

MEMORANDUM

To: Barry Jacobs, Chair, Board of Orange County Commissioners
Mark Chilton, Mayor, Town of Carrboro
Kevin Foy, Mayor Town of Chapel Hill
Tom Stevens, Mayor Town of Hillsborough

From: Gayle Wilson, Solid Waste Management Director

Subject: Interim Report on Development of Solid Waste Management Plan

Date: March 15, 2006

cc. Cal Horton, John Link, Eric Peterson, Steve Stewart, Jan Sassaman

Attachments: 3

This memorandum provides an update of the work and meetings of the Solid Waste Plan Work Group from its inception in April 2005 to date. The memo also reviews the information presented to the Work Group and presents a projected schedule and tasks for work yet to be completed.

Background

Last February, the Board of Orange County Commissioners tasked the Solid Waste Advisory Board (SWAB) with moving the solid waste planning process forward to develop the next three year update required by the State of North Carolina and also to clarify and create consensus on that plan as a road map for long term solid waste planning in Orange County. The SWAB's response was to expand into a broader working group for this task. Dubbed the Solid Waste Plan Work Group, it includes the current SWAB membership and Solid Waste Department staff, an elected official and key staff people from each jurisdiction, as well as an additional staff person from UNC. (List of work group membership Attachment 1).

A subsequent staff memo (Attachment 2) introduced a possible schedule through which the Board could receive an updated solid waste plan for submittal to the State by the statutory due date of June 30, 2006. It has become clear due to our rate of progress on this project, as well as the upcoming budget work required by the various elected Boards and their staff, drive a realistic date of completion later into calendar 2006. It is reasonable to say that the three-year update of the ten-year plan will not occur by June 30, 2006. That delay will allow a more thorough consideration of all the elements of a relatively complex plan by all the jurisdictions and should result in an effective consensus on a plan that moves deliberately towards the County's stated 61% waste reduction goal.

Summary of Meetings

The work group began meeting in April 2005 and has met six times:

April	June	October
May	September	November

A brief recap of the primary discussion topics of each meeting is below. The minutes from the meetings are available on request from the Solid Waste Management Department.

April:

Introductory meeting with a brief history of solid waste management in Orange County and opportunity for each jurisdiction to state its concerns about solid waste. This meeting was essentially an open forum for discussion of topics of interest by each member. Topics included:

- Meeting the 61% goal.
- Transitioning from landfill to transfer station.
- Handling commercial waste.
- Allocating recycling fee funds among programs.
- Residential OCC collection.
- Expansion into commercial recycling.
- Effects of PAYT on dumpster systems.
- Ability to process commingled materials locally.
- Future tipping fees.
- How to achieve higher recycling rates.
- Integration of recycling with other aspects of solid waste management.
- Limits of recycling.
- Need for disposal options.
- Financing.
- Private sector compliance with County (and Town) regulations.

May

Presentation on how the waste reduction rate is calculated, showing it at 46% for 2003-04, how C&D waste has been reduced and the potential within the waste stream to get to 61% reduction from the current 46%. Continued discussion of the underlying issues included:

- Solid Waste Fund solvency.
- Expanding the number of materials collected, particularly mixed paper and a PAYT system.
- The need to build a large MRF that is dependent on huge amounts of material versus tailoring a processing facility to meet only estimated local processing requirements.

June

Report on waste stream analysis, comparing 2000 to 2005. Discussion of keeping the goal if it is hard to reach given the current materials discarded. Additional discussion consisted of PAYT and the Work Group and/or SWAB role in it. Focus future discussions on collection and processing (of recyclables). Collection of recyclables at the curb in carts v. bins.

September

Report on collecting additional materials including residential food waste, other (non-food) organics, plastic film, injection molded plastics, scrap metal, textiles, electronics, clean wood. These show that at a 50% capture rate for all recyclables remaining in the waste that Orange County could reach 54% a waste reduction rate. Disposal options were discussed and recycling collection options were tabled. Report on administrative cost of PAYT was submitted with no presentation.

October

Report on residential recycling options dual-stream v. single-stream/automated v. semi-automated. Report on commercial recycling options delivered but not presented orally. Commercial recycling waste stream analysis and options presented.

November

Clarification of commercial waste analysis, PAYT cost presentation, landfill v. transfer station, and solid waste collection in Orange County. Other informational staff reports have also been prepared but not presented addressing drop-off sites and rural waste collection.

At the November meeting, the Work Group realized they had been presented with a significant amount of information and had given staff and SWAB some feedback and direction. They stated their next step would be to have staff prepare some analyses of possible program options. Through December, January and February, the SWAB continued to receive informational reports about aspects of the current system including rural garbage collection, multifamily recycling, regulatory mechanisms for increasing recycling and controlling waste, transfer station development, development of MRF and landfill siting guidelines. The remaining Work Group members can readily review these presentations and the minutes of the subsequent discussions to further their decision-making effectiveness.

