SOLID WASTE ALTERNATIVES FUNDING TASK FORCE

May 9, 2011

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Curtis Binney (Chairman)
Mr. Lindell Dorsett
Mr. Richard Grier
Mr. Dan Gorden
Mr. Donald Taylor
Ms. Brenda Boggs
Ms. Chloe Gentry

MEMBERS NOT PRESENT

Commissioner Jennifer Hill
Mr. Peter Tarby

OTHERS PRESENT

Mr. Sandy Minkoff, County Attorney
Ms. Wendy Taylor, Executive Office Manager, County Manager's Office
Mr. Jim Stivender, Public Works Director
Mr. Jeff Cooper, Financial Coordinator
Mr. Gary Debo, Solid Waste Operations Director
Ms. Courtney Vincent, Recording Secretary

CALL TO ORDER, ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM,

Mr. Curt Binney, Chairman, called the meeting to order and announced that they had properly noticed the meeting and that a quorum was established.

MINUTE APPROVAL

On a motion by Mr. Taylor, seconded by Mr. Dorsett and carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0, the SWATF approved the minutes of March 28, 2011.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STUDY

Mr. Binney stated that since the last meeting he had several discussions with members of staff and also with more than one County Commissioner, and there was no movement to grant an extension so the Committee needed to have their report completed by June 1.

Mr. Stivender referenced the study that had been distributed to the Committee members, noting the report indicated that incineration plants emitted fewer particulate hydrocarbons than coal fire plants, but more than natural gas plants, and that open burning had a higher pollution rate than an incinerator.

He added that in 1990, one-third of dioxins came from incineration plants but by 2000, it was less than one percent. He also added that private households that used fireplaces and other associated functions in cold climate areas had a higher dioxin rate than incineration. He stated that according to the US EPA, incineration plants no longer emitted significant amounts of dioxins, mentioning that the 1987 study reported a total of 10,000 grams (350 ounces) dioxin emissions from US incinerators but today the emissions were 10 grams or less (0.35 ounces), showing a reduction of almost 99.9 percent. He attributed the dramatic reduction of dioxin output essentially to filtration. He added that many of the upgrades associated with the waste to energy plant came through the County contract.

Mr. Treshler clarified that dioxin control was tied to good combustion, which was something Covanta had always had.

Mr. Grier asked if there were any recommended environmental controls that had not been instituted because of cost or other reason.

Mr. Treshler answered no, that their plant met all the current standards.

Mr. Gorden opined that the environmental impact statement put the issue into perspective when it stated that a family using a burn barrel produced more emissions than an incineration plant disposing of 200,000 metric tons of waste per day.

Mr. Dorsett asked Mr. Treshler if he thought there was anything that could be done to reduce the amount of chlorinated compounds that went into the waste stream and then to the incinerator.

Mr. Treshler replied that manufacturing had been shifting away from some of those products plus the controls around the facility were preventing the emissions from escaping into the atmosphere. He stressed that measurements of chlorinated compounds were in the single digits from the facility and the only way to lower the amount would be for them to not come in at all. He noted that it was an EPA suggested approach to eliminate chlorinated compounds from the manufacturing processes.

Mr. Dorsett asked if more improvements in recycling would reduce the PVC and other chlorine compounds.

Mr. Treshler replied yes, that the more they recycled the less there was to deal with and the less of a burden there would be on the air pollution control filter.

Mr. Binney commented that when there was a change in law or regulation, the County had the predominant burden for making sure that happened, but as they moved forward into 2014 and moving into a new world contractually, the burden would shift more to Covanta. He asked if the County would still have a part in the changes to Covanta required by law or regulation.

Mr. Minkoff answered that the County required everyone they conducted business with to follow the law, noting that the haulers had their own set of regulations and the County monitored them for compliance and if they failed to comply they would be in violation of their contract.

Mr. Treshler added that if a regulation affected business for one of the companies then they would have to advise the County on the impact to their business and the County would have to make a decision on whether or not they wanted to continue using their services because the County had contractual protection in the existing contracts in case of a change in law.

Mr. Binney asked if there was a dedicated staff member who was in charge of monitoring the companies to ensure they were in compliance.

Mr. Minkoff replied yes.

Dr. Ney stated there was no enforcement.

Mr. Stivender remarked that enforcement came through the EPA

Mr. Minkoff added that the County would fire the contract.

