

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
November 10, 2010

Approved December 8, 2010

Attendance: Jan Sassaman, Al Vickers, Remus Smith, Steve Yuhasz, Jim Ward and BJ Tipton

Staff: Gayle Wilson, Blair Pollock Paul Spire, Cody Marshall, Jane Cousins and Wanda McCain

Audience: Bonnie Hauser, Stan Cheren

1. **Opening and Welcome** Sassaman states that over the years this board has operated in an informal manner. In the past few months the meetings tend to get longer and there is a lot of overlap and circular discussion. There are some down sides to this informality. I would like to propose for the next few meetings to try a more formal process. In watching how the Chapel Hill Town Council and the County Board of Commissioners hold their meetings I would like to have some sort of middle ground that is a bit more structured for all involved but also allows a degree of flexibility for input from all parties.

Following what is typically item 2 on the agenda, adoption of minutes -- at that point I would like to invite any comments from the public. Starting next month the public will need to sign up before the meeting [for us] to get a feel of how many people want to talk. One of the benefits of this is that it will allow us to hear the concerns of the citizens before we have our discussion.

That leaves the question of later on when there are other individual items that may be of significant interest to the public. I encourage the public to talk about those issues in the beginning. However there will be situations where it might be appropriate for dialog between the SWAB and the public when the actual issue is brought up. Such a discussion will be at the discretion of the Chair. If the SWAB members or staff wishes to hear from the public on a specific item I ask that a note or something be given to the Chair to indicate that.

Finally for us we've gotten in the habit of jumping in to speak at the same time. I will try to go around the table and hear first from the SWAB members so that we talk in turn.

We will try this for a few meetings and you all can get back to me with any comments.

2. **Adoption of Minutes from October 13th SWAB meeting** Smith moves to accept. Vickers 2nd. Passes unanimously.

3. **New Boards and Commissions Policy – Development of Annual Work Plan**
Sassaman states that the BOCC has asked each of the County boards to come up with

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
November 10, 2010

Approved December 8, 2010

what the boards have done over the past year and what they are planning to do in the coming year. You received in your packet the form that should be filled out. I took the liberty of filling it out and am bringing it to you as a draft for your comments and or approval.

Smith states that regarding the last item there have been more people interested about the hours and days the convenience centers are open. This board will not take any kind of action on that but I will write a note to the Commissioners that a lot of folks in Hillsborough feel very strong about that.

Sassaman states that another way to get at that is for you to ask Gayle to get it on the agenda.

Yuhasz states that I will take Remus' comment under advisement

Wilson states that the SWAB hasn't taken a position on that but as part of the Work Group a fairly substantial expansion of hours and days have been recommended as part of the solid waste convenience centers recommendation that is going to the BOCC. There has been a strong statement but it is from the Work Group which includes the SWAB but the SWAB hasn't made a separate resolution.

Ward states that regarding the last question there are things that we are working on that are concerns and emerging issues. I suggest instead of saying "none identified at this time" say "see work plan".

Sassaman suggests adding the "SWAB considers the revisions or consideration of the interlocal agreement of prime importance for 2011."

Pollock states that where you talk about the solid waste plan issues associated with finalizing the plan I wanted to make clear that as soon as this one is done, we have the 2012 version to work on. Beginning work in January 2011 may get us done by 2012.

Where you indicate under other resources "none identified at this time", it was a bit of a stretch in terms of the budget to bring only Dr. Circeo here in the spring and if you address the alternative technologies in the same way as last time and foot the bill for each person that wants to come talk to us, that's a lot. There haven't been any resources identified for that. But a precedent was set and now we'll need to decide whether we want to continue it or break it. There may be 3 to 6 of these people so we need to be clear about how we are going to address this evaluation of alternative technologies as we get into whatever evaluation of alternatives means and whether 'other resources' includes money for travel and so on.

