

APPROVED

APPROVED

APPROVED

**CHITTENDEN SOLID WASTE DISTRICT
SPECIAL EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING COMBINED WITH
LANDFILL OVERSITE COMMITTEE
AUGUST 8, 2007**

EXECUTIVE BOARD PRESENT: Ken Nolan, Paul Stabler, Bert Lindholm, Mike Coates

LANDFILL OVERSITE COMMITTEE: Alan Nye, Tom Nostrand, Paula Mouser

CSWD STAFF PRESENT: Tom Moreau, Tony Barbagallo, Amy Jewell, Nancy Plunkett, Brian Wright, Clare Innes

OTHERS PRESENT: Bill Burbank, Steve Casalle, Williston Residents
Candace Page, Burlington Free Press
Paul O'Leary, O'Leary-Burke Civil Associates
Ben Siebecker, Shaw Environmental

AGENDA ITEM:

1. Review Landfill Scenario D
2. Develop criteria for Scenario E

Agenda #1 Scenario D and Agenda #2 Develop Criteria for Scenario E:

T. Moreau summarized that this meeting would include a presentation of the most recently completed conceptual design and economic analysis, which is Scenario D. It was emphasized that this not a formal proposal, but is rather a review of Scenario D, which will result in discussion, and what design assumptions or goals need to be modified and incorporated into the next conceptual design iteration, which will become Scenario E. T. Moreau noted that Scenario D does not fully comply with the Host Town Agreement footprint and when initially discussed with Williston a few years ago, this was not an issue. However, around six-months ago certain Williston officials made it clear that one scenario of the landfill does need to fit within the existing Host Town Agreement footprint.

T. Barbagallo introduced consultants and explained that we would review Scenario D, which would then lead into answering the questions on the memo as outlined in the packet. T. Barbagallo also stressed that this board is advisory only and will prepare to bring this to the full CSWD Board at their September board meeting.

B. Siebecker began PowerPoint presentation on the CSWD Conceptual Landfill Design D and noted that on April 19, 2006 the Landfill Oversight Committee (LOC) decided to limit the rate for till removal from the site, reassess the incoming waste rate projections, and evaluate reducing wetland impacts. Concept D was a result of changes to Concept A, B, and C, which had different locations for stockpiling the Redmond sand that CSWD must make available to HS&G on the property. The LOC changed Option C to include ground water modeling that would address potential groundwater level impact concerns raised by nearby residents and should include intra-gradient conditions, and the plan should better address the storage of Redmond Sand.

B. Siebecker reviewed Conceptual Plan D, which included the following:

- a) review and discussion on Groundwater modeling. He explained that the bedrock piezometric surface drops in response to landfill development but not near the residents on Martel Hill. This would only affect the landfill. The source for the Martel Hill water is the regional bedrock aquifer to the east and south of Martel Hill.
- b) Redmond Road Stockpile, which increased by locating additional sand stockpile to the northwest of the existing north edge and is close to the 30 year removal goal.
- c) Till excavation, which puts the groundwater drain at 10 feet below the elevation assuring an intragradient condition.
- d) Landfill height, which has not changed from the existing plans, but the rate of buildup is earlier than previous models.
- e) Landfill stability, which now includes a 10 to 20 foot high berm to assure stability on the steeper base grading plan associated with the future ground water table conditions and the south to north development progression, which is now downhill versus the previous design of uphill.

A. Nye asked about the aesthetics of the landfill and when the design changed from south to north. A. Nye expressed concern over what this would mean for Essex residents in regards to aesthetics.

T. Barbagallo explained that the new concept is to try and keep the Redmond Sand on the Site and it makes sense to keep it on the north end, where it resides. This would result in less moving of the sand. He said this would make the landfill higher sooner than originally discussed.

