Date: January 9, 2020

Time: 10:00-12:00pm

Location: Hearing Room, 200 W Oak St Fort Collins, CO 80522

Contact: Stephen Gillette, Director of Solid Waste

Attendees:

Solid Waste Policy Council Members
Wade Troxell, Cody Bird, Stephen Gillette, Kevin McEachern, Caroline Mitchell,
Tyler Bandemer, Ken Zornes, Mick Mercer, Susie Gordon, Ross Cunniff, Steve
Johnson, John Kefalas, Leah Johnson, Lou Perez, Lorie Kadrich

Phone Attendees:
None

Notes from December 12, 2019 approved

Old Business  None

Additions or deletions to the agenda:

Amending IGA topic as time allows or next meeting, Ross Cunniff

Overview of Retreat December 12, 2019, Laurie Kadrich

- The Facilitation Team gave summary of S.W.O.T., (strengths, weakness, opportunities, threats
  identified for the Policy Committee).
- We’ve been requested to look again at the timeline for next year and how we structured
different topics for various meetings by quarters. Today, we have supplemental information
from Lou Perez that ties the IGA project and timelines together. There is also a section for
parking lot thoughts where we can add any additional direction that the Board has for us.
- Wade Troxell suggested that we create vision, values and outcomes statements that we are
working towards and that the SWOT analysis is a good frame to use to achieve this.
- Chair asked to identify what are the next steps to ensure the group is keeping up and checking in
with the vision and outcomes. Laurie Kadrich responded; the Technical Committee has not yet
had time to review the Retreat or create a way to inform how it’s keeping up with the plan.

- Tier one projects have mission, vision and values and are very structured within the IGA. Another retreat is not necessary for now.
- It would be helpful to have some sort of document or reminder of why we are gathered, suggesting we are already executing beyond our IGA tasks, as we discuss topics closely related to the IGA like closing the current landfill, future purpose for other site locations. The scope of this group goes beyond executing on the IGA tasks and helping to implement the Masterplan to making sure we are supported in the future and making adjustments as challenges arise.
- Additional SWOT comments; suggestions regarding moving some items into different categories and returning with amendments the next meeting.
- Diversity was labeled a weakness due to some confusion about what was intended by its placement in the weakness category. It was mentioned and acknowledged as necessary and should grow beyond the parties that are represented at present.
- It’s important to extend participation invitation to private haulers. Different community perspectives in how we go about reaching goals, need to be represented like public haulers and private utilities etc. We have a unified goal of 40% diversion, and we were recognized for our collaboration. These comments will be taken up at the next Technical Council meeting and brought back to the next Policy Council meeting.

Work plan for Technical Committee: Lou Perez
Yard Waste (blue insert)

- Gantt charts show major points of Tier 1. Permit application for yard waste collection, processing program, and compost. (Tier 3 in 2022 will add food waste) We will need assurance of more yard waste beyond what city of Loveland brings. Additional yard waste could come in through a competitive market or through a flow control program.
- Comment: Mayor Wade Troxell would like to see reports on all sources and destination of yard waste.
- Discussions: This was part of the HDR Wasteshed analysis. Project Manager received data saying most of the Fort Collins yard waste is going to the private sector. A new facility will require a certain volume of material to operate and need to know where it will come from. Most of the yard waste is from landscapers right now.
- Ideally, we will attract material by the markets. Price per ton often varies depending on volume, more tonnage is usually a lower thus complicating the market driven option. Other models observed have commitments and agreements in place for the volumes to keep them funded and sustainable. Open market and volumes can drive the cost to be very high
- Consideration for the private sector and the impact on their businesses will also be factored in, these private companies have demonstrated environmentally and fiscally positive impacts on our community.
- Greenhouse gas created by trucking are part of the analysis.
- Decisions should not be about justification for a facility but other impacts in the community as well. Discussion can include how these private business models have been able to work so well. Suggested we may want to rethink our plans toward a total solution rather than forge ahead with plans we’ve already made.
- Chair Leah Johnson reminds the decisions that were made with the Master Plan and the early Wasteshed, were based on the impact and sustainability aspect was a weighted component of the decision that got us to where we are at right now. If we are diverting 40% but impacting greenhouse gasses it becomes a moot point. The objective is to divert it from the landfill no matter where it goes and to ensure that it goes someplace where it can be returned at a reasonable price and the facility won’t be out of business in a couple of years.
Partnerships in the yard waste facility are also a discussion point. The landfill currently uses Hageman’s to grind the green waste. These comments are good but have been factored in early on.

