

**REPORT OF BUDGET WORKSHOP
HORRY COUNTY SOLID WASTE AUTHORITY, INC.
February 27, 2025**

The Horry County Solid Waste Authority, Inc. held a Budget Workshop on Thursday, February 27, 2025, 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: Robert J. Kemp, Chairman; Pam J. Creech, Vice Chairman; W. Norfleet Jones, Secretary; Amos C. Berry, Sr., Treasurer and Board Members Wayne Fox and Dr. Albert G. Hayward and Board Member Samuel T. Johnson, Jr. was not in attendance.

SWA Environmental Liaison Ives, Horry County Administrator Barry Spivey, Horry County Assistant Administrator Shannon Todd, City of Conway Reggie Jenerette, and Amelia Wood 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; Richie Stetter, Director and other staff to include Monica Collier, Trina Cooke, Katherine Bell, Chris Calhoun and Victoria Johnson.

CALL TO ORDER

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Ms. Creech led the group in the Pledge of Allegiance.

FY2026-2027 BUDGET DISCUSSION

Mr. Knight commended staff on their preparation of the budget for FY26. He also provided a summary of designated funds. He then turned the meeting over to Mrs. Bitting.

Mrs. Bitting expressed gratitude to everyone who came to the budget workshop. She gave special thanks to staff for developing a balanced budget.

Mrs. Bitting informed the Board that staff had prepared a two-year operating budget and five-year capital budget covering day-to-day expenses. Mrs. Bitting stated that she wanted to present the budget differently this year. She said there were no major changes to the line items and she wanted to spend time discussing projects and personnel changes. She directed the Board to ask questions or voice concerns they might have regarding specific line items.

Mrs. Bitting welcomed Mr. Spivey and Mrs. Todd to the workshop. She also thanked Ms. Wood, Mr. Ives and Mr. Jenerette for attending. Mrs. Bitting stated that she invited all municipalities to attend the workshop.

Mrs. Bitting began the discussion by outlining the operating budget and expenses. She said that personnel costs were one of the SWA's largest expenditures. She stated that staff set aside funding each year for increases in worker's compensation and health insurance. Mrs. Bitting stated that the budget included a 3% merit increase in addition to a 4% cost of living increase. She stated there was no increase in retirement.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS, ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCE DEPARTMENTS

Mrs. Bitting said her division included the Finance and Administration departments in addition to the Board of Directors Department. She said that the only expected change in the Board of Directors area was to increase their pay to match what the County recently did with their Boards and Commissions.

Mrs. Bitting said that in order to better collect credit card fees, the Finance Department had contacted Horry County Treasurer Angie Jones regarding the use of a credit card processing company. She stated that the Treasurer approved and in the upcoming fiscal year, staff intends implement this change.

Ms. Creech inquired as to what the staff had done in terms of aligning the Board of Directors compensation with the County. She said that before any changes were made, the Board needed to have a discussion. Mrs. Bitting said the County approved its Commissions and Board Members received \$100 for each meeting a member attends and \$150 for each meeting for the chairman. Ms. Creech stated that before making any changes, she would like the Board to discuss the matter.

Mrs. Bitting turned the meeting over to Mrs. Todd to present the Landfill Operations Department budget.

LANDFILL OPERATIONS DEPARTMENT

Mrs. Todd stated the main changes in landfill operations was personnel costs. She stated staff added additional funding to purchase rock for road systems due to significant rain storms throughout the year. Mrs. Todd stated there was an increase in depreciation due to new equipment purchases. She said the current radio system is obsolete so staff is looking to replace it.

Chairman Kemp commended staff for excellent work on the landfill gas maintenance. He stated he would like to see the availability of gas to where staff can expand that system.

Ms. Creech asked if the gas pumps were working correctly and if there were a lot of maintenance issues with them. Mrs. Todd stated that staff continues to maintain the gas pumps to ensure they are working properly. Mrs. Todd stated that over time the wells die off and the only way to increase was to expand the well field. Ms. Creech asked if the SWA needed more wells. Mrs. Todd said that as the Solid Waste Authority grows, more wells would be installed to capture emissions as that was part of the Tier Two Test. The Tier Two test was what dictates when the SWA fall into the NSPS regulations which are the new source performance standards. Mrs. Todd said the SWA was there with tonnage but are still below the required emissions level. Ms. Creech asked if there was money in the budget for an expansion. Mrs. Todd responded that it was in the budget.

