

**REPORT OF BUDGET WORKSHOP
HORRY COUNTY SOLID WASTE AUTHORITY, INC.
March 13, 2024**

The Horry County Solid Waste Authority, Inc. held a Budget Workshop on Wednesday, March 13, 2024, at 9:00 A.M., at the Authority's Administrative Office, 1886 Highway 90, Conway, South Carolina. In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, notices setting forth the date, time, and place of the meeting were mailed to the media.

Present were the following Board Members: W. Norfleet Jones, Chairman; Robert J. Kemp, Vice Chairman; Michael H. Hughes, Secretary; Amos C. Berry, Sr., Treasurer and Board Members Pam J. Creech and Samuel T. Johnson, Jr. Board Member James H. Cokley was not in attendance.

Former Board Member Bo Ives, Horry County Administrator Steve Gosnell, Horry County Assistant Administrator Barry Spivey, Joe Chestnut, Phil Westmoreland and Sam Kirsh from HDR Engineering attended the workshop. There were no members of the media in attendance.

The following individuals were also in attendance: Danny Knight, Executive Director, Ed Marr, Assistant Executive Director; Jan Bitting; Director, Stephanie Todd; Director; Esther Murphy, Director and other staff to include Monica Collier, Cindy Keith, Katherine Bell, Rodney Cannon, Chris Calhoun, Richie Stetter, Trina Cooke, Drake Morris and Josh Nesbit.

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Jones called the meeting to order and asked Mr. Berry to render the invocation.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Jones led the group in the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chairman Jones asked for any revisions to the Agenda as contained in the Agenda Packet; however, there were none.

Mr. Berry moved to approve the Agenda. There was a second by Mr. Hughes and the Motion was carried.

RATE STUDY MODEL PRESENTATION – HDR ENGINEERING

Mrs. Bitting welcomed and thanked everyone for being in attendance. Mrs. Bitting stated that if anyone had questions or concerns, please ask. Mrs. Bitting stated that staff would begin the morning with the rate study. She informed the Board that Sam Kirsh and Philip Westmoreland from HDR were in attendance. Mrs. Bitting reminded the Board that last year, staff submitted a bid to do a rate study, which was later awarded to HDR Engineering. She said that the SWA has previously conducted rate studies; however, this rate study was different.

Mrs. Bitting indicated that following much discussion with Mr. Marr, it was decided that a rate study model would be more useful for planning purposes. She informed the Board that the program would allow staff to factor and analyze how various scenarios would affect the tipping fee. Mrs. Bitting advised the Board to feel free to ask any questions or express any concerns. She then requested that Mr. Westmoreland and Mr. Kirsh offer an overview of the process and how the rate study model works.

Mr. Westmoreland stated that it was their pleasure to be at the meeting. He advised the Board that this was a tool, not a study. He stated that HDR contributed to the development of the SWA Management Plan Update. He said that this tool provided an additional tool to assist the SWA in making decisions. Mr. Westmoreland provided an overview of what HDR came up with and how the program was developed. Mr. Westmoreland stated that Mr. Marr and Mrs. Bitting helped put together the cost-of-service study which has been updated to reflect historical balances and tipping fees. He stated that if staff reviewed the next 10, 20, or 30 years, there would be a lot of changes in a short period of time.

Mr. Westmoreland discussed how staff determined if this model was a useful indication tool to utilize. He stated that they demonstrated what had occurred during the previous five years, and that the model corresponded to what Mrs. Bitting and Mr. Marr had observed, so they knew it was a good indication. Mr. Westmoreland stated this model was as accurate as the information put in and it would provide a decent frame of reference. Mr. Westmoreland stated that HDR also considered the cost of allocations to the SWA landfills and recycling facilities.

Mr. Kirsh informed the Board that using a tester would help to smooth out the large cost increases that the SWA had seen in recent years. He indicated that he believed this was the goal of using five years of data and projecting from there.

Mr. Westmoreland presented an update on the model and stated that it was only as good as the information it received. He stated that it was going to be a live tool that staff could use frequently to update and help make decisions as the economy changes, materials change, and so on.