Ms. Boggs mentioned that there had been no discussion on possible water pollution from the incinerator.

Mr. Treshler answered that they did not discharge anything into active groundwater, everything was zero discharge at the facility and it was his understanding that the leachate at the landfill was being properly controlled.

RECYCLING AND YARD WASTE/COMPOSTING AND VARIABLE RATE REFUSE

Mr. Stivender mentioned they had merged composting into the recycling recommendations because it was another method of reducing the volume of waste that was being burned or buried. He stated yard waste, composting, and recycling all reduced volume before the waste was burned or buried.

Mr. Binney asked Mr. Stivender if his suggestion was that they move the recycling discussion to become part of the discussion of the report.

Mr. Stivender said that was correct.

Mr. Grier mentioned that Mr. Doug McCoy from Waste Management had said a while back that the clamshell type truck would be better than the “one-armed bandit” automated lift with a set barrel size for collecting yard waste. He suggested if the County went to using the “one-armed bandit” that they should do a one day per week yard waste pick up using either a clamshell or rear-loader truck. He handed out an information sheet on composting, specifying the information was from the Florida DEP and the 30 community study was from the EPA. He stated the FDEP report determined yard waste might be as high as 50 percent of the entire waste stream during the summer. He mentioned the Committee had also suggested the possibility of only doing yard waste collecting during certain times of the year when concentrations were high. He noted that both reports suggested having a weekly pick up of yard waste because it greatly increased the volume collected. He mentioned Waste Management was in the process of opening two composting facilities and one of them was in Apopka. He commented

that it appeared there would be some good private options that could work on site at the landfill as well as the option for the County to do its own composting. He added that the County would be its own best customer for composting because of all the possibilities for its use.

Mr. Stivender agreed that the County had a number of uses for the compost.

Mr. Grier commented that he had read that weekly yard debris collection in rural areas might not be appropriate, mentioning if there were ample drop-off possibilities and a variable rate refuse system was used it would drive people to bring their yard waste to the drop sites.

Mr. Binney remarked there might not be an overreaching county-wide solution, noting that each area was different in the amount of yard waste produced there.

Mr. Dorsett supported the once a week yard waste collection and reducing the amount of volume going into the garbage can which would be accomplished by improving the recycling through the use of at least a 64 gallon bin and a manageable yard waste system. He remarked the yard waste might have to be managed by the County or subsidized in order to be effective and the potential revenue was small.

Mr. Taylor commented that currently yard waste was picked up with garbage, which went to Covanta.

Mr. Stivender noted that that could change without the contract obligation, explaining that it was currently set up that way to ensure the County sent the necessary tonnage to Covanta. He mentioned there was an education program to work on the incentives to do a better job from the customer standpoint at the curb before the waste was ever collected. He added that once the need for the tonnage was gone they could move forward with a different program.

Mr. Taylor asked if the new scenario would be garbage collection on one day, recyclables a second day, and yard waste on a third day.

Mr. Stivender answered it might be something like that.

Mr. McCoy noted if they tried to keep twice a week garbage collection then they would be adding one additional pass of the trucks which would have more trucks on the street, create more carbon emissions, and cost more money.

Mr. Taylor commented that with the amount of reduction in waste because of recycling and yard waste collection they would only need to pick up garbage once a week.

Mr. McCoy remarked if they stuck with twice per week service then he would not recommend using a 96 gallon container. He also mentioned that if they decided to continue sending yard waste to Covanta that they could instead reduce collection to two days per week, one for combined garbage and yard waste and the other for recycling, which would save money and emissions.

Mr. Binney replied that if service was reduced he did not think it would save the County that much money because citizens would then say they did not need to pay as much for the services rendered, causing the assessment to decrease.

Mr. Minkoff commented that they were talking about a disposal issue and not a collection issue and then asked if Covanta were to give them a rate to burn yard waste that was cheaper than composting would the Committee elect to burn it as opposed to composting. He noted that the answer to that question would determine the collection because if they were not going to burn it then yard waste would need a separate pick up.

"DRAFT" SWATF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1

The Chairman announced the Committee would discuss the first recommendation which was to continue universal collection. He clarified that "universal collection" meant that they would pick up from everyone in unincorporated Lake County, doing a special assessment to pay for it, and letting the Tax Collector collect the money.

Mr. Gorden asked if the Committee agreed with continuing universal collection.

