

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF
THE HAMILTON COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT DISTRICT
POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING
September 14, 2006**

DATE: September 14, 2006

TIME: 2:00 pm

PLACE: Hamilton County Environmental Services
250 William Howard Taft Road
Cincinnati, Ohio 45219

PRESENT: Policy Committee Members

Dr. Carl Evert, General Interest Member
Bernie Fiedeldej, Township Representative, Vice Chair
Tim Ingram, Hamilton County General Health District Representative
Deborah Holston, Representative of Largest Municipality
Larry Riddle, Ex-Officio Member
Glenn Welling, Public Member

DOES Staff

Cory Chadwick, Director
Holly Christmann, Solid Waste Program Manager
Sarah Dowers, Public Affairs Coordinator
Ken Edgell, Environmental Administrative Coordinator
Ali Khodadad, Operations Coordinator
Sue Magness, Education Specialist
Susan Schumacher, Administrative Secretary, Clerk

Others In Attendance

Nee Fong Chin, Hamilton County Prosecutor's Office
Chuck DeJonckheere, Hamilton County General Health District
Tiffany Hardy, City of Cincinnati
Bob Orr, CSI Waste
Bruce Schmucker, Cornerstone Environmental Group
Cathie Thieman, Resident

ABSENT: Policy Committee Members

Tony DiPuccio, Generator Representative
Todd Portune, County Commissioner, Chair

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Fiedeldej called the meeting to order at 2:05 pm and acknowledged Mr. Portune and Mr. DiPuccio's absence.

II. CLERK'S REPORT

A. Approval of Minutes – July 13, 2006

Mr. Fiedeldej entertained a motion to approve the July 13, 2006 minutes. Mr. Ingram moved; Ms. Holston seconded. Due to their absence at the last meeting, Mr. Welling and Mr. Fiedeldej did not vote. Everyone else was in favor and the minutes were approved.

B. Additions/Changes to the Agenda

Ms. Christmann stated that Commissioner Portune has a scheduling conflict and is no longer available at 2:00 pm for the Policy Committee meetings. Commissioner Portune requested that Ms. Christmann bring up the option of changing the meeting time to the morning i.e. 9:00 am. The meeting day would remain the same (second Thursday of every other month).

After discussion, Ms. Christmann stated that Staff would contact members with times to see what worked best with everyone and would let the Committee know before the next meeting.

III. DISTRICT REVENUE REPORT

Ms. Christmann stated that compared to 2005, revenues were down by approximately \$23,000. Mr. Welling moved to accept the revenue update as presented. Dr. Evert seconded. All were in favor and the motion was accepted.

IV. POLICY ITEMS

A. Approval of 2007 Budget

Ms. Christmann stated that all members received a budget packet in early August. Ms. Christmann stated that the total 2007 budget request was roughly \$2.99 million. This was higher than the expected revenues of \$2.7 million which would result in a slight drawdown of the carry-over balance. Regarding the carry-over balance, the District is anticipating the balance will be \$2.5 million as of January 1, 2007. If the 2007 budget is expended, the carry-over balance would be reduced to \$2.1 million by January 1, 2008.

Ms. Christmann stated that the reason the 2007 budget is higher than the 2006 budget is because of two programs: the residential recycling incentive program which increased \$100,000 as prescribed in the Plan Update and the household hazardous waste program which increased by \$105,000 which was caused by increased demand. For 2006, the household hazardous waste program will cost the District approximately \$195,000.

Ms. Christmann stated that there were reductions in the 2007 budget as well. Personnel costs reduced by \$27,000 mainly due to the turnover of the Staff, advertising was reduced by approximately \$30,000 due to finding more cost effective ways of advertising, the compost bin sale budget was reduced to zero due to only having the sale every other year (2006 called for \$17,000), EPP grant was reduced by \$15,000 per the Plan Update, and a reduction of Cincinnati Health Department costs of \$34,000 due to contractual adjustments.

Mr. Fiedeldey stated that he thought the District had agreed to conduct compost bin sales every year to flood the market for two reasons: 1) removing yardwaste from the waste stream and 2) trying to persuade Ohio EPA to allow credit for compost and wondered why. Ms. Christmann stated that there were benefits to conducting sales every year and discussed some of the reasons. Ms. Christmann stated that she thought the 2007 budget could absorb \$10,000 if the Committee wanted to move forward with having annual compost bin sales. Dr. Evert motioned to conduct compost bin sales every year; Mr. Fiedeldey seconded. All were in favor and the motion was approved.