The initially planned trajectory was for the Work Group to reconvene once the recycling programs' technical analysis had been completed and there was some substantive information to review. At the December SWAB meeting, the SWAB requested a 'decision-points' memorandum to make explicit the types of decisions needed to build a solid waste plan. That memorandum and questionnaire on the decision points was distributed to the Work Group March 2 (attachment 3). Preliminary results of the questionnaire will be compiled and discussed in April then used again when discussing the analysis in subsequent meetings. Having a preliminary set of preferences and comparing them to a second set once the technical data are available may sharpen the decision making process. It now appears the analyses will be completed in late April and presented at the following Work Group meeting.

Discussion

Through preparation of the previous solid waste plan update in 2003, there was dissention among the jurisdictions on a number of key issues including whether to consider an in-County materials recovery facility and how to go about achieving the 61% waste reduction goal. A significant outcome was that the Town of Chapel Hill did not endorse the 2003 plan update. Another key outcome was that the County, as lead agency, did not firmly commit to a strategy to achieve the goal and, notably, removed its previous at least tacit support for a materials processing center as integral to meeting the waste reduction goal.

As the various jurisdictions and the Solid Waste Advisory Board re-engage, the intent is to produce the statutorily required three year update of the State-required ten year solid waste plan, as well as develop a consensus around a workable, practical plan that achieves the waste reduction goal. While staff believes plan development must be an iterative process, it is also useful to try to clarify at least generally, procedural and substantive steps in moving forward.

Technical Assistance and Analysis

The staff has engaged its Departmental engineering consultant, Olver, Inc and their subcontractor Resource Recycling Systems Incorporated, to assist in technical aspects of the analysis of recycling collection and processing options. The collection options will compare dual stream to single stream collection in each of the three sectors – residential, multifamily and commercial - along with corollary issues of types of containers and automated to semi-automated collection. There will be a specific analysis of public v. franchised collection options for the commercial sector, as this is the least developed part of the County's recycling program. This analysis will be combined with an analysis of potential processing for recyclable materials – how much does it cost and what are the pros and cons of processing materials in-County with a County-owned and/or controlled facility compared to sending materials out to be processed by other private processors.

Other possible work by staff

Other important elements of the overall plan will continue to be worked on by staff at the direction of the Work Group including:

- whether and how to include PAYT or mandatory recycling in the planning process,
- franchising solid waste collection, particularly in unincorporated areas,
- franchising solid waste collection in some or all jurisdictions for non-residential waste,
- multiple jurisdictions working together to franchise waste and/or recycling services,
- the future of drop-off sites and solid waste convenience centers under changed solid waste and recycling collection options,
- financing of the solid waste system,
- soliciting and compiling public input.

NOTE: Where we address franchising issues above, it is important to point out that in the upcoming legislative short session of the North Carolina General Assembly, Senate Bill 951, could be adopted. This bill would require local governments to pay any private haulers collecting waste or recyclables in areas in which they were considering collecting waste or recyclables beginning as soon as July 1, 2006. Adoption of this bill as written, would require immediate action by Orange County and the Towns, outside the solid waste planning process considered below, to ensure passage of a local franchising ordinance which would preserve local governments' flexibility to franchise or outright collect waste and recycling without pre-paying private haulers who might already be working within the jurisdiction.

Schedule and Process

The staff has prepared a survey of decision points (attachment 3) that will provide the building blocks for development of a solid waste management system. The first iteration of the decision points survey will be completed without analytical data. Once data from the technical analyses are available to help the Work Group inform their decisions and ranked preferences for types of collection and processing, then they can begin development of a first draft of a system.

A series of decisions on recyclables collection methods will impact processing choices and there will have to be more feedback once the impact on processing is assessed. Plan development could go through several cycles including financial analysis, until there is an outcome that the work group wishes to put forward as the first draft of the system plan.

Other elements to be included in the system include decisions such as whether or not to provide universal waste collection services and use of Pay As You Throw methods for financing residential waste collection. Once a whole system is established, it will be revised by the Work Group and then presented to the elected boards and the public for further feedback.

Once the substantive recycling analyses are complete, they could be presented at a scheduled meeting of the Solid Waste Plan Work Group. The Work Group could then develop its straw plan including the other elements mentioned above and a financial analysis, and then present that to the various elected Boards. Following those presentations and subsequent revisions to the plan, in response to board feedback, would be one or more public hearings and a final draft to be prepared for the BOCC and other governments' approval and subsequent submittal to the State. This process could take the remainder of the current calendar year.

There are then several steps to putting this draft forward that could be taken in a variety of sequences. It will be a Work Group decision on the sequence. Thus the order of the steps below does not reflect any preference, just enumeration.