B. Siebecker reviewed the Bedrock water table contour and changes due to liner system and bedrock water table drawdown, Redmond Sand Stockpile Plan, Cross Section, Base Grading Plan, Phase 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. B. Siebecker explained that Phase 3, would vegetate those slopes and would be 5 to 8 years before they get to that point and that Phase 4 would be about 29 years of life going north to south.

P. Stabler asked about moving sand in the first phase and B. Siebecker replied that some sand will be moved in the first Phase, but the cost model shows it being all moved at once.

B. Siebecker reviewed the CSWD Solid Waste Management Facility Landfill Phase Capacity and Site Life Spreadsheet and explained that Phase 6 includes importing clay for cells 1, 2, and 3.

T. Moreau handed out spreadsheets on the economic model with the private tip fees estimated at \$86 per ton, \$76 per ton, and \$100 per ton. He said that the initial bond for Phase I and II of this landfill could be as high as \$93 million. T. Moreau explained that the \$76 per ton tipping fee is what is believed to be happening in the marketplace today. T Moreau said that the landfill will lose \$2 million in the first 30 years if using this scenario but will save a net of \$12 million over the 56 years (in years 34 through year 56). K. Nolan expressed concern that these numbers were reflecting tipping fees and questioned whether they were accurate numbers. He asked about the existing trucking cost fees and felt that there were externality costs that were not factored into the model.

B. Lindholm agreed with K. Nolan that there were costs for shipping trash to Coventry and fuel costs and environmental impacts that were not included in the model.

A. Nye questioned whether a lower tipping would lessen the standards that CSWD is putting on the landfill to stay competitive. T. Moreau said that he prefer that CSWD follow the New York State

standards (third liner of a clay layer) rather than Vermont's more lenient standards and questioned whether ANR would go back into Act 78 and upgrade the standards. A. Nye expressed concern for the long-term liability of our county by going to the existing landfills.

B Siebecker summarized the presentation on the Conceptual Plan D Conclusions that the landfill development will not impact Martel Hill residential wells; Redmond sand stockpile removal is modeled to occur in 29 years; a stockpile area needs to be identified; the landfill will be developed from south to north with phase increasing visual exposure; development of south to north requires additional design considerations for stability management; and the cost modeling shows comparable short term costs to Plan C and better long term costs than plan C.

A. Nye asked for further information on the new plan that includes north to south. T. Barbagallo explained the desire to move Redmond sand as little as possible and that there are up front capital costs that would also include not having to dig as deep. The advantage of this is not having to stockpile sand on the VELCO property. T. Barbagallo said that this discussion then moves into the next phase of the meeting which is discussing Scenario E.

K. Nolan expressed concern that the discussion so far has been negative and he does not want the Burlington Free Press reporter to take the wrong message and base an article on this conversation and that there are other factors that need to be considered besides the ones discussed thus far.

Discussion was held on other factors that will need to be provided when going out for a bond, including environmental costs and benefits.

B. Siebecker said that in the landfill development scenario it is necessary to know how long we will want it to last and can we build it cheaper. T. Barbagallo said the question is whether CSWD will be in favor of building a landfill that can hold as much as possible, which will be more cost-effective in the long run or one that is smaller and has a lower life.

T. Barbagallo referred to consideration A on whether the forecasted disposal projections adequately accommodate impacts of potential future diversion programs and also reviewed the disposal rate spreadsheet. T. Moreau said he felt that c&d could be dealt with sooner than the projected seven years and that could be changed to two years. Discussion was held on c&d disposal and possible options. Discussion was held on organics and the difficulty of getting a system in place. T. Moreau said that it may be necessary for mandates for organics to work. He also commented that franchising may be necessary. T. Barbagallo completed a revised tonnage chart after discussion and input.

