SOLID WASTE ALTERNATIVES FUNDING TASK FORCE

APRIL 25, 2011

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Curtis Binney (Chairman)
Mr. Lindell Dorsett
Mr. Richard Grier
Mr. Dan Gorden
Mr. Donald Taylor
Ms. Brenda Boggs
Ms. Chloe Gentry

MEMBERS NOT PRESENT

Commissioner Jennifer Hill
Mr. Peter Tarby

OTHERS PRESENT

Ms. Wendy Taylor, Executive Office Manager, County Manager's Office
Mr. Jim Stivender, Public Works Director
Mr. Jeff Cooper, Financial Coordinator
Mr. Gary Debo, Solid Waste Operations Director
Ms. Courtney Vincent, Recording Secretary

CALL TO ORDER, ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM,

Mr. Curt Binney, Chairman, called the meeting to order and announced that they had properly noticed the meeting and that a quorum was established.

MINUTE APPROVAL

Mr. Taylor mentioned that Mr. Johnny Taylor, Hazardous Waste Coordinator for Public Works, had spoken at the February 14 meeting and asked it be clarified in the minutes for that meeting when Mr. Johnny Taylor was speaking versus when he was speaking to avoid any confusion.

On a motion by Mr. Dorsett, seconded by Mr. Gorden and carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0, the SWATF approved the minutes of February 14, 2011.

Ms. Boggs mentioned there was a correction to the March 14 minutes regarding the spelling of Pembroke Pines.

On a motion by Mr. Taylor, seconded by Mr. Dorsett and carried unanimously by a vote of 6-0, the SWATF approved the minutes of March 14, 2011.

COVANTA DISCUSSION

Mr. Joe Treshler from Covanta gave a PowerPoint presentation entitled, "Energy from Waste as Part of Lake County's Long Term Solid Waste Management Solution." He stated Covanta's recommendation was to renew the commitment to an integrated solid waste management approach through continued use of the Lake County Energy from Waste Facility. He explained the reasons for the recommendation were that it was a good source of renewable energy, it complemented the County's recycling program, and it reduced long-haul trucking to waste to out-of-county landfills.

Mr. Dorsett asked if Covanta did not want recyclable materials.

Mr. Treshler replied that it was ultimately up to the County what to do with the recyclables and that while Covanta encouraged recycling, if the County decided it was more economical to recover the energy of those recyclables by burning them then Covanta would help with that.

Mr. Dorsett asked if that meant Covanta did not have long term interests in constructing its own recycling operations.

Mr. Treshler responded that their facility was not large enough for that because they could not put in a single stream system.

Mr. Binney mentioned that a significant portion of the waste stream was recyclable and asked should the County find another company that could process the recycling economically, causing the County to pull out 60 percent of the waste stream, if it would still be a viable business model for Covanta.

Mr. Treshler replied yes, mentioning that Covanta had not sought waste streams from other places or made commitments to other people because of the current contract with the County. He stated Covanta was not looking for a put or pay contract with the County, they were only asking for a commitment from the County to send over what solid waste they had that they were not doing anything else with instead of sending it to a landfill.

Mr. Grier asked if there were environmental issues the Committee had not yet heard about in regards to waste to energy.

Mr. Treshler said absolutely not and stressed that the energy could not get any cleaner. He continued with the presentation, stating the facility allowed the County maximum flexibility in all market conditions and helped the County maintain full control of the economic impact of providing fully integrated solid waste management services. He added that it included the County retaining control of the landfill. He reviewed the energy benefits of the Covanta plant such as generating clean energy from local renewable fuel sources, the plant's ability to have base load power, and the promotion of energy security. He then recapitulated the economic benefits, mentioning Covanta was a fairly good economic engine in the County and that once 2014 arrived Covanta would be a direct benefit to the tax roll, also commenting that energy from waste offered predictable waste disposal costs. He discussed the case against landfilling, mentioning the greenhouse gas emissions emanating from landfills, the economic

risks associated with landfills, and that the public viewed energy from waste as more favorable than landfills and landfill gas collection. He reported that Covanta desired to work with the County and they were willing to start negotiating now on contract terms. He opined that the key things the Committee wanted as long term goals were maximizing recycling, minimizing rate payer impact, and eliminating the put or pay requirement from the Covanta agreement.

Mr. Dorsett asked how Covanta would manage the variable amounts of solid waste coming in from the County if they were not operating on a put or pay requirement.

