

**APPENDIX D
AD HOC SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING SUMMARIES**

This appendix provides a copy of the meeting summaries for each meeting of the Ad Hoc Solid Waste Management Planning Committee.

Document	# of Pages
1. Meeting Summary for September 11, 2002 (presented on September 25, 2002)	3
2. Meeting Summary for September 25, 2002 (presented as Attachment 1 to Item 2 on October 9, 2002)	5
3. Meeting Summary for October 9, 2002 (presented as Attachment 1 to Item 2 on October 23, 2002)	7
4. Meeting Summary for October 23, 2002 (presented as Item 2 on November 20, 2002).....	7
5. Meeting Summary for November 20, 2002 (presented as Item 1 on January 22, 2003)	6
6. Meeting Summary for January 8, 2003 (presented as Item 2 on January 22, 2003) (includes recorder notes from each of the four discussion groups)	15
7. Meeting Summary for January 22, 2003 (presented as Item 1 on February 12, 2003).....	5
8. Meeting Summary for February 12, 2003 (not distributed to the Committee)	4

**APPENDIX D
AD HOC SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING SUMMARIES**

This page is intentionally left blank.

Loudoun County Ad Hoc Solid Waste Management Plan Committee
Meeting Summary
September 11, 2002

Present:

County: Sally Kurtz, Chairman
Jim Burton
Eleanore Towe

Towns: Tom Mason, Town of Leesburg
Keith Reasoner, Town of Hamilton
Kelly Yost, Town of Round Hill
Charles Hartgrove, Town of Middleburg

Absent: Elaine Walker, Town of Lovettsville
Steve Morgart, Town of Hillsboro
Rob Lohr and Martin Kloeden, Town of Purcellville
Kristin Umstadd and Robert Noe, Town of Leesburg

Call to Order

Sally Kurtz, Chairman, called the meeting to order, which was followed by introductions from the town representatives and staff.

Ms. Kurtz reviewed the purpose of the committee, which is to review and provide revisions to the Solid Waste Management Plan (SWMP). She also discussed the process and schedule requirements. She reviewed the proposed meeting schedule of the committee, which may include two public input sessions, using the small group process, to receive feedback from special interest groups on the SWMP. These sessions are scheduled to be held in October. The committee will then review this feedback as they update the plan document at their November meetings. Ms. Kurtz intends to present the final draft plan to the full Board in December. She noted that all of the incorporated towns will be included in the Solid Waste Management Planning District.

Ms. Kurtz referenced the materials provided for tonight's meeting which include a draft of the first four chapters of the Solid Waste Management Plan; a letter dated August 13, 2002 to the ad hoc committee members; as well as a copy of the staff slide presentation. She noted that a letter from the River Creek Owners Association had been received regarding the cost of refuse service for River Creek and will be discussed at the next meeting.

Staff Presentation – Part I - Trash: Who Makes It? What Are They Making and How Much Are They Making?

Stacey Anderson, with the Office on Solid Waste Management, provided the first part of the presentation, which included:

- Growth indicators and demand factors;
- Waste types;
- Solid Waste Management Planning through the years; and
- Waste generation (MSW, construction debris, vegetative, and automobile maintenance waste).

Staff noted that the biggest change in the Solid Waste Management Plan will be the additional waste types considered in the plan including “special wastes” that require special handling such as petroleum contaminated soils and construction wastes such as drywall and waste lumber.

Staff responded to questions from the committee members and town representatives regarding disposal of various wastes, i.e., latex paints, tires, etc. Staff also responded to questions related to the amount of waste going to transfer stations vs. County landfill.

Staff Presentation - Part II – Trash: Where Does It Go and Who Takes It?

The second part of the presentation was provided by Jane Tatum, also with the Office of Solid Waste Management, who reviewed the following components:

- Solid Waste Management System Service Providers;
 - private sector
 - the Towns
 - the County
- Solid Waste Management Facilities;
- Current System Capacity;
- Recycling;
- Public Information & Education;
- Waste Flow Models; and
- Virginia Waste Hierarchy

Staff responded to questions related to calculations used to obtain numbers on waste distribution; recycling rates and household hazardous waste. Staff also reviewed the various phase requirements of the landfill and capacity projections.

(A copy of the staff presentation is available at the Office of Solid Waste Management or the Office of the County Administrator.)

Next Meeting

Ms. Kurtz announced that the next meeting of the Committee is scheduled for Wednesday, September 25 at 6 p.m. in the Board Room. She asked that any questions from tonight's meeting be forwarded to her within the next two days to allow staff time to prepare information. She also noted that staff would provide information related to financing the system and review other issues and options at the next meeting.

Adjourn

There being no further business to come before the committee, the meeting was adjourned.

Loudoun County Ad Hoc Solid Waste Management Planning Committee
Item 2, Attachment 1
Meeting Summary for September 25, 2002
October 9, 2002

Present:

County: Supervisor Sally Kurtz, Chairman
Supervisor Jim Burton

Town Representatives: Tom Mason, Town of Leesburg
Charles Hartgrove, Town of Middleburg
The Honorable Elaine Walker, Town of Lovettsville
Martin Kloeden, Town of Purcellville
Kelly Yost, Town of Round Hill

Absent: Supervisor Eleanore Towe
Steve Morgart, Town of Hillsboro
The Honorable Kristin Umstattd, Town of Leesburg
Robert Noe, Town of Leesburg
Keith Reasoner, Town of Hamilton

Call to Order

Sally Kurtz, Chairman, called the meeting to order, which was followed by introductions from the Town representatives, staff and members of the public.

Review of Agenda

Mrs. Kurtz reviewed the agenda, highlighting staff presentations for the meeting: Agenda Items 3 and 4 are about financing the solid waste management system and Agenda Item 5 is about assorted issues in the system. Mrs. Kurtz noted that Michael Fairbanks, manager of the Loudoun County Landfill, would give a finance presentation and take questions, followed by a short break. After the break, staff would present issues and options for the system to include Committee discussion.

Follow-up to September 11 Meeting-Questions/Issues

Richard Weber, Director of the Office of Solid Waste Management (OSWM), reviewed a letter from River Creek Owners Association. The Association had been told that a lack of facility capacity in the County was affecting trash collection costs for River Creek. This information was included in the meeting packet materials.

Mr. Weber also addressed a question raised in a letter to the Chair from Mayor Reasoner of Hamilton. He spoke of successful use of recycled concrete in the Town of

Hamilton, and indicated that the District might wish to consider some effort to increase the level of concrete recycling.

The meeting summary of September 11 was accepted as presented.

Staff Presentation

Ms. Kurtz suggested that staff review each issue with the corresponding Options. She asked that the Committee take straw votes on Options as outlined below.

Recycling Issues:

Kate Glass, Recycling Coordinator, presented issues and options about recycling.

Issue 1 – How will the LCSWMPD maintain compliance with the Existing 25% Recycling Rate?

Discussion: Town representatives provided their experience with their contract recycling requirements. This discussion included a cost comparison among the representatives.

Suggestions/ideas: Towns participating as one contract; reminding residents to recycle by letter on annual basis.

Options and Straw Votes:

1. Do nothing further until results of ordinance amendments are known (No Formal Vote Taken—The inferred vote was 0-7 in favor of consideration of Option 2).
2. Town members of SWMPD could adopt Chapters 1084 and 1086 (7-0).
Consensus on this Option, pending Town representatives check with respective Town councils and if there is no cost impact. (County staff is to bring back further information as to the potential fiscal impact on the Towns if these ordinance amendments are implemented.)

Issue 2 – How will the Board address the Deficit in the Recycling DOC policy implementation to insure that convenient and equitable recycling opportunities will be maintained for the residential and business communities?

Discussion: Committee inquired about the cost of DOCs and location of various sites. Questions about locating at schools, fire companies' facilities were discussed as well as DEQ's enforcement for recycling if the County does not meet 25% rate. Committee members asked why DOCs could not be included in standard design of new schools and requested staff determine how many parking spaces would be eliminated if DOCs were installed. (*The request about parking spaces was withdrawn*).

Options and Straw Votes:

1. Funding additional DOC sites is not a current priority due to budget constraints (No Vote Taken).
2. Develop a capital improvement and funding schedule to construct and operate DOCs for immediate needs in the Purcellville area, to replace three sites lost in 1995, and in the Ashburn and South Riding areas (No Vote Taken).
3. Develop a capital improvement and funding schedule to implement fully the County's current recycling policy (No Vote Taken).
4. Develop a recycling dropoff center plan for co-locating DOCs in a comprehensive Countywide joint-use public facility plan for parks, schools, fire stations and other capital projects (7-0).

Issue 3 – Does the District wish to proactively address future increases in the recycling rate?

Discussion: The Committee inquired if Option 2 of Issue 3 were adopted, would a recycling rate committee begin meeting after adoption of the SWMP in July 2003. Staff responded that was correct. Mr. Burton indicated that he was uncertain about being too proactive, and asked staff to continue to carefully study any developments and make recommendations. Mrs. Walker agreed with prior comments but felt that Option 3 would be a good incentive (both Options 2 and 3 go together). Mr. Hartgrove agreed with Mr. Burton on staff study and assessments. Mr. Mason stated that he would support outreach programs and that the District should not get ahead of state requirements. He said he believes Option 2 is better. Mr. Kloeden stated that being proactive is important and supports Option 2. He further stated that this would ensure that a plan is in place if and when rates increased.

Options and Straw Votes:

1. Take no action at this time and wait for an increase to be announced (No Formal Vote Taken—The inferred vote was 0-6-1 in favor of Option 2).
2. Refer the issue to a committee for formal study and could be deferred until after SWMP process is complete. A study/work group could be appointed to assess options and provide recommendations for consideration by the District membership within 18 months (6-0-1, Burton abstained).
3. Increase the current level of recycling program effort to achieve higher rate (2-4-1 Kurtz and Walker, Yes; Burton abstained).