T. Barbagallo explained that in addition to the forecasted disposal projections the following other items need to be discussed:

- B. should the landfill be designed to hold the greatest amount of waste or should CSWD limit capacity to encourage a movement towards zero waste;
- C. the amount of long-term debt CSWD is willing to incur to build a landfill. The per ton capital costs go down if the landfill is not as deep but a larger capacity landfill will likely have a lower tip fee but a larger capital cost. A smaller landfill will not have the intra-gradient underdrain design CSWD envisioned.
- D. How long the landfill bond should be. Longer periods reduce short-term costs but then becomes an issue of commitment from future CSWD members.
- E. The landfill was originally decided that it should maintain a \$20 differential from the next

best disposal option and discussion should be held on whether this factor should remain or should CSWD place a higher priority on environmental protection and waste minimization.

T. Moreau referred to the economic model spreadsheet and said that a 56 year landfill with an initial \$93 million bond is too much, given that it would lose \$2 million dollars over the first 30 years, and the way technology is changing that this scenario is irresponsible. T. Moreau went over a brief PowerPoint that referred to the balance of numerous factors that CSWD is faced with.

P. Stabler said he would like an overview on the different scenarios and the impact of those scenarios to the neighbors, including Essex residents, and truck traffic. T. Barbagallo referred to the memo from May 2006 and the visual impact assessment. P. Stabler questioned the change from building north to south.

B. Siebecker said that by going this direction we limit the Redmond sand movement but we have to fill in the base area and then move progressively higher. P. O'Leary said the new design will have more of an impact on the Williston side than the Essex side because we will have to build higher at a faster rate than the other design. He said the impact will be minimal and Essex will have a berm shielding the view.

T. Barbagallo said he would like for the LOC and Executive Board to provide input to the engineers on the number of years the landfill should be built for. B. Lindholm said he would not like to see the number of years for the landfill reduced. T. Nostrand says he agrees with T. Moreau that we should have a smaller landfill because eventually there will be technology that will reduce the need and society needs to pay for this. He concluded that Zero Waste is good for our society. P. Stabler said he felt he was closer to designing for 40 years. P. Mouser said she believed that it should be designed for 50 years. P. Stabler said he feels the next design round needs to comply with the Host Town Agreement and should include the revised disposal projections, but also CSWD should again review the impact on surrounding towns and the permitting process.

Discussion was held on the likelihood of new technologies and their impact over the next thirty years.

A. Nye said he would like the landfill to be designed for 30 to 40 years. M. Coates said he would like to look at scenarios and see what other options there are for Chittenden County. B. Lindholm said he was comfortable with 30 to 40 years. T. Moreau said he would like to see 30 years and would make the first cell smaller and more affordable. He said that he prefer that this county move laterally to take care of immediate needs and have flexibility and that we can build one for 30 years and be competitive, although not as competitive as we originally thought.

T. Moreau said that diversion is important and the more we divert, the less the bond costs will be and the less sand we will have to move.

T. Barbagallo asked what the LOC and Executive Board felt would be reasonable upfront bond costs. B. Lindholm felt that the public will object to any number that we put out there. A. Nye said he did not feel anything about \$40 million would pass by voters. N. Plunkett noted that in surveys that have been done the question was asked and the public opinion was fine with a bond vote. She noted that a

number was not included in the question. Discussion was held on a comfortable bond vote amount and whether it should be done in two phases or at once.

Discussion was held on what else the engineers would need for working on Scenario E. It was determined that they would need to know what CSWD is willing to spend on a landfill, and whether they would go as deep as Conceptual Plan D, not intra-gradient, whether we would continue with the north to south build, and what are we willing to invest and then what does that get CSWD for it's money. T. Nostrand felt that the board should see a few variations of footprints and the economics of those footprints.

T. Barbagallo commented that discussion should be held on capacity versus up front capital costs and before we move forward that needs to be discussed. He proposed reconvening to discuss further or to direct staff to do further research and hold another meeting before the full board meeting. T. Moreau recommended meeting again in early September.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Mike Coates, SECOND by Paul Stabler, to adjourn the meeting. VOTING: unanimous; motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.