The meeting of the Solid Waste Technical Management Committee (TMC) was held at the Department of Solid Waste (SW) Conference Room, 2:00 pm on January 22, 2020. Members present were Earl Gloster, Deb Bush, Willie Joseph, Bob Turner, Bill Pickrum, Tracy Meehan, Michael Gordon, Ray Boler, Bart Diebold and Scott Witt. Pinellas County employee attendees were Paul Sacco, SW Director, Linda Larkins, Office of Management and Budget (OMB), Brendan Mackesey and Joe Morrissey, County Attorneys. Members absent without an alternate: Dean Scharmen, Indian Rocks Beach and Andy Butterfield, City of St. Pete Beach. Deann Baker, TMC Secretary recorded the minutes.

Call to Order

Earl Gloster, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 2:04 pm.

Citizens to be heard

None present

Minutes

Mr. Gloster entertained a motion to approve the minutes of the November 20, 2019 meeting.

A motion was made by Bob Turner, seconded by Scott Witt to accept the TMC Minutes as written. Motion carried unanimously.

Operations Report

Deb Bush, SW Division Manager

- The Operations report was presented for November and December.
- There were incorrect numbers reported and provided in the handout for the System Performance Summary. They have since been corrected and uploaded to the TMC SharePoint site.
- Boiler availability was at 83% in November and 70% in December.
- TRP and Operation updates were provided.
- The fall 2019 outage ended in late December 2019. The next scheduled maintenance outage for each boiler will begin middle of March 2020 and end May 2020.
- In November, our department participated in the Great American Teach-In. We had 5 employees at 6 schools who gave 31 presentations to 1,158 students and 41 adults.
- The 2020 mobile collection flyer is available on the main Solid Waste webpage. The events listed are from January through June. We will add July through December dates later.
Financial Report
Linda Larkins, Pinellas County OMB

- Electric and capacity revenue reporting is always one month in arrears from Duke.
- Interest earnings are up, as they are budgeted conservatively.
- The “other” category is $165,000 for hurricane reimbursement that was received. The remaining 2 million is an adjustment that the Clerk makes at the end of every year for fair market assets.
- Expenditures side, the personal services are running favorable. Operating expenditures were quite a bit less than budgeted, primarily in consulting, legal, utilities, chemicals, R and M and supplies.
- Plant management came in a little under budget. This was due to the monthly Covanta service fees that were lower than anticipated.
- Landfill management came in slightly over budget.
- CIP came in under budget due to the reduced need of having to purchase some assets and timing of the CIP projects.

Pinellas Partners in Recycling (PPR) Update
Deanna Doss, PPR Chair

- PPR held elections for Chair and Vice Chair at the January meeting. Deanna Doss was elected as the Chair and Jack Crooks from the City of St. Pete was elected Vice Chair. A motion was made by Tracy Meehan to ratify the PPR Chair and Vice Chair elections and was seconded by Tom Nichols. The motion passed unanimously.
- The PPR is working on updating the bylaws. They were originally written in 1989 and have been updated 6 times since. There is a bylaws committee working on this mainly to reflect the group of 17 voting members, reducing that number down to 15.
- The FDEP has some grant opportunities that the municipalities should be aware of. The first is the Municipal Management Program (MMP). This is a free program or tool that can be used for actual recommendations to your existing programs, assess where you’re currently at, how to improve your outreach as well as how to reduce contamination levels. The FDEP is stressing that this grant money is out there and to apply for it on their website. Another grant is the Recycling Recognition Program. This program encourages making donations to a business for outstanding recycling designed to reduce contamination levels. Another program is “feet on the street”. This grant is designed to reduce contamination at the curbside recycling.
- The haulers have questioned if cartons are a commodity. Should they remain in the recycling guide? At this time, they will remain in the guide, even though there is a minimal amount that are in the curbside recycling bins. Bob Turner questioned if they were looking to remove the cartons altogether from the acceptable recyclable items? Answer: We don’t want to discourage residents to stop recycling cartons at this time. Stephanie Watson talked to 3 MRF’s and none of them are recycling cartons currently. Cartons represent only .2% of the collected recycling materials. Bill Pickrum spoke about the various contracts the cities have and how it would be good to have the cartons listed as an acceptable item versus a contamination factor. It’s listed in the Recycling Guide as an item that is accepted.