Issue 4 – Does the District Wish to Set a Higher Recycling Goal?

Discussion: Staff responded to a question to clarify the difference between arboreal and yard waste. There were also comments on development waste and how that is counted within the total recycling rates and clarification on targeting specific rates. Town representatives commented on their experience with yard waste collection. Mr. Mason indicated that he would prefer Option 1 for the time but would need to know what the increased rates would be and the source of materials that would be recycled. Ms. Kurtz commented that yard waste should not be leaving someone's yard—it could be recycled as mulch, etc. and would like to see yard waste excluded. Discussion continued on this. Mr. Burton commented that he would expect the recycling rate to increase based on earlier actions taken by the Board.

Craig Stuart-Paul of Fairfax Recycling, Inc., made comments regarding the difficulty of locating a recycling facility in Loudoun County. He stated that a lack of collection infrastructure makes it difficult for him to get recyclables out of Loudoun County and that zoning issues make it difficult to build the facility he would like to build. Mr. Stuart-Paul spoke to rebates paid by his facilities in other jurisdictions, and also spoke to new recycling technologies he is eager to begin using in Loudoun County.

Steve Cawthron, a private citizen and a member of the Woods Road Special Exception Review Committee (WRSERC), commented that a significant portion of the current 28% recycling rate is related to new growth through CDD (6.3%) and arboreal waste (5%). Mr. Cawthron noted that if new growth in Loudoun County were reduced by even half due to economic forces then the District would not be able to meet the 25% mandate. Mr. Cawthron further commented that he believed the recycling rate in Loudoun County could be improved and the reliance on development-related waste could be reduced. He said that there are small but vocal groups of people in Loudoun County who believe in recycling—as he does—and that given a chance they could improve recycling in the County.

Options and Straw Votes:

NOTE: Due to technical difficulties, the actual voting on these options is unclear. Staff requests that the Committee affirm or correct the tallies below.

1. Do not set a higher recycling rate at this time (Inferred 5-2).
2. Set the recycling rate target at 25% excluding yard waste (Inferred 2-5).
3. Target specific rates for specific waste types such as MSW, CDD or vegetative wastes (Inferred 2-5).
4. Set the recycling rate goal higher than the minimum rate without respect to waste type (Inferred 0-7).

Due to time constraints, the Committee will continue review of the remaining Issues and Options at the next meeting. Ms. Kurtz asked that questions be submitted prior to the next meeting.

Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Ad Hoc SWMP Committee is scheduled for Wednesday, October 9 at 6 p.m. in the Board Room.

Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Ad Hoc SWMP Committee, the meeting was adjourned.

Loudoun County Ad Hoc Solid Waste Management Planning Committee
Item 2, Attachment 1
Meeting Summary for October 9, 2002
October 23, 2002

Present:

County: Supervisor Sally Kurtz, Chairman
Supervisor Eleanore Towe

Town Representatives: Tom Mason, Town of Leesburg
Charles Hartgrove, Town of Middleburg
Martin Kloeden, Town of Purcellville
Kelly Yost, Town of Round Hill

Absent: Supervisor Jim Burton
The Honorable Keith Reasoner, Town of Hamilton
The Honorable Steve Morgart, Town of Hillsboro
The Honorable Kristin Umstattd, Town of Leesburg
Robert Noe, Town of Leesburg
The Honorable Elaine Walker, Town of Lovettsville

Call to Order

Sally Kurtz, Chairman, called the meeting to order, which was followed by introductions from the Town representatives, staff and members of the public.

Mrs. Kurtz announced the meeting dates that will follow tonight's meeting, Wednesday, October 23 and November 20th. Both of these meetings will be held in the Aspen Room at Trailview Court in Leesburg beginning at 6 p.m. Directions will be forwarded to all members.

Item 2 – Follow-up to September 25th Meeting-Questions/Issues

The meeting summary of the September 25th meeting summary was accepted as presented.

Richard S. Weber, Director of the Office of Solid Waste Management, noted that Tom Mason, Leesburg representative, had submitted a list of questions related to items used to calculate the recycling rate. This was presented in Item 2, Attachment 2 of the meeting packet.

At the last meeting, the Committee had asked about the cost impacts on the Towns' collection contracts of adopting the County Solid Waste Ordinances. Mr. Weber provided a response to this question, which is outlined in Item 2, Attachment 3 of the meeting packet.

At the previous meeting, Craig Stuart-Paul of Fairfax Recycling, Inc., provided comment on his company's interest in expanding their operations in Loudoun County. A letter regarding this matter is provided in Item 2, Attachment 4 in the meeting packet.

Mr. Weber reported that since the previous meeting, two letters had been received from private sector providers of solid waste services: Fairfax Recycling and AAA Recycling and Trash Removal Services. Both of the letters describe a public-private partnership with the County to establishment a centrally located recycling facility. Staff's assessment of this issue was provided in an addendum to Item 2, Attachment 4, and was distributed at the Committee meeting.

Discussion ensued on the issue of a recycling facility and its impact on the towns' contracts. Mr. Weber explained that this type of facility could lower the costs and allow for more vendors' participation.

Mrs. Towe suggested that staff pursue this proposal if this meant cost savings and would help the towns.

Tom Mason, Town of Leesburg, believes that it would be a good idea; however, the Town would need more information to include in the contract and might require an amendment to the contract depending on the timing of the contract award and the opening of the facility.

Discussion continued on the schedule of pursuing this proposal. Staff responded it would take roughly a year, considering the procurement process, construction schedule, and permit requirements.

Comments from the other town representatives were in favor of pursuing the idea of a public/private partnership recycling facility.

Craig Stuart-Paul of Fairfax Recycling, Inc., provided comments on the timeline for completing this type of facility. He indicated that construction of the facility would take 3 to 6 months and discussed the recycling process that would be used in the facility.

Mrs. Kurtz agreed with Mrs. Towe on pursuing this proposal and asked staff to start working on the details of what is involved.

Mr. Weber continued review of issues outlined in the Addendum to Item 2, Attachment 4. This included the impact of Fairfax Policy decisions on Loudoun MSW flow/capacity. He also reported on the issue of construction waste disposal capacity. This issue will be part of tonight's discussion as Issue 6 in System Deficits, with options for the Committee's consideration.

Item 2 – Summary of Recycling Policy Discussion

Mrs. Kurtz asked for comment on the summary of straw votes taken on Options 1-12 at the September 25 meeting as provided in Item 3 of the meeting packet. The summary of the Committee's positions on these various issues was accepted unanimously as presented.

Mrs. Towe inquired about statement 12, which was the possibility of distributing information about County solid waste policies, especially recycling, via students in the public schools. She asked if there were grants available that could be pursued and how to get the message out and/or are there groups that might want to work on this issue.

Mr. Weber responded to this and discussed the various programs available in the elementary schools through the Bluemont Concert Series and the Litter Grant that the County uses. He stated the key is to standardize – for everyone to get the message. He added that the County has made a great start in the recent ordinance amendments. Discussion continued on this issue.

Kelly Yost, Town of Round Hill, asked about the impact of the public-private recycling facility and statement 10 which is to develop a recycling dropoff center plan for co-locating DOCs in countywide plan.

Mr. Weber responded to this question indicating that a contract amendment would be considered should a public/private recycling facility be approved as part of the DOC contract.

Non-Votes in Recycling Issue 2 (from September 25th meeting)

Staff asked for clarification on the non-votes on the following options:

1. Funding additional DOC sites is not a current priority due to budget constraints.

Mrs. Towe discussed the issue of no western Loudoun DOC sites. She reviewed the problems of not finding a suitable site in the Purcellville area. She indicated that during the Board's FY04 budget review, she would bring forward a request for funding a site now available on property leased by the School Board.

Martin Kloeden, Purcellville, agreed with Mrs. Towe on the need for a DOC site in the Purcellville area.

The Committee voted 0-5-1 (Yost abstaining)—i.e., do not recommend this option.

2. Develop a capital improvement and funding schedule to construct and operate DOCs for immediate needs in the Purcellville area to replace three sites lost in 1995 and for immediate needs in the Ashburn and South Riding areas.

Following discussion on this option, the Committee voted to amend and approve this option unanimously (6-0) as follows:

Develop a capital improvement and funding schedule to construct and operate a DOC for immediate needs in the Purcellville area, which replaces three sites lost in 1995. The Committee further recommends continuing maintaining current operations at existing DOC sites.

3. Develop a capital improvement and funding schedule to fully implement the County's current recycling policy.

The Committee reaffirmed that its vote on this option was 0-6.

At this point in the meeting, the Committee took a short break.

Item 4 – Continuation of Staff Presentation of Solid Waste System Issues and Options for Consideration by the Committee

Jane Tatum, Office of Solid Waste Management, reviewed this section, which addresses the solid waste management system deficits.

Issue 1 - Should the Board take actions that would establish a more level playing field and stimulate competition among solid waste service providers?

Options:

1. Do not address this issue at this time and allow resolution by market forces.
2. Revise the tipping fee rates at the LCSWMF to foster more competition.
3. Permit additional transfer facilities for MSW.
4. Enter into a contract with the private facility.

Staff noted that the Board has set its capacity requirements and that the County is already in the marketplace. The SWMP is where this issue needs to be addressed. If the current model is to work, there should be one facility and no competition. Should a public-private venture be determined, there would still be some control.

Following discussion, the Committee requested that this be tabled and asked that staff prepare information on capacity, timelines and at what point is tonnage lost, etc.

(Mr. Hartgrove left the meeting at this time.)