Mr. Berry asked if any more wells would be added. Mrs. Todd responded by saying that the wells that are no longer what staff believed to be excellent producers were abandoned and a replacement well would be drilled. She said that the wells have a R next to their name, and staff was aware that some are being replaced. She stated that in order to identify the ideal sites, staff considered a few different options.

Mrs. Bitting introduced Mr. Stetter as the most recently promoted Director of Fleet and Building Maintenance and asked him to present the Maintenance Shop budget.

MAINTENANCE/SHOP DEPARTMENT

Mr. Stetter stated the biggest change in the Maintenance Department was the additional two maintenance positions that were previously in other departments that were moved to the Maintenance Department. Mr. Stetter stated this change would help to better manage if all maintenance positions were in the same department. Mr. Stetter stated a new assistant clerk position had been added. He said this would help with spare parts and with streamlining the department.

Mr. Stetter indicated that it has been a struggle to hire mechanics.

Mr. Stetter said he was looking to find cheaper parts and better equipment and to improve on current equipment.

Mr. Stetter stated the maintenance budgets in all departments had increased slightly. Mr. Stetter indicated that the MRF had a higher increase than other departments due to being in its fifth year running. Mr. Stetter said that the SWA had to absorb the increased costs of outside services due to travel fees and hourly rates.

Mrs. Bitting asked Mr. Stetter if he would provide an update on the fuel that just went out to bid. Mr. Stetter indicated that the County used state contract for fuel. However, he said in comparing the price to what the SWA paid it was twenty cents less per gallon. Mr. Stetter indicated that the SWA goes through approximately 350,000 gallons of fuel per year and that every bit of savings adds up. Mr. Stetter said staff planned to award the bid to a new company which was half a cent cheaper than what the SWA was currently paying.

Chairman Kemp stated his hope was for the SWA to get to a point where there was enough fuel to exist for at least a week in the event of a national emergency. General discussion followed.

Chairman Kemp thanked Mr. Stetter for his hard work and dedication.

Ms. Creech asked if the SWA had backup generators. Mr. Stetter said there are generators on site.

Ms. Creech asked about the condition of the equipment at the MRF and if there was any equipment that needed to be replaced in the event of mandatory recycling. Mr. Stetter said the SWA could do it with more staff. He stated the equipment was up-to-date. Mr. Stetter indicated more equipment and personnel would be necessary with the implementation of mandatory recycling. Ms. Creech asked if this would be doable with the equipment budget for this year.

Mr. Stetter responded he was comfortable with the current budget. General discussion followed regarding equipment and mandatory recycling followed.

Ms. Creech said she wanted to increase recycling in Horry County and she wanted to ensure the SWA had the capability to do that.

Chairman Kemp stated in regard to the difficulty of hiring mechanics that the SWA should give mechanics the best operating environment. Chairman Kemp mentioned the upgrades to the shop and commented that Mr. Stetter should continue improvements in order to give them the best operating environment.

Ms. Creech stated that the SWA should send all of our mechanics to mechanic school. Mr. Jones responded that staff tried and it did not work.

Chairman Kemp asked if there were programs at Horry Georgetown Technical College for diesel and heavy equipment operators. Mr. Stetter responded yes. General discussion ensued.

Mrs. Bitting asked Mrs. Murphy to review the Public Education, Recycling & Corporate Affairs and Unincorporated Collection Systems departments.

PUBLIC EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Mrs. Muphy informed the Board that the Public Education Department was developing a new mascot that would work along with the current mascot, Bruce Refuse. She said that staff had not named the mascot, but it would be a raccoon. Mrs. Murphy stated this new character would help introduce and promote recycling and environmental awareness in the schools. She indicated the new mascot would be introduced in the upcoming school year.

Chairman Kemp stated if the SWA was going to increase recycling in the area, there would need to be an increase in the marketing budget. He stated that recycling and MRF activity are not keeping pace with the growth seen in the area. Chairman Kemp indicated that staff should make sure that they are efficiently getting the recycling message to the public. He said that he does not understand why the MRF was not busier. Mr. Marr commented where he lived there was only one hauler that provided curbside recycling. Mr. Marr said the recycling centers are busy with recycling.

