

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF
THE HAMILTON COUNTY SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT DISTRICT
POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING
May 11, 2006**

DATE: May 11, 2006

TIME: 2:00 pm

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

PRESENT: Policy Committee Members

Tony DiPuccio, Generator Representative
Dr. Carl Evert, General Interest Member
Bernie Fiedeldey, Township Representative
Tim Ingram, Hamilton County General Health District Representative
Deborah Holston, Representative of Largest Municipality
Todd Portune, County Commissioner, Chair
Larry Riddle, Ex-Officio Member
Glenn Welling, Public Member

DOES Staff

Holly Christmann, Solid Waste Program Manager
Jeanie Cooper, Receptionist
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

Kathy Binns, Chief of Staff for Todd Portune
Nee Fong Chin, Hamilton County Prosecutor's Office
Chuck DeJonckheere, Hamilton County General Health District
Brian DePeel, Environmental Enterprises, Inc.
Mark Derrick, Perry & Derrick Paints
Marjorie Evert, Resident
Tiffaney Hardy, City of Cincinnati
Bob Orr, CSI Waste
Will Terwort, Bavarian Waste

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Portune called the meeting to order at 2:08 pm. Mr. Portune congratulated Ms. Christmann as the new Solid Waste Manager. Mr. Portune introduced his new Chief of Staff, Kathy Binns.

II. CLERK'S REPORT

A. Approval of Minutes – March 9, 2006

Mr. Portune entertained a motion to approve the March 9, 2006 minutes. Mr. Fiedeldey stated that on page 3, second paragraph, there was a modification: "Mr. Fiedeldey asked if what Mr. Aluotto was saying was that Ohio EPA regulates the industry and they do not regulate the ~~Plan~~ land". Mr. Portune entertained a motion to approve the minutes as drafted with the correction. Mr. Welling moved; Mr. Fiedeldey seconded. All were in favor and the minutes were approved.

B. Additions/Changes to the Agenda

There were no additions or changes to the agenda.

III. DISTRICT REVENUE REPORT

Ms. Christmann stated that compared to 2005, revenues were down by approximately \$28,000 and the District will continue to monitor the situation to see if this is a trend. Mr. Riddle stated that from year to year some of the in-district volumes are sent to other landfills.

Mr. Portune entertained a motion to approve the revenue report as indicated. Dr. Evert moved; Mr. Fiedeldey seconded. All were in favor and the motion was approved.

IV. POLICY ITEMS

A. Request for Funds for Paint Recycling Project

Ms. Christmann stated that District Staff has been working with Environmental Enterprises, Inc. and Perry & Derrick Paints on reestablishing the paint recycling program. Perry & Derrick has run a test batch of 100% recycled paint which was equivalent to 1,200 gallons of latex paint being recycled.

Ms. Christmann stated that in order to help market this product and raise awareness, Perry & Derrick has requested \$2,500/month through the end of the year to pay for a part-time sales representative to market and sell the paint. Ms. Christmann stated that in the past, the District has funded Nu-Blend for large sums of money but this only equates to \$15,000. Unlike Nu-Blend, this is what Perry & Derrick does; manufacture paint. Perry & Derrick also sells other sorts of paint; not just recycled paint.

Ms. Christmann stated that Mark Derrick from Perry & Derrick Paints and Brian DePeel from Environmental Enterprises were present to answer any questions. Ms. Christmann stated that through this project, the District will continue to work with Perry & Derrick to help them market the program as much as possible but she thinks that in order to continue to be a partner in this program, and to responsibly dispose of paint, this might be a great partnership that the District could enter into.

Mr. Portune briefly discussed the history of Nu-Blend and asked Mr. Derrick why Perry & Derrick needed a subsidy from the District. Mr. Derrick stated that the \$15,000 is not just to pay for a sales person to market the paint; this will be a part time situation. The requested funds are required to support it with its stand alone marketing pieces because it is a unique product.

Mr. Derrick discussed the history of recycled paint and stated that this project was not a stand alone project and also discussed the differences between Perry & Derrick versus Nu-Blend. Mr. Portune asked Mr. Derrick if the requested funding would be a "one time" request. Mr. Derrick stated that this request would not exceed past 2006 and that this is just to help get the program off the ground. Mr. Portune asked Ms. Christmann where the funding would come from. Ms. Christmann stated that it would come from the District's carry-over balance.