Ms. Boggs stated the recommendation should include that the special assessment should still remain on the tax bill.

Mr. Binney asked if they needed to clarify in the description what universal collection was.

Mr. Stivender stated they could put in definitions of terminology and asked for the Committee's opinion on the wording of the pros and cons so they could make adjustments accordingly.

Mr. Binney clarified that what they were recommending was to continue the existing policy and suggested the recommendation clarify what the existing policy was.

Mr. Taylor agreed.

On a motion by Mr. Grier, seconded by Ms. Boggs and carried unanimously by a vote of 7-0, the Committee approved Recommendation 1: Continuing Universal Collection, including the addition of a definition by staff.

Recommendation 2

The Chairman announced they would discuss Recommendation 2: "Continue with three franchised residential and commercial collection districts passed on regional efficiency and a minimum of two haulers". He commented that they had discussed giving some flexibility to staff to negotiate with the haulers in regards to what the districts should be, adding that they never came to a consensus on that issue.

Mr. Gorden agreed, opining that none of the Committee members were capable of saying how many districts the County should have.

Mr. Stivender mentioned that they were going to sit down next year and work with some of the haulers and the cities to find out where the district lines needed to be.

Mr. Dorsett commented that if they put out an RFP and asked for proposals based on two, three, and possibly four districts, it would show the waste haulers' perspective of what was most efficient for them. He opined that two districts would produce the best results.

Mr. Stivender agreed with Mr. Dorsett, but clarified that they were still working out whether it would be better to split the County into north and south areas or into three sections.

Mr. Gorden suggested taking the number out of the recommendation.

Mr. Binney agreed, suggesting the recommendation read "Continue with, as appropriate, franchised and residential commercial districts based on regional efficiency."

Mr. Dorsett commented on the pro item under the recommendation that said a minimum of two haulers would protect the County should a hauler default on contract, saying it inferred that the other hauler was standing ready to pick up the slack should that occur.

Mr. Minkoff explained it was required by contract that if one of the haulers stopped picking up then the other had to take over.

Mr. Dorsett asked if that happened did they then acquire the second contract for the remainder of term, or would it be rebid.

Mr. Minkoff answered that it had only happened once and in that case the company did acquire it, they did not rebid it, but added that it could go either way. He noted that on the emergency timeframe, which would give the County time to decide what to do, they agreed contractually to come in and pick up the waste.

Mr. Binney asked if they assumed the terms of the existing contract.

Mr. Minkoff clarified that it was the County's decision to bid it out between the two remaining haulers because they had a good relationship with them but they could have also bid it out to a new third hauler. He added that in an emergency basis if something happened to one of the remaining haulers the other would pick up service but it was not a guarantee they would get the contract.

Ms. Boggs commented that they needed to include that they were keeping that part of the contracts in the recommendation.

Mr. Binney specified that if that was to be added to the recommendation it would need to be added to the actual language of the recommendation and not put in the pros/cons section. He summarized the

decisions right now to eliminate the number "3" from the recommendation and add an additional sentence supporting the current contractual protective provisions.

Mr. Minkoff added that they could add to the first pro that it protected the County should a hauler default on a contract because the other contractor would have to pick up the garbage.

Mr. Binney requested that the pros and the cons not be intermingled, that instead they be listed as pros and then cons.

Ms. Gentry asked if they needed to put a maximum number of haulers.

Mr. Binney responded that it would fall under the regional efficiency issue.

Mr. Minkoff recommended changing the wording at the start to read, "Continue with exclusive franchised residential and commercial districts," to address Ms. Gentry's question.

Dr. Ney remarked that he did not understand why the comment about policing infractions such as spills was listed because it was a hazmat problem.

Mr. Stivender explained that having exclusive haulers would eliminate any guesswork as to who owned a leaking truck.

Dr. Ney asked if they really meant leak instead of spill.

Mr. Minkoff recommended changing "spills" to "leaks".

Ms. Boggs commented that they had talked about expanding commercial recycling and asked if that would go under Recommendation 2, or if not there then where?

Mr. Stivender mentioned that Recommendation 5 was single stream curbside recycling but it was for residential only.

Mr. Minkoff noted that if the Committee thought there needed to be another number then they could add it to the list.

Ms. Boggs opined there needed to be an additional recommendation because they had talked about wanting whoever the haulers were to work with their customers to increase commercial recycling.