Approved December 8, 2010

Sassaman states that I was aware of that and left that "none identified at this time" because of trying to struggle with item 4 on the agenda. There are so many things that trickle down into that one issue. Technically there isn't anything identified at this time but if we do anything we will need help.

Pollock states that the concern is if this gets to be a draft through the end of the month before we have to actually submit something to the BOCC and discussing item 4 we flesh out and identify those needs as this gets transformed into a final document.

Sassaman asks Steve how much do you all want fleshed out. I can put a dollar amount on it.

Yuhasz states that it is probably important to identify that serious evaluation might require some commitment of financial resources.

Pollock states that the last thing that I have is the third bullet under "evaluation of alternative means to handle solid waste disposal issues for the county". That could be the umbrella for any specifics we might discuss, but in terms of some of the specifics, as the role of the SWAB has evolved over the years, it used to be a primarily staff role for example to discuss things like 'what materials we'll take on next' or adding a second bin. They have become more items for SWAB discussion in terms of those kinds of policy matters v. operational details. I don't know if we want to continue in this sort of wide open manner that every time there is a consideration for expanding a particular program or new materials, does that continue to be SWAB business or we want to explicitly make that staff business. Somehow make a line about specifics of recycling being for staff business. Does the SWAB want to continue to discuss these type things or leave it primarily to the staff to add those opportunities when they come up to move towards the overarching goal of 61%.

Sassaman states that that is referring to item 4 on the agenda tonight. I tried to keep it generic. Regarding your comment about the alternative technologies and other resources, that was addressed actually under funding impacts – minimal unless additional technical resources are needed to evaluate solid waste disposal issues. [On this later matter] if you as staff bring it to us for support or tweaking we will discuss it; if you don't bring those things to us, you don't hear from us.

Coming back to talk of alternative technologies and other resources, there has been enough changes in this that what I'd like to do is make the changes and send it out to you all to bless it.

Ward states that on the bottom of the first page Remus mentioned that the expansion of hours it says the SWAB has not given recommendations to the Commissioners with respect to the solid waste convenience centers. Then Gayle said this board has not.

Approved December 8, 2010

You mention on the second page at the top the solid waste county wide convenience centers development and operation leading to Work Group recommendation so it sounds like that shouldn't be there if in fact it didn't come from SWAB.

Sassaman states that everything on these bullets came right from the agendas. I went through every agenda.

Ward states that not needing an answer now but what is the SWAB recommendation for solid waste convenience centers in terms of upgrades and hours. What did this board end up saying?

Wilson states that there is a final report that will probably be discussed and presented to the BOCC next week at the work session.

- 4. Development of Timeline and Framework of Evaluation of Alternative Methods to Landfill Disposal** Sassaman states that I have struggled with how we are going to deal with this. You should have a copy of the resolution that was made last December by the BOCC. I tried to come up with a straw man schedule and it looked to me that if we devoted all our time and energy to dealing with this issue, we might come up with some recommendation in a year. I put together with Gayle's help all the questions and talking points I could come up with. I would like to take some time to go through some of the talking points and hear from the public.

Wilson states that the portion of the December motion from the BOCC when they made their transfer station decision is fairly wide open – *establish a timeline and frame work for a process to evaluate alternative methods for solid waste disposal*. The guidance is to make sure they are environmentally sensitive, socially responsible, cost effective and multi-jurisdictional. There are innumerable technologies that have been under development for a number of years and that remain currently under development.

Depending on whom you talk to, a mixture of vendors, salesmen, entrepreneurs and academics there own version is the best. If the universe is open for evaluation and examination by this group there isn't a prayer to finish that work in a year. In some fashion you will need to develop some type of criteria and with the vague guidance from the BOCC you will essentially have to develop that criteria yourself in order to make the evaluation systematic. Additionally I am not aware of anyone on staff or a SWAB member that has the level of technological expertise and knowledge to be able to provide a technological and economic environmental evaluation of these technologies. Jan, Steve and I have made a list of issues that we can talk about. Somehow the scope of the task will have to be narrowed to make it doable.

