

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY

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

July 7, 2016

M I N U T E S

PRESENT: Chairman Jeffrey E. Turner (SWMA Member), Vice-Chairman Sonna Gregory (SWMA Member), Mary-Ann Carp (SWMA Member) and Terry Baskin (SWMA Member). Also present were Jeff Metarko (Director of Transportation and Development), Tim Gilliam (Landfill Manager), Johnette Smith (Deputy Chief Financial Officer), Jack Hancock (Interim Chief Staff Attorney), Josh Lawson with Jacobs Engineering and Sandra T. Davis (Clerk).

ABSENT: Earl Randall (SWMA Member), Andrew Love (SWMA Member) and Victor Lett, Sr. (SWMA Member).

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Chairman Turner called the meeting to order.

II. AMENDMENT OF AGENDA

Chairman Turner made a motion to amend the agenda to include a presentation by Mr. Jeff Metarko- Director of Transportation and Development, second by Mr. Baskin. Vote unanimous by the four members present for this meeting.

III. ADOPTION OF MAY 26, 2016 MEETING MINUTES

Motion by Mr. Baskin to approve the May 26, 2016 Meeting minutes, second by Chairman Turner. The motion passed 3-0-1 with Vice-Chairman Sonna Gregory abstaining due to being absent from the meeting.

IV. CONSULTANT CONTRACT

Interim Chief Staff Attorney Jack Hancock reported that a draft contract has been provided to Jacobs Engineering for their review; however, after conferring with the attorney representing Jacobs Engineering, it has been determined that this contract is not ready for a vote. He suggested two options on addressing this matter, at which time, Chairman Turner agreed with the latter in that once the contract has been properly prepared, the board would schedule a date to hold a meeting.

V. LANDFILL UPDATE PRESENTATION

Mr. Jeff Metarko noted that this powerpoint is the same as the one presented to the Board of Commissioners on July 5, 2016. He then made reference to the powerpoint to provide an overview of the landfill. He began by showing the Site 3 area, where we are disposing of trash right now and, both Sites 1 and 2 which are our closed landfills. He also displayed a visual of the entrance road to the landfill and a view from the Site 2 closed landfill to include the gas extraction system, and this is how it should look as a finished topped off landfill. He noted that the next slide is of Site 3 where we are currently disposing of trash. As the visual display shows, Mr. Metarko pointed out that we are getting close to the gas extraction system with the next slide displaying debris piled up right next to that base and this is not the safest situation and this is the concern that we have with the disposal of trash.

He recalled that in previous years, the county had the inert landfill to dispose of yard debris, concrete, asphalt, etc. and not in the Site 3 facility. As a recap, Mr. Metarko provided a graph depicting the amount of tonnage that we are seeing coming across the gate, which shows that our intake has drastically gone up. He illustrated the current fill level cross section for the current landfill, showing that Cell Five (5) and Cell Six (6) have not been developed yet and there is no trash coming into there. Mr. Mertako points out a limit shown on the cross section illustration which is our current guess as to how high we are and how much space we have left to dispose of waste. He then provided a representation of where the gas wells are located. Currently, trash is being disposed of in Cell 4, and there are no wells; all of the wells have been placed in Cells 1 through 3. He noted this is where we get into the conflict points where the gas wells would need to be relocated, redrilled or something else in order to have trash placed in that area. At the last meeting, he had explained what EPD had permitted us for that includes the entire landfill. It is approximately 25 years and noted this is about a year old worth of data how we report to EPD; this includes the capacity in Cells 5 and 6 that have not been developed; therefore, those cells cannot receive any trash. If Cells 5 and 6 are excluded, there is approximately 12 to 12.5 years of capacity in the developed landfill, which are Cells 1 - 4. With the inert impact and the rise in the intake rate, the life span of the landfill is approximately 6.5 years of capacity. When looking at the conflicts with the gas extraction wells, the life span goes down to 1.5 to 2 years. He recalled that the gas extraction system impacts the power plant operation which impacts the Trane Energy contract that the county has; the power plant generates enough power to support other county facilities. He then spoke of the impact of removing the wells that could cause not enough gas to be generated, which would affect other aspects of county operations and impact budgets.

A summarization of all of the issues that have been discussed as it relates to the county landfill was provided by Mr. Metarko and are listed as follows: County service vs. Enterprise operation; the true cost of disposal at approximately over \$100.00 a ton; Transfers from General Fund of approximately \$1 million over the last several years; Revenue issue vs. Disposal volume issue; Cell 5 and 6 Development costs; Gas to energy plant / inert waste and Internal County operations

with 30% of intake from county operations, which totaled around \$600,000 worth of services being provided. However, with the intake rate going up, that rate has gone down to around 20% of intake over the last year.

