

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
May 7, 2009

Approved June 3, 2009

Attendance: Jan Sassaman, Bonnie Norwood, Linda Bowerman, Al Vickers, Remus Smith, Steve Yuhasz, and Doug Guild

Staff: Blair Pollock, Paul Spire, and Wanda McCain

1. **Open & Welcome** Sassaman states that before getting to the agenda items there are two pieces of housekeeping that need to be addressed. There are people here from the public that have signed up to speak. The other issue is Board member comments. That has typically been at the top of the agenda. In the past few months its use has fallen off. It seems that to continue to have this item it may be more appropriate to have it at the end of the agenda because there are some things that might come up during the meeting that may generate comments.
2. **Adoption of Minutes from March 31 and April 2 SWAB meetings**
Smith moves to accept the March 31 minutes. Norwood 2nd. Passes unanimously.
Norwood moves to accept the April 2 minutes. Bowerman 2nd. Passes unanimously
3. **Transfer Station Site Search Update** Wilson states that at the April 21st BOCC meeting there was a substantial discussion of the status of the environmental evaluations, the report on contingency plan, and some discussion on the various financial analysis on hauling that had been performed. The Board adopted the manager's recommendation to hire a law firm to be available in the event that a lawsuit resulted from the transfer station site search process. The Board directed the County manager to bring back to the BOCC the final ruling from the County Planning Department once the Planning Department received all the information from the State clearing house regarding the various environmental issues related to site 056 known as the Howell property.

There will be a work session in which the Town Councils will be invited as well as the SWAB, which will be on May 14th at 7pm at the Southern Human Services Center where there will be a broader discussion of the transfer station siting process.

One of the options in the contingency report was a temporary transfer operation on Eubanks Rd. They determined that there would not be a temporary transfer operation on Eubanks Rd. An environmental impact statement or a rough equivalent of an environmental impact statement would be performed on the Howell property. Staff was requested to speak to the Orange Grove Fire Department about fire issues related to a possible transfer station on Hwy 54.

Sassaman states that at the request of the Commissioners I made a statement on behalf of the SWAB. That is in the minutes of the BOCC meeting. It was a summary of the memo we sent to them. [passes out some copies of the statement]

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
May 7, 2009

Approved June 3, 2009

Regarding the issue of Al Vickers' transfer station resolution I would like to distribute the vote. Of seven members there were four "no"s, one abstention and two "yes"s.

Vickers states that if this is going to be distributed, distribute the request for vote also.

Audience Comments

Gary Carver of Blackwood Mountain Road states that it has been quite some time since I've attended some of your meetings. Most of you were not here the last time I was here so you may not know me. I live off Millhouse Rd. What I'd like to talk about are some facts and some methods. I have limited facts. I acknowledge I don't know if they are accurate and I don't know how true they are, however I find them quite disturbing. I find them disturbing in the fact that it pertains to Millhouse Rd. and as far as I know no one on Millhouse Rd. knows about this.

The facts as I know them are as follows: The proposed transfer station site is out on [Hwy] 54. I don't know where that is. I really don't care. All I know is what I read in the paper. There has been a lot of push back. Now it seems that there is a current that says "Let's just keep it in the neighborhood it has always been in" and that's this neighborhood. I don't live on Rogers Rd., but I am part of the neighborhood. We stood with Rogers Rd. when no one else stood with them. The groups that are standing with them now are newcomers.

I've heard that there is a little secret get together that is now proposing the waste transfer station site goes on Millhouse or somewhere thereabouts. Specifically I do not know. I have two guesses – the Blackwood property and the property adjacent to the [Town] operations center. I understand the heat that has been generated and why you would want to consider that proposal. My position is we are not saying "not in my back yard" we are saying "not in my back yard no longer". We have put up with it for 30 years. Whether it is on Millhouse or Eubanks it is still the same neighborhood. We consider ourselves pretty close to Rogers Rd. and we consider ourselves closer to Eubanks. I don't know if the proposal is an official one and I don't know where it stands, I do know enough that it is spreading around and I take it at this point to be true. If you want to deny those rumors now is the time to do it. I've also heard that the Mayor [of Chapel Hill], which we can't vote for or against, has held his meetings with the group from Rogers Rd. and trying to divide and conquer. He wants the Rogers Rd. group to say OK to put it on Millhouse, it's not really Rogers Rd. so why don't you join us and come out and say this is a great idea. It is not a great idea. It is no better on Millhouse than it is on Eubanks.