Mr. Treshler answered that they would handle it similarly to how any merchant plan was handled and what they would look for from the County would be a commitment that everything not being sent to recycling would be sent to Covanta but with no guaranteed amount.

Ms. Boggs asked if Covanta would try to bring in other types of waste besides household solid waste.

Mr. Treshler replied they would not bring in anything that was outside the definition of municipal solid waste, though they would bring in some secure services such as expired pharmaceuticals, explaining the reason was because they would only bring in what they were permitted for.

Ms. Boggs asked if they would try to get a permit to bring in other types of materials.

Mr. Treshler answered no. He noted they were currently handling international waste and some cruise ship waste that was not allowed to be landfilled and had to be incinerated.

Mr. Dorsett asked if Covanta had a non put or pay agreement with the County after 2014 would there be a fixed rate with no adjustments due to prices.

Mr. Treshler responded yes. He asked how long the County wanted to commit to a contract, mentioning they would like to see one for 20 years. He stated Covanta wanted to negotiate a contract with simple terms acceptable to the County and once they had those terms they could plan how to fill the rest of their facility. He asked what the County's participation rate would be, if they wanted to set a minimum tonnage or if they wanted to accept whatever the going tipping fee was.

Mr. Stivender explained an RFP would go out for proposals to provide services to dispose of the solid waste and it would be written in such a way that it gave different scenarios for the proposals to provide more options, adding that the proposals would be listed as price per option.

Mr. Binney asked at what level the County got involved and if that was something they wanted to work into the negotiations with the haulers.

Mr. Stivender clarified that he viewed the Committee as giving direction of how the public in general would want the County to dispose of their solid waste. He stated the Committee's biggest responsibility was to determine if the public of Lake County wanted the solid waste to go in a landfill, to Covanta, or somewhere else and what the comfort zone was of the general public when it came to how to dispose

of the solid waste. He noted if the Committee gave County staff the direction they would be able to use those as guidelines to move forward.

Mr. Grier asked Mr. Treshler if Covanta would be wiling to renegotiate before 2014.

Mr. Treshler answered that Mr. Sandy Minkoff, County Attorney, said there would be no amendments to the existing agreement until the end of the contract. He opined that the reason was to get the Committee to make a recommendation so the County could make a decision on what to do next.

Mr. Stivender added that it would put the Committee at a disadvantage if the County was negotiating with Covanta at the same time they were trying to make a recommendation.

Mr. Cooper stated the issue was not only with put or pay or whether to pay a certain amount per ton, that there were so many different facets to be looked at and the County staff looked to the Committee to actually tell the Board where the community felt they should go, and if the Committee felt that waste to energy was better than landfilling they needed to tell the Board that. He commented that waste to energy was always going to be more expensive; the question was how much more expensive.

Mr. Grier asked if that meant staff was not interested in the Committee's input regarding the length of the current contract, adding that he heard more negatives than positives from both sides.

Mr. Stivender said that was fine, he had no problem with that.

Mr. Cooper remarked he did not know about the negatives and from staff perspective they wanted to do what the community wanted them to do and they would negotiate the best deal they could for everyone involved.

Mr. Grier remarked if it was the best deal for Covanta and for the citizens of the County to look at ending the contract in 2013 instead of 2014 then why not make the change.

Mr. Binney stated it was a valid point, but it was putting the cart before the horse and the Committee should come up with their recommendations and then possibly consider an early termination to the contract, should that be the direction the Committee thought the County should go.

Mr. Dorsett asked Mr. Treshler if it would be a valid assumption that what was most important to Covanta was not moving the new contract date earlier than 2014, but rather having the certainty of what its situation would be beyond 2014.

Mr. Treshler answered that both were important, noting they would like to see everything in place for 2014 by October 2013. He stated long term certainty was better for Covanta, so regardless of what the County decided, or even if there was no decision, they would need to go out and find the necessary tonnage for the facility because they could not wait until the County invited them without neglecting their responsibility to the people dependent on Covanta for their jobs as well as the stock holders.

Mr. Dorsett asked if negotiating a contract earlier would not have to be tied to ending the existing contract early.

Mr. Treshler replied that was correct, the two did not have to be tied to each other and if they could create something that worked and would benefit both parties Covanta would not be opposed to it.

Mr. Stivender commented that they were looking at a 30 year plan instead of a contract. He mentioned if the Committee completed their task by their deadline in June then the earliest they would most likely be able to present to the Board would be in September or possibly October, stressing that his goal was to start putting RFP's out on the street by the start of 2012 and he wanted to be finished with getting contracts in place before 2013. He remarked that because of all the different variables that would go into preparing the new contracts he thought it would be tricky to see any change before 2014.