A brief discussion ensued regarding the compost bin sale and the other reductions within the budget.

Ms. Holston asked if the funding for the Strategic Planning Initiative would come out of the 2006 or 2007 budget. Ms. Christmann discussed the timeline regarding the 2007 budget's approval process within the county regarding the inclusion of the Strategic Planning Initiative and stated that if the budget was approved by the Policy Committee today then there would be time to include it before submitting it to the county.

The Policy Committee decided to vote on the total budget including the Health Department issue as a whole versus voting separately.

Ms. Christmann stated that the District funds the Hamilton County General Health District (HCGHD) annually to inspect solid waste facilities such as composing facilities, open dumps, and MSW facilities. In 2006, the District funded the HCGHD \$240,000 to inspect those facilities. The District set aside \$60,000 in a separate line item for C & D landfill inspections. Since the HCGHD is currently receiving C & D fees, per HB 432, to cover the C & D inspections, they have asked to use the \$60,000 to increase the frequency of inspections at MSW facilities in the county (Rumpke Landfill and Evendale Transfer Station).

Ms. Christmann stated that currently, MSW facilities are inspected 14 times/year and the HCGHD propose that number be increased to every other week; at a minimum. Included as Attachment D was the request from the HCGHD that outlines the justification for this request. Mr. Ingram recused himself from discussion.

Ms. Christmann stated that in terms of the budget, there are two options and that the \$60,000 is currently included in the 2007 budget. Option 1 – Approve the budget as is/include the \$60,000 or Option 2 – Approve the budget without the \$60,000. Ms. Christmann stated that Mr. DeJonckheere from the HCGHD was present to answer any questions.

Dr. Evert asked if Rumpke Landfill was so dynamic that it changed week to week that weekly inspections could tell the difference between one week and the next. Mr. Riddle stated no and that a landfill is basically a large construction site. Mr. Riddle stated that Rumpke is building something with obvious tolerances, pre-planning and drawings. From an environmental standpoint, the issue is that there is a construction segment and an operational segment. When speaking of daily cover or covering the trash on a day to day basis, today looks just about what it looked like yesterday and next week it will look like it did last week only it will be in a slightly different location and its pretty dynamic from that standpoint.

Mr. Riddle stated that it was a 24-hour a day operation and that Rumpke covers outside slopes and tops. The construction activity is very closely monitored with third party quality control and quality assurance. Mr. Riddle stated that the landfill does have very close inspections from a third party that certifies that the construction was done according to the requirements of the permit and/or the regulation. It is dynamic to the extent that Rumpke moves gradually where the landfill puts garbage but it doesn't look much different week to week.

Mr. Riddle stated that he hoped he had answered Dr. Evert's question. Dr. Evert stated yes and with that being said, is there someone that can speak to the need of additional or more frequent inspections. Mr. DeJonckheere stated that Rumpke Landfill was a very dynamic operation. With all due respect, it does change significantly day to day, week to week and month to month. Mr. DeJonckheere stated that cover has always been an issue with the HCGHD because Rumpke starts their workday very early. What the HCGHD is planning on doing is flexing their schedules to verify the cover has been placed the night before.

Mr. DeJonckheere stated that there has been considerable concern from residents regarding odor, materials that are accepted at the facility, vectors, etc. It is difficult to respond to those complaints with the current staffing of the HCGHD. The additional funding would enable the HCGHD to respond quickly and effectively to residents concerns.

Ms. Holston asked that currently, Rumpke is inspected 14 times/year and the HCGHD wanted to double that. Mr. DeJonckheere stated that at a minimum, every other week with the anticipation of when the HCGHD is fully staffed, trained and ready, they can inspect the landfill every week. Ms. Holston stated that currently Montgomery, Mahoning and Stark counties inspect weekly and that the

HCGHD was inspecting 14 times/year? Mr. DeJonckheere stated that Mahoning was inspected twice/week.

Mr. Riddle stated that different landfills and facilities are different depending on a lot of different variables and that it is not unusual but they are the exception of being monitored that much.

Mr. Riddle stated that he wanted to make a clarification regarding what Mr. DeJonckheere had stated about the cover and inspectors being there early in the morning. Rumpke uses cover on the outside slopes and on top of the landfill because garbage is always coming in so a daily cover is not needed hence, no inspection of daily cover is needed. As far as monitoring creeks, Rumpke samples Banklick Creek on a weekly basis.