On a motion by Mr. Dorsett, seconded by Mr. Taylor and carried unanimously by a vote of 7-0, the Committee approved Recommendation 2: "Continue with exclusive franchised residential and commercial collection districts based on regional efficiency and a minimum of two haulers," including replacing the number "3" with the word "exclusive," adding additional language to the first plus regarding the contractual obligation for the remaining hauler to continue the collection services for the defaulted hauler on an emergency basis, changing the second plus to better describe benchmarking, changing "spills" to "leaks," and moving the negative items to the bottom of the list.

Recommendation 3

The Chairman announced the Committee would discuss Recommendation 3: "Continue two times per week garbage and once a week recycling and consider replacing one garbage pickup with one yard waste pickup when and where feasible."

Mr. Gorden recommended the use of stronger language by removing the word "consider." He commented that the recommendation should say they should start single stream recycling and then phase in once per week garbage pick up.

Mr. Dorsett agreed with Mr. Gorden's suggestion, stating there was validity in switching to one trash collection day per week, integrating yard waste as needed or on a seasonal basis, and then implementing a once per week recycling program. He noted some people would find it inconvenient but having a rigid and reliable system would facilitate people adapting to that program.

Mr. Taylor agreed with removing the word "considered".

Mr. Grier agreed with having a fixed rigid system and suggested replacing the word "considered" with "institute" as well as only having one day per week for waste collection, one day for recycling, and one day for yard waste as well as having all changes made at the same time as opposed to phasing them in.

Ms. Boggs commented that if they phased the programs in then it would only end up confusing people, agreeing it would be easier to make the changes at once.

Mr. Taylor suggested eliminating the first part of the sentence of the recommendation and starting it with the second part.

Mr. Gorden suggested going ahead with single stream recycling and look at the issue of twice a week collection in the future.

Mr. Binney asked if he meant they should eliminate the wording "when and where feasible" from the recommendation.

Mr. Grier commented that the wording "when and where feasible" addressed the issue of rural areas where there were more options for yard waste.

Ms. Boggs suggested changing "where and when feasible" to "in areas that are conducive to automatic pick up."

Mr. Binney asked if an area did not have a yard waste collection day if that day of collection would be replaced by a second day of trash collection.

Mr. Minkoff replied that they would not receive a second day of trash, there would be nothing to replace the day of yard waste collection. He also noted that there were currently separate systems for rural and urban trash collection with the rural areas only having garbage collection once per week.

Mr. Grier asked if they were basically going to leave the rural situation the way it was.

Ms. Gentry asked why they could not collect yard waste in rural areas.

Mr. Grier replied that there was a low collection rate for yard waste in rural areas. He asked if they could add yard waste collection in rural areas upon request.

Mr. McCoy remarked that on call yard waste collection was more expensive.

Mr. Binney mentioned that some areas, such as his own neighborhood, did not have a lot of yard waste to be collected. He asked what was done with the yard waste currently.

Mr. McCoy answered that it was collected with the trash and burned.

Ms. Gentry asked if part of the theory in collecting yard waste was to help with the County's landfill classification.

Mr. Debo replied that yard waste could not be put in a Class 1 landfill unless there was a gas collection system in place that generated electricity.

Ms. Gentry remarked that separating the yard waste gave the County more options in the long run.

Mr. Grier noted that, per the 30 community study, communities that had tried to institute yard waste collection at a different rate than once per week all ended up switching to a weekly pick up.

Mr. Binney asked if there were limitations on the amount of yard waste a person could put out at one time.

Mr. McCoy replied there were parameters on the size, weight, and amount a person was allowed to put out at a time, adding that if there was something larger that needed to be collected the clamshell truck would have to come to collect it.

Mr. Minkoff recounted that the suggested changes to the recommendation would read, "Change to one time per week garbage and one time per week recycling pick up and implement one yard waste pick up per week in areas that have automatic collection equipment and in other areas where feasible."

Mr. Grier suggested replacing "implement" with "institute" to remain consistent with the other recommendations. He added that they could remove the single listed plus from that recommendation.

Ms. Boggs questioned what would happen if the County did not go to automated collection.

Mr. Binney replied that Recommendation 4 addressed the implementation of automated collection and the way Mr. Minkoff had worded the recommendation, if they decided not to recommend automated collection then there would still be three days per week of collection for recycling, trash, and yard waste when and where applicable.