The direction includes multi-jurisdictional across county lines. The SWAB and staff have little stature or persuasion to go to county managers or chairs of county

Approved December 8, 2010

commissioners and try to inquire and get some response to whether they are interested in some type of as yet ill-defined technological methodology to handle their waste. What is missing from here is to confer with the University to see what if any and what fashion interest they might have. The SWAB has a fairly big challenge in trying to figure out how to appropriately and in a timely manner respond to this assignment from the BOCC.

As a reminder the BOCC obtained the services of a technical consultant about two years ago who was asked to provide a preliminary analysis of available technologies to handle waste that might be suitable for Orange County waste stream and situation circumstances. I don't recall a substantive discussion of this report. It is also unclear what this [report] didn't answer that the Board now wants answered.

Yuhasz states that in reading the resolution and thinking back on the process that we went through to get to that resolution, the City of Durham solution was identified as an intermediate solution, a 3-5 year solution. The thrust of the charge to the SWAB was in response to the BOCC's overall dissatisfaction with the way the process that got us to making the decision we had to make on that was unsatisfactory. As I read this now maybe the charge to the SWAB is smaller than what we are thinking about here. It is not so much to do the evaluation but to provide specifically what it says a "timeline and framework for public process". How is it that we can create a new process or a different process that will allow us to have a longer term solution when this intermediate solution with the City of Durham expires? That is a smaller task. Exactly what that framework is and the timeline is obvious we want a solution before the 3-5 years with Durham runs out. That process is going to be difficult but the SWAB has the experience of going through the previous process and see possibly where some of the difficulties were and the possibility of creating a different process that will hopefully lead us to if not a better solution a more readily acceptable solution.

Sassaman invites the public to speak.

Hauser states that understanding the predicament having sat through all those Commissioner meetings I would suggest that the problem that you have is that you are not trying to solve the problem. Right now the question is how to define the problem. That is the struggle that I hear. The thing that I know for sure is that Durham and Chatham have exactly the same problem that we have. We are having lunch tomorrow with a bunch of people in Chatham County because we are going to start the fight against the landfill project. I've heard that Durham is interested in "incineration", which is the term they use for waste-to-energy. I don't know anything more than that but it would be a good start to just as you know Greensboro is shutting down their waste transfer station and looking at alternatives as well. Is it possible to at least start by just meeting with these other communities and say "what

Approved December 8, 2010

are you thinking, what are you looking at, what's practical"? I also know that if you go see UNC, Ray Dubose his staff has a great deal of knowledge of waste-to-energy. They are really high on the RDF technology, not so high on plasma but there is a great resource there. It could be fun just to talk to them and start feeding back to the Commissioners what is happening in our marketplace.

Notes: Following this statement by Bonnie Hauser at the meeting about Durham's interest in incineration, staff contacted the staff at City of Durham and based on information provided by Donald Long, Durham Solid Waste Director, the issue of incineration has not, to his knowledge been addressed by Durham.

The staff also contacted City of Greensboro to respond to Bonnie Hauser's statement that they are planning to close their transfer station and based on information provided by Jeryl Covington, Greensboro Environmental Services Director, Greensboro is not considering closing their waste transfer station.

Vickers states that the real issue that hasn't been resolved is the political issue in the Towns and the BOCC of making a decision that someone will dislike. As long as there is the position that everybody has to be on board 100%, you will not get there. We may study it more and not make a decision. That is where I see us going.

Tipton states that to reiterate what Steve said, the task is defining the public process, the timeline and framework of the public process. John Stevens with the School of Government is a great resource for public input discussions. If you want to talk about the process I don't think the first thing to focus on is the technology report that is there or talking to the other counties, but it's to think about what is the process. That seems like what is being tasked as we think about things whether it is a transfer station or waste-to-energy or whatever it is; what's the process we are going to use to engage the public and evaluate. This board knows a lot about waste and we've been party to public process, but I don't think we are experts on how to design public process input.