Mr. Kirsh indicated that the tool could alter tonnages as they fluctuate regularly with interest rates, yearly operational expenditures, equipment purchases, and the SWA's annual non-tipping fees. He stated that they were simply taking the overall cost and constructing tests to illustrate what an average year might look like for various expense categories while totaling and then deducting all non-tipping fee revenue.

Mr. Kirsh stated the tool would back out what was known as the yearly net revenue required, which referred to the income gap between non-tipping revenue and expenses covered by tipping fees.

Mr. Westmoreland stated that this was a model for staff to use and that HDR was available to provide assistance. He stated that the tool also had the capability to determine the tipping fees. Mr. Westmoreland provided several scenarios on a PowerPoint presentation of how the tool operates. He stated that the beauty of this concept, as Mrs. Bitting proposed, was that there are operational changes that could be implemented, and if staff would like to add additional services and do other things to operation, it provided staff an indication of where that tipping fee should

be. Mr. Westmoreland stated that the model was flexible and that this would be a valuable document. He reviewed what the impact would be if someone wanted to modify the equipment, and gave a screenshot of the model as an Excel file.

Mr. Kirsh indicated that all costs could be updated in real time. He stated that he only wanted to demonstrate the impact of modifying a single program rather than a combination of programs. He remarked that HDR was working themselves out of a job, and that this was a living, breathing tool that could be updated. Mr. Kirsh discussed the impact on operations.

Mr. Westmoreland added that he wanted to develop a tool that would provide flexibility throughout the year.

Mr. Marr stated that the beauty of the program, as he and Mrs. Bitting discussed, was that as staff developed new programs or if circumstances changed over the year, staff could offer a better response to the Board about what it would mean for operational expenditures and have a realistic understanding. Mr. Marr stated that tipping fees provide a significant portion of the SWA's revenue, and that adding costs and modifying operations could shift the line up or down. He stated that this tool would assist in determining where the line should be. Mr. Kirsch provided different scenarios of how the model works.

Mr. Hughes inquired whether any other landfill in the state was utilizing this technology and if there was any historical data on how well it works, or if there was any input from companies that might be using this software. Mr. Westmoreland responded that other organizations had a somewhat different model than this one. However, other counties for whom HDR has conducted rate studies have been more conventional.

Mr. Hughes stated he was aware that the statistics would change if a different landfill was used due to differences in tonnage. He indicated that he was simply wondering if there was another landfill utilizing it and whether or not they have any results from them about how well it worked for them. Mr. Westmoreland responded, not for this specific model.

Mr. Hughes stated that he observed that each year there would be an increase in tipping fees due to increased expenses. He inquired what would happen if there was a decrease in expenses. He asked whether the tipping fees would change or remain the same. Mr. Kirsh replied that they would remain the same.

Mr. Hughes inquired whether there was an approach whereby, before any decisions were made, the League of Cities and other municipalities would be aware of an increase in tipping fees. Mr. Marr commented that was something that could be considered. General discussion ensued.

Mr. Hughes stated that during earlier talks with the League of Cities, staff agreed to keep them informed of any changes or cost increases. He stated that the citizens of Horry County would be the ones who would be affected while other businesses may have to increase their garbage collection costs. Mr. Hughes said that he inquired if there was an approach for this program that staff could follow and said the SWA would be developing their own. Mr. Hughes said it would benefit the SWA to keep people in the loop so that nobody comes up stunned due to the increase in tipping fees.

Mrs. Bitting offered additional insight into the model. She said the model had actual expenses and revenues in the chart as of FY2023 and said once FY2024 was completed, the model could be used to predict costs for FY2026. Mrs. Bitting stated that staff was now focusing on FY2025, which would provide staff the opportunity to detect an increase in tipping fees.

Mr. Hughes inquired if staff could look at this model on a daily or monthly basis. Mr. Marr answered, yes.

Mrs. Bitting stated staff was in communication with municipalities and the County in regards to budgets. She stated that she spoke with the City of Myrtle Beach and the City of Conway about the anticipated tipping fee increase.