On a motion by Mr. Taylor, seconded by Mr. Grier and carried unanimously by a vote of 6-1, the Committee approved Recommendation 3: "Change to one time per week garbage and one time per week recycling pick up and institute one yard waste pick up per week in areas that have automatic collection equipment and in other areas where feasible."

Mr. Binney voted "no."

Recommendation 4

The Chairman announced they would discuss Recommendation 4: "Institute automated collection with the variable size containers and rates."

Ms. Boggs suggested changing the wording to "Explore automated collection," because there might not be much of a cost savings with automated.

Mr. Grier suggested adding "when and where feasible" to the recommendation because they might not be able to do automated collection in all areas, mentioning rural areas as an example.

Mr. Gorden asked if they needed to define "automated collection" in their report.

Mr. Stivender replied a definition and explanation of automated collection would be included in the report.

Mr. Dorset expressed concern over the variable rate aspect, opining that the amount of trash on the curb was not as large a cost element as the truck, the labor, or the time to stop. He added that whether he had 10 or 50 pounds of waste had very little impact on the cost and if they implemented variable rates to allow people to have smaller cans then people might abuse the system because they think it will save them $10 a month. He remarked that people should be allowed to have smaller cans but still pay the same rate for the service.

Mr. Gorden remarked there could be an enforcement problem as well because people could have smaller cans but they might always be overflowing.

Ms. Boggs suggested just having one can size.

Mr. McCoy noted that from a cost standpoint, as soon as they told a hauler he had to go to a variable container, more containers would need to be stocked and a support delivery crew would be needed. He reported it would require a lot more administration, a lot more physical delivering and removal, and from a cost standpoint it could actually cause the cost to increase.

Ms. Boggs added that a variable rate would also interfere with billing for services on the tax bill so it would be easier if they just used one sized garbage can.

Mr. Dorsett asked if having smaller cans for people such as the elderly, who could not physically handle the larger bins, would be acceptable.

Mr. McCoy answered that was not a problem, explaining that in the recent contracts if a customer could not physically handle the standard bin they would be provided with a smaller bin at no additional cost. He added that for handicap customers they provided manual collection at no additional charge as well.

Mr. Taylor asked why they had put “variable sized containers and rates” in the recommendation.

Mr. Grier replied that if they had variable rates it would drive recycling to a much stronger level than a flat rate. He noted that to resolve the can issue that they could just have a single sized can but offer the option of the customer being charged for extra cans if they want or need them.

Mr. Dorsett suggested using the 64 gallon cans for both recycling and trash.

Mr. Taylor asked how the waste collection services would be billed to the consumer.

Mr. Stivender explained they would be billed once per year on the tax bill and if a customer chose to change container size during a certain part of the year they would either see a rate reduction or increase.

Ms. Gentry left the meeting at 11:07 a.m.

Mr. Binney asked what kind of an administrative burden would be placed on the County to switch to variable sized containers and if the County would have to hire additional staff to handle that burden.

Mr. Stivender postulated it would be busier on a regular basis and they might have to hire people to keep up with the work flow.

Mr. Grier asked how difficult it would be to bill for a different number of cans.

Ms. Cindy Heffler, Assessment and Customer Service Supervisor for Garbage Collection, replied that the computer system they used would be able to handle whatever they needed, adding that it was the call volume that would pose the actual difficulties.

Mr. Minkoff opined there would be more problems in subsequent years once a person decided to switch to a different size container because someone would have to collect the original size, someone would need to replace it with the new size or have the customer go get the new bin, and someone would need to change the charges on the tax bill. He remarked there would be a cost and so there would most likely be a fee to make such a change in order to recoup the cost.

Mr. Binney asked how the hauler would bill the County for the change in container size.

Mr. Minkoff replied that the cost to the hauler would be the same, that it was more of a disposal cost.

Mr. Binney asked if theoretically there would be no change in the bidding process for the haulers whether it was for multiple cans or curbside.

Mr. McCoy answered that there would be differences in capital costs, that there was a slight difference in cost between the larger and smaller containers, but it was not enough to affect bidding the project. He added that they would need to understand the haulers would have to keep an inventory with a larger total number of containers than they would normally hold if they were all the same size. He opined it made more sense to have one can size and offer the option of multiple cans.