Mr. Riddle stated that regarding additional oversight; He is not sure that spending \$60,000 to accomplish this will be the best “bang for the buck.” Mr. Riddle stated that Rumpke and CSI would like to have the opportunity to debate the merits of this because they are in the business and asked if it was a useful \$60,000 expenditure or not.

Dr. Evert asked if an inspector found something objectionable in the landfill, what was the process. Was it a matter of issuing orders and going through two months of negotiations before a minor thing could be corrected?

Mr. DeJonckheere gave examples of needed corrections found (erosion, ponding on the capped areas, etc.) and stated that usually these items are corrected by the next inspection followed up with a letter. If it is severe enough, the HCGHD will issue a Notice of Violation (NOV) which is a formal violation or citation and corrective action would be required in that letter.

Mr. Riddle stated that typically, if its an issue like ponding or erosion, Rumpke would have a machine on that before the inspectors leave. If the problem is larger, then it might take until the next day to correct. Generally, Rumpke will have those things on their daily inspection sheet and that they are aware of them.

Dr. Evert stated that it was not like mine safety problems and that there was a back log of two years of orders that are unrepaired or anything like that. Mr. DeJonckheere stated that the landfill is a large site and each inspection the HCGHD views a small portion of the landfill. The HCGHD is generally at the landfill 3-4 hours during an inspection and with more frequent inspections more areas could be viewed more frequently.

Dr. Evert asked if the inspection process interfered with the operations at Rumpke. Mr. Riddle stated that typically the site will be walked and once a quarter, random load inspections will be conducted. The random load inspections take a little effort but generally the inspection itself does not. Mr. DeJonckheere stated that the operator is not required to accompany the HCGHD on the inspection.

Ms. Chin stated that what she was hearing back and forth right now was specifics and what is before the Policy Committee was the budget either with the \$60,000 or without the \$60,000 and obviously depending on if its passed or not Rumpke, CSI, or whomever can sit down and talk with the HCGHD. Right now, she was beginning to hear different things regarding how things are going and that the Policy Committee was here to either pass the budget with or without the \$60,000 and that additional issues could be addressed later.

Mr. Fiedeldey stated that the discussion was just to see if the \$60,000 was valid. Ms. Chin stated she understood but was hearing the Committee getting into more detail. Dr. Evert stated that he was asking questions in an effort to understand whether the Committee should leave it in or out.

Mr. Welling stated that in an effort to help him understand, does the HCGHD feel like they are missing something now and what does the HCGHD anticipate will be gained by additional inspections? Mr. DeJonckheere stated regarding the Banklick Creek, walking this area could be done on more of a routine basis and the HCGHD could catch seepage before it entered the creek and contaminated the water. Mr. Fiedeldey asked how often was that done now. Mr. DeJonckheere stated that the HCGHD did not do this on a regular basis and that they sample the surface water twice/year for a full list of parameters. Mr. Riddle stated that Rumpke samples the creek weekly for ammonia which would indicate a leachate outbreak. Mr. Riddle stated that Rumpke's consultant has not found that while doing some mitigation work in the old section of the landfill. With Rumpke sampling weekly and the HCGHD sampling twice/year, the spring quality has been very good.

Mr. Riddle stated that as he understood it, Ohio EPA contracts with the County to do the inspections for them on a quarterly basis and OEPA comes out and audits the method of inspection and also uses that as a training as well. Mr. Riddle stated that he thought the reports have been very good as far as the auditing. Mr. DeJonckheere stated the OEPA audits annually and the minimal requirement for the State is quarterly inspections.

Mr. Fiedeldey stated that it seemed to him that what the issue is here is that does the Committee feel that the HCGHD is being real forthright in sort of a way and he does not believe they would be asking to do this if they didn't feel it was necessary and stated that the Committee has to have faith in the HCGHD; they are a regulatory agency. Mr. Fiedeldey stated that getting back to what a member was asking earlier is, does the Committee feel that the \$60,000 should go into the budget or not and does the Committee have the faith in the HCGHD as far as that issue goes.