Dr. Evert asked if the recycled paint would be available at the Highland Avenue warehouse outlet. Mr. Derrick stated that it would be and that Perry & Derrick is also working with the Work Resource Center and discussed the partnership. A brief discussion ensued regarding how much paint would be removed from the waste stream.

Dr. Evert asked what happened to the residual stock of Nu-Blend. Mr. Derrick stated that he believed anything of value was auctioned and there was approximately 40,000 gallons left on the top floor that he believes is still there. Dr. Evert asked if Perry & Derrick would be using that paint. Mr. Derrick stated that the paint would need to be inspected first.

Mr. Portune asked Ms. Chin who had residual ownership of the paint (due to the numerous grants that were given to Nu-Blend over the years). Ms. Chin stated that she would need to look at the grant again and that it would probably be a fine line.

Mr. DiPuccio stated that he has concerns about the lack of markets for recycled paint and feels as though this question has not been adequately answered. Mr. Derrick stated that the last two years of operation, Nu-Blend averaged 18-20,000 gallons/year. The survey that the District sent to 100 paint companies (with a 30% return rate) averaged organizations using 4,500-55,000 gallons/year. Mr. Derrick stated that he thought that if there was some sort of consorted effort and some sort of information that could be left behind, and a convenient location other than Over-the-Rhine, that he believes the product could move. Mr. Derrick discussed other items that would affect increased paint sales.

Mr. DiPuccio asked if there was any sort of overall written business plan. Mr. Derrick stated that all partners in this project have met and created a strategic plan (responsibilities, who would be contributing what into the effort, etc.) and the sales and marketing piece was Mr. Aluotto's doing. Perry & Derrick was going to do the technical work, filling, processing as a private enterprise and EEI was going to do the collection, dumping, sorting, delivery to Perry & Derrick. Keep Cincinnati Beautiful was going to look for avenues to pursue for markets where the paint could be utilized. The Work Resource Center was going to possibly provide some labor if the environment was acceptable to the kind of people they wanted to train and employ. Mr. Derrick reiterated that technically, there was not a detailed business plan but without a budget, there could not be a business plan developed.

Mr. Derrick stated that there was an informal sales and marketing plan and that was why the survey was put together, to see if the interest was there. Mr. Derrick named several organizations that had indicated in the survey that were interested in purchasing recycled paint. Mr. Derrick also stated that anyone that purchases the paint will be given a sheet to grade the product. In a traditional sales sense, there is a sales and marketing plan in place.

The Policy Committee continued to discuss the specifics of the program and Mr. Portune asked if the \$15,000 was for the salary of the part time employee or was it to apply to the marketing efforts. Mr. Derrick stated that it was for all sales and marketing and this funding was strictly seed money to try and move the paint.

Mr. Portune asked Mr. Derrick if it would work to approach this from the standpoint of a monthly amount up to \$2,500 to cover the cost of promotional materials, the efforts of the marketer, etc. where you basically are monthly detailing the cost of those efforts and this being a grant that reimburses up to \$2,500/month for the balance of 2006. Mr. Portune asked Ms. Chin if the grant could be structured in this sense. Ms. Chin stated yes. Mr. Derrick stated that an exception to this language would be that it was May 11 and the paint season basically ends in October or November and he thinks that initially they could develop something that you are going to produce 2-5,000 pieces for, there might be some more cost up front in order to get this going as opposed to later in the year. The Policy Committee suggested other ways the grant could be structured.

After discussion, Mr. Ingram moved to authorize a contract subject to Staff and Prosecutor review for an amount not to exceed \$15,000 through December 31, 2006 to market and promote recycled paint. Mr. Welling seconded. All were in favor except Mr. DiPuccio, who voted no on the motion.

Mr. Fiedeldej stated that over the years, the District has funded a lot of grants that supported recycled paint and that if this fails, he thinks programs such as these should not be funded in the future.

Mr. DiPuccio stated that the problem he has is how many markets are there out there for recycled paint but wished Mr. Derrick good luck.