1. Complete draft plan after receiving technical reports, conducting internal debate, further analysis and discussion. Planning level estimates of financial aspects will be included for the straw plan.
2. Take complete draft plan to each jurisdiction for presentation to the elected boards and their constituencies. We believe this effort should be led by the elected officials and SWAB representatives from each jurisdiction, with solid waste staff providing technical backup.
3. Work Group and staff revise the resultant plan and present to the public in a public hearing or series of hearings. This phase would include other public education including articles in the newspapers and on the County web site as well as possible radio interviews or other media coverage. At least one public hearing is statutorily required for this process.
4. Reconsider the plan in light of public comment,

5. Develop a more precise financial model of the selected plan including revenue sources and levels.
6. Revise plan as needed to meet BOCC requirements,
7. Get final approval from all jurisdictions.
8. Submit to the State.

Frankly, the only things we are certain of in the sequence are item one being first and item eight being last. The other six items could be subject to a variety of sequences and we believe the next Solid Waste Plan Work Group meeting should consider this procedural sequence and provide some direction on the staff work they need. We believe one focus of the Work Group could be on items that relate to individual jurisdictions' control of waste, specifically PAYT, mandatory recycling, and franchising. While we recognize these are potentially important elements of the solid waste system, arguments could be made that they are solely the responsibility of each jurisdiction and not of the Solid Waste Department. Therefore each jurisdiction could implement at its own discretion. Conversely, implementing for example PAYT in only one jurisdiction would potentially have effects in other jurisdictions that they have to react to. If the Town of Chapel Hill implemented PAYT alone, then the County might have to restrict use of solid waste convenience centers in some way by providing PAYT there, which would cause the County to reassess its method of tax-based financing of these centers.

Summary

The Solid Waste Plan Work Group began meeting in April 2005 to begin a planning process that would result in adoption of the three-year update to the State-required ten year solid waste management plan for Orange County. The Group has laid out its concerns, received a series of staff technical reports explaining aspects of the current solid waste and recycling system and requested additional information to inform their future decision-making. While the Work Group last met in November, the SWAB and staff have continued to examine details of the solid waste management system over the past three months.

In the coming months, the Work Group will complete a decision-points survey, evaluate its results, receive additional technical analysis and craft a draft plan and time line for submittal to the elected boards and the public for consideration.

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN WORK GROUP

SWAB

Jan Sassaman
Randy Kabrick
Al Vickers
Linda Bowerman
Remus Smith
Joe Clayton
Bonnie Norwood
BJ Tipton
Tom Draney

Chapel Hill

Bill Strom
714 Greenwood Rd
Chapel Hill, NC 27514
933-2711 H
billstrom@nc.rr.com

Carrboro

Mark Chilton
203 Ashe Street
Carrboro, NC 27510
919-636-0371 H
919-932-1990 W
Mark.chilton@hotmail.com

Hillsborough

Brian Lowen
659 Cornelius Street
Hillsborough, NC 27278
644-1427
lowenb@madisonriver.net

UNC

Jim Alty
CB 1800, Giles Horney Bldg.
UNC-Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-1800
962-0761 W
468-2620 H
Jim.alty@fac.unc.edu

County

Barry Jacobs
2105 Moorefields Rd.
Hillsborough, NC 27278
732-4384 H
732-4941 W
barry.j@mindspring.com

Note: Work Group members may involve
jurisdictional management staff as needed

Memorandum

To: Solid Waste Plan Work Group

From: Jan Sassaman, SWAB Chair

Subject: Decision Points Questionnaire

Date: February 28, 2006

Attached is a questionnaire that I requested the staff prepare to define and detail some of the decisions that must be made to move forward in development of a comprehensive, integrated solid waste management plan. The plan for using this questionnaire is that all Solid Waste Plan Work Group members will complete it, electronically if possible, and return it to staff with any additional comments by March 23. The completed questionnaires will form the basis for the April Solid Waste Plan Work Group meeting to further develop its ideas, positions and possible consensus on these decision points as well as other decision points that may arise through discussion and further comment from the Work Group. In your response please indicate what dates in April and May you are available for meetings exclude week of April 3-7.

We expect completion of a technical report on primarily the recycling portion of the County's scope of work due at the end of April. We expect to schedule a presentation of that work in May for the Solid Waste Plan Work Group. Once you receive the report, you will, at the subsequent Work Group meeting, have an opportunity to reconsider the responses to the questionnaire in light of data presented in the report.

We realize that some of the questions are better answered with data the technical report in hand, while some, such as developing ranking preferences, may be better made before the data are presented. Feel free to answer *all or some* of the questions this first time as a way to express initial preferences; once you get data you may change your mind on some of them. Group consensus may shift. You may choose to not answer those that are more data-driven until you get the data; that's fine too. There is a lot of indecision right now, as no data on projected program performance has been presented, e.g. single stream v. dual stream. cart v. bin.

Use of the decision points tool is a two-step process. The first iteration allows representatives of the various entities to express what they want at this point and to a certain extent, we will use that to push against the recycling technical analysis. Then we'll do a second iteration once the data are in and come to consensus about the system we recommend.

