

Minutes Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
November 9, 2011
Approved January 11, 2012

Attendance: Jan Sassaman, B.J. Tipton, Al Vickers, Remus Smith, Stan Cheren, Steve Yuhasz

Staff: Gayle Wilson, Paul Spire, Cody Marshall, Farouk Banna, Jane Cousins, Wanda McCain, and Mary Carlson

Audience: Bonnie Hauser, Carly Perrin and Robert Campbell

1. **Opening & Welcome** Tipton introduces Carly Perrin as her supervisor. Sassaman states that he and the rest of the SWAB board appreciate the University's involvement in SWAB even though they are not a signatory on the inter-local agreement and do not have a vote. The University's involvement has been important and really helpful.
2. **Adoption of Minutes from October 12, 2011, SWAB meeting:** Smith moves to adopt. Vickers seconds; passes unanimously.

Cheren asks when the minutes are posted to the website, as June 2011 minutes were the most recent he could see.

McCain states the minutes should be posted within a day or two of approval.

Wilson states that while there was no meeting in July, August on should be posted, and he and McCain will discuss with Muriel Williman a posting process that ensures minutes are posted within a few days at most of approval.

3. **Public Comment Period:** Hauser prepared a typed transcript of her comments. These are below in their entirety.

My name is Bonnie Hauser and I am speaking for Orange County Voice.

My comments pertain to your agenda item regarding single stream recycling – a program that we support for most town residents and the convenience centers since it should reduce hauling costs and may reduce waste to the landfill. As we've already told you, roll carts present problems with homes that have long gravel driveways or roads.

Tonight we ask that you support us as we seek a change in policy for the curbside recycling program for residents in the unincorporated part of the county. We are asking that the program be changed from a mandatory to a voluntary program which complies with North Carolina Statute.

Minutes Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
November 9, 2011
Approved January 11, 2012

According to UNC's School of Government, the county has no legal authority to operate a mandatory collection program which imposes a fee on residents in the county. I quote:

“If a county provides solid waste hauling or collection services it may assess a fee on all individuals or entities that contract with the county to provide the collection services. A county may not force its residents to use its (or any other) solid waste collection services.”

The towns do have the authority to operate a mandatory program and can delegate that authority to the county.

We've been told that the county has a legal opinion to support the current program. However the basis for that opinion was challenged in 2006 in Durham in a case regarding impact fees. In that case (http://www.impactfees.com/caselaw_pdf/20060606_impactfees.pdf), the court's analysis makes clear that G.S. 153A-102 does not provide authority for a county to impose mandatory recycling fees.

We will provide this documentation to Wanda and to the county's attorneys. You may know that other counties have looked at Orange County's program and agree that it does not comply with North Carolina Statute.

Please don't misinterpret this as opposing recycling. As you know, rural residents recycle heavily using the convenience centers – which collect over 40% of the county's recyclables – vs. 33% from the urban curbside and 15% from the rural curbside program. The county convenience centers are not only the cheapest – but the most widely used recycling program in the county.

So as you upgrade the curbside recycling program, please shift to a voluntary program. We will help promote the policy change. We realize that some users will opt out.

You might also consider shifting the voluntary program to whatever schedule and fee that you set for the towns.

As you solicit bids for single stream recycling in the towns, we encourage you to consider inviting the vendors to take over the program in the unincorporated parts of the county – and the recycling transfer operations. Also to provide all the bins – which presumably work best with the vendor's equipment.

Outsourcing the entire recycling operation could avoid \$2 million in capital costs over the next 2 years - without impacting service. Vendors could even be asked to take the county staff and guarantee employment for at least 5 years – at their current rate of compensation.

Thank you for hearing our comments. I will forward our comments to the commissioners and the county manager. We hope that you will support our request for this policy change.

- 4. Presentation on Planning for Conversion to Single Stream for Curbside Collection and other Recycling Programs:** Marshall states that he'd like to discuss the timeline, highlight the major points of the memo, answer questions and concerns, and then take a look at the sample recycling carts he has brought in, and explain why it will be more efficient and other details. In December, we will update the Commissioners.

Single stream means that the bottles, cans, and all fiber are going to end up in one container and we will sell it as one commodity to one of the regional MRF's (a materials recovery facility). There are several options there—ReCommunity in Greensboro, Sonoco in Durham and Waste Management in Raleigh.