Mr. DiPuccio stated that he thought that the District should encourage future grantees to use recycled paint as a condition and to potentially include language to reflect that.

The Policy Committee congratulated Mr. Derrick and wished him luck. Mr. Portune asked Mr. Derrick to keep them informed on the progress of the program.

B. District Priority Grant

Ms. Christmann stated that under the Plan Update, the District changed the Reduction Assistance Grant to a District Priority Grant. The Plan Update states that the Policy Committee will identify three key solid waste management issues each year and those issues will be eligible for grant funding. Staff is recommending that the 2007 District Priority Grant address the following solid waste issues: organics, appliance recycling, and development of new community-sponsored recycling drop-off locations.

Ms. Christmann stated that Staff realizes that the Plan Update has not been approved by Ohio EPA, but in order to have time to write new grant guidelines and to give communities enough notice that the grant program has changed and that these are the priorities, Staff is recommending that the Policy Committee vote on those three priorities for the 2007 grant cycle.

Mr. Portune asked what items were specifically discussed and not chosen for the grant and the reasons for it. Ms. Christmann stated that based on the waste composition study, organics were a large percentage of what is going into the landfill. Additionally, the District has seen some communities opt out of separate collection of yardwaste. The other two chosen were based on the top responses the District received from past community survey's conducted in 2004 and 2005.

Dr. Evert asked for examples of acceptable appliances and asked Ms. Christmann if TVs were included. Ms. Christmann stated that examples of appliances included: refrigerators, stoves, washer/dryers, air conditioners, etc. and that if the Policy Committee does not have an objection then TVs could be included but the community survey did not specifically state TVs.

Mr. Welling asked if computer equipment would also be included. Ms. Christmann stated that computer equipment is considered electronic waste and since the District already conducts annual computer recycling events, electronic waste would not be included in this grant.

Mr. Fiedeldej asked for clarification on organics collection. Ms. Christmann gave an example if a community does not have separate yardwaste collection and wanted a chipper, this grant would fund it. Mr. DiPuccio asked about the processing end. Ms. Christmann stated that this grant was eligible to both communities and non-profits and she would like nothing more than for a community or non-profit to step up and be able to take food waste at a composting facility. Currently, there is a small one at Gorman Heritage Farm. Mr. Riddle elaborated on permitting issues regarding composting facilities.

Mr. Portune stated that all the committee was identifying today was subject matter areas that will serve as the priority area in which the grants would be awarded. It is up to the individual applicant to submit a proposal identifying some of the committee's concerns.

Mr. DiPuccio asked if the District would only fund the three established priorities. Ms. Christmann stated that if an application outlined another area other than the three priorities, it would be low priority funding.

Dr. Evert asked if cooking oil would be included under organics for alternative fuel. Ms. Christmann stated that she would have to check with Ohio EPA and if they approved of solid waste funds being used for something like that then it would be alright. Mr. Portune stated that the District has already checked with Ohio EPA concerning this issue and Ohio EPA approved it. A brief discussion ensued regarding alternative fuel.

Mr. Fiedeldej stated that the District is promoting back yard composting which seems to him that the District is going in two different directions; e.g. chipper versus a compost bin and it would be better to keep the yardwaste in someone's back yard. Mr. Portune agreed and stated that in an urban county, it is a needed service.

Mr. Portune entertained a motion that would approve the District's recommendations establishing the priority parameters for the District. Mr. Ingram moved that the District set the 2007 District Priority Grant priorities in the following areas: organics, appliance recycling, and new community sponsored recycling drop-off locations. Ms. Holston seconded. Mr. Fiedeldej questioned the fairness of the priorities due to the possibility of communities that are already conducting these events. Mr. Portune stated that he would hope that a community would not feel like that as any community could apply for the grant. All were in favor and the motion was approved.

C. Hamilton County General Health District Request for New Vehicle

Ms. Christmann stated that the District funds the Hamilton County General Health District to help enforce solid waste laws at all the local solid waste facilities. In order to conduct those inspections, a vehicle is required. Ms. Christmann stated that in 1997, the District purchased a vehicle for the Health Department to be used for those solid waste inspections.