It will be important for all jurisdictions to express their preferences particularly in the part VII B of the questionnaire that pertains specifically to them. Work group members from outside the particular jurisdiction may express their preferences for solid waste management techniques in communities other than their own, but the opinions of those representing that jurisdiction will have most importance. The exception to this is that all members are able to comment on solid waste management needs for the unincorporated area because all are residents of Orange County and all pay taxes to support the current system of convenience centers.

Please respond to the questionnaire along with any comments you may have on it, preferably electronically, and return to Blair Pollock of the staff by March 23 so he can prepare a summary of responses for presentation at the as yet unscheduled Solid Waste Plan Work Group meeting to be held in April.

Decision Points Requiring Solid Waste Plan Work Group Recommendations

This document lays out a series of decisions that must be made to continue development of the updated solid waste management plan. Those decisions will provide guidance to the staff on how to conduct the detailed analysis needed to bring back specifics on how various solid waste and recycling systems might perform fiscally and in terms of the tonnage of materials managed by each element of the system e.g. dropoff recycling, residential solid waste collections, etc.

Since the Solid Waste Plan Work Group began its effort last April, they have reviewed descriptive data from the various recycling programs operated by the County and learned about the potential for further waste reduction through a detailed examination of recyclables remaining in the waste stream. The Work Group has also learned about various recycling collection and processing concepts and options that could be involved in advancing our County's recycling efforts. Considerable additional analysis is underway and will continue through the spring, when the Work Group will begin formulating recommendations. We anticipate results of our technical analysis to be available in May and plan to schedule a presentation when the technical analysis is complete.

At this point, the staff is presenting the Work Group with this decision-making framework for a preliminary opinion forming exercise. We do not expect you to answer all the questions presented without more data, but do answer as much as you like to help create a bounded useful discussion at the April meeting. As you answer the questions, critically review this document with an eye towards ensuring that the questions being asked get us the answers we need to develop a comprehensive, integrated solid waste management plan that reflects the priorities and desires of the County and its municipalities regarding the future of waste management. We urge you to answer at least those questions that do not require data e.g. ranking of the importance of various criteria to decide where and by whom materials should be processed. Staff believes that the criteria should be established and ranked prior to seeing the data so that the data don't drive what we believe should be values-based decisions. You will see the questionnaire again when the data are analyzed and continue to use it for decision-making.

Many critical items in this summary are currently under analysis. Once the analysis is complete the number of items will likely be reduced. One thing to keep in mind is that all of these items are interconnected and interdependent. While we may look at residential collections separately, in the end decisions made in processing or even multi-family collection may dictate the residential course.

Development of the solid waste plan will be an iterative process that will be informed by the data from the upcoming analyses along with the judgments of the Work Group and staff. We anticipate being able to present a planning document to the Towns and County later this year based on the decisions taken from this document. For the past several months the Work Group has been involved in reviewing and discussing the many different alternatives for managing solid waste in the County, particularly as regards reducing solid waste in the most effective and efficient manner. Considerable data and reports have been presented and discussed, but to date no recommendations have been made. The SWAB has continued focusing on elements of a new plan in the absence of recent formal Work Group meetings.

Name_____

Affiliation_____

The breakdown is by sector. Please circle your response and for the few questions requesting additional information please so respond:

- I. Waste Reduction Goals- The County has been working towards a 61% waste reduction goal. This goal is ambitious, but appears to be achievable considering that we are currently at 45% (2005). The staff has presented information that 54% is a reasonable step based on the recyclables materials matrix provided earlier. This assumes that additional investment and commitment is provided in support of these goals.

1. Should the County keep its waste reduction goal of 61%?
Target date- 2016 Yes (or by _____) No
2. Is an intermediate goal of 54% acceptable?
Target date- 2011 Yes (or by _____) No

II. Residential Curbside Recycling Collection-

A. Urban-

1. How often should we pick up the curbside recyclables?
 - a. Weekly
 - b. Bi-weekly (every other week)
2. What method of collection should be used to collect recyclables?
 - a. Single stream
 - b. Dual stream
3. What type of collection container should be used?
 - a. Cart/Carts or Bins
 - b. If bin(s)- Should the county provide additional bin(s) at no cost to the resident: Yes No
 - c. If YES to b above: Does the County provide at no cost:
one bin two bins as many as needed
Or
Does the County charge a fee for each additional bin Yes No

*** NOTE:** Especially if carts are chosen as the standard method, it is possible that standard methods of collection may be difficult in some neighborhoods due to roads, terrain, geography or other factors and a different combination of collection containers specific to these areas may be necessary.