Mr. Fiedeldey stated that beyond that though, the HCGHD is currently receiving C & D fees that they never received before and that the District was subsidizing this funding to the tune of \$60,000. Mr. Fiedeldey asked how much funding the HCGHD was receiving for C & D. Mr. DeJonckheere stated that approximately \$200,000 and that money is tied specifically to the C & D program and can not be used for other purposes. Mr. Fiedeldey asked if the HCGHD now has three times the money, what will it be used for? Mr. DeJonckheere stated that money is currently accumulating with the exception of some capitol purchases (vehicle, computer equipment, etc.). Mr. Fiedeldey asked if it would be safe to say that the HCGHD was receiving a lot more money than needed? Mr. DeJonckheere stated they were receiving more than needed but were contracting with engineers for review of some of the facilities engineering plans which was a considerable part of their budget as well. Mr. DeJonckheere stated that when the C & D landfills close, there is post-closure period as well where there needs to be oversight but no funding. The fee is based on incoming cubic yards and when a facility closes and goes into post-closure, there is no funding for them so it would be wise to bank some of the funding for when that happens.

Ms. Holston asked if the C & D fees were currently being used for inspections and if the Committee votes not to include the \$60,000 would the HCGHD increase inspections anyway? Mr. DeJonckheere asked for clarification: C & D facilities or MSW facilities. Ms. Holston stated she was referring to MSW facilities. Mr. DeJonckheere stated that he didn't know if he could and that the funding sources were separate and could not be combined into one.

Mr. Riddle stated that regarding the issues on the bulleted items; Rumpke is already highly scrutinized and gave an example about the creek sampling. Mr. Riddle stated that the daily limit for the landfill is

10,000 tons/day and that Rumpke rarely hits that amount; its more like 7,500 tons/day. Mr. Riddle stated that Rumpke was very highly regulated already with 9-10 permits. There are other groups that make sure their reports are done properly, on time, and submitted. Regarding creek sampling; Rumpke is more than happy to work with the HCGHD and that they have done a nice job, diligent, etc. and Rumpke will continue to cooperate to make sure Rumpke stays in compliance and that Rumpke has been doing this with the existing procedures.

Mr. Welling asked if there was anything else Mr. DeJonckheere could tell him other than the one creek incident which happened two years ago and a couple of other NOV's and anything else that is not included on the request that the Policy Committee would expect to gain with the additional \$60,000? Mr. Welling stated that he knew Mr. DeJonckheere spoke about increasing inspections for unauthorized materials; is that where the HCGHD is focusing? It seems that the effluent going into the creek is not a major problem if there was only one of those instances and a couple of other violations that were talked about. Mr. Welling stated that he was wondering what the sense is about what the major issue is or is it may be that things may be occurring and the HCGHD just does not know? Mr. Welling stated that he still has not heard a real compelling argument.

Mr. DeJonckheere stated that the biggest thing was that when the inspectors go out, they are finding things that need to be addressed so the HCGHD is in need of an inspector for this facility and gave examples including: erosion, seeps into the creek, etc. and that they are finding things. The confidence would be higher if the HCGHD was at Rumpke more frequently. Mr. DeJonckheere stated that Rumpke is very responsive when violations are found and the fact is that the HCGHD has to point them out. Mr. DeJonckheere stated that he would like nothing better then to go to Rumpke and find nothing.

Mr. Fiedeldey stated that in looking at what other counties are doing; Hamilton County is just doing a fraction. Stark, Mahoning, and Montgomery counties are either inspecting weekly or twice weekly and asked if they are doing that because they feel it is necessary or do they just want to spend money? This is the issue and they must feel that they would rather err on the side of caution instead of having a problem. Mr. Fiedeldey stated that he thought the Policy Committee should approve the \$60,000 expenditure for at least one year and see what the results are. That way the Committee would know instead of saying, its only once or twice or just like I understand what you said, we inspect a load once every quarter. How many of thousands of loads come into Rumpke within a quarter? So the HCGHD is really inspecting one which would be so minute. Mr. Fiedeldey stated that he thought the Committee should do that for the reasons he said: give it a one year shot, hire some people to put things in place then next year the Committee does not approve the \$60,000.

Mr. Fiedeldey stated that one of the things he has heard as a Trustee of Colerain Township is that quite often residents will call, and that the HCGHD must have a hotline, and by the time someone gets there, it might be the next day or it might be on a weekend and because Rumpke does not cover, there is a potential for odors, nuisance, etc. What Mr. Fiedeldey has been told is that residents will call, the HCGHD will respond only to find out that there is nothing there because it may be over a weekend, etc. and asked if it was possible that after hours someone is assigned a pager and when they get a call, they respond within an hour or two. It might cost a little overtime but at least we will find out what is going on and asked Mr. DeJonckheere if this was a possibility to attempt to see if there is a problem.