All programs will move to single-stream recycling, including commercial, multi-family, urban and rural curbside, drop-off programs and schools, but the urban curbside collection will be the most noticeable change to citizens because they are going to get new carts, and their schedule will change (in some cases, drastically according to day).

Right now, government buildings are left out, because they have clean office paper, and it is still questionable if it makes sense for us to bring that back here and bale it and sell it for a better price for extra revenue compared to the extra manpower needed to bale it. That will be decided before everything is moved to single stream.

As of July 1, 2012, everything in urban curbside will move to single stream. We will put out an RFP for the collections for the municipalities. Waste Industries does it now, but their contract is up in 2012 so it marries well with our transition. We will have the RFP include a cost with carts provided by the hauler and the county owning them, leasing them or owning carts after a period of time. We will then compare that to the cost of the county purchasing carts directly from the cart company, either through piggyback options or not. The cart prices depend primarily on resin prices, but the full cost per cart includes the cost of the cart, the distribution and assembly. The piggyback option is where we might be able to add on to another order from a larger city and qualify for lower bulk prices. For instance, Asheville is one option—they are going through an RFP process now, and will buy around 28,000 carts, while we are only going to buy around 19,000, but by piggybacking onto their order, we would get a much better price.

Minutes Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
November 9, 2011
Approved January 11, 2012

Hopefully in February we would bring a decision to the Commissioners as to who will provide collection and acquire carts at that time. Then in March through June, we would work through the re-routes with the hauler. Because of all the efficiencies in single-stream, it will take less time to do each route. Waste Industries, for example, currently has four trucks on the road, but will possibly be able to go to three trucks, and each truck would be able to stay on route the entire time instead of coming here to dump and then returning to the route.

Then starting in April and May, Blair Pollock and Muriel Williman will be doing all of the public relations—newspaper ads, postcards, newsletters, updates on the monthly listserv, as much information as possible.

The company will come in mid-June to assemble and deliver carts to individual driveways. That will take two to three weeks. Then, hopefully in July we will start the service; primarily the new urban service. All the rural residents can then start putting all their materials in one bin. It won't affect them as much. In July through December, we will be fine-tuning everything, from malfunctioned carts to routes with issues such as alleys. On our property, we may face issues such as how to service missed collections. Right now, we can put a bin in a pickup and take care of missed service within 24 hours, but we may need a collection truck for carts.

The reasoning for single-stream is that the most expensive part of recycling is hauling. This includes the trucks, the people and the fuel. Urban efficiencies in the route will be reflected in the contracted cost from our hauler. On the rural routes we won't find as many efficiency changes, but we will be able to run routes quicker which will lead to benefits. There will also be increases in participation and overall volume since the message is clearer to people and the carts are larger and easier to move. Around the country after a move to single-stream there is usually a spike in participation and collection, some as high as 15% increase in volume. Local cities such as Asheville, Cary and Durham experienced high increases as well. Since we already have good participation in our area, we may not see the same high increase, but we should see some increase in volume.

Another great benefit is that we will only have a single area on our property to maintain and for trucks to unload. Currently, trucks use 40-yard dumpsters to dump paper, and then go to another section to dump all the bottles and cans. It will be a quicker turnaround for all the trucks. Also, we have hook trucks that currently take all our paper to Raleigh and tractor trailers that take bottles and cans to Greensboro. With single-stream, we will take the consolidated materials in tractor trailers to one market, and will have better payloads. We have about 8-10 tons of bottles and cans now, and when we add paper, we hope to get to 15 tons per trip, which is a great efficiency in our hauling.

Minutes Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
November 9, 2011
Approved January 11, 2012

With the cost savings from the decreased urban curbside hauling contract, we plan to buy the carts. That cost savings will be determined by the cost of the hauling and the cost of the carts. With that savings, we will pay the carts off in five or six years.

In the rural, commercial and multi-family programs we currently have trucks that are separated in half, so that the back side collects paper and the front side collects bottles and cans. Currently on a route, bottles and cans might fill completely up, but only half of the paper space is used. The driver would then have to come back to our property to dump the truck, and then return to the route.