Smith states that in the beginning I thought it was the function of this board and staff to find out what is available. I don't know about disposing of garbage other than what Gayle Wilson tells me. To me we need to know how Hillsborough feels, what they want to do and what they are going to do. What are Carrboro, Chapel Hill and the University going to do? Do we know that Durham County will take our refuse as is? Is that not the answer to our 3-5 year program? We solve 5 years then get into all the goodies that we need to get into. We are going to have to do something for the next 18 months. I think Hillsborough will go along with what this board decides. To me we need to solve a short-term problem before getting into a long-term problem.

Approved December 8, 2010

Sassaman states that that is sort of an operational issue at Gayle's level and also in part a political issue at the level of the individual towns. As near as I can understand the consensus of the Towns for the interim is to go along with the Durham option. That is an intermediary issue and there are a lot of things that fall out from that, one of which is the interlocal agreement. Specifically what we do and how we handle our waste as individual entities in the short term, in the medium term and in the long term are really tied part-and-parcel with that interlocal agreement. One of my problems of dealing with these is that we need to wrestle with, as a community, the issues associated with the interlocal agreement.

Ward states that my understanding is that Chapel Hill, Carrboro and Hillsborough have ceded responsibility for handling solid waste to the County. Is that generally correct? It was the County's decision to direct things to Durham. My feeling is that Chapel Hill gave up that responsibility and if we are looking for what to do after that agreement, then depending if the County has the prerogative to ask the Towns what they want or not. If they want us to be part of the conversation, then fine I think we would. What BJ said is a great suggestion to get either Orange County bring in those kinds of people to help us figure out what kind of public process will help us synthesize the technical information and synthesize the public input, so that at the end of the day, the public officials will make a decision and not just pass the buck for another 3-5 years. I can see the County doing that on its own or the County and the Municipalities having that conversation with the resources that BJ identified and or others. The SWAB has a role to play too because most members of the Chapel Hill Town Council don't have very much feel for this issue, the history and I think the SWAB can help guide the discussions with the additional experience the elected officials around this table have and the staff that is here.

I agree with Al. I see unless we get some help this issue is going to be just as contentious as it was a year ago.

Vickers states that we went through the technology reviews and it came down to transferring our waste to a solid waste landfill was the only economic alternative [based just] on dollars for communities the size of Chapel Hill etc. without a huge investment and high risk investment in any alternate technology. If we go through the study again I don't see any reason to expect we won't come to the same place. Is it really looking at the technology an issue or is it really the decision that we are going to buy a more expensive technology because we can't make a decision politically that is acceptable to everybody or are we going to stay with going to Durham or even a Waste Management as the next option?

Sassaman asked, what would another technology assessment show us if we keep the criteria of economics and risk, that won't change.

Approved December 8, 2010

Wilson states that being a part of the six plus year landfill site search process after it was done there was some academic evaluation of the process and it was determined that that process was text book and could not have been any better. But we didn't get a landfill because we didn't get a decision. The process just finished with the transfer station search probably wouldn't be considered an ideal process and one unusual aspect of the process was the BOCC were sitting as a committee as a whole as the search committee. Starting out it sounded good but a decision wasn't reached there either. The point is you can only rely on process so much. At some point it comes down to decision-making. Regardless of what other process that you all develop at the end someone will have to make a decision. Finding an alternative technology through a unanimous decision won't happen either.

Tipton asks wouldn't the process identify how decisions are going to being made. Whose responsibility? If there is citizen input, is it a vote? Is it information? Where does the decision making lie? That is one thing that needs to be crystal clear. What is the purpose of citizen input? Who are the decision makers? That has to be part of the process design. I understand that we already have information. I do think that it is something that this county is going to continue to struggle with. It is tough spending time on process. How do we decide is the ultimate decision.

Sassaman states that process is a very good thing and important but has to be coupled with results. Where we are chasing our tail is that [that] entity [that] has assumed the mantel of making the decisions is not making a decision.

