

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
October 5, 2006
Approved November 2, 2006

Attendance: Linda Bowerman, Remus Smith, Joe Clayton, Randy Kabrick, BJ Tipton, and Jan Sassaman

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

1. **Adoption of Minutes from September 7 SWAB meeting** Smith moves to accept. Bowerman 2nd. Passes unanimously.

2. **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 what I did was look at the landfill and recycling criteria that, in general, a private client looks for. One of our private clients has very stringent criteria. I've listed seven things:

- Regulatory compliance
- Properly permitted
- No notices of violations for a three-year period

Any one of these you don't meet, you're out. They are all or nothing criteria.

Environmental facility will be compliant, excellent housekeeping, odor control
ISO 1400 certification (that's the management certification)

Quality all facilities are in excellent conditions with equipment
replacement program ISO 9000 certification is desirable

Financial stability three years information showing sound fiscal operations,
owner has to recognize and account for any closure or any
environmental liabilities. We would never send anything to a
solid waste facility without a closure reserve fund.

Safety the facility must have three years of superior safety
performance with an experience modification rating of less
than one, basically no lost worker time or OSHA recordable
incidents for three years.

Personnel must have a living wage and health insurance at a reasonable
cost for workers.

Community management staff involved in life of community financially,
through the Chamber of Commerce and community volunteer
activities

Sassaman asks how that would be measured.

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
October 5, 2006
Approved November 2, 2006

Kabrick states that most facilities have a community relationship plan, financial contributions to charities and required volunteer number of hours for an annual basis. A lot of this is stated in part of the [existing SWAB] attachments in a different way.

Sassaman states that we should consider trying to combine the two. You've been more specific in some spots, the community issue, the reserves, the personnel getting health insurance at a reasonable cost.

Bowerman asks Randy if there are problems finding places that fit all the criteria.

Kabrick replies not when you work for the world's largest oil company. BP can drive any bargain they want. We don't have that kind of leverage.

Sassaman states that it doesn't have to be binding, these are guidelines.

Kabrick states that we could marry these together.

Sassaman suggest that he and Randy work on that together.

Smith asks if we transfer our garbage are they required to tell us what they pay their employees? Is that our business?

Kabrick states we should make it our business. OWASA is doing that with their biosolids, they say 'if you want our business you will show us your facility.' They are not obligated to open their books to us.

Clayton states that one could ask if they pay a living wage.

Pollock states that a lot of places may not define that the same way Orange County does. It terms of putting it as a criterion, you may want to refer to the hourly equivalent of the federal poverty line for a family of four or use Orange County's definition.

Clayton states that the State may have that by County.

Sassaman states that it's questionable that if the living wage clause was part of the criteria, would a private facility meet that criteria.

Pollock states that based on what we've learned about MRFs it would be unlikely.

Sassaman states that ultimately we will need to find a facility to take our recycling and if the standards are set too high we may not find it and may force us into building our own which is another option.

Pollock asks what is the outcome of this. Does the SWAB present this to the Commissioners as a set of criteria to adopt or select?

Sassaman replies that we were asked to come up with some selections. How would the group like to proceed? Do you want Randy and me to put the two together?

Smith agrees but thinks you need to waffle a little on this living wage thing. For example I'm thinking that the Hillsborough Town Board will be focused on lowest cost and they won't necessarily care about what a private company does.

Kabrick states that some of the criteria have an intersection. They may have inferior safety performance using day laborers at \$5 hour. Those will probably get booted out for safety performance. If a couple of the criteria are made hard and fast such as financial stability and safety then you will get an outfit that is well-run.

Clayton suggests looking at criteria that are "pass/fail" which is similar to a RFQ.

Pollock mentions that all the criteria have to have some flexibility. Not all Notices of Violation are created equal.

Wilson states that the details do not have to be figured out now. If the Board of Commissioners agrees with the approach, then you can figure out the details. If someone has an excellent safety reporting program, it may show some violations but someone with sloppy reporting may show none because it's covered up and we'll penalize the good one.

Kabrick says the goal is to short-list some companies.

Sassaman states that Randy and I have agreed to put this together.

Kabrick states that the goal is to get a final at the next meeting and pass it on to the Commissioners.

3. Solid Waste Management Planning Process

Review/discussion of September 13 Work Group Meeting Pollock states that most of you were at the Work Group meeting and saw the report from RRSI where they laid out the economics and a potential course of action. What they suggested and the sense of the work group was to proceed with some next steps that involve letting some requests for proposals that allow us to get some real world data on the cost of transporting recyclables out of county to various facilities and the cost of processing by the existing private processors as well as the potential cost of new equipment and some of the cost of using brokerage services that might help us in the marketplace.