Ms. Creech stated that she believed it was an excellent tool. General discussion followed.

FY2025 BUDGET DISCUSSION

TIPPING FEES AND REVENUE PROJECTIONS - FISCAL YEARS 2025

Mrs. Bitting began with a review of highlights of significant changes within the overall budget. She reviewed with the Board the Summary of Revenues and the Tipping Fees. Mrs. Bitting stated that staff anticipated a tipping fee increase of \$3 per ton for solid waste, increasing the fee from \$40 per ton to \$43 per ton. She stated the anticipated increase for mixed construction was \$2 per ton, increasing the fee from \$32 per ton to \$34 per ton. Mrs. Bitting explained that staff had anticipated a \$2 per ton tipping fee to offset the cost of the new shredder that was purchased in FY2024. The additional \$1 would help with general operating costs. Mrs. Bitting also commented that staff originally thought the increase would be \$4 but had done a wonderful job of looking at existing programs for ways to cut expenses or to generate new revenue.

Mrs. Bitting stated staff was recommending eliminating the C&D Recycling Incentive. She stated this incentive was created as an incentive for haulers to sort their loads so they could be taken to the C&D recycling facility. She advised staff noticed haulers had not been sorting the loads and staff ended up having to sort the materials once they were taken to the C&D facility. Mrs. Bitting commented the incentive was a cost that no longer benefited the Authority and said eliminating the incentive would save approximately \$200,000 annually. Mr. Berry asked if the incentive was being eliminated because the haulers weren't sorting materials like they should. Mrs. Bitting stated that was correct. Ms. Creech asked if this had started yet. Mrs. Bitting responded that staff had not implemented the change yet and the anticipated start date was July 1, 2024. Ms. Creech responded that it should be done. Mr. Hughes asked if it could be implemented earlier or if it had to wait until July 1, to which Mrs. Bitting responded it could be started at any time with Board approval. Ms. Creech stated that it should be implemented as soon as possible. Mr. Knight advised if the Board wanted to make the change, staff needed 30 days to notify haulers.

Mrs. Bitting then discussed the disposal and recycling operations revenue. She stated the tipping fee revenue proposed for FY25 was \$19,273,680, a 7.1% increase over FY24. She advised this increase was due to the tipping fee increase. Mrs. Bitting stated recycling sales materials have a 21% increase due to an increase in prices which were anticipated to remain the same or increase. She advised that the market had been stable.

Mrs. Bitting then reviewed interest earnings and advised there was a large increase there. She commended the County Treasurer's Office for a good job on handling investments. She commented that projections were conservative based on conversations with the Treasurer's Office.

Mrs. Bitting then pointed out a \$1 Million increase in miscellaneous container revenue. She stated that this was one area staff had looked at revamping in order to recoup some of the costs associated with the program. She stated Mr. Marr would discuss it in more detail during the Collection and Hauling presentation.

Mrs. Bitting stated there was an 11% increase, a little over \$2.5 Million in overall revenue in FY2025. Mr. Kemp asked about landfill gas. Mrs. Bitting responded there had been an increase in the past few months. Mrs. Todd then commented there should be a continued increase as the SWA had entered into a new agreement with Santee Cooper.

Mr. Hughes commented on the decrease in C&D materials. Mrs. Bitting responded that the decrease was due to a decrease in the number of recyclable materials and hoped that with the expansion of the C&D facility, there would be an increase in the amount of that material. Mr. Hughes then commented on the decrease in e-waste. Mrs. Bitting discussed the state mandate on e-waste, which resulted in lower costs.

FY2025 EXPENDITURE REVIEW

Mrs. Bitting began the review of the departmental budgets and indicated each director would review the significant increases/decreases within their divisions. She mentioned that the most noticeable increase in each department was personnel cost. She stated a 7% cost of living increase (COLA) had been budgeted. She advised the Board that she had reached out to other agencies and that was the average cost of living increase. Mrs. Bitting indicated that other increases included health insurance which had increased by 12%, retirement which increased by 1% and worker's compensation which saw an increase of 20%.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS, ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCE DEPARTMENTS

Mrs. Bitting reviewed the Administration Division, which included the Board of Directors, Administrative Department, and the Finance Department. She noted the consulting and miscellaneous in this division had been reduced by \$50,000 due to no rate study being conducted in FY2025. Ms. Bitting noted there was a budget allocation to work with engineers for PFAS.