Mrs. Murphy indicated that many of the new residents to Horry County moved from areas that have mandatory recycling and are familiar with recycling. She said that many indicated they desire to continue recycling, but most often only if it was collected curbside. Mrs. Murphy concurred with Mr. Marr and commented not many private haulers offer curbside pickup for recycling.

Ms. Creech asked if there was any way to encourage private industries to provide curbside recycling. Mrs. Murphy stated several years ago the SWA offered an incentive to the haulers for recycling and no one took advantage of the incentive. General discussion ensued.

Mr. Jones asked Mr. Spivey if it would be practical for the County to make haulers offer recycling services. Mr. Spivey responded that he would assume that would be possible. Mr.

Knight asked if it would be possible to require haulers who apply for a business license to offer curbside recycling. Ms. Creech stated curbside recycling would help reduce the need to expand the landfill.

Ms. Creech asked if it would be possible to put recycling dumpsters in areas for residents. Mr. Marr stated if they were unmanned dumpsters they were likely to turn into garbage dumpsters. Mrs. Muphy said it could work if someone was there to man the recycling container at all times.

RECYCLING & CORPORATE AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT

Mrs. Muphy stated that staff was looking at different avenues to keep the recycling message fresh to residents. She stated staff introduced seventeen new commercials last month. Mrs. Murphy stated these commercials focused on important topics such as battery recycling, food waste recycling, and the recycle right campaign. Mrs. Muphy stated the ads ran on television and on social media. Mrs. Muphy stated the ads would run on digital platforms. Mrs. Murphy indicated the productions and the advertising of commercials was through a DES grant.

Ms. Creech stated she would allow a bigger budget for advertising recycling.

Chairman Kemp said he was impressed with the food waste recycling program at CCU. He commended staff on working in conjunction with CCU. Mrs. Murphy stated Jeremy Monday was over the sustainability program at CCU. She said one of the grants CCU applied for through the SWA grant program was for composting containers to be placed over campus.

Mr. Fox asked if staff noticed an increase in recycling from the marketing ads. Mrs. Murphy responded that recycling at the centers always had a steady incline. She stated this could be because of an increase in the population or it could be because of the advertisements. Mrs. Murphy stated several years ago staff held an event giving away compost bins and surveyed customers finding that the majority heard about the event from the advertisements.

Mrs. Murphy said based on conversations with DES and other counties, many counties wanted to mimic the SWA's recycling programs. Mrs. Murphy said staff was grateful for all funding counties received to promote recycling.

FUND 06 - UNINCORPORATED COLLECTION SYSTEM DEPARTMENT

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.

Mrs. Murphy stated two new employees were requested this year in the UCS Administrative Department. She said one position was an HEO III and the other a tradesworker position. She indicated staff was slated to purchase a mobile compactor to compact bulk waste at the recycling centers. Mrs. Murphy stated the recycling center system had close to five hundred containers that staff maintained in-house. She said the SWA also used third party contractors to help maintain equipment.

Mrs. Murphy stated that the largest increase in the budget was due to an increase in systems costs such as the new recycling center slated to be constructed. She said there was a schedule for expansions and new facilities that was developed a few years ago. Mrs. Murphy stated the FY26 budget included the construction for a new recycling center.

Chairman Kemp asked if the plan for expansions and new facilities was updated periodically. Mrs. Murphy responded the plan was reviewed annually. Mr. Spivey said the County tried to identify areas that are reaching capacity. Mr. Spivey noted the County was making an effort to target additional land to purchase for these facilities. Mr. Spivey said the County should secure the land now in order to prepare for the future.

Mr. Berry asked for an update on the new North Myrtle Beach Recycling Center relocation. Mr. Spivey noted it was in the permitting process.

Mr. Ives asked if there are funds in Fund 06 to supplement recycling efforts. Mr. Spivey noted it would take additional resources to supplement recycling efforts. Mr. Ives asked if there was political willingness to help supplement recycling efforts. Mr. Spivey noted Council was hesitant to raise millage outside of public safety. Mr. Knight stated that encouraging people to recycle was a good thing. Mr. Knight said the recycling centers would need more manpower in order to accommodate mandatory recycling. General discussion on mandatory recycling ensued.