Issue 2 – How will the Board ensure that adequate facilities exist to support recently enacted yard waste recycling requirements?

Staff noted that a deficit in yard waste capacity might compromise the Board's efforts to improve the level of yard waste recycling. At this time, this matter is not an issue. Therefore, no options are necessary. The Committee accepted staff's recommendation.

Issue 3 – How will the Board ensure the available capacity of the current solid waste management system (facilities) to handle all generated waste?

Options:

1. Establish a method and schedule (every 2-3 years) for reviewing solid waste facility capacity for MSW, CDD, and vegetative waste (assuming that most solid waste will continue to be transferred out of the County).
2. Establish a plan to permit additional facility capacity for existing or new facilities in accordance with 9 VAC 20-130-10 et. seq.
3. Explore options for mechanisms to ensure that Loudoun County facilities give priority to solid waste generation in Loudoun County.

Discussion continued on the varied options.

Mrs. Kurtz asked for straw votes: approval of all three options?

On options 1-3: 5-0-1 (Hartgrove absent for the vote).

Discussion continued on the options and the issue of establishing a schedule and amending the permit.

Following this discussion, the motion was withdrawn and the Committee voted 5-0-1 (Hartgrove absent for the vote) for options 1 and 3 together. The Committee voted 0-5-1 (Hartgrove absent for the vote) for option 2.

Issue 4 – What are some waste reuse and exchange options to be pursued by the District?

Options:

1. Identify and enlist a non-profit organization, community service agency, or other interested group with some interest and expertise in materials reuse and exchange to conduct a resource availability and needs assessment for waste reuse and exchange.
2. Identify and enlist a non-profit group or groups that can establish a network of communication for waste reuse and exchange.

3. Establish funds to provide staffing/contract resources to County solid waste efforts to develop a web-based waste reuse, waste exchange bulletin board and links to related resources.
4. Establish feasibility for a materials exchange warehouse location in the County for used goods, building supplies and other materials available to non-profit agencies and organizations.

Mrs. Towe commented that options 1 and 2 appear feasible but 3 and 4 would require funding that is not available. Discussion continued on examples of 1 and 2, which include groups such as Good Will and Salvation Army. The Committee raised concerns regarding the management of these efforts. The Committee members commented that non-government management would be preferred but there was some concern that there may still be some cost with options 1 and 2. The Committee also agreed that the concept of reuse is good and should be included in the plan. Discussion continued on this issue.

Mrs. Kurtz called for the vote. On Options 1 and 2, 5-0-1 (Hartgrove absent for the vote). On Options 3 and 4, 0-5-1 (Hartgrove absent for the vote).

Issue 5 – What are some options for ensuring solid waste collection services in rural areas?

Options:

1. Do not address this issue at this time.
2. Provide an incentive to small independent collectors (defined in Chapters 1084 and 1086 of County Codified Ordinances as “minor” collectors) through a reduced Landfill disposal fee.
3. The County could study the need to establish one or more solid waste service districts and manage the contracts for solid waste collection services to households in the service district for rural areas.

The Committee discussed the issue of the small hauler in the rural areas of the county and incentives that could be used to encourage these haulers. Staff will confer with the County Attorney on potential legal issues associated with this matter as well as provide information on the percentage of tonnage that is received from smaller haulers. The Committee also discussed concerns with the option of establishing a service district and management of contracts for collection services in the service districts for the rural areas. They concluded that this might be something for a future plan.

Mrs. Kurtz called for the vote. Options 1 and 2 were tabled by a vote of 5-0-1 (Hartgrove absent for the vote). On Option 3, 0-5-1 (Hartgrove absent for the vote).

Issue 6 – Assess the district’s status in regional construction/demolition and debris (CDD) waste generation, recycling and disposal.

Options:

1. Continue to depend on private sector to transfer CDD waste out of the County and assume that the capacity is available.
2. Establish a CDD waste reduction, reuse and recycling initiative to elevate management of at least a portion of these materials on the waste management hierarchy.
3. Propose and help fund a regional CDD waste generation/characterization study and needs assessment with options and recommendations through the Northern Virginia Regional Commission (NVRC) or the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG).
4. Fund a Countywide study of CDD waste generation/characterization study and needs assessment with options and recommendations for action.

Staff responded to questions related to the impact should facilities stop accepting CDD waste and review of the state requirements. Staff also discussed the “green building” concept and how this might be considered in the next update of Zoning Ordinance amendments and the Facilities Standard Manual.

Mrs. Kurtz called for the vote. On Option 1, 0-5-1 (Hartgrove absent for the vote)—i.e., do not recommend this option. On Option 2: Tabled by the Chair. On Option 3: Strike the language “and help fund,” 5-0-1 as amended (Hartgrove absent for the vote). On Option 4: 0-5-1 (Hartgrove absent for the vote)—i.e., do not recommend this option.

Next Meeting

The third and final set of issues, Emergent Trends, will be addressed at the Committee’s next meeting scheduled on October 23 at 6:00 p.m. in the Aspen Room, 906 Trailview Blvd., in Leesburg. The issues were identified in Item 5C in the September 25 packet.

Adjourn

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned.

**Loudoun County Ad Hoc Solid Waste Management Plan Committee
Item 2: Meeting Summary for October 23, 2002
November 20, 2002**

Present:

County: Sally Kurtz, Chairman
Eleanore Towe
Jim Burton

Town Representatives: Tom Mason, Town of Leesburg
Martin Kloeden, Town of Purcellville
The Honorable Keith Reasoner, Town of Hamilton

Absent: Charles Hartgrove, Town of Middleburg
The Honorable Steve Morgart, Town of Hillsboro
The Honorable Kristin Umstattd, Town of Leesburg
Robert Noe, Town of Leesburg
The Honorable Elaine Walker, Town of Lovettsville
Kelly Yost, Town of Round Hill

Call to Order

Sally Kurtz, Chairman, called the meeting to order, which was followed by introductions from the Town representatives, staff and members of the public.

The meeting summary of October 9 was accepted as presented, 5-0-1 (Burton abstaining due to absence on October 9).

Chairman Kurtz announced a departure from the order on the Agenda and requested staff to present the Emergent Trends first to ensure that the Committee completed that portion of the agenda.

Staff Presentation of Solid Waste Issues – Emergent Trends

Monica Gorman of the Office of Solid Waste Management provided an overview of the Emergent Trends issues in the current solid waste management system with options for the Committee's consideration.

Issue #1 – Should consistency between the Zoning Ordinance and the Solid Waste Management Facilities Ordinance with regard to solid waste be a priority?

Mr. Burton raised a question concerning the timing of the Zoning Ordinance revisions as it relates to solid waste management facilities and whether this should be included during the first phase of the zoning ordinance revisions.

Discussion continued on this issue.

Staff was asked to prepare a memo to the Board of Supervisors to address the most significant of the inconsistency issues between the Zoning Ordinance and Chapter 1080 for consideration in the current Zoning Ordinance revision process.

Options:

- 1 – This is not an issue
- 2 – Add consistency review and revision as needed to zoning ordinance time table (with date)

Straw votes cast:

Option 1 – 0-6

Option 2 – 6-0

Issue #2 – What are some options for handling increasing types and amounts of special wastes?

Ms. Gorman reviewed the background on this issue.

Options:

- 1 – Maintain current level of service for County funded special waste programs.
- 2 – Expand waste oil and other special waste collection to a regional site in the Western and one in the Eastern parts of the County.
- 3 – Provide more routine (e.g., monthly) HHW collection events.
- 4 – Help source reduction and reuse of special wastes via comprehensive public education for purchasing, handling, storing and disposal of special wastes in residential and non-residential settings.
- 5 – Construct a permanent HHW facility for routine acceptance of special wastes, expand collection sites, and train personnel or contracted services to manage increasing waste types and volumes.

Staff responded to questions related to the traffic volume at the HHW, answering that there are approximately 400 cars per event at 6-7 events per year. Staff also discussed the locations of the events throughout the county.

Staff commented that one of the main HHW problems is the disposal of waste oil.

The Committee commented on the various options but raised concern for cost of expanding program due to limited funds.

Straw votes cast:

Option 1 – 0-6

Option 2 – 6-0

Option 3 – 6-0

Option 4 – 0-6

Option 5 – 0-6

Issues #3 – What can the Solid Waste Management Planning District do to ensure an adequate response to solid waste/debris disasters?

Ms. Gorman reviewed the options for this issue.

Options:

- 1 – Do not address this issue at this time.
- 2 – Procure pre-approval of an emergency solid waste/debris site(s) from VADEQ.
- 3 – Establish mutual aid agreements with other Northern Virginia jurisdictions.
- 4 – Include SWM planning as an element in the County's emergency management plan.

The Committee discussed the options. Staff responded to Mrs. Towe's question regarding Option 2, on the process of pre-approval. Mr. Weber noted that the County has a permitted site but staff would require Board authorization to pursue a pre-approval for an emergency solid waste/debris site with DEQ.

Straw votes cast:

- Option 1 – 0-6
- Option 2 – 6-0
- Option 3 – 6-0
- Option 4 – 6-0

Issue #4 – Does the County want to regulate unauthorized dumping of waste dirt and/or the accumulation of waste dirt in surface piles by persons that accept dirt for a fee?

Ms. Gorman reviewed the problems of unauthorized dumping in the County of waste dirt from land clearing and development activities.

Options:

- 1 – Do not address the issue at this time.
- 2 – Amend Chapter 1080 and the Zoning Ordinance to restrict unauthorized dumping of waste dirt.
- 3 – Amend Chapter 1080 and the Zoning Ordinance to regulate surface piles of waste dirt.
- 4 – Amend Chapter 1080 and the Zoning Ordinance to regulate soil processing.