Mr. Binney remarked that there were multiple issues being discussed. The first was that they were removing a trash collection day so customers would need a larger can, and the second was that they were trying to drive more recycling so they should have a smaller can. He asked if it would make more sense to go with the 64 gallon can and try to drive residents into putting out more recycling if that is their goal.

Mr. Dorsett and Mr. Taylor agreed.

Ms. Boggs commented that if they did more on the education side of recycling it would help people reduce the amount of trash they were disposing of and increase the recycling.

Mr. Gorden stated he would support having one sized garbage can.

Mr. Dorsett said he supported it, too.

Mr. Grier asked if everyone started out with one can and a person called and said it was not enough if they would be charged for a second can.

Mr. Dorsett replied yes, but it would be a nominal charge because it was essentially the same cost to stop and pick up two cans as it was for one.

Mr. McCoy noted the extra charge would be minimal to cover the capital cost of the can plus the operating time of the hauler.

Mr. Taylor asked if how they would bill for a second can because it would not be able to wait for the tax bill, it should be something the customer could pay to get the can immediately.

Mr. McCoy replied the County would be doing the billing. He mentioned that all the automated collection services he knew of used 96 gallon garbage cans and 64 gallon recycling cans, adding that in some communities they actually switched the use of the containers because they were recycling more than they were throwing away. He noted he was not aware of any variable bin size collection in the State currently.

Mr. Binney noted there were a lot of financial factors, so he was not comfortable recommending the Board go through with automated, he was comfortable recommending they should explore it as an option.

Mr. Taylor and Mr. Dorsett agreed that explore was a good word.

Ms. Boggs suggested providing an explanation in the report that they used the term "explore" in certain instances because the Committee was not knowledgeable on the financials of a particular option.

Mr. Binney suggested adding a plus/minus bullet that stated that the financial impact could not be determined at this time.

Mr. Dorsett suggested adding a clause saying they recommended the action provided it was economically viable and placing it before the start of the recommendation so it would read, "Provided it is economically feasible, institute automated collection…"

Mr. Gorden and Mr. Grier agreed with Mr. Dorsett.

Mr. Binney agreed with Mr. Dorsett's suggested verbiage.

On a motion by Mr. Dorsett, seconded by Mr. Gorden and carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0, the Committee approved Recommendation 4: "Provided it is economically feasible, institute automated collection."

Recommendation 5

The Chairman announced they would discuss Recommendation 5: "Institute residential single-stream curbside recycling with outside contractor through privatized handling."

Ms. Boggs noted that they needed to make a determination on the variable rate and variable size issue of Recommendation 4.

Mr. Minkoff replied they would address those based on their decision for the current recommendation.

Mr. Binney noted the committee was in favor of single stream recycling but the question was who should do it and if it was feasible.

Mr. Dorsett opined it should be privatized and the existing recycling program should be phased out.

Mr. Stivender concurred.

Ms. Boggs suggested there could be profit sharing between the County and the outside contractor, that there should be oversight by the County to ensure the items were actually recycled, that they should explore addition of new items to add as markets become available, and that there should be an increase in commercial recycling.

Mr. Grier stated he agreed, adding he would like to see commercial recycling mandated.

Mr. Binney suggested creating a new recommendation and inserting it between the current Recommendations 5 and 6 to address commercial recycling.

Mr. Minkoff explained that profit sharing was a function of a contract and the Board might not elect to go to profit sharing and it was not something that needed to be part of the recommendation.

Mr. Binney asked if it was economically viable for the County to do a single stream recycling program, noting the negative bullet that stated it may cost more. He asked for clarification.

Mr. Grier, Mr. Dorsett, and Ms. Boggs expressed that the bullet was incorrect and it should be removed.

Ms. Boggs suggesting adding that if recycling could not be offered county-wide that they would offer an alternative through drop off centers.

Mr. Minkoff asked if the recommendation should read "Institute mechanized residential single-stream curbside recycling," because they could institute single-stream recycling county-wide but they could not do mechanized recycling collection county-wide.

Mr. Binney asked if they would still keep the current 18 gallon bin should they switch to single stream.

Mr. McCoy replied that was correct and they could keep the 18 gallon bin or go to a 64 gallon bin and either pick it up with an automated system or with a rear-load truck with a tipper on it, so it could be provided throughout the whole system.

Mr. Grier stated that meant they could strike out that it was not available county-wide.

