

Minutes – Regular Meeting  
Solid Waste Advisory Board  
November 2, 2006  
**Approved December 7, 2006**

Attendance: Linda Bowerman, Bonnie Norwood, Randy Kabrick, Remus Smith and Jan Sassaman

Staff: Gayle Wilson, Blair Pollock, Wanda McCain, and Paul Spire

1. **Adoption of Minutes from October 5 SWAB meeting** Norwood moves to accept. Bowerman 2<sup>nd</sup>. Passes unanimously.
2. **Update to October 24 BOCC Work Session** Sassaman states that the main issue related to solid waste was the transfer station. The BOCC are very reluctant to continue any kind of waste operations on Eubanks. However they can't come up with any alternatives either. The thing that was stressed by Gayle, Blair, Rod and myself was that time is short and something needs to be done fast. Siting another location will not be easy. Gayle made the comment that it took six years to site a landfill and the end result was not to have another landfill. Eubanks is an ideal location for all the practical environmental and engineering considerations. There is sufficient buffering. It is convenient for all the municipalities. The Durham plan came up and Gayle, Blair and Rod spoke on how inappropriate using Durham would be. After further discussion the Commissioners came to the following conclusions, the Durham issue came off the table and on November 14 they would make one of three choices – locate the transfer station at Eubanks, look for an alternative location, or have a public meeting. I stated to them that the transfer station should be thought of as a different kind of neighbor than a landfill. A transfer station is a building and can be designed and built to look like whatever you want it to look like.

The other items were the solid waste management plan update, the landfill gas opportunities, solid waste operations center status report, and landfill post closure uses.

Pollock states that it was mentioned to the Commissioners, in light of some of their specific concerns, that enclosed trucks were going to drive into a building that is contained, environmentally sound, with odor control and then drive out. The other thing mentioned was the traffic issue. With the traffic from Chapel Hill Public Works and Transportation, UPS traffic, and the general increase of traffic coupled to the new development slated for Eubanks Road, the fifteen or so tractor trailers from a transfer station would not be noticeable. We feel that some of the specific things are covered in the response. There will be an eighty foot tall hill of grass between the neighborhood and the transfer station as a buffer zone. The environmental impact as a transfer station will be minimal, the odors that are experienced now will be eliminated. There are no more public [owned and operated] sanitation trucks using the road as a pass-through. But Carrboro trucks are now picking up waste in that neighborhood on their side of Rogers Road.

Smith asks if there are any requirements from the State for zoning or environmental studies.

Wilson states that typically it would not be unusual for some kind of environmental study to be done, but since this facility would be located on property that has had intensive environmental evaluation and a long history of monitoring there would be no reason to do so.

3. **Principles/Values for Selection of recyclables processing facility to Process Orange County Recyclables and for Selection of Landfill to Receive Orange County's Transferred Waste** Kabrick states that the hand-out is a compilation of ideas Jan presented several months ago and the information I presented from Retec's private clients to do private MRFs and landfills. So this is a combination of Jan's and my ideas.

Sassaman states that the objective tonight is to put this to bed. Let's look over it, discuss it and if there are no major objections we can approve it and pass it along.

[Group read over hand out and brainstorms wording for criteria]

Wilson states that we can wordsmith this and send this out in a couple of days with the revision.

Sassaman suggests voting by mail.

Wilson states that this could also help to select a transfer station, but not if we site our own.

Kabrick states that this is a guidance document for Orange County. "You want a MRF, you choose us, no NOV's ever". "Safety, keep it here because we do it right." We want to keep it here because we do it right.

Norwood asks if the transfer station were placed on Eubanks Road, what time in the morning would trucks run and how many.

Wilson states that presumable operating hours would stay the same. The number of trucks will depend on the day. On a slow day it may be ten or eleven. On a heavy day it could be fifteen or sixteen.

Spire states that it will depend on the trucking company.

Minutes – Regular Meeting  
Solid Waste Advisory Board  
November 2, 2006  
**Approved December 7, 2006**

Norwood states that it may make attractive to the commissioners to have control over the time the trucks leave from the transfer station.