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
October 5, 2006

Approved November 2, 2006

Jim Frey's sense of the world of MRFs is that brokers may get us a better deal because they're handling 10,000 tons of paper, for example, rather than the 1,000 we have. There was some serious questioning of the validity of the numbers in the report so getting the proposals back will put finer points on the numbers and make the analysis more rigorous and enable you all to come back and make some more finely-tuned decisions of what to send forward to the local governments and public to take a look at.

Sassaman asks when the RFPs will go out.

Wilson states that as soon as the final draft of the scope is complete and I meet with the purchasing director. It may be the first of November. There may be some variability of how long they are out because some may be more complicated than others. A minimum of 30 days and some are 45 to 60 days.

Kabrick asks for a list of the RFPs and what they are for.

Pollock states that there is one for transporting recyclables [that we control] to MRFs. At this point it's highly likely they'll pick up cans and bottles separated from paper. There is also an issue of how we manage what we now have source separated, do we want to make a more attractive package of tons that is a lower value due to being commingled. The tendency is to look at all the tons that we control as if they're commingled.

Clayton asks if the spots will be chosen in order to compare apples to apples.

Spire states that the RFP for transportation will be released after receiving the responses for the MRF RFP.

Wilson states that the first bid will be an option for a processing facility to process the materials delivered and will also have the option as a part of that will be hauling and processing. Then there is a separate RFP just for hauling. Then there is the brokerage service and the equipment for processing.

Kabrick states that one concern is the broker. How would you tie up a waste broker? He is taking his money off the top and doesn't care what happens once he gets his money.

Wilson states that we haven't worked with brokers and are relying on Jim Frey to give us the tricks and trades on that.

Clayton states that going with a broker throws away any downstream accountability. You will not be able to track the materials.

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
October 5, 2006
Approved November 2, 2006

Wilson states that it would be hard to meet the criteria previously discussed.

Pollock states that once the data is returned in sequence it will be folded back into a redo of the report. That you will see again and there will be an opportunity to take that forward. The procedure hasn't been determined in terms of how it will work, whether every board will see it and we will redact all their comments and then the public will see that version which will go to the County Board. There are also other pieces out there including the rural solid waste study, the transfer station issues and side stream issues like the commercial recycling task force, so how long do we want this process to go and how many times will we iterate before it goes to the BOCC for final action.

Sassaman states that it would behoove us to have the elected officials that are part of the work group have frequent input into the order in which this is revealed.

Wilson says there should be some feedback from the elected officials before we take it on the road. If we take it on the road before the elected officials see it, then they may not like what the public has said it wants.

Sassaman asks if the participation of the elected officials on the work group is sufficient.

Pollock notes that there was little feedback from the elected on the work group as they did not stay until the end of the meeting.

Schedule/Next Steps Pollock states that what's coming next is the RFPs and then the public input.

Clayton states that if they [the RFPs] go out in order the earliest we could see it would be March.

Pollock agrees.

Pollock notes that there is a long lead time for the RFPs and if we don't meet for six months we lose the continuity but there is not a lot of substance to meet about.

Clayton suggests that there is an opportunity to meet on mixed paper.

Elected Board Updates Wilson states that whether the work group meets in November or not there needs to be some formal written board update and give some detail of where things are and the next steps. The written update will make sure everyone's brought along at the same level.

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
October 5, 2006
Approved November 2, 2006

Sassaman states that there should be two. One for the elected officials and do something else in the paper.

Pollocks states that the intentions for the newsletter this year as a front page story was about the plan.

Wilson states the Carrboro Board has asked for an update and we will be there Tuesday night for that. On October 24 the County has scheduled a work session that includes solid waste and an update will be given along with landfill gas and the transfer station.

Sassaman states that I polled Bill Letteri and Bill Strom to see where they [Chapel Hill] stood on this. What Chapel Hill wants is a transfer facility for MSW located in Orange County and prefer it to be on Eubanks Road. Chapel Hill wants to continue the collection and hauling of MSW.

Wilson asks commercial and residential?

Sassaman replies residential. Chapel Hill wants a MRF, private or outsource or the ability for Orange County to transfer recyclables to a MRF. Chapel Hill continues to support 61% waste reduction goal. [They] want mixed paper and cardboard collected at the curb dual stream. Bill Strom added Chapel Hill wants recycling to be at least as easy as tossing the trash. Chapel Hill wants a legit PAYT option.

Wilson states that there are a couple interesting things in all of this. One is that they want to continue to haul their residential MSW which may mean that they would be open to discussing satisfactory arrangement of handling their commercial waste. Also as required in the interlocal agreement that member governments deliver their waste to county facility but there is a good deal of residential waste that doesn't come to our facility because the Town does not pick up compactors that they are recommending for large multi-family developments. It would also be interesting to hear why an in-county MRF is OK as long as it not publicly-operated. It would appear that an in-county facility is probably closest to nailing most of your principles.

Sassaman states that Kabrick said that Bill Strom says he didn't want a MRF.

