

Report of Special Projects Committee Meeting December 10, 2024

The Horry County Solid Waste Authority, Inc. held a Special Projects Committee Meeting on Tuesday, December 10, 2024, at 10:30 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 news media.

Present were Committee Chairman W. Norfleet Jones and Committee Members Pam J. Creech and Robert J. Kemp. Board Member Amos C. Berry was also in attendance. Danny Knight, Executive Director, Assistant Executive Director, Ed Marr and Directors Esther Murphy and Jan Bitting were in attendance. Other staff in attendance included Josh Nesbit, Trina Cooke and Monica Collier.

Horry County Assistant Administrator David Gilreath, Wayne Beam and Tom Ballou, of Beam & Associates, Craig Fortner of Garrett & Moore, SWA Environmental Liaison, Bo Ives and Highway 90 Liaison, Michael Hughes represented the public in attendance. There were no members of the media present.

Mr. Jones called the meeting to order and Mr. Kemp rendered the invocation. Ms. Creech led the group in the Pledge of Allegiance. Mr. Jones asked for any revisions to the Agenda as contained in the Agenda Packet; however, there were none.

Ms. Creech moved to approve the Agenda as presented. There was a second by Mr. Kemp and the Motion was carried.

Chairman Jones asked that everyone introduce themselves and their role.

HCSWA Class 2 Waste Future Management Options

Chairman Jones asked Mr. Knight to begin the meeting by reviewing the one item on the agenda, the HCSWA Class 2 Waste Future Management Options. Mr. Knight provided the history of the potential transfer stations in the past. He said that staff would need to find other alternatives because the SWA would eventually run out of C&D. Mr. Knight stated that the Committee had given permission to explore potential options on the landfill capacity for C&D waste. Mr. Knight said that Mr. Fortner would provide a presentation outlining the three options for the future management alternatives for Class 2 Waste. Mr. Knight said based on the information acquired today, that he would like a recommendation from the full Board of what actions the SWA should take. Mr. Fortner expressed his gratitude to Mr. Knight and the Committee Members for the opportunity to assist with this project.

Mr. Fortner provided the history of the Piggyback and explained how the SWA came to be where it was today. A copy of his presentation is attached to and made a part of the report.

Mr. Hughes inquired as to whether the wetlands needed to be mitigated and asked how long would it take. Mr. Fortner estimated that permitting the wetlands would take a year and a half, followed by three to four years of designing, permitting, and construction. Mr. Hughes asked whether the wetlands could be eliminated and what the possible effects would be on the area. Mr. Fortner indicated that the flow would not be interrupted and that the water would continue to flow as it does largely through the storm water falls and open water features on the property.

Mr. Hughes expressed concern about the flood zone and what would happen if the wetlands were removed. Mr. Fortner remarked that they are not creating a downstream flooding problem; they are improving the upstream.

Ms. Creech asked if the flooding would have any effect on Highway 90 or on any of the residents' properties on Highway 90. Mr. Fortner stated that, according to regulations, the amount of water in the wells would not be increased or affected.

Mr. Kemp inquired as to why this land was protected by a conservation easement. Mr. Fortner stated that some of the wetlands that were currently under the landfill had to be impacted and mitigated in the early 2000s and late 1990s and setting aside other wetlands was one aspect of the mitigation process. Mr. Beam went on to say that the restrictive covenant was put in place to mitigate other effects that were taking place on the property.

Mr. Hughes asked what affect the water would have on the landfill. Mr. Fortner said they would be replacing soils with engineered backfill. He stated that neither altering drainage features nor altering drainage patterns was necessary outside of the wetlands and said there would be little harm.

Mr. Fortner provided an update on the strategies of how to make the most of the available space on site.

Mr. Kemp asked whether these options could be connected to the existing landfill. Mr. Fortner stated that it was quite challenging from the perspective of stream impacting, permitting, and certain engineering issues.

Mr. Kemp inquired which direction the water was flowing. Mr. Fortner indicated the flow direction was west to east. Mr. Kemp asked whether the impact was exceedingly difficult. Mr. Fortner stated that stream effects were difficult, and the second difficulty was engineering issues. He stated that they have yet to find a solution to the landfill's low spot. Mr. Beam stated that the Corps of Engineers and DHEC allowed them to monitor impacts on both wetlands and streams. He stated that wetland impacts are measured by the acre, whereas stream impacts are measured by the linear foot of stream. Mr. Ballou said that there were several mitigation banks that provided wetland mitigation credit but it could be very challenging. Mr. Kemp inquired whether it was feasible to pipe the stream. Mr. Fortner said that it would be the same as previously mentioned. Mr. Fortner stated that there were two issues: an additional cost issue and an availability issue. Mr. Ballou replied that was correct. Mr. Ballou advised the Board that the credits were exceedingly expensive.