FY2026 EXPENDITURE REVIEW

Mrs. Bitting said the General Administration Budget overall had a 7.6% increase, the Operations Department had an increase of 8.5% and the Public Education and Corporate Affairs Department had a 5.5% increase. She stated in general, there was an 8.3% increase.

DESIGNATED FUNDS REVIEW

Mrs. Bitting discussed designated funds transfers for landfill construction, closure and post closure that were discussed last year. Mrs. Bitting said the SWA had budgeted a \$4 per ton increase in those accounts based on engineers estimates for future costs. She said there was an increase in tonnage for MSW and C&D. Mrs. Bitting indicated there was also a \$2.25 per ton waste disposal fee that was sent to Horry County. She said this had increased 3.4% from the previous year. She said contingency funds are set aside for what ifs and the SWA was able to transfer \$286,349 to the contingency fund for purchases that would have to be approved by the Board. Mrs. Bitting stated overall expenses increased 14.6%. Mrs. Bitting commended staff on minimal increases this year.

TIPPING FEES AND REVENUE PROJECTIONS - FISCAL YEAR 2026

Mrs. Bitting stated the only significant changes were in the tipping fee area. She said there was a slight increase in tonnages for solid waste and mixed construction. Mrs. Bitting said the SWA had to increase the amount allocated for closure and post closure to \$4 per ton. She said staff anticipated having to increase the MSW tipping fee by \$4 per ton but were fortunate enough to only have to increase it by \$3 per ton for the MSW. Mrs. Bitting stated the largest tipping fee increase would be in mixed construction moving the tipping fee to \$46 per ton from \$34 per ton. Mrs. Bitting stated this should help detour out-of-county waste that had come into the landfill. Mrs. Bitting noted a 17% increase in tipping fee revenue from FY25 to FY26. Mrs. Bitting stated staff reached out to municipalities about the tipping fee increase and there were no comments. Mrs. Bitting noted that interest earnings were up and gave credit to Angie Jones and the Treasurer's Office for managing SWA investments. Mrs. Bitting mentioned a decline in waste tire revenues.

Chairman Kemp stated the SWA was out of space in the C&D Landfill in four years and significant costs would follow. He mentioned that money should be put aside for these costs to reduce the bonding amounts.

WASTE TIRE UPDATE

Mrs. Bitting asked Mr. Marr to provide an update on waste tires.

Mr. Marr expressed gratitude for the Board's participation in the waste tire project. Mr. Marr stated that some counties are charging \$350 per ton to haul, process, and manage tires. He said that the SC Solid Waste Policy and Management Act, which was created in 1991, permitted counties to charge \$150 per ton for tire disposal. Mr. Marr said the State's Tire Grant Fund or the Waste Tire Fund had been drastically cut. He said that the budget had decreased due to several tire cleanups Mr. Marr stated that waste tire manufacturing had some struggles in the last 3 years, He said there were certain difficulties and that grant funding reimbursements had decreased by 30% most recently.

Mr. Marr stated according to DES the SWA was not required by law to take used tires for free. Mr. Marr said that the SWA accepted two types of tires: the ST 390, which was used by retailers, and the standard tires that consumers bring in, which are priced at \$150 per ton

Mr. Marr stated the proposed legislation could charge up to \$400 per ton for waste tires. He said that allows the SWA the ability to charge, but it does not imply that staff would have to charge this amount.

Mr. Marr stated that retailers may bring tires to the SWA, but they would be charged \$150 per ton. He said the SWA should not accept ST 390 tires at no cost. Instead, the SWA should charge \$150 per ton. Mr. Marr stated that he was unsure of the future of the ST 390 program.

Mr. Marr advised the Board that it was staff's recommendation that the SWA should begin charging for tires. He stated that the cost of retailers transporting tires to the landfill does not have to be entirely paid by the County or its residents. Mr. Marr stated that while he would like to keep the price at \$150 per ton for the duration of the upcoming fiscal year, he implied that it might be lowered eventually. Ms. Creech said that was a very good idea.