Kabrick states it's complicated by the fact that I think that Bill Strom has zero confidence in Jim Frey. He didn't believe any of the numbers he saw. He doesn't believe that if it cost \$5 million eight years ago it would still cost the same now. Show me the real cost of building a MRF. If it's the right thing to do to build an in-county MRF he'll get behind it. He's taking a pre-position that we can't build it for the same price as eight years ago.

Clayton states that I also questioned Jim's numbers. I do know because I do buy equipment, that a lot more are being built so the cost has come down.

Kabrick notes that the responses to the RFP will be the real numbers, not consultant numbers. They will tell us what we need to know.

Wilson states that we have found a method to firm up the numbers and make them credible.

Pollock states that Strom comes from the private sector and he is all about letting the marketplace tell you what you want to know.

Clayton states that the number that will be critical is the projection of tonnage. Jim's numbers were very pie in the sky.

Wilson states that ultimately he will use the numbers we give him.

4. Programs/Services Update

SW Operations Center Wilson states that we have received a bundle of construction drawings for review. We will be meeting with the architect to go over them. It appears unless there are some major issues that this could go out for bid next month.

Pollock notes that progress is being made on the use of wood also. It has been segregated out, got graded and [we have] moved that which we're planning to use.

Kabrick asks what is the timetable of getting off the property.

Wilson replies that the county has an extension. We are not held to the same standard as the Town. The Animal Shelter will be there two years after we're gone.

Kabrick says that UNC says the property is to be completely vacated by the end of '07.

Transfer Station Planning Wilson states that I hope to receive substantive feedback at the work session on October 24th. Rod is prepared to give them a gentle nudge to make a decision.

Sassaman asks if the county owns any property that would be suitable.

Wilson replies no.

Smith states that the only commercial zoned property is in the Efland area.

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
October 5, 2006
Approved November 2, 2006

Wilson states that the economic district was broached several years ago with no response.

Clayton states that at the last meeting I asked the question of co-locating the transfer station with recyclables transfer. In the minutes your reply is that it could work for a while. I thought that there was a number stated. Is there a number?

Wilson states that it depends on what's run through it. Running a bottle/can stream it will probably work. Running a dual stream there is probably not enough room. As when we think tonnage wise, both bays will be utilized for MSW it's at least ten years.

Landfill Gas Study Wilson states that I also met with Olver today regarding this project, regarding the option to power a cluster of local government facilities including school, Animal Shelter and our new facility on Eubanks Road or piping gas or generating power for Carolina North. The effectiveness of this is determined by when they will have something on the ground. If it is six or seven years out this is not a good option as we will be going down in gas production. Generally we're venting gas; we flare gas from one wet well as there have been some special [odor] issues at that manhole.

Kabrick asks is there a draft report.

Wilson replies not at this time. There are draft spreadsheets. The consultant is going to make some changes, take that to the University staff for comments and make a final report to BOCC and UNC and the BOCC will have to decide if they want to pursue one option or the other. The UNC option is break even, [the other is worse]. We can't take advantage of the credits that a private developer could. The whole set of credits is complicated.

Kabrick asks if you have talked to UNC about the carbon reduction program that the Town has signed up for. This will be a good way to do something with greenhouse gases.

Highway 57 Convenience Center Site Identification Wilson states that a committee of the BOCC has authorized staff to negotiate for a piece of property a couple of miles past the existing site. The property's primary use will be a regional park of which a solid waste convenience center would be an auxiliary use.

Walnut Grove Convenience Center Temporary Expansion Wilson states that the same committee has also authorized staff to negotiate for an 18 acre piece of property adjacent to Walnut Grove site. Staff has developed a short term interim site plan for that property and a draft of a long-term permanent site plan for that.

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
October 5, 2006
Approved November 2, 2006

Clayton asks if the county will buy or lease the property.

Wilson replies leasing is not part of the discussion.

Sassaman asks how many acres are needed for storm debris.

Wilson replies for storm debris only approximately 25 acres which one fourth would be used for buffers. What I proposed previously was a larger piece of property in the 50 to 60 acre range and to help to pay for it by taking land clearing and inert debris.

Sassaman states that I was thinking of the potential of storing storm debris and a convenience center.

Mixed Paper to Curbside Collection Programs Wilson states that the bins have been ordered. It's likely to be January before collection begins.

Sassaman asks not cardboard.

Wilson states that cardboard has some different operational issues.

Clayton states that it would be my guess that people think cardboard is a part of mixed paper.

Wilson states that there is an education campaign planned and hopefully it will be obvious what is accepted.

Landfill Leachate Sewer Project Wilson states that the engineer has been working on this for about two years. There hasn't been much progress.

Other None

5. Other Business None

Smith moves to adjourn. Kabrick 2nd

Adjourn: 8:55pm

Next meeting: November 2, 2006
Southern Human Services