In single-stream, we will let the hauler choose whether to buy a semi-automated or fully automated truck based on the characteristics of our area, such as alleys, tight streets, and side street parking. In a semi-automated truck, the driver hooks the cart to the side of the truck and it tips into the truck. There is compaction that occurs during the route, so there is much less air space. In our current trucks for rural or multi-family, we are getting a maximum of three tons in a load. With the truck we tested on rural, multi-family and commercial routes, we ended up with six tons in the load, and it was not completely full. A fully automated truck picks up the cart and dumps it into the back, and there is also compaction.

We have not yet decided on the cart size, and we can discuss the differences. Our office is recommending a 95-gallon cart. There is also a 65-gallon cart. If we decide at some point in the future to go every other week, there would be enough room in the larger cart for people to go two weeks. Concord recently bought the 65-gallon carts for their every other week service, and found the carts were not large enough. The difference in price is between \$3-4.

In addition to using the cost savings from efficiencies to purchase carts, we are also going to apply for a \$75,000 grant from the State to purchase carts for curbside recycling. One stipulation of the grant is that the carts have RFID chips.

A RFID chip is a small unnoticeable chip, either in the lid or handle of the cart. It reads to a computer on the truck and can track participation and set-out rates. It will also help us find low participation areas so we can target our outreach to those specific areas. Additionally, the RFID chip is tied to a specific address, so if the cart is misplaced it will be much easier to find.

The footprint of both carts is about the same—the larger carts are a little taller and rounder on top.

Vickers states that the larger carts will not go through a 28” door. Carrboro has the 95-gallon carts for waste, and they will only go through 30” or larger doors. For the urban area, the smaller one should definitely be considered.

Minutes Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
November 9, 2011
Approved January 11, 2012

Marshall states that a final decision has not been made, and both cart sizes are options. One reason for the larger cart choice is that many households are recycling more cardboard at the curb, and a 65-gallon cart often cannot hold even the 10 cardboard box maximum (folded 3' x 3') currently acceptable for curbside recycling, whereas the 95-gallon cart has additional room even after the cardboard is placed inside. If we wanted to offer recycling of more materials at the curb, such as rigid plastics, in the future, the larger cart would allow for that.

Sassaman states that a key issue with size is the likelihood that we would slip into a bi-weekly collection. With a lot of cardboard, the smaller container would probably get critical after two weeks.

Marshall states that that is exactly what Concord found. There is volume increase simply because it is easier in one container, which is why we are recommending the larger cart.

Vickers states that like San Francisco, we could give residents the option of what size cart to have.

Wilson states that that is difficult because individuals may change their minds and it leads to frequent substitutions.

Vickers states that in Carrboro residents purchase their waste cart and this could be no different.

Wilson states that then if the cart breaks, the residents would then have to repair them.

Spire states that cart shapes are variable, and can be addressed in the RFP so that a larger cart might be taller and less round in order to fit through a 28" door.

Vickers states that new housing has less room to store such carts. Also, most residents with large amounts of cardboard can use one of the 24-hour drop-off sites or convenience center, as that is more convenient than folding for curbside recycling. The large carts may be easier for hauling, but not for customers.

Marshall states that ultimately, the decision is based on what the customers do want, and that is why discussion is needed. Throughout the urban curbside route, people complain that they should not have to drive to recycle cardboard if there is curbside recycling. There are a lot of houses where a 65-gallon cart would work fine, but there are some residents who currently use more than the 2 bins, and have large amounts of cardboard every week since they buy products on the internet.

Communities that have different size options are suggesting that we not. Durham offers 35-, 65- or 95-gallon carts, and the 35-gallon cart is definitely too small and light.

Minutes Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
November 9, 2011
Approved January 11, 2012

Vickers states that another option would be to have a certain size cart be offered free by the county, but allow residents the option to buy smaller compatible carts if they would prefer.

Marshall states that that might be difficult due to the semi-automated trucks being able to only pick up specific cart sizes.

Sassaman asks if cart color has been thought through. Recycling carts need to be a distinct color in order to avoid cross-contamination of materials, while not being so distinctive that they detract from the landscape.

Wilson states that before making a recommendation to the board, opinions on two key points—primarily size, and secondarily color, would be helpful. Based on our extensive discussions with other communities and makers and dealers of roll-carts there is an almost universal consensus on the direction we should go with regard to size, , , whatever the public wants is fine with us, although we would strongly recommend against multiple sizes.