4. Which of the following materials should be added to urban curbside collection:

- | | | |
|-------------------------|-----|----|
| a. Mixed Paper- | Yes | No |
| b. Corrugated Cardboard | Yes | No |

- | | | |
|--|-----|----|
| c. Textiles | Yes | No |
| d. Injection Molded Plastic (e.g. tubs, cups) | Yes | No |
| e. Scrap Metal (Pots, Pans, small household scrap) | Yes | No |
| f. Other: _____ | | |

B. Rural Residential Curbside Recycling -

1. How often do we pick up the curbside recyclables?
 - a. Weekly
 - b. Bi-weekly (every other week)
2. What method of collection should be used to collect recyclables?
 - a. Single stream
 - b. Dual stream?
3. What type of collection container should be used?
 - a. Cart/Carts or Bins
 - b. If bin(s)- Should the county provide additional bin(s) at no cost to the resident: Yes No
 - c. If YES to b above: Does the County provide at no cost:
one bin two bins as many as needed
 - Or
Does the County charge a fee for each additional bin Yes No

* **NOTE:** Especially if carts are chosen as the standard method, it is possible that standard methods of collection may be difficult in some neighborhoods due to roads, terrain, geography or other factors and a different combination of collection containers specific to these areas may be necessary.

4. Which of the following materials should be added to rural curbside collection:

a. Mixed Paper-	Yes	No
b. Corrugated Cardboard	Yes	No
c. Textiles	Yes	No
d. Injection Molded Plastic (e.g. cups or tubs)	Yes	No
e. Scrap Metal (Pots, Pans, small household)	Yes	No
f. Other: _____		

5. Should we continue to pursue the objective of providing curbside recycling collection to all eligible households in the unincorporated county? Yes No

Additional Comments:

III. Multi-family Recycling Collections-

1. How should material be collected?
 - a. Source-separated
 - b. Single stream
 - c. Dual stream
 - d. Commingled with glass collected separately

2. Which of the following materials should be added to multifamily collection:

a. Mixed Paper-	Yes	No
b. Corrugated Cardboard	Yes	No
c. Textiles	Yes	No
d. Injection Molded Plastic (e.g. cups, tubs)	Yes	No
e. Scrap Metal (Pots, Pans, small household)	Yes	No
f. Other: _____		

IV. Commercial Recycling Collections- Expansion of commercial recycling programs is essential to achieve the volume goals projected in the materials matrix.

1. Rank in order 1 through 5 where 1 is first preference. Which of the following commercial options you recommend the county pursue (more than one choice may have the same rank):
 - a. County-provided comprehensive universal commercial recycling service funded (primarily) by 3-R fee to non-residential properties. _____
 - b. Ordinances banning recyclable materials from collection and landfill/transfer station with recycling services provided by the private sector. _____
 - c. County competes with private sector on a fee-for-service basis. _____
 - d. County and privates co-exist with county providing some services and private sector others. _____
 - e. County franchises commercial recycling services and directs materials to its facility. _____

2. Which of the following materials should be recycled through commercial collection:

a. Bottles and cans	Yes	No
b. Newspaper and Magazines	Yes	No
c. Mixed Paper-	Yes	No
b. Corrugated Cardboard	Yes	No
d. Plastic Film	Yes	No

- | | | |
|---|-----|----|
| e. Textiles | Yes | No |
| f. Injection Molded Plastic (e.g. tubs, cups) | Yes | No |
| g. Scrap Metal | Yes | No |
| h. Other: _____ | | |

3. Do we expand the commercial food waste/organics waste collection?

Yes No

4. Do we lower the threshold for participating in the food waste collection program?

Yes No

5. Do we require food stores over a specified size to participate in the food waste collection program? Yes No

- V. Processing- Any growth in collections will require additional processing capability. Without having finalized all of the collection decisions it is difficult to determine exactly what the county's recycling processing requirements will be. Once this is complete, we will provide analysis breaking down internal and external options and costs. It is important to get feedback in determining the philosophic direction the department should pursue. Primarily that is one of "Does the County build its own MRF or contract out to a private merchant facility?"

1. Does the county expand its processing capabilities for all materials it collects?

Yes No

2. In selecting processing capability rank the following criteria in selection of the processing alternative where 1 is most important and 5 least important:

- a. Worker protection and care including: living wage, safety and a health plan and benefits for employees. _____
- b. Facility is operated in environmentally responsible manner, is fully in compliance with all regulations and permits and demonstrates the highest degree of environmental protection (even going beyond the minimum regulatory standards) _____
- c. Highest diversion rate (net of all residue, out throws, rejects, etc) _____
- d. Lowest cost option.
- e. Processor provides flexibility in materials accepted. _____

3. If a processing facility can be built and operated more economically in county than out of County, would you recommend doing so (this includes debt service on capital as well as operating costs)

Yes No

4. If a processing facility can be built and operated in county at a higher cost than out of County, but would process additional types of materials not accepted by an outside processor would you recommend doing so and at what cost premium?

