

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
September 7, 2006
Approved October 5, 2006

Attendance: Linda Bowerman, Al Vickers, Joe Clayton, Bonnie Norwood, Jan Sassaman, Randy Kabrick, Remus Smith, and Barry Jacobs

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

1. **Adoption of Minutes from August 3 SWAB meeting** Clayton moves to accept. Smith 2nd. Passes unanimously.
2. **Principles/Values for Selection of MRF to Process Orange County Recyclables and for Selection of Landfill to Receive Orange County's Transferred Waste** Deferred
3. **Solid Waste Management Plan Process Update**

Summary of Key Issues: Pollock states that we are going to hold a couple of preliminary meetings with RRSI before the formal presentation on the solid waste plan and then the meeting is next Wednesday the 13th at 4pm where we'll get into some of the nitty gritty issues brought up in the report. One of the things that came out is that there is a lot of decision making, some of which is related to the plan and some outside scope of the plan. The narrative part of the memo touches on the big decisions - processing, how materials will be managed, to build a processing facility of our own or to ship materials out.

The development of a commercial recycling program is another big segment to take on. There are some smaller pieces, some of which are in process like food waste that is undergoing a healthy incremental expansion. Should we continue on the turnkey basis or once we reach a certain point should we consider our own organic management facility. It's a peek at the future, but not on the table right now.

Other areas that are related directly to the solid waste plan which relates primarily to waste reduction, but which we will have to look at carefully is the rural solid waste collection. How do we effectively serve the 40% that are not now served? We are looking at rural solid waste collection and are engaged in a contract to look at rural solid waste collection options.

A key point that crosses the boundary to solid waste and recycling is the future of the drop-off centers, both the convenience centers and the unstaffed drop-off sites and the decision that will impact each other around that. The most radical approach would be to eliminate the unstaffed drop-off sites and use the savings from that and invest in other parts of the recycling system.

With respect to the solid waste convenience centers (SWCC), there are some important decision as to what function they will serve, how many there will be and how many will be come a super center and the number of services to provide and how they will be financed.

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
September 7, 2006
Approved October 5, 2006

Siting a transfer station. [Previously discussed]

Overall system planning and integration. The notion of the transfer station is going along a track other than all the other solid waste planning is a critical thing [and it is important] to figure out how to do all these things at once. Aside from the transfer station what is our next most important task. The outline gets into the detail of what we will be facing in the next two years.

Wilson states that the non-recycling issues will be done in modules. The SWCC and drop-off sites are part of the recycling program but since SWCCs have a heavy garbage component they will be looked at separately along with the rural waste collection. It may not take the same track as the everything else, since it is primarily a county issue, like town collection issues are the towns' responsibilities. The outline is bare bones. Each element has its own complex decisions. Just around containers you could have a meeting.

Letteri states that there seemed to have been a lot of issues to be discussed that needed the sequence thought through. I thought it would be useful to get them all in one place, but also to think through the timetable for wanting to accomplish some of them and set some goals and when they should be resolved.

Pollock states that hopefully on the dry recycling issues, the RRS report will put some focus on the decision-making pieces. Particularly about processing and commercial recycling. Those are the two biggest bites on that side. The rural waste collection study will be done in December. There may be an option to include municipal non-residential waste. But this is predominantly a county issue. The other interaction is that if we capture that additional tonnage, it gives us short term financial gain but shortens landfill life.

Clayton states that regarding the transfer station and the pictures/drawings previously presented, has there been any discussion on having recycling loaded inside or will RRSI show any of that analysis.

Wilson states that there has been discussion with the transfer station folks about that. If you are talking about the Eubanks Road site, there is not room to do that there. It is a very constrained site. They [the engineer] say it will not work.

Clayton states that there will be two bays. Will you need both to run garbage?

Wilson states that that one would suffice for a while.

Clayton states that every place where a savings could be made on the cost of transferring recyclables to a different facility I don't believe the analysis of that was

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
September 7, 2006
Approved October 5, 2006

very rigorous and didn't show ways to lower the costs of transferring and didn't show enough time looking at alternatives. The analyses seem to show that transferring is not as good as our own processing facility.

