

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY

Solid Waste Management Authority Board Meeting  
11:00 A.M.

November 30, 2017

M I N U T E S

PRESENT: Chairman Jeffrey E. Turner (SWMA Member), Tax Commissioner Terry Baskin (SWMA Member), Mary-Ann Carp (SWMA Member) and Robb Leatherwood (SWMA Member). Also present were Jeff Metarko (Director of Transportation and Development), Dennis Johnson (Budget Manager), Josh Lawson with Jacobs Engineering and Sandra T. Davis (Clerk).

ABSENT: Vice-Chairman Michael Edmondson (SWMA Member), Victor Lett, Sr., (SWMA Member) and Andrew Love (SWMA Member).

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Chairman Turner called the meeting to order.

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Terry Baskin offered the Invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chairman Turner.

II. ADOPTION OF OCTOBER 10, 2017 MEETING MINUTES

Before the vote was taken, County Clerk Davis noted one correction to the minutes on Page 2, Paragraph 3 add the word “not” to the sentence so that it may read “Transportation and Development Director Metarko responded that door is not shut at this point.” Motion made by Mr. Baskin to approve the October 10, 2017 minutes as amended, second by Mr. Leatherwood and carried unanimously by the four member present. Vice-Chairman Edmondson, Mr. Lett and Mr. Love were absent.

III. CONSULTANT CONTRACT RENEWAL & TASK ORDER APPROVAL

Transportation and Development Director Metarko presented the First Amendment to On-Call Solid Waste Professional Engineering Services Agreement and the Task Order No. 3. He then provided some history with regards to the contract with Jacobs Engineering. In his discussions with Jacobs Engineering, he noted that we want to get this back on a fiscal year basis and would explain this further once the authority gets to the Task Order. Even though this agreement was executed on December 2, 2017, we just want this extended through the end of June. He pointed out that this does not commit the authority to any monies; this just changes the dates for another

year. He said in order to keep Jacobs Engineering under a master services contract for all that they do for the landfill, this needs to be proposed and executed today to continue the services.

With regards to Task Order No. 3, Transportation and Development Director Metarko explained that a part of the Master Service Agreement is to issue task orders for any individual items. He provided a recap of the previous two task orders and explained each: Task Order No. 1 and Task Order No. 2. He pointed out that Task Order No. 3 is the exact same as Task Order No. 1., which is for environmental compliance services that Jacobs Engineering does at the landfill. We are asking that Task Order No. 3 go back to July of 2017 and make it valid to June of 2018; this would correspond with the fiscal year. He explained that if it does not correspond with the fiscal year; then, we have all sorts of accounting issues. This is why we also want the Master Services Agreement to fall on a fiscal year basis too. Transportation and Development Director Metarko added that when the authority meets again, there would be another task order to cover fiscal year 2019 with everything remaining the same as what was approved for Task Order No. 1.

Mr. Baskin moved approval of the First Amendment to On-Call Solid Waste Professional Engineering Services Agreement thru June 2018 and the Task Order No. 3, second by Ms. Carp and carried unanimously by those four members present for this meeting. Vice-Chairman Edmondson, Mr. Lett and Mr. Love were absent.

#### IV. TRANSFER STATION DISCUSSION

Transportation and Development Director Metarko recalled that at the last meeting, there was some discussion regarding a site visit to Fayette County regarding the transfer station. Instead of a site visit, Mr. Josh Lawson was able to produce some video of the area. Chairman Turner said the request was to set up a visitation, because he did want to see it before this meeting. He maintained that he still would like to do a site visit, at which time, Transportation and Development Director Metarko responded that we would set that up. Also noted by Mr. Metarko was that there was discussion on meetings with a couple of the major industry providers and they were able, within the last month, to meet with Waste Industries. He pointed out that Mr. Leatherwood was able to be a part of that meeting.