Mr. Fortner stated that it would require more impacts but it was possible to expand. Mr. Fortner said that the layout was based on a previous design from decades ago. Mr. Marr stated that the red and green areas signified the possible footprints for the new landfill cell and made reference to the border or other areas that were shown on the map during Mr. Fortner's presentation. Mr. Kemp asked about the number of potential additional acres. Mr. Fortner said that it depends on how far north or west you wish to go.

Ms. Creech asked Mr. Fortner about the difficulty in determining if it could be expanded. She indicated that if there was no covenant on it, it appears to be quicker and simpler for SWA. She indicated the other one seemed to have had greater impact on Highway 90. Mr. Jones said that if we use the 100 acres for a certain purpose, can it be substituted elsewhere. Ms. Creech replied that it was the storm damage debris site. Mr. Jones inquired if this was the course of action, what would be the plan for replacing that site.

Mr. Kemp stated that the space was solely for emergencies.

Ms. Creech asked if the first two sites were available to use for storm debris. Mr. Ballou said not without violating the restricted covenant. Ms. Creech asked whether the storm debris was not going to be mulched, shredded or used for other purposes. Mr. Fortner said it was primarily going to be burned. Mr. Jones stated that he understood storm debris was utilized to keep roadways open. Mr. Jones stated that the goal was to keep infrastructure open and functional, as well as to have a place to store debris so that it would not end up in the landfill. Ms. Creech inquired about how much land was used for storm debris. Mr. Jones said none that he was aware of. Mr. Knight provided a brief overview on storm debris sites on the landfill and at the MRF. General discussion followed.

Mr. Beam added that the SWA must convince the federal government that this idea was a requirement before they could obtain a permit and mitigate. Ms. Creech stated that she believed that option number three was an excellent decision. Mr. Ballou replied that the impact was so much smaller and if you were in an expanded format the start would be much more equal. Mr. Beam indicated that this was possible; it simply depended on what the SWA was willing to sacrifice. Ms. Creech stressed that the SWA had a responsibility to protect the people in these places by considering financial conservation and other factors. Ms. Creech stated that things needed to be looked at realistically, timewise, and financially in order to support communities around us.

Mr. Ballou inquired about the 100 Acres, which, according to his knowledge, was located near the new Horry County mitigation bank area. He stated that having a new landfill area would be another conceptual concern, and he believed there should be some separation. Ms. Creech stated that she agreed, but the C&D landfill was less problematic than the MSW. Mr. Knight added that if one looked back in history, C&D landfills have never been widely acceptable in Horry County.

Ms. Creech said in order to avoid venturing into another community, she advised the Board to make use of the existing land. Mr. Knight said the decision was up to the Board.

Mr. Kemp said that he did not think Class 3 would benefit from the areas that were being discussed. Mr. Fortner said that was accurate and the SWA would have to keep C&D out of a Class 3 landfill. Mr. Kemp said in 2051 the area would become smaller and said there would not be a shortage of time due to commingling. Mr. Fortner said that was correct.

Mr. Ives inquired as to whether the SWA had looked at every available piece of contiguous property surrounding the SWA's current area for possible acquisition. Ms. Creech said that it was looked into to see if there was any nearby property that was close to the landfill that the SWA might purchase or utilize as buffers. Mr. Knight reported that the County was on two sides and then there was Clear Pond. Mr. Ives inquired about the property across the street. He asked if the SWA had used the Green Space across the street and all other possible choices. Mr. Fortner replied that they are all privately owned.

Ms. Creech asked where was the Blueberry Farm location in relation to the SWA and how many acres are there. Mr. Fortner replied that was 22 acres. Mr. Ives said that he wanted to make sure that the SWA explored every option. General discussion ensued.

Ms. Creech asked Mr. Fortner what option he preferred. Mr. Fortner said that it depended on the SWA's ultimate goal. He said if the SWA wanted to maximize the life or wanted to have something in place as quick as possible. Mr. Fortner said the quickest space would be the green space. He said if you want to get the most of what was anticipated you would look at the Oak Tree site because it gives one more year

of capacity relative to the green space. Mr. Fortner said that the first option would provide you three more years than the 100 Acres.

Mr. Fortner stated that it was important to think about and understand the challenges of relocating one of your two main operations three miles away. He stated that in order to operate a facility three miles away, additional infrastructure would be required.