Ms. Creech inquired as to whether the County's business permits for retailers selling tires state that they must report the tonnage or quantity of tires they handle. Mr. Marr stated that he was unsure if it was on the business licenses, but he did know that it was a component of the Solid Waste Policy and Management Act, and they have been using the ST390 program since its implementation in 1991.

Mrs. Bitting said that retailers would submit their ST390 form, which would show how many tires they sold during the month, and then send a copy of the form to the SWA. She generally explained the process the SWA was taking tires for free because this was the way it was set up even though it was never an accurate approach.

Ms. Creech stated that she would like to track down those who are dumping tires in the ditches. Mr. Marr stated that under the proposed regulation there was a manifesting system in place that records the number of carriers and the quantity of tires they would be transported to the SWA.

He stated that staff would have to personally count tires next year, as they were not required to do so previously. Mr. Marr said in order for the state to conduct an audit, staff must maintain a manifest record of tires.

Mr. Berry inquired as to whether staff was pleased with the \$150 per ton tipping fee for tires. Mr. Marr commented based on the numbers from last year, they were.

Mr. Fox questioned why the extra \$5 that retailers charge was not being used to cover the cost and where did it go. Mr. Marr stated that the tire retailers are free to set their own tire fee prices. General discussion ensued regarding tires.

Mr. Spivey advised the Board that good information was presented, they recommended presenting this information to Council in order for them to be educated about the problem and come up with a workable solution.

C&D UPDATE

Mr. Marr distributed a packet and discussed information explaining the landfill discussion, including the timeline created by Wayne Beam and Tom Ballou of Beam & Associates. He said that the restrictive covenant and mitigation was Part One which was on the first page under the suggested time range for long-term disposal options. Mr. Marr stated the major milestone phases were identified in the steps on Page One. He said this would give the SWA an estimate of how long it would take providing everything goes according to plan. Mr. Marr said that it might take between a year and a half to two years, depending on the mitigation and restrictive covenants.

Mr. Marr said that with this outline he wanted to show the Board what it would look like as we move forward. He explained the locations and stated the 100 Acres was on the 1187 property, the Oak Tree site was by the composting operations and the Green Space site was by the shop. Mr. Marr stated that the stages for the permitting process were listed on Page 2. He stated that the project would move onto Part 2 once Mr. Beam and Mr. Ballou completed their work and Garrett and Moore would assume leadership. Mr. Marr stated that Beam & Associates would provide assistance to Mr. Fortner.

Mr. Marr stated the options represented significant events based on the most recent Piggyback 3 permitting process. Mr. Marr said this was the worst-case scenario for a Class 3 landfill. Mr. Marr said it would take approximately seven and a half years with FIN process, which was not necessary for the Class 2 landfill permit process. Mr. Marr stated that the FIN process might save some time with the window of opportunity to proceed and obtain the permit.

Chairman Kemp questioned what would happen if the SWA ran out of room in four years.

Mr. Marr informed the Board that the next section consisted of a number of steps that Mr. Fortner put together. He stated the table discussed capacity in addition to the years and expenses involved in getting there.

Mr. Marr said that Table 1 listed the three locations—the Green Space, Oak Tree, and the 100 Acres that are currently opened. Mr. Marr said if the SWA were to designate all three as Class 2 landfills the Green Site would not be completed until 2049. He said the Oak Tree Site would give the SWA up until 2063 and the 100 Acre property to 2081.

Mr. Marr said the MSW facility was slated to reach capacity in 2051. He said that the SWA would have to request a transfer station and all of the MSW materials beginning in 2051 would be transferred out of county. Mr. Marr said that was the Class 2 landfill and it would be the same for Class 3 landfill. Chairman Kemp stated that if the SWA finished the Green Space first and the Oak Tree Site would be finished between 2049 and 2063. Mr. Marr said that was cumulative. Mr. Marr said the entire sum of the development costs for the three locations would be \$131 Million.

Mr. Marr said by adding the Green Site as an MSW facility it would extend the capacity until 2060, the Oak Tree site until 2070, and the 100 Acre Site until 2080 which was basically the same time frame. Mr. Marr said the SWA would begin transporting C&D material in 2029, four years from now.

