SOLID WASTE ALTERNATIVES FUNDING TASK FORCE SPECIAL MEETING

JULY 21, 2011

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

MEMBERS NOT PRESENT

Commissioner Jennifer Hill
Mr. Richard Grier
Mr. Donald Taylor
Mr. Peter Tarby

OTHERS PRESENT

Ms. Wendy Taylor, Executive Office Manager, County Manager's Office
Mr. Jim Stivender, Public Works Director
Mr. Sandy Minkoff, County Attorney
Ms. Melanie Marsh, Deputy County Attorney
Ms. Susan Boyajan, Recording Secretary

CALL TO ORDER, PROPER NOTICE, AND ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM

Mr. Curt Binney, Chairman, called the meeting to order and announced that this was their last meeting, that they had properly noticed the meeting, and that a quorum was established with five members present.

MINUTE APPROVAL

On a motion by Mr. Dorsett, seconded by Ms. Boggs and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the SWATF approved the minutes of May 9, 2011.

On a motion by Mr. Gorden, seconded by Ms. Boggs and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the SWATF approved the minutes of May 16, 2011.

On a motion by Mr. Gorden, seconded by Mr. Dorsett and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the SWATF approved the minutes of May 23, 2011.

Mr. Binney reminded the committee members that the task force authorized him at a prior meeting to approve the final minutes of this meeting.

CONTINUATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS/REPORT

Mr. Binney explained that the changes in red that were made by staff on page 7 under Disposal were just verbiage changes which were recommended as the best way to present them to the Board and which did not change the intent.

Mr. Stivender added that they were simply language changes to make numbers 10 through 14 under Disposal similar to the wording in the previous sections.

Ms. Boggs pointed out that the mention of pharmaceutical waste had been omitted in numbers 10 and 11, and she believed they should have the same verbiage regarding pharmaceutical waste.

Mr. Binney responded that pharmaceutical waste was not a disposal option, because law enforcement has to dispose of it.

Ms. Boggs stated that it did not specify anywhere in the document how and why yard waste would be reused.

Mr. Binney noted that the recommendation as he remembered it would be to suggest to the County that they enhance those programs, but he did not think they wanted to be definitive in telling them what to look at but rather to give them an open-ended statement for them to look at other options.

Mr. Gorden pointed out that there were probably uses that they do not know about.

Mr. Stivender related that the objective is to minimize volume first and to try to do something successful with the yard waste, but how they work out the funding for any of these programs is not known yet until they get Board direction on that.

Ms. Gentry asked about whether they could mandate single-stream commercial recycling regarding number 12.

Mr. Binney answered that they could not mandate that they recycle, but could only mandate that it was offered.

Mr. Minkoff added that he did not think number 12 was intended to be a mandate, but rather just a goal to get the haulers to offer it to all commercial customers, which would increase the recycling.

On a motion by Mr. Gorden, seconded by Mr. Dorsett and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the SWATF approved the changes staff made under disposal for numbers 10 through 14.

Mr. Binney recapped that they have approved all of the items under the Collection section, which were Items 1 through 9, have just approved items 10 through 14 under Disposal, and would now start discussing Covanta in item 15. He asked if they needed to add the words “or successor” after Covanta, in case Covanta would not be the owner of the facility in the future.

Mr. Minkoff responded that Covanta is listed there only because their plant is located there, but they could just state "negotiate with any private entity engaged in waste disposal," which would include Covanta as well.

Mr. Stivender stated that he liked the wording in that item, because it was all-encompassing of the objective.

Mr. Binney asked whether they should mention that they do not want a put-or-pay provision in any contract which would require them to provide a certain tonnage. However, it was pointed out by other task force members that it was mentioned in Item 16a.

Mr. Gorden opined that all of these cover what he feels is important, and he moved that they accept the rest of the report.

Ms. Boggs noted that she had some questions regarding item 16. However, there were no questions or comments from anyone regarding items 15 or 17.

In response to a question regarding number 18, Mr. Stivender clarified that the appropriate law enforcement agency would be taking care of the pharmaceutical waste and would be providing that service as part of the collection program.

Ms. Boggs commented that she thinks they should put all of the positives together and have the negative after that in item 21 and to also add the pharmaceutical waste in the positive bullet which would state "removes more household hazardous and pharmaceutical waste from the waste stream."

On a motion by Gorden, seconded by Ms. Boggs and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the SWATF approved items 15, 17, 20, 21 as amended, and 22 of the recommendations.

