

CLAYTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Solid Waste Management Authority Board Meeting
10:00 A.M.

April 30, 2015

M I N U T E S

PRESENT: Chairman Jeffrey E. Turner (SWMA Member), Vice-Chairman Gail Hambrick (SWMA Member), Mary-Ann Carp (SWMA Member) and Rodney C. Givens (SWMA Member). Also present were Mayor Bobby Cartwright (Mayor of Lovejoy), Jeff Metarko (Director of Transportation and Development), Tim Gilliam (Landfill Manager), Dennis Johnson (Budget Manager), Edie Yongue (Keep Forest Park Beautiful, Inc.), Josh Lawson with Jacobs Engineering, Chuck Button with Jacobs Engineering, Charles Ferree with Jacobs Engineering and Sandra T. Davis (Clerk).

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Chairman Turner called the meeting to order.

II. ADOPTION OF JANUARY 29, 2015 MEETING MINUTES

Motion by Vice-Chairman Hambrick to approve the January 29, 2015 Solid Waste Management Authority Board Meeting minutes, second by Ms. Carp. The motion carried 3-0-1. Mr. Given abstained due to him being absent from the last meeting.

III. POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF SITE 3, CELLS 5 & 6

Mr. Metarko called attention to previous discussions on providing an update on the current situation with Site 3 and how it is being filled up. He then recognized Mr. Josh Lawson to offer a power point presentation.

Mr. Josh Lawson with Jacobs Engineering reported on the current conditions to include, how much trash is in the landfill and in what areas and that in comparison to how much space is left in terms of the design in the landfill. He described the brief frame by frame movie clip version of the landfill. He noted Cells 1 through 4 with Cell 4 being the only one that does not have a well. Cells 1 through 3 are not at final grade; we still have remaining capacity above those. However, there are wells in that area actively pulling gas out feeding to our power plant. He then spoke of Cells 5 and 6, which is the area that we have talked about in terms of the development. We would get another 1.3 million cubic yards of landfill space if we were to fill and develop Cells 5 and 6. He pointed out with Cells 1 through 4, there is another 1.3 million cubic yards to fill just where we are now and based on the intake rate, that's about 14.5 years of capacity. We would double that capacity with the development of Cells 5 and 6.

Mr. Lawson said the question is do we only develop just Cells 1 through 4 or do we move forward and develop the landfill in its complete design, which means developing Cells 5 and 6. The cost to develop Cells 5 and 6 is approximately \$7.4 million. If the landfill is closed as designed, the cost is approximately \$11 million. The closure cost for Cells 1 through 4 only is approximately \$7.9 million.

He explained that the county is actively in Cell 4 with the remaining capacity reaching the current elevation of Cells 1 through 3 in approximately a one year time frame. However, if the entire landfill is built as designed, it has approximately 30 years of life left in it. He then provided and described the drawing of the Site 3 Landfill Plan View and Site 3 Landfill Cross-Section. He outlined an estimated timeline for constructing Cells 5 and 6 with the total time before waste can be placed in Cells 5 and 6 between 18 to 23 months. He pointed that there are two options: (1) Staying in Cells 1 through 4. He then shared the difficulties of working within the confines of what we have to maintain in Cells 1 through 4. Option (2) Move into Cells 5 and 6. He shared that there would not be the issues with landfill wells.

Mr. Lawson responded to questions from Mr. Givens regarding the landfill wells. He explained that the wells could not be extended because they have already been sealed; therefore the wells would have to be abandoned and reset and the headers would be abandoned and rerouted. Mr. Givens then asked was that not the intention when the headers would put in, at which time, Mr. Lawson said that he believes that when Trane modeled it; they modeled it assuming all of Site 3 had wells in it. In response to a question of Ms. Carp, Mr. Lawson explained that the wells do not go into the ground until there is trash in place. He added that in an ideal design, the wells go in once the waste is at final height and the caps have been put in; then, the wells are dropped. He explained this way the wells are put in one time and receiving the full benefit of the well. Ms. Carp concluded that the price for putting in the wells are not included in the cost provided with Mr. Lawson agreeing that it is not included.

Chairman Turner stated that if we continue to use Cells 1 through 4; then, we would have to go back and modify the extraction system. When Chairman Turner asked how long, Mr. Lawson advised that it depends on how long we could stay in Cell 4. He then estimated that it could be two years depending on intake rate and compaction.

Mayor Cartwright asked if the county could legally use some of the monies that have been set aside for closure to offset the bond cost for the building of the new cells. Mr. Johnson responded that every year a calculation is determined; however, he does know that there is some bond money that has been set aside for closure as well. Mayor Cartwright suggested raising the gate rate so the margin is up. He maintained that if the county has to redo those wells in 24 months, there is no telling what the cost is because we did not get any of that data originally.

Mr. Gilliam then explained the difference between closure and post closure and the cost and requirements involved with each. Mr. Gilliam explained that there is a capacity report done each

year, which establishes what the design capacity was and where we are now. The years are calculated based upon the rate of flow now and there is a formula that Finance does through it to create how much they have to put aside in an account that has to be reported to EPD each year and the amount goes up and down according to how many years are left. Mr. Johnson said we are permitted for 35 or 36 years capacity; therefore, if that time is decreased in half, the amount is going up tremendously. He reported that last year it was \$139,000, in FY13 \$151,000 and in FY12 it was \$159,000; these numbers were based on 30 years.