To give you some background, a long, long time ago there were no landfills on Eubanks Rd. It was shoved down their throat because it was the neighborhood that had no say. People want to deny that but that is the truth. Not too long ago when the first part of the landfill started to fill up there was a proposal for a new landfill so they

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
May 7, 2009
Approved June 3, 2009

did a county wide search just like for the transfer station and looked at many sites and came up with 16 sites. They went through a long process of many months and about one month before they decided to vote on it all of a sudden site 17 was added to the list. Site 17 was on the Blackwood property. Everyone thought that was a great idea. It didn't quite work out that way. That was dropped and we went to the waste transfer sties. The promise was always made not on Eubanks Rd. Now we come back to the full circle.

Let me talk about the method. I find it extremely underhanded that I only learned about this tonight. I find it extremely underhanded that they have said nothing, as far as I know, to anybody on Millhouse Rd. This divide and conquer is not the way to go. That is poor. I don't know the facts. Does anybody care to tell me the facts? I also find it strange going to meetings for 20 years it is always a one-way discussion. Whoever is on these boards don't like to talk to the public. We get to stand up here and say our little speall but the people on the board don't like to answer questions. Can you tell me if this is fact or fiction? Am I invited to the meeting tomorrow?

Sassaman states that you know more than I do. The issue of Millhouse Rd. is not on our table.

Carver asks, "Do you know about it?"

Bowerman states that I know of one group that has mentioned putting it on Millhouse. I know that when it was brought up with me I said they are the same people they have it next to us. I consider myself part of the same neighborhood and I've always had an issue with the fact that we are divided into three with a third of being in Carrboro, a third being in Chapel Hill or to be annexed by Chapel Hill and a third being County, never to be annexed by anyone, so that we never act as an entire group. Besides that I can't tell you what will happen. I've just heard people mention it and they are not people in power.

Carver states that Mr. Foy is in power. Is this a process that is going to go forward?

Sassaman states that whatever might happen, the issue of the siting of a waste transfer station is not our agenda. It is the responsibility of the BOCC. They have not delegated that to us. We have made some recommendations of where we think our good sites and bad sites are in the past. The whole issue of siting is not our responsibility.

Carver states that I accept that and I understand that. At the same time I would say you certainly had inputs to the BOCC and I take it that Chapel Hill and Carrboro and in that perspective you've had more say than I do. In fact if you live in Chapel Hill or

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
May 7, 2009
Approved June 3, 2009

Carrboro you have a lot more say than I do. I cannot vote for him. We are in no-mans land.

My summary is we consider this one in the same as Eubanks Rd. If the position is 'not on Eubanks Rd.' then the position should also be 'not on Millhouse Rd.' One more point that I find a little extremely disturbing, Site 17 was the Blackwood property. That property was in that family since 1750. It was a land grant from the King of England to the Blackwood family. Mrs. Blackwood owned that property and she considered it a legacy worth fighting for. It wound up that her only choice with that property was to sell it to the County. No one else was interested because of the history and background of the landfill being in that area. I also find it quite unusual that this now surfaces with a few weeks after Mrs. Blackwood dies. They made promises to her about the use of that property and it wasn't for a waste transfer station and it wasn't for a landfill. Once again we come to a point where promises were made.

Smith asks where is the Blackwood property.

Carver states that it is across the railroad tracks around the curve and it's the red brick house that sets on the corner. The property extends to the back of the landfill. It is a tempting and wonderful site. The County owns it, they don't have to buy it, it's there, it's next to the existing landfill; the temptation is tremendous. That does not make it right.

Sassaman suggests to Mr. Carver to communicate at the appropriate time to the BOCC. They are the body that makes the decision.

Bonnie Hauser states speaking on behalf of Orange County Voice I would like to first thank Al Vickers and BJ Tipton for having the courage to stand behind their principles and speak out against the waste transfer station in Bingham [Township]. That is what the citizens of Orange County expect from this Board – principled stands.

I also wanted to clarify I know that Commissioner Yuhasz is new to the board, but I think that it is really important that he clarify when he is speaking for himself and when he is speaking for the Board. When he spoke about vendors as alternatives at the meeting on the 31st he was not speaking for the Board, at least that is what I've heard from other Board members.