NON-DEPARTMENTAL BUDGET SUMMARY

Mrs. Bitting reviewed the Non-Departmental budget and said there was a \$150,000 increase in unrestricted capital. She stated there were some small equipment purchases staff was planning to make that would save money in other places, thus allowing for the increase in unrestricted capital.

Mr. Hughes asked about the increase in contractual services in the Finance Department. Mrs. Bitting stated the increase was due to the cost of financial software and employee software. Mrs. Creech asked what UCS Support Services were. Mrs. Bitting explained that was the amount the SWA charged the County for managing the recycling centers.

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

Mrs. Todd offered a review of the Environmental Management Department and indicated that the Assistant Director of Operations position had been eliminated resulting in a decrease in personnel costs. She commented that Landfill Gas Maintenance was increased by \$22,000 in preparation for NSPS which should begin in FY2026. Mrs. Todd discussed the purchase of new pump system for the well field. She stated these new pumps have a longer life cycle and would reduce maintenance costs. She mentioned that the new pumps could be monitored from staff's phone which would reduce the repair time.

LANDFILL DEPARTMENT

Mr. Calhoun stated that the landfill department budget remained much the same as before. He stated there was a reduction of \$30,000 in the contractual labor budget because staff was looking to purchase two new pieces of equipment that would be able replace contracted labor. Mr. Calhoun said one piece of equipment was a tracked lawn mower that could reach places that current standard equipment could not reach. He advised this would reduce the need for contracted laborers having to weed eat certain areas. Mr. Calhoun stated the second piece of equipment being purchased was a litter trailer which would be able to go up and down slopes and would reduce the number of laborers needed to manually pick up litter.

Mr. Calhoun stated there would be an additional HEO III added to staff in FY2025. Ms. Creech commented that staff had done a good job of thinking outside of the box and finding some good equipment.

YARD WASTE DEPARTMENT

In the Yard Waste Department, Mr. Calhoun stated the budget would remain the same as FY2024 other than adjustments for inflation.

C&D LANDFILL DEPARTMENT AND C&D RECYCLING FACILITY

Mr. Marr stated that the increases in the C&D Landfill budget were due to the purchase of the shredder. He said the costs had been split across all areas of the budget. Mr. Hughes asked about the increase in personnel costs and Mr. Marr explained the increase was due to hiring an operator for the shredder.

Ms. Creech asked if the 7% increase on salaries covered salary as well as benefits and Mrs. Bitting responded that the 7% was a COLA increase on salary only. Ms. Creech asked for the total percentage increase the COLA would have on the budget. Mrs. Bitting advised that the Administrative Division had a total of an 8% increase in personnel, the Operations Division had an 11.1% increase, the Recycling and Corporate Affairs Division had a 6.8% increase, resulting in an overall increase of approximately 25%. She stated the largest increase was in the Operations Department due to adding new positions.

Mr. Kemp asked if staff were considering purchasing another shredder. Mr. Marr responded that was not being considered yet. Mr. Marr discussed the adjustment that staff had made to get the shredder to optimal production. He stated the shredder was able to process 58 tons of material per hour as opposed to the 25 tons per hour originally thought. Mr. Marr commented with this being the case, there was not currently enough material to warrant another shredder. Mr. Marr said if staff saw the need for a second shredder, they would bring it to the Board for

discussion at that time. Mr. Knight mentioned that the shredder had been added to the capital budget and that going forward the money would be in the budget.

Ms. Creech inquired if DHEC was okay with the shredder and Mr. Marr said they were. Mr. Marr went on to state another benefit was that DHEC was planning to perform a waste assessment for C&D materials and the SWA facility was being considered for this assessment.