Chairman Jones asked Beam & Associates which of the three options would be best choice. Mr. Beam stated the first observation was that it would be easier to get a permit for the wetlands without a restricted covenant that it would be to mitigate or to remove a restrictive covenant. Mr. Beam said it would have an impact on the 100-Acre property. Mr. Ballou said that the landscape has changed dramatically since the areas were permitted 20 years ago. General discussion ensued regarding restrictive covenant and mitigation banks.

Chairman Jones inquired about the cost details and asked if the \$24 Million cost of the 100 Acrea site included in the addition of the scaleshouse and other facilities. Mr. Fortner stated that the scaleshouse and other SWA operational infrastructure was included in the cost. Mr. Fortner advised the Board that the timeline should be taken into account while evaluating expansion alternatives.

Ms. Creech inquired as to whether MSW could be extended. Mr. Fortner indicated that Class 3 MSW capability might offer approximately six years of capacity with higher development cost. Ms. Creech asked was it possible. Mr. Fortner said yes it was possible. He said the cost fluctuates.

Mr. Kemp inquired if the 100 Acres could be developed for Class 3. Mr. Fortner said that the same problems may arise and the development cost would almost double. General discussion followed.

Ms. Creech inquired as to whether the cities or county have land set aside for storm debris Mr. Knight said no, but the SWA does. General discussion followed regarding storm debris management.

Ms. Creech asked Mr. Gilreath if he had any questions. Mr. Gilreath stated that he had one issue, which was if the SWA should maintain the Green Space site next to the MSW landfill and keep the MSW concentrated in order to make future permits easy. He stated that he didn't want to advise which option was the better choice. Mr. Knight said the cost of the green area with the fencing and mitigation would be expensive and said the green space was the most practical of the three possibilities with one being the location.

Mr. Ives said that MSW verses C&D was problematic. He stated that the SWA needed to decide if the first priority was MSW or C&D. Mr. Knight informed the Board that there are choices available to the SWA about C&D. He said that he would recommend that the Green Space option be taken to the Board, where they can vote and begin the process. Ms. Creech said that the three options would be costly and that the SWA would either need to increase tipping fees or find other organizations to cover the costs.

Mr. Ives asked about the extra space surrounding the 100 acres, and recommended conducting a new wetland delineation study. He said that losing the area would also be a risk. Mr. Jones expressed his opinion that there might be some possibility and that the option should be taken off the list of options and use it for C&D. Mr. Kemp asked Beam & Associates if they believed the green space could be implemented. Mr. Ballou replied it was doable but not easy. Ms. Creech inquired as to whether it was simpler than the second option which is the Oak Tree site. Mr. Ballou said that they are equivalent.

Mr. Fortner summarized the advantages and disadvantages of the options that were discussed. He said it was clear that the green area would require the least amount of time for engineering design and construction. Mr. Fortner, said the Oak Tree site has the largest footprint and the longest lifespan of the two possibilities taken into consideration, and it aligns with the overall assessment of the facility. Mr. Fortner stated that this alternative also necessitates the infrastructure modifications and the transfer of the yard waste processing composting improvement. Mr. Fortner stated that the 100-Acre site option would have the lowest projected total development cost at the footprint of drawing and would require infrastructure upgrading. He stated that the 100-Acre site disadvantages included the close proximity to the current landfill and related infrastructure, as well as the fact that it has the lowest lifespan of the choices taken into consideration.

Ms. Creech asked if the Green Space site and the Oak Tree site had a higher price difference and if there was simply a one-year difference. Mr. Fortner replied, that was correct.

Mr. Kemp inquired as to whether the SWA could create a green area for Class 3. Mr. Fortner said that it was discussed at the Workshop back in October and that it would give an anticipated capacity for seven years while doubling the development costs from the construction side.

Ms. Creech stated that Oak Tree site could be left to handle C&D and that the Green Space site and 100-acre site would be used for MSW. Mr. Fortner said that he did not believe that the SWA wanted to relocate the MSW.

Mr. Kemp asked how many years the SWA would receive if the whole Class 3 facility was combined. Fortner said approximately seven. Mr. Fortner stated as of right now, the prediction indicated that if the SWA used the green space for co-disposal when the present Class 2 was full, 2051 would accelerate to 2044 when full since the seven years would be added back on, bringing the SWA back to 2051. General discussion followed regarding Piggyback Phase 3.

Mr. Jones said the SWA needed to choose the best possibilities. Mr. Ballou said in order to avoid having to return and review on a regular basis, he advised mentioning to the regulatory authorities in general and if they favor the visionary approach, there would be a specific technique when requesting both the Oak Tree site and the Green Space site.