Mr. Josh Lawson with Jacobs Engineering came forward to provide a power point presentation on the "Transfer Station Discussion and Waste Industries Meeting Recap". (*A copy of the presentation has been filed for the record.*) The presentation had images of the Single Bay Transfer Station, Multiple Bay Transfer and Recycling Station and the Fayette County Transfer Station and Recycling Center. He also explained the loading operations for each. With regards to the Fayette County Transfer Station and Recycling Center, he noted that the facility is owned by Fayette County but operated by Waste Management; therefore, there is a public/private partnership. He then expounded further on the setup and operations at this facility. He explained

the two ways to manage a transfer station, which would be for the county to build it, own, and operate it or there could be a public/private partnership. He provided a slide that incorporates the Transfer Station Cost Elements for a Low Capacity Transfer Station (~200 tpd) and a High Capacity Transfer Station (~500 tpd). The capital costs involved are the annual operating cost, hauling cost and disposal cost. This equates to an initial capital outlay yearly cost of \$8.2 million for the Low Capacity Transfer Station and \$14.3 million for the High Capacity Transfer Station. He maintained that this is why the public/private partnership option is far more appealing. The operating, hauling and disposal cost all go away; the county would just provide the property and permitting. Transportation and Development Director Metarko added there would be a long term lease of 15 to 20 years.

At a meeting held at the Transportation and Development Office, Mr. Lawson highlighted the three topics of discussion with representatives from Waste Industries; Jason Zepp and Dwayne Wright. Mr. Wright runs the Stockbridge Waste Industries Hauling Facility and Mr. Zepp is the Regional Manager for Waste Industries. The first topic was short term solutions to create a lower cost disposal option. The response from Waste Industries was a Green Box Site, which is where the waste company would provide roll-offs at the landfill for citizen use. This way citizens would still deposit their waste as they do now but would pay a lower fee, because they would no longer be paying the county tipping fee but would be paying a fee negotiated with the private entity. The waste would then be diverted to their facility; this means that it would continue to reduce intake at the landfill. It was discussed what that lower cost needs to be and the proposed amount was \$20 and the feedback we received from Waste Industries is that this seems reasonable.

Once it was explained that the revenue would go to the company, Chairman Turner asked what kind of impact would that be for the county, because we would lose that revenue. After that meeting, Mr. Lawson shared that he and Mr. Metarko had talked about negotiating a small host fee for the arrangement to assist with offsetting the revenue loss. After seeking clarification, Budget Manager- Mr. Dennis Johnson determined that there would still be cost there necessary to handle the internal operations. Mr. Johnson estimated that it was typically around \$900,000 that the county was subsidizing the landfill in this existing model; in this new model, we were \$1.7 million in the hole. This would provide a lower cost to the citizens, but it is costing the county \$1.7 million to do that. Mr. Lawson suggested that with the host fee, the county could open up intake to Henry County, which could offset what the county would be losing. He reiterated that none of this waste would go into the landfill.

Chairman Turner said that he would be interested in knowing what those numbers are for cities with that type of model that have a host fee. Mr. Leatherwood shared that during that meeting, Waste Industries representatives mentioned that there would be a lower price point for Clayton County residents, and out-of-county residents would pay a higher cost.

Continuing with his presentation, Mr. Lawson advised that the second option was a Transfer Station. He called attention to the private/public partnership and reiterated that the private partner

would take on all costs associated with design, contract bidding, construction and operations. Mr. Lawson maintained that Waste Industries is very interested in this; however, they do not want to go through the permitting process. Mr. Leatherwood added that they were so interested that Waste Industries has already outlined potential properties. Mr. Lawson then added that they have conducted a property search and are looking towards the north end of the county.

In conclusion of the transfer station slides, Mr. Lawson mentioned that the host fee could be a potential revenue source. A transfer station could be a long-term solution for county solid waste planning and this was the discussion that we had. Mr. Leatherwood added that another option was to use the Clayton County landfill as the transfer station and that would reduce the operation cost. Chairman Turner said that he would not want to see a transfer station set up at the landfill.

Mr. Lawson also shared that there were discussions with Waste Industries regarding a county-wide collection program and they are very much for the idea. For them, the transfer station in combination with the county-wide collection program would be a win/win situation. After Mr. Lawson spoke of the concerns on the citizens that their bill would go up, Mr. Leatherwood pointed out that Waste Industries had advised that they could potentially do \$13 a month; then, the administrative fee of \$2 would be added for a \$15 monthly cost. Mr. Lawson advised that most citizens are spending approximately \$20 a month; therefore, this would be a cost savings for them. In addition, there could be expanded services to include single-stream recycling along with other possible programs, because this would not change the overall cost. Another interesting measure is that they could share in illegal dumping enforcement. He then explained how this would be accomplished by stating that all of their trucks are currently equipped with systems that allow them to document illegal dumping on their routes.