We were surprised that after two long work sessions with this board and after your deliberation and your vote that the resolutions that were discussed by this board were not presented to the BOCC. There was no notification to the public about a change. The citizens of Orange County expect this board to represent their interest in an open and transparent manner. We were very displeased at the resolutions presented. One

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
May 7, 2009
Approved June 3, 2009

of the things that this board discussed was not to endorse the report from Olver, which in fact you ended up doing.

I am curious if anyone has read the report from Olver. Could anyone answer why there are two different volume projections in that report? Did anyone know that UNC's waste volume was used as part of the vendor cost estimates? That would overstate the cost by at least \$4 million. Did anyone confirm the assumptions given by the Towns were assumptions used by Olver? We have confirmed that they were not. Did anyone look at Olver's use of fuel [cost] estimates of \$2/gallon? Does anyone think that \$2/gallon for diesel is reasonable estimate for 2011 fuel prices?

This is all in addition to some good work that was in this meeting and it wasn't an issue until this board changed its mind and decided to endorse the report that I can't image that the professionals on this board looked at and reviewed. I know that the report was reissued after your resolution was written. Collectively from what we could tell, it's hard to tell because the reports are pretty confusing, the errors underestimate the cost for Bingham by a lot, they overestimate the cost for vendors by at least \$10 million, probably more like \$12 to \$15 million, and the report fails to reasonably depict how much more it will cost to build and operate a facility in Bingham Township than it will to build and operate a facility that is kept closer to town.

Now this board has been invited to an important work session. The reason the work session has been requested was because the Board was given a pile of reports from Olver and the reports had contradictory points in it and they didn't understand what was going on. They really want to know the facts. This board has been invited so how can you help the Board?

We would say what are the real options for a waste transfer station for this county and one is, and I think there is some agreement, that the best option would be a smaller site that is closer to town and Eubanks Rd. is not that site.

I think that everybody agrees that a Bingham site commits every taxpayer in this county to 20 years of excess costs, bad service and environmental risks. I think that we all agree that if we are stuck that vendors are a reasonable interim option. It has not been discussed, but I wonder if there isn't another good option to end the interlocal agreement. That was a great idea for managing the landfill but maybe it is time to let the Towns go on their own. Clearly Hillsborough is well on its path to using vendors for three-quarters of its waste. Even with all the distortions in the report it was cheaper for Hillsborough to use vendors. Maybe Hillsborough should go out on its own. Maybe this county doesn't need a waste transfer station to serve the whole county.

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
May 7, 2009

Approved June 3, 2009

Another thing that hasn't been discussed is when you put all the costs together do the Towns know how much more a waste transfer station in Bingham or anywhere will cost over the cost of using the current landfill. That is assuming all the recycling subsidies are taken out. What are the real costs to tip garbage into this landfill versus a waste transfer station? I'm guessing it is roughly double. You the Solid Waste Advisory Board your job is to represent the citizens we are not sure that we were properly served in this last board meeting. You are being asked to serve the board as experts to the Board we would ask please let the Board and the Town leaders know the truth in what their real options are for solid waste management.

Robert Campbell states I found out about a meeting that was to take place last Friday. I found out about it Wednesday evening. Thursday morning I called the Town of Chapel Hill to see what the meeting was about. The mayor of the Town of Chapel Hill had called some of the members that was on the [Rogers Road] Small Area Task Force and invited them to come to a meeting Friday morning. The proposed site on Millhouse Rd. was the subject of discussion about placing a transfer station on Millhouse Rd. Millhouse Rd. is a part of the Rogers-Eubanks neighborhood community. We have always said "no" to a transfer station and "no" to expanding the landfill operation.

Whether you know about this meeting or whether you know this to be true or not, today I get a phone call there is going to be another meeting tomorrow at 3pm down by the Chapel Hill Operations Center to walk over the land that is the proposed site. If you have any true interest in not being a part of this you should be there tomorrow at 3pm to walk with Mayor Foy of the Town of Chapel Hill and those that will gather together to walk over this property. You have an opportunity to voice your opinion for or against but don't be kept in the dark or don't pretend to be kept in the dark about what is happening on Eubanks Rd.