Dr. Ney asked if the County was looking for longer or shorter term contracts, considering the likelihood of rising costs in the future.

Mr. Stivender responded that the County was putting out long term contracts that included a CPI to allow adjustments as the market change.

Mr. Binney asked if trash was considered the property of the County as soon as it was collected at the curb, also asking if it was still considered County property after being dropped at the disposal site.

Mr. Cooper replied that there was a point in time when the custody shifted, explaining that when waste was delivered to Covanta and was spread out over the floor, until Covanta accepted it, it was still considered County property, so if there were red biohazard bags it would be the County's responsibility to clean them up.

Mr. Debo noted it was the same for landfills; as soon as the disposal site touched the waste and put it into the working phase they took possession of it.

Mr. Treshler stated they treated outside customers the same way, holding them responsible for what was in their trash until Covanta took possession of it.

Mr. Binney asked, if they had contract haulers and a contract disposal operation, why the County should have any liability at that point in time.

Dr. Ney related that the EPA had what was called the potential responsible parties and a person was never relieved from their potentially responsible party status.

Mr. Binney asked if having the haulers collect the waste and haul it to an out of County landfill was increasing the liability because it was in possession that much longer.

Mr. Doug McCoy from Waste Management suggested adding language in a contract that would protect the County once the waste left the County.

Mr. Cooper added that the hauler contracts had a stipulation in them of who owns the waste up to what point and that there were indemnification provisions in the contracts as well.

Mr. Debo sited a recent event where a truckload of leachate was overturned on the highway. He stated the County was responsible in reporting it to the State because they were the generators of that waste and once the contractor came in and took possession of the waste the hauler had liability and also had insurance coverage to cover the liability. He added there was also a similar incident in December of 2008 where a truck overturned and it took three years to get that resolved through the State and they remediated any environmental impact that the accident caused.

Mr. Fred Hawkins from Waste Services explained that in the example Mr. Debo gave, his company would already have taken possession of the waste because it would have gone through a transfer station and they would have accepted the waste before transferring it to the trucks of the contractors who did their hauling. He added that should something happen before the hauler got to the landfill then the landfill would also be sued, surmising a good attorney would spread the blame at approximately 20 percent on the County, 60 percent on the landfill, and 20 percent on the hauler.

Mr. Binney remarked that the County resources and tax dollars were at risk the further the distance the trucks were on the road.

Mr. Hawkins replied it could also be looked at that the haulers were accepting the responsibility and had more liability because they were the ones transporting it and the County could say they had nothing to do with the transport.

Mr. Binney said the shorter the haul, the less at risk.

Mr. McCoy stated he had never seen an accident where the contractor had sole responsibility.

Mr. Debo emphasized that they should not think of it in terms of the number of miles, that there were liabilities with the operations of the receiving facility and in the operation of the generator.

Mr. Binney asked if there were any bonding requirements on the current contracts that the haulers were required to cover the County's costs.

Mr. Hawkins said absolutely, adding that the County would not let them keep any truck over two years old for the sake ensuring there were healthy vehicles on the road.

Mr. Grier mentioned the current contract with Covanta stated the County was responsible to pay if there were any environmental costs incurred for cleaning up emissions from the plant.

Mr. Treshler specified that changes in law had been a County responsibility and it was decreasing as they moved towards the end of their contract.

Mr. Cooper clarified that if the costs for the change in law came to less than $25,000 then Covanta could go ahead and do whatever they wanted to do and it was ok, but if it was more than $25,000 the County

paid for it once the change in law had been verified through the State, adding that the amounts had been negotiated in the contract.

Mr. Treshler stressed that the structure of that agreement would change after 2014, especially if the County was using the facility on an as-needed basis.

Mr. Binney noted the costs came down to tonnage and asked if the County ran the weigh station at Covanta.

Mr. Cooper answered that was correct.

Mr. Binney asked if it was factored into the current contract.

Mr. Cooper replied it was.

Mr. Stivender added that even if they were not the principle contract they would still want some kind of a third party guarantee that the loads were certified.

Mr. Cooper noted that the contract required the County to recertify the scales.

Mr. Binney remarked that the major concern of renewing a contract with Covanta other than economics would be environmental. He asked if there was any evidence that burning trash was not a viable environmental option.

Mr. Grier commented he was trying to get a report asking what the argument against Covanta was.