Yuhasz states that it is clear that under the current interlocal agreement it is the BOCC to make the decisions as to how solid waste is handled in the county. The question is, "Is that appropriate going forward or do we need to look at some other decision making mechanism that we could provide through a different interlocal agreement?" Part of what Jim said is that the municipalities would like to be engaged and I think we would like to have the municipalities more closely engaged in this decision making process, because it effects municipalities more than the unincorporated parts of the county. That needs to be built into the process what side of the interlocal agreement considerations does that come on. Or we decide on a new interlocal agreement and have that process in that decision inform what the interlocal agreement looks like or do we work on an interlocal agreement first and then have that interlocal agreement determine what the process for making decision should look like. I don't have the answer to that and I think that is part of what the Board is looking for recommendations on – how that fits together.

Ward states that the County needs to make the first step because it's their baby right now. What I hear you saying is "Yes we want the towns involved I think there should be an invitation extended by the BOCC to the towns and University which would be a great addition to the conversation. The 3-5 year decision horizon is a great basis to

Approved December 8, 2010

structure a new interlocal agreement. Not that one comes before the other this is necessitating a new agreement.

Pollock states that it's unclear about our collective capacity to do both of these fairly large tasks at once. The conversation started out to develop the timeline for the process for evaluating technologies, but it is becoming clear that especially based on what Jim just said that developing the interlocal agreement and honing it has to come first so we have a framework for doing the work inside of. Maybe there is a certain sense of urgency so unlike the previous one it doesn't take 18 months to craft. We do have a platform or something to push against. We have a limited amount of time until the landfill closes.

On the technology piece, backstopping what GBB stated in its 2008 report, none of the other technologies is mature yet, has arrived, is sound. So we need to be real about that and these are some of the best solid waste minds in the country saying you can do things for \$500 a ton but not \$50 or \$60 or \$70 a ton that incineration might cost. We should not be deceived in thinking that there is some kind of thing in our future to make the problem go away. To pose an approach: let's get the ball rolling on developing whatever crux there has to be for an interlocal [agreement] and if at the same time the BOCC were to give this group clear direction that the Board is going to lead interlocal process perhaps the SWAB will be directed to design the process for technology review so it's waiting when until the IA gets out of the gate.

Spire states that the 3-5 year time frame sounds like when the landfill closes in three to five years, everything will be solved. It takes 2- 3 years to locate any type of facility unless we nail down some very good direction before we get to the 3-5 year timeframe the 3-5 year becomes a 5-7 year. We need to figure out who the players are and how much will be committed so we need the interlocal agreement and it has to be done in a fairly short timeframe.

Sassaman states that one thing that may get the County and the municipalities to deal with this is to plate it off in small chunks. One thing that hangs out in the interlocal agreement is making sure of two things -- that the municipalities participate in the temporary Durham option and second that there is a mechanism to finance closure of the landfill.

Wilson notes we have cash for closure, but not necessarily all the problems we might have post-closure.

Sassaman continues that it seems that one option is to come up with a memorandum of understanding between the municipalities and the Commissioners that would serve as a codicil or amendment or appendix to the current interlocal agreement. The memorandum of understanding would confirm the issues of dealing with the

Approved December 8, 2010

municipal garbage going to Durham, whatever issues associated with financing might arise, a commitment or reexamination to the interlocal agreement with a timeframe within the next 3-5 years. It could also set a limit on how long people are committed to taking material to Durham and some conditions there and agree to funding or the actual process for post-Durham planning. We talk about not having enough garbage in Orange County to make things economically viable so the first thing to think about is multi-jurisdiction solutions. There is a lot of difficulty there. If there is a multi-jurisdictional incinerator where would you put the beast? If we can't get a landfill in Orange County it would be hard to put an incinerator here. If there were one in Orange County how willing would the residents be to accept and handle the garbage from some other county? If there were an incinerator in southern Chatham County we would need a transfer station. Those things will have to be dealt with. What we can do is make a recommendation along these lines that we encourage the electeds to come up with a memorandum of understanding that addresses the issues that need to be addressed now and to come up with a process with addressing those issues that need to be decided in the next 3-5 years.