Mr. Marr indicated if it was all C&D the SWA would not need to begin hauling until 2051, but if it was all MSW, the SWA would need to begin hauling in 2029. He stated that a transfer station was among the things the SWA should avoid doing.

Mr. Marr said that Table 3 presented a scenario that considers Class 2 and Class 3 development, which would have implications for haulers and the longevity of the SWA. Mr. Marr explained that there were two different kinds of disposal facilities Class 2 and Class 3. He stated that although it was only one example, it seemed to have the greatest potential for the money spent.

Mr. Marr said if the expansion were carried out on the Green Space as a C&D facility it would finish in 2049, and the Oak Tree site would finish in 2063. He stated that if you look at Class 3, you would notice in the final line that the 100 Acre Site expansion extended until 2067, which amounts to \$113 Million.

Mr. Marr stated that it would push C&D out to 2063 and MSW out to 2067. He said that everything kind of merges at the end about the same time. Mr. Marr said that the SWA had to haul or identify another site somewhere in the county around 2070.

Mr. Marr informed the Board that the problem was Class 2 landfill's capacity would run out in 2029, which he said based on capacity for both streams, the SWA instructed staff to determine on-site disposal options for Class 2 and Class 3 waste. Mr. Marr reported the restrictions that included the desire to avoid commingling. He stated that restrictions were placed on the SWA staff and they were asked to go out and look for solutions. Mr. Marr said three options were the Green Space, Oak Tree and 100 Acre Site.

Mr. Marr stated that if Class 2 was implemented it would cost \$102 million, Class 3 would cost \$228 million, and a combination of the two alternatives would cost \$113 Million, with both facilities being completed about at the same time in 2063 to 2067. Mr. Marr said with only four years remaining the SWA was running out of C&D capacity. He stated that timing was crucial and cost needed to also be taken into account.

Mr. Marr expressed gratitude to the consultants for quickly compiling the figures.

Ms. Creech stated that she would like to examine the possibility of mandatory recycling, as well as the various expenses, percentages, and its impact on these years.

Chairman Kemp inquired as to what proportion of C&D could be recycled. Mr. Marr stated that as of right now, the SWA was receiving between 550 and 600 tons of C&D waste per day and was diverting 100 of those tons to recycling facilities. He said the same amount of material was being processed through the shredding process, which reduced the volume by 70%. He said approximately 30% of the material entering the landfill was C&D.

Mr. Marr questioned was there a method to divert shingles. He said that was a significant portion of the C&D waste stream. He inquired as to whether sheetrock, another material that could be diverted and whether there were any markets for it. Mr. Marr stated the he was constantly searching for ways to divert material. He said there was not. Mrs. Bitting stated staff was already recycling a sizable amount. She said the material that could not be recycled either go up on the hill or to the shredder. She said that staff was recycling C&D loads effectively.

Chairman Kemp expressed his concern and said he was fully in favor of attempting to enhance recycling. He stated that he was unsure if the SWA would gain anything from enforcing recycling laws. Chairman Kemp stated that this does not imply that we would not need to proceed with the expansion. He said with good recycling; we might get it in 2063 or 2070.

Chairman Kemp said with time and airspace, we may not have the time.

Mr. Marr stated that the more diverted the longer these facilities would last. He said they would make every effort to divert as markets and technology changed. Mr. Marr indicated the SWA was impacted by the work of Mrs. Murphy, Operations & Planning, municipalities, and Mr. Jenerette. Mr. Marr said the SWA was essentially an asset that required management. He said the SWA was essential to the health and safety of all citizens, institutions, and businesses. Mr. Marr said that the next place to haul material was Columbia. He said that the SWA brings in 2000 plus tons on a day-to-day basis and the cost was astronomical.

Ms. Creech inquired as to whether sheetrock and asphalt were the largest materials that could not be recycled. Mr. Marr replied it was. Ms. Creech inquired as to whether the SWA decided against accepting asphalt and sheetrock. Mr. Marr said the goal for staff was to provide a cost-effective alternative.

Mr. Ives asked how many trucks of 500 tons were made each day. Mr. Marr said it was dependent on C&D material.