The operation of this landfill has gone on for 30+ years. I know that there are voices that say we have to put it somewhere but there was a site that was proposed by UNC and the people that are developing Carolina North, they put that piece of property out there when they thought they were going to put an airport on 54. You probably haven't heard this being discussed but it has been. Why put it on Eubanks Rd. when you can put it on Carolina North. They have acres they are not going to develop in 50 years. It is not an appropriate thing to put out here. You are already dealing with the UPS trucks, school buses, the Town Operations Center and their trucks and vehicles, Solid Waste and Recycling, and the Transit buses how are you going to control the eighteen wheelers that will coming down Eubanks and Millhouse Rd. There is enough congestion out here already. The people in this community have endured the operations of municipal facilities too long. I know that the County is talking about hiring a lawyer in case there may be some litigation but there will be some more litigation. It is time to start looking at the humanity side of things and not the

Approved June 3, 2009

economic part of it. Too long has the community suffered. It is time to be responsible. We need to learn how to handle our trash more. We need to have the human side of what all this is doing to the ecosystem out here and the lives that depend on it. Where is the future for the community out here if we are going to keep being impacted by the operations of the solid waste facilities. It is time for us to begin to do the right thing.

I know of the many times that I have spoken to the different boards and spoken here. I know you hear me but are you hearing what I'm saying. Enough is enough. There are other ways of dealing with our waste and there are other ways of dealing with the situation we have here. We can either find something we can all work together with or we can work in our own way to come up with a solution to the pollution this operation has caused this community.

Guild states that this is the first I've heard any of the information and it is a little surprising. Steve if I may ask has there been any communication from the Board to the Town of Chapel Hill about assisting with the selection of a site.

Yuhasz states that there hasn't been any communication that he is aware of from Chapel Hill to the BOCC on a site. Rev. Campbell has said that there is a meeting. That is a meeting that I was not aware of.

Norwood asks Steve if this board went to the BOCC and said "Don't you dare", what impact would it really have? The paper I have here says the ultimate site selection is the responsibility of the Commissioners. What I'm really asking is how much power do we really have. I think there is an assumption that we have more and if we have more I'd like to play with it. But I'm not aware we have any.

Yuhasz states that at the risk of speaking for the Board, I believe the BOCC listens to all the comments and all the groups that speak to it. I think the BOCC looks at SWAB as a technical advisory board. To the extent that recommendations are technical in nature, I think the BOCC gives great weight to those recommendations. I think that those that are not technical, but rather political I think the Commissioners are likely to give less weight to that recommendation.

Norwood clarifies if we are going with our guts and following the public and the residents here, that is not going to carry any weight. We would have to come up with a technical reason why as a board [we would oppose the site].

Yuhasz states that as a board that is probably true. As an individual [or] a non-technical recommendation yours would be given as much weight as every other citizen.

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
May 7, 2009
Approved June 3, 2009

Bowerman asks Steve is the Rogers Rd. community viewed as a small community by the Commissioners or is it larger out Millhouse way. I know the people that live in the area have one way they look at things but I'm not sure it is shared by those in the county.

Yuhasz states that a lot of this that we are talking about predates my participation and knowledge so I can only speak by hearsay. It is my understanding that at some point in the past there was a definition of the historic Rogers Rd. community created to which all parties agreed. Whether Millhouse is or is not a part of that I don't know.

Vickers states that there was a report that talked about that issue not too long ago. It defined the Rogers Rd. community as those landowners that had been there from the 60's or something like that. It was a period of people that had continued residents on the property not newcomers to the area. It surprised me that it was somewhat split. This was in a Carrboro report and how they were dealing with the sewer assistance.

Norwood states that if it is allowed, Rev. Campbell can tell you what areas were included.