Smith states that he would be in favor of a larger can with bi-weekly pick-up.

Sassaman states he would vote for the larger size to allow for bi-weekly pick-up if it becomes a necessity. A non-garish color that is distinctive from garbage carts is important.

Wilson states that some communities are having different color lids for garbage and recycling, so there are multiple ways to deal with the situation.

Marshall states that lids might be helpful in rural areas, because some streets have both rural and urban service due to annexing.

Vickers states that Carrboro currently uses an automated cart for trash pickup, except for seniors that cannot wheel a roll-cart down to the edge of the driveway. Then, the driver walks up to get the cart.

Marshall states that the handicap curbside recycling service currently in place will be the same. Whether a resident wants bins or a cart will be discussed, but the driver will use the same truck, and walk up to the house as done now.

Our trucks currently in use for rural areas cannot accommodate carts, so we will continue to use bins. Two trucks in use for rural routes and a back-up truck are overdue for replacement, so in 2013 and 2014 when we need to replace these trucks, we will purchase trucks that can use carts, and then begin using carts in some rural areas. We will audit areas, and in places where there are private roads or steep driveways, bins may remain. Other rural areas, such as Churton Grove in Hillsborough, are extremely dense, and carts

Minutes Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
November 9, 2011
Approved January 11, 2012

would make sense. Finding efficiencies in the rural route will also allow us to expand services slightly.

Vickers asks if many families would fill up the 95-gallon cart in a week.

Marshall replies that he sees many families that could, especially if cardboard and rigid plastics are included. In our current program, many would fill it up halfway, but several could fill it completely. Driving through the routes, several people have five or six 18-gallon bins.

Wilson states that if collection day is Friday, and a resident takes a longer weekend and misses collection, the larger cart gives flexibility until the next week. The added flexibility of a larger cart allows not only for that, but also for the possibility of adding more materials. We do not want to have to buy larger carts later, and if the carts are not used to capacity initially, that's OK. If the cost spread were greater, it would become more of a financial issue, but for \$3-4 more, there is 30% more capacity. It's not a cost issue, but a matter of personal preference.

Cheren asks what the approximate cart cost is.

Marshall states that the cost varies across the State, but Charlotte bought 65-gallon carts for \$38, and Raleigh bought carts for \$42. Mount Airy purchased their carts for \$58.

Cheren asks how long the carts will last.

Marshall replies that there is a 10-year warranty.

Cheren asks if the carts are mobile if completely loaded.

Marshall replies that often carts at businesses weigh 300-400 pounds and are still moveable.

Hauser asks why the vendors would not provide the carts.

Marshall replies that is a possibility. Often, the vendors' price is much more expensive--\$70 per cart, instead of \$38.

Hauser asks why it is not built into the rate.

Wilson states that we will bid it as an option, explore piggyback possibilities, and directly bid for carts, then procure the carts according to what is least expensive.

We also plan to go to each municipality and give a presentation and answer any potential questions.

Sassaman states that speaking for Chapel Hill, he is thankful for the change to single-stream.

Yuhasz asks if we have considered the problem of storing the carts for residents with restrictive covenants.

Wilson states that they are not intending to add new rules, but are planning on incorporating current rules.

5. **Walnut Grove Church Road Convenience Center Conceptual Design and Planning Update:** Wilson states that the GIS map shows that the conceptual design will eliminate the need for the leased property that part of the convenience center is now located on, and save that cost. Expansion would occur solely on the county's property. There is a stream that would need to be worked around.

The public information meeting was held on October 24, 2011, and nine county residents attended and asked questions and gave comments. We plan to meet with the Board of County Commissioners on December 5, 2011 and inform the Board of comments and how we will proceed. We hope to have authorization at that time for detailed design and bidding, and then in February, the Commissioners would approve and award a bid for construction. We hope to have this site running by July 2012. It will depend on the bidding process, weather for construction and other factors.

We have considered some changes based on comments. The new entrance will be on the county's property, and the exit will remain where it is currently. The most common activity done at a site is MSW (garbage). In the new plan, after entering the site there are two compactors and room for four cars at the hopper at one time. There is a long queuing area so that traffic would not be onto the road. If you entered but did not have MSW, instead had scrap metal, you could bypass the MSW compactors altogether and go where you needed to.