Mr. Metarko then outlined the potential next steps in the process and are as follows: Develop Cells 5 & 6 which is approximately a two year process with an approximate cost of \$7.5 million; to have a Waste Transfer Station; budget the closure and post closure expenses which is pushing around \$8 million; Waste Collection Service Regulation; internal county government usage only; and disposal fees: which include county versus non-county, businesses versus residential, property owners versus citizens. At this time, he recalled that at the last board meeting, the decision was made to raise the rate to \$100 flat minimum. However, that is still an option for anything above, below or in between. He continued with his presentation by mentioning volume limits (which is counterintuitive to a landfill), and tonnage rate versus minimum.

For the final slide, Mr. Metarko outlined a summary of where the board is because we have received a lot of public input. The Solid Waste Management Authority voted on May 26, 2016 to increase the rate. At the June 7, 2016 Board of Commissioners Regular Business Meeting, it was believed that the Board of Commissioners would ratify the increase; however, the decision was made to pull this item from the agenda because the Solid Waste Management Authority has the authority to raise the rate. The notifications to the public were posted via the website, sign and notices were handed out to the people that came to dispose of items on June 8, 2016. On June 9, 2016, there were signs posted at the landfill. The effective date was July 1, 2016; therefore, the website page was updated to reflect the new fees. Thereafter, the Clayton County News Daily and the Atlanta Journal Constitution ran articles on it, as well as, WSB made a video about it with Tom Jones.

Vice Chairman Gregory said that it seems to be a combination of the “Potential Next Steps” as outlined in the slide presentation to insure sustainability. There was listed the development of the new cells, waste collection service and property owners vs. non-property owner citizens. She recalled that it was mentioned that a lot of the pick-up is internal; however, we get calls every day about trash on the roads and so forth. She maintained that she still feels that this increase in price is only going to add more to it and internally, we are still just going to fill it up because people are not going to pay that \$100 to go to the landfill. She believes that it is not right to punish citizens who do what is right and do not dump on the side of the roads. Once again, she believes that we need to look at a combination of these things as a solution to sustain the landfill, as well as, serve the citizens of the county.

Mr. Terry Baskin said that he is sure that everyone at the May 26th Meeting had concerns about the price increase, but we are “on the clock” and that is what we are facing. We are at a critical state with this landfill and time is of the essence. He has always questioned why we are in the business in the first place. He called attention to the amount of money being drawn from the General Fund, which is approximately \$1 million every year. He then spoke of the options that

are available. He noted that citizens are looking at the \$100 and he is looking at the time span and what could happen if we do not take initial steps to move forward with slowing this process down and not be in line to having higher taxes possibly.

In response to Mr. Baskin as to the reason for the meeting today, Chairman Turner explained that it was initially to discuss the contract, but since there has been citizens input and concern, it is also his concern as well; this is why we are taking up this issue again.

As it relates to the comments from Vice Chairman Gregory to combine some of the potential solutions, Chairman Turner noted that each comes at a price to the county and identified some of the cost involved. He maintained when we look at the options and the need for space capacity, we have to make some hard decisions.

Responding to Chairman Turner, Mr. Metarko shared that right now with the \$100 rate, we are trying to look at how many wells do we need to shut down and how many wells we can keep active. He explained that we don't know the impact as to how much gas will be continuously flowing and if that would sustain the energy plant or not; we won't know that until we start deactivating some of the wells. He shared that the authority has bought us time, post July 1st, to try to incrementally make those steps; however, if the authority goes back to the system where it was or somewhere in between, it will be until the customers regulate themselves and we try to get established with what the intake rate is as to how quickly we have to act on the wells, and then what the capacity is remaining.

Chairman Turner recalled that at the Board of Commissioners Regular Business Meeting on July 5, 2016, the board asked to be provided with an estimate on the county usage versus non-county usage. He then asked if we moved to an in-county use only (residents and businesses) and reduce the rate to \$75 per ton and over and \$40 for less than a ton would this still buy us sufficient time or putting us back in the same ship. Mr. Baskin responded that he believes that this would put us back in the same ship. From an operational prospective, Mr. Metarko maintained that it is the volume that is coming in. The majority that is coming in, we believe, is coming from neighboring counties; mainly Henry and Spaulding Counties. He pointed out that does buy us time, but is it enough for the authority to make decisions on what other directions to go towards.