Ms. Christmann stated that in February, 2006 the transmission of the Health Departments vehicle failed and the cost to replace the transmission exceeds the value of the vehicle. The Health Department approached the District to request funding of a new vehicle; a GMC Canyon truck that would cost \$15,500. These funds would come from the District's carry-over balance. The 1997 vehicle is being auctioned and monies received will be deposited into the District's account.

Dr. Evert stated that he thought the County should be making a statement with any new vehicles by purchasing alternative fuel or hybrid vehicles even if they cost a little more. Ms. Christmann stated that she had a cost for a new Ford Escape hybrid of \$25,000. A brief discussion ensued regarding flex fuel vehicles, emission ratings, engine size, price, gas mileage, vehicle comparisons, etc.

Mr. DiPuccio stated that if this vehicle will be inspecting C & D landfills as well, he thought there was a separate funding source. Ms. Christmann stated that this vehicle will only be used for solid waste facilities, composting facilities, and illegal dump inspections and that the Health Department uses a separate vehicle for C & D inspections.

After further discussion, Mr. DiPuccio moved to approve Staff's recommendation for funding the Hamilton County General Health District in the amount of up to \$15,500 for the purchase of a new vehicle. Mr. Welling seconded. All were in favor except Dr. Evert who voted no on the motion.

D. Vision Statement (Tabled from the Sept. 1, 2005 Meeting)

Mr. Portune stated that in light that this item has been tabled since September 1, 2005, he is not sure what additional discussion needs to be done; that it is a simple question of just selecting an option. Mr. Portune stated that the options for the mission/vision statement would read either: The Hamilton County Solid Waste District provides ethical environmental leadership to equitably promote the public

good through innovated and responsible strategies leading to: Option 1 – a society that generates zero waste or Option 2 – the management of all waste as a resource.

Mr. Portune entertained a motion for either of the vision statements and stated that he would like to see option 1 approved. Ms. Holston moved for option 1 to be approved: a society that generates zero waste. Dr. Evert seconded.

Mr. Fiedeldey stated that what the Policy Committee has been doing is looking at all kinds of ways to recycle and he considers this waste as a resource and it is almost counter productive. Everyone would like to see zero waste but is this even possible? Mr. Fiedeldey stated that on the flip side, waste today is being turned in to a resource and gave examples.

The Policy Committee discussed the pros and cons of zero waste.

The Policy Committee continued to discuss both options and Mr. Ingram moved to include both options into the vision statement as follows: The Hamilton County Solid Waste District provides ethical environmental leadership to equitably promote the public good through innovated and responsible strategies leading to the management of all waste as a resource that leads to a society that generates zero waste. Dr. Evert seconded. All were in favor and the amended motion was approved.

V. INFORMATIONAL/DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Solid Waste Plan Ratification

Ms. Christmann stated that to date, the District has received 24% approval from Hamilton County political jurisdictions. Ms. Christmann stated that she would be presenting to the City's Vibrant Neighborhood Environment & Public Services Committee on Tuesday, May 16. Mr. Portune asked Ms. Christmann if the City of Cincinnati approves the Plan Update, would it put us over the approval mark. Ms. Christmann stated that it would because the City represents 40% of the population.

Ms. Christmann stated that at the July 13 meeting, as long as Cincinnati approves the Plan, the Policy Committee will be voting on the ratification of the Plan and stated that it was imperative that a quorum be present. Once the Committee votes, Staff will be forwarding the Plan to the Ohio EPA.

Mr. Welling asked for clarification on the ratification percentages. Ms. Christmann stated that the Plan must be approved by political jurisdictions representing 60% of the population including the City of Cincinnati, being the largest municipality, and the Board of County Commissioners.

B. Proposed Rumpke Expansion

Mr. Portune stated that Attachment D from the Policy Packet was a report Ms. Christmann prepared on the proposed Rumpke expansion which is currently working its way through various aspects of County Regional Planning and other considerations. Mr. Portune stated that the report was informational only for the moment. One question that arises is, does the District, take any position on the proposed expansion or remain neutral.

Mr. Portune stated that he requested Ms. Christmann to prepare this report so a general outline could be provided to the Committee of the issues, the importance of the landfill to not just the workings of the District but the disposal of solid waste in Hamilton County for now and in the immediate future.