Pollock states that with respect to the RRSI report which was stand-alone from the transfer station, I did bring that up to Jim as a key concern going forward. Absent constraints of that site it probably makes sense to transfer everything under one roof.

Wilson states that if we had a large enough facility we could make some savings from transferring all under one roof. The issue of how big to build the transfer station is going to be a topic that once the where is decided then the decision of what kind of transfer station can be made.

Spire notes there are options for the shorter term to utilize the site for recycling but ultimately we'll need both sides for MSW.

Kabrick asks if that's true even with a more rigorous recycling program that diverts more recycling.

Wilson states that second bay area could be used to divert loads to inspect and pick out materials. We can get by with a single bay but we need to build the two bay system all at once so we can have a clear span with no columns in the floor to interrupt loading.

September 13 Work Group Meeting Pollock states that next week there will be a couple of meetings with RRSI. On Wednesday morning there will be the coffee klatch from 10 am to noon for those who can't make the afternoon meeting or just want to come for a more informal setting to talk to Jim about the report. On Wednesday evening at 4pm will be the meeting in which Jim will present the report.

A detailed discussion of the surveys at SWCCs and the use of landfill permits ensued. There are some data about where users of permits are from and what they do with their permits. Clayton suggests that the form have a place on the permits for addresses so you can track where they're coming from.

4. Programs/Services Update

Utilization of Durham Transfer Station/No Orange County Transfer Station Wilson states that there is nothing new to report. It is in the process of getting on the Commissioner's agenda to be discussed.

Landfill Gas Study Wilson states that there is a landfill gas feasibility study looking at two potential possibilities. One is utilizing landfill gas to provide energy to a complex of local government facilities on Eubanks Road. That part of the study is complete.

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
September 7, 2006
Approved October 5, 2006

The other option is providing energy to the University for their Chapel Hill North facility. That part of the study is underway. That report should be ready for the Commissioners in another month or so and will be shared with you all. The next step is once the report is complete the Commissioners will indicate a preference for one or the other and then the next step of more evaluation and measurement will happen.

Pollock asks if there will be consideration of making electricity but everything to be direct fire.

Wilson states that the University option is essentially cleaning up the gas and piping it directly to them. The other option has sub-options but is generating electricity.

Highway 57 Convenience Center Wilson states that a search for an alternate location is still underway.

Smith asks if the site is closed.

Wilson replies that it is still open and is on a 30-day notice arrangement with the property owner. Preparations are being made to try to expand the Walnut Grove site on a temporary basis to receive the overflow if the Hwy 57 site closes.

Solid Waste Operations Center Wilson states that this is moving forward with construction drawings. Hopefully within another four weeks those will be complete.

Association of County Commissioners Ralph W. Ketner Employee Productivity Award – Rob Taylor Wilson states that Rob Taylor has won the Ketner Award with a cash prize of \$1,000 for innovative programs. The recommendation was written by Blair.

Pollock states that this was specifically for the improvements for the HHW program. The cost per person was improved, the cost per ton was lowered and the tonnage increased.

Other Wilson states that the State landfill enforcement folk is beginning to focus on gray waste in C&D landfills. For a number of years we have placed various dry and bulky wastes diverted from the valuable lined area and put it in the C&D area – like mattresses and furniture. Now those items can not go in there. The definition of C&D waste means it must be generated from construction or demolition of a structure. Plans are being made now to stop putting mattresses in C&D.

5. **Other Business** Jan states that Joe brought up an issue by email to add an item to the agenda.

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
September 7, 2006
Approved October 5, 2006

Clayton states that in light of the emails going around following our last resolution to the BOCC (on the transfer station) there needs to be clarification of exactly what we are doing as a board.