Mr. Gorden commented that the underlined and bold statements were the key part of the recommendations and the most important things that the task force should agree on, and the pluses and minuses were just underlying detail that could always be changed, since different people could have different ideas about those.

Mr. Binney asked Mr. Stivender what he looked at when doing a 30-year planning horizon.

Mr. Stivender responded that the 30-year outlook was the whole philosophy of how to address solid waste as a county government and what the present vision is to come up with a locked in direction. He commented that he wanted to avoid what happened in the late 1980's when they ran around trying to figure out what they were going to do so that they have a stable funding source, since they do not want solid waste to be a highlight of every year's budget, but just part of the status quo so that it would not need to be a controversial issue on the horizon for several years in the future.

Mr. Dorsett commented that he believed it was important that the County have a good handle on what the philosophy is, but that it be reviewed periodically, since factors that influence decisions could change, such as incentives for private enterprise, changes in law, and environmental mandates.

Ms. Gentry suggested that they put in something about costs and environmental concerns in item 16 which also mentioned avoiding transferring the environmental burden to outside the county.

Mr. Gorden related that one of the things they discussed was the County possibly using an out-of-county landfill in order to minimize the amount of the County's own landfill usage, so he did not want them to restrict the possibility of choosing that option.

Mr. Binney opined that they needed to address that issue as a line item.

Mr. Minkoff suggested that they could ensure that any contract with the County evaluates not only costs but environmental factors or at least require the evaluation of it.

Mr. Binney read the possible new sub-item as "The evaluation of any solid waste alternatives should include both cost and environmental factors."

Mr. Stivender clarified that they would include that as sub-item b under item 16 and shift the original b and c underneath that. He also opined that they are concerned about not sending their problems somewhere else, and their goal is to minimize the county's waste as well as their disposal efforts anywhere else. He noted, however, that they could send waste to a landfill nearby but not within the county's borders after they have reduced the amount of the waste as much as possible if it was a very cost effective alternative.

Mr. Binney listed the options they had for the waste after they recycle and reduce it as much as possible as burying it in the County's landfill, hauling it somewhere else, and burning it; and he asked how they would weigh those environmental issues against each other.

Mr. Minkoff pointed out that one of the problems is that what is commonly thought of as the best and most environmentally-friendly waste disposal method is a constantly changing landscape, so he suggested that they do not get too narrow in their scope, especially since they did not know what new methods would be available in the future.

After several suggestions on the wording for that section from the task force members, Mr. Gorden proposed that they let Mr. Minkoff figure out the verbiage for that section concerning balancing environmental and cost factors.

Mr. Minkoff indicated that he would try to come up with language sometime that morning for that.

Mr. Binney announced that they would defer item 16 and go on to item 18.

Ms. Boggs suggested that they add something in Item 18 which would mention the funding of pharmaceutical waste collection and disposal.

Mr. Stivender suggested changing 18a to "Hazardous, electronic, and pharmaceutical waste collection and disposal."

Ms. Gentry advocated that language should be consistent for drop off centers, since they were also referred to as solid waste residential service centers in other sections of the recommendation handout.

Mr. Stivender responded that they were not sure yet if they wanted to call them drop off centers or service centers.

Mr. Binney opined that the wording should be clear for the general public. It was decided to use the term "drop off centers" for those facilities throughout the document.

Mr. Dorsett suggested that they change 18a to "Collection and disposal of hazardous, electronic, and pharmaceutical wastes."

On a motion by Mr. Gorden, seconded by Ms. Boggs and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the SWATF approved Item 18 as amended, which included changing 18a to "Collection and disposal of hazardous, electronic, and pharmaceutical wastes" and changing the wording in 18b from "solid waste residential service centers" to "drop off centers," with the understanding to keep the wording for those centers consistent throughout the document even if it is changed in the future.

Mr. Binney opined that he agreed with the idea presented in Item 19, which was for the County to work with the cities to provide a coordinated collection and disposal system, and he thought there were opportunities to work with the municipalities.

Ms. Boggs wanted to add some more positive bullets in that item, such as provide standardized services for all residents, comprehensive education and information available for all city and county residents regarding services, and less trucks on the road with combined routes and less vendors, which would result in less wear and tear on the roads.