This is a two-level site. One grade is for customers to put material into the roll-off boxes over a 42 inch railing (that is an OSHA requirement). There are also areas for yard waste, white goods, and bulky items. A similar grade exists on the other side where rigid plastics and other materials can be disposed of. There is a loading dock, and we will utilize a baler to bale plastic film at this site. The site has flexibility, which allows for increased services in the future. Also incorporated in our basic plan are some additional programs and services. There are areas for standard motor oil and filters, but we will also add cooking oil. Next to that, we will initiate a residential food waste program, with an enhanced service schedule.

There will be electronics trailers as we have now, but an important service that will begin is household hazardous waste. This will become the HHW collection center for northern

Minutes Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
November 9, 2011
Approved January 11, 2012

Orange County. That will contain any of the current materials we take at our present HHW site.

There is an attendant's building where he or she would oversee the back portion of the site. Around and on the way out is a single-stream recycling compactor and a cardboard compactor. There is a second attendant's shed and this attendant will operate the compacting mechanism.

We also have a separate area with a slightly expanded salvage shed. At some point in the near future, we will add some residential building materials, primarily wood, for use in home projects. We don't want to begin a full-scale C&D salvage operation, but are considering dimensional lumber and plywood to be incorporated into the existing salvage area.

We will also begin taking used clothes and shoes in textile receptacles. The new services are textiles, plastic film, HHW, food waste and cooking oil. At some point in the future, we would like to offer mulch and compost for residential use, so there is an area where a skid steer could navigate.

None of the sites have bathrooms or running water. We would like to explore the possibility of a single, small restroom. If there is not a suitable septic field, in conjunction with the Environmental Health we will determine some alternative means.

This is fairly close to the intersection of HWY 86 and Walnut Church Road. We have looked at having a single entrance at one side or in the middle, and it really impedes traffic flow on the site. Ultimately, DOT will influence that decision; we have a meeting scheduled with DOT soon and we have already had preliminary phone discussions with them, but will continue to discuss ways to make this area safer, and if we have to convert to a single entrance we will make it work as best we can. The circulation pattern works much better with a separate entrance and exit.

Smith asks how many vehicles use the site per day.

Wilson states that there are specific counts by hour, not only residential, but also service trucks--this is the second-busiest site. It is approximately 130,000 visits a year. Speaking of service trucks, they will no longer need to comingle with residential vehicles at this site, which has been a major safety issue in the past.

Sassaman states that it seems similar to the previous design, but with comments addressed, such as moving the white goods area.

Wilson replies that is true. Also a physical divider at the entrance was suggested, so there is now a small island.

Minutes Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
November 9, 2011
Approved January 11, 2012

Marshall asks if the dumpsters can be switched.

Wilson states that except for the compactors which have to be placed where wired, there is great flexibility, and the other containers can be shifted as needed.

Vickers asks if the roll-off containers are a similar size.

Wilson responds that this site allows for 40-yard containers, as opposed to the 20-yard containers at the current site.

Hauser asks if a traffic signal could be installed.

Wilson states they will discuss that with the DOT, but the BOCC will determine what they believe to be best, and will make requests to DOT.

Hauser states that at peak periods, the center is packed, and lines are a continuing concern.

Spire replies that the site is much larger, and the queuing line is dramatically longer. Residents coming in for recycling will not stop the flow as it happens now.

Hauser asks if there will continue to be long lines for the two compactors.

Spire replies that the new site will allow for lines to move much faster. The new flow will not have the anticipated back-ups the current site has.

Wilson states that four cars can use the MSW at one time. Currently, if a residents stops their car at a bin, it may stay parked there while the resident goes to the salvage shed or another area altogether. One of the reasons we think this will work is that the staff have toured dozens of convenience centers, held discussions and received photographs of several different sites across the country that have been successful. In following best practices, this is the modern theme, but if we do encounter problems, we will make adjustments as needed. This layout and flow should be very helpful once residents become accustomed to it.

Marshall adds that the proposed flow does not allow for reversing, as happens on the current site, and that passing will also be possible.

Cheren asks if all convenience centers will convert to single-stream.

Marshall replies that is correct.

Wilson states that cardboard will be separate, but everything else will be comingled. At the December meeting, we will brief you on the Commissioners' meeting.