Ms. Creech asked Mr. Jenerette did he have any concerns. Mr. Jenerette said that he believed that the SWA was on the right path with concentrating on recycling. Mr. Jenerette stated that one of the most significant challenges was cardboard and large volumes of recycling that needed to be transported to the MRF. Mr. Jenerette said it takes a lot of manpower, equipment and time.

Chairman Kemp inquired what the SWA was going to do with the next three years and clarified that the goal was not to commingle Class 2 and Class 3 waste. Mr. Marr informed the Board that time was of the essence.

Mr. Marr stated that the sooner the Board decides on a course of action, the sooner the project could begin. He stated time was of the essence.

Chairman Kemp inquired how the SWA would pay the \$113 Million. He said that was the least expensive option with the longest lifespan. Mrs. Bitting advised the Board that bonding would be used to cover the costs of construction and mitigation. She stated that she had already contacted Mr. Spivey and his staff for assistance. Mrs. Bitting stated that the sooner they begin, the better.

Chairman Kemp inquired if staff was trying to find a possible funding mechanism and how much it would cost each year. He said that the SWA should start looking at tipping fees to try and reduce the amount of bonding. Mrs. Bitting stated that she could begin working with Mr. Spivey and his staff to determine what steps need to be taken to proceed but she needed direction from the Board regarding the course they choose to follow in terms of C&D and MSW.

Mr. Spivey stated that there was a combination approach to take regarding bonding. He said the new capacity's development cycle was lengthy and would be utilized for a considerable amount of time. He said normally, those who are using that capacity would pay the bond. Mr. Spivey advised the Board to not take out a loan now and not use it for five years. He said the SWA should have enough money to cover the cost of the permit process before placing a bid. Mr. Spivey stated that the SWA could stage debt from the perspective of a bond anticipation note, which is similar to a credit line. He claimed that the time frame would be shortened since there would be funds available to enter the market while the loan was being repaid. Mrs. Bitting stated that staff felt comfortable because the funds would be set aside before the construction was started.

Mr. Berry inquired whether there was additional equipment that might provide an additional lifetime for C&D. Mr. Marr stated that there was not enough sufficient material. Mr. Marr said DES would be performing a waste characterization study on C&D material and once that was completed staff could identify the material to justify the cost.

Mr. Knight said that Option 3 was staff's recommendation.

Mr. Berry expressed concern about the 100 Acre Site in the case of a significant disaster. Mr. Knight stated that the Green Sea and Highway 57 properties were set aside in the event of a natural disaster.

Chairman Kemp asked with regard to this year's budget if Mrs. Bitting included the \$7 Million in the budget for mitigation and the \$2 Million for permits. Mrs. Bitting said that \$7 Million was available for mitigation and \$2 Million was available for permitting.

Ms. Creech asked Mr. Knight which option was he recommending. Mr. Knight said Option 3. Option 3 included the developing of the Green Space and the Oak Tree areas as Class II facilities at an estimated cost of \$53,849,000 and the 100 Acres Site as a Class III facility at an estimated cost of \$85,405,500.00. This would provide C&D waste disposal capacity until approximately 2063 and MSW waste capacity until approximately 2067.

Mr. Jones moved to accept staff's recommendation to proceed with Option 3 for Future Waste Management. There was a second by Mr. Berry. The Motion was approved.

Mrs. Bitting thanked everyone for coming and expressed her gratitude to the staff, particularly Mrs. Cooke, who worked very hard on this year's budget. She also stated she appreciated the Board's cooperation. Mrs. Bitting said the County's Budget Workshop would be held on April 10th. She said that she would have a budget for July and that it would be sent to the County before returning to the Board for final approval. Mrs. Bitting asked the Board to contact her or staff if they had any questions.

Mr. Berry expressed gratitude to the employees for their diligence and hard work. He expressed gratitude for the time and effort.

Chairman Kemp expressed his appreciation and acknowledged staff for their hard work and dedication.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

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

Minutes approved on March 25, 2025.

HORRY COUNTY SOLID WASTE AUTHORITY, INC

BY: _____ (L. S.)
Robert J. Kemp, Chairman

ATTEST:

W. Norfleet Jones, Secretary

Amos C. Berry, Sr.

Pam J. Creech

Wayne Fox

Albert G. Hayward, Dr.

Samuel T. Johnson, Jr.