

MINUTES

RAPPAHANNOCK REGIONAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

November 20, 2013

George L. Gordon Government Center
Board of Supervisor Chambers

Meeting Convened: A regular meeting of the Rappahannock Regional Solid Waste Management Board (R-Board) was convened at 1:30 P.M., Wednesday, November 20, 2013 at the George L. Gordon Government Center, Board of Supervisor Chambers.

Roll Call: The following members were present: Paul V. Milde, III, Chairman (arrived at approximately 1:45 P.M.); Frederic N. Howe, III, Vice Chairman; Beverley R. Cameron (departed meeting at approximately 2:30 P.M.); George Solley; and Anthony Romanello. R-Board Member Gary Snellings was absent.

Also in attendance were: Bill Hefty, Esq., R-Board Attorney; Robert L. Hundley, Resource International, Ltd.; Keith Dayton, Director; Jason Pauley, R-Board Superintendent; Diane L. Jones, Julie May, and Stephanie Persico, R-Board Staff.

Mr. Solley motioned, seconded by Mr. Cameron, to approve the minutes for September 18, 2013.

By voice, the vote was:

Yea: (4) Cameron, Howe, Solley, Romanello
Nay: (0)

Presentation by the Public: The following members of the public desired to speak:

Barbara Pyatt-500 Eskimo Hill Road; She stated that she thought it would be at least a year before the Waste to Energy update would be on the R-Board agenda. She would like to know why it was put back on the agenda. She stated she read that Mary Washington University students think it's a good idea. She stated she didn't know how things had improved from the last meeting. She said that she didn't want the incinerator. She was concerned about any increase to the number of trucks on Eskimo Hill Road.

Bill Johnson- Mountain View Road; He stated he was surprised to see that an RFP be issued again without taking the step to change from by right use back to requiring a conditional use permit; he thought the Board was going to make a recommendation and he was surprised that the RFP would be issued. He is concerned about the plant having the potential of environmental hazards (ash, toxins). He noted that Stafford will not forbid proposers from coming back and importing tires from other places. He spoke about how burning tires, no matter how hot, will always create some kind of residue. He stated that 55% of the trash coming into the landfill is recycled and noted that it is a huge feat that the landfill is able to do that.

Alane Callandar- 622 Lancaster Street; She supported Mr. Johnson and stated that she doesn't support the incineration; she supported the recycling program. She made suggestions about the

R-Board website; she suggested that minutes from meetings be posted on the website as well as the R-Board meeting materials in advance of the meeting.

Mr. Howe spoke to the audience about discussing the RFP and how there will be a lot of opportunities to listen to their concerns and comments as we go forward and there have been no decisions made as of this point. This is round two in exploring new ideas. He wants Mr. Dayton to update the website with all current information.

Report of the R-Board Attorney: Mr. Hefty reported that no new regulations affecting landfill operations were passed in the general assembly during the 2013 session. There is no new litigation against the R-Board at this time.

Report of Staff: Mr. Dayton reported the current status of staffing. The landfill currently is authorized for 34 positions, 27 positions are filled with 7 vacant positions. He reported we are recruiting for a Landfill Maintenance Worker I position and a Heavy Equipment Operator I position, all other positions will remain vacant and will not be recruited at this time.

Permits: Ms. May spoke about the Air Permit; they have met with DEQ to help clarify the relationship of our air permit with the Ameresco air permit. DEQ will be amending the R-Board's permit administratively which shortens the time necessary for revisions. The R-Board will be issued a permit amendment that specifically states when the Ameresco power plant is running and utilizing all the landfill gas, the candlestick flare does not have to be on. She spoke about the solid waste inspection; this was held on November 14th. She spoke about leachate seeps that were in the July inspection which were all taken care of. DEQ was pleased with Cell F1 filling operations; they were concerned about the litter that was blowing around. Overall the site looked really good.