Tipton states that I like the idea of a memorandum of understanding. You said a lot. I would suggest chunking some things together. First steps could be dealing with if we are going to Durham and are they all going to agree. The second thing is commitment to planning and then a commitment to reevaluating the interlocal agreement. Two other things were process and the post-closure of the landfill. That should be kept separate.

Vickers states that the planning piece of it is do we look at another mechanism of managing solid waste in the county other than having the Solid Waste Department, such as an authority. One of the issues is politically the bodies are very difficult to make any decisions directly because everybody that's making those decisions is directly facing election. Can you insulate these decisions from political heat?

Smith asks what tonnage does the University generate and what do they do with theirs.

Tipton replies the University landfills about 5,500 tons using the Waste Industries' transfer station in Durham.

The other thing I want to ask Al is are you saying instead of a new interlocal agreement that there might be a recommendation from this [not yet formed] "working group" to create a solid waste authority.

Vickers states that the interlocal agreement should have, as part of the evaluation among the parties, about what it would mean and how they would go that route [towards an authority]. It is going to be a political decision in the end whether you go

Approved December 8, 2010

to an authority or not but you need to how the bones [would be] fleshed out to what it would mean and the details so people would know what they are addressing. It is still not a perfect solution. It seems that there is a paralysis at the end of the process and that will still be there no matter what we do.

Wilson states that the 3-5 years will go by quickly. In five years there should be something ready by then, not finished talking about it by then. Whether you can accomplish it or not you need to show a timeframe.

Tipton asks what do you mean by "something ready".

Wilson replies something more permanent and long-term other than hauling to Durham. The BOCC resolution states clearly that it's going to be technological solution that will not involve landfilling. Long long term that's obvious but with Randolph County deciding to build a landfill and should Chatham build a landfill that will drive the cost of disposal down and will make the technology alternatives less competitive long-term. This economic malaise may last a long time too. I'm not sure we should take the most economic alternative off the table. There are a lot of dynamics going on. If Durham can get a lower disposal cost, they are not going to build an incinerator for \$100 a ton if they can reduce their tipping fee five dollars. We are not isolated in Orange County and can afford to look independently at these other things. Greensboro has not made a decision to close their transfer station and if they can transfer to Randolph County rather than where they are going now that will substantially reduce their transportation cost.

Ward states that one thing that hasn't been brought up is the discussions among the Hillsborough Board of creating a waste-to-energy site of their own. It hasn't gotten the attention of many people.

Yuhasz states that there have been rumors to that effect, but not that it would be the Town of Hillsborough but a private entity that would be creating within Hillsborough's area of influence. I don't know how far along the discussions are on that. I've heard it mentioned as part of a larger eco-park development. If that were to happen that would provide a solution to a situation that we hadn't contemplated, but I don't want to count on a private firm finding a way to economically convert trash to anything without seeing a lot better numbers than anything that I've seen presented in this venue.

Sassaman states that as we get closer to wrapping this up, where do you all want to go with this?

Approved December 8, 2010

Yuhasz states that whether or not we get a formal recommendation from the SWAB on this, the essence of what I'm hearing here is the process is we need to get the jurisdictions to talk and the time line is 'hurry'.

Sassaman asks can you carry this to the commissioners.

Yuhasz states that I will take that on myself to communicate to the commissioners that the SWAB feels there is a need to get the jurisdictions to talk. It is really up to the jurisdictions to get together and figure out how they want to go about talking about this. I agree with Jim that the Commissioners should take the lead on that.

Hauser states that an option that we never get to is the option of a public-private partnership. Regardless of whether Hillsborough does their thing or not, the concept is still a sound one where you get a private entity to come in, economic development is important in this county, do an eco-industrial park and they take on all the risks and get the tax benefits. There are \$50/ton solutions available like that.