Mrs. Towe commented that she supports Options 2, 3 and 4 as the problem of waste dirt is a safety issue and has become a problem with property owners.

Mr. Burton inquired as to whether or not the draft Zoning Ordinance provides for this as a permitted use.

Mr. Weber responded that he was not aware of this language.

Mr. Burton commented that he would like to see this language added in this phase of the Zoning Ordinance revision.

Discussion continued on this issue with this added use.

Mr. Burton added that he would support Options 2, 3 and 4 if language could be added into the draft Zoning Ordinance regarding this matter.

Straw votes cast:

Option 1 – 0-6

Option 2 – 6-0

Option 3 – 6-0

Option 4 – 6-0

Issue #5 – Does the Board want to prohibit burning of solid waste by residents?

Ms. Gorman reviewed the options for this issue.

Options:

1 – No change to current regulations.

2 – Recommend that the Board amend Chapter 1080 to prohibit the burning of MSW.

3 – Recommend that the Board amend Chapter 1080 to prohibit the burning of yard waste.

Mr. Burton stated that he supports Option 2 but has a problem with Option 3 in the rural areas.

Mrs. Towe agreed and asked about the Fire Marshal's opinion on Option 3.

Discussion continued on the issue of burning yard waste in some areas but not in others and the ruling from the Fire Marshal on this matter.

Mr. Burton suggested that language be added to continue burning in certain areas and that staff check with Fire-Rescue Services on their regulations on burn restrictions.

Straw votes cast:

Option 1 – 0-6

Option 2 – 6-0

Option 3 – Tabled until clarification and follow-up from staff.

Issue # 6 – How will the district ensure that the SWMP is implemented and updated in a dynamic solid waste environment?

Ms. Gorman provided a brief overview of this issue and provided the following options:

Options:

- 1 – Maintain status quo and continue to rely upon national averages to estimate generation of waste types in the absence of specifically reported levels.
- 2 – Establish an annual SWMP review process.

The Committee amended Option 2 for biennial reviewing, commented that one year was too soon.

Straw votes cast:

Option 1 – 0-6

Option 2 – 6-0 (As amended for biennial review)

Item #7 – What opportunities exist for the County and the Seven Incorporated Towns to partner to achieve and sustain effective solid waste management?

Ms. Gorman reviewed the options for this issue.

Options:

- 1 – Do not pursue any further policy or program options at this time.
- 2 – Towns could adopt Chapters 1080, 1084 and 1086 to extend uniform enforcement of the County's solid waste management ordinances.
- 3 – Towns and county could develop joint contracts for solid waste services and other best practices implementation.

Straw votes cast:

Option 1 – 6-0

Option 2 – 0-6

Option 3 – 0-6

(At this point in the meeting, the Committee took a break)

Follow-up from October 9 Meeting

Rick Weber reviewed the letter submitted by Buff Mundale of American Disposal Services regarding the lack of a level playing field for collection companies and lack of local recycling infrastructure to support recycling requirements. (See Attachment 2 to Item #2 in the packet.)

Chairman Kurtz commented on the request for information to Loudoun Environmental Indicators Project (LEIP). She further noted how beneficial LEIP is to the County and to request they include in their work how much clearing of land is lost.

Mrs. Towe seconded this request.

Mr. Weber noted that the issue of economic incentives for small haulers is under review by the County Attorney who asked that more time would be needed to complete this review.

Analysis of Tipping Fees and Disposal Consumption at the Landfill

Staff provided an overview on the impact of a lower tipping fee and the life span of the landfill capacity. This information included an assessment developed by the County's solid waste engineering consultant, Solid Waste Services, (SWS). Four tipping fee scenarios were presented and are outlined in Item 4 of the meeting packet.

Discussion on this issue continued.

Mr. Burton commented that lower fees at County for small haulers would be good.

Buff Mundale, American Disposal Services, commented that it would increase the volume at a lower price and would be better for larger haulers. He also commented on the alternatives that small haulers have.

Staff reviewed the graph that provided waste flow and tipping fee scenarios.

Discussion continued on the impact on capacity with the lower tipping fee. The Committee also discussed keeping the landfill operations "revenue neutral".

Following this overview and discussion, the Committee asked that this issue come back at the next meeting for further discussion.

Information on Public-Private Partnership Recycling Depot at the Landfill

Staff provided the background on this issue that was discussed at the October 9 meeting. As previously discussed, this facility could be located at the County's landfill. Staff reviewed the permitting, construction and operations issues related to this proposed facility. (See Item 3 of the meeting packet)

The Committee discussed the issue of the impact on current drop-off centers, increased truck traffic, oversight and regulations.

The Committee asked staff to prepare additional information and to bring this back for further review. This information would include other sites that currently operate in this capacity in other parts of the state.

Summary of Issues Discussion for Recycling and Solid Waste Management System Deficits

This item (#5 in meeting packet) provided a summary of straw votes on options for each of the above noted areas. The Committee confirmed their positions on Options 1-4 for the SWM System Deficits.

The Chair tabled the landfill tipping fee issue pending further information at the next meeting (Option 1). In addition, the economic incentive for small haulers issue is still under review by the County Attorney and will be reported at the next meeting.

Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled for Wednesday, November 20 at 6 p.m. at Trailview Blvd., Leesburg. The Committee discussed the public input session for their December meeting. *(Following discussion with Chairman Kurtz and staff, this session is planned for December 11 in the Board of Supervisors' Meeting Room.)*

Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned.

**Loudoun County Ad Hoc Solid Waste Management Planning Committee
Item 1: Meeting Summary for November 20, 2002
January 22, 2003**

Present:

County: Sally Kurtz, Chairman
Eleanore Towe
Jim Burton

Town Representatives: Tom Mason, Town of Leesburg
Martin Kloeden, Town of Purcellville
The Honorable Keith Reasoner, Town of Hamilton
Charles Hartgrove, Town of Middleburg
The Honorable Elaine Walker, Town of Lovettsville

Absent:

The Honorable Steve Morgart, Town of Hillsboro
The Honorable Kristin Umstattd, Town of Leesburg
Robert Noe, Town of Leesburg
Kelly Yost, Town of Round Hill

Call to Order

Sally Kurtz, Chairman, called the meeting to order, which was followed by introductions of the Town representatives, staff and members of the public.

The Committee voted unanimously to approve the meeting summary from the October 23rd meeting.

Wrap-Up of Questions/Issues

Staff reviewed the pending issues and presented followup as previously discussed at the October 23rd meeting. The issues and recommendations on each are provided below:

(Please reference the meeting materials from the November 20th packet labeled Item 3A-3E for detailed information.)

A. Actions for Revenue-Neutral Landfill Operations

The Committee voted 7-0-0 on option 1 (*Towe moved motion and Burton seconded the motion*) to recommend that the Board of Supervisors amend their operating policy for the County Solid Waste Management Facility by deleting the

current policy statement on the level of facility operations and replacing with the following:

Delete the current policy statement on level of facility operations:

The Landfill will operate as public service and will not seek to compete for waste. As such, it provides important option / alternative to prevent the County from relying on sole source providers of solid waste services.

Add a revised operations level statement as follows:

The County Solid Waste Management Facility will operate six days a week (M-S) to provide an important solid waste management and disposal option to prevent the County, residents, and businesses from relying on sole source providers of solid waste services. The County Administrator is charged with achieving a workable balance between conservation of permitted disposal capacity, and revenue neutrality among tipping fee revenue, operations costs, and capital construction costs.

The Committee voted 7-0-0 on option 2 (*Towe moved motion and Burton seconded*) to authorize the County Administrator to develop a plan consistent with the guidelines, and to adjust the tipping fee within the range, according to Attachment 2, Item 3A (attached to this meeting summary as Attachment 1.)

B. RFP for Public-Private Partnership Recycling Transfer Station at Landfill

The Committee voted 7-0-0 on option 3 (*Towe moved motion and Burton seconded*) to recommend that the Board of Supervisors direct staff to prepare and issue an RFP by July 1, 2003, consistent with Item 3B, Attachment 1 and the Public-Private Education Facilities and Infrastructure Act of 2002 once implemented by the Board.

C. Incentives for Minor Haulers

The Committee voted 7-0-0 on option 2 (*Towe moved motion and Burton seconded*) to recommend that, in the absence of other fee reductions, the Board of Supervisors adopt a reduced tipping fee for Minor Collectors provided that they hold a County permit in good standing. This reduced tipping fee would not be available to Minor Collectors operating under contract to a Major Collector. The votes for options 1 and 3 were 0-7 against.

D. Regulations on Open Burning of Yard Waste

The Committee voted 6-0-1 (Mayor Walker abstained) on option 1 as amended (*Towe moved motion and Burton seconded*) to recommend that the Board of Supervisors amend Chapter 1080 and other County ordinances as appropriate to prohibit the burning of construction waste and/or vegetative waste (including yard waste) generated offsite.

E. Zoning Ordinance and Chapter 1080 Conformance Issues

The Committee voted 7-0-0 on option 2 as amended (*Burton moved motion and Towe seconded*) to recommend that the Board of Supervisors make the staff-recommended list of items a priority during Phase II of the Zoning Ordinance revision process, with the exception that in Phase I will be technical input into the Permitted Use list for Dirt Dumps and an appropriate list of performance standards.

Final Review of Chapters 1-4 and 7

The final draft chapters 1-4 and 7 were presented and accepted by the committee. No comments were given on these chapters.

Chapter 5 – Goals and Objectives

Committee members discussed goal #4 – recycling rate above 25%. The committee also added goal 5 to support proper disposal of household hazardous waste in order to protect public safety health and welfare as well as the environment.