5% 10% 20% other_____ Tied to what potential increased
 level of diversion from new materials:
 5% 10% 20% other_____
 No, lowest cost processing is most important_____

5. Would you oppose building an in-County facility, even if the economics are favorable or neutral?
 Yes (oppose in County) No (don't oppose)
 If Yes, state major concerns:
 siting/environmental concerns_____
 financial risk of investing is too great for County_____
 this is best done privately by existing facilities_____
 other (state)

VI. Drop-off Recycling Centers-

A. Unstaffed

1. If countywide curbside recycling is provided with mixed paper and corrugated containers should we?
 a. Close all drop-off sites
 b. Leave all drop-off centers the same- no change
 c. Reduce the number from the current six to how many
 5 4 3 2 1
2. As follow-up to question one, if we are collecting mixed paper and corrugated containers curbside, does the county modify the scope of drop-off recycling centers to accept other materials in addition to traditional recyclables.
 Yes No
 Which materials (list)

B. Staffed

1. Would you like to see a staffed site replace the unmanned drop-off centers (meaning higher costs and more limited hours) if more materials were added including those now collected at staffed convenience centers such as oil, filters, batteries, anti-freeze and electronics as well as materials not now collected such as other hazardous materials or food waste?
 Yes No

2. Would you like to see staffed drop-off centers accept other types of materials as textiles, reusable goods?
 Yes No
 Which materials (list)

VII. Jurisdictions- Regulatory and Waste Collection

(ALL MAY REPLY TO SECTION **A** BELOW, AS ALL ARE COUNTY RESIDENTS AND TAXPAYERS)

A. Unincorporated (outside Town limits)

1. Should the County offer universal solid waste collection in unincorporated areas (Towns take care of incorporated now)? Yes No
2. Should it be universal for only residences or also non-residential users including commercial or non-profits? Residential only All waste generators
3. Should universal solid waste collection be:
 - a. Voluntary
 - b. Required (and possibly pre-paid through taxes or fees)
4. Would the above be:
 - a. Franchised
 - b. County-provided
 - c. Combination of both
5. (If the County does not opt for pre-paid collection and/or disposal through taxes or fees) Should the county implement residential PAYT? (This would apply to universal pickup or convenience centers if maintained.)
 Yes No
6. If yes, should the PAYT fees be set to cover cost of:
 - a. collection
 - b. disposal
 - c. both collection and disposal
 - d. other amount not based on collection and/or disposal
7. Should the county ban collection the following materials mixed with solid waste?

a. Bottles and cans	Yes	No
b. Newspaper and Magazines	Yes	No
c. Mixed Paper-	Yes	No
d. Corrugated Cardboard	Yes	No
e. Other _____		

Note: All bans will apply throughout the county, which would include the incorporated and unincorporated areas. Towns would have to adopt corollary ordinances affecting waste within their corporate limits.

8. Should the county make commercial recycling mandatory?

Yes No

9. If yes to 8, above what criteria or thresholds will apply?

- | | | |
|--|---------------|----|
| a. By square footage/number of employees | Yes | No |
| b. Type of Business | Yes | No |
| c. Tonnage | Yes | No |
| d. Materials | _____ (which) | |

Remainder of this page intentionally blank

B. Municipalities

THOSE REPRESENTING THE MUNICIPALITY LISTED SHOULD REPLY FOR THAT MUNICIPALITY. Others may comment. Indicate if you are from Chapel Hill or not for this section.

Chapel Hill representative : _____

Not a representative: _____

Chapel Hill-

1. Do you see any changes in residential collection?
 - a. Methodology? If so, what? _____
 - b. Competitive? If so, what? _____
 - c. Franchised? If so, what? _____
 - d. Compliance with inter-local agreement in terms of the level of commitment of delivery of solid waste to the county disposal facility? If so, what? _____
 - e. Other? If so, what? _____
2. Do you see any changes in commercial (and other non-residential) collection?
 - d. Methodology? If so, what? _____
 - e. Competitive? If so, what? _____
 - f. Franchised? If so, what? _____
 - g. Compliance with inter-local agreement commitment of delivery of solid waste to the county disposal facility? If so, what? _____
 - h. Other? If so, what? _____
3. Should Chapel Hill implement residential PAYT?
Yes No
4. If yes, should the PAYT fees be set to cover cost of
 - a. Collection
 - b. Disposal
 - c. Both collection and disposal
 - d. Some other amount not based on collection and/or disposal
5. Should the Town ban the following materials from the trash?

a. Bottles and cans	Yes	No
b. Newspaper and Magazines	Yes	No
c. Mixed Paper	Yes	No
d. OCC	Yes	No
e. Other _____		

Note: The objective is for all bans to apply throughout the county, which would include the incorporated and unincorporated areas, but each Town must adopt its own collection bans.

6. Should the Town require commercial (non-residential) recycling?
 Yes No
7. If yes, above should criteria or thresholds will apply including:
- | | | |
|--|-----|----|
| a. By square footage/employees/other | Yes | No |
| b. Type of Business (only those that might be high waste generators) | Yes | No |
| | Yes | No |
| c. Tonnage | Yes | No |
| d. Materials | Yes | No |
- If so, which list _____

Carrboro:

THOSE REPRESENTING THE MUNICIPALITY LISTED SHOULD REPLY FOR THAT MUNICIPALITY. Others may comment. Indicate if you are from Carrboro or not for this section.