Mr. Cooper mentioned there were some people and former commissioners who were completely against waste to energy in any form. He added that the County and State required a stack test which was performed every January to ensure pollutants were not being released into the atmosphere. He commented that it was not the case to suggest there were no negative aspects and that there were rules that said during start up and shut down they were allowed to exceed certain parameters.

Mr. Grier stated there was scant information for the Committee to make a decision off of and the Committee should have gotten the information regarding the environmental impacts of the waste to energy plant earlier.

Mr. Treshler remarked that Covanta's operations emitted pollutant amounts that were far lower than the known risk exposure amounts dictated in their permits.

Mr. Grier asked Mr. Treshler when the last time was Covanta had to make adjustments due to changes in the Clean Air Act.

Mr. Treshler answered that they had to make some adjustments last year at some facilities to add additional CO2 monitoring on units over 600 tons per day.

Mr. Grier commented that earlier in the presentation Mr. Treshler had mentioned Covanta was a negative carbon dioxide (CO2) operation.

Mr. Treshler clarified that they were a negative greenhouse gas operation, which referred to methane (CH4), and that by combusting the waste properly and allowing it to release the CO2 they actually had a lower greenhouse gas impact because methane is 20 times more effective than carbon dioxide in trapping heat in the atmosphere.

Mr. Binney asked if he meant the waste to energy plant was cleaner than producing the equivalent amount of energy using coal.

Mr. Treshler said yes, absolutely. He opined the most important thing to look at in the State of Florida was that there was no opposition to any of the new facilities built throughout the State; no one showed up at the public hearings for either of the expansions in Lee County and Hillsborough County and there was basically no opposition to the new facility in Palm Beach County.

Dr. Ney noted one potential problem would be in dealing with the ash, stating right now the County was meeting the requirements but one day that might change. He commented that wood was burned at the waste to energy plant and wood could give off radioactivity that it picked up from the soil and which could transfer to the ash.

Mr. Binney asked if there was any other information regarding the environmental impacts of the waste to energy plant to please forward it to Mr. Stivender so he could go through it. He emphasized the Committee did need to see if there was an argument against waste to energy facilities.

Mr. Treshler stated he would be glad to provide a copy of their sustainability report.

Mr. Binney commented that if the Committee was not comfortable then they needed to look into it, and if not enough information could be provided then they needed to let the Board know they had not looked through an issue as much as they felt they should.

Mr. Grier asked if anyone else was uncomfortable with the level of information regarding waste to energy.

Ms. Boggs stated she was uncomfortable.

Mr. Dorsett noted there was no basis for any recommendations and the Committee could say they had identified concerns, but that was as far as they could go now.

Mr. Binney suggested the Committee could recommend for staff to renegotiate the Covanta contract to be more economical but the recommendation needed to state whether or not the Committee was comfortable with whether the option was or was not environmentally sound or if they did not know.

Mr. Grier stated they did not know because they had asked and had not gotten the answers, and he opined it was not the fault of the Committee that they did not have that information.

Mr. Taylor and Ms. Boggs agreed that it should be clarified in the recommendation.

Ms. Gentry remarked it would be difficult to give a recommendation on what to do with solid waste if they did not know if an option was safe.

Mr. Binney noted the consensus appeared to be that they needed to resolve whether it was environmentally sound to recommend moving forward with Covanta.

Mr. Treshler asked if the Committee was asking the same question for recycling and landfill that were being asked of Covanta.

Mr. Grier replied that the Committee had not heard anything about landfills yet.

Ms. Boggs remarked they were asking the question of waste to energy because they had not gotten that information yet.

Mr. Treshler commented that if the Committee was going to rank an option as safe or unsafe then they should rate all options and not just waste to energy.

Mr. Grier answered that they were not going to say if an option was safe or not safe; they only wanted to hear the environmental impacts of the waste to energy business.

Mr. Binney mentioned they did have one report that was an independent study from a consultant of the County stating that the waste to energy facility was fine.

Mr. Stivender clarified that the report was from Mr. Smith from Tampa HDR.

Ms. Gentry opined that if it was a professional presenting them with information then at some point they needed to stop questioning the data and trust they were getting the right information.

Mr. Binney suggested tabling the discussion because there was no additional information for the Committee to consider currently. He suggested the first item on the next agenda be the environmental impacts of disposal options.

The Committee agreed to Mr. Binney's suggestion to table the discussion until the next meeting.