Wilson states that the more control over a private company the more costly it can be. If the waste were going to Guilford County or Wake County, I would recommend doing our own hauling. If you get out fifty, sixty or seventy miles, you have to contract due to the uncertainty of needs for equipment. We would not be allowed to leave any waste on the tip floor overnight.

Bowerman asks as far as the recycle, we are not planning on having a recycling equivalent to the transfer station? I know that we talk about bringing recycling in there while it is feasible. Are we at some point, ten years down the line when it is not feasible building another recycling transfer station?

Wilson states that there could be a MRF in county but there is nowhere at the landfill to build one. The Greene Tract is off. We might be transferring recyclables from that transfer station or in some other way. But there's not going to be another facility similar to the transfer station.

Bowerman states that at some point the recyclables are going to be more than the waste it may be that doing the weird stuff with the recyclables is actually not the best choice. They are almost of equal importance as far as a transfer station goes. And we're only looking at one of those.

Wilson states that there is only room on the existing landfill property for one such facility. I see no scenario by which there would be two facilities on the same property. It's possible some time later that we would build a MRF. I don't think we will in the near future whether you recommend it or not.

Bowerman asks what about when the recycling is more of the tonnage.

Sassaman states that the waste transfer station needs to be located as closely as possible to the centroid of garbage generation. Garbage is collected by little trucks that are not geared to haul stuff long distances. Presumably a recyclables transfer station would take less of a foot print than a MRF.

Wilson states that if there were going to be no processing, probably (a lesser footprint).

Sassaman asks could we do a pre-sort?

Spire states that it depends on how the materials came in – single-stream or dual-stream.

Pollock notes that Jim Frey's study says to push 18,000 tons we need a 10,000 square foot pad.

Wilson states that with recyclables there would only be your employees or contractors coming in. With garbage there could be Mr. Jones Company in a pickup truck so there would be more allowance needed for safety.

Sassaman suggests to Gayle to distribute a revision of the criteria and everyone make any response to me, I can redact it. Once we have it and are happy with it transmit it to the Board.

- 4. Solid Waste Management Planning Process** Pollock states you have a copy of the County Board's agenda item. We've also discussed the transfer station and other issues. The other biggest thing that is going on is the rural solid waste study. We laid this out for Carrboro and the County board the various elements of the plan. There are two things that are in play right now. One is a series of requests for proposals as discussed at our last meeting. There is a draft contract from RRSI to do the four sets of proposals – what kind of MRFs would take our materials, who might take them there, what kind of equipment we might use and the use of brokers to determine if we could improve our prices received. The objective of getting the information is to inject it back in to the report to have real numbers to contrast with those used by the consultants. The time frame is to get it back is in mid-February.

The waste collection in unincorporated areas has three elements to the rural waste study – survey of people using the convenient centers – how far they travel, how often they go, etc. , cost from the [County] Public Works Department, people who use private services both commercial and residential. That is our platform from which to extrapolate the total system cost. Against that value of the current bundle of activities in rural solid waste we will look at the franchise option and a light version of “county does itself” option. Could we save money for people against the current system? Here's what it looks like in a rationalized system and do the savings, both air emissions and economic, to justify going after that.

We have our consultants looking at the notion of franchising. Franchising is a legal framework and there are a lot questions of what can you do inside the franchise, which will inform the whole process. This will also be folded into the report you will see. Those things are a few months out. Another component is how the drop-off sites and convenience centers might look in the future. Then we have to compile all these things to see how they make sense together, especially in light of wanting to get super centers v. replacing the existing centers at Walnut Grove and Highway 57. We have given an update to Carrboro and the BOCC. Our intent is to bring back an integrated package to the elected boards, the SWAB and the Solid Waste Plan Work

Group. We want elected officials not to be surprised but we also don't want to make the public feel like it's a done deal when we first present it to them.

Wilson states that absent of a request from Hillsborough or Chapel Hill for an in-person update, we will do a written update and send it to them.

Sassaman states that there should be a workgroup meeting in December and have as an item of discussion with whatever we have available. We need to do something to keep the process going even if it's just a review of where we are. How do the elected officials inform themselves of what's going on?