Campbell states that when the discussions began in the 90s about all the different 16 sites and during the land[fill]owners group and neighborhood association group work groups we identified what the Rogers – Eubanks community was to be and what it is. All the way from Billabong to New Jericho Rd. and part of the Blackwood Mountain area up to the Emerson Waldorf School was put into that section. When they began to talk about the water and sewer and the cost it was all the way over to Allen's Barbecue. That was part of the area that was considered as being the historic Rogers –Eubanks community. It has never changed. The only thing that changed is when they came back and [former] Commissioner Carey headed up the Enhancement Taskforce they redefined an area for enhancing the Rogers Rd. neighborhood. Even at that time we said “You cannot leave out the other area. We are one community and have always been a community even when it was farmland and they were using it to cut down timber to use the wood to make houses in this area. “

Sassaman states I've got one question for staff or whomever, that Rev. Campbell mentioned something about the University offering a site, which is new to me. The only person that I've heard suggest that the UNC North property might be a good place for a waste transfer station is myself. Despite the fact that I live less than a mile from that property that has a lot of appeal to me because it meets all of what I think are the key criteria of being close to the waste centroid, transportation routes and where the garbage is but that is the first time I've heard anybody other than myself say that. Do any of you know anything about it?

Approved June 3, 2009

Yuhasz states that in the five months serving as a Commissioner I have not heard any suggestion from the University that that would be a place to site a transfer station or any other facility.

Hauser states that in some transient comment Caroline Efland had mentioned the notion of Carolina North being used for a plasma gasification facility in the long term. So it would seem to me if they would be open to a waste-to-energy facility they might be interested in a waste transfer station as a phase one. Just a comment.

Yuhasz states that as part of the parallel tract effort made there were overtures made to the University for cooperation on waste-to-energy and I'm sure there would have been discussions about potential for siting a waste transfer station at that property. I think if that was a viable suggestion we would have heard about it by now.

4. Solid Waste Department Budget Update Wilson states that it has been a tough year for all departments. We have all had to submit a budget with 10% reduction from the budget that was approved for this year. (*Hands out draft budget to be presented to the manager*) In the Sanitation Division some possible budget reductions could be:

- Miscellaneous cuts in the amount of \$92,000.
- Free dump permits be eliminated.
- Mattresses no longer accepted at the SWCCs. We are suggesting that when people buy new mattress they have the old ones hauled away by the company they purchased the new one from or find a way to get them to the landfill themselves.
- Closing one of the SWCCs- Bradshaw Quarry Rd. It is the least used and doesn't have the full array of our services. It is a very small site with no opportunity to expand.
- Closing all the SWCCs on Thursday, Wednesday (as is currently done), and Sunday and close an hour early all other times. That would be a savings of \$120,000. Users may not like it and the Board may not like it, you can't save without cutting costs. The BOCC will determine what will 'give'.

For the non-Sanitation budget of the enterprise fund possible budget cuts of \$400,000 are:

- Eliminate interns including one we've had since 1990.
- Reduced materials like stone for maintenance.
- Cut back on training, but no specific programs were eliminated.

Norwood states that regarding cutting the hours for the SWCC is the last hour of the day the least used time or is it from 7 - 8 in the morning.

Wilson states that usually the last hour of the day is the slowest.

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
May 7, 2009
Approved June 3, 2009

Vickers states that item 2 says to delay work on the solid waste management plan, is that feasible?

Wilson states that it is feasible. The State will just have to understand.

Vickers states that rural recycling is twice a month, is there any consideration of doing that in the Towns.

Wilson states that it has been discussed. It has not been pursued or recommended for a number of reasons. The urban residents have had recycling a lot longer than the rural residents. On a household basis it is a lot cheaper. Going to every other week in the urban areas the result would be not people holding their stuff for two weeks but taking it to the drop-off sites and we would be over burdened at the drop-off sites. We would be shifting the expense and materials from curbside to the drop-off sites.

Norwood states that there are some people that receive [handicapped] special service where a separate truck goes to the house to get the materials, do you all still do that and would it be more cost-effective if the driver of the regular truck just picked it up.

Wilson states that the Town used to have a special truck get the garbage depending on the situation. Regarding the recycling in the urban area it is serviced by a contractor and they are doing it the most efficient way. I don't think there is any money to be saved there.

Pollock states that they don't charge any extra for that service. It is a flat fee per household.

Yuhasz asks on the elimination of the permit distribution and the mattress acceptance do you have any guess of how much that would increase illegal dumping? And how much illegal dumping there is now.

Wilson states that I have a notion that there is less illegal dumping than there has ever been. A combination of expanded enforcement, general awareness and little reluctance from the public if it is seen and due to expansion of the towns there are fewer good places to dump. We scout those more frequently. Regarding the mattresses and elimination of permits, [it] could result in illegal dumping. I suspect that at first there could be a brief period of illegal dumping because they can't get a permit or they're protesting. But illegal dumping is a hard way to get rid of waste on a regular basis, so eventually they're going to do whatever they have to do.