Dr. Ney reported there were two different types of environmental impacts they would need to consider, first being the waste that would go to Covanta or the landfill and the second being the ash waste that would go to a landfill after the waste was burned at Covanta.

Mr. Grier suggested adding the environmental impacts of mulching and composting.

Mr. Binney asked if the Committee wanted information for the pros and the cons to the environment.

Mr. Stivender noted there were pros and cons to each option and it came down to the level of comfort the Committee had towards each part that would determine their direction.

Mr. Binney stated they needed to be careful about saying that an option complied with the law as justification for their recommendation. He added they needed to know what the environmental impacts were so they could make their own judgments.

Mr. Grier agreed.

Ms. Boggs added that the Commissioners had not been exposed to the information the Committee had and they might have questions on whether or not an option was environmentally safe. She commented that they also needed to look at the issue of the ash waste and what they would do with it.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF LANDFILLS

Mr. Binney segued into discussing the landfill, commenting that when MSW trash was dumped into the landfill there were certain risks to the environment, such as leaching into the ground water, even though liners were designed to keep that from happening. He asked what the really big risks of burying the trash were, such as what would happen if a liner ripped or was installed improperly.

Mr. Stivender asked Mr. Debo to discuss the unlined landfill in Astatula.

Mr. Debo related that solid waste landfilling had become an evolving process, giving the example that over the years the liner system had changed. He described that originally a lot of landfills did not have any liner at all and the permitting process consisted of writing a letter to the district and saying there was a pit at an address that could be used as a landfill for MSW or construction and demolition debris.

Mr. Taylor commented that there was not even a specification on what the liner was back then.

Mr. Debo recounted that the process began to evolve from general permits to where the State would look at the specific conditions for each site, adding that a lot of the pits were not dug for the purpose of a landfill but rather were left over from a previous mining operation. He stated it became acknowledged by the State that to put waste into an old clay quarry would be better than putting it into a sand pit where there was higher permeability. He remarked that waste inside a landfill would develop a liquid through the accumulation of rain water as well as decomposition and that liquid would drain through and cause groundwater contamination. He added that as the waste rotted it generated gasses that floated up into the atmosphere and contributed to the methane and air pollution through passive venting, and that was what prompted the start of gas collection. He reported that the Astatula Phase 1 landfill and the landfills in Lady Lake and Umatilla were unlined and the first lined landfill in Lake County was the Phase 1A ash monofill built in 1990. He stated that the liner at that time consisted of one foot of impervious clay covered by a layer of HTPE. He explained that when they started to build the Phase 2B landfill to the north of that there was a big debate between the EPA and the State of Florida over whether two or three feet of a high impervious clay liner would be sufficient to protect the environment, with the final decision being two feet would be enough. He noted the excavation had been completed and they were only waiting for the final decision on what was needed to make the landfill operational and one of the arguments against using only two feet of clay was that the bottom six

inches would degrade and crack because of the subsoil and same might happen on the top layer even with the liner because of the heat, so essentially there would only be one foot of solid clay that would be effective.

Mr. Hawkins mentioned he had a fully enclosed Plexiglas container that was a visual of the lining of a landfill, starting with garbage on top and showing the material of the double composite liner as they were currently built. He offered to bring it in at the next meeting.

Mr. Debo added that he also had a model showing the different layers of liner material and drainage fabrics. He described the layers as one of highly impervious geo-synthetic clay, a layer of HTPE, a drainage layer called the detection layer, a second layer of HTPE called the primary layer, another layer of drainage material, and then two feet of permeable sand to help leachate flow down to the bottom. He stressed that every bit of plastic material was welded together to very exacting specifications. He mentioned the pumping system used to pump out the leachate from the bottom of the landfill and how there was a secondary pump that would alert to a leak in the lining.

Mr. Taylor asked if there were monitoring stations beyond the dump site itself and how far beyond the dump site they were located.

Mr. Debo answered that it depended on a number of things, but they were generally within 500 feet of each other and outside the dump site, noting they would be within an area described as the zone of influence.

Mr. Stivender noted the monitoring sites would also be at different depths within the water.

Mr. Debo stated those were tested every six months.

Mr. Hawkins mentioned they tested quarterly and then added that their liner system ensured no welded seam would ever be on top of another seam. He also mentioned it was determined that, per acre, there was less than a shot glass worth of leakage over a year's time with the current system.

Mr. Stivender commented that the potential for additional leachate collection was eliminated once the landfill was capped.