Mr. Hughes asked if there was any material coming from the shredder that the SWA would be able to sell. Mr. Marr responded that staff was planning to take sample material to scrap metal dealers to see if there was an interest. Mr. Hughes asked if staff had any ideas if there would be an increase in the number of materials being brought into the C&D facility. Mr. Marr stated the amount of C&D material depended on the economy.

MAINTENANCE/SHOP DEPARTMENT

Mr. Stetter stated two new positions had been added to the FY2025 budget - one to maintain the shredder and a mechanic welder. He said the small capital budget increased due to adding the shredder and for purchasing tools that were needed for efficiency. He stated that maintenance and tire budgets had been raised across the board due to the hourly rates increasing and the cost of parts going up. Mrs. Bitting stated there was a 30% increase in maintenance costs overall. Ms. Creech asked if there was machinery available to make parts for the equipment. Mr. Stetter said there was equipment available, but additional staff and a larger maintenance area would be needed. Mr. Hughes asked if staff was still working on diesel equipment or had electrical equipment taken the place of diesel. Mr. Stetter responded that the electrical equipment had not worked out like it was thought but that eventually it would come. Mr. Kemp asked what was being done for overtime to be zero in FY2026 and staff responded that was a mistype. Ms. Creech asked if the mechanic program with HGTC was still in place and Mrs. Bitting responded that FY2024 was the last year, so it had been taken out of the budget.

Mrs. Bitting stated Mr. Stetter had requested a second additional position for FY2025 that had to be turned down. She mentioned that staff had made cuts as necessary. Ms. Creech stated that the SWA had a lot of equipment and if hiring additional maintenance staff would help extend the life of equipment, the Board would like to know.

Ms. Creech discussed the importance of safety. Mr. Kemp stated that safety needed to be thought about. Mrs. Bitting mentioned that there was \$250,000 in capital for a shop expansion.

MATERIALS RECYCLING FACILITY

Mr. Marr indicated that the most significant change to Department 521 was an increase in personnel services. He stated that Mr. Cannon required someone to work on electronics. He advised that one person was a risk. Mr. Marr stated that when things become hectic, Mr. Cannon needed to call in someone from the MRF to help. He stated that the MRF needed another mechanic.

COLLECTIONS & HAULING DEPARTMENT

Mr. Marr stated that the most significant change in Department 530 was the cost of operations and paying for operations. He stated that Department 530 had three hauling operations. He indicated that all three programs were focused on recycling and they all use different trucks and

containers but all collect the same material. Mr. Marr stated that his thought process was to have one operation that could manage material collection. Mr. Marr proposed the reorganization of the hauling operation, reallocating personnel and resources that could be better used in other parts of the operation to keep expenses down in other places and to be able to charge back and generate new revenue that offsets the remainder of the cost. Mr. Marr recommended eliminating the use of the mini-loader and roll-off trucks and utilizing 8-yard containers and front loader trucks for all recycling operations, whereby combining all recycling collection programs into one program. He advised the Board that staff was also recommending initiating a \$60 per month charge to service 8-yard containers, in addition to the monthly rental fee. Mr. Marr generally discussed other proposed new program fees, to include charging for call backs and non-routine repairs.

Mr. Hughes asked about the process used to select which programs would be changed and/or modified. Mr. Marr indicated that he studied the cost of each program and determined which offered the most efficiency and cost savings.

Ms. Creech expressed her delight and stated that was an excellent idea.

Mr. Hughes inquired about the school office paper programs. He asked whether it would be comingled. Mr. Marr stated that staff had not done anything to promote this change and stated it was being presented to the Board for their consideration. General discussion followed.

PUBLIC EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Mrs. Muphy indicated that there were a few significant changes in Public Education for FY2025. She indicated with the exception of an increase in minor equipment capital that it was mostly due to staff plans to refurbish the SWA mascot and said that it had not been renovated in over a decade. Mrs. Murphy stated that staff was seeking to improve the design to make it more flexible. She stated that the Public Education Department budget had an overall 6% increase.