In response to Chairman Turner regarding the time frame for waste collection service, Mr. Metarko pointed out that is roughly 2 to 2.5 years out; we were looking at three years out, but he believes we can do it in 2 years. He recalled that this would require residential trash service pick-up in the unincorporated county; that would take some of the burden off.

Also, Mr. Metarko addressed a question from Vice Chairman Gregory regarding the fee, in that a fee would be attached to the property tax bill. He then continued to ask the question if the landfill is a county service or is it an enterprise operation. He explained the difference between the two is that with an enterprise operation, you want to make money or at least break even, but

any rate structure that is set that does not allow free market to come here, means that the authority is reverting back to that internal county service operation; the budgets were set up as an enterprise operation, which means there is some conflict there in how we are operating it.

Chairman Turner then made a motion to change the rates to in-county use only for residents and businesses for \$75 a ton and over, \$40 for less than a ton and in six month, revisit this issue once we get some true numbers to determine how this affects the lifespan of the landfill, second by Mr. Baskin. In response to Vice Chairman Gregory, Chairman Turner determined there would be no out-of-county rates; Clayton County citizens and businesses only. When Vice Chairman Gregory clarified that means that anybody from out-of-county cannot use the landfill, Chairman Turner agreed. Vote unanimous.

Mr. Metarko asked to clarify that the \$75 a ton for in-county businesses and residents that would be what goes over our scales to add that this would be trailers and commercial vehicle type equipment. In contrast, the \$40 would be for light-duty pickup trucks. He also asked for a minimum on the scale weighs and suggested \$75 or \$50. Chairman Turner then reiterated the \$40 and clarified that the modifications on the trucks and things of that nature, we cannot have that; therefore, it's light trucks only for the minimum of \$40.

Mr. Metarko also recalled that during a previous meeting, we enacted all trailers have to go over the scales. Chairman Turner said that should remain. Mr. Metarko then asked for clarification on "in-county businesses and residential". Chairman Turner explained that if the business is located within the boundaries of Clayton County, he would consider that to be a Clayton County business regardless of where they live. Chairman Turner described some instances that would circumvent the concept, but asked that Mr. Metarko and his staff mitigate it the best they can. Also, they would have to provide proof, such as; identification and business license.

Chairman Turner advised of his plans to meet with the Public Safety Officials to have an aggressive campaign to stop some of this illegal dumping and maybe that would mitigate some of the Refuse Control issues with going out to pick up trash off the sides of the roads.

Mr. Metarko then asked about the City of Jonesboro due to the city bringing their residential trash to our county for dumping. He did not know if there would be some consideration that the authority would have extended to the city. Also, the Water Authority has asked if they could be considered a county department in their operations.

Lastly, Mr. Metarko noted that a citizen could call Refuse Control and schedule a pickup for \$20.00 and pointed out that Refuse Control does not pay any fees for dumping. Chairman Turner suggested the rate of \$40 to structure it to have the same rate. Vice Chairman Gregory asked if the Board of Commissioners would have to vote to change the rates for Refuse Control pick ups. Interim Chief Staff Attorney Jack Hancock advised that if the Board of Commissioners established that rate; then, he would say yes. Chairman Turner said the Refuse Control is a county department; however, we are talking about the fees that are charged for the debris that

goes to the landfill. Therefore, we are voting on the landfill fees and need to get ratification from the Board of Commissioners.

Referring back to the City of Jonesboro and the Water Authority, Chairman Turner asked what rates are they paying now or what rates were they paying before the increase. Mr. Metarko replied that they were paying the gate rate. He reported that the City of Jonesboro paid the landfill just over \$37,000 and that was based off the \$40 a ton rate. The Water Authority, for items subject to fees, paid just about \$13,000. Chairman Turner recommended to keep that the same as the flat rate that we charge everybody else and reiterated that we would review this again in six months.

Chairman Turner then asked if there were any other clarification points. Mr. Metarko asked for an effective date. After Mr. Metarko was asked to provide input on the effective date, Chairman Turner made the motion for the effective date of Monday, July 18, 2016, second by Mr. Baskin. Vote unanimous.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

Chairman Turner asked if anyone had any further business to bring before the authority. There was none.

There being no further business to discuss, motion by Mr. Baskins, second by Chairman Turner, to adjourn the Solid Waste Management Authority Board Meeting of July 7, 2016 at 10:59 a.m. Vote unanimous.