Mr. Debo remarked that when he started working with the County the Umatilla landfill had been closed but had to have repairs, the Lady Lake landfill was in the process of closing, and the Astatula Phase 1 landfill was in the process of closing, adding that the County elected to close the Astatula Phase 1 and the Lady Lake landfills using a geomembrane which was a linear low density polyethylene capable of stretching and elongating.

Mr. Binney asked what happened when an ash monofill was decommissioned.

Mr. Stivender stated the ash monofill was entombed and turned into a green grass hill.

Mr. Binney recapped that there were three kinds of waste going to the landfill: ash monofill, MSW, and composting wood waste.

Mr. Debo said there were other materials that were Class 3 waste and Lake County did not have a Class 3 facility even though it had a C & D landfill, mentioning that most of the Class 3 was either processed at the waste to energy plant or exported out.

Mr. Binney clarified that the only materials going in the ground were the ash or the MSW and the possible environmental impacts, liners not withstanding, were leeching from the waste into the groundwater or some type of gas being produced and put into the atmosphere.

Mr. Debo added there was also the leachate and how they would handle and process that. He remarked that if they did a good job building the bottom liner and closure cap that eventually a point would be reached where there would be no more liquid inside the cell.

Mr. Binney asked if there would be a new cell prior to 2014.

Mr. Stivender stated they were in the second cell right now for ash and they had the 23 acres for MSW ready to go.

Mr. Grier asked Mr. Debo what the length of responsibility was once a landfill was capped and whether the MSW landfill was different than the ash landfill.

Mr. Debo replied that the length of responsibility was being debated within the State.

Mr. Stivender clarified that debate was going on when the governor shut everything down, and the discussions had been regarding how long the long term care was.

Mr. Debo mentioned the State was focused on the site specifics because not every landfill was the same. He stated the long term care for a C & D landfill was five years but the State was thinking of changing that to 15 years which meant an expense to the owners and operators of the landfills because they would have to do continuous monitoring and maintenance. He stated there was no difference between an ash monofill and an MSW landfill at the present time, both had a 30 year long term care timeline from the date their closure was accepted by the State.

Mr. Grier asked for more information on the bioreactor landfills, mentioning that the long term care responsibility had been lowered from 30 years to between five and ten depending on the particular landfill.

Mr. Debo said he would call around for information but he was not familiar with anyone having their long term care period reduced.

Mr. Hawkins added that the long term care closure costs needed to be in place before the landfill was ever permitted to open.

Mr. Cooper reported the County budgeted about $120,000 a year for all the landfills including long term care.

Mr. Binney asked what did the County do with the properties after the landfills were capped.

Mr. Debo commented that a lot of people tried to build in passive uses for the land such as bicycle paths, golf courses, soccer fields, things like that.

Mr. Binney asked if it remained municipal property.

Mr. Stivender said yes.

Mr. Debo stated that once they closed a landfill they were required to enter the property with the Clerk of Court's Office for that parcel of land so the use would be known and in the public record.

SOLID WASTE BUSINESS PLAN

Mr. Binney stated he wanted to go over some general discussions about format and content for the preliminary report, mentioning he had spoken to two of the Commissioners about the report the other day and he wanted to relay their comments on it as well. He opined the theme of most of the bullet points should be alright. He reported speaking with Commr. Parks and Commr. Campione and inquired about what they were looking for as the end result of the report. He paraphrased their response as not just wanting the Committee to tell them what the recommendations were but also why they were being recommended and to discussing the pros, cons, economic impacts and environmental impacts of the various options. He explained the information could be presented as bullet points as opposed to paragraphs as long as it conveyed to the reader why the Committee made the decision they did. He asked if for the next meeting the Committee members could go through the report and think about how they personally would want to convey the information to the Commissioners. He stated if any of the Committee members had ideas as far as presentation that they wanted to share with Mr. Stivender then they could send the ideas directly to him but not the group as a whole.

Mr. Dorsett asked if they could work with the document, include their own personal thoughts, and then submit it to Mr. Stivender.

Mr. Stivender replied yes.

Mr. Binney remarked that the only thing they needed to be mindful of was that they send the suggestions only to Mr. Stivender and he would be the arbiter of what he changed because they could not let one person change everything unilaterally without a public discussion.

Mr. Stivender suggested his staff could take the proposed changes, highlight them in red to identify it came from a Committee member, and bring it back to the Committee for review.

Mr. Binney stated that if the changes were for spelling, grammar, or a word preference, the Committee give the staff leeway to fix those issues themselves because the purpose of the Committee was to look

at the content. He added that they needed to be careful that one person was not changing the whole report, so if the Committee members submitted suggested changes that they do so through Mr. Minkoff or Mr. Stivender.