Mr. Romanello asked Ms. May to clarify about when we are supposed to run the flare. She stated the permit states that the flare is supposed to run when the gas collection system is running and the gas collection system is supposed to be always running. Ameresco's permit authorizes them to run their generators off of landfill gas, and running the generators at a reduced rate to provide gas to burn our flare is counterintuitive. Mr. Romanello stated that his daughter was part of the group who took a tour of the landfill and stated that she said that Julie was awesome.

Mr. Hundley spoke about Permit 589. He stated that Resource is working with the R-Board staff to complete review of the draft application for the landfill's Title V air permit. He spoke about the status of the closure permit for the former Fredericksburg landfill.

Recent Activities of Note: Mrs. Jones spoke about the updates of the florescent bulb collection system. She stated that the residential drop-off areas have been rearranged with drop-off areas which are easily monitored by the gate attendant. She spoke about Hugh Mercer Elementary School and the recycling program. She stated that the students and staff were excited to start this program. She stated that the fleet inspection program is up and running with little to no problems so far.

Correspondence & Media: Mr. Dayton noted Ms. May's blog on florescent bulb disposal. Also included is correspondence from the staff of Hugh Mercer Elementary school as well as Widewater Elementary school.

Report on Finances: Mr. Dayton reported continued strong revenue performance with very good commercial activity. Presently at 37% of revenues collected after 33% of fiscal year. Mr. Dayton called attention to a small error in the interest line – the year to date interest collected is about \$15,000 higher than reported. He noted that revenues are expected to decline during holiday/winter period. Expenses on target (34% expenditure vs. 33% of the fiscal year expired) and staff will continue to monitor expenses very closely. That's a breakeven number, and doesn't include anything for depreciation; he cautions that it's satisfactory, but not exemplary.

Mr. Howe stated that we are 7 positions short and that will affect the budget if we have to hire more employees. He stated that the numbers wouldn't look good if we had to hire more employees. Mr. Dayton concurred.

Customer Account Status: Once again, Quantico is the significant delinquent account. Total delinquencies are about \$55,000 less than reported at the last meeting.

Weight & Material Analysis: The tonnage collected data reflects the strong commercial waste collection. Billable collection performance is still strong, as reflected by revenue generation. Stafford non-billable increase is still the result of the change in weight audit procedures, and not a real increase. Staff is analyzing waste tire disposal trends. Mr. Dayton noted that the number of tires coming into the landfill free of charge at the residential collection area is raising questions, with the residential waste tire drop off 4 times higher than the commercial waste tire drop off. Mr. Pauley will report on this in more detail later.

Unfinished Business:

Update on Environmental Monitoring and Gas Installation Contracting: Ms. May reported that the monitoring and maintenance RFP for the existing landfill gas collection system is out. She stated that we will be having a pre-proposal meeting on Thursday November 21st. She stated we have received a number of inquiries and the proposals are due on December 5th. She expects that the cost will be less than \$100,000 for the remainder of the fiscal year and, if so, staff would proceed to contract for this service. She stated the bid for the extraction wells for Cell E is still in development; we are working with Resource International and will be out for bid soon.

Waste to Energy Proposal Update: Mr. Dayton spoke about the Alternative Solids Handling request for proposals (RFP) progress. The R-Board directed staff to complete a draft RFP and solicit public input for 2 weeks and received multiple comments. Staff prepared a log of all the comments and included responses. The completed log was included with the R-Board packages. All comments were provided with a response in the log, with changes made to the RFP where staff felt it was appropriate. Where the recommendation was to change the RFP, the log notation is in red, and the additions to the RFP addressing these comments are also noted in red. Comments related to subsurface conditions, bonding, additional information relative to engineering and permits, as well as clarification about the subsequent environmental study were addressed by changes to the RFP. Draft revised RFP also included with the R-Board packages.

Mr. Dayton advised that proposed Resolution RB13-05 was included if the R-Board wished to provide direction to staff to proceed to advertise for proposals.

Mr. Howe spoke about the memorandum and he stated he was concerned about the professional assistance to evaluate the proposal responses, and the lack of funds in the budget for this service. He asked how much this service would cost. He spoke about Phase One and Phase Two assistance, with Phase One being the development of a short-list of firms for further consideration, and Phase Two the technical evaluation to select the preferred firm from the short listed companies.