The committee voted 7-0-0 to recommend approval of Chapter 5 as amended.

Chapter 6 – Implementation of SWMP

Staff responded to questions related to page 6-2 (Section 6.1.3 Emergency Preparedness) and page 6-7 (Section 6.4.2.4 – Household Hazardous Waste and Business Hazardous Material) clarifying the number of annual HHW events from 7 to 12. This chapter was accepted as presented.

Rick Weber, Director of OSWM, reviewed the implementation plan status quo elements on the various categories to include: collection, disposal, recycling and reuse, environmental, planning and public information.

Mr. Burton suggested that language be clarified to state that after “landfill” in #4 of Disposal section that the following be added: “(as opposed to incineration or other methods)”. This change was accepted by the committee.

Elaine Walker commented on #18 under the section "Planning and Public Information" (Status Quo) and that the "towns" be included to show there is a cooperative effort on their part and did not understand why they are not mentioned throughout the plan.

Mr. Weber responded to this and indicated that there are certain portions that are referred to as "county" due to Board policy. However, he pointed out that all of the towns along with the County are one district. Therefore, towns are included when language refers to "district".

Discussion continued on this and the issue of the County's regulations for trash haulers and their contractual arrangement with the towns.

Mr. Weber suggested language that would provide that OSWM staff would serve as a resource to all district members, if requested. This language will be added in the planning and public information section.

Steve Cawthron suggested that in the "Recycling and Reuse" Status Quo section #8 that the word "District" replace the word "County's" and would read as follows:

"8. The County will support private sector vegetative waste processing and yard waste composting to enhance the District's ~~County's~~ recycling efforts."

This change was accepted by the Committee.

Implementation of Immediate Action and Future Initiatives

Mr. Weber reviewed these sections.

Under "Recycling and Reuse", # 4, Tom Mason suggested that the word "District" replace the word "County". This change was accepted by the committee. It was also noted that the change "all appropriate public facilities" be added in the "Recycling and Reuse" section. This amendment was accepted by the committee.

The final vote on the action plan as amended was approved 7-0-0.

Staff responded to question raised by Mayor Walker regarding state requirements enforced by the County.

Addendum to Chapter 5

As discussed earlier tonight, language was suggested to be included as follows: Goal 5 – “To provide safe recycling and disposal options for special wastes that may pose harm to the environment and/or to public health and safety.” Related objectives were also provided. The Committee accepted this as amended.

Chapter 8 – Description of Public Process

This chapter was accepted as presented.

Next Meeting

The next meeting of the committee will be the public input session, which is scheduled for December 11, 2002. Representatives from the solid waste industry, community and government will be invited to attend this session. This session will be designed to receive comment on the SWMP and the committee’s proposed recommendations on continued current action; immediate action steps and future planning efforts.

Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the committee. This meeting was adjourned.

(A digital recording of this meeting is available in the County Administrator’s Office.)

Attachment 1: Guidelines for Tipping Fee Changes to Achieve Revenue Neutral Operations

**Loudoun County Ad Hoc Solid Waste Management Planning Committee
Item 1: Meeting Summary for November 20, 2002**

**Attachment 1: Guidelines for Tipping Fee Changes
to Achieve Revenue Neutral Operations**

January 22, 2003

The following guidelines are established for considering tipping fee reductions at the County Solid Waste Management Facility. The dual objectives of such reductions are 1) to make County Landfill disposal operations revenue neutral, and 2) to avoid accelerating consumption of permitted disposal capacity. To achieve a balance between the two goals, several parameters are suggested for consideration:

- 1) The Office of Solid Waste Management shall develop an implementation plan subject to the approval of the County Administrator that will ensure that both objectives remain balanced. This plan would contain action steps should undesired events or actions occur as a result of the reduction of tipping fees.
- 2) All per ton fees will be in whole dollar amounts.
- 3) The tipping fee for customers other than County permitted haulers remains at \$55.00 per ton for all weighed waste including MSW.
- 4) There will be a minimum transaction fee of \$2.00 established for all transactions at the facility.
- 5) The fee for non-compacting rolloff containers, dump trucks, and demo trailers transporting construction and demolition waste will remain stay at \$55 per ton of waste. These types of vehicles are used extensively to haul construction and debris waste that is bulky and fills disposal space much faster than MSW.
- 6) The facility would reopen on Mondays, and 5 additional positions (FTEs) are authorized. These costs are included in the financial analysis.
- 7) Minor haulers holding valid County issued collection permits would be offered a tipping fee of \$47 per ton of MSW only and would not be required to contract with the County.
- 8) Major haulers holding valid County issued collection permits would be offered a tipping fee of \$47-52 per ton of MSW only and would be required to enter into a put or pay contract with the County that would limit the amount of waste that could be brought to the facility at that rate.
- 9) All tipping fee revenues above annual operating costs would be placed in a dedicated non-reverting fund and reserved to offset future capital construction costs.

Loudoun County Ad Hoc Solid Waste Management Plan Committee Item 2: Meeting Summary for January 8, 2003 Public Input Session January 22, 2003

Present:

County:

Sally Kurtz, Chairman and Supervisor,
Catoctin District
Eleanore Towe, Supervisor, Blue Ridge
District
Jim Burton, Supervisor, former Mercer
District

Town Representatives:

Tom Mason, Town of Leesburg
Martin Kloeden, Town of Purcellville
The Honorable Keith Reasoner, Town of
Hamilton
Charles Hartgrove, Town of Middleburg
Kelly Yost, Town of Round Hill

Public Input Session Participants:

Doug Atcheson, BFI Winchester
Gem Bingol, Piedmont Environmental
Council
Bill Brown, B&B Refuse
Shirley Brown, B&B Refuse
Steve Cawthron, Woods Road Special
Exception Review Committee
Steve Epstein, CSI Inc.
Jack Freeman, Blue Ridge Condo
Association
Susan Gleba, AAA Recycling
Steve Loftus, Woods Road Special
Exception Review Committee

Dorn McGrath, George Washington
University, LEIP
Conrad Mehan, BFI
The Honorable Paul Miller, Vice-Mayor,
Town of Lovettsville
Buff Mundale, American Disposal
John Myers, Myers Farm
Shirley Pearson, Keep Loudoun
Beautiful
The Honorable Karl Phillips, Council
Member, Town of Purcellville
Ed Warmus, BFI Northern VA
Dave White, Waste Management Inc.

Absent:

The Honorable Steve Morgart, Town of Hillsboro
The Honorable Kristin Umstatt, Town of Leesburg
Robert Noe, Town of Leesburg
The Honorable Elaine Walker, Town of Lovettsville

Call to Order

Sally Kurtz, Chairman, called the meeting to order. After introducing members of the Committee and recognizing other attendees, Ms. Kurtz outlined the purpose of the meeting. She noted that the State requires solid waste management planning, that the Committee has met since September and has developed recommendations for updating the Loudoun County Solid Waste Management District's Plan, and that the purpose of tonight's meeting is for the participants to review and react to the Committee's recommendations. She also noted that tonight's meeting is an extra public input session and that additional comments can be made in writing to the Committee and in an upcoming formal Public Hearing of the County Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Kurtz introduced Dick McAffery of McAffery Associates who outlined the process for the evening's group discussions as a chance for the citizen, government and industry representatives present to be informed of the Plan's key elements, to react to the proposals before they are finalized, and to propose additions, deletions or changes. He further explained that there would be five staff presentations on the topics of collection, disposal, recycling, environmental protection, and policy and public information. Each presentation was to be followed by a small group discussion of the Ad Hoc Solid Waste Management Planning Committee's recommendations for activities or policies in place that will continue (status quo), immediate or near-term actions recommended, and long-term recommendations.

The meeting continued with each of the five presentations and group discussions conducted in four small groups. The small groups consisted of

- a facilitator whose role was to keep the group on track to finish in the allotted time and to ensure that each participant had an opportunity for input,
- a staff member whose role was to clarify terms and to respond to technical questions regarding the recommendations or the plan,
- a recorder whose role was to capture the feedback from the group, review the major points with the group at the end of each discussion, get the group's consensus on the major points, and to transmit the notes for further summarization and consideration by the Committee, and
- the participants who were invited to provide input to the recommendations.

Committee members listened and moved among groups to hear as many points from the four groups as possible. Additional solid waste management were also roving to assist groups with questions and to clarify terms and technical points.

After the presentations and discussions were complete, Ms. Kurtz asked the Committee members present to react to what they heard and each gave a summary comment. A summary of each group's discussion and suggestions to the Committee is included as **Attachment 1**.

Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled for Wednesday, January 22, 2003 at 6 p.m. in the Lovettsville Room of the County Government Center, 1 Harrison Street SE, Leesburg.

Adjournment

The purpose of the meeting was completed and after the next meeting date was announced, the meeting was adjourned.

Attachment 1 – Major Discussion Points of Groups 1, 2, 3 and 4 - January 8 Public Input Session

**Loudoun County Ad Hoc Solid Waste Management Planning Committee
Item 2: Meeting Summary for January 8, 2002**

**Attachment 1: Recordors' Notes from Individual Group Discussions
at Public Input Session**

January 22, 2003

The following are the recordors' notes to the four (4) groups who participated in the Solid Waste Management Planning Committee's Public Input Session.

Group 1: 3 pages Attachment 03-01-12A
Group 2: 3 pages Attachment 03-01-12B
Group 3: 3 pages Attachment 03-01-12C
Group 4: 3 pages Attachment 03-01-12D

PUBLIC INPUT PROCESS
Ad Hoc SWMP Committee
January 8, 2003

RECORDER NOTES
Group #1

Facilitator: Gena Davis
Technical Advisor: Kate Glass

Recorder: Mike Ball

1. Collection Presentation and Discussion

A. Clarification Questions Answered Satisfactorily

- How do the Towns co-adopt County ordinances?
- Would landfill rates increase or decrease?
- What does the term "C&D" mean?