Mr. Binney asked if they inserted the word "mechanized" to the recommendation if they would have to add that it would be more capital intensive to the list of cons.

Ms. Boggs noted it was mentioned as the last con on the list.

Mr. Stivender suggested Recommendation 5 have similar language as Recommendation 4 for consistency in collection, noting the key language was "mechanized" and "single stream."

Mr. Gorden mentioned they were recommending that the current recycling program be discontinued by the County.

Mr. Binney suggested having that wording come before the rest of the recommendation so it would read, "Discontinue current County program and institute residential single-stream curbside recycling."

Mr. Stivender remarked they did not need to say "discontinued" because it is assumed that the current program would be discontinued with the institution of the new program.

Mr. Taylor recommended using the word "establish" instead of "institute."

Mr. Stivender noted that the key line in the recommendation that would be in their contract was that the County would give the direction to the haulers where to send the recycling to and right now the County was the designated location for recyclables, and that would change once a third party was contracted.

Mr. Binney asked if the RFP would include recycling and waste collection in the same proposal or if it might end up being that one hauler collects waste while another picks up recycling in the same district.

Mr. Grier and Mr. Taylor replied that recycling and waste collection would be together.

Mr. Stivender added that he had been under the assumption they were together but it might not be clear enough.

Mr. Grier stated that Recommendation 2 made it clear that the County would be divided into exclusive franchise districts for collection purposes and recycling was part of that.

Mr. Binney summarized the current suggested changes as removing the word "institute" and inserting "establish mechanized" instead.

Mr. Dorsett agreed.

Mr. Binney read the proposed Recommendation as, "Establish mechanized collection of residential single-stream curbside recycling with outside contractor through privatized handling.

Mr. Stivender asked if they were putting too much into the recommendation, opining that mechanized collection was a collection issue and handling it privately was a disposal issue.

Ms. Boggs and Mr. Grier agreed.

Mr. Stivender explained they could leave out the section that read, "…with outside contractor through privatized handling," because there was already a recommendation covering universal collection. He suggested if clarification was needed on that part then they could add it to the disposal section.

Mr. Dorsett agreed with Mr. Stivender and suggested adding another recommendation under the disposal section.

On a motion by Mr. Taylor, seconded by Mr. Grier and carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0, the Committee approved Recommendation 5 as follows: "Establish mechanized collection of residential single-stream curbside recycling."

<u>Recommendation 6</u>

The Chairman announced they would discuss the new proposed Recommendation 6 to address commercial recycling. He asked if the Committee was referring to collection or disposal of commercial recycling.

Mr. Grier answered that he thought commercial recycling should be mandated. He noted the reasons were because the amount of commercial recycling would increase with a mandate and it would save businesses money.

Mr. Binney asked Mr. McCoy if it was practical to tell everyone they needed to have separate recycling at their location.

Mr. McCoy replied that not all businesses had space for separate containers so for those businesses it would not be practical.

Mr. Minkoff informed the Committee that the County could not make businesses give them their recyclables because legally they did not have the ability to control the flow. He added that businesses had the ability to hire whoever they wanted to collect their recycling.

Mr. Grier asked if the County had the legal right to demand that businesses recycle in general.

Mr. Minkoff explained that it would then become a regulatory issue that would require inspectors to be sent out to ensure the businesses were in compliance and it would be enacted through a regulatory ordinance, not a collection ordinance.

Mr. McCoy expressed that education would help encourage business owners to recycle.

Mr. Minkoff reported that most of the commercial businesses were within the municipalities, there were few commercial businesses located in unincorporated areas.

Mr. McCoy recommended including a section in the contracts that required the haulers who did commercial collection to outline what they would do to educate the business community about the benefits of recycling and require they show evidence of their education efforts.

DISCUSSION OF OPEN ITEMS FROM STAFF AND TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Mr. Grier commented on bioreactor landfills, noting the closure time period dropped from 30-40 years to 5-15 years. He added that bioreactor landfill technology reduced volume by about 30 percent. He remarked that if the Committee wanted to do the most economical and cost effective option possible then that would be using the landfill, and if they decided to go in that direction he recommended they seriously look at bioreactor landfills.

PUBLIC INPUT

There was no public comment.

NEXT MEETING

Mr. Binney informed the committee that the next meeting will be May 16 at 9:00 a.m. at the Agricultural Center.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 12:03 p.m.