Mr. Dayton spoke about the need to issue another RFP to contract for professional assistance in evaluating proposals and providing recommendations to select the lead candidate for the Alternative Solids Handling proposal. Mr. Dayton noted that this process usually takes about 4 months. The cost for these services is estimated to be between \$25,000 and \$100,000, depending on the extent of services requested. The process was described as follows: develop a scope of services, issue the RFP, evaluate the proposal responses and short list the responding firms. At that point you would request non-binding cost estimates for professional services, hold interviews and make a selection.

Mr. Howe stated that we would have the opportunity to learn about the alternative processes as we go through the selection of firms. He also asked if similar professional resources will be available so we can make a good financial decision. Mr. Romanello answered that on the financial side we would rely on our financial advisors, PFM.

Mr. Milde commented that it would be smart to have the extra level of protection/advice. Mr. Howe stated it is his main goal is to not spend extra money but the goal is to learn from the experience and also ensure that we are bringing back those who make the cut/qualify for the work and this is another opportunity to improve on that as we go forward. Mr. Milde commented we need to try to hire someone who will be not biased and have an objective view. Mr. Dayton suggested that we look at firms that are completely disassociated with any of the process, and any of the R-Board activities to this point.

Mr. Solley stated that it's reasonable to hire someone with outside expertise in this field, and prefers finding a firm who will provide objective input. Mr. Milde asked if we could use the help from a university, Mr. Dayton suggested that universities are primarily focused on teaching and research, and he recommends that we look for professional engineering support. If we go with a university we may limit our prospective responses. Mr. Howe emphasized requesting Phase One, short listing services; and Phase Two, selection of the preferred candidate.

Mr. Howe motioned, seconded by Mr. Solley, to move forward with a Request for Proposals for professional and technical services to review the draft RFP for Alternative Solids Handling Processes, and provide Phase One support to include the initial screening of received proposals to develop a short list of preferred candidates, and Phase Two support to include assisting with the selection of the preferred vendor. Funding for these services was authorized to be from the R-Board reserve fund in an amount not to exceed \$100,000.

By voice, the vote was:

Yea: (5) Cameron, Howe, Milde, Solley, Romanello
Nay: (0)
Absent (1) Snellings

The vote was then followed by a discussion of whether the RFP for Alternative Solids Handling Proposals could proceed simultaneously with the selection of a firm to provide technical assistance with the evaluation of the proposals received. Mr. Romanello then offered that it would be wise to have the firm providing support in the selection of proposing firms review the RFP prior to it being issued. Discussion ensued with it being explained that this step would postpone issuance of the Alternatives Solids Handling RFP until around May of 2014. After discussion, it was decided to postpone action on RB13-05 until after selection of a firm to assist with evaluation of the RFP and proposing firms.

Mr. Howe motioned, seconded by Mr. Romanello, to defer action on RB13-05 until after selection of a firm to provide assistance in the evaluation of the Alternative Solids Handling RFP and the submitted proposals.

By voice, the vote was:

Yea: (5) Cameron, Howe, Milde, Solley, Romanello
Nay: (0)
Absent (1) Snellings

New Business:

Recycling Report: Ms. Jones discussed the recycling markets on a global level. She stated that the markets are changing, with the recycling standards becoming more restrictive, and the negative affect on our operations. We had two contracts with our single stream; one was a year old with Waste Management (WM), and the other with Tidewater Fiber Corp (TFC). WM paid us \$22/ton to take their entire single stream recycle product, transfer it to larger trucks, and deliver it to their recycling facility. The TFC contract is in the 3rd of 5 years, and they were paying us almost \$20/ton to load and ship the balance of our single stream recycle product. Upon time for contract renewal last July, both companies requested the current contracts be renegotiated or they wouldn't renew; WM wished to continue to deliver recycle product to our facility, but would no longer receive the material at their facility; consequently, they would not pay for the product. We were the only facility in the nearby area willing to receive single stream materials.