Cheren asks if this will become a model for converting the other convenience centers.

Wilson replies that this is in keeping with the neighborhood[/district] concept. The idea is to have two large, multi-purpose service centers that would have HHW and the full range of programs. This would be the proposed northern one, and Eubanks Road is the proposed southern one. The other three are proposed to be neighborhood centers that will not have all services. They will include garbage and recyclables, but not HHW and food waste, for instance, but a smaller scale. They will still include compactors for efficiency. We hope to closely replicate this concept for Eubanks Road.

6. Programs and Services Update:

a. *Landfill Gas Recovery Project:* Spire states that the landfill gas recovery project is moving ahead. The flare station and the flare itself arrived. The landfill gas from both sides goes through the pipes. The two blowers, which are actually vacuums and blowers, can run independently or concurrently. The moisture falls out, and the cleaning process begins. The air cooler extracts more moisture. There are barrels of a glycol mixture, and the large evaporators will add in the glycol mixture and continue to clean and cool the gas so it can be more readily burned into the engine. The blowers will force the gas [in a pipeline] to [a engine-generator to be located at] UNC at Carolina North. At the backside of the blowers are numerous gauges which measure methane content, carbon dioxide content, pressure and temperature. Everything is monitored and measured to a fine degree.

This is the bottom of the flare. The flare will only run when the engine is not running, or until the engine is running. There is a flame inside at all times, and the flame arrestor ensures the flame stays lit and does not back into the system.

Cheren asks if it is similar to a pilot light.

Spire agrees that it is. There is a sensor wire inside that will monitor that all the emissions are destroyed by the burn, and the burn is controlled by the air put into the bottom. It is automatically louvered to read temperature and exhaust and will input more or less air throughout the process.

Also, some of the current clearing will be replanted. There is still another week-and-a-half until the wiring is finished, and then it will be tested by an independent third party, and then tested by the State construction office. Start-up is scheduled to be around December 4, 2011. There will need to be two weeks of training and certification for these items and UNC's controls, and UNC's contractor will tune the landfill itself. UNC may take over ownership at the beginning of the year.

Minutes Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
November 9, 2011
Approved January 11, 2012

UNC has a press release coming out. They have awarded the contract, and have installed the duct bank on Homestead [Road] to Carolina North. They will set the gen-set on Carolina North, and feed it [electricity] back to the substation on Homestead Road, until it can be captured possibly for Carolina North, or they may use the heat from the engine assembly for Carolina North.

Campbell asks if this system will run continually 24 hours a day, and what noise it makes. Also, will there be a buffer to quiet noise, and will it be near the Rogers Road neighborhood since it is set up on the South side?

Spire replies that UNC has done a noise level study on this piece of equipment from the manufacturers. They have tested similar units, on the noise at the buffer of the property, and from their study, it is less than 65 decibels at the property line. It is our hope that the system runs continuously, and it will improve some of the issues currently notable on Eubanks Road. We have already discussed with UNC that if there are issues, UNC will address them as quickly as they possibly can.

Wilson states that the Town required it to meet the noise ordinance, so it went through the permitting process. The University is responsible for responding to any noise issues.

Sassaman states that if there is any noise, it is easily remedied with berms, shrubbery, and wall-type fencing. Noise attenuates very rapidly.

Campbell states that right now there is no barrier around the system. The Chapel Hill noise ordinance runs until 11:00 p.m. This will be running 24 hours a day, and most of the people who live next to it either work the midnight shift or the second shift and are trying to rest. It doesn't seem that consideration to quiet the noise has been put in place. Sixty-five decibels is high. The Navy system on-board ship is 25.

Spire responds that the implementation procedure is in place, and UNC will immediately address issues to the satisfaction of Orange County.

Wilson states that noise was a major discussion piece throughout the design and permitting. We knew it would be an issue, and even though the University is responsible for it, we will receive any calls. Noise was a consideration throughout, the design, and location of the system was in keeping with that. If they can't meet noise standards, and that is a problem, then they need to do whatever they can to make it acceptable.

Campbell asks if that includes shutting it down.

Wilson responds that they may need to build a wall around it, but would not need to shut it down.

Minutes Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
November 9, 2011
Approved January 11, 2012

Sassaman states that some examples of noise are 50-60 decibels is a quiet office, 50-65 is normal conversation, and 60-65 is laughter.