Mr. DeJonckheere stated that he was open to that idea and that the HCGHD has not discussed this issue internally. Mr. Fiedeldey asked if air and water was the HCGHD's responsibility. Mr. Ingram stated that the HCGHD does not regulate air. Mr. DeJonckheere stated that the HCGHD is involved in odor complaints against landfills. Mr. Chadwick stated that Hamilton County Environmental Services was responsible for the roads regarding dust, etc. and the nuisance odors were the HCGHD's responsibility.

Ms. Holston motioned to approve the 2007 budget as presented including Option 1 which, from the Manager's Memo reads: This option would include funding for basic District programming, including the increases in HHW and RRI as prescribed in the Plan Update. This option would also provide \$60,000 to the HCGHD for increased inspections of MSW facilities. Dr. Evert seconded. Mr. Ingram abstained from the vote. All were in favor and the motion was approved.

B. District Strategic Planning Initiative

Mr. Fiedeldey asked Mr. Welling to discuss this item. Mr. Welling told the Policy Committee how proud he was of the Committee regarding going through that process of developing a vision statement. One of the items that was discussed was to make a decision of whether to move into a more full fledged strategic planning type process which is much more in depth and time consuming.

Mr. Welling stated that regarding past conversations of policy items i.e. grease car would probably help make the decision of whether a strategic planning process needs to be developed which he thinks is a valuable undertaking on many fronts. It will help the Committee clarify and clearly identify what the Committee's objectives are and it will also give the Committee the opportunity to see if there is merit to expand the role of this group recognizing that there are some statutory limitations to budget, expenditures, etc.

Mr. Welling stated that also another significant benefit is that it will allow the Committee to contribute more effectively and to work together more effectively for the benefit of the citizens of the County, the environment, etc. Mr. Welling stated that he thought it was certainly a worthwhile endeavor. The Committee also needs to know that this will also require a significant amount of investment of time and effort in order to do it effectively over the regular meetings of the Committee. The Manager's Memo talks about a timeline of 12 – 15 months and he thought this was a pretty accurate assessment from start to finish and also stated that he thought the benefits would be worth the investment.

Ms. Holston stated that she thought the Committee should engage in a strategic planning process for all of the reasons Mr. Welling mentioned. Ms. Holston stated that she thinks the meetings should be facilitated but the consultant should not be brought in to facilitate the meeting, write the report, etc. because the Committee should have some ownership.

Mr. Ingram stated that he is in support and asked how often the Committee would need to meet. Mr. Welling stated that he would anticipate monthly meetings over the course of a year in addition to the regular Policy Committee Meetings and briefly spoke of the process.

Mr. Fiedeldey asked if the Committee should consult Mr. Portune for his opinion and schedule. A brief discussion ensued regarding everyone's busy schedules and how it would be a waste of time to start the process and not be able to finish it.

Mr. Welling stated that he would put together a proposal on how the Committee would go about organizing this so that it can be discussed later. Ms. Holston asked that the recommendations, in the interest of time, come two ways. 1) to provide an opportunity for input, not only from former members, but from stakeholders in general. There are ways this could be structured i.e. working committees that is chaired by a board member, etc. 2) An option that involves just board members.

Mr. Fiedeldey suggested contacting former Committee members to assist in this process as a one year project. Mr. Ingram stated that what would come out of this would be a "group work plan" and that former Committee members would not be able to vote. Mr. Welling stated that the end product would be a broad plan for the goals and objectives of the District and also stated that the Committee has had a lot of discussions about activities that were not necessarily related to solid waste specifically i.e. grease

car. Dr. Evert stated that he would be willing to volunteer for this venture fully realizing that he is not able to vote and added that there were probably others who felt the same.

There was nothing to vote on at this time.

C. School Recycling Research Project

Ms. Christmann stated that there is nothing to vote on at this time but it will affect the Committee down the road. Ms. Christmann stated that every year, the District's Education Program does a tremendous job of reaching approximately 15,000 students through field trips, teacher workshops, classroom presentations, etc. Through these avenues, students learn a lot about solid waste and recycling. The frustrating part for Staff is that once the recycling lesson is over, they may not take the information home.