Mr. Metarko recalled the exasperation of this situation because of the inert matter. He explained that this was on the horizons in about another five years; however, once the inert was sold, and we began to see the inert coming in here and how quick it was filling up, that's why we have brought this forward on how it has been compressed. In terms of solid waste in general, he recalled that there are a lot of options on what to do and we wanted to explain the situation of the landfill itself. If we start talking flow control with only county owned dumping; this would decrease the intake. Therefore, the county may not have to look at this bond right now. He said he wanted to make sure that we presented the cell development, before the board start making decisions on the broader solid waste management in this county.

IV. CONTINUATION OF SOLID WASTE PROGRAM DISCUSSION

In conclusion, Mr. Lawson recapped the program change options and briefly described each outlining the advantages and disadvantages and is listed as follows:

Program Change Options:

- Do Nothing
- Conduct Public Outreach Program
- Enhanced Business Licensing
- Transfer Station
- Flow-Control
- Mandatory Collection
- County-Controlled Franchising
- County-Controlled Franchising w/Flow Control

Mr. Givens asked if numbers could be attached with each option. Mr. Metarko said that we could run a financial analysis; however, there are so many assumptions in there that we would need some direction from the board in terms of what direction we should look towards. He then explained that it would be more realistic than the assumptions in providing an analysis on all of the options. Mr. Givens then suggested giving Mr. Metarko two or three options to research and provide a financial analysis. Chairman Turner added that would be his suggestion as well and have them to run their analysis and bring the information back at the next board meeting.

With regards to County-Controlled Franchising, Mr. Lawson explained that this option could provoke lawsuits from both citizens and haulers. At this time, Chairman Turner asked Mr. Chuck Button if Gwinnett County has been sued for this and how did it work out. Mr. Button responded that Gwinnett County was sued and it has cost the county approximately \$1 million in legal fees. He said the outcome was a reduction in dumping and the county won in a roundabout way. He explained that we had some really good pricing; therefore, Gwinnett County decided to go with the large haulers. Some of the smaller haulers that did not have the ability to bid and have that kind of pricing sued. The judge gave it to them; therefore, the pricing went up. The contract will be over next year and we would rebid the whole thing next year, and the pricing would come down again. He pointed out that there is better pricing, no more dumping and it was put on the county's tax bill.

Mayor Cartwright shared that Lovejoy put some extra money in the budget that would be adopted next month and Lovejoy is going to mandatory trash service and would be collected on the tax bill.

Chairman Turner said that he is interested in finding out more about the County-Controlled Franchising. Mayor Cartwright asked if with the County-Controlled Franchising, would there be mandatory dumping in Clayton County with Chairman Turner responding yes. Chairman Turner then asked how it was handled in Gwinnett County. Mr. Button informed that Gwinnett County has no landfill or none that they own; Gwinnett County has private landfills. Mr. Gilliam added that the revenue comes to the landfill by administrative fees. With that being said, Chairman Turner stated that there would not be mandatory dumping in Clayton County. In response to comments from Vice Chairman Hambrick, Chairman Turner explained that if we made dumping in Clayton County mandatory, we would have a problem with decreasing the life of the landfill, and another problem in that we would have to develop the other two sites.

Chairman Turner then asked if any board members had any objections with the County-Controlled Franchising. No one expressed any objections. He also asked that when the data is collected, include what is needed from a personnel perspective to get it up and running from customer service, administrative, etc. Mr. Givens mentioned Flow Control but also advised that he is in favor of anything that increases revenue and decreases illegal dumping. Chairman Turner then asked for information on County-Controlled Franchising and Flow Control for the next meeting. If the information is compiled before the next meeting; then, let's move forward with providing it to the board members. Mr. Lawson advised that Flow Control does not necessarily have an illegal dumping aspect attached to it. Mr. Givens then suggested County-Controlled Franchising with Flow Control.

At this time Mr. Metarko suggested that the board schedule the next Solid Waste Management Authority meeting. Chairman Turner then suggested the board schedule the next meeting for August 27, 2015. There were no objections to this meeting date.

V. JACOBS CONSULTING CONTRACT RECOMMENDATION

Mr. Metarko advised that the contract with Jacobs has been a professional services contract that the board signs each year; the contract coincides with the budget year. He recommended that the Solid Waste Management Authority members approve the recommendation to go to the Board of Commissioners for another contract with Jacobs for another year. He then noted that Jacobs is vital in preparing analysis and taking a look at the industry. He recalled that last year's contract was \$196,000 and this contract would raise the amount slightly to \$205,000. He briefly explained the additional reporting measures that Jacobs would have to do. Vice Chairman Hambrick asked how long Jacobs has been working for the county. Mr. Metarko estimated that it has been approximately 15 to 20 years. Vice Chairman Hambrick recalled the statement regarding when Trane was involved and that some things may were done incorrectly and where was Jacobs when this was happening. Mr. Metarko explained that Jacobs was hired by Trane Engineering to provide some data. He then went into further details explaining the responsibilities of Trane Engineering at that time and that of Jacobs.

Chairman Turner made the motion to extend the contract of Jacobs to be forwarded to the Board of Commissioners for final approval. Seconded by Ms. Carp and carried unanimously by those four members present for this meeting.

There being no further business to discuss, motion by Mr. Givens, second by Vice Chairman Hambrick, to adjourn the Solid Waste Management Authority Board Meeting of April 30, 2015 at 11:25 a.m. Vote unanimous.