Municipalities Recycling Opportunities
- Paul spoke about the city of Safety Harbor and their recycling efforts. There were discussions between the City Manager and the County Administrator regarding what was being proposed by the city and how it could affect what Solid Waste is trying to do with the Master Plan. There is now more attention being focused on recycling. An agreement was made to work together to accelerate the discussion regarding recycling opportunities. The Board is verbally giving the
TMC direction with regards to recycling. There are 3 elements that the Board would like the TMC, as the advisory board, to take control of.

1. Conduct domestic and international market research of mixed recycling commodity markets with the primary objective to understand what markets exist for ‘clean’, non-contaminated recyclables. This may mean an addition of a municipal or regional MRF.

2. Assess current recycling practices and waste composition of curbside recycling for each municipality. Collaborate to develop a standard list which simplifies what is to be recycled. The objective would be to increase the yield of best marketed materials. This may mean that we’re not recycling as many of the materials as in the past, but we’re recycling better, meaning more pay for the material and perhaps the contamination levels would be less.

3. Review the feasibility for a publicly-owned regional MRF, based on the outcomes of items (1) and (2).

- We need to know what the markets are. Each city has their own recycling contracts, some are standard and some are not. Cities are working with different processors that have different end markets. The County doesn’t have the knowledge base that the cities have, as we don’t know what the processors are telling the cities as to what they can and cannot do.

- The County is interested in accelerating the talks to see if a MRF is an answer for this region, but numbers 1 and 2 above would need to be vetted, making sure that we’re doing this collectively and that all of the cities are involved. The Board is requesting that the TMC look at this, using the resources that are available, then complete a waste composition study. The County may or may not be able to assist in this area. The recycling grants would be an option. The County would consider hiring a consultant to assist with the studies.

- Bill Pickrum asked if each city is to complete their own waste composition study or is it possible to have the county take the lead here? Ray Boler brought up putting together a subcommittee with a representative from the county and some of the larger cities, perhaps a total of 5 people.

- The last county solid waste composition study was done in 2014. The recycling waste composition study was done in 2015. We’re looking at doing another one this fiscal year, starting in the fall and completing it in the spring.

- Earl Gloster thinks we need to do another recycling composition study. Since no one has a current curbside recycling composition study done, perhaps as a group, there could be something put together. There is strength in numbers, so each city should participate.

- Bill asked if they could utilize the recycling grant money for the studies. The cities should put in the request for the monies, as it would be a great way to spend the grant money. The county can obtain the proposals and costs for the studies, whether it’s through the grant or other funds that are available. The TMC members that represent multiple cities will need to speak with each of the cities they represent. This needs to be a Pinellas County regional effort. Population for each city would be taken into consideration with the cost factor.

- The county would be willing to pay for #1, which is to conduct domestic and international market research of mixed recycling commodity markets with the primary objective to understand what markets exist for ‘clean’, non-contaminated recyclables.

- Paul stated that the county would move forward with #1, keeping the TMC abreast of what progress is being made. For the 2nd item, the county will take the lead and put together a scope of work and present it to the TMC, obtaining approval prior to going public.