Wilson expresses concern that with their busy schedules they may not show up if they see it as just an update.

#### **5. Programs/Services Update**

*SW Operations Center* Wilson states that everything is going smooth. By the time of our next meeting we are hoping the bids have gone out.

*Transfer Station Planning* Previously discussed.

*Landfill Gas Study* Wilson states that the Commissioners were shown a slide show. The University option is still clearly the best option. By the middle of the month there should be a final feasibility study report and then it will come down to what the Commissioners want to do. For the University it comes down to timing.

*Highway 57 Convenience Center Site Identification* None

*Walnut Grove Convenience Center Temporary Expansion* Wilson states that the Commissioners have given the go ahead to the purchasing director to bargain with the property owner of 18 acres.

*Mixed paper to Curbside Collection Programs* Pollock states that bins will be distributed this month. All the curbside eligible households will get a bin for paper and will use their existing bin for cans and bottles. Most will get a postcard that will explain what will happen. We are hoping to see a 700 ton/year bump in recyclables. It will be interesting to see what it does to the traffic at the drop-off sites.

Sassaman asks aren't gable top cartons waxed.

Pollock states that they are no longer waxed they have a thin film plastic coating. There are four strategies for educating the public. The postcards will have a definition of mixed paper and bottles and cans and show the separation. The second strategy

Minutes – Regular Meeting  
Solid Waste Advisory Board  
November 2, 2006  
**Approved December 7, 2006**

will be the news release. Next when the bin is delivered it will have a sticker that explains mixed paper and finally a brochure also delivered with the bin.

Norwood states that the comment I've heard the most is that it's too confusing. Maybe there should be a way to educate one thing at a time.

*2007 Meeting Schedule* Wilson states that there are four of our meetings that fall on the night the Commissioners have a regular meeting or a work session. This may matter to Barry Jacobs. You may want to reschedule or consult with Barry.

Sassaman states that we should continue to do as we have in the past whereas if there was a meeting where we wanted Barry to attend we would tell him and make sure the meeting did not conflict with the BOCC meeting.

*Other* None

- 6. Other Business** Kabrick suggests that the board or staff consider changing the way the meetings are run. Having a consent agenda which would be composed of the minutes of the previous meeting and stuff for informational purpose only. There would be some information that wouldn't need to get discussed unless a member wanted to pull it for discussion. Then there would be the discussion agenda. We spend a lot of time belaboring stuff that shouldn't be belabored. This way we could focus on the meat of what we need to talk about. This would mean that the programs/services update would be written and given to the board a week before the meeting so the board could look at it and decide if they wanted to pull something.

Wilson states that it may not be possible given the workload.

Kabrick states that I am contrasting this board to the OWASA board where the discussions are much more focused and the information packet is thick but we only discuss the meat. This board needs to focus on the solid waste management plan and transfer station and everything else on this agenda is in the 'noise' at this point; it doesn't matter.

Sassaman states that one way to approach it is to have the agenda divided into things that are informational and clearly indicate the discussion and try to strict the discussion to those things that need to be discussed.

Kabrick states that items 2 and 3 are what we really needed to do today.

Sassaman states that part of the function of this board has been informational and to educate people on the board who aren't as aware as other so they can then deal with their constituents. Maybe we could set the time to spend on an item.

Minutes – Regular Meeting  
Solid Waste Advisory Board  
November 2, 2006  
**Approved December 7, 2006**

Smith agrees that a time limit should be tried.

Norwood states that if it is too focused and too tight I will not learn anything.

Kabrick states that this was just a suggestion and you we should do what is good for the group.

Sassaman states that the way the meetings have gone is to allow people to talk until they have said what they want to say unless we are pushing for time. I feel strongly that in a public meeting of this nature where we are dealing with four entities it is important for everyone to really vent.

Wilson states that Jan and I can talk about it some more and come up with something.

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

Adjourn: 9:10 pm

Next meeting: December 7, 2006  
Government Services, Hillsborough  
(subsequently changed to Southern Human Resources Center, Chapel Hill)