Mr. Grier asked if it would infringe on the Sunshine Law.

Ms. Sarah Taitt, Assistant County Attorney II, explained it would be fine as long as the Committee members only sent the suggested changes to Mr. Stivender and copied them to Ms. Wendy Taylor and did not send them to the entire Committee. She added that Mr. Stivender would need to bring all of the suggested changes to the next meeting for the Committee to discuss.

Mr. Grier mentioned that there were a few things in the content of the draft report he was not sure the Committee had recommended.

Mr. Stivender clarified that the draft report had been intended as a starting point and that the Committee had the right to take out items that they did not agree with.

Mr. Gorden requested the Committee see the final report at the last meeting before it was presented to the Commissioners.

Mr. Gorden asked how concrete the June first deadline was and if it would have to be changed through the approval of the Commissioners.

Mr. Binney stated it was in a resolution so the Commissioners would have to approve an extension. He suggested having an additional meeting before May 30.

Mr. Stivender mentioned the possibility of having an all day meeting. He added that they could talk to the Board about an extension because they had a substantial body of work and were only trying to finalize it.

Mr. Binney stressed that over the next two meetings the Committee needed to get through the substantive part of their recommendations.

Mr. Grier suggested having a meeting sooner than the end of May to make sure the Committee could get through everything it needed to.

Mr. Binney stated May 9 and May 23 were the next two scheduled meetings. He stated he could not come in on Monday, May 2.

The Committee discussed available dates before the end of May and decided on May 16 if a quorum could be reached.

RECYCLING DISCUSSION

Mr. Binney asked Mr. Stivender to provide clarification on how the numbers for the fiscal analysis he had provided were derived.

Mr. Stivender replied he wanted to give the Committee some good news about the County's hazardous waste collection program, stating that a week ago at the Tractor Supply in Eustis there had been a hazardous material collection event that also accepted pills so they could be properly disposed of. He reported they had collected about 6,000 pounds of materials with 105 pounds of it being pills. He added that they were working with the Sheriff's Department to do more of those types of collection events.

Mr. Taylor asked how the event had been noticed.

Mr. Stivender answered that it had been noticed by a press release through the news papers. He then discussed the Recycling Financial Analysis that he had distributed. He stated they wanted to show the Committee that they would break even this year when it came to the revenue projections but that one of the problems those numbers illustrated was that unless they had more tonnage their overhead would eat them up on their operations. He explained that phasing out the County's recycling program so a third party could take it over and switching to single stream was more cost effective. He reported the data presented reflected that the operating costs and the revenue generated did not cover the necessary costs even though the operation had been set up to receive revenue. He stated they were proposing that in the next year's budget the recycling program be phased out.

Mr. Dorsett asked what percentages of the estimated revenue for this year would be from bulk cardboard, bulk plastic and bulk news print.

Ms. Debbie Fore, Environmental and E-Cycling Coordinator, stated that bulk cardboard was about 30 percent of what they brought in but the plastic would not be very much because not enough was generated. She added that if they could generate more bulk plastics it would bring in higher revenue. She estimated the bulk news print at about 40 percent.

Mr. Dorsett asked if doubling the amount of curbside recycling would not double the revenue because of the cardboard and newsprint contributions.

Mr. Cooper stated the Recycling Financial Analysis data pointed out that under the single stream there could be about a 40 percent increase in recyclables generation. He reported that it should show that the amount of money spent to support recycling was increased and the net loss was reduced by going to a single stream with a 40 percent increase, suggesting that single stream was a better alternative than the current method. He stated that doubling the effectiveness of curbside recycling would not double the revenue. He commented that they were anticipating a 40 percent increase in tonnage, but they would not know the exact amounts until the process started.

Mr. Dorsett asked if that would also increase the cost of pick up.

Mr. Cooper replied that it was possible.

Ms. Fore commented that there were different views on using single stream and Lake County had always been a dual stream county. She opined that while single stream was not the answer for everything, it was the answer for Lake County and its citizens at this time.

Mr. Gorden asked Mr. McCoy if he knew of any curbside recycling programs that were paying for themselves.

Mr. McCoy answered no, but the gap was narrowing.

Mr. Cooper commented that they were trying to figure out what the tonnage level would need to be to allow the operation to break even.

Mr. Grier asked if the Recycling Financial Analysis was reliable.