[Jan distributes a copy of the interlocal agreement]

Sassaman states that the major part of this document that addresses this board is Exhibit C [Interlocal Agreement], page 23. Responsibilities spelled out here seem to orient to the County manager, the County's governing board and recommendations to that board for approval. To receive and interpret for the County public input. A good example of that would be input for our own jurisdictions. On the first page under determining policy this is the responsibility of the County with the respect to solid waste management and in determining policy it read: The County agrees to consult with the other parties and the advisory board frequently and consistently to determine views on the solid waste management plan and policies and possible changes thereto. This is where the responsibility to our respective jurisdiction applies but it appears our responsibility is two-fold – to our individual governing bodies [and] to the BOCC and County manager.

Jacobs states that to some extent this models the OWASA board. There are representatives from Chapel Hill, Carrboro and Orange County. As a representative of that board for many years, rarely did we think of ourselves as representing a particular jurisdiction. We considered ourselves as representing the utility. It wasn't looked at as protecting certain interests. What would be better from the Commissioners perspective is to improve communication between the chair and the manager's office and the commissioners so that when we ask for information or comment it is clear what we are asking for and in what form we are asking it. Commissioner comments may need to be considered before you make a decision or recommendation back to us. In talking with Jan there may be a change in the way the agenda is done so that there is an opportunity for staff to send it out to the manager in a timely manner so that if the chair and vice chair of the BOCC had a question or concern they could talk to Jan as oppose to reading it later.

Sassaman asks [Barry] how do you see the role of the Towns? If Chapel Hill has something that they want or that is a problem in the solid waste arena, you don't have a problem with that being on the agenda?

Jacobs states that there should be an attempt to accommodate the partners. Sometimes there is a conflict between what the partners want and it is a good thing to work it out here. Part of the role of this board is to provide a venue to bring different concerns. I am not saying 'don't represent your municipalities', but from a county perspective, since we are the ones that ultimately pay the bill and will likely be

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
September 7, 2006
Approved October 5, 2006

praised or blamed for whatever happens the more holistically we can do things as opposed to coming from separate corners, the better off we are.

Letteri states that this board is an advisory board. It is designed and is here to provide a venue to bring together the various views of the different jurisdictions. [It is] Not a decision-making body.

Jacobs states that being a part of boards like this in the past, it comes to feel like you are the decision making body, because you are the ones most knowledgeable. That is one of the beauties and one of the problems, especially with an advisory board with a special expertise.

Smith states that the first sentence of the interlocal agreement states that this board is to help aid financially and economically solid waste management. I don't know anything about solid waste, I depend on staff. I take what they say and take it back to Hillsborough. Hillsborough comes back to me and I tell you. Our purpose here is if staff has a problem or they want to try something new, they come to us, I go to Hillsborough, Hillsborough comes to me and then I come back here. We are here to help staff.

Pollock states that Remus has a very formalized relationship with the Town Board, but I haven't heard the other two municipalities say they have that type of relationship.

Kabrick states that I was appointed to the board because I practice in this area as Jan [does]. We were appointed as experts to guide the county as to how they practice municipal solid waste management and assist staff in problems as outlined in "C" of the document.

Vickers states that with quite a bit of background in this area, I act as a citizen who is working on the county advisory board trying to assist Carrboro on outstanding issues and give the best advice to both parties. I don't feel I am there to mirror the opinion of Carrboro, but to find out what's going on. Help them understand what is going on and work issues to resolution between the county and the town. I see the board as a bridge between the county and town and try to give citizen input.

Pollock states as a concrete example, there is a clear sentiment from the Town of Chapel Hill to have a discussion of Pay As You Throw and bring that to this board. There was a clear commitment from the county board to then consider it [as part of the deliberations] I don't know if other issues are that clear cut, like how to handle the information about the transfer station. It's fundamental because there is a fair amount of expertise on the board on this topic, but there is a contradiction about how to handle who gets what information first in terms of how it gets discussed. The towns

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
September 7, 2006
Approved October 5, 2006

appear to have had a high level of concern about the fiscal and operational impacts on them of how waste transfer was managed. I have no idea if they made their positions clear to Gayle or to Jan

Vickers states that he wrote a letter to the Town of Carrboro Alderman about how inefficient it would be to travel far and that it would have a fiscal impact on them. I didn't tell them a specific location but just that they had to realize there would be an impact based on location.