Carrboro representative _____
 NOT a Carrboro representative _____

1. Do you see any changes in residential collection?
 - a. Methodology? If so, what? _____
 - b. Competitive? If so, what? _____
 - c. Franchised? If so, what? _____
 - d. Compliance with inter-local agreement in terms of the level of commitment of delivery of solid waste to the county disposal facility? If so, what? _____
 - e. Other? If so, what? _____

2. Do you see any changes in commercial (and other non-residential) collection?
 - a. Methodology? If so, what? _____
 - b. Competitive? If so, what? _____
 - c. Franchised? If so, what? _____
 - d. Compliance with inter-local agreement in terms of level of commitment of delivery of solid waste to the county disposal facility? If so, what? _____
 - e. Other? If so, what? _____

3. Should Carrboro implement residential PAYT?
 Yes No

4. If yes, should the PAYT fees be set to cover cost of
 - a. Collection
 - b. Disposal
 - c. Both collection and disposal

- d. Some other amount not based on collection and/or disposal
5. Should the Town ban the following materials from the trash?
- | | | |
|----------------------------|-----|----|
| a. Bottles and cans | Yes | No |
| b. Newspaper and Magazines | Yes | No |
| c. Mixed Paper | Yes | No |
| d. OCC | Yes | No |
| e. Other _____ | | |

Note: The objective is for all bans to apply throughout the county, which would include the incorporated and unincorporated areas, but each Town must adopt its own collection bans.

6. Should the Town require commercial (non-residential) recycling?
- | | |
|-----|----|
| Yes | No |
|-----|----|
7. If yes, above should criteria or thresholds will apply including:
- | | | |
|--|-----|----|
| a. By square footage/employees/other | Yes | No |
| b. Type of Business (only those that might be high waste generators) | Yes | No |
| c. Tonnage | Yes | No |
| d. Material | Yes | No |
- If yes, which _____

Hillsborough

THOSE REPRESENTING THE MUNICIPALITY LISTED SHOULD REPLY FOR THAT MUNICIPALITY. Others may comment. Indicate if you are from Hillsborough or not for this section.

Hillsborough Representative _____

NOT a Hillsborough Representative _____

1. Do you see any changes in residential collection?
- | | |
|--|--------------------|
| a. Methodology? | If so, what? _____ |
| b. Competitive? | If so, what? _____ |
| c. Franchised? | If so, what? _____ |
| d. Compliance with inter-local agreement in terms of the level of commitment of delivery of solid waste to the county disposal facility? | |
| | If so, what? _____ |
| e. Other? | If so, what? _____ |
2. Do you see any changes in commercial (and other non-residential) collection?
- | | |
|--|--------------------|
| a. Methodology? | If so, what? _____ |
| b. Competitive? | If so, what? _____ |
| c. Franchised? | If so, what? _____ |
| d. Compliance with inter-local agreement commitment of delivery of solid waste to the county disposal facility? If so, what? | |
| | _____ |

e. Other? If so, what? _____

3. Should Hillsborough implement residential PAYT?

Yes No

4. If yes, should the PAYT fees be set to cover cost of

- a. Collection
- b. Disposal
- c. Both collection and disposal
- d. Some other amount not based on collection and/or disposal

5. Should the Town ban the following materials from the trash?

- | | | |
|----------------------------|-----|----|
| a. Bottles and cans | Yes | No |
| b. Newspaper and Magazines | Yes | No |
| c. Mixed Paper | Yes | No |
| d. OCC | Yes | No |
| e. Other _____ | | |

Note: The objective is for all bans to apply throughout the county, which would include the incorporated and unincorporated areas, but each Town must adopt its own collection bans.

2. Should the Town require commercial (non-residential) recycling?

Yes No

3. If yes, above should criteria or thresholds will apply including:

- | | | |
|--|-----|----|
| a. By square footage/employees/other | Yes | No |
| b. Type of Business (only those that might be high waste generators) | Yes | No |
| | Yes | No |
| | No | No |
| c. Tonnage | Yes | No |
| d. Materials | Yes | No |
| If yes, which, list _____ | | |

VIII. Staffed Solid Waste Convenience Centers- this section refers to waste only, recycling at these sites was addressed in section VI above.

1. If universal MSW collection is provided in the county, do we continue to operate convenience centers?

Yes No

2. If above, do we charge those citizens for dumping trash at the centers recognizing that not charging may attract more waste to the centers and make curbside waste collection uneconomical as economies of scale will be lost if most don't participate?

Yes No

3. If we charge, do we allow other, non-residential users at the centers?

Yes No

If yes, any thresholds/maximums/restrictions?

What level? _____

4. If one or more municipalities adopt PAYT, should the County implement a fee for solid waste disposal at the convenience centers? Recognizing that leaving solid waste disposal at convenience centers free would attract significant amount of waste from those avoiding paying waste disposal fees.