- Deb Bush wants us to confirm that we can use the grant money, as it is specific as to what the money can be used for. Linda Larkins read what is in the Municipal Recycling solution that initially set the wheels in motion for the grant to the municipalities. It’s not clear if the grant would cover a composition study.

  o Voting for item #1 – the county would hire a consultant to conduct domestic and international market research of mixed recycling commodity markets with the primary objective to understand what markets exist for ‘clean’, non-contaminated recyclables. A motion was made by Bart Diebold, seconded by Bill Pickrum and approved unanimously.
Voting for item #2 - Assess current recycling practices and waste composition of curbside recycling for each municipality. The county would create the scope of work for this. The county would hire a consultant to work with each municipality, however each municipality would pay according to their population. Bill Pickrum made a motion and was seconded by Ray Bolder. The motion was passed unanimously.

Rate Review Subcommittee Recommendation
- Ray Boler presented to the TMC information that the Rate Review Subcommittee discussed at 1:00 pm, prior to the TMC meeting. Raftelis gave an updated presentation. Not much has changed since the previous presentation, as there is still the unknown with regards to the Master Plan. In addition, there is no Power Purchase Agreement in place after 2024. These 2 items were discussed by the subcommittee and the vote was 3-2, passing the same 6% proposed rate increase for each of the next 2 years, which was the original 3-year timeframe. This will help to fund the closure costs in out years as the reserve funds build over time. The Rate Review Subcommittee is recommending a 6% rate increase beginning on 10/1/20. A role call of the TMC was conducted with the following results:
  - Group “A” Cities - Aye
  - Group “B” Cities – Nay
  - Group “C” Cities – Absent
  - City of Pinellas Park - Aye
  - City of Largo – Nay
  - City of Tarpon Springs – Aye
  - Private Sector – Aye
  - City of Dunedin – Nay
  - City of St. Petersburg Beach – Absent
  - City of St. Petersburg - Aye
  - Pinellas County – Aye
  - City of Clearwater - Aye
- The motion was passed voting 8-3 in favor of the 6% rate increase to begin on 10/1/20.

Additional Items for Discussion
- Paul discussed renewable energy credits and continuing to work with Raftelis. They’re working on an evaluation of the facility to make sure it meets the renewable energy credit standard. The credits come from the WTE facility. They don’t have a high dollar value and are offered on a per ton basis. They can be anywhere from .25 to $2.00 a ton, per month. If we ever did get into a non-regulated environment, like energy has in other parts of the country, the value could be anywhere from $100 - $250 per ton, per month.
- The Power Purchase Agreement – no movement. There is a stalemate with Duke at the levels that we’re able to negotiate. There will be a briefing with the County Administrator on 1/27, discussing what Solid Waste wants. He’ll be requesting an audience with the President of Duke Florida, to go through the levels on both sides.
- The draft of the Master Plan will be presented to the Board on 2/6 at a work session. The County Administrator has already been briefed. The Board will be provided with a written draft form and there will be a formal presentation made, entertaining any questions they may have. We’re seeking direction from them to move forward as the plan is written or provide us with any changes they would like to see. We’ll adjust accordingly and once the plan is finalized, it will be communicated back to the TMC. Paul thanked the TMC and our partners.
• Solid Waste is working on a partnership agreement with other facilities that have Waste to Energy facilities. This is something that has not been formalized, however, we’ve been working with Hillsborough County for the past year. We’ve been taking waste from them on occasion, the most recent being this past Friday. We’re able to process the waste, not putting anything into the landfill. They’re paying disposal fees just like any other customer.

• The TRP projects are now in the structural steel area, painting the steel as it’s being replaced. The larger elements or components of the TRP have been completed in the last outage. We’re now seeing this in the availability which has gone from the high 80’s to 98%. We’ve spent $250 million dollars to get us to this point.

• Bill Pickrum suggested that spotters start using signs at the tipping floor instead of just waving the drivers to the bay. Some of the drivers are having a difficult time seeing just a wave.

Adjournment:
Ray Boler made a motion to adjourn and was seconded by Bob Turner to adjourn the meeting at 3:06 pm.
The next TMC Meeting is scheduled for March 25, 2020.
Respectfully submitted, Deann Baker, Recording TMC Secretary