CORPORATE AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT

Mrs. Muphy indicated that there were a few significant changes in Recycling & Corporate Affairs. She said that staff was planning capital equipment purchases for the upcoming fiscal year. Mrs. Murphy advised the Board that staff was seeking to purchase an electronic storage system for corporate records. In addition, she stated that the computer system currently being utilized to record meetings was scheduled to be replaced in FY25. Mrs. Murphy indicated there was an overall 6.2% increase in this department.

FUND 06 - UNINCORPORATED COLLECTION SYSTEM DIVISION

Mrs. Muphy informed the Board that the County's Unincorporated Collection System was managed by the SWA for residents of Horry County's unincorporated areas. She noted regarding the Administrative Departmental budget, there were no substantial changes in terms of personnel.

Regarding the Recycling Centers budget, Mrs. Murphy stated that there was an increase in staff for FY2025. Mrs. Murphy reminded the Board the North Myrtle Beach Recycling Center was being relocated. She stated that the County was still completing the design plans and that she hoped by July, the construction project would be out to bid and that the construction project would be completed before the end of the fiscal year.

Mrs. Murphy stated that, in addition to the relocation of the NMB Center, the County was close to finalizing the purchase of property at Highway 90 and 22. She stated that it was previously suggested to establish a new recycling center to accommodate growth in the area. Mrs. Murphy said the purchase should be completed before the end of the fiscal year.

Mrs. Murphy advised the Board of plans to relocate the Longs Recycling Center to a larger location in the future budget year. She stated that many areas in Horry County had experienced growth, but those three were the locations currently being focused on. Mrs. Murphy stated establishing a new center and expanding centers required an increase in both full-time and part-time employees. Mrs. Murphy informed the Board that there were six new full-time and five part-time positions being added to the FY2025 budget.

Mrs. Murphy advised the Board that staff had increased the budget for Equipment Maintenance as well as Fuel and Lubricants.

Mr. Knight stated that the recycling centers are funded by Horry County and operated by the SWA. He stated that staff would be present at the County budget meeting if anyone had any questions.

Mrs. Murphy then reviewed the budget for UCS-System Cost. She discussed the County's hauling contract with a third-party hauler to carry material from centers and said it included an 8.5% increase for each year of the 5-year contract. She stated that the cost of land improvement had increased, and that the current plan was to expand a current recycling center in FY25.

Mr. Hughes inquired whether there would be an expansion or construction of a new facility. Mrs. Murphy stated that in FY2025, a center would be expanded. Mr. Hughes inquired whether there was only one facility. Mrs. Murphy stated only one facility was planned for FY25; however, things are susceptible to change. General discussion followed.

CAPITAL BUDGET DESIGNATED FUNDS

Mrs. Bitting discussed the Capital Budget and generally reviewed some of the larger projects and equipment purchases slated for FY25, which included the compactor (\$1.4 million), the grinder (\$1.4 million) the shredder (\$1.3 million). Mrs. Bitting stated that this was equipment that staff would want to have and that if funds were available, they would be purchased based on need.

Mrs. Bitting indicated the same regarding the equipment replacement schedule. She commented that just because the money was available, it did not guarantee that new equipment would be purchased next year. She stated that on average, staff may purchase five items each year. Mrs. Bitting said that staff does a great job with maintaining equipment.

Mrs. Bitting stated that in FY2026, the SWA has budgeted \$5.2 Million for staff to consider long-term C&D capacity. She stated the SWA should start looking into building a transfer station.

Ms. Creech inquired whether the SWA would build a C&D transfer station. Mr. Knight remarked that the SWA had to construct a transfer stations. Creech inquired whether C&D would be delivered to the landfill, the SWA be paid, and the material transferred out. Mrs. Bitting responded yes.

Ms. Creech replied that she was not interested in building a transfer station because of what occurred with the SWA E-waste and the liability that would come from transferring of E-Waste.

Mr. Knight advised the Board that this year staff would look at transfer stations and locations. General discussion ensued.

