

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY BOARD MEETING

10:00 A.M.

June 29, 2022

PRESENT: Vice-Chair Gail Hambrick (SWMA Member), Edie Young (SWMA Member), Robb Leatherwood (SWMA Member) and Captain Sean MacDonald (SWMA Member).

ABSENT: Chairman Jeffrey E. Turner (SWMA Member), Tax Commissioner Terry Baskin (SWMA Member) and Mary Ann Carp (SWMA Member).

ALSO PRESENT: Jeff Metarko (Director of Transportation and Development), Josh Lawson (Jacobs Engineering), Nathan Perrot (Landfill Manager of T&D), Staff Attorney John O’Neal, Tina Howard (District 2 Constituent Aide), Orlando Gooden (guest constituent) and Courtney Rushin (County Clerk).

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:

Vice-Chair Hambrick called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m.

II. ADOPTION OF NOVEMBER 3, 2021 MEETING MINUTES:

Motion made by Captain Sean McDonald, second by Edie Young to approve a motion to adopt the November 3, 2021, meeting minutes. The motion carried unanimously by the four board members present.

III. CONSULTANT CONTRACT & TASK ORDERS FOR FY23:

Director Jeff Metarko outlined two documents for the board to review: 1) yearly contract renewal with Jacobs Engineering and 2) Task Order #3; stating there are currently two sites at the landfill, one is closed, and one is open. The budget has not increased and has already been approved.

The board entertained questions on the contract and task order. Director Metarko clarified that the task order comes after the contract and sets the framework.

Motion made by Captain MacDonald, second by Edie Young to accept the contract with Jacobs Engineering. Motion passed unanimously by the four board members present.

Attorney O'Neal stated he will check on the execution details of the contracts.

IV. SOLID WASTE COLLECTION PROGRAM STATUS DISCUSSION:

Director Metarko outlined prospective vendors, stating that the Board of Commissioners approved all six of the vendors.

The next steps needed from this board include clarification about the type of program, best practices, and discussion of future meetings with commissioners for a consensus.

This would potentially mean coming before the board during a Work Session but would be no guarantee to move forward because the Board of Commissioners decides whether to move forward.

V. POWER PLANT DISCUSSION:

Josh Lawson of Jacobs Engineering gave a brief PowerPoint presentation entitled, "Clayton County Landfill Power Plant Status".

This presentation outlined the following:

- Aerial of Clayton County Landfill
 - Layout of gas extraction system
 - Site 2 – closed landfill
 - Site 3 – open/active landfill
 - All gas goes to flare system, which goes to power plant
 - Number of wells in Site 3 > than Site 2
- Power Plant (Engines)
- High Level History of Power Plant (LFGE Engines)
- Contract Agreement with Trane
 - Initial performance agreement contract in 2009
 - Performance agreement update
- Status of revenue sources
- Benefits to continued operations
 - Landfill Gas Extraction System
 - Site 2 installation complete
 - Site 3 Phase I installation complete
 - Power Plant (Engines)
 - Site 2 and Site 3 gas generation rates declining
 - Plant is currently offline with minimal operations over past year
 - Per state regulations, organic inert debris can be disposed of in Site 3 Landfill, which would eliminate alternate disposal costs to the county.

- Options for moving forward with Power Plant
 - #1 – Continue to operate with:
 - New upgrades and expansions to piping, engines, extraction wells
 - Requires additional capital costs
 - #2 – Continue to operate without
 - Will have continued challenges and issues
 - No costs
 - #3 – Decommission Power Plant
 - Voluntarily with additional costs
 - To include:
 - (i) Transport and dispose of organic and inert debris off site
 - (ii) Permit new inert landfill for disposal
 - (iii) organic and inert debris onsite (~ 80% of current intake)

We would also have to look at the costs of potential offsite facilities which take inert debris.

The board further discussed proposed next steps and it was decided to create a contract extension with Trane; and for the SWMA board to provide direction for further evaluation.

In conclusion Director Metarko asked the board to define some options so Mr. Lawson can further investigate and provide a quantitative analysis. There was additional discussion on cost efficiencies for the landfill and county.

Director Metarko also stated that the Trane contract is needed for their expertise. He asked to start discussions with Trane for: 1) Scope of Services and 2) Solicitation of Timeline

Mr. Leatherwood requested more information on the Trane extension and contract; the permit on expansion for Sites 5 and Site 6 and more information on the mulching operation. The board further discussed the three options presented to the board for review.

VI. OPEN DISCUSSION:

Mr. Leatherwood led an open discussion on the transfer station location options with Director Metarko and Vice-Chair Hambrick. The discussion concluded with agreeance to wait on suggestions for further action.

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT:

There were no public comments.

VIII. ADJOURN:

Vice-Chair Hambrick made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 11:04 a.m. The motion carried unanimously by the four board members present.