Yes No

IX. Landfill/ Transfer Station-

1. Should the county give further consideration for a landfill within the county?
Yes No
2. Is there still a commitment by all municipalities to continue to take all solid waste to the County-owned landfill or transfer station?
Yes No
3. Should the county accept out of county solid waste at the transfer station?
Yes No
4. Should the county continue to offer free landfill permits?
Yes No

X. UNC

1. Should the County and municipalities consider UNC's concerns/interests when evaluating and/or implementing PAYT?
Yes No
2. Should the County consider expanding recycling services (residential or non-residential) to UNC, assuming an equitable funding mechanism can be developed?
Yes No

XI. Budgets and Financials/ Fee Changes – Decision Points to be developed at a later point.

Orange County Solid Waste Management Plan Reconsideration/Review Process

The current adopted Orange County Solid Waste Management Plan contains several components. The component that is the focus of this planning document is the waste reduction goal, including the operational/financial means to achieve that goal. In the most recent BOCC approved Solid Waste Management Plan that was submitted to the state earlier this year, a number of substantive changes were made from earlier approved Plans relative to future waste reduction strategies. While the waste reduction goal of 61% was maintained, virtually all of the waste reduction and recycling program improvements/expansions were eliminated. This memorandum discusses how the County could reestablish a long-term waste reduction plan that is acceptable to the stakeholders and is aimed at achieving the adopted 61% goal.

Suggested participants in the process include:

- Solid Waste Advisory Board
- Board of County Commissioners
- Carrboro Board of Alderman
- Chapel Hill Town Council
- Hillsborough Town Board
- Citizens
- Staff

At the February 8 Board of County Commissioners' Work Session the BOCC indicated that the SWAB should take the lead role in development of a revised Solid Waste Management Plan. The SWAB intends to initiate a plan development process that involves the key stakeholders, especially interested elected officials. The SWAB will request each jurisdiction appoint at least one elected official to become part of the SWAB Solid Waste Plan Work Group. UNC would also be invited to send a representative to the Work Group. The SWAB Work Group would meet periodically (at least monthly and occasionally more often) over the course of a year to review and discuss staff work and provide guidance. Additionally, these members would keep their own boards' apprised of the progress and key issues relative to the planning process.

The following represents an outline of a timeline and process that could be followed to:

- reexamine and reconsider the portion of the Plan that serves as the means by which the 61% goal could be achieved, including
- residential and commercial recyclable material collection methodologies
- equipment and staffing
- adding new materials and marketing
- regulatory issues
- material processing options

- financial impacts and funding requirements for the enterprise fund
- implementation issues
- receive input from the SWAB, the Town's, the public, and the BOCC, and
- prepare a recommended revised Plan and have that revised Plan considered and adopted by the three Towns and the BOCC before the next 3-Year Update to the State required plan is due on June 30, 2006.

Suggested Timeline

2004

November-December -Solid Waste staff to examine and identify a scope of work and timeline necessary to reexamine and analyze future waste reduction policy (including recyclables collection and processing options).

Staff begins information gathering and analysis and discussions with the SWAB that will continue throughout the process.

2005

February – Staff presents to the BOCC a proposed process and timeline to conduct a study reconsidering the County's long-term waste reduction strategy, including specific issues previously raised by the Towns of Chapel Hill and Carrboro. Staff receives guidance and proceeds to implement approved process/timeline.

March – Staff discusses approved process with SWAB and defines and discusses the SWAB's role in the process. (SWAB will discuss as necessary at any scheduled monthly meeting or at a special meeting if desired). A letter will be sent to the four jurisdictions requesting appointments to the Work Group.

March/April - Work Group is formed and meets to receive progress update and review work to date, discuss their role and degree of involvement in the process, and to provide guidance/input to the process.

April – Staff provides status of process to the Assembly of Governments, including discussion of Interlocal Agreement provisions regarding long term planning policies.

August/September – Work Group meets as necessary.

September - SWAB provides status update to BOCC and Town Boards (if desired). Public education conducted on the newly proposed Plan elements.

October – SWAB sponsors open forum for citizen input.

November/December – Staff submits preliminary draft of recommended revised Plan to Work Group and SWAB. Receives feedback on recommendations.

2006

February – Staff submits final draft of recommended Plan to SWAB Work Group. Receives final input prior to submitting recommendations to governing boards.

March - SWAB submits final draft of recommended Plan to BOCC, summarizing input from citizen forum, Work Group and SWAB. Public invited to attend and provide input. BOCC provides guidance.

April – SWAB submits final draft of Plan to Towns. Towns provide feedback. Requests for any substantive changes by Towns will be shared with BOCC. (This could be done at AOG meeting, if desired)

May – Towns endorse revised 3-Year Solid Waste Management Plan Update to State, which includes revised waste reduction and recycling component.

June – BOCC endorses revised 3-Year Solid Waste Management Plan Update and authorizes submission of 3-Year Plan to State (Due June 30).

Summer – Staff prepares comprehensive implementation plan for adopted Solid Waste Management Plan, including financing, capital, and operational elements.