Pollock states that using that concrete example did the Carrboro Board then come back and say "We want you to represent that concern at the Solid Waste Advisory Board."

Vickers notes that this is part of the quandary of whom I represent and where is a transfer station best sited, there might be a conflict between the two sectors.

Pollock notes that he's trying to draw out how the process might be undertaken. After you sent your letter to the town, did the town then come back to you in a formal manner?

Sassaman asks Bonnie for input on her role on the SWAB.

Norwood states that I am the mouthpiece for my neighborhood because we live basically at the landfill. I take bits of pieces of information back to the public. My role in this is to educate the public in an informed manner and put fires out with different folk. I discuss with Animal Shelter about where the animal bodies will go when the landfill closes.

Clayton states he was appointed by the County Board Chair and the reason for bringing this up is to clarify who is setting the agenda. Where are the issues coming from? This last issue seems to have been something that the Commissioners asked staff to look at and this board got in the middle.

Jacobs states that the Commissioners asked staff for information [on the transfer station]. Go to Durham, analyze the information and bring it back. One of the things we were considering was social justice issues which have nothing to do with cost and feasibility per se. It is one of the factors that we have to consider, because this neighborhood has had the landfill for 30 years and it was convenient for the Towns and County to dump it in the low income African American neighborhood and there was a cost-savings to keep doing it. We wanted to make an honest attempt to open up the possibility that there were other alternatives and that we might even be willing to consider paying more to address the social justice issue. We were expecting a report back to the BOCC, at which point we would have commented and referred it to

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
September 7, 2006
Approved October 5, 2006

the SWAB for a recommendation. Instead we got a recommendation before we saw anything. I didn't think it was overstepping but we didn't communicate well enough what the process ought to be. In that way you could have considered what we were thinking about. You may have made the same recommendation; we were trying to step back and make an attempt to think about doing something different for the sake of that neighborhood. We don't want to have a lack of understanding about what we're asking [of the SWAB].

Sassaman states that the SWAB waded in on that one, maybe precipitously from your point of view but as a group we felt something had to be said and get our position clearly on the table.

Jacobs states that maybe the BOCC needs to build the trust that a solid waste decision will not be made without asking your opinion.

Vickers states that the biggest motivation behind this was to push to some decision. The decision will be tough no matter where it goes but there is a tendency to procrastinate and put the whole solid waste operation in some jeopardy to not be able to complete the transfer station in time. The motivation of the board came as a nudge to force the process forward.

Wilson states that the BOCC assigned the SWAB the task of recommending a site for the new transfer station. The BOCC discussed it several times and when the question arose about using the Durham transfer station we met with the Durham folks and after staff had done some analysis, it seemed the natural thing to test some of the analysis on the SWAB.

Sassaman states that it was done that way because Eubanks Road, from an operational standpoint, was a good location for the transfer station. There was a sense of urgency and we wanted to give the BOCC our opinion in a forceful way.

Clayton states that the reason I wanted to discuss this was to burst the bubble instead of letting it simmer and I thought we were in a position of marginalizing our usefulness as a board and I wanted to clear the air.

Pollock states that it not just important looking backward but we have the solid waste management plan coming before us and some of the decision making around that could be heavily impacted by the kind of steps we take on the process. We will have a second report from RRSI so what does the work group do after hearing the second report from RRSI? Does the work group as a quasi-SWAB make a recommendation to the BOCC? Or does the BOCC say "We'll ask for your recommendation only after we've heard the report." Or is it OK this time going forward to make a recommendation out of this group.

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
September 7, 2006
Approved October 5, 2006

Sassaman says the Solid Waste Plan Work Group role is to do that as it's been specifically charged with this task.