Chairman Turner asked if they would follow up by going to court to testify about illegal dumping, at which time, Mr. Lawson responded that they did not ask that question, but if they are going through these measures to document it; then, he believes they would do whatever within reason that the county requested to be a part of the deal.

After Mr. Lawson mentioned the potential partnerships in education, community cleanup and amnesty days, Chairman Turner then asked about the educational component. Mr. Lawson maintained that he believes the county could get an educational component out of that agreement; it would just have to be worked into the agreement.

Lastly, Mr. Lawson advised that we discussed a landfill operational lease. He explained that basically the company would run the landfill like a business, which means it would fill up fast. However, they have the potential to offset, in full or in part, all of the county's expenses associated with the landfill. They would shorten the lifespan of the landfill but would build out Cells 5 and 6. He said that there idea was that the host fee be large enough to balance out the closure / post-closure costs. Budget Manager Johnson reminded the members that the county has to put money

aside for closure / post-closure costs and there is monitoring that is done every year. Mr. Lawson maintained that the transfer station would be needed once the landfill is closed.

In conclusion, Mr. Lawson pointed out that these were the topics of discussion that we had with Waste Industries. At this time, the members shared their views on the matter. Chairman Turner asked for some additional information on the transfer station and the potential location on the north side would be a plus. He added that we still need to continue to have that discussion on mandatory trash pickup, but we need to make sure we get the answers to the questions the citizens have posed in reference to the billing of the fee. Mr. Leatherwood said if we are going to continue with the idea of mandatory pickup; then, the county needs to lead by example to make trash clean up a priority. He pointed out that Gwinnett County has a clean and beautiful program and they partner with businesses, but Clayton County does not have a keep Clayton beautiful program. However, there are things that we can do, such as; Adopt a Road Program. Chairman Turner added that we also need to get the School System involved in this initiative, and he has a meeting with the School Superintendent and that would be one of the topics of discussion. Mr. Lawson recalled his conversation with Ms. Kimberly White with Keep Cobb County Beautiful. He maintained that she is willing to come down and share ideas on what they are doing in Cobb County. Chairman Turner recalled that Clayton County did have a good program but it came down to funding. Mr. Leatherwood made mention of his talks with Keep Gwinnett Beautiful and Keep Georgia Beautiful and by partnering with them, they come in with all of the material for the educational piece. Chairman Turner said that he would ask the Board of Commissioners to look at the funding.

For clarification, Mr. Leatherwood asked if the recommendation would be to pursue the north side transfer station option. Chairman Turner agreed and added that one of the expectations for our next meeting is to have some information in terms of location and we need that before a conversation with the Board of Commissioners. He pointed out that wherever the location is to be considered, we have to sell that to the district commissioner.

In conclusion, Transportation and Development Director Metarko asked about the next meeting date, at which time, he suggested late January. The authority members also suggested late January.

## V. PUBLIC COMMENT

- 1) Mr. Mickey Garber came forward to point out that today is the birthday of our great county born November 30, 1850. He then pointed out some garbage that he has picked up. He said we are all responsible for garbage and we all produce garbage. He said that it is good to see that the members realize that education is part of the solution, but there is more to this. He pointed out that some of the garbage has identifying factors to it. He concluded by saying that his goal is to keep the streets clean.

Mr. Leatherwood asked about the intergovernmental agreement that was passed around the table at the last meeting. Chairman Turner recalled that we held that agreement. In response to a question of Mr. Leatherwood regarding the 12 month agreement and the auto renewal piece, Transportation and Development Director Metarko responded that it is a relationship between the Board of Commissioners and the Solid Waste Management Authority and how the landfill works.

There being no further business to discuss, motion by Ms. Carp, second by Tax Commissioner Baskin, to adjourn the Solid Waste Management Authority Board Meeting of November 30, 2017 at 12:35 p.m. Vote unanimous by the four members present for this meeting. Vice-Chairman Edmondson, Mr. Lett and Mr. Love were absent.