Mr. Portune stated that the report does a pretty good job of, from the District's perspective, outlining the issues. Mr. Portune stated that he wanted to open up discussion regarding the issue in the event that members want to engage in that. Mr. Portune stated that he thinks there is an argument that can be

made that it is appropriate for the District to weigh in on this issue from the standpoint of the District and the District's perspective but he would also recognize that that is up to the decision of the Policy Committee whether this step is taken or not.

Mr. Portune asked Mr. Riddle what the status of the permitting process was. Mr. Riddle passed out a report packet to the Committee outlining the process. Currently, Rumpke has received approval from the Hamilton County Planning Commission which is a modification of the original plan but did include the 209 acres of landfill area. The total project will be about 350 acres; 59 acres of which will be light industrial. Mr. Riddle stated that included in the report packet was a map detailing the expansion. Mr. Riddle also discussed the availability of a DVD which goes into more detail.

Mr. Riddle stated that now that Regional Planning has approved the expansion, the application must now be approved by the Colerain Township Zoning Commission and that the public hearing date will be on May 16, 2006. Assuming the Zoning Commission takes action that day, Rumpke would then go before the Colerain Township Board of Trustees for their review and public hearing.

Mr. Riddle explained the maps and other items included with the packet and stated that this expansion would provide an additional 30 years of capacity and discussed the ramifications of the landfill closing. Mr. Riddle also discussed the positives of having a landfill in Hamilton County and asked for the Policy Committee/District's support in recognizing the need for the expansion.

Mr. Portune asked Mr. Fiedeldey what steps Colerain Township was taking with respect to any township planning, etc. Mr. Fiedeldey stated that May 16, 2006 was the first public hearing through the zoning commission. Mr. Fiedeldey stated that he could not speak too much about this issue but stated that Colerain Township's land use plan did not illustrate what Rumpke would like to do and that Colerain Township's land use plan has been adopted by both the zoning commission and trustees a few years ago. Last year, Colerain Township developed a comprehensive plan for the whole township.

A brief discussion/question/answer session ensued regarding clarification of acreage, years of capacity and the Bond Road facility.

Mr. Fiedeldey stated that the Policy Committee just passed a vision statement that talks about zero waste. Mr. Portune stated that the Committee's vision statement of what we are working to move towards and there is no doubt about that and what we are talking about with respect to the report is information on a matter that is pending with respect to Rumpke Landfill which is the primary funding source for the operation of the District. Rumpke Landfill is also the primary disposal location of solid waste that can not be used as a resource at present in Hamilton County; the County that currently is not at zero waste. Mr. Portune stated that the presence of that landfill both now and in the future is an important element in the overall way in which Hamilton County deals with the waste that is generated today in Hamilton County and that may be generated in the future.

Mr. Portune stated that he did not see anything inconsistent in talking about the current operations of the landfill or what Rumpke's plans are in terms of planning for anticipated future waste or disposal needs of Hamilton County and at the same time, continuing to work towards the elimination of the creation of waste, finding ways so the Policy Committee/District can reduce that because that is what the Policy Committee/District does.

Mr. Riddle stated that the vision statement is a long term vision and obviously it is unrealistic to think that zero waste generation could be achieved without incorporating shareholders that have significant financial impact in making that happen years down the road. Rumpke's goal is to assure adequate disposal capacity and maintain their ability to survive in the marketplace. Rumpke's inventory is to

conserve airspace and their ability to survive without billing and having capital expenses is predicated on being able to get expansions. Luckily, Rumpke is in a position to get an environmentally friendly expansion without transporting waste 90 miles.

Mr. Riddle believes that it is not realistic to think that within this Committee's tenure that we are going to be at zero waste and not need a place to go with garbage.

VI. TENTATIVE FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

There were no future agenda items at this time.

VII. POLICY COMMITTEE MEMBERS' COMMENTS

There were no Policy Committee comments at this time.

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Dowers stated that the District would be sponsoring a compost bin sale on Saturday, May 13, 2006 and discussed the specifics.

IX. UPCOMING DISTRICT MEETINGS

Regular Policy Committee Meeting - Thursday, July 13, 2006 at Hamilton County Environmental Services, 250 William Howard Taft Road, Cincinnati, Ohio 45219 at 2:00 pm.

X. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 3:58 pm.