Negotiations with TFC ultimately led to an acceptable agreement, although with much reduced revenues. We were required to take additional measures to reduce the quantity of contamination in the recycle stream, and they would compensate us at the reduced rate of \$12/ton for our single stream items. Measures taken to improve the quality of our product were listed as follows:

- We stepped up our inspections and screening of recyclable items, and implemented a contaminated load policy where haulers were charged \$71/ton for contaminated loads.
- We increased our efforts to educate the public and single stream suppliers. Particular emphasis has been placed on speaking with commercial haulers and the schools about single stream recycling.

These efforts have greatly improved the quality of our recycle stream, and helped stabilize the \$12/ton price.

Ms. Jones also discussed changes in the quality of recycled waste demanded by the largest importer of this product, China. China has set up a "Green Fence", raising standards on waste imports. She stated that the global markets for recycled products are shrinking, and becoming more restrictive about the quality standards for the recycled materials they accept. This has led to increased costs to prepare the recycled products for shipment, and resulted in a lower price for materials generated by the R-Board.

Mr. Milde asked is there a market for certain types of plastic, such as the Starbucks plastic cup. He asked what we do with it, and if there a market for that kind of plastic. Mr. Howe accented Mr. Milde's inquiry and spoke about how Stafford informs the public about plastics. He spoke about how Fredericksburg has buckets for certain items. Mr. Milde asked what the cost would be to recycle/reuse this kind of plastic. Ms. Jones suggested that TFC come and speak to the R-Board about this. Ms. May mentioned that the plastic industry is getting rid of the recycling symbol with the number inside because it's confusing for the public. She also stated that when we speak to the public, we ask for all types of plastics since if we accept all grades of plastics, then the volume of the valuable recycle products is increased. She noted that it is important to maintain consistency with our material acceptance policies to avoid confusion with people interested in recycling.

Mr. Dayton noted a recent newspaper article identifying the R-Board with the highest recycle rate in the region, and the 10th highest rate in the state among larger landfills. Mr. Dayton noted that this achievement is largely due to the efforts of Ms. Jones and Ms. May.

Madison County, Out of Area Waste Authorization (RB13-06): Mr. Dayton noted that Madison County had requested authorization to bring 6,000 tons per year of municipal solid waste (MSW) to Stafford. The R-Board authorized this, but the agreement was never finalized, and Madison County never brought any MSW to the County. Madison County advised they were no longer interested in delivering MSW to Stafford.

Mr. Solley motioned, seconded by Mr. Howe, to approve RB13-06 rescinding the previous authorization to receive MSW from Madison County.

By voice, the vote was:

Yea:	(4)	Howe, Milde, Solley, Romanello
Nay:	(0)	
Absent	(2)	Cameron, Snellings

Waste Tire Abuse (RB-07): Mr. Pauley noted that upon review of recent waste tire data, scale tickets and discussions with staff, it appears we have a disproportionate amount of tires coming through our residential area. We are trying to keep our waste tire collections at “zero cost” to our residents, while charging commercial tire companies bringing waste tires to our facility. It seems that certain individuals are bringing 4 waste tires every day. It appears that businesses have found a loop hole in our policies so they can drop off 4 tires a day without having to pay. Mr. Pauley spoke about making a new policy and informing the gate attendant and start enforcing this policy. We currently have a \$36,000 loss from all these tires coming into the residential area.

Mr. Howe motioned, seconded by Mr. Solley, to adopt RB 13-07, restricting residents of the City of Fredericksburg and Stafford County to the free disposal of eight (8) waste tires per calendar year.

By voice, the vote was:

Yea:	(4)	Howe, Milde, Solley, Romanello
Nay:	(0)	
Absent	(2)	Cameron, Snellings

Holiday Closure (Add On Item): Following discussion, Mr. Romanello motioned, seconded by Mr. Solley, to close the landfill at noon on December 24th.

By voice, the vote was:

Yea:	(4)	Howe, Milde, Solley, Romanello
Nay:	(0)	
Absent	(2)	Cameron, Snellings

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 2:58 pm with a unanimous vote.



Keith C. Dayton, Director



Stephanie Persico, Clerk