vickers clarifies that we are endorsing this as the location for a transfer station in Orange County.

Clayton 2nd. I would also like to add absent a landfill.

Vickers moves that absent a landfill and the need that the Orange County needs to have a transfer station option, the SWAB endorses the use of the Eubanks location as the most logical and appropriate option for a transfer station in the county from the aspect of transportation costs.

Bowers states that that has nothing to do with this plan. What was stated is that we agree on the location and not this particular plan.

Wilson states that that is correct. You are not recommending this plan but the location.

Sassaman states that what we were told is that it is feasible to put a transfer station in that area and here is an example.

Vickers states that we can reword the motion to say the SWAB in the absence of a landfill option for Orange County has determined that is feasible to place a transfer station at the Eubanks location and it is the most appropriate location for a transfer station in the county.

Clayton 2nd

Wilson states that when you vote there are two ways to handle it. Vote on the resolution and get the last wording from the minutes and draft for Jan's signature a letter, which would go with that, and forward as indicated earlier. The other way is to prepare the resolution and the letter and bring it back and let you all endorse that specifically at the next meeting.

Sassaman states that I would prefer the latter.

Vickers states that some of the things to include in the whereases include in absence of a landfill, the transfer station design should be environmental sensitive in recognizing the need to reduce transportation costs and impacts on the community.

Vote 6-0 Passes

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
February 2, 2006
Approved March 2, 2006

6. **Rural Garbage Collection** Deferred
7. **Convenience Center/Drop-Off Center Operations** Deferred
8. **Decision Points for Solid waste Plan Development** Deferred

9. **Programs/Services Update**

Highway 57 Convenience Center Wilson states that the County has withdrawn their plan to ask the Town of Hillsborough to approve the temporary convenience center at the Public Works site. The task of looking for a permanent site has been expedited. The property owner of the existing Hwy 57 site has relented and agreed to a two-month extension of the site at it's current location and if there are no buyers has agreed to continue the two-month extension until we either move or until he has a buyer.

Waste Plan Consulting Assistance Wilson states that this is for you all to know we are going to hire someone to help us with the most complicated part of the analysis as it relates to processing flows, estimation of time and cost for primarily to do with the transfer station and some collection issues. This will expedite the work a good deal for a reasonable investment.

Sassaman asks if this is a consulting firm or a person?

Wilson replies that it is a consulting firm – RRSI. They have worked with the County before.

Hampton Pointe Recycling Center Wilson states that it is ready. There is a desire for an opening ceremony and the only two days to do it are Wednesday and Thursday. At some point it will be open for business.

Operations Center Design Wilson states that we do have a conceptual plan for the new center. I hope that I can suggest that as an agenda item for the next meeting. It hasn't gone to the Commissioners yet but I do plan to have something to show you and get your feedback.

Development of Interim Report – Solid Waste Planning Process Wilson states that unless you direct us otherwise we are going to prepare a brief interim report suitable to delivering to the three municipalities and the county to give us an update of where we are in the solid waste management plan process. It will summarize the issues we've talked about to date. It's been a while since we've had a workgroup meeting and we don't want anyone to forget that this is going on.

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
February 2, 2006
Approved March 2, 2006

Chris Wachholtz – Building Supply Recycling Center Status Wilson states that at the last meeting there was a presentation by Chris Wachholtz who was waiting for a possible approval from the Town of Hillsborough for his building supply recycling center. The Town of Hillsborough did approve it and he is proceeding forward to developing the piece of property on Orange Grove Road.

Comparative Analysis of MRF's Toured by SWAB Wilson states that at the last meeting there was a request for a comparative analysis of the two MRFs that we toured. We have provided that for you. [Distributes handout].

Sassaman suggests that this is added as an agenda item for next meeting to allow anyone to ask questions.

10. **Other Business** None

Norwood moves to adjourn

Adjourn 9:10 pm

Next meeting: March 2

Government Services, Hillsborough