Discussion will continue as a future agenda item: Update on public private partnership integration on yard waste and find out if it’s scalable.

- Commissioner John Kefalas felt the newer members of the team could benefit from being updated on work so far including the definition of what yard waste is.
- HDR, is working on regulatory requirements. Intention is to file Engineering, Design, Operation Plan (EDOP) with the state in spring of 2020 to apply for license to open a landfill. Other permits and requirements will take most of a year to deliver and get reviewed for approval.
- Would like public review and engagement on the border line discussion. Need to have an outreach program to keep public engagement. Currently seeking a communications team member for the Tier 1 project. We'd like more regular and consistent accurate communications with the community and to make this as inclusive as possible.
- Commissioner John Kefalas offered to include this topic when he hosts his monthly Wellington Community Conversations, and also the BCC has Town Hall meetings, and this could be a topic on alternating months. Wellington, Buckeye and Waverly communities could all partake. Suggested also the elected within their municipalities can speak to their constituents. Concern was mentioned about existing landfill and CDPHE issue and how information and public relations around that could affect the project moving forward. We will let this Communication Liaison person develop a plan for communication to avoid duplicating or being a hinderance to their work.
- Transfer truck routes need to be discussed in detail, it’s a sensitive subject and there are many implications that need to be considered. Schools, constraints of road, seasonal variations, ag harvest truck traffic, city improvements, crosswalks with pedestrians. Wellington has great interest and we’d like to add this to topics of discussion next agenda.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North Landfill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2020</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1 - March 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Apr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April - Sept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May - Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept - Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2021</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Jul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Aug</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yard &amp; Food Waste Compost Phase 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2022</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Sep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Central Transfer Station (yellow insert)

- Question: What is the level of collaboration with the people working on the Behavioral Health facility?
- Response: Small group meetings are a few times a month on coordinating the projects. Site plans will be brought to the next meeting.
- Wade Troxell suggested that these two facilities at this site are incompatible and is reluctant to proceed with construction plans without reconciling the incompatible use for this location. It is suggested that the Behavioral Health Director come to a meeting with conceptual drawings, or that the Chair Leah Johnson and Vice Chair Wade Troxell, go to the Behavioral Health Policy Council to discuss any perceived incompatibilities.
- Wade Troxell noted that the presentations on compost was made with photos of composting sites that were surrounded by vegetation for wind break and this plan has it located at the bottom of schnook ridge. Would like to discuss if all these concerns were addressed before construction begins. Chair would like to hear from Planning what the corridor will look like, including the open space in this area and how this integrates into that as well.

![Central Transfer Station](image)

### Central Transfer Station

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>PAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Feb Transfer Station 65% Design Review (Drawings, Front-ends, Specifications, Engineering Analysis and Calculations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Apr Transfer Station 90% Design Review (Drawings, Front-ends, Specifications)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-May Final Contract Documents &amp; Bidding Document Preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1, - July 30 Construction bid pkg (RFP released)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Aug Award construction bid and Operations bid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Oct Start Construction (estimated 12 months)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Oct Start Operations Central Transfer Station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Construction and Demolition (orange insert)**

- Investigating private entities regarding finding markets and sourcing them to keep from shipping. Some entities are looking at Colorado.
### Toolkit for Education

Policy Committee will oversee and will put on the agenda for a broader discussion. It will be the Communication persons role to create a timeline and a plan once hired.

### Field trip options

There is interest and should just move forward with scheduling and allowing people to partake as their schedules allow.