Ms. Christmann stated that the Education Program has developed some programs to incentivize recycling at schools. One program is the School Recycling Grant Program to get schools to start recycling. Ms. Christmann stated that in late 2005, the District started developing a study to figure out if schools that have recycling programs affects recycling behavior at home. In other words, do school recycling programs affect community recycling rates?

Ms. Christmann stated that this program will bring the education program in line with District recycling goals. Education Staff partnered with the University of Cincinnati, Rumpke Recycling, and the Education Council of Ohio to develop and fund this study. The study is being conducted at two Mt. Healthy Schools: North Middle and South Middle School. Mt. Healthy North Middle School will start a recycling program and Mt. Healthy South Middle School will not. Both schools will receive educational presentations.

Ms. Christmann stated that the District will track the number of households in those neighborhoods that feed to those schools to determine if the number of households that recycle increases. A recycling program is currently being set up at Mt. Healthy North Middle School, along with educational program. Computerized pre-tests are also being conducted to find out if students are recycling at home. This program will run throughout the whole year and at the end of the year, a post-test will be administered and Staff will conduct another bin count to find out if school recycling programs have an impact on home behavior.

Ms. Christmann stated that depending on the results of this program, an item will come before the Policy Committee: "Should the District switch funds in the education program to fund more school recycling programs?"

Dr. Evert stated that a concern of his was that the District was looking at the whole community's response to recycling by counting bins and only a small portion of that would be people that had children in school that may be influenced by this and the incremental change might be 100% among the school kids but only 1% of the population and some way the District has to look at the results in a way in which the District can see what has been accomplished and that it might get masked by the whole number of grandparents that do not pay attention or already recycle.

Ms. Magness stated that Dr. Evert's concern could possibly happen because within the study areas, there are about 300 students and 1,500 households. Ms. Magness stated that what the District believes is that students will have an impact and by having the students take the post test, the District will have some data on if they are now recycling at home whereas before they were not.

Ms. Magness stated that the District is hoping, through the outreach program, certain materials will be provided to the students so that they will have an impact on their community because part of their recycling program is a fund raiser so they will be encouraging their neighbors to participate as well.

A brief discussion ensued regarding the logistics of conducting bin counts.

V. INFORMATIONAL/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. District Awards Luncheon

Ms. Christmann stated that last year, the District's first annual awards luncheon was held in which the District recognized leaders in the community for their recycling efforts. The awards luncheon is scheduled for America Recycles Day which is on November 15 of each year and will be held at the same location as last year, Mill Race Lodge at Winton Woods Golf Course from 11:30 am – 1:00 pm.

Ms. Christmann stated that the list of awards are listed in the Manger's Memo and encouraged all of the Policy Committee Members to attend.

VI. TENTATIVE FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- Strategic Plan
- Carry-Over Balance
- Charging residents to use the HHW Drop-off sites and the Yardwaste Sites

VII. POLICY COMMITTEE MEMBERS' COMMENTS

Mr. Fiedeldey stated that today was Dr. Evert's last Policy Committee meeting as he has resigned his position as public member and also stated that it had been a true pleasure serving on a board with his knowledge. Mr. Fiedeldey stated that on behalf of Hamilton County Environmental Services – Solid Waste Management District presented Dr. Evert a plaque that stated "for service from 2002 – 2006 on behalf of the Hamilton County Solid Waste Management District thank you for your time and service as member of the Policy Committee." Mr. Fiedeldey commented that the plaque was made from 100% recycled glass bottles.

Dr. Evert thanked the Committee and stated that it had been a pleasure to serve on the Committee for four years and being on this board has been an experience of business being conducted for the government, citizens, etc. Dr. Evert also wanted to thank Mr. Portune for his educational leadership on how to conduct meetings efficiently and the whole department has been run with Mr. Aluotto and now with Ms. Christmann in a way which is a credit to the County and he has been pleased to be a part of it. Dr. Evert thanked everyone.

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments at this time.

IX. UPCOMING DISTRICT MEETINGS

Regular Policy Committee Meeting - Thursday, November 9, 2006 at Hamilton County Environmental Services, 250 William Howard Taft Road, Cincinnati, Ohio 45219 at 2:00 pm.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Dr. Evert moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Holston seconded. All were in favor and the meeting was adjourned at 3:24 pm.