Hauser states that in the county's noise ordinance, 50 or 55 is not permitted after 10:00 p.m.

Wilson states that this is in Chapel Hill's jurisdiction. Not speaking as a noise expert, but there are likely to be small differences in standards between a city and a rural, country area. I would think the standards in a rural area would be stricter; I can hear the interstate from my office right now at night. There will be more competing noises from an urban area.

Sassaman states that the noise is measured at the receptor; the location where it is received. The level is indeed 50 weekends and evenings according to the ordinance. This is an issue the University and Chapel Hill will deal with.

Campbell asks what apparatus is in place as a fire suppression system, and what fire department would back it up since it is a joint venture between the County and UNC.

Spire states that New Hope would, and that there are many back-ups within the system.

Wilson states that this is not a new idea. There are 40-50 within the state, and is tried and true technology in use all the time. It is as safe as a natural gas line that runs through the neighborhood.

Hauser states that this one is very close to a neighborhood. There is already odor, truck traffic and vermin in the community, and now we're adding noise and increased fire risk, so we ask for some sensitivity so Rogers Road doesn't have to address the generator as an assault on the community.

Wilson states that this has been one of the important concerns in the three years since the process for the flare started. This system will make the landfill safer than ever in regard to fire potential, and hopefully it will significantly decrease odor.

Spire states that we are sensitive to comments and will address them, and remain committed to that. Durham and Raleigh have this system within their facilities, as do many other cities. Most major landfills have this now. It's not new; it's just a technology that will provide a benefit for Orange County.

Vickers asks if the flare will be running continually along with the generator.

Spire replies that it most likely will not. There may be times that it does. The fans run at variable speed, RPM up or down depending on what is needed.

Minutes Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
November 9, 2011
Approved January 11, 2012

Vickers asks if it will be idling.

Wilson states it will.

b. Elimination of Rigid Plastics Recycling at Unstaffed Drop-off Sites

Marshall states that the overly high contamination of rigid plastics recycling containers at unstaffed drop-off sites unfortunately led to cost of sorting materials outweighing benefits and, as of November 1, 2011, all purple rigid plastics recycling containers will be eliminated from these sites. The staffed solid waste convenience centers will continue to offer rigid plastics recycling.

c. Other: none.

7. Board Member Comments: Cheren states that he has a prepared statement to read, as follows.

When I raised my hand about a year ago to volunteer for SWAB, I was initially looking to represent the rural Orange County community to keep an eye out for locating another transfer station or another landfill to replace the existing one now scheduled to close.

And much to my surprise, I was appointed.

During the past year, I've participated in these monthly SWAB meetings hoping to work with you all to make the Solid Waste Department a forward-thinking force for environmentally responsible community waste collection and disposal with a focus on protecting the interests of all residents of the rural community. It's been very interesting, but very frustrating.

In addition, as you know, I've worked with the Rogers Road community to try to reduce the impact of the landfill on their families, pushing for an early closure of the landfill and working to bring about an appropriate mitigation plan as compensation for the 40 years of dealing with the county's garbage. And we're all still working on that with the municipalities, the county staff and elected officials.

As the year went on, the issue of what we should do with our waste after the landfill finally closes became an increasing concern and it appeared that no one in Solid Waste or the BOCC or the other municipalities in Orange County had a solid solution either - other than to close the landfill gates and truck our garbage to Durham only to have it shipped from there to someone's else's backyard in

Minutes Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
November 9, 2011
Approved January 11, 2012

Virginia – or site another landfill in rural Orange County, neither one of which are great long-term solutions.

But, we do need to find a better long-term, environmentally and socially responsible solution. And because here at SWAB we're not dealing with that immense and looming problem, I've decided to resign my position on SWAB as of this evening and move ahead aggressively to discover better solutions for our county's waste.

I have a lot of respect for each of you on SWAB – you are all proven professionals in your fields – and because of that, I'd like to encourage you to take part in the search for a better, long-term solution to our county's waste, either internally as a member of the Solid Waste staff or as a concerned private citizen, after-hours.

Thanks for the opportunity to serve on SWAB.

I look forward to working with you in the future.

8. Other Business: None.

Vickers moves to adjourn.

Smith seconds.

Adjourn: 9:05pm