Spire states that 25% was counted for large loads being redistributed back into the convenience centers through the process of education that the public would know you couldn't bring an over flowing pickup but only a regular load and still dispose of it at

the convenience centers. Some would reduce the size of their load and go once a week instead of every other week.

Wilson adds there has been some abuse of the permit system. They say they need three loads when they need one and let someone else use their permit.

5. Programs/Services Update

Joint Landfill Gas Recovery Project Spire states that the project is moving forward on a fairly fast track. We have received the first preliminary draft of the installation and made our comments back to UNC. There is another meeting next Monday with UNC staff, architects, and engineers to go over the second draft that shows the proposed installation on the landfill. Once the proposed piping is agreed upon we will move on to the permitting and construction. This will hook the gas wells on the north and south sides together and getting them to a flare station on the south side of the road. Once we agree on the piping route, we will proceed on the permitting on that. There have been some good discussions between us and the Town to get the pipeline down to Homestead Road and Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. and the duct bank down to Carolina North from there.

Smith clarifies that it will transport gas to Carolina North. What will they do with it once it gets there?

Spire states that from the gen[erator] set there will be a substation and UNC is in the process of getting permission to put what they call a duct bank of high voltage power transmission line down to Carolina North where it is currently located. It is 1,000 kilowatts to be generated.

Smith asks if we are furnishing gas that they will use to make steam to generate electricity.

Spire states that they are not looking to generate the steam yet. They are looking specifically at the generation of electricity. There has been talk about capturing the exhaust heat and doing some work with that in the local facilities that may be built around that area. It is a reciprocating engine, not a gas turbine. The generator will be at the old Duke Power facility at Homestead Road and Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.

Norwood states that with the way the world has changed recently there is a concern for security. What security measures will be on site to prevent tampering? Fences, cameras?

Spire states that this site will be heavily fenced where no one could get into it. It has multiple backup systems where it will be on an auto-dialer. If it 'hiccups; and shuts

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
May 7, 2009

Approved June 3, 2009

down someone will have to come and restart it. This is not a new approach, it will serve us well as a community. UNC and we feel comfortable with it.

Norwood states that it should be in writing how long it would take for this person to show up and how many backups are to that person if something happens.

Spire states that if something happens the system shuts down and stops. It will have a control panel that can be read on site and off site. If the flare for the gas now shuts down, the blower automatically shuts down.

Sassaman states that the system in the transportation of the gas will be similar to the residential gas system throughout Chapel Hill with the possible exception that it is going to be lower pressure and the gas coming out of the landfill will have a lower thermal energy.

Yuhasz asks won't all those questions be asked during the permitting process.

Spire concurs.

Sassaman states that there are certain safety standards that are required.

Norwood states that previously living next door to the largest natural gas pumping station on the east coast it went 'boom.' No matter what the checks and balances are, my reason for going through all this is because I do live here, a lot of the people are afraid of the gas, they don't understand it and we all have stories of things going wrong. What I'm asking (especially since the Town of Chapel Hill is involved) they tell us nothing and do what they please I was hoping that we might have some control or with our commissioner here, so that neighbors know what's going on and someone in the neighborhood to be notified if something happens - something to reassure us that we are not just going to go boom.

Spire states that as the plans develop we will share them with you. As staff I don't have anything to do with what UNC does with the Town of Chapel Hill. I take faith that UNC and the Town of Chapel Hill will do whatever is required to make sure it is safe on that end. We can make sure through our engineer that whatever is put in on our end is the highest quality and the safest system out there. I don't think they can go forward without that.

Landfill Construction Activity Spire states that we have started refilling the last outer slopes of the landfill. We are on the southeast corner of the landfill. This will gain approximately six to seven months of life for the landfill. We have built back out to the permitted grade. We have had the landfill [topography] flown again to verify the expansion that the consultants say we have gained.

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
May 7, 2009
Approved June 3, 2009

Norwood points out that the smell is obvious when this is being done.

Spire states that we're putting garbage on top of garbage and then we recover it with daily cover to reduce odor but we are trying to make the landfill last as long as we can.