Jacobs states that the way to do it is to put it on a work session agenda so that this board is there when the Commissioners hear the report and can ask questions and then ask SWAB to make a recommendation. In the last two meetings no commissioner has noticed or made any comment about your resolution, because it was out of phase; whereas if we'd had a presentation then there might have been some buy-in to your response. It has been hard to get solid waste issues in front of the BOCC. It is hard to find time for an advisory board to plan time with the BOCC.

Sassaman states that one of the things that we feel is for years solid waste has been able to chug along we've had a landfill and operating system that works well, but in the next couple of years there is a necessity of fundamentally changing the way the solid waste is handled in this county. It will not impact only the economics but everything as we ship it out of the County. The BOCC needs to increase attention to this matter as do the Towns. Town of Chapel Hill and Carrboro have, as has Hillsborough, been heavily involved, but the BOCC has a different role, not only the operational aspect but also you have to interact with us [SWAB]. We need as a board better feedback from you all. It helps the decision-making process and the acceptance of what you all want to do if we have a sense of what your priorities and boundaries are.

Kabrick states that if the planning process had continued, the siting of the transfer station, including social responsibility, environment and economics, would have played out. It's not clear how the cart got ahead of the horse. If we had been able to stick to the process, we could have included all the values in our decision making.

Wilson states that the transfer station is a little unique in that if it's not going to be on Eubanks Road and it's not transferred to Durham, then a place has to be found for it, you're saying "What are we going to do with it?". Depending on where it is about four years is needed to plan, permit and site it. By the first of the year the permitting of the facility needs to begin. If by the first of the year there is no site, that is a bad indicator that you will have a facility ready by the time it's needed. It can't be tied up with the other solid waste plan process because that will play out as long as it needs to.

Kabrick states that the concern is the vision of the transfer station what that looks like, where it is, and what it does impacts long term. We haven't figured out long term yet.

Wilson states that there is a clear policy statement that there will not be another landfill in Orange County by default that means there will be a transfer station. A

Minutes – Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
September 7, 2006
Approved October 5, 2006

temporary transfer station hasn't been discussed therefore we've been moving under the opinion that if and when there is a transfer station it will operate as long as it can.

Kabrick states that if Chapel Hill as a signatory of the interlocal agreement decides that the transfer station, the shipment of out-of-state, of our solid waste is not sustainable and too expensive I think you could assume that Chapel Hill might think about withdrawing from the interlocal agreement.

Wilson states that Chapel Hill has known for a long time that there would not be a new landfill. They led the site search that ended in 1996.

Kabrick states that it's a new day. Oil is \$100 a barrel, the Town has signed up for a carbon reduction program. Building a 30-year transfer station knowing that it is the end all and we are half way through the planning process seems not the right thing to do.

Wilson states that the issue at hand needs to be dealt with which is the landfill will be full in 2010 and we have to come up with something to do with the waste. What happens in 2030 will play itself out.

Sassaman states that this is why it has been encouraged that each jurisdiction and the University to participate in the work group and things are beginning to coalesce.

Norwood states that there has been a sense of urgency since becoming a member of this board. It is past the point of discussing PAYT for two years and that is why SWAB was so strong with what was written. It is decision-making time. Putting a band-aid on something now will cost more later.

Sassaman states that we need to come to some consensus.

Clayton states that it seems we have. More communication with the commissioners and sending the agenda to them to look at.

Bowerman states that it appears that they don't want to put it on Eubanks Road but they don't want to put it anywhere else either is that the way we should be looking at it or are there other options or just put it off as long as they can.

Jacobs states that that is why staff was asked to talk to Durham. There aren't many other options. At one point using one of the economic development districts between Efland and Mebane was discussed. It is totally in the County's jurisdiction but we didn't use it. It was good to have a discussion. We should just move forward and get the report on the October or November work session.

Minutes - Regular Meeting
Solid Waste Advisory Board
September 7, 2006
Approved October 5, 2006

Vickers moves to adjourn.

Adjourn 9:10 pm

Next meeting: October 5, 2006
Government Services Centers, Hillsborough