Ms. Creech inquired about its completion, stating that it must be completed all at once. Mr. Ballou responded, absolutely. Mr. Marr stated that if the SWA reference the mathematical part, it becomes relevant because we are attempting to think about the C&D capacity in relation to the MSW capacity. General discussion followed regarding the Class 2 waste future management options.

Mr. Knight said if a permit was required for one of the three options under consideration, it would take more time. Mr. Ballou replied he would think so.

Mr. Jones asked if all three options were submitted and it was determined it was creating a problem, would the SWA have the option of dropping two of them and going with the one. Mr. Ballou replied 100%.

Mrs. Bitting advised the Board of the need to examine the costs for all three possibilities, which total around \$15 Million. She said that does not include construction, only to mitigation. Mrs. Bitting said that in order to build the SWA would probably need a bond. Mr. Ballou said he believed it was possible to set up a permit in such a way that the fee may be deferred over time.

Ms. Creech inquired that if the SWA selects all three options and wanted the Oak Tree site to be the first

for the C&D, the SWA would just have to handle the cost and mitigation until the work began on the other two. Mr. Ballou replied Beam & Associates would try to structure it that way.

Mr. Gilreath commented the important issue was not which option to select or start with but rather which option was the best for today.

Chairman Jones asked if the Board was in favor of handling all permits, and stated that this was the first course of action. He then said, the next decision would be which of the three options to choose. Mr. Ballou stated that Beam & Associates required a detailed strategy and that the SWA must be adaptable to changes in recycling and other areas that may be impacted. He said they would want whatever was best for the SWA. Chairman Jones inquired as to whether a recommendation for the SWA's starting point was required. Mr. Ballou said it would be a great idea. Mr. Ballou said the Green Space site was the first option that was evident when looking outward from the center, and the Oak Tree site was the second option. Chairman Jones said that he would prefer to start with the Green Space site.

Ms. Creech asked Mr. Fortner if the presentation that he provided was a good place to start. Mr. Fortner replied yes, it would be. Mr. Kemp asked if the Green Space site was being developed as a Class 1, Class 2, or Class 3 site. Chairman Jones stated he believed it would be for C&D and inquired as to whether it would be easier to approve permits for both. Ms. Creech stated that she believed it would be for the Green Space site and that the 100-acre site may be used for MSW. Mr. Kemp stated that he wanted to know if the 100-acre site would be Class 3, the Green Space site would be Class 2, and the Oak Tree site would be Class 2. Ms. Creech said that anything that the SWA can use MSW should be saved for that purpose. She stated that all three options might be done concurrently, with the Green Space site and the 100-acre site being used for MSW, the Oak Tree site being used for C&D, and during the last few years the SWA could commingle.

Mr. Ballou said choosing MSW for all three options would make him feel better. He said there are other options for C&D landfills, but not so much for MSW. Mr. Ballou asked if the SWA chose MSW, would it be feasible to incorporate C&D. Mr. Marr replied yes but it would be costly. Mr. Ballou stated that Beam & Associates would ask for what maximizes the internal flexibility for all three areas.

Mr. Ballou inquired as to whether the C&D landfill met the goal of the SWA. Mr. Marr said as a cost center, it makes more sense to put the material in the ground at \$20 per ton instead of \$40 per ton. Mr. Ballou asked if the SWA's mission was to handle MSW waste. Ms. Creech replied that MSW waste was the SWA's mission.

Mr. Fortner indicated that since everything would be changing if the SWA chose Class 3 for all the areas, he would need to conduct a different analysis for Class 3. He expressed his belief that some of the footprints may change.

Mr. Ballou asked Mr. Fortner to provide an overview. Mr. Fortner stated that he would have to conduct the same analysis for Class 3 that he did for Class 2.

Ms. Creech said the time frame was crucial to the project's completion.

Mr. Hughes advised the Board that the public would be disappointed regardless of their decision.

Ms. Creech moved to accept all three Class 2 Waste Future Management Options and asked Mr. Fortner to give Beam & Associates what they needed to move forward to apply for the permits. There was a second by Mr. Kemp the Motion was carried. Mr. Kemp inquired as to whether Mr.

Fortner could provide updated figures for the three options. Mr. Fortner stated that he would need to update the capacity estimations, cost estimates, and footprints for each of the three options. Mr. Kemp inquired as to whether the updated figures would be available by next week. Mr. Fortner said it should be ready by early January. **There being no further discussion, the Motion was passed.**

MOTION TO ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Board, **Chairman Jones moved, seconded by Ms. Creech, to adjourn the meeting. The Motion was carried,** and the Special Projects Committee Meeting was adjourned at 12:45 P.M.

Minutes approved on January 28, 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.