Mr. Stivender mentioned that the general fund will be doing the drop off centers education program countywide, and the cities would automatically be partners. He mentioned that they talked to the City of Clermont about extending the hours of operation and adding more transfer stations for cities as part of the program to minimize their haul time. He summarized their discussion that a negative point was that there would be a cost for the transfer station, but a positive point was that there would be less wear and tear on the equipment.

Ms. Gentry asked whether they should mention as a positive bullet in Item 19 that working with the cities would help them make mechanized pickups more feasible and affordable for the County.

Mr. Binney summarized that the recommendation in item 19 as read above would stay the same, but the pluses and minuses would change to reflect what they have just discussed.

On a motion by Mr. Dorsett, seconded by Mr. Gorden and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the SWATF approved Item 19 with the proposed changes, which was an added positive bullet stating "Increases feasibility of implementing mechanized collection; provides standardized services, comprehensive education and information about services for all city and county residents; and uses less trucks on the road with combined routes" and a combined positive and negative bullet stating, "May require transfer stations."

Mr. Minkoff announced that he was prepared to offer some wording for item 16, which was "Prior to the entry of any disposal contract, an environmental analysis must be conducted evaluating environmental impacts of that disposal method as well as other alternatives. Adverse environmental impacts may justify choosing a more expensive disposal option in appropriate cases."

Mr. Gorden suggested changing the word "must" before "be conducted" to the word "should."

Mr. Binney clarified that 16a would remain the same, and what Mr. Minkoff just read would become 16b, which would push the existing b to c and the existing c to d.

Ms. Boggs questioned whether the first bullet which stated "Long-term commitments may obligate the County to continue with a method of disposal that becomes outdated or uneconomical" should be positive.

Mr. Binney proposed that they change that bullet to read "Reducing long-term contracts will reduce the obligation of the County to continue with an outdated or uneconomical disposal method."

Mr. Minkoff commented that they would have to change it to say "avoid long-term commitments, because they may obligate the County to continue with the method of disposal.." He indicated that he would be able to change the language to reflect that.

Mr. Joe Treshler from Covanta commented that a longer commitment could reduce pricing, and he advocated flexibility and to make it part of the evaluation.

Mr. Binney commented that the most important thing is the base recommendation in bold print and a, b, c, and d under that, and he thought that staff could work out the verbiage with the task force's guidance. He recommended that they approve item 16, with the changes to a, b, c, and d as stated, and direct staff to change the pluses and minuses to reflect the guidance the task force has given.

Mr. Dorsett proposed changing the old 16b to "Avoid long term contracts that create unjustifiable economic risk" and to not specify the number of years.

Mr. Binney responded that he would propose to take the word "economic" out.

Mr. Dorsett also opined that since the EPA has two different classifications of environmental impact statements and environmental assessments, he did not want to add wording that in the future could be

construed to mean that they are requiring an environmental impact study, which was very time-consuming and expensive. He wanted to change the word "impacts" in b to "considerations."

Mr. Minkoff suggested changing the word "impacts" to "factors," which was agreed on by the committee.

Mr. Binney clarified that the base recommendation for item 16 and 16a would remain unchanged; there would be a new b which was the wording that Mr. Minkoff read with the change of the word "impacts" to "factors"; the new c would be what Mr. Dorsett just read above; and d would be the old c with the wording unchanged. He recapped that the bullet points would be tweaked by staff to reflect the intent of the prior pros and cons to support their recommendations.

On a motion by Ms. Boggs, seconded by Mr. Dorsett and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the SWATF approved item 16 with the changes.

Mr. Binney related that he would write his cover letter to go with the recommendations and provide it to Ms. Wendy Taylor, Executive Office Manager, County Manager's Office, as well as to Mr. Stivender for comment. He asked Ms. Taylor to send an e-mail out to the task force with the link to the online streaming for the BCC Meeting on September 20 in which he would present the recommendations.

Mr. Stivender announced that the County has hired Mr. Skip McCall as the new Solid Waste Division Director, who would begin August 15. He also reported that they were hoping to further discuss putting these recommendations in a budget with the BCC in January or February of next year and will send the task force a copy of the PowerPoint presentation of that.

On a motion by Mr. Gorden, seconded by Ms. Gentry and carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0, the SWATF gave the Chairman authority to make necessary verbiage changes, but not to change the content.

Mr. Binney reminded the task force members that they were still under Sunshine Law guidelines, and they needed to forward any communication dealing with this subject matter to Ms. Taylor.

PUBLIC INPUT

There was no public comment.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.