B. Questions Raised that were Not Satisfactorily Answered

- Who is responsible for the trash that blows out of dumpsters at a construction site or DOC?
- What are the County's special collection requirements?

C. Suggestions/Comments by Group

- One participant, a large hauler, stated his company offers recycling to its customers. It is the customer's responsibility, to initiate the use of this service. (1 of 4)
- One participant, a large hauler, considers its responsibility limited to hauling their customer's solid waste. The hauler picks up their customers solid waste and delivers it to a landfill site. It is the site's responsibility to separate the recyclable material from the trash. (1 of 4)
- Town contracts should state the minimum levels of service for collection and recyclables. (1 of 4)

2. Disposal Presentation and Discussion

A. Clarification Questions Answered Satisfactorily

- What does the term "out-of-district" mean?
- How would a regional study be more complete than a study performed just for Loudoun County?
- What is the "region"?
- What is the status of Cell IIIA?

B. Questions Raised that were Not Satisfactorily Answered

(There were no questions that were not satisfactorily answered)

C. Suggestions/Comments by Group

- “Recycling” should be the primary method for handling MSW. “Disposal” should be the second choice for getting rid of MSW, C&D, etc. (1 of 4)
- Individuals should be held to the same anti-litter and tarping standards as haulers. (2 of 4)
- A reduction to \$47.00 per ton for C&D will not result in additional C&D waste being brought to the Facility. Most other C&D facilities charge \$22.00 to \$32.00 per ton. (1 of 4)

3. Recycling and Reuse Presentation and Discussion

A. Clarification Questions Answered Satisfactorily

- Who hauls from the DOC?
- When will ordinance 1086 be effective?
- How does the County support private sector vegetative waste processing?
- Is there a site for this DOC in the Purcellville area?
- What is a public/private partnership?
- What is being done to ensure future recycling areas are located in new development?
- How is the County addressing its future recycling needs?
- What does the term “recycling rate” mean?

B. Questions Raised that were Not Satisfactorily Answered

(There were no questions that were not satisfactorily answered)

C. Suggestions/Comments by Group

- The general consensus was the Internet-based waste exchange “sounds great”, but concerns were raised regarding how do you implement/manage it”. (4 of 4)
- The County and Town members need to work towards consistent recycling and solid waste management. Anything that can improve recycling is good. (1 of 4)
- Improve communications about solid waste and recycling to ensure that this information gets to the correct people. (4 of 4)
- OSWM should continue to provide public information and education and promote recycling and source reduction. (1 of 4)

4. Environmental Protection Presentation and Discussion

A. Clarification Questions Answered Satisfactorily

- What environmental systems are at the Landfill?
- Will the County continue assisting Towns regarding solid waste and recycling?
- Will annual solid waste reporting continue?

- Can waste oil be part of an HHW event?
- When can C&D waste be burned?
- What is “soil processing”?
- Is the expense of waste oil collection at the proposed remote sites similar to that at the Landfill?
- Can commercial and household hazard waste events be combined?

B. Questions Raised that were Not Satisfactorily Answered

(There were no questions that were not satisfactorily answered)

C. Suggestions/Comments by Group

- 12 HHW events per year may be too many. Somewhere between the current 7 and 12 may be more reasonable number of events and they should be concentrated in the eastern part of the County due to the larger population. (1 of 4)
- Expanding waste oil and other special collections to two regional sites is a good idea. (2 of 4)

END

PUBLIC INPUT PROCESS
Ad Hoc SWMP Committee
January 8, 2003

RECORDER NOTES
Group #2

Facilitator: Mary Margaret Meadows
Technical Advisor: Mike Fairbanks

Recorder: Teri Jackson

1. Collection Presentation and Discussion

A. Clarification Questions Answered Satisfactorily

(There were no questions asked)

B. Questions Raised that were Not Satisfactorily Answered

- What are the special collection requirements? (whole group)
- Please provide more explanation on reducing landfill rates. (whole group)

C. Suggestions/Comments by Group

- Concerns were raised that the County would not have adequate support to handle the enforcement of the ordinances if the Towns were to co-adopt them.
- Industry would like to be considered for providing solid waste and recycling services to the County, if it could be done cheaper.
- Tipping fee rates should be revised across the board. Tipping fee rates should be more competitive.
- All liked to idea of C&D being phased in as part of Chapter 1084.
- One participant felt it was difficult to provide curbside services to rural areas and be cost effective.

2. Disposal Presentation and Discussion

A. Clarification Questions Answered Satisfactorily

(There were no questions asked)

B. Questions Raised that were Not Satisfactorily Answered

(There were no questions that were not satisfactorily answered)

C. Suggestions/Comments by Group

- Would like the County to promote competition among the Solid Waste Facilities.
- Concern was raised that if the rates become competitive this would mean the landfill would be back in the "landfill business."
- Rate reduction may encourage other jurisdictions to lower their rate, in-turn neutralizing the intent of the initiative.

- Rate reduction may attract additional volumes.
- Concern was raised that market forces should be looked at frequently for Solid Waste Facilities, lowering rates for Solid Waste Facilities one time may not be adequate enough.
- Concern was raised that if NVRC or MWCOG conduct a regional C&D waste generation and characterization study, it would be difficult to track because other jurisdiction are not required to differentiate between types of waste.
- Encouraged the County to do the study if COG does not.
- The C&D waste generation and characterization study should concentrate on waste generated in the County not disposed of out of the County.

3. Recycling and Reuse Presentation and Discussion

A. Clarification Questions Answered Satisfactorily

- Needed clarification on the County Land Use Referral. Rick explained. No other clarifications required. (whole group)

B. Questions Raised that were Not Satisfactorily Answered

- How does the County meet the 25% recycling rate? (whole group)

C. Suggestions/Comments by Group

- Put more emphasis on the resident to recycle.
- Haulers should not be responsible for recycling material that has been contaminated by resident/commercial users.
- More clarification on recyclables being contaminated by resident/commercial users.
- Would like the Towns and County to support dry waste reclamation relating to construction projects.
- One participant felt that constructing a DOC in the Purcellville area and revising the comprehensive county-wide joint-use public facility plan to incorporate DOCs in all appropriate public facility sites were in conflict.
- Expressed concern that residents would rather use the DOCs than pay for curbside recycling.
- Would like to add the following to Future Initiatives: "County and Towns will support and incorporate in the Solid Waste Management Plan dry waste/C&D reclamation products which may encompass separation, processing, and/or re-application/re-use of material."
- One participant would like incentives considered for recycling additional construction material.

4. Environmental Protection Presentation and Discussion

A. Clarification Questions Answered Satisfactorily

(There were no questions asked)

B. Questions Raised that were Not Satisfactorily Answered

(There were no questions that were not satisfactorily answered)

C. Suggestions/Comments by Group

- Would like to include electronics recycling as a permanent program.
- All agreed that expanding waste oil and other special waste collection to two regional sites in the Western and Eastern parts of the County were a great idea.

END

PUBLIC INPUT PROCESS
Ad Hoc SWMP Committee
January 8, 2003

RECORDER NOTES
Group #3

Facilitator: Dave Tong

Technical Advisor: Monica Gorman

Recorder: Randy Reed

1. Collection Presentation and Discussion

A. Clarification Questions Answered Satisfactorily

- Where did the numbers used to determine the project amounts of waste in 2005 and 2025 come from?
- What are “special collection requirements” for the County? (ie: Why does the County collect waste from schools, libraries etc.?)
- Can Solid Waste be collected in Loudoun 7 days a week?
- Does Loudoun County regulate solid waste collectors?
- How would Towns go about adopting the County Ordinances, specifically Chapters 1084 and 1086?
- How do Towns currently enforce regulations/ordinances concerning trash?
- Who handles hazardous waste in the County and how is it regulated?
- Are the ordinances referred to in the slides “current” or will they be a result of the SWMP Committee’s recommendations?
- Have any Towns adopted the County’s ordinances?
- Is roadside litter (ie: animal carcasses) considered a trivial matter in regards to solid waste”?
- Does the County regulate VDOT’s collection of animal carcasses?
- Please explain the reasoning behind revising the landfill rates (with regards to Minor Haulers).
- Is there anything the County “wishes it could do” but is prevented from doing by the Commonwealth?
- Do any of the Towns have the authority to “rezone” in order to regulate solid waste collection?

B. Questions Raised that were Not Satisfactorily Answered

(There were no questions that were not satisfactorily answered)

C. Suggestions/Comments by Group

(The Group offered no Collection Suggestions)

2. Disposal Presentation and Discussion

A. Clarification Questions Answered Satisfactorily

- Does the definition of C&D include “dirt” or just building materials?
- Is the use of a Landfill in Loudoun County solely a function of ‘cost’?
- How does lowering Landfill fees affect long term consumption of landfill space?
- Would the County desire to accept out of County Trash in order to increase Landfill revenues?
- Has the County considered adjusting rates at the LF to decrease traffic, reduce public impact?

B. Questions Raised that were Not Satisfactorily Answered

(There were no questions that were not satisfactorily answered)

C. Suggestions/Comments by Group

- Loudoun County should conduct a feasibility study on alternative methods of disposal. (2/5)
- Loudoun County should examine the possibility of using “mined out quarries” as possible landfill sites in the future. (2/5)
- Loudoun County should consider asking NVRC and MWCOG to conduct a regional study on “all solid waste types”, not just C&D, also extending the deadline to beyond 2004 as that is too soon. (1/5)

3. Recycling and Reuse Presentation and Discussion

A. Clarification Questions Answered Satisfactorily

- Why did MSW recycling rates decline from 1995 to present?
- Does VA DEQ regulate specific recycling rates for specific materials?
- Do the Towns have requirements/ordinances regarding solid waste and recyclables that are similar to the County’s?
- What are the current markets like for recyclables?
- Has a schedule been set for the construction of a Transfer Station?
- Please explain an Internet-base Waste Exchange.
- Is VA currently considering increasing the 25% recycling rate?
- How do Hi-Tech firms deal with recycling of computers etc.?