### Hauler Licensing Update Lou Perez (attached final 3 pages)

- Looked at other best practice ordinances in other municipalities along with expertise from Solid Waste Association of North America, (SWANA) input. Need input from Technical Committee and private haulers to define boundaries and services offered. We will bring the feedback to the Policy Committee for recommendations.
- Yellow municipality areas on map already have their own ordinances in place and guidelines for what they expect the haulers to do with their waste, recycling, and yard waste.
- The red area that is sketched in, is the unincorporated urban areas, where properties could be candidates for varied recycling materials services.
- The areas outside would be very rural and represent difficult areas to implement varied services. Cost and labor for haulers is too great. Presently this is all private haulers and only subscription waste services.
- Franklin street sells the single stream materials as individual commodities. They are having 20% contamination rate and landfill contaminated materials. Contamination requirements are getting stricter. Most paper gets shipped overseas. Most plastic stays in the U.S. and is marketable. A lot of cardboard also stays in North America.
- If the objective becomes diversion rather than money, the haulers will have to charge more and more for these additional recycling services. This is part of the ordinance challenge, to be fair to all income segments of the communities.
Mayor Wade Troxell questioned: “What’s happening at the federal level to reduce packaging, and what are we doing with advocacy in that regard” still suggesting waste to energy due to the energy content of material. He stated, not everything has to be at Wasteshed scale and we have to feed the monster. I think we could do things at other scales and we could do waste to energy. I know that we haven’t looked at the economics of the revenue that could be generated from an energy perspective. I think the analysis we’ve looked at up to this point is not realizing a lot of revenue from our waste streams, it’s a cost that should be put onto the disposal aspect rather than the economic aspect so two things; 1) what’s the federal involvement relating consumer packaging and 2) building the strategy more around a circular economy of highest and best use and the economics that can help drive that

Comments: The difference between rural and urban Larimer County we don’t want to push and expense on someone to recycle in rural Larimer County that would impact them disproportionately to someone who lives in more urban Larimer county. The lines drawn on the map are open to discussion where it makes more sense to include recycling vs more sense to push education efforts. Thought should be given to where it’s economically feasible.

Suggestion and discussion: Offer more centralized drop off areas for recycling. These drop off’s are expensive to run and ripe with challenges including wildlife. Is the diversion paying for itself? No. The costs of recycling and collection sites are subsidized for the last 20 years with landfill tip fees.

At the next meeting in February 13th, there will be a presentation of a more detailed map including what is available presently for recycling.

Question: Should the discussions be with private haulers first or the Board first?

IGA language indicates we are not going to mandate recycling for urban and rural.

**New Business:** Ask for a modification to the IGA on the dates, with the agreement stating a super majority of the policy committee can change dates. Request the Policy Committee can offer opinions on topics outside the scope of IGA that impact the Wasteshed work solidifying the group beyond the Master Plan.

**Next meeting Feb 13, 2020**

Adjournment
Hello Tac Member,

For our 1/16/20 TAC meeting, we have a large agenda to fill. That said, we like to be proactive and ask if each of you can supply the following information so we can move quickly and as efficiently as possible.

*** if possible, please bring your written response to tomorrow’s TAC meeting or email, Lou, your response within the next few days ***

Hauling Licensing Input

1). Geographical Area and Boundary for the unincorporated area
   - During the last Policy Council, it was suggested that we consider narrowing the boundary lines for the Unincorporated Urban Areas, see attached. Please provide us with your input and suggestion regarding the below map & boundary lines for the Unincorporated Urban Areas. Do you like the current map layout or have an alternative recommendation? We have also attached the map as a separate PDF document.

2). Service for the Unincorporated Urban Areas

Do you agree that we should make a recommendation to offer the following services to the Unincorporated Urban Areas:

   A. Pay as you throw volume base MSW service.
   B. Grouped Pricing or Bundled Services for MSW and Curbside Recycling.
   C. Yard Waste Collection.
   D. Any other program suggestions?

3). Service for the Unincorporated Rural Areas

Do you agree that we should make a recommendation to offer the following services to the Unincorporated Rural Areas:

   E. Pay as you throw volume base MSW service.
   F. Offer Curbside Recycling as an option.
   G. Offer Grouped Pricing or Bundled Services for MSW and Curbside Recycling as an option.
   H. Yard Waste Collection as an option.
   I. Any other program suggestions?

4). Meeting with the Hauler

We like to meet with the haulers and propose the above questions. First, we like your input and suggestions, please. What is your recommendation towards interacting with the local Haulers and attaining their input?

   1. Do you agree that we should send them a questionnaire and plan a group meeting?
   2. Any other suggestion on how to best approach the hauler group?
   3. Besides the questions from above, any other questions or input you like to suggest?
2019 Research Hauling Ordinance
Compare Industry Best Practices

Unincorporated "Urban" Larimer County
- Pay as you throw Volume Base Services
- Grouped Pricing for Bundled Services or Service Options
- Yard Waste Services

Unincorporated "Rural" Larimer County
- Pay as you throw Volume Base Services - For Discussion
- Curbside Recycling - Optional
- Yard Waste Services - Optional

Develop Model for IGA Members
Discuss Program Options with TAC and Receive Input
Discuss Program Options with Hauler and Receive Input
Present to PAC Program Options and input Received