Yuhasz asks Paul what has the extended life done to increase the probability that we will actually get a transfer station built in time.

Spire states that the only thing I can say is that we are putting as much trash in that hole as we possibly can. We are maximizing our compaction with our new [heavier] compactor. We're making more space through, for example recycling 2,000 mattresses from UNC. Without standing the slopes up we would not have made it. Making it on time will depend on acquiring the land and getting the design and permitting done.

Best Paper Recycling Community Award – American Forest & Paper Association Pollock states that we won the national best community paper recycling award from the American Forest & Paper Association. There is a short film that highlights the program – www.afandpa.org . There were 126 submittals so it was very competitive. One of the things we tried to point out was the ubiquitous nature of recycling in our county and that it is an expectation that everywhere you go it is going to be available. We are particularly proud that we have had 22 years of good support from the public.

Compost Bins Sales Pollock states that we have been selling compost bins at cost for the last eight years. We have an opportunity to consider selling the bins for \$10 over cost and recovering some of our other costs and still provide them at about half the standard retail cost. I don't know how much the demand will change if we went from \$40 to \$50.

Norwood states that not knowing what you intend to add to what we recycle but if the public were told it would cost \$5 or \$10 more for the compost bins and the money would go towards a specific project might make people happy.

Sassaman asks would it make sense to try it for six months or a year to see.

Pollock replies a pilot might make sense.

Solid Waste Plan Work Group Pollock states that the work group has not been that active since the last meeting since December, the transfer station issue and the budget have taken all the solid waste [staff] attention. We do feel it will be time to get back to the business of solid waste management plan. What we are doing right now is finishing up phone conversations with our consultant RRSI to bring us a

Approved June 3, 2009

comprehensive financial model. The model would encompass the landfill/transfer station to the recycling programs, sanitation budget and administration, which are our four divisions. The financial model would give us a chance to look at a lot of 'what if' scenarios. What happens if MSW tons decline to 40,000 or rise to 60,000. What happens if we introduce a commercial recycling program with the attendant 3-R fee, shifting waste from the garbage can to the recycling bin?

Our timetable is to have staff review the model in June and be able to bring that as a live working item to the work group in August or September. We are hoping to use this final piece as a tool to advise the commissioners and the public what are some of the options going forward. As a couple of concrete examples, should the Sanitation budget continue to be part of the general fund or what are the other opportunities to use availability fees, pay as you throw, are they feasible, should they be phased in? The commercial recycling is another key issue; that's where the last semi low-hanging fruit is. That is limited now and the model would help us define the implications of expanding it before we do the detailed planning. We hope to bring you that as a working tool, familiarize the SWAB and work group with the tool, and use the tool to give you some scenarios to give you options to bring back to the BOCC – Commercial recycling, transfer station, Sanitation Division.

Vickers asks will it also include the franchising piece?

Pollock states that the notion of franchising to either simply rural residents or including rural non-residential solid waste collection or it could possibly include commercial solid waste collection, that set of sub-options dealing with solid waste [franchising] , not recycling, definitely will be part of the decision making package.

Other -- None

6. Board Member Comments

Norwood asks if the needle guards for diabetics are recyclable?

Guild states that when I was talking about the plasma [arc] units I said I would bring in a tile. I have that. It is made of the waste slag that comes out of the bottom. The two byproducts [of plasma arc waste reduction] are syn[thetic] gas and the slag. The slag is totally inert and very dense. The company is Integrated Environmental Technologies. Inentech if you want to look it up.

Sassaman states that while visiting family in England, they have a very interesting disposal arrangement. Everything that comes out of their house goes into one of two bins [roll carts]. Wet waste-- any food product, paper towels, meat scraps – goes into bin A. Everything else goes into the other bin – bottles, cans, pieces of plastic etc.

Minutes - Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
May 7, 2009

Approved June 3, 2009

My understanding was that everything in A gets composted and everything in bin B goes through a recycling operation. That is throughout London. Both are picked up once a week. It's not quite as hot there. They do use a small bucket with a little pad of newspaper under it to absorb the odors. It works well.

7. Other Business - None

Vickers moves to adjourn. Guild 2nd.

Adjourn: 9:10 pm

Next meeting: June 4, 2009
Solid Waste Administration Bldg.