B. Questions Raised that were Not Satisfactorily Answered

(There were no questions that were not satisfactorily answered)

C. Suggestions/Comments by Group

- Would the County consider implementing a special wastes program for battery types other than automotive? (1/5)
- The County should do everything in its power to bring the Towns on board with the new solid waste collection and recycling requirements, including offering subsidies. (2/5)
- The County should initiate a “Green Campaign” to reaffirm the importance of and need to recycle. (2/5)
- The convening of a Citizens Committee should be moved from a “Long Range Planning” element, to an “Immediate Action” element. (Item #11). (1/5)
- The County should convene a Business Advisory Committee with a focus on the new business recycling requirements. (Perhaps working with the Chamber of Commerce) (2/5).
- The County should initiate a public awareness campaign focusing on the need to recycle uncommon electronic goods (ie: cell phones, VCRs, power tools, special batteries, etc.) (2/5).

4. Environmental Protection Presentation and Discussion

*(Group Size Now “4” instead of “5”)

A. Clarification Questions Answered Satisfactorily

- How extensive is OSWM’s groundwater monitoring program?
- Does Loudoun County play any role in disposal of radioactive wastes in the County?
- Why are there “7” HHW events?
- How big a problem is dumping of waste dirt in Loudoun County?
- Does the County have a helicopter to use for its enforcement program?
- Would a Waste Exchange program work for dirt?
- Does OSWM regulate TFI?
- If Loudoun County establishes additional (future) special waste sites, will they be “staffed”?

B. Questions Raised that were Not Satisfactorily Answered

(There were no questions that were not satisfactorily answered)

C. Suggestions/Comments by Group

- If Loudoun County does establish additional special waste collection sites, they should be staffed for environmental and safety reasons. (2/4)

PUBLIC INPUT PROCESS
Ad Hoc SWMP Committee
January 8, 2003

RECORDER NOTES
Group #4

Facilitator: Tom Ambrose
Technical Advisor: Tony Hayes

Recorder: Karen Burnett

1. Collection Presentation and Discussion

A. Clarification Questions Answered Satisfactorily

- What are the County's special collection requirements for collection of solid waste and recyclables for County Facilities?
- What are the minimum services levels for the haulers and the residents? Do the haulers and residents know what the minimum service level requirements are?
- Is the County planning on further reductions of landfill rates?
- Please explain what this means. Why is the County looking at C&D waste? Is there a potential problem?

B. Questions Raised that were Not Satisfactorily Answered

(There were no questions that were not satisfactorily answered)

C. Suggestions/Comments by Group

- Why can't private contractors collect waste generated by County Government/Facilities? (3 people out of 4)
- The Committee needs to add where the minimum service levels for haulers and residents can be found (in 1084). (4 people out of 4)
- The Committee also needs to provide a brochure/flyer to residents as to what the minimum requirements are that they should expect from their recycling contractors. (4 people out of 4)
- The haulers don't have a problem with the County having a landfill, which offers service to individuals who don't have services provided through a hauler such as in Western Loudoun County. (2 people out of 4)

2. Disposal Presentation and Discussion

A. Clarification Questions Answered Satisfactorily

- What will happen to the revenue stream if the landfill rates are decreased?
- What percentage of MSW waste currently goes out of the County?
- Do we really want to look at the region or just Loudoun County?
- Would this study only look at the present?

B. Questions Raised that were Not Satisfactorily Answered

(There were no questions that were not satisfactorily answered)

C. Suggestions/Comments by Group

- The NRRC and COG regional Study would need to look at the future not just the present and do projections for the future. (4 people out of 4)
- This group suggests the addition of element 8. Element 8 would be to look at the capacity of the one existing MSW transfer station in the community. A new MSW transfer station would receive support by both the towns and haulers in the community. (4 people out of 4)

3. Recycling and Reuse Presentation and Discussion

A. Clarification Questions Answered Satisfactorily

- How confident is Loudoun County of the accuracy on recycling reports currently provided by business' and haulers?
- Is there a date scheduled for the Board of Supervisors to pursue a recyclables transfer station at the Loudoun County Solid Waste Management Facility?
- How would the County monitor if someone were providing adequate recycling opportunities?
- Would the County Land Use Referral process ensuring that recycling standards are set and used in new developments apply to towns?
- What is an Internet based waste exchange?

B. Questions Raised that were Not Satisfactorily Answered

(There were no questions that were not satisfactorily answered)

C. Suggestions/Comments by Group

- There is no way to improve on the accuracy of recycling reports currently provided by business' and haulers to the County. (3 people out of 4)
- The Towns should be encouraged to follow the County's example and promote recycling by maintaining mixed paper recycling and procurement of recycled paper. This should be voluntary but encouraged. (3 people out of 4)
- Coordination with the towns is critical as part of the evaluation process when planning locations of DOC sites in the community. Transportation is the major point of concern on the towns' part. There may be other issues that the town needs to focus on in cooperation with the County. (Group strongly agreed that cooperation is needed between the towns and County on this issue.) (4 people out of 4)
- The towns should be encouraged to participate in the planning of recycling within the communities at the same level as the County. The County should provide assistance. (4 people out of 4)
- The group would support an Internet-based waste exchange program. (4 people out of 4)

4. Environmental Protection Presentation and Discussion

A. Clarification Questions Answered Satisfactorily

- What is HHW collection?
- Do the towns currently adopt their own ordinances on dumping?

B. Questions Raised that were Not Satisfactorily Answered

(There were no questions that were not satisfactorily answered)

C. Suggestions/Comments by Group *(Group Size Now "3" instead of "4")

- Towns should on a voluntary basis adopt County ordinances to address dumping or improper storage of solid waste and enforcement of chapter 1080. (2 people out of 3)
- County will assist towns with enforcement of chapter 1080. (3 people out of 3)
- The towns should "make the ordinance standard to avoid confusion." (3 people out of 3)
- The Group stressed that they want an amendment to 1080, having the County include the towns when addressing dumping/improper storage and enforcement. (3 people out of 3)

END

#1

Loudoun County Ad Hoc Solid Waste Management Plan Committee Meeting Summary January 22, 2003

Present:

County: Sally Kurtz, Chairman
Eleanore Towe
Jim Burton

Town Representatives: Tom Mason, Town of Leesburg
The Honorable Karl Phillips, Council Member, Town of Purcellville
The Honorable Keith Reasoner, Town of Hamilton
The Honorable Elaine Walker, Town of Lovettsville
Charles Hartgrove, Town of Middleburg
Martin Kloeden, Town of Purcellville
Kelly Yost, Town of Round Hill

Absent:

The Honorable Steve Morgart, Town of Hillsboro
The Honorable Kristin Umstattd, Town of Leesburg
Robert Noe, Town of Leesburg

Call to Order

Sally Kurtz, Chairman, called the meeting to order, which was followed by introductions of the Town representatives, staff and members of the public.

Review of the Agenda

Chairman Kurtz asked that the order of the agenda be reversed to move the discussion of Draft Chapter 5 – before the Summary and discussion of comments and recommendations from the January 8, 2003 public input session.

Supervisor Towe moved approval of the November 20, 2002 meeting summary, which was seconded by Tom Mason. Voting on the motion was unanimous.

(See Item #4, 1-22-03 meeting packet)

Item #4, Revised Draft Chapter 5 – Solid Waste Management Plan Document (Committee Findings)

Staff presented the summary of Chapter 5 which represented the Committee's Findings and Outcomes discussed and voted upon from meetings held on September 25, October 9, October 23 and November 20th. Staff asked that the Committee review and affirm the Findings and Outcomes as presented in draft Chapter 5.

Following a brief discussion on Section 5.2, Solid Waste Collection, Supervisor Towe moved that the Committee recommend the adoption of draft Chapter 5 as presented to include the Findings and Outcomes for inclusion in the Solid Waste Management Plan. This motion was seconded by Keith Reasoner, which passed unanimously.

Consideration of Public Input Comments

Following a brief recap of the January 8th public input session, the Committee reviewed the comments which were grouped into nine topic areas which contained the suggestions/comments received from the small group discussions. (See *Item 3 – 1-22-03 meeting packet*)

Topic 1 – New or expanded recycling programs – this section addressed the Committee's proposed expansion in recycling programs or suggestions for further programs.

The comments were reviewed on this section and the Committee agreed to make no change in its findings and outcomes.

Topic 2 – Landfill operations – this section included proposed changes to the operations policy of the County SWMF including the reduction in tipping fees.

The comments were reviewed on this section and the Committee agreed to make no change in its findings and outcomes.

Topic 3 – Outsourcing Collection of County-Generated Solid Waste – responded to the small group discussion of the outsourcing of the public school's collection and transportation of the County's waste. The Committee has recommended maintaining the status quo for collection of solid waste generated in County government buildings including schools.

During the discussion on this topic area, Evan Mohler, Assistant Superintendent of Support Services, discussed the school's waste collection and transportation

process. Following his review of this process, the Committee asked that he prepare a cost analysis and bring this information back to the Committee.

Topic 4 – Town/County Uniformity of Requirements and Cooperation – this topic included comments on issues of cooperation between the Towns and the County with emphasis on consistent regulations and District-wide requirements.