The second question is our going forward solution only a trash solution or are we going to look at all the waste streams in this county like sewage sludge or medical waste.

Sassaman states that those things should be negotiated in the interlocal agreement.

5. Programs/Services Update

a. *Staff Government Visit to Albemarle County, VA* Wilson states that on Sunday a group of county department heads along with two assistant managers and the county manger are going to Albemarle County, VA to have an exchange. We will examine how they do things and exchange information. At some point in the future we will invite some of the key staff from Albemarle County down and show them how we do things in Orange County. An interesting thing about Albemarle County is they essentially have no solid waste role – an authority operates there. I would like to know how the authority was formed.

b. *Removal of plastics recycling container at Hampton Pointe Recycling site due to contamination* Pollock states that as of this Friday we will be removing the container for the rigid plastics from the Hampton Pointe site in Hillsborough. The program started last February. We have been reasonably successful at reducing contamination. The staffed sites are down below 10% and the unstaffed sites are generally 20% except for the site in Hillsborough. Despite sending nasty grams to people whose garbage is found with their names on it and stepped up patrols the last two loads were well above 50% material we didn't want. We don't expect this to have a negative impact on the tonnage but a positive impact on the productivity and will keep the plastics containers at the other nine sites.

Approved December 8, 2010

Marshall states that a small correction regarding the loads of contamination it has been since the end of the summer that the loads have continually gotten worse. It has been a long process in trying to make it better with newspaper ads and letters to people.

Ward asks what is particular or unique about this location.

Marshall replies that we don't know. It's mind boggling because that site is normally the cleanest site. There is a bottles and cans container right beside the plastics container and it doesn't get any of the trash.

Ward asks are there cameras.

Marshall states that it has been discussed.

Yuhasz asks if there is concern once the purple containers are removed that trash will then be placed into the other containers.

Marshall states that that has been considered and all the blue containers that have similar windows that are for just bottles and cans we are putting in metal bars across so that you can only dump smaller items. We will also keep a close eye on the site along with more advertising and education. There wasn't a problem there in the past.

Yuhasz asks are you able to tell what days garbage is being dumped.

Marshall replies we have noticed that Mondays are worse. Cardboard is picked up on Sundays and the drivers noticed that Sunday nights were popular.

Wilson states that we haven't abandoned the idea of cameras. Depending on our mid-year budget reconciliation if there are funds available we may suggest to the manager to buy some cameras.

Tipton asks did you consider putting the bars on the purple container.

Marshall replies yes but the rigid plastics can't fit through the bars.

c. Visit of Chinese delegation from Duke to view electronics recycling program Pollock states that a group of Chinese national bureaucrats come to Duke to take some environmental training and they have hooked up with us because our electronics recycling recovery program is highly regarded. They will be coming on Friday as part of their semester long training.

Approved December 8, 2010

d. *Opening of compost demonstration site here/first workshop* Pollock states that there has been a compost demonstration site at the community center in Chapel Hill. We've tried other sites such as different schools around the county and the agricultural extension office in Hillsborough and it hadn't worked out. They haven't worked out so we opened our own. The first workshop was last Saturday and was our best attended in the ten years that they have been done.

e. *Other* Wilson states that you all should have received the upcoming year's meeting schedule which maintains the existing Wednesday schedule.

Next week on the 18th the BOCC is having a work session and one of the items on is a presentation of the solid waste convenience center recommendation from the Work Group and an update on various elements of the December 2009 motion that we talked about earlier.

6. **Board Member Comments** Tipton states that I think that you all just posted a new electronic newsletter. I would like to suggest that you send the SWAB members a notice of it.

Sassaman states that he visited the [recycling] drop-off site behind A Southern Seasons and it is nice and clean.

7. **Other Business** – None

Smith moves to adjourn.

Vickers 2nd.

Adjourn 8:55 pm

Next meeting: December 8, 2010