REVIEW OF CLOSURE, POST CLOSURE AND LANDFILL CONSTRUCTION FUNDING

Mrs. Bitting provided an update on closure and post-closure construction funds. She stated that staff had set aside \$10 per ton for the last several years. She said in the past, she believed the SWA had seven years capacity remaining on C&D, but now there are only five years. Mrs. Bitting indicated that the amount being set aside would increase from \$10 to \$13.75 per ton next year. She stated that staff was looking at \$3.75 per ton on C&D and MSW, which would either increase the tipping fee or methods would have to be found to minimize costs. Mrs. Bitting stated that staff was exploring new ways to save money and generate more revenue so that the SWA does not have to increase tipping fees by \$3.75 next year. Mrs. Bitting advised the Board that staff would find ways to save money. Mrs. Bitting then provided an update to the Board on designated funds.

PERSONNEL POLICY CHANGE – ELIMINATION OF VACATION BUYBACK

Mrs. Bitting informed the Board that currently, full-time employees have the opportunity to sell up to 80 hours of vacation time each year. She stated staff was proposing to eliminate the limit and allow employees to purchase as much of their accrued vacation time as they desired. Mrs. Bitting stated employees would be paid their vacation time whether they used it now or were paid for it when they retired. She stated allowing them to purchase as much of their time now would remove the liability from the books sooner than later. The Board generally discussed the vacation buyback program and asked about the amount of liability currently on the books. Mrs. Bitting indicated she did not have the figure currently available but would provide that information to the Board at a later date. Mr. Kemp stated it was important that employment at the SWA remain attractive to applicants.

HOLIDAY REVIEW

Mrs. Bitting stated that at the time the Juneteenth holiday was added to the SWA holiday schedule discussion was held regarding Memorial Day and the possibility of adding it to the SWA holiday list. Ms. Creech stated it was her understanding that there were a certain number of personal holidays that staff could use at their discretion. Mrs. Bitting stated that was correct. General discussion ensued regarding holidays and personal holidays, with no change being made to the current holiday schedule.

OPERATING HOURS

Mrs. Bitting stated staff reviewed all areas of operations to determine where savings could be made. She indicated as a part of the review process, Mr. Marr studied how equipment hours could be saved by possibly changing the current landfill operating hours.

Mr. Marr informed the Board that staff was looking at potential cost savings by reducing operating hours at the landfill. He recommended potentially closing 30 minutes early Monday through Friday and 2 hours early on Saturdays. He said this would reduce equipment operating hours and equipment depreciation. Mr. Marr stated closing early should have minimal effect on customers.

Mr. Hughes expressed his concerns regarding closing the landfill early. He asked staff to provide a summary on the potential cost saving.

Chairman Jones commended staff on their efforts to save money and stated it would be an interesting summary staff would be bringing back to the Board.

ELIMINATION OF C&D RECYCLING INCENTIVE

Mrs. Bitting indicated if the Board desired to eliminate the C&D Recycling Incentive a motion would be needed.

Ms. Creech moved to eliminate the C&D Recycle Incentive. There was a second by Mr. Kemp and the Motion was carried.

Mrs. Bitting thanked the Board for their time and questions and again encouraged them to contact her with any additional questions. She advised the Board that staff would be attending the Horry County Budget Retreat on March 21, 2024. Mrs. Bitting indicated she would proceed with finalizing the budget for Board's approval at the May Board Meeting.

Mr. Kemp inquired about the entry for Piggyback 4. Mr. Marr stated this was a potential option for additional landfill capacity in the future.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Board, **Mr. Kemp moved, seconded by Mr. Hughes to adjourn the meeting. The Motion was carried** and the SWA Budget Workshop was adjourned at 11:50 A.M.

Minutes approved on March 26, 2024.

HORRY COUNTY SOLID WASTE AUTHORITY, INC.

BY: _____(L. S.)
W. Norfleet Jones, Chairman

ATTEST:

_____(L. S.)
Michael H. Hughes, Secretary

_____(L. S.)
Amos C. Berry, Sr.

_____(L. S.)
James H. Cokley, D.Min.

_____(L. S.)
Pam J. Creech

_____(L. S.)
Samuel T. Johnson, Jr.

_____(L. S.)
Robert J. Kemp