Karl Phillips, Town council member of Purcellville, stated that Chapter 1080 did not include language that would require enforcement and that Purcellville does not have the resources as Leesburg does, for example, to conduct enforcement. He stated that the Town would need a guarantee that the County would assist with enforcement.

Staff responded to this concern indicating that the County would help if they were contacted on enforcement issues.

Other comments included concern with contractual arrangements with haulers and added responsibility of enforcement.

The comments were reviewed on this section and the Committee agreed to make no change in its findings and outcomes.

Topic 5 – Solid Waste Planning Issues – this section of comments included issues of transfer stations, alternative methods of disposal, future landfill sites and surveying of the private sector for feedback on adequacy of disposal infrastructure.

Staff responded to questions on current transfer station facilities in the County.

The comments were reviewed on this section and the Committee agreed to make no change in its findings and outcomes.

Topic 6 – Construction Waste Study – this section included comments on a request to a regional study of construction waste generation and disposal capacity. The Committee was asked whether they would consider an extension on the requested response date for the study.

The Committee inquired as to the response date for the study.

Mr. Weber responded that when they discussed this issue, that a suggested timeframe would be in 2004.

The comments were reviewed on this section and the Committee agreed to make no change in its findings and outcomes.

Topic 7 – Construction Waste Recycling – comments received at the January 8th session addressed various issues related to the recycling of construction waste.

The comments were reviewed on this section and the Committee agreed to make no change in its findings and outcomes.

Topic 8 – Increase effort on public education and outreach – this area of comments addressed various aspects to improve public education and outreach.

Staff briefly reviewed current legislative bills that would mandate some type of electronics recycling program.

The comments were reviewed on this section and the Committee agreed to make no change in its findings and outcomes.

Topic 9 – Recycling Issues – this set of comments addressed various issues regarding recycling.

The comments were reviewed on this section and the Committee agreed to make no change in its findings and outcomes.

Topic 10 – Miscellaneous comments – this set of comments did not fit into any of the identified topical area and were accepted as presented.

Tom Mason asked if the Committee members could obtain a final copy of Chapter 1080 and 1086.

Mr. Weber suggested that a final copy be included as an appendix to the final draft of the Solid Waste Management Plan.

Mr. Burton discussed DEQ regulations on open burning and indicated he would get a copy of the state regulations and template for a proposed local ordinance. He stated that he would like the Board of Supervisors to consider adoption of a local ordinance that would prohibit open burning during the April-September timeframe or whatever DEQ's regulations specify in terms of the time period. He suggested that this be included in the plan and that he would provide the requisite documents to staff.

Mrs. Towe stated that she agreed with Mr. Burton on this issue.

Mayor Walker asked for clarification on the comments from the November 20th meeting and explained her vote on the open burning issue. She also discussed a concern of the Town of Lovettsville having a sufficient water supply in the event of fires that may get out of control if open burning is permitted.

Mr. Weber stated he would incorporate the proposed open burning regulations with the ordinance section. He also asked for clarification that the recommendation would prohibit open burning of all wastes generated offsite and would prohibit burning of waste generated onsite during ozone season to include construction waste and vegetative waste.

Discussion continued on open barrel burning, rural lot burning and the time period this is prohibited (May-September) but need to verify. The Committee requested that staff obtain DEQ regulations concerning this issue and to follow the time period they specify. This information will be brought back to the Committee at its next meeting. *(Note: Prohibitions are actually June, July and August. The current draft of the SWMP addresses this issue per the direction of Mr. Burton in Chapter 5, Findings and Outcomes, Chapter 6, Goals and Objectives, and Chapter 7, Implementation Plan to revise the County's solid waste and fire codes to prohibit such activity.)*

Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Solid Waste Management Plan Committee is scheduled for Wednesday, February 12th at 6 p.m. in the Lovettsville Room.

Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned.

Loudoun County Ad Hoc Solid Waste Management
Planning Committee Meeting Summary
February 12, 2003

Present:

County: Sally Kurtz, Chairman
Eleanore Towe
Jim Burton

Town Representatives: Tom Mason, Town of Leesburg
The Honorable Keith Reasoner, Town of Hamilton
Charles Hartgrove, Town of Middleburg
Martin Kloeden, Town of Purcellville
Kelly Yost, Town of Round Hill

Absent:

The Honorable Steve Morgart, Town of Hillsboro
The Honorable Kristin Umstatted, Town of Leesburg
The Honorable Elaine Walker, Town of Lovettsville
Robert Noe, Town of Leesburg

Call to Order

Sally Kurtz, Chairman, called the meeting to order, which was followed by introductions of the Committee members, staff and members of the public.

Supervisor Towe moved approval of the meeting summary of January 22, 2003 and Mr. Reasoner seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

Resolution of Outstanding Issues

Rick Weber reviewed the outstanding issues that were raised by the Committee members requesting additional information. (*See item #2 of the meeting packet*). These issues included the cost for school staff to collect trash and recyclables from public buildings. This information was provided by Evan Mohler in Attachment 1 of the above noted item. He reported that \$199,201 was the cost for FY 03. It was also reported that the County's General Services' department incurs contractual costs of an additional \$33,874 for FY 03 to cover collection and transport of recyclables from County buildings.

Staff responded to questions related to the amount for the Schools explaining that the \$199,201 is in the Schools' budget and covers the salary and fringe

benefits for three equipment operators and operational, maintenance and depreciation costs.

The second issue discussed in this item was the recommendations to control open burning during periods of poor air quality. Based on the committee's direction, staff reported that revisions to the draft SWMP include the recommendation of prohibiting open burning during the portion of the year when poor air quality is likely to occur. The Committee accepted this revision with a vote of 8-0. (*See Attachment 2 of the item.*)

Staff also reported on the receipt of a written public comment from Jack Freeman concerning the SWMP District's reliance on landfilling in lieu of incineration and resource recovery. (*this comment is provided as Attachment 3 to the item*)

Supervisor Burton provided comments on the issue of incineration and stated that incineration is not economical for the County as Loudoun does not generate enough waste to support this method of disposal.

Final Committee Draft of the Solid Waste Management Plan

Chairman Kurtz suggested that the Committee review the draft plan by chapter and discuss any changes and/or comments. (*See item #3 of the meeting packet.*)

Chapter 1 – Introduction and Overview

The Committee voted unanimously 8-0 to accept this chapter as written.

Chapter 2 – Waste Characterization and Quantities

The Committee voted unanimously 8-0 to accept this chapter as written.

Chapter 3 – The Solid Waste Management System

Supervisor Burton raised the question regarding the amount of municipal solid waste (MSW) generated and the percentage that goes to the transfer station. He asked staff to clarify a chart on page 3-27 in the draft plan showing that 87% of MSW is transferred out of the district. In preparing for the Board meeting, he suggested that this information be revised to include:

- Percentage of waste transferred by haulers;
- Percentage of total MSW waste;
- Percentage of all waste that is taken to the transfer station.

Chairman Kurtz asked the Committee if they would accept the chapter as presented, with the proposed changes. The Committee agreed that this chapter would be accepted with these changes.

Chapter 4 – Consideration of the Solid Waste Hierarchy

The Committee voted unanimously 8-0 to accept this chapter as written.

Chapter 5 – Findings and Outcomes of the Ad Hoc SWMP Committee

The Committee voted unanimously 8-0 to accept this chapter as written.

Chapter 6 – Objectives for the Solid Waste Management Plan

The Committee voted unanimously 8-0 to accept this chapter as written.

Chapter 7 – Implementation of the Solid Waste Management Plan

Rick Weber noted that this chapter was completely rewritten to incorporate all of the Committee's recommendations and continuation of the status quo items. He reviewed the key recommendations of this section. He also noted that the County's solid waste ordinances have been added to this section as discussed at the last meeting.

The Committee voted unanimously 8-0 to accept this chapter as written.

Chapter 8 – Funding the Solid Waste Management System

The Committee voted unanimously 8-0 to accept this chapter as written.

Chapter 9 – Public Participation

The Committee voted unanimously 8-0 to accept this chapter as written.

Supervisor Towe moved that the Ad Hoc Solid Waste Management Plan Committee approve the final Committee Draft of the Solid Waste Management Plan for the Loudoun Solid Waste Management Planning District and forward it to the Loudoun County Board of Supervisors and to the District member Town Councils with a recommendation for approval as amended.

Supervisor Burton seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Next Steps for the SWMP

Chairman Kurtz reviewed the next steps for completing and approving the Solid Waste Management Plan. (See *item #4 of the meeting packet*) She stated that the plan would be presented to the full Board of Supervisors at their March 17th business meeting and that the committee members will be notified of a time certain for this presentation and are encouraged to attend.

Following the presentation to the Board, the plan is tentatively scheduled for the Board of Supervisors' regular public hearing on Tuesday, April 8, 2003. The Committee members will be notified of the time of the hearing. This hearing will provide an opportunity for further comment on the draft plan.

In response to a question regarding the public hearing, it was noted that the hearing includes the Towns and that the legal advertisement announcing the hearing will include each town. However, each Town will need to submit a resolution from their respective Councils, which will be submitted for the record.

Final action on the plan is anticipated at the Board of Supervisors' regular business meeting on April 21, 2003. Town Councils may consider scheduling review and action on the plan during the month of May with final submission to DEQ by July 2003.

Discussion ensued on the proposed process for finalizing the plan.

Closing Remarks

Members of the Committee and Town representatives commended staff on their work on the draft plan and the process. The members of the Committee also praised Chairman Kurtz for her leadership on this project.

Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Committee, this meeting was adjourned.

Editors Note: *This meeting summary was not approved by the Ad Hoc Solid Waste Management Planning Committee because it was distributed after the Committee's final meeting.*