Mr. Cooper replied that it depended on how much tonnage there was elsewhere in the system. He gave the example of three years ago when they did not have enough waste, it might have been more cost effective to not recycle and take all recycling to Covanta, but more recently they were in a situation where there was too much waste. He added that if he eliminated some of the waste in order to take the recycling then he would lose tipping fee revenue.

Mr. Stivender added that what waste they had left over they either disposed of in a landfill or burned. He said relying on recycling for a revenue stream was not the objective; they should be recycling what they could to reduce their cost of the others.

Mr. Grier agreed, saying that was why he said they needed to think in terms of what it was saving the County as well.

Mr. Stivender stated that since they were currently in a put or pay situation it created the need for a revenue stream. He commented that if the goal was rewritten to minimize what they had to spend money on then it would become a very high priority in the front end and the only thing that would be greater would be making sure the hazardous materials were removed from the system.

Mr. Gorden reported he calculated the numbers a little differently than Mr. Cooper, stating he took the total costs, using the 2012 total cost of $815,000 as an example, and divided it by the number of tons, which in the example given was 11,000 tons; it came out to $74 per ton. He added that when he performed the same calculations for single stream the amount per ton dropped to $41.45.

Mr. Stivender remarked that he and Mr. Cooper were meeting regularly over the next few months to work through the finances and to create a budget for the next six years on how they would transition away from the landfill and the incinerator with the put or pay contract as well as paying off the bonds and getting out of the general fund transfers and how it affected the special assessment costs and the

cost per ton they would be charging. He commented that based on the direction given in the report and how they got the numbers to work, how they would present a budget after Covanta was a big challenge.

Mr. Gorden referenced the FY 2011 – FY 2012 Budget Comparison sheet that had been handed out, asking what the $104,000 piece of machinery was that was listed under the hazardous waste expenses for 2012.

Mr. Stivender explained it was a truck to replace an older truck in their fleet. He added that they still intended to use the body off of the truck being retired for storage and sell off the cab and chassis and buy a smaller and more useful truck.

Mr. Gorden asked if, considering the cost, it was a specialized truck.

Mr. Stivender answered that it was the cab, chassis, box, the lift, and everything, adding that it was the budgeted number but he planned to get it cheaper.

Ms. Boggs asked Ms. Fore if they were separating the cardboard from the paste board or were they being sold together.

Ms. Fore answered that it all went together and the only thing they took out was the wax.

Ms. Boggs commented that if they went to a single stream that theoretically they should be getting more of the paste board which would in turn increase the cardboard amount.

Ms. Fore replied that most of the cardboard they handled was commercial.

Mr. Taylor asked if the County went to single stream subcontracted would Ms. Fore still do cardboard and newsprint separately or would they be totally out of it.

Ms. Fore answered that the County would be completely out of it.

Mr. Stivender explained that it was not only the haulers bringing recycling to them, there were also other vendors and other cities bringing material in meaning they would have to work through a phase out plan. He added that they were going through a reorganization at the landfill and they planned to keep the personnel they had but have them doing different jobs.

Mr. Binney asked Mr. Stivender what the County paid per ton to burn at Covanta.

Mr. Cooper estimated that the cost per ton came to about $37.

Mr. Binney said, for the sake of his example, to assume it was $40 per ton and at 10,000 tons that was $400,000, so even in 2011 they would be at a half a million dollar loss.

Mr. Cooper remarked that was assuming they got 10,000 tons that was payable at $40 per ton, and right now they would get it for nothing because they did not pay for recycling that came from the unincorporated areas.

Mr. Binney commented that if they did not recycle it then they had to pay to burn it at approximately $37 to $40 per ton so the opportunity cost was around $400,000 once they added that back in which still resulted in a half a million dollar loss in 2011.

Mr. Cooper clarified that was if it was taken to Covanta, because if they had too much waste at Covanta then they would have to take it to the landfill and figure out how much it would cost to landfill it.

Mr. Grier commented that it was cheaper than taking it to the incinerator.

Mr. Cooper responded that they would think it was cheaper, and normally landfilling was always cheaper than waste to energy.

Mr. Stivender stated that right now they had no budget plans for expanding their space so they did not want anything coming to the landfill.

PUBLIC INPUT

There was no public comment.

NEXT MEETING

Mr. Binney informed the committee that the next meeting will be May 9, 2011 at 9:00 a.m. at the Agricultural Center. He asked the Committee members to take a look at